

DIENIȘ THE CHANCELLOR AND DIENIȘ THE CONSTABLE, A 15TH CENTURY HOMONYMY IN THE PRINCELY COUNCILS OF MOLDAVIA*

Cătălin HRIBAN¹

Keywords: *prosopography, Medieval Moldavia, joint rulership of brothers Elias and Stefan, princely council*

Cuvinte cheie: *prosopografie, Moldova medievală, Iliăș și Ștefan voievozi, Sfatul domnesc*

The fifteenth century is and will remain the classic era of Moldavian mediocrity. This is due to the two great personalities with which the age begins and ends: Alexander the Kind and Ștefan the Great. Two glorious reigns, two eras of prosperity. Between these fortunate ages stretches a quarter-century hiatus of blood and mists. Well, this is the image of history textbooks. The reality is, however, different, and a segment of this reality we try to address in this paper.

As an exceptional phenomenon in the history of Moldavia, the common reign of the brothers-princes Elias and Ștefan, the sons of Alexander the Kind, through its inherent peculiarities, contributes in particular to the decryption of certain intimate features of the social and political structures of the Romanian medieval statehood. Although a number of issues of this dual reign have been somewhat delineated and structured – such as those regarding the residence, territory, status of the two princes in relation to the Polish Crown or in reciprocal relations – the issue of the Conseil or Conseils continues to raise discussions. Regarded as separate political-administrative bodies, the issues raised by the people

* A version of this study was published under the title of *Dieniș spătarul și Dieniș logofătul: o omonimie în veacul al XV-lea*, in *Arhiva Genealogică*, IV (IX), 1997, 1-2, p. 27-36.

Throughout this paper, the “chancellor” was used as a translation of Romanian *logofăt*, while “constable” was used as a translation of Romanian *spătar*.

¹ Academia Română, Filiala Iași – Institutul de Arheologie, IAȘI.

who compose and give identity to a princely council, that is, their precise roles, their residences and the loyalties of these boyars, remain only partially solved.

The weak density of documentary sources forces us to resort to widen the range of investigative means, first of all to resort to the thorough use of existing information.

The problematics is complicated by the network of homophones and homonyms that successfully resist the standard methods of historical investigation, a network supported by two elements that complement each other, almost in the spirit of Murphy's laws: the parsimony of the scribe's pen, which often glosses over the nickname, the patronymic or the residence, and the positivist mentality of the historian, which does not allowed him/her, in this case, to lift the eyes from the parchment.

In the case of the aforementioned historian, the homonymy of two or more characters may have negative consequences: confusing up to two distinct persons or, conversely, transforming a name into two or more characters. In order to avoid such results, it is compulsory to detach from the overbearing spirit of the source document.

Such is the nature of the subject in case of the present paper: the homonymy or identity between Dieniș, the spatharius of prince Stefan II, and Dieniș, the chancellor of prince Elias. The two are present in acts between 1434 and 1452, a period that goes by several years beyond the limits of the common reign of the two sons of Alexander the Kind.

In the following, I will concisely present the data of the problem. In the beginning of year 1432, following the death of his father prince Alexander, Elias becomes the ruler of Moldavia², only to be dethroned and expelled to Poland two years later by his brother Stefan (October 1433)³. After several battles, the two brothers make peace in the fall of 1435, agreeing to share the rule of the country. Elias, as an older brother, retains the princely see of Suceava and rules of the Upper Country, while Stephen, with his residence in Vaslui, takes over the Lower Country⁴. With separate residences, separate courts and princely councils, the two brothers clearly defined their dominions: the same separatism characterized the chancery and the administrative apparatus⁵.

² Ștefan S. Gorovei, *Mușatinii*, București, 1976, p. 48.

³ *Ibidem*, p. 50.

⁴ Veniamin Ciobanu, *Țările Române și Polonia, secolele XIV-XVI*, București, 1986, p. 47.

