D. P. SOULIOTIS

A GREEK PRELATE IN THE TATAR KHANATE OF THE CRIMEA
IN THE EARLY SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

The existing Greek sources relating to the Tatar Khanate of the Crimea before it was annexed by Russia (1792), and particularly between the end of the sixteenth century and the midseventeenth century, are few and obscure. Information about Greeks in the khanate during this period is conspicuously absent. Consequently, the discovery of a Greek source relating to this region is, I think, of particular interest, especially when it contains details and information which are not found in other contemporary Greek or non-Greek testimonies.

One such source is an unpublished and hitherto unstudied Greek document, which I have located in the National Library of Budapest, and which

1. A well-documented work (based on Russian, Polish, and, particularly, Turkish sources) is Carl Max Kortepeter's *Ottoman Imperialism during the Reformation: Europe and the Caucasus* (New York and London, 1972), which, despite the title, chiefly concerns the khanate of the Crimea at the end of the sixteenth and beginning of the seventeenth century. For a general bibliography relating to the khanate, see the collection of documents titled *Le Khanat de Crimée dans les archives du musée du palais de Topkapi* (Paris, 1978), pp. 405-23.

2. See, e.g., K. A. Palaiologos's old survey, «Ο ἐν τῇ νοτίϊς Ρωσίᾳ Ἕλληνισμός ἀπὸ τῶν ἀρχαίων χρόνων μέχρι τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς», *Παρνασσός*, 5 (1881), 409-20, 535-50, 585-616. Concerning the Greeks of the Mariupol' region in particular, from the fifteenth to the eighteenth century, see I. I. Sokolov, “Mariupol'skie Greki”, *Trudy Instituta Slavjanovenija Akademii Nauk SSSR*, 1 (1932), 297-317. However, references in these studies to the period which concerns us here are sketchy in the extreme. Turkish sources relating to the khanate, with sporadic references to the presence of Greeks in the Crimea (in the eighteenth century), are to be found in *Le Khanat de Crimée*, 26, 28, 231, 232. On the other hand, sources and literature relating to Greeks in the early period of Russian domination over the region are quite satisfactory, at least from the point of view of quantity. See, e.g., the sources and publications cited by Stephen K. Batalden in *Catherine II's Greek Prelate Eugenios Voulgaris in Russia, 1771-1806* (New York, 1982), pp. 146f., 172f. Finally, with respect to the Greeks' presence in the Crimea generally, Kostas Fotiadis offers plentiful historical information in *Ο Ελληνισμός της Κριμαίας: Μαριούπολη, δικαίωμα στη μνήμη* (Athens, 1990): for the period which concerns us here, see pp. 29-30; for the bibliography, pp. 106-9.
forms the Appendix of this article\(^3\). It is an original letter written, as we shall see directly, in March 1609 by a Greek prelate, Archbishop Nectarius of Ochrid. Written in “Γκιοζλάβι” (1. 8) — i.e. the town of Gözlev (which later became the Russian Yevpatoriya) in the south-west Crimea — it is addressed to a certain “Prince of Dacia, voivode Bogdan”, who was in Constantinople at the time (1. 26: “αυτού εἰς τὴν Πόλιν”)\(^4\).

Nectarius’s letter is written in the vernacular, with a few orthographical variations and the usual misplaced accents encountered in similar Greek texts of the same period\(^5\). The letter is dated at the end (ἐν μηνί Μαρτίω ζ′); again at the end, there is also the indiction VII (Μηνί Μαρτίω ἱδικτιώνος ζ′) in green ink, as was the custom of the Archbishops of Ochrid when signing official documents. If we correlate the indiction with the historical data contained in the document, we arrive at the precise date of 7 March 1609\(^6\).

Archbishop Nectarius of Ochrid is by no means unknown; however, we have only limited and fragmentary information about him, chiefly relating to his wanderings through central and eastern Europe and Russia\(^7\). It is difficult even to determine precisely when he was on the archiepiscopal throne.

3. I should like to thank those who have helped me in my work: Mr István Kapitányfi, Prof. of Byzantine Literature at the University Eötvös Lorand of Budapest, for his observations concerning the reading of the document and also his essential aid to this introduction; Ms Orsolya Karsay, Head of the Department of Greek Manuscripts in the National Library of Budapest, for her unreserved support; and my friend I. K. Hassiotis, Professor of Modern History at the University of Thessaloniki, for bibliographical and historical information about almost all the persons and events mentioned in the document and his drastic interventions in the final text of this study.


5. The letter is written in the standard minuscule script of the *codices novelli* of the first centuries of the Ottoman era (E. Mioni, *Εισαγωγή στην ελληνική παλαιογραφία*, trans. N. Panagiotakis, Athens, 1985, pp. 80f.).


