

**Romanian family, ecclesiastic
and confessional history,
diplomatic and ethnographic
aspects during the
Rákóczi War of Independence**

BALÁZS ÁDÁM DEMJÉN

Doctoral (PhD) thesis

THESIS BOOKLET

**PÁZMÁNY PÉTER CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY,
FACULTY OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES;
DOCTORAL SCHOOL OF HISTORY;
WORKSHOP ON ECONOMIC, REGIONAL AND POLITICAL HISTORY**

Supervisor:

DR NORBERT MEDGYESY-SCHMIKLI, PhD

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

2026

I. The research task – spatial, temporal and conceptual frameworks

The thesis examines the role of the Romanians participating in the Rákóczi War of Independence (1703–1711) – with special regards to the Principality of Transylvania, where this ethnic group was the second largest after the Hungarians in the territories recaptured during the anti-Turkish wars of liberation between 1683–1699 – the main groups of which are as follows:

- Transylvanian and Partium lay people (mostly serfs, occasionally of lower and middle nobility, together with their family members; the more prominent and widespread families and surnames – Boér, Drágos, Finta, Pap, Sztán, Sztojka, Tatár – provided with a longitudinal study from their origins to the 20th century, 1.) to confirm or refute their Romanian origin, 2.) to explore the reasons for and consequences of their participation in the War of Independence)
- biographies of individuals from Transylvania and Partium who did not have extensive family or other networks but were of proven (or at least presumed) Romanian origin; their activities before, during and after the War of Independence
- clergy from Transylvania and Partium (organised under the auspices of Emperor Leopold I (1657–1705) and the Jesuits of Vienna; with their leaders, notably Anghel Athanasius (1660–1713) and Ioan Țirca)

- the key figures in the Romanian folk tradition and memory of the Rákóczi War of Independence (primarily the activities of Gligor Pinteá (1670?–1703), the bandit leader of Ávas; and the memory of this in the ‘last Tatar invasion’ of 1717 and the 18th-century (*János Bocskor’s codex*, 1716–1739), as well as the tradition of the Reform era (*József Gaal’s historical novel Ilona Szirmai*, 1836)
- the Principality of Moldavia (*Moldova*) and Wallachia (*Havasalföld*) (voivodeships), vassals of the Ottoman Empire and a decisive factor in the uprising’s foreign policy (in terms of diplomatic history, the dissertation examines the emigration of the Kuruc movement led by Imre Thököly (1657–1705) in the 1690s, through the 1698 negotiations between Prince Ferenc Rákóczi II (1676– 1735) and Prince Constantin Brâncoveanu (1688–1714) of Wallachia; and through the Moldavian and Wallachian aspects of the War of Independence right up to the Treaty of Szatmár (1711). It seeks to provide a detailed overview of the events of emigration diplomacy, which also had Romanian implications and was active between 1716 and 1739, Kelemen Mikes’s (1690–1761) correspondence with his half-brother, József Boér of Kövesd (1695–1763), who was of partly Romanian descent, from 1759 to 1761; and are included in the thesis within the framework of drawing conclusions.)

Nationality and ethnic group: seemingly synonymous at times, but until the 1784 peasant uprising led by Horea, Cloșca and Crișan, there was no ethnic national consciousness in the modern sense; merely an interpretation of linguistic self-identity based primarily on religious affiliation and secondarily on social class. For similar reasons, this also applied to other linguistic-ethnic groups (the special class- and denominational privileges of the Romanian (*oláh*) and Serbian (*rác*) ecclesiastical elites; but also, for example, in the case of the Highlanders, who were generally serfs and, in rare exceptions, held the status of minor or middle nobility) it is more appropriate to use the terms '*non-Hungarian-speaking peoples of the Lands of the Holy Crown*' or '*ethnic groups of the Kingdom of Hungary*'.