⁵ Ioan Ursu, *Relațiunile Moldovei cu Polonia până la moartea lui Ștefan cel Mare*, Piatra-Neamț,

In these circumstances, however, Elias remains the head of state. Having his residence in the capital of Moldavia, being the only one paying homage to the Polish Crown (after September 1453)⁶, his name and titles appear in the *intitulatio* of the acts issued in Suceava before the ones of his brother Stefan, in the position of a sole ruler: “Io Elias voivode and lord of the Country of Moldavia and my lordship’s brother, Stefan voivode”⁷. It is almost certain that the tensions between the two gentlemen are far from being resolved: Stefan was not satisfied with the inferior position forced on him by his brother (somewhat against the reconciliation agreement). Therefore, the ambitious and energetic Stefan does everything to emphasize the strength he possesses and to show a status if not equal, then very close to equality with that of his older brother. In addition to holding, “against the will of his brother (...) the White Fortress and its large revenue” (according to Nicolae Iorga)⁸, Stefan’s name appears in the *intitulatio* of the acts issued by the Vaslui chancery on the same hierarchical level with Elias’ one, in the formula: “Io Elias voivode and the brother of my lordship Stefan voivode, the lords of the Country of Moldavia”⁹, prince Elias precedence being rather protocolary, being the older brother.

Both princes are aware that the so-called reconciliation is only a fragile, temporary, peace, if not just a cease-fire, because the tensions will eventually lead to conflict, in 1442, when Stefan, supported by a third brother, Peter, as well as by a part of Elias’ boyars, ousts the latter from the throne and from Moldavia¹⁰.

As a result of this evolution, the boyar camps are quite well defined. Although a number of boyars appear in documents issued by both chanceries, the differences are not hard to detect. The place of issue, the name of the chancellor and of the scribe, as well as the structure of the *intitulatio* shows to which prince, in fact, the document in question belongs.

Once this delimitation is effected, one can see a division of the boyars of the princely council into three categories. The first one consists of boyars who are at

1900, p. 56.

⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 156; Mihai Costăchescu, *Documente moldovenești înainte de Ștefan cel Mare*, vol. II, Iași, 1932, p. 689.

⁷ *DRH*, A. Moldova, vol. I, edited by Const. Cihodaru, I. Caproșu, L. Șimanschi, București, 1975, p. 206; Ștefan S. Gorovei, *op. cit.*, p. 51.

⁸ Ioan Ursu, *op. cit.*, p. 56; Ilie Minea, *Informațiile românești ale croniciei lui Jan Dlugosz*, Iași, 1926, p. 25; N. Iorga, *Studii istorice asupra Chiliei și Cetății Albe*, București, 1899, p. 96.

⁹ *DRH*, A. Moldova, vol. I, p. 211; Ștefan S. Gorovei, *op. cit.*, p. 51.

¹⁰ Ștefan S. Gorovei, *op. cit.*, p. 52.

the top of the council list, the old, rich and, consequently, important ones, who testify together with their children, boyars who, regardless of their residence, appear in the acts issued by both chanceries. With whom lies the fealty of these great potentates? The answer is a difficult one, as the differences are visible only in the changed order of their names in documents, such is the case with the names of Giurgiu of Frătăuți, Vâlcea, Isaia, Petru Hudici or *High Justiciar Crâstea*¹¹.

The second category of boyars are those who appear in the middle of the council lists, who show only seldom in the documents issued by the chancery of the other party. They are, in the vast majority of them, from the Upper Country, in the rare cases when they appear in documents issued in Vaslui they have their rank and position omitted and their places in the list differ from that in which they appear in document issued in Suceava.

The third category of boyars, which is of particular interest to us, is made up of young and/or less important ones, who always appear at the end of the list of testifying council members. Their names appear, as the case may be, **only** in the acts of one of the two chanceries. For example, we will give below, two series of boyars appearing in four documents, from 1438 and 1439, two issued in Vaslui and two issued in Suceava.