This is not a problem exclusive to Nectarius, however; it also relates to other Archbishops of Ochrid, for they persisted in using their ecclesiastical title—without the proper clarification “former” (πρώην)—even after they had left the see, having been either downgraded or dismissed from it. Almost without exception, all the former Archbishops of Ochrid, who for various reasons left the Orthodox East, followed this “non-canonic” practice.

Thus, we find Nectarius apparently Archbishop of Ochrid in a document of 14 August 1598, when precisely the same ecclesiastical title was borne by Athanasius Rizeas (his possible predecessor and successor), a well-known Greek prelate, particularly for his revolutionary initiatives and his long wanderings in the West. A few years later, at the beginning of the seventeenth century, when he was far from his see once more in France and the Netherlands, Nectarius again had no qualms about calling himself Archbishop of Ochrid. In the time of Boris Feodorović Godunov, Grand Duke of Muscovy (1598-1605), we find our beleaguered prelate, this time in Moscow using the title yet again. It should also be borne in mind that the fact that Nectarius uses the title in the present document, even though he is no longer far away in the West or in Moscow, but rather in an area which was then under the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the Oecumenical Patriarchate, does not necessarily mean that he had recovered his archiépiscopal see in Ochrid. Equally unreliable evidence of this is the fact that Nectarius mentions having met the local Orthodox Metropolitan of Gothia at Balaklava. Consequently,

8. See the difficulties in drawing up lists of bishops experienced by H. Gelzer, Der Patriarchat von Achrida: Geschichte und Urkunden (Leipzig, 1902). Cf. D. A. Zakythinos, «Συμβολαί εἰς τὴν ἱστορίαν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν Ἀχρίδος καί Ἰπεκίου», Μακεδονικά, 1 (1940), 429-58 (partic. 440-7). For further examples of the abuse of the title by other former archbishops of Ochrid, who were removed from the archiepiscopal throne after Nectarius’s time, see Varnalidis, O αρχιεπίσκοπος Ἀχρίδος Ζωσιμάς, 55-7. Literature relating to the history and the archbishops of the Ochridan archiepiscopate is listed in I. E. Anastasiou, Βιβλιογραφία των επισκοπικών καταλόγων τον Πατριαρχείον της Κωνσταντινουπόλεως και της Εκκλησίας της Ελλάδος (Thessaloniki, 1979), pp. 70-2.


13. Appendix, lines 33-4: “Thus I told the overlord that I had business in Balaklava and was to meet the Metropolitan of Gothia” (Έτζι ἐγὼ ἔπα τὸν ἄρχον πῶς ἐξι δουλεῖα ἔς τὸ Μπαλοκλαβά, νὰ σμιξω τὸν μητροπολίτην τῆς Γοθθίας). Unfortunately, we have
just as little actual credence may be given to Nectarius's use of the title of Archbishop of Ochrid during his second visit to Russia, which took place a few years after his journey to the Crimea. And this regardless of the fact that, during his second Russian sojourn, the busy prelate embarked upon a new career in 1613 as Archbishop of the Russian ecclesiastical province of Vologodskaya.

Nectarius seems to have had close connections with Moldavia. To begin with, there was the tradition of the Ochridan Archbishop's at least nominal jurisdiction over the episcopates of “Hungro-Wallachia and Moldavia” or—as these two Danube principalities were also sometimes called—of “(Inland and Riverine) Dacia”. Nectarius's own repeated visits to Moldavia were probably connected with this tradition. In 1598, for instance, while on his way to Moscow via Poland, he remained on Moldavian territory for over a year. Two years later, in June 1600, we find him there once again, actively participating with other Greek prelates in the politically significant ecclesiastical council which had been convened in the old Moldavian capital, Suceava, by the rival of Yeremiya Movila, Mihai Viteazul, voivode of Wallachia and Moldavia (1593-1603).
Nectarius’s connection with Moldavia and its voivodes is clearly apparent from the contents of the letter under discussion here. As we have said, the letter is addressed to the “Prince of all Dacia, voivode Bogdan”, who seems to be directly concerned by most of the information it contains. Naturally, quite a number of sixteenth-and seventeenth-century Moldavian princes were called ‘voivode Bogdan’; but the additional data contained in the address on the verso enable us to determine the recipient’s identity with precision and certainty: “To be delivered to the supreme and most eminent master, voivode Bogdan, Prince of Dacia, son of voivode Ioannes Iancu, at the residence of the Ambassador of England» (Τφ ύψηλοτάτω και έκλαμπρωτάτω αυθέντη, τφ Μπογδάν βοηβόντα, τφ ήγεμόνι Δακίας, υίφ Ίωάννου Γιάνκουλα βοηβόντα, είς οίκον ελτζή τφς Ἑγγλέτερας, εύ δοθείη)19. He is, then, the son of Iancu Sasul, Prince of Moldavia (1579-82), and none other than Stefan Bogdan, quite a well-known figure in Moldavian history20. He had indeed sought refuge, in an attempt to evade arrest by the Turks, in the residence of the British ambassador to Constantinople — who at that time (1606-11) was Sir Thomas Glover21 — and in fact spent at least two years there (from 1608 to 1611) stubbornly demanding that the Sublime Porte give him the throne of Moldavia. I do not intend to recount this adventurer’s chequered life story here: besides, many aspects of it were published ninety years ago by the eminent Romanian historian Nicolae Iorga, who also investigated the activities of other pretenders, whether legitimate or not, to the Moldavian throne22. In that turbulent period of Moldavia’s history, they were encouraged by the obscure system of succession operating in this Danube principality, as also by the confusion arising from the constant and blatant interference in the region of a number of warring external factors (the ruling