War of Independence and uprising: these terms can be regarded as synonymous – apart from the quoted passages (which, by implication, reflect the original author's intentions at the time) – provided that the former is understood in the romantic-nationalist sense of the mid-19th century, whilst the latter is free from the pejorative and courtly overtones of the period and later (i.e. freedom is understood not as some kind of ideal or civic-national concept, but as class autonomy; and the uprising is by no means to be understood as a rebellion)

Kuruc: strictly and exclusively applicable to members of the Thököly movement – and possibly to earlier fugitives, or participants in the 1697 Hegyalja uprising. As Ágnes R. Várkonyi (1928–2014) pointed out, in the correspondence of Ferenc Rákóczi II and his immediate circle, he never actually identified his own soldiers in this way. In the case of those who joined the armed struggle on the side of those who facilitated its outbreak

in 1703 or thereafter, we most commonly use the term '*insurgent*' and, less frequently, '*freedom fighter*' (the term '*malcontents*', meaning 'dissatisfied', also occurs in the terminology of the time). After 1705, the soldiers were officially designated as *members of the armed forces of the Confederation of the Estates* – in a manner comparable to the legal status and public law interpretation found in Poland; although the former Thököly rebels among the ranks of the freedom fighters continued, despite all this, to bear the name 'Kuruc' with pride and fondness.

II. Research methodology, sources, literature

A detailed and comprehensive discussion of the aspects of the Rákóczi War of Independence outlined above – as is evident from the works cited above – has so far been lacking. On the occasion of the three-hundredth anniversary of the uprising, some studies did touch upon these aspects, but the Romanians

- either mentioned them only briefly (as one ethnic group among many – see, for example, the summary co-authored by Klára Papp and János Barta Jr. in the bibliography of this paper),
- or they have singled out only isolated moments of Romanian participation from the historical process (see, for example, the 2003 study by Béla Köpeczi (1921–2010) in the bibliography of this thesis).

The main sources for this thesis are

- the Finta family of Gelence; the Tatár families of Bellová, Csegez, Gyulafehérvár and Nagyenyed; the Sztán families of Borosjenő and Szaplonca; the source material on the Sztojka family of Máramaros and the Boér family of Nagyberivo available in the National Archives of the Hungarian National Archives, as well as data on individuals bearing the surnames Drágos and Pap and others lacking any substantive family connections, which can be found there; and the major genealogical collections (*Béla Kempelen*, I–XI. (1911–1931); *László Kőváry* (1854 – Transylvania), *Iván Nagy*, I–XII. (1857–1865));
- the most important publications based on contemporary sources (*Archivum Rákócianum I–XII*, *The Papers of Pál Ráday I–II*, *The Correspondence of the Transylvanian Consilium*; and, alongside Prince Ferenc Rákóczi II, *Miklós Bethlen* (1642–1716), *Mihály Cserei* (1667–1756), *Mihály Teleki* (1671–1720), *István Wesselényi* (1674–1734) and other memoirists);
- contemporary, and particularly late 19th or early 20th-century, native-language historical sketches and syntheses by Romanian and other international (predominantly Moldavian and Italian) historians (*Nicolae Muste*, *Anton Maria Del Chiaro*);
- Hungarian and Romanian specialist literature from the 19th, 20th and 21st centuries discussing contemporary relations between Hungarians and Romanians (noted by *Dr. Oroszhegyi (Szabó) Józsa* (1822–1870) from 1860–1862 and the synthesis written by *Gergely Moldován* (1845–1930), as well as studies primarily concerning specific sub-themes).

Main research questions:

- what role did the Romanians play in the diplomacy of the Rákóczi War of Independence?
- What stance did they take on the movement's denominational issues?
- How did they preserve the memory of the uprising?

III. Research findings

The main supporters of the Rákóczi War of Independence among various ethnic groups in Hungary and Transylvania

As the thesis shows in more detail, there were exceptions even among ethnic groups that, for the most part, did not support, or supported only to a very limited extent, Ferenc Rákóczi II (1676–1735) and his movement:

: Germans in (North-)Western Hungary:

- Bernát Wohlmuth (Prior of the Pauline Order at Felsőelefánt, delegate to the 1707 Diet at Ónod)
- Ádám Wolfart (an imperial lieutenant who defected from Győr in 1706 and became a colonel in the uprising – and was therefore executed in 1710 after his capture)

: Croats:

- József Vojnovich (a defected imperial hussar captain of Dalmatian origin, who recruited soldiers in Bosnia in 1706 for the war of independence; he had previously been Rákóczi's envoy to Venice, and later

his envoy to Poland; after his marriage in 1710, he disappeared from the historical record

: Serbs (Rács):

- Iván Belgredán (a border guard from Hunyad County, formerly a captain commanding the Bulgarian militia along the Mureş, who joined the uprising in 1704)
- Farkas Draguly (Rácz Draguly, his former subordinate, a key figure in relations with the Ottoman Porte; following the signing of the Treaty of Szatmár, a colonel in the Russian Tsar's army from 1711)