For those issued in Suceava: March 1-2, 1439¹² and July 15, the same year¹³:

- in the first category: *Chancellor* Neagoe, Stan Bârlici with his children, Mihai Popșa, *Master of the Horse* Stanciul;
- in the third category: Duma of Neamț (Dulcescul or Limbădulce – *Sweet-tongue*) with his brother Mircea and their children, *Constable* Petru, Duma son of Isaiah, Vitolt, Baloș, *Domestikos* Berindei, Manoil of Hotin, Crâstea Negru, Mîsea, Costea son of Androinic, Nemirca, Stețco son of Coșilă, Iacuș Pântecosul, *Constable* Alexandru. Written by: Dieniș the chancellor and Christophor the clerk. Some of these boyars will also be present in the council of Stefan II in Suceava, after 1442.

For the documents issued in Vaslui: August 24, 1438¹⁴ and May 10, 1439¹⁵:

¹¹ DRH, A. Moldova, vol. I, p. 197-313, doc. 143-222.

¹² *Ibidem*, p. 272.

¹³ *Ibidem*, p. 280.

¹⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 269.

¹⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 276.

-
- *Justiciar* Oana Ureacle, *Chancellor* Simon, *Domestikos* Bogdan, Simeon Turcul, *Chamberlain* Costici, *Treasurer* Thomas, Banciul and his brother Șteful, *Cup bearer* Ioan Balcean, *Constable* Dieniș, *Justiciar* Moica, *Steward* Badea, Purice, Manoil Șerbici. Written by Mihail Oțel the clerk.

One cannot include the two councilors who are the subject of the present study in the first or second category of boyars for a good reason: both have a lower position in the princely council (Dieniș the constable appears between 1434 and 1437 most often among the last four positions). A hierarchical ascension of constable Dieniș is found only after 1442, when it appears in the median ranks of the princely council list, while Dieniș the chancellor does not appear until 1441 in the list of testifying councilors, but only as the writer of the act, and after 1441 occupies positions similar to his namesake. By analogy with the boyars of the third category, the presence of one and the same person in both princely councils with different positions is practically impossible.

In the following we will try to prove, with logical, historical and – not least – paleography arguments, the above statement.

It is hard to believe that a fifteenth-century councilor could actually carry out a double position. However, there are examples: three throughout the whole Moldavian Middle Ages, except for the case studied in this paper. All three examples could hardly resist a criticism, they are found during the reign of Alexander the Kind and, besides the precarious information that the documents of the time provide on the boyars, their names are quite common: Vlad, justiciar and cup bearer (period of presumed double position – 1413)¹⁶, Dan cup bearer and sometimes chamberlain (1422-1424)¹⁷ and Stan, treasurer and chamberlain (1409-1411)¹⁸. Given the short period documented and the low density of information, one cannot really argue against the validity of these examples of double position, assuming, in the case of no confusion of names, only a brief interim of the holders in the second position.

However, the analogy with the case investigated by us is unsustainable. First of all, the two councilors belong to different categories of specialization, as the requirements for promoting a chancellor being very special and, of course, more special than those for promoting a simple constable. Then how could one justify a combination of functions in two different courts!? The two boyars were subjects

¹⁶ Nicolae Stoicescu, *Lista marilor dregători ai Moldovei*, in *AIIAI*, VIII, 1971, p. 403, 408.

¹⁷ *Ibidem*, p. 415, 418.

¹⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 415, 419.

to two princes, who were brother but still enemies, and between the two princely sees stretched a two-day trip on a fast horse! This issue can be answered by invoking the non-existence of a document that mentions both councilors, as well as the non-simultaneity of their documentary appearances. As I said, the chanceries of the two princes were geographically and functionally separated, and there is no evidence of a document truly promulgated and signed by both princes.

In support of our opinion, we will bring forward two examples of acts issued by the two chanceries at short intervals.