19. Ιω(άννης) was, of course, part of the rather singular title of all those who were appointed voivodes of Moldavia: see G. Nandris, “L’origine de Ιω dans le titre des souverains bulgares et roumains”, Revue des études slaves: Mélanges André Vaillant, 30 (1964), 159-66. Cf. Evlogios Kourilas, «Τὰ χρυσόβουλλα τῶν ἡγεμόνων τῆς Μολδοβλαχίας καὶ τὸ σύμβολον Ιω ἢ Ιωάννη», Εἰς μνήμην Σπυρίδωνος Λάμπρου (Athens, 1935), pp. 245-54.


Ottomans, the Crimean Tatars, the Hungarian princes of Transylvania, the Habsburgs, the Poles, and the Russians). Nectarius's letter, then, confirms that Stefan Bogdan did not abandon his efforts to take the Moldavian throne during his long stay in the British embassy in Constantinople. Furthermore, the British ambassador not only took him under his wing, protecting him with an armed guard of British and Moldavian soldiers, but also spent a great deal of money in the furtherance of his cause and came into frequent conflict with the Ottoman officials. As a result of this friction and his ultimate failure to put Stefan Bogdan in the place of the Poles' protégé, voivode Constantin Movila of Moldavia (1607-11), Glover was eventually recalled to London. A Venetian source, dated 28 October 1608, informs us that "questo principe Steffano Bogdano, con il favore dell'ambasciatore d'Inghilterra, si maneggia grandamente per ricuper il suo stato, et farne scacciare il principe regnante; et in suo favore sono venuti molti Bogdani, fastiditi dal governo de' Polachi, et anco questo ambasciatore del Tartaro se gli mostra favorevole. Ma la conditione de' tempi gli e molto contraria, come anco contrarissimo se gli dimonstra il Bassa luogotenente". Other evidence too attests the British ambassador's staunch support of Stefan Bogdan. A Spanish source, for instance, of December 1610 mentions the vast amounts of money the British diplomat spent to maintain the exiled Moldavian at his house and also his systematic, albeit unsuccessful, efforts to obtain "un arz, que es lo mismo que villete o consulta, del Primero Visir, para que el Turco mandasse, que el principe de Moldavia fuese restituydo en su estado". It should be noted, finally, that Stefan Bogdan did

23. Cf. the case of a Greek pretender to the Moldavian throne in the period which concerns us here in I. K. Hassiotis, "George Heracleus Basilicos, a Greek Pretender to a Balkan Principality", Balcanica, 13-14 (Belgrade, 1982-3), 85-96.
25. It was not a question of "restoration", of course, since Stefan Bogdan had never held power in Moldavia in the first place.
26. Regarding the interference of Poles and Tatars in Moldavia's domestic affairs in the early 1600s, see Kortepeter, Ottoman Imperialism, 174f.
27. Hurmuzaki, Documents, IV/2, p. 300. The "Bassa luogotenente" must be Murad, known as Kuyüzü, who was of Croatian descent and Grand Vizier from 1606 to 1611; for his activity and influence, see Kortepeter, Ottoman Imperialism, 224.
28. A. Ciorănescu (ed.), Documente privitoare la istoria Românilor culese din arhivele din Simancas (Bucharest, 1940), p. 233, where there is also a reference to the British diplomat's displeasure "assi per la reputación que perdió en no salir con su pretension, como por los gastos que ha hecho con el Moldavo el tiempo que le ha tenido en su casa". Concerning the significance of the term arz, cf. G. Moravcsik, Byzantinoturcica, II, third edition (Berlin, 1983), p. 71.
not cease his efforts to take the Moldavian throne even when he was imprisoned in Abydos (in "the Dardanelles fortresses"), nor yet when he managed to pass — again with the British ambassador's help — to the West (between February 1604 and July 1608) in order to secure the Christian rulers' support in achieving his demands.