: Transylvanian Saxons:

- János Arelt and András Soppel, judges of Beszterce
- Pál Auner of Medgyes, and a certain Lengyelfalvi, a Saxon deputy to the Diet (1704, Gyulafehérvár and 1707, Marosvásárhely)
- János Zabanius (1663–1703), Saxon count (executed by Imperial Field Marshal Rabutin de Bussy (1642–1717))

: the Vends of Zala and Vas counties:

- neutrality, two-pronged self-defence
- Under the leadership of Miklós Szapáry (1680–1733), but not a theatre of operations → no significant historical record, no specific participants

Among ethnic groups that expressly supported Rákóczi:

: Saxons of Szepesség (Cipszerek):

- Orbán Czelder (1674–1717, a brigadier from Lőcse, executed in Kassa for organising a further uprising following the suppression of the War of Independence)

: Slovaks (Highland Slovaks):

- Dániel Krman(n) (1663–1740, pastor in Zsolna, Lutheran superintendent, Rákóczi's envoy to Sweden)
- Juraj Jánošík (1688–1713/1717, a bandit who changed sides several times during the military operations)

: Rusyns (Ruthenians):

- Petronius Kamiński (Kamens(z)ky) (?–1710, Orthodox priest, former guardian of Rákóczi)

Among the Romanians (Vlachs) who supported the uprising, five groups of equal size and influence can be distinguished:

- the one-off soldiers, whose identities and networks of connections were often uncertain (Balică (Balla) Vasile (Nichita), Ion Ciurulea, Bucur Cîmpeanu, Marcu Haț(i)eganu, Negru Vasile, Ștefan Sudricean-Șuncar)
- families with several members supporting Rákóczi (primarily the Sztojkas of Maramaros and the Boers of Fogaras and Nagyberivo)
- the legendary heroes of folk tradition (above all Gligor Pintea of Avas, 1670?–1703)
- Greek Catholic and

Orthodox church leaders (who often sought to represent both denominations in a single person following the Romanian schism of 1691–1692 – such as Ioan Țirca, Bishop of Transylvania and later Co-Bishop of Munkács)

- diplomats from Moldavia and Wallachia, as well as from Turkey and Russia (such as Máté Thalaba (1670?–1714?); who, alongside Sándor Nedeczky (1654–1719), was, among other things, Rákóczi's chargé d'affaires in Minsk in 1709, dealing with the matter of winning over the Serbs to the side of Tsar Peter I of Russia (1689–1725))

Families of Romanian origin who took part in the uprising

Descendants of István Boér (?–1507), captain of Fogaras,
the Boérs of Kövesd and Nagyberivó:

- Ferenc Boér (?–1720, chief magistrate of Kraszna, foster father of Kelemen Mikes)
- Sámuel Boér (in 1709 he owned 104 hereditary serfs, and through his estates beyond the Carpathians he also maintained close ties with Constantin Brâncoveanu, Voivode of Havaselvi)
- Tamás Boér (on his initiative, a petition from the Făgăraș region was drawn up in December 1705, signed by several members of the family and other influential local nobles; the petition imposed excommunication from their church on signatories who prioritised their own personal interests over the cause of the freedom struggle)

- János Boér (former cupbearer to Ilona Zrínyi; in 1706, he served as an envoy alongside János Pápai in Constantinople)
- Gábor Boér (in 1708, he served as an envoy among the Transylvanian nobles who had fled to Moldavia)

The Boér family of Boérfalva in Máramaros, who were also related by marriage to the Sztojács; and the other, of unknown first name; as well as the branches in Nagyberivo:

- Zsófia Boér's husband, Péter Kórispataki Kálnoki (?–1706, vice-captain of Háromszék and chief judge of Csík, Gyergyó and Kászsónszék)
- the husband of Zsófia Boér of Nagyberivo (?–1773), Count Ferenc Lázár of Szárhegy (1675–1742, captain of Csík and Maros counties)
- Miklós Keresztúri (?–1743, Commissioner of the Székelys and later of Transylvania), husband of the daughter of Simon Boér of Nagyberivo
- Sára Boér (?–1710), her husband Ferenc Németh of Homoródszentpál (1651–1713, former royal judge of Vízakna), and their sons, Benjámín (a member of the Noble Society) and István (captain of an infantry company)

In the case of other families, several of whose members were involved in the uprising, it is worth referring to *Gergely Moldován's* (1845–1930) His 1913 work, titled **The Romanians of Hungary**—a post-Romantic, strongly politically inspired piece (which was published on the eve of the First World War as part of the **Ethnic Information Library** series by Dr.