On August 18, 1438, in Suceava, Dieniș the chancellor seals an act written by scribe Pașco¹⁹, and on August 21, the same year, in Vaslui, *Constable* Dieniș is present in the council of prince Stefan, the last on the list of 26 boyars, after the *Cup bearer* Albul²⁰. On March 6, 1443, in Neamț, prince Stefan issues his first act as sole ruler; *Constable* Dieniș appears in the 19th position of the 32 boyars, a significant hierarchical ascension²¹. Two months later, on May 18, 1443, he appears in the council in Suceava, the 17th out of 35 councilors²², while, on May 22, in Buczacz, Dieniș the chancellor seals an act of donation of the exiled prince Elias, to Ditrich Buczaczki²³, and on May 27, after five days, *Constable* Dieniș is present in the council in Suceava, the 16th of 26 members of the council²⁴. A really great ride to reach a prince dethroned and exiled and share his sufferings, followed by another, just as tempestuous, to give testimony to some charter! The trip Suceava-Buczacz is about 250 kilometers, four days of galloping, crossing a border and going through dense forests, notwithstanding the fact that the valiant and speedy rider could easily lose his head, either during the going, in Buczacz (prince Elias being known as rash and quickly angered), or during the return, in Suceava, where prince Stefan would have not forgiven his relations with the opposing camp who he just defeated in battle!

¹⁹ *DRH*, A. Moldova, vol. I, p. 266.

²⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 268.

²¹ *Ibidem*, p. 315.

²² *Ibidem*, p. 325.

²³ *Ibidem*, p. 326.

²⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 328.

Despite these facts which would have suggested serious doubt, several historians, such as Al. Gonța²⁵, N. Stoicescu, L. Șimanschi and N. Ciocan²⁶, continued to argue against Mihai Costăchescu's earlier opinion, namely that the two councilors would be different persons.

Continuing our demonstration, we hope that we will finally separate the persons of these two boyars.

The name Dienis – Dieniș is less common in the Romanian space. Based on the Dionysius of the Classic Antiquity, widely documented in the 14th century in Transylvania²⁷ and at the end of the 15th in Wallachia²⁸, the evolved forms Dienis, Dieniș, Dinisco, Donisi, are found only in Moldavia (15th century), with only one exception. It should be borne in mind that the later mentions, in the 16th century, refer to people living in an earlier time, in the first half of the fifteenth century. Despite the high number of variants, in Moldavia they refer to only two toponyms and three people. The first of these mentions is from 1415, when Alexander the Kind gave to the Humor monastery, among other villages, the village Diianiș, a donation confirmed to his inheritors (the future village of Dianișești)²⁹.

This is followed by the donation of the same prince to the monastery of Bistrița, the village of Căucelești on the Cracău, "where there were judges Michael and Dieniș", which is mentioned in 1500³⁰. In 1428 a certain Dieniș, the son of Șerbco, is confirmed as owner of the villages of Lucaveți and Pânăcăuți³¹. And between 1434 and 1447 are attested, with a singular mention in 1451, the chancellor Dieniș with his name variants (1435-1443) and Dieniș the constable (between 1434 and 1447).

²⁵ Nicolae Stoicescu, *Dicționarul marilor dregători din Țara Românească și Moldova, secolele XIV-XVII*, București, 1971, p. 286; Idem, *Lista...*, p. 401; Nistor Ciocan, Leon Șimanschi, *Acte slavone inedite din 1443-1447 privind istoria Moldovei*, în *AILAI*, XI, 1974, p. 176.

²⁶ *Documente privind istoria României. A, Moldova, veacurile XIV-XVII, 1384-1625, Indicele numelor de persoane*, by Al. Gonța, edited by Ioan Caproșu, București, 1995, p. 152.

²⁷ *DRH*, D. Relații între Țările Române, vol. I. edited by Șt. Pascu, Const. Cihodaru, K. G. Gündisch, D. Mioc, Viorica Pervain, București, 1972, *passim*.

²⁸ *DRH*, B. Țara Românească, vol. I, edited by P. P. Panaitescu și Damaschin Mioc, București, 1966, p. 109, 190, 335; vol. II, edited by Șt. Ștefănescu and Olimpia Diaconescu, București, 1972, p. 412.

²⁹ *DRH*, A. Moldova, vol. I, p. 53.

³⁰ *DRH*, A. Moldova, vol. III, edited by Const. Cihodaru, I. Caproșu, N. Ciocan, București, 1980, p. 459.

³¹ *DRH*, A. Moldova, vol. II, edited by L. Șimanschi and collab., București, 1976, p. 103.