Our document also confirms the information in available Western sources to the effect that a good many Moldavians not only rejected Constantin Movila as ruler of their country, but also sent representatives first to Constantinople and then to the Crimea in order to persuade both the Ottoman sultan and the Tatar khan to intervene and 'restore' Stefan Bogdan to the Moldavian throne. This effort to obtain the Tatars' intervention on Bogdan's behalf may be explained by the fact that the principality of Moldavia was to a certain extent practically subject to the khan of the Crimea. Nectarius's letter clearly mentions that the Moldavian representatives were in Gözlev throughout the month of November, obviously after the failure of Stefan

29. For his wanderings in the West and the appeals made by him and his representatives, see Iorga, "Pretendenţi domnesci", loc. cit. Cf. Pippidi, Tradiţia Politica, p. 196, 200, and Ciorănescu, Documente, 224-30, 233. The efforts of Geronimo Meoli, the special envoy of "voivode Stefan of Moldavia", to secure Spanish support on the Italian peninsula are mentioned in a number of documents in the Spanish archive of Simancas, Sección de Estado, file 1948, Nos 140-50, 165, 170-4, 183-8, 189-93. Concerning Stefan's earlier activities and his arrest, cf. Sección de Estado, file 1346, No 149 (information supplied by Prof. Hassiotis).

30. Even the Prince of Transylvania, Gabriel Bâthori, apparently advised the Sublime Porte in 1610 and 1611 to restore Stefan Bogdan to the Moldavian throne. This, at least, is what may be understood from an anonymous Spanish source of early November of that year, published by Ciorănescu, Documente, 233: in Bâthori's opinion, "no avrà quietud en la Moldavia [from the Poles' constant interference], si no se beuelve el govierno a Giancola Bugdano [he obviously means his son], a quien favorece el embaxador de Inglaterra alli residente". On Bâthori's efforts in the interest of Bogdan also consult E. Veress, Documente privitoare la istoria Ardealului, Moldovei şi Tarii Romanesti, vol. VIII, Bucarest 1935, pp. 115, 128-132, 163-165, 183-184.

31. For examples between the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century, see Korte-peter, Ottoman Imperialism, 8, 32-3, 136-7, 143-6, 148-9, 172-3, 181. Cf. Le Khanat de Crimée, 332-3, for the Tatars' efforts to bring the principality under the khanate. Concerning the Porte's reactions to the Tatars' incursions into Moldavian territory during the period in question, cf. the command issued by Sultan Ahmet I on 14 January 1610 to Khan Selâmet Giräy (concerning whom, see below) in the collection of documents published by Tahsin Gemil, Rețeleiți târîilor române cu Poarta Otomană în documente turcești (1601-1712) (București, 1984), No 54.

32. Appendix, lines 6-8, where we read that Nectarius has informed the addressee of his letter that "the ambassadors of Bogdania were constantly here throughout November... and the khan came to Gözlev, while the ambassadors were still here, on the second of December" (πάντοτε ἦτον ἐδώ οἱ ἐλεγξίδες τῆς Μπογδανίας, ἔως ὅλον τὸν Νοέμβριον... καὶ...
Bogdan’s supporters and the British ambassador to elicit the coveted arz from the Sublime Porte.

Consequently, the title of ‘Prince of Dacia’, which Archbishop Nectarius accords Stefan Bogdan in 1609, does not reflect the latter’s true position. It could, of course, be interpreted simply as a compliment. However, when associated with other data in the document, this mode of address does seem to indicate that the Greek prelate accepted Bogdan’s claims. Indeed, the document almost exclusively concerns the various efforts made by the Archbishop himself and some of the aspiring Prince of Moldavia’s friends to further the latter’s cause either with the khan of the Crimea or with the Sublime Porte.

These actions seem to have been designed to offer some protection to the Orthodox population of Moldavia against pro-Catholic Polish infiltration. Furthermore, Stefan Bogdan was frequently known to champion Greek interests. His connections with the Greek world lay in his father’s old links with Rhodes (where he had lived in exile for a number of years) and in his mother’s Greek origin (she belonged to a branch of the Palaeologus family)\(^{33}\). The ambitious Stefan exploited his Greek descent in his various appeals to West European rulers, to whom he offered to conduct anti-Turkish military operations in the Greek East in exchange either for his own “re-establishment” in Moldavia or for the “restoration” of his ancestral “noble” titles in Greece\(^{34}\).