Oreszt Szabó (1867–1939), a *Rusyn Greek Catholic* who maintained close ties with Prime Minister Count István Tisza (1861–1918) on the eve of the First World War)

“The prominent farmers in Avas today are the descendants of the Finta, Tatár, Pap, Drágos and Sztán Kurucs.” – yet we find sources confirming the direct involvement in the War of Independence only for those with the surname (or first name) Pap and the Sztojka family, which is not mentioned here, whilst no such evidence exists for the other three families.

- Pap(p) Péter (standard-bearer, mentioned only by Gergely Moldován)
- Sámuel Pap of Margita
- and Theodor Pap, who served in an unknown location; in the case of the thirty-year-olds, their possible Greek Catholic or Orthodox Romanian origins can at least be surmised (even if not proven) based on their area of service and/or first names.

The Sztojkas of Máramaros: family records from between 20 December 1702 and 6 March 1712 are suspiciously missing; given their integration into society following the Treaty of Szatmár at the level of sub-prefect (László Sztojka, 1670–?) and, in ecclesiastical terms, at the level of bishop (Antal Zsigmond Sztojka, 1699–1770), this is hardly a coincidence...

- István Nagyidai (1641–1711; Máramaros delegate to the 1706 Diet of Huszt, son of court judge Miklós Kulcsár Nagyidai and Kata Sztojka)
- László Sztojka (1670–?; district administrator of Máramaros and Partium, later commissioner; following the acceptance of the Treaty of Szatmár, as sub-prefect, he was a key figure in repelling the Tatar invasion of 1717; among the other members of the family

include Zsigmond Sztojka; as for other individuals of Romanian origin, these include Simon Szaploneczai, Jónás Sztán, who later gave an account of the events as a juror, Tódor Karácsony, who was granted a noble title with the prefix 'of Bikszád' for his heroic deed, and Farkas (Lupu) Sándor, the Orthodox priest of Borsa)

- Zsigmond Sztojka (1651–?; juror, clerk and deputy sub-prefect of Máramaros)
- József Sztojka (?–1711; Romanian bishop of Máramaros following the Greek Catholic Union of 1691, and from 1705 ecclesiastical leader of the Rusyns in the same region)

Soldiers of Romanian origin in the ranks of the insurgent forces

The Rákóczi War of Independence had further Romanian connections; however, rebels who lacked family or other extensive networks of contacts were generally integrated into the Transylvanian military organisation:

- Ioan Bota (a lieutenant who served in the same unit as the standard-bearers György Szentmártoni and István Székely)
- Ion Ciurulea (with a Hungarianised name: János Csuru(l)ya, most likely of Bihor or Záránd origin, he already held the rank of captain in the rebel army, which he lost in July 1704, presumably for committing a criminal offence under civil law – it is also conceivable that he was executed)

- Marcu Haț(i)eganu (also known as: Hátszegi / Hatzogan; or Markó, Markuly or Márton – judging by his name, a former imperial officer of Hunyad County origin; in 1703, he joined the service of the uprising at Vetés in Szatmár, and later became a captain)
- Ștefan Raț (István Rác – presumably a Romanian nobleman from Ompolykisfalud in Fehér County who had converted to Roman Catholicism; in 1704, Imperial Field Marshal Rabutin had his library confiscated in Sibiu; although he did not actively support the struggle for freedom, he adopted a passive stance)
- Ștefan Sudricean-Șuncar (Szudricsán(y) or Sedriksán, or István Sunkár; a serf of the Belényes estate in Bihar who became a captain of a thousand during the uprising; although doubts later arose regarding his loyalty, after his captivity by the Serbs in Arad between 1706 and 1708, he rejoined the freedom struggle in Ugocsa.)
- Vasile Balică (in Hungarian: Bal(y)ika, or, according to Gergely Moldován: László Balla; a court judge in Magyarpeterd, Torda, who rose through the ranks of the rebel army to become a colonel. It cannot be conclusively established whether he is the same person as the marauder Nichita, who was murdered by a butcher's apprentice in 1712)
- Bucur Cîmpeanu (Kimpian Bukur – a bandit from Arad County, who fled to Wallachia in 1709, where he was executed by Constantin Brâncoveanu)