In Wallachia, we have only one attestation, a boyar, pan Dieniș, who is sent as a messenger to Brașov by Alexandru Aldea, in 1433 or 1435³².

As we have found, the name of the chancellor appears in several variants, while the name of the constable appears in one form. For Dieniș the chancellor, the most frequent forms are: *Dieniș* (with 13 mentions, in acts written by Petru Bârlăci, Pasco the clerk and Hristofor³³, as well as in an act written, probably, by his own hand, in 1438³⁴) and *Dinis*, with seven mentions, in acts written by Iacuș the scribe, Zancea the scribe, Pașco the clerk, Hristofor and Cristea³⁵. One should note that, besides the document already mentioned, there are four other documents probably written by the chancellor himself, in which he appears with the name *Denis*³⁶.

In opposition to this abundance of forms, the name of the constable appears exclusively in the Dieniș form, both in contemporary sources and in later mentions in the following century.

All the scribes who wrote the acts in which the constable appears have used only this unique form, a fact that is worth noting, because they are no less than 13: Oancea (later a chancellor), Gideon, Sima (a future chancellor also), Mihul (as well) and Mihail Oțel, then, after 1442, Tador, Hristofor, Oanță, Luca, Șandru, Iliăș, Giurgiu, Tador son of Prodan³⁷. It is worth noting the presence, after 1442, of two scribes who worked in the direct subordination of chancellor Dieniș, in Suceava: Tador and Hristofor, who write now the name of constable Dieniș in the good tradition of Vaslui Chancery. Also, the fact that the Dieniș form never appears in the documents issued by prince Elias' chancery shows that the scribes of the two chanceries clearly made a difference between the two homonymous boyars. The somewhat different variant *Dinișul* (high) chancellor belongs to the 1763 translator of the document, Gheorghie Evloghie the daskalos³⁸.

Following the personal data of the two characters, one can strengthen the delimitation, not only in their capacity as members of the princely council, but also in their origins, properties and their descendants.

³² *DRH*, D. Relații între Țările Române, vol. I, p. 297.

³³ *DRH*, A. Moldova, vol. I, p. 210, 241, 255, 256, 272, 274, 275, 278, 280, 286, 288, 304, 306.

³⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 252.

³⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 198, 200, 222, 227, 238, 251, 289.

³⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 216, 255, 253; M. Costăchescu, *op. cit.*, p. 802.

³⁷ *DRH*, A. Moldova, vol. I, p. 128-386.

³⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 197.

About chancellor Dieniș too little is known, except for the period in which he appears in documentary sources. It does not appear among the scribes of Alexander the Kind's chancery, so we have no data on how he promoted to be the chancellor of prince Elias. In 1436, in the fealty act given by the boyars of prince Elias to Wladislaw III in Lviv, Dinisco the chancellor of Hropotăuți is present, the 12th of the 36 boyars who guarantee the faith of their prince³⁹. Although Mihai Costăchescu mentions his seal hanging down the parchment⁴⁰, a careful examination of Ioan Bogdan's photocopy proved the opposite: the parchment strip bearing the chancellor's name hangs free⁴¹. The village of Hropotăuți remains unidentified, not mentioned later. One cannot ascertain whether the lack of seal is just a coincidence or not; it is certain that on the same date we have an act given in Suceava (September 19), written by Pașco the clerk and sealed by Dieniș the chancellor⁴². I believe that the chancellor was at that time in Suceava, as a reliable man of prince Elias and keeper of the princely seal, which he applies onto the mentioned act.

He was also quite old, as during Elias' reign he does not take part in the progressions of the princely court. He was linked to the northern part of the country and to Poland, and he did not care to return to Moldavia with prince Roman or with prince Alexăndrel, the sons of Elias. One finds him in 1451 in Sambor, on the Dniester, in Ruthenia, where he gives testimony to the reconciliation between Jan Buczaczki of Litvinov and Mihail the chancellor. The document, dated August 3, 1451, mentions six boyars, all well-known: Braevici (probably Duma Braevici), pan Pârcălabul (Manoil of Hotin), Vitolt, Șandru, Costea Danovici and Denis, who probably also writes the document⁴³. All, except for Dieniș, appear in charters issued by Alexăndrel (1453)⁴⁴, by Petru Aron (1456)⁴⁵ and even by Stefan the Great⁴⁶. Most probably Dieniș dies in exile and we do not find him among the boyars of Alexăndrel, as it was natural, given his constant loyalty to prince Elias and his family.