These data help us, I think, to interpret Nectarius’s references both to his own involvement in the efforts on Stefan Bogdan’s behalf and to the help the latter received from certain other Greeks, who were living in the Crimea at the time and apparently had special influence with the khanate’s high-ranking officials. Thus, having received Bogdan’s written appeals to the Tatar ruler, Selâmet Girây (1608-10)\(^{35}\), Nectarius hastened to pass them on to the “archon” Alexandris. The latter had already gone to Bagçesaray (Rus. Bakhchisaray), the capital of the khanate, where he was endeavouring, with his associate Kyritzis Filippis (a recipient of similar letters from Bogdan to the

\(^{33}\) N. Iorga briefly mentions his parents’ origin in *Byzance après Byzance*, Bucarest 1935, pp. 136, 138-139.

\(^{34}\) In November 1607, for instance, in a discussion with the Spanish Ambassador to London, D. Pedro de Zúñiga, he asked for Spanish military reinforcements to help him take the two Dardanelles fortresses or even the town of Larisa, in exchange for King Philip III’s granting him the title of “Prince of Greece” (infeudándole por príncipe de Grecia): Ciorănescu, *Documente*, 226; cf. also p. 230 (11 Sept. 1611).

A Greek Prelate in the Tatar Khanate

khan, written in Turkish), to persuade the Tatar khan to permit the British embassy’s voluntary internee to come first to the Crimea and thence to try to enter his native Moldavia.

Nectarius makes no secret of his pessimistic view of the distrustful Tatar’s attitude, for the latter was insisting that, before he would agree to receive Bogdan, he must first see the necessary sultanic documents ("ἀρζια"), which the sultan’s special envoy, Halil Aga, was expected to bring any day. Kyritzis Filippis was thus obliged to seek out other intermediaries capable of influencing the khan. He hastened to "the land of Sivritash" (εις τήν χώραν αυτής, εις τό Συβρητάς), where he had a meeting with the "great noblewoman" and Christian, Albige. She turned out to be the sister of Stefan Bogdan’s brother-in-law, who was in Poland (Λεχία) at the time, and also a relation by marriage of two of the khanate’s high-ranking officials: "Mehmet Shah Celepi, who is a great aga of the khan and his word carries the greatest weight" (του Μεεχμέτ σαχ Τζελεπή, οπού είναι μέγας αγάς του χάνη και ο λόγος του δεύτερος δεν γίνεται), and who had been sent to Constantinople as Selâmet Girây’s representative precisely in connection with the Stefan Bogdan affair; and "Mustafa Celepi, the vizier of the sultan, Sain Kerem, and son-in-law of the khan" (του Μουσταφά Τζελεπή, βεζίρη του σουλτάνου, του Σαϊν Κερέμ, οπού είναι γαμβρός του χάνη), who at the time was away either in

36. Appendix, lines 11, 12-14: "Thus, the whole of December having passed, the overlord went to the khan, taking with him Kyritzis Filippis, and I remained in Gözlev. And here I received your honour’s letters and sent them to the overlord. And he also requested the Turkish letter from Kyritzis Filippis, which was from your honour to the khan" (Έτζι, ἀπεραζόμενος ὁ λός ὁ Δεκέμβριος, ἐπήγε ὁ ὁρχος εἰς τόν χάνη καὶ ἐπήρε μαζὶ τοῦ καὶ τὸν Κυρίτζη Φιλιππῆ, καὶ ἐγὼ ἀνέμεινα εἰς τὸ Γγιοσλάβι. Καὶ ἐδὼ ἐλαβα τές γραφῆς τῆς αὐθεντίας σου καὶ ἐπέειλα τές εἰς τὸν ὁρχοντα. Καὶ ἐζήτησε καὶ τὴν γραφὴν ἀπὸ τὸν Κύ­ριτζη Φιλιππῆ τὴν τουρκικῆν, ὅπου εἶχε ἀπὸ τὴν αὐθεντίαν σου εἰς τὸν χάνην). The overlord’s name is given in 11, 31 and 35. There is not enough evidence in the document to enable us to identify these two individuals with historical figures attested elsewhere. They may well have been members of the group of Moldavian “ambassadors” who were seeking Stefan Bogdan’s “reinstatement” in Moldavia. However, it seems more likely that they were Greeks who had been living in the khanate for many years; rather like, for instance, Alexandros Palaiologos, who, in 1598, had endeavoured to play a political role as mediator in negotiations between the Crimean Tatars and Western rulers (see a reference to him in Iorga, Byzance, p. 120: cf. Kortepeter, Ottoman Imperialism, 185, for a reference to another of his missions in 1601-2). The Dimitrios Kyritzis mentioned by Iorga (ibid.) does not seem to have had any connection with the present Kyritzis, given that the former was related by marriage to Stefan Bogdan’s rivals, the Movila dynasty.

37. Whom he had met before in Constantinople: 1. 19.

38. Appendix lines 11, 17, 26, 32, 37-8.
Akkerman (εἰς το Ακτζερμένι), the modern Belgorod-Dnestrovsky in the Ukraine, or at the fortress of Özu Qalesi (έως την Οζού), which was later to become the Russian Očakov, at the mouth of the Dniepr⁴⁹.