- Vasile Negru (Black Vasile, also appears as ‘Vasul of Olah-Bölkény’, László Mojszén – a poor young man and bandit from Aranyoslón in Torda County)

Greek Catholic–Orthodox Romanian struggles in the shadow of the War of Independence

Romanian Greek Catholic denominational organisation:

- Emperor Leopold I’s initiative of 1691–1692 (an agreement with Rome, similar to the 1646 Ruthenian Union of Uzshhorod, among the Olahs of Transylvania and Partium)
- At the synod of 1697, Theophilus (?–1698), Bishop of Gyulafehérvár, accepted the religious union with the Catholics; after his death, his successor was Anghel Athanasius (Atanasie, Atanáz, 1660–1713), who was also supported by the Jesuits in Vienna
- From 1698, Athanasius’s rival for the episcopal title – with the support of the Hungarian Reformed community in Transylvania – was the Orthodox Ioan Țirca, who did not support the union (in the Hungarian version of his name: C(z)irka or Circa János, or Jób – having been released from imperial captivity, he eventually became the Orthodox co-bishop of József Sztojka in Máramaros from 1709)
- The Diploma Leopoldinum of 1699: the exemption of converting priests from feudal dependence, tithes and corvée labour
- the reception of Greek Catholics was rejected by the Transylvanian Diet of 1701

- From 1702, local authorities burned down Greek Orthodox monasteries in several settlements around Fogaras → this violence also drove some of the Uniates into the camp of the discontented

Members of the Romanian lower clergy who emerged during the War of Independence:

- an adventurer from Háromszék, referred to as an ‘olá pap’, who left his silent family behind
- the priest from Petrozsény in Hunyad County and the priest from Széplak (probably in Kolozs County), both of whom fell victim to horse theft

Romanian ecclesiastical diplomats in Wallachia in 1707:

- Damaschin (Archbishop of Râmnic in Wallachia)
- David Corbea (?–1707, priest-chancellor (*logofăt*), who had previously spent time in Transylvania and Hungary; in 1688, following the imperial takeover, he moved from Braşov to Bucharest. First, as an envoy of Constantin Brâncoveanu, Voivode of Wallachia, he interceded with Tsar Peter I of Russia regarding the matter of Rákóczi’s potential kingship of Poland, and then entered the Tsar’s service, remaining there until his unexpected death during this mission.)

In discussing the denominational aspects of the Romanian War of Independence, it may be stated that – contrary to Aladár Mód’s (1908–1973) dichotomy of ‘reactionary Greek Catholics and revolutionary Orthodox’

— for different reasons, though primarily by accepting the principle of religious tolerance, the overwhelming majority of both the Greek Orthodox and the Uniates sided with the uprising.

The memory of the Rákóczi War of Independence in Romanian folk tradition – the memory of Romanian participants in Hungarian literature

At the heart of the Romanian folk tradition surrounding the Rákóczi War of Independence is the outlaw leader Gligor Pinteá, who was born around 1670 in Hollómező (*Măgogia* or *Măgoaja*) in Inner Szolnok; According to Rákóczi's Memoirs, during the siege of Nagybánya between 14 and 22 August 1703, he broke down the city gate, for which he was shot by Councillor István Décsy.

Romanian variants of the legend (based on the collections of Ion Muşlea (1899–1966) and Ovidiu Bîrlea (1917–1990)): *Valea lui Pinteá* (Pintye's Valley), *Năzdăvanul Pinteá* (Pintye the Wonder-Worker), *Pinteá Viteazul* (Pintye the Brave), *Hora Pint'ei* (Pintye's Dance – ballad) were collected by Romanian ethnographers. Hungarian variants (Nagybánya-Veresvíz, based on the collections of István Görbe (1935–2010)):

Pintye's Tree, Pintye and the Pandurs, The King of Avas, Pintye and the Noblewoman, Pintye's Barber, Pintye's Cave, The Death of Pintye the Brave, God, the Devil and Pintye.

Geographical place names (in the regions of Dorna and Naszód, along the Szamos, around Nagybánya, in Bihar, Szilágyság and Máramaros): *Poiana Pinteá* (Pinteá's clearing), *Fîntîna Pintii* (Pinteá's well), *Şatra Pintii* (Pinteá's tent), *Dealul Pintii* (Pinteá's hill), and in the same area his cave, spring, inn, cellar, and even the well and stone table at Beszterce-Naszód, where he is said to have hidden his treasures.