³⁹ M. Costăchescu, *op. cit.*, p. 702.

⁴⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 703.

⁴¹ Jean Bogdan, *Album paléographique moldave*, București, 1925, plates 94 and 95.

⁴² *DRH*, A. Moldova, vol. I, p. 254.

⁴³ M. Costăchescu, *op. cit.*, p. 802.

⁴⁴ *DRH*, A. Moldova, vol. II, p. 30, 32.

⁴⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 86.

⁴⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 137.

About the other Dieniș, we have more data: the constable of prince Stefan II as early as 1434⁴⁷, he appears for some time in positions at the end of council lists, following a constable Petru. He is attested for a period and in the council of Elias (between 1436 and 1438); for a time he even disappears, to appear again, for good, in 1438⁴⁸, and with the title of his rank. He remains among the less important councilors until 1443. After the removal of prince Elias, the constable, probably after his active participation in the coup, climbs several steps in the hierarchy, maintaining himself constantly in the median zone of the council lists⁴⁹. If until now we have found him in the company of Albu the cup bearer, domestikos Radu Pisc or Ioan Balcean, he is now ascending, appearing together with Stanciul Ponici, treasurer Costea, Toma Vereșceag, Oană Julici or Duma Dulcescul, some having made similar unexpected jumps after 1442. With these councilors, he seems to make a “team”, with frequent synchronous disappearances and reappearances.

After the murder, in 1447, of prince Stefan II by Roman, the son of prince Elias, Dieniș the constable disappears definitively. By the end of Stefan the Great’s reign, information about his descendants begins to appear. In 1492, a certain Costea sells, from the land of his ancestor Dieniș “the messenger”, a village on Crasna, Tămiceștii, to Costea pitărel, for 70 Tatar florins. This village sold by “our servant Costea”⁵⁰ is the modern village of Tăbălăești, Bunești-Averești commune, in the north of Vaslui county⁵¹. This document, as it survived through a late translation by Gheorghe Evloghie the daskalos (1787) should be taken with a pinch of salt. However, one can accept its main data, as well as the correction made by the editors of volume III of *Documenta Romaniae Historica*, series A: from Dieniș “the messenger” to Dieniș the constable.

At quite the same time, before 1500 (the date is uncertain), the daughters of Stoica Dieniș, Er(in) and Fedca, the grand-daughters of constable Dieniș, sell Toader Lazin their inherited land, the village of Rădeștii at the source of Covurluiul Sec⁵². The village is identified with the modern village of Rădești,

⁴⁸ *DRH*, A. Moldova, vol. I, p. 181.

⁴⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 257.

⁴⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 316-384.

⁵⁰ *DRH*, A. Moldova, vol. III, p. 319.

⁵¹ *Ibidem*, p. 637, index.

⁵² *Ibidem*, p. 269.

Balăbănești commune, Galați county⁵³. As mentioned above, this document survived through a translation, that of Gheorghe Radovici (1815).

This inventory is completed with original documents: in 1507, Fedca, the grand-daughter of constable Dieniș, changes the village of Mascureii de Sus, from her grandfather's charter, for half of the village Batinești, exchange made with her cousin domestikos Costea Cârje, who had received it from prince Bogdan III⁵⁴.

The fourth document with direct reference to constable Dieniș is from 1527: Fedca, the daughter of Stoica Dieniș, granddaughter of constable Dieniș, sells half of Batinești to her brothers Dragotă and Anna and their cousin Barsu, for 200 Tatar florins, the property being divided equally, a quarter for the two brothers, and a quarter for Barsu⁵⁵. Both Măscureii and Batineștii are located in the territory of Pogana commune, Vaslui county⁵⁶. A somewhat collateral document, dating from 1507, mentions a certain Voica, Ana's daughter, the niece of Dieniș (by a sister?), who sells a village, Mihăileștii on the Siret, to Ilie the master of horse⁵⁷.