Despite all these efforts, Stefan Bogdan never was lawfully proclaimed voivode of Moldavia. He tried again after he had left the British elci's residence in 1611, but this final attempt changed nothing: On 20 November 1611, after the defeat of voivode Constantin Movila, the Moldavian throne was won by Stefan II, known as Tomşa (1611-16)⁴⁰. Bogdan's failures did not quell his apparently incurable lust for power. It was probably this which motivated his eventual conversion to Islam, by which he finally achieved, shortly before his death, the governorship of a sanjak⁴¹.

³⁹. Appendix, lines 21-7. I have been unable to find further information about Mustafa Celepi. The “sultan” is probably Şahin Giräy, the Kalgäy-sultan, the khan's deputy, and frequently serasker-sultan and governor of Bessarabia, Yedisan (between the Dniestr and the Dniepr), and Kuban (between the Sea of Azov and the Kuban River): For him, see Kortepeter, *Ottoman Imperialism*, 15. 22 n. 72). Concerning the close ties between Selâmet Giräy and his relations, the brothers Mehemed (who became Khan of the Crimea in 1610) and Şahin Giräy, high-ranking officials (Hänzädes, Kalgäy, and Nüreddin) of the khanate, cf. *Le Khanat de Crimée*, 146, 152-3, 333, 334, 337, 338, 363, etc. For these dignities and their holders, consult H. Inalcık, “Kirim”, *Islam Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 6, pp. 741-56. Cf. Kortepeter, *Ottoman Imperialism*, 176, 253 (genealogical table).

⁴⁰. These events are well known and there is no need to go over them again here. See briefly Constantin C. Giurescu, *Chronological History of Romania*, second edition (Bucharest, 1794), p. 123.

⁴¹. Iorga, “Pretendenți domnesci”, 251-9 passim.
APPENDIX

Letter from the Archbishop of Ochrid, Nectarius, to the Prince of Moldavia

Gözlev [Yevpatoriya] in the Crimea
7 March 1609

[Reproduced from Greek Ms No 3, ff. 1r-v, in the collection of Greek manuscripts in the Hungarian National Library. Brief description by M. Kubinyi, Libri manuscripti graeci in Bibliothecis Budapestenisibus asservati, descr. M. Kubinyi (Budapest, 1956), p. 16: “Epistula Nectarii Archiepiscopi ad voivodam Bogdanum ... Sequuntur monocondylia viridi atraimento scripta: en μηνι μαρτίω ν [sic] ζ”. On the verso is the address: Τφ ύψηλωτάτφ καί εκλαμπρωτάτω ανθέντη, τφ Μπογδάν βοηβόντα, τφ ήγεμόνι Δακίας, υίοι Ιωάννου Γιάνκολα βοηβόντα, είς οίκον ελτή της Έγλιτέρας. ευ δοθείη. The document is published here with the original orthography. Minor interventions have been made only with respect to capitals and punctuation.]

†Νεκτάριος, ἐλέω Θ(εο)ϋ αρχιεπίσκοπος τῆς Πρώτης Ἰουστινιανῆς, Ἀχριδῶν καί πάσης Βουλγαρίας, Σερβίας, Ἀλβανίας, Ούγκροβλαχίας, Μολδανίας καί τῶν λοιπῶν:-