József Gaal (1811–1866): *Ilona Szirmay* – the first Hungarian historical novel, the story of the fictitious, secret brotherly relationship between Pintye and Tódor Karácsony, the hero of the defence against the 1717 Tatar invasion

Pintea (The Captain of the Poor): a film containing largely fictional elements, a defining work in 20th-century Romanian cinema history – in the three decades following its release (1976–2007), it was seen by nearly five million viewers!

(Screenwriters: Vasile Chiriță and Dumitru Mureșan; director: Mircea Moldovan (1936–2020); lead actor: Florin Piersic (1936–).)

Romanian diplomatic relations in Transylvania, Moldavia and Wallachia, and participants in the Rákóczi War of Independence

- following the stay in Wallachia of the fugitives from Thököly's emigration after the Battle of Zernest in 1690, in 1698 Rákóczi consulted with the voivode of Wallachia, whilst Thököly consulted with the voivode of Moldavia
- during the first phase of the War of Independence (1703–1705): initially, Rákóczi's main foreign policy ally was Moldavia (~ Leopold I's unsuccessful attempt, via Lőrinc Pekry – who was still on the imperial side at the time – to recruit Transylvanian mercenaries)

- In March 1704, a delegation led by Mihály Henter, deputy captain of Háromszék, and István Daniel Vargyasi, adjutant-general, visited the court of Constantin Brâncoveanu and Mihai Racovița (voivode of Moldavia during the War of Independence: 1703–1705 and 1707–1709)
- The lively economic relations between Rákóczi and Brâncoveanu in the first half of 1705: shipments of oats and millet in exchange for copper from Torockó and cheap cattle; the removal of obstacles from the postal route between Háromszék and Wallachia
- From 11 November 1705: the reception of exiles in Moldavia and Wallachia following the lost Battle of Zsibó – under the leadership of General István Thoroczkay (1649–1712) and the Szekler nobleman Péter Kőrispataki Kálnoki (?–1706), a Székely noble; however, there were also pro-imperial emigrants (though they later also sided with Rákóczi). (The second wave of emigration by the rebels to Moldavia – following the renewed loss of Transylvania, and specifically the forced surrender of Görgény Castle, from 1708 onwards – was led by Mihály Mikes (1661–1721), Captain-General of Háromszék.)
- during the second phase of the War of Independence (1705–1707): the mission of Mihály Bay and Gáspár Pápai through Moldavia to the Crimean Peninsula, to the Tatar Khan Gázi Giráj III (1704–1707) – establishing contact with the Hungarians of Csöbörösök
- Good relations between the envoys of Moldavia and Rákóczi's court (Alexandru Mavrocordat and Ferenc Horvát of Ládony)

- 1706–1709: a three-year, unsuccessful boyar uprising led by his maternal uncles, Constantin and Mihai Cantacuzino, aimed at deposing the Wallachian voivode Brâncoveanu – Rákóczi remained neutral
- First Transylvanian Romanian diplomats: ‘a Wallachian man named Volni’, Sztán Magos, Miklós (Nicolae) Posta, Todoran Ternaveanu (served as chief courier at the Porte in 1706–1708), Máté Thalaba (the prince’s envoy to Russia alongside Sándor Nedeczky (1708–1710), who also maintained close ties with the Boér family of Nagyberivo, and negotiated at the Porte in 1711)
- 1707–1708: Transylvanian-made paper and Hungarian scribes at the courts of Moldavia and Wallachia
- issues relating to the Diet of Marosvásárhely in April 1707: princely capitulation with the obligation of good neighbourly relations with Moldavia and Wallachia; the reclamation from the voivodes of serfs who had fled beyond the Carpathians; holding to account the trustees responsible for the estates of nobles who had gone into hiding following the defeat at Zsibó; legal redress against the boyars of Moldavia and Wallachia who had seized land on the border; a ban on the import of copper coins from Wallachia and the export of silver coins; the annulment of the unconstitutionally acquired privileges of the two Oláhfalva villages in Udvarhely County, inhabited by settled Romanians