By summing all the mentioned locations, we obtain a quite restricted area, limited to Vaslui county, plus a narrow strip along the Siret, in the area of the town of Tecuci. Located strictly in the Lower Country, this area makes a delimited interest zone of constable Dieniș, far enough from the village Hropotăuții of chancellor Dieniș and his Podolian interests. In conclusion, from a geographical point of view as well, there is no identity whatsoever of the personal trajectories of the two namesakes. As a result, we have a pretty complete picture of constable Dieniș's close descendance; to the above information one could add that "our servant Costea" of 1492 could very well be the same person as domestikos Costea Cârje, the son of pan Șandru and of a daughter of constable Dieniș⁵⁸.

The range of data about constable Dieniș is supplemented by two late mentions, which do not seem to have a direct connection with the descendants of the constable, but, since these cannot modify in any way the results of the demonstration, are worth mentioning: on January 5, 1635, a Dieniș of Plotonești, in the county of Fălciu (today, in Dimitrie Cantemir commune, Vaslui county), is

⁵³ *Ibidem*, p. 625, index.

⁵⁴ *DIR*, A. Moldova, XVI, I, p. 36.

⁵⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 231.

⁵⁶ *Documente privind Istoria României, A, Moldova, Veacurile XIV-XVII (1384-1625), Indicele numelor de locuri*, by Al. Gonța, edited by Ioan Caproșu, București, 1990, p. 23, p. 157.

⁵⁷ *DIR*, A. Moldova, XVI, I, p. 64.

⁵⁸ Nicolae Stoicescu, *Dicționarul...*, p. 286.

a witness to a property survey⁵⁹. The second document, much closer to the family in question, is from April 23, 1635, when Tuda, Ionașco Holteiu, Vasile Morcov, Băloș, Ion Vătămanul, Bujeniță and Nenuța sell their lands, the village of Dienișești on Tutova, which was inherited from their parents, with the settlement, the watermill weir and digging place (clay quarry, probably), to Grigorie Mașteiu Roșea for 30 thalers, in front of the alderman and the burghers of the town of Bârlad⁶⁰.

Admitting now, as a result of this demonstration, that the identification of constable Dieniș – chancellor Dieniș is unfounded, we can definitively separate the persons of the two councilors and solve one of the vagueness in the Index of person names of the *DIR* collection, series A, also perpetuated in the Index of volume I of *DRH* collection, series A, Moldavia⁶¹.

*DIENIȘ LOGOFĂTUL ȘI DIENIȘ SPĂTARUL, O IDENTITATE
DE NUME ÎN SFATUL DOMNESC AL MOLDOVEI
LA ÎNCEPUTUL SECOLULUI AL XV-LEA
(REZUMAT)*

Cercetările de prosopografie efectuate asupra nobilimii moldovene de la începuturile statalității medievale se lovesc adesea de dificultățile date de identitățile de nume, agravate de lejeritatea de transcriere a diecilor contemporani și, mai grav, a traducătorilor de documente din secolele XVIII-XIX. Articolul de față are ca subiect o astfel de omonimie, între doi membri ai sfatului domnesc, un logofăt din sfatul lui Iliăș voievod și un spătar din sfatul lui Ștefan al II-lea voievod, din perioada în care cei doi fii ai lui Alexandru cel Bun au domnit împreună, ca și din anii imediat următori. Cei doi boieri au fost considerați multă vreme ca fiind aceeași persoană, de către istorici editori de documente, cercetarea noastră dovedind, însă, fără dubii, că sunt persoane diferite, cu loialități opuse și interese funciare complet separate geografic, Dieniș logofătul în Țara de Sus, iar Dieniș spătarul în Țara de Jos.

⁵⁹ *DRH*, A. Moldova, vol. XXIII, p. 3, doc. 2A.

⁶⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 136, doc. 100.

⁶¹ *DIR*, A, *Indicele numelor de persoane*, p. 63; *DRH*, A. Moldova, vol. I, p. 454.