†Ψηλῶτ(α)τε, Εκλαμπρώτ(α)τε Αὐθέντη καί ἤγεμὸν πάσης Δακίας, κύριε Μπογδάν Βοϊβοντα, χάρις εἰς τῇ σῇ /4 Εκλαμπρό(τη)τι καί εἰρήνη καί ἔλεος παρὰ Θ(εο)υ Π(ατ)ρός καί Κ(υρίου) τῆς Θ(είας) Επιφάνειας, ὑγίαινε μοι τῇ ψυχῇ καί τῷ σώματι, οτι καὶ ημείς καὶ ήμετὲρος /5 ἐχόμεν τῷ σώματι χάριτι Χ(ριστοῦ). Όμως γράφομεν τῇ σῆν Εκλαμπρώτῃ περὶ τῆς υποθέσεως, κατά τὰ γράμματα τὰ πρῶτα, πως /6 πάντοτε ήτον ἐδώ οἱ ἐλτήδαις τῆς Μπογδανίας, εἰς ὅλον τόν Νοέμβριον, καί ο ἄρχος μελετόντας νὰ παένῃ /7 εἰς τόν χάνιν, καὶ ἔμποδηζόμενος εἰς τόν ταραπχανά νά κύψη ἀσπρα καὶ ἀλλα πράγματα, ὅπου εἰς ἔδωμα τοῦ, /8 καὶ ο χάνις ἦλθε ἐδώ, εἰς τὸν Γγιοζλάβι, παρόντων, ἀκόμι, καὶ τῶν ἐλτήδων, δευτέρα Δεκε(μ)βρίου, καὶ ἔμην /9 ἐδώ μίαν ημέραν. Ὅμως ο ἄρχοντας, καθως μας λέγει, διότις οὔτε ἐγὼ ἐπηγά, οὔτε ο κυρήτζης Φιλληπίς, μόνον μόνον τοῦ /10 ο ἄρχος, καὶ λέγει πως ἐλάλησεν τὸν χάνιν, καὶ πως ο χάνις ἑδέκτικες μετὰ χαρας τὸν λόγον, καὶ ὑπε τοῦ, ὅτι οταν ἐλθεί /11 ἀπὸ τὴν Πόλιν ο Χαλήλαγας, τότε νὰ γράψω καὶ τὰ ἁρξία, νὰ εἰδω καὶ ἐγὼ ποίοι εἶναι οἱ ἑξθροὶ μου καὶ ποίοι οἱ
φίλοι μου, /12 τότε νά γράψω, και νά πάρης και τόν ἄνθρωπον αὐτὸν, νά τὸν φέρης εἰς τὸ Μπαχτζά Σαράϊ. 'Ετης ἀπεραζόμενος ὅλος ο Δεκέ(μ)-βρις, /13 ἔπηγεν ὁ ἄρχος εἰς τὸν χάνι, και ἔπηρε μαξῆ του και τὸν κυρίτζη Φιληππί, και ἔγω ἀνέμεινα εἰς τὸ Γκιοζλάβι. Καὶ ἔδω ἐλαβά /14 ταῖς γραφαῖς τῆς ἀνθεντία<ζ> σου, καὶ ἐστειλά ταῖς εἰς τὸν ἄρχοντα, καὶ με μεγάλην χαρὰν ἔδεικυεν αὐτοῖς, καθὼς μὲ λέγει /15 ο κυρίτζης Φιληππίς. Τότε ἐξήτησε καὶ τὴν γραφὴν ἀπὸ τὸν κυρίτζη Φιληππί, τὴν τούρκηκην, οποῦ εἶχε ἀπὸ τὴν ανθεντία σου /16 εἰς τὸν χάνιν, μὲ τοὺς νὰ τὴν δώσῃ τὸν χάνιν, καὶ αὐτὸς δὲν τὴν ἐδώσε, μοῦνον πάλαι υπέ, ὅτι ἔσηντυχε δεύτερον τὸν χάνιν, /17 καὶ πάλαι τὸν ἄνθρωπον τοῦ υπε, ὅτι ο Χαλήλαγας ἐγνήκε ἀπὸ τὴν Πόλιν, καὶ εἰς ὅλιγας ἡμέρας ἔρχεται, καὶ ο κυρίτζης Φιληππίς /18 υπε, πω(ς) νὰ δώσῃ τὴν γραφήν τὸν χάνιν, καὶ ό ἄρχος υπε, δὲν κάνει χρία, μοῦνον, ὅταν ἔληθη ο Χαλήλαγας, τότε καὶ τὴν γραφὴν νὰ δώ­σωμεν. /19 Υπε καὶ ἔτούτ(ο), πως τὸν υπε, καὶ ἀπεζόθηκε τὴν ἀνθεντία σου τὸν χάνιν, ομως αὐθέντη, τὰ πράγματα ἐως αὐτὸν ἔχουν. /20 Καὶ εἰς τὸν κυρίτζης Φιληππίς ὄτον εἰς μεγάλη λύπην: Εὐρέθη μὲ ἕναν Τζορ­κέζη, καὶ μετ' αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ λόγον εἰς λόγον, καὶ λέγοντας περί τοῦ /21 γαμβροῦ σου, ὅτι εἶναι εἰς τὸν Λεχίαν, καὶ αὐτός τὸν υπε, ὅτι ἔχει ἐδώ ἀδελ­φῆ χριστιανοῖ, τοῦ ὅνομα αὐτῆς 'Αλμπηγγέ. Καὶ ὅσαν ἤκουσε /22 ο κυρί­τζης