- From spring 1707 to autumn 1708: David Corbea's failed mission; an unsuccessful attempt to win over Orthodox Serbs, similar to that of the Romanians
- December 1707: The mission to Wallachia and Moldavia by Jakab Grabarics, inspector of Bihardiószeg, Érchegeység and Abrudbánya
- following the defeat at the Battle of Trencsén on 3 August 1708: the mobilisation of Moldavian exiles
- in the final phase of the War of Independence (1709–1711): relations with Moldavia and Wallachia were increasingly confined to dealings with emigrants; their significance in foreign policy diminished considerably in parallel with developments in the military situation in Hungary and Transylvania
- following the Peace of Szatmár on 30 April 1711: for Rákóczi, the political reality was to be listed as Prince of Transylvania in the texts of the Peace of Utrecht (1713) and the Peace of Rastatt (1714)
 - In January 1712, the promise of Abrudbánya to Brâncoveanu, Voivode of Wallachia, in exchange for his mediation, but the plan came to nothing
- The Tatar invasion via Moldavia in 1717
- In 1735, the unsuccessful attempt to place József Rákóczi (1700–1738), invited from France, on the throne: the unexpected death of the late prince's son in Cernavodă, Dobruja, on 10 November 1738

Possible continuation of the research:

- further Romanian (Moldavian and Wallachian) aspects of the diplomatic relations of the Rákóczi emigration (1711–1761)
- the survival of the Romanian Rákóczi memory in public discourse (speeches, memoirs, memoranda) and education policy (textbook publishing) to the present day
- the extension of the study to other ethnic groups involved in the Rákóczi War of Independence

IV. List of publications on the subject

1.) “Amicizia di cuore o di carbone?” – the role of Wallachia, Moldavia and Transylvanian-Romanian diplomats in Rákóczi’s War of Independence

In: *Études sur le XVIII^e siècle V. Editura Universității din București, Bucharest, 2016, 7–21.*

ISBN (of the series): 978-973-737-906-1

ISBN (of the publication): 978-606-16-

0718-1

2.) Notes on the relationship between the Rákóczi War of Independence and Romanian denominationalism, with particular

reference to the Boér family of Nagyberivo In: *Church History Review XVIII/1, Scientific Collections of the Reformed College of Sárospatak, Sárospatak, 2017, 3–20.*

ISSN: 1585-7476

3.) The Boér family of Nagyberivó and their role in Rákóczi's War of Independence

In: Études sur le ^{XVIII}e siècle VI. *University of Bucharest Press, Bucharest, 2018, pp. 7–17.*

ISBN (of the series): 978-973-737-906-1

ISBN (of the publication): 978-606-16-0992-5

4.) “The maid who served the blessed princess”. From court servants to *homo principes*, or continuity among the retinues of Ilona Zrínyi, Imre Thököly and Ferenc Rákóczi II (focusing on the Boér family of Nagybeirvó)

In: Res Publica Confoederata. Studies in honour of the 375th anniversary of Ilona Zrínyi's birth

and the 315th anniversary of her death, *Szent István Társulat – The Apostolic See's Publishing House, Budapest, 2018, 62–71.*

ISBN: 978-963-277-782-5

5.) *(as co-editor of the collection of studies; and as organiser of the international conference held in Košice on 28 October 2019, which formed the basis of the volume)*

“Pinte, Pinte, viteaz Pinte”. The memory of a Wallachian soldier-bandit and his companions in the Rákóczi legend

In: The Memory of Ferenc Rákóczi II. Studies in honour of the 315th anniversary of the election of Ferenc Rákóczi II as Prince, *Szent István Society – Publisher of the Holy See, Budapest, 2021, 151–159.* ISBN: 978-963-277-937-9

6.) “A friendship of the heart or of convenience?”. Wallachia and Moldavia, and the role of Romanian diplomats in the Rákóczi War of Independence

In: From the Caucasus to the Leitha II. Apocalypticism, identity, history and culture in Central and Eastern Europe. Festschrift for Sándor Őze on his 60th birthday, *Erdélyi Szalon Publishing House, Budapest, 2023, 196–216.*

ISBN (of the series): 978-963-646-061-7

Forthcoming:

7.) Romanian Uniates and Orthodox Christians at the Turn of the 17th and 18th Centuries. Denominational Organisation in the Shadow of the Rákóczi War of Independence

In: *‘He taught my hands to fight, my fingers to battle...’. The relationship between religion and wars in the Middle Ages and early modern period* (HM Institute of Military History – PPKE-BTK TDI – PPKE “Denomination and Identity” research group, Bálna Defence Centre, 9 May 2024) conference proceedings, *Budapest, 2026 (?), 12 pages*