Φιληππίς, ἐσεκόθην ἀπεζός, καὶ ἔδιαβει εἰς τὴν χώραν αὐτῆς, εἰς τὸ Συβρητάς, καὶ ἔπηγε καὶ ζήτησε /23 νὰ εἴη <υ> μεγάλην ἀρχοντήσα, καὶ ὅσαν τὶς ὑπε, ὅτι εἶναι ο γαμβρὸς τῆς αὐθεντία<ζ> σου ο αδελφὸς τῆς, μεγάλην χα­ράν έχαριν, καὶ πως ἠλθέναι δι αὐτήν τὴν ὑπόθεσιν, /Μ καὶ πως ὁ ἄρχος ἔτης υπε ἀπὸ τὸ στόμα του χάνι, καὶ μεγάλην λύπην ἠλυπήθηκεν, ὅτι δὲν ἔπηγε πρῶτα εἰς αὐτὴν, /25 ὅτι ἔχει δύο γ(α)μβρούς, τὸν Μεεκμέτ Σάχ Τζελεπί, ὅπου εἶναι μέγας ἄγας του χάνι, καὶ τὸν λόγος τοῦ δεύτερος δὲν γίνεται, καὶ αὐτὸν /26 ἐστειλεν ο χάνις αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν Πόλιν, πρού του Χαλήλαγα, καὶ ἀκόμη δὲν ἠλθε καὶ ὁ άλος, ο Μουσταφά Τζελεπίς, εἶναι βεζήρις /27 του σουλτάνου, του Σαίνη Κερέμ, ὅπου εἶναι γαμβρός του χάνι, καὶ αὐτὸς λεί­πει μὲ τὸν σουλτάνον τοῦ Ακτζερμενι, ὅπου εἶναι ὁ ἄρχοντας, ἡ /28 άρχοντησα, πω<ζ> νὰ εἶναι ὑπομονην, ἔως νὰ ἔλθουν οι γαμβροί της, καὶ αὐτοὶ κάνουν τη δου­λιά γλήγορα, διατί καὶ αὐτοὶ λείπουν /29 καὶ ο χάνις λείπει, καὶ αὐτὸς ἔδι­αβει, εως την Οζου, καὶ ἔμαθαμεν, ὅτι ἐγύρησε, καὶ ἔρχονται καὶ οι αρχονταις οι γαμβροί της, καὶ ὅταν /30 ἔλθουν, ἔγω παένως εἰς αὐτούνους, ἢ ο κυρί­τζης Φιληππίς. 'Ομως τὸ γράμμα ἐγράφετον καὶ ο χάνις ἐγύρησε, /31 καὶ ο Αλεξανδρῆς, ἤγουν ο ἄρχοντας, ἤθελε να παένω εἰς τὸν χάνι, καὶ εἶπαμεν πως να παένη καὶ ο κυρίτζης Φιληππίς, καὶ λέγει δὲν μας (κάνει) χρία, μόνον όταν ἔλθει ο Χαλήλαγας. Καὶ ημείς δὲν του ἐδείξαμεν περὶ τούς ἀ­γάδας /32 ἐκείνους, ος να τους ἐσμήξομεν, να ἱδομέν την γνώμην τους.
Ετζή εγώ είπα τὸν άρχον πως ἔχω δουλιά εἰς τὸ /34 Μπαλοκλαβά, νά σμη-ξώ τὸν μ(η)τροπολίτην τῆς Γωτθίας. Έτζη καί ἠλθαμεν ἐδώ, καί τόρα στέλω τὸν κυ(ρήτζ)η Φιληππίν εἰς /35 τὴν άρχοντησα, τὴν ἀδελφήν του γαμβρού σου, μή ἰξεύροντας ο άρχος ο Ἀλεξανδρής, καί εἰς τούς ἀγάδαις τοὺς γαμβρούς της, /36 νά ἰδομεν καί αὐτονων τὴν γνώμην, εἀν δυνηθουν νά στρέψουν τὴν γνώμην του χάνι νά δώση τὸ άρζη /37 πρωτήτερα, παρά νά ἔλθη ο Χαλήλαγας. Καί εἰς τὸ δεύτερον καράβι, ἡ ο Κυ(ρήτζ)ης Φιληπ-πίς ἐρχεται, ἡ πάλαι γράμματα στέλλομεν, /38 καί ἡ αὐθεντία σου αὐτὸ μήν τὸ ἀμελεις, μόνον ἢ τι δύνασε κάμε, οσο που νά ἔλθουν καί τοῦτα τὰ άρζια. Στέλει καὶ ο άρχος γράμμα /39 στὴν αὐθεντία σου, ως καθὼς ἐγειναν τὰ πράγματα, εὼς τόρα. Ταῦτα μὲν διὰ τὴν ωραν, ο δὲ Θε(ός) της εἱρή(νης) καί τὸ ἀπειρον αὐτὸν /40 ἐλεος, καί η εὐχή, καί η εὐλογία τῆς ημον μετριότη-τος, εἴη μετὰ τῆς σῆς Ἐκλαμπρότητος ἐν βίω παντὶ. — Ἐν μηνι Μαρτίω ζ’.

Μηνι Μαρτίω ιν(δικτιω)νος ζ’ς: