

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<sup>1</sup>. Information about Greeks in the khanate during this period is conspicuously absent<sup>2</sup>. 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One such source is an unpublished and hitherto unstudied Greek document, which I have located in the National Library of Budapest, and which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, «Ὁ ἐν τῇ νοτίῳ Ρωσίᾳ Ἑλληνισμὸς ἀπὸ τῶν ἀρχαιοτάτων 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 Ἑλληνισμὸς τῆς 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<sup>3</sup>. 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" (l. 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 (l. 26: "αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν Πόλιν")<sup>4</sup>.

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<sup>5</sup>. The letter is dated at the end (ἐν μηνί Μαρτίῳ ζ'); again at the end, there is also the indiction VII (Μηνί Μαρτίῳ ἰνδικτιῶνος 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<sup>6</sup>.

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<sup>7</sup>. 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 Kapitánffi, Prof. of Byzantine Literature at the University Eötvös Loránd 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.

4. The document is briefly mentioned (as No 3) by the compiler of the catalogue of Greek manuscripts in the Hungarian National Library, M. Kubinyi: *Libri manuscripti graeci in Bibliothecis Budapestinensibus asservati, descr. M. Kubinyi* (Budapest, 1956), p. 16. She also mentions it, again briefly, in "A Magyar Nemzeti Múzeum görög kéziratái", *Antik Tanulmányok*, 1 (1954), 280.

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.).

6. The seventh indiction corresponds to the years 1579, 1594, and 1609 (H. Lietzmann and K. Aland, *Zeitrechnung*, Berlin 1956, pp. 62-3).

7. The information has been collected by the Bulgarian historian N. I. Milev, "Ochridskijat patriarch Atanasij i skitanijata mu v čuzbina, 1597-1616", *Isvestija na Istoričeskoto Družestvo v Sofija*, 5 (1922), 116. Cf. S. L. Varnalidis, *Ο αρχιεπίσκοπος Αχρίδος Ζωσιμάς (1686-1746) και η εκκλησιαστική και πολιτική δράσις αυτού* (Thessaloniki, 1974), pp. 72-3. Nectarius is also mentioned in A.-P. Péchayre, "Les archevêques d'Ochrida et leurs relations avec l'Occident à la fin du XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle et au début du XVIII<sup>e</sup>", *Échos d'Orient*, 40 (1937), p. 422 n.

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<sup>8</sup>.

Thus, we find Nectarius apparently Archbishop of Ochrid in a document of 14 August 1598<sup>9</sup>, 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<sup>10</sup>. 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<sup>11</sup>. In the time of Boris Feodorovič Godunov, Grand Duke of Muscovy (1598-1605), we find our beleaguered prelate, this time in Moscow using the title yet again<sup>12</sup>. 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 archiepiscopal see in Ochrid. Equally unreliable evidence of this is the fact that Nectarius mentions having met the local Orthodox Metropolitan of Gothia at Balaklava<sup>13</sup>. 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. Zakythinis, «Συμβολαὶ εἰς τὴν ἱστορίαν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν Ἀχρίδος καὶ 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, *Ο ἀρχιεπίσκοπος Ἀχρίδος Ζωσιμάς*, 55-7. Literature relating to the history and the archbishops of the Ochridan archiepiscopate is listed in I. E. Anastasiou, *Βιβλιογραφία τῶν ἐπισκοπικῶν καταλόγων τοῦ Πατριαρχείου τῆς Κωνσταντινουπόλεως καὶ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος* (Thessaloniki, 1979), pp. 70-2.

9. E. Hurmuzaki, *Documente privitoare la istoria Românilor, Supplementul II*, vol. 1 (1510-1600) (Bucharest, 1893), pp. 478-9.

10. Milev, “Ohridskijat patriarh Atanasij”, 116.

11. Michael Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, vol. 2 (Paris, 1740), p. 299; Gelzer, *Der Patriarchat von Achrida*, 26. Cf. N. Iorga, “Exilés grecs en France au XVe siècle”, *Revue historique du sud-est européen*, 5 (1928), 34.

12. Milev, “Ohridskijat patriarh Atanasij”, 116.

13. Appendix, lines 33-4: “Thus I told the overlord that I had business in Balaklava and was to meet the Metropolitan of Gothia» (Ἐτζι ἐγὼ εἶπα τὸν ἄρχον πὼς ἔχω δουλειὰ εἰς τὸ Μπαλοκλαβά, νὰ σμίξω τὸν μητροπολίτην τῆς Γοτθίας). 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<sup>14</sup>.

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"<sup>15</sup>. 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<sup>16</sup>, he remained on Moldavian territory for over a year<sup>17</sup>. 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 (1593-1601)<sup>18</sup>.

been unable to locate this metropolitan's name. For information about the development of this Orthodox ecclesiastical province, see Fotiadis, *O Ελληνισμός της Κριμαίας*, 29-31.

14. N. T. Kapterev, *Harakter otnošenij Rossii k provoslavnomu Vostoku v XVI i XVII stoletijah* (Sergiev Posad, 1914; republ. The Hague, 1968), pp. 147f.; Milev, "Ohridskij patriarch Atanasij", 116, n. 7.

15. This jurisdiction was denied — unjustifiably, I think — by N. Banescu, *L'ancien état bulgare et les pays roumains*, Bucarest 1947, p. 84. For literature relating to the administrative boundaries of the archiepiscopate of Ochrid, which were nominally expanded by a pseudo-Justinian *Novella* (in the thirteenth century!) to include large areas of the Balkan Peninsula as far as Moldavia and Hungro-Wallachia, see Varnalidis, *O αρχιεπίσκοπος Αχρίδος Ζωσιμάς*, 100-2, nn. 11-12.

16. This information is from a letter from the voivode of Moldavia, Yeremiya Movila, to his ally the great chancellor and hetman of Poland, Jan Zamoyski (1542-1605). The letter, dated 14 August 1598, asked Zamoyski to facilitate the journey of the Archbishop of Ochrid, Nectarius, to Muscovy. Cf. n. 7 above.

17. Milev, "Ohridskij patriarch Atanasij", 116, n. 7.

18. Hurmuzaki, *Documente*, vol. XIV/1, Bucarest 1915, p. 109-111. Cf. N. Iorga, *Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches*, vol. 3 (Gotha, 1910), p. 280; idem, *Istoria lui Mihai Viteazul*, second edition (Bucharest, 1968), p. 348. Concerning the council's significance, see A. Randa, *Pro Republica Christiana: Die Walachei im "langen" Türkengrieg der katholischen Universal-mächte (1593-1606)* (Munich, 1964), p. 255; Andrei Pippidi, *Hommes et idées du sud-est européen à l'aube de l'âge moderne* (Bucharest, 1980), p. 62. For Nectarius' doubtful presence in the archbishopric of Proilav see D. Russo, *Studii istorice greco-române*, vol. I, Bucarest 1939, p. 256. Cf. also Andrei Pippidi, *Trafiția politică bizantină în țările române în secolele XVI-XVIII*, Bucarest 1983, pp. 180, 188 (n. 217), 193.

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» (Τῷ ὑψηλοτάτῳ καὶ ἐκλαμπρωτάτῳ αὐθέντῃ, τῷ Μπογδάν βοηβόντῃ, τῷ ἡγεμόνι Δακίας, υἱῷ Ἰωάννου Γιάνκουλα βοηβόντῃ, εἰς οἶκον ἐλτζῆ τῆς Ἑγλιτέρας, εὐδοθείῃ)<sup>19</sup>. 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 history<sup>20</sup>. 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 Glover<sup>21</sup> — 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 throne<sup>22</sup>. 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. Ἰω(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 Iω 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 Ἰω ἢ Ἰωάννη», *Εἰς μνήμην Σπουδαίου Λάμπρου* (Athens, 1935), pp. 245-54.

20. N. Iorga, "Pretendenți domnesci în secolul al XVI-lea", *Analele Academiei Române*, ser. III, vol. 19 (Memoriile Secțiunii Istorice) (Bucharest, 1898): for Stefan Bogdan, see pp. 251-9 *passim*; concerning the claims and the activity of Stefan's father, Iancu, see pp. 22-7.

21. Concerning his activity in Constantinople, see the information given by contemporary British travellers in A. C. Wood, *A History of the Levant Company* (London, 1964), pp. 82-4. He is also briefly mentioned in Samuel C. Chew, *The Crescent and the Rose: Islam and England during the Renaissance*, second edition (Oxford, 1965), pp. 179-80.

22. Iorga, "Pretendenți domnesci", *loc. cit.*

Ottomans, the Crimean Tatars, the Hungarian princes of Transylvania, the Habsburgs, the Poles, and the Russians)<sup>23</sup>.

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<sup>24</sup>. 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 ricupar il suo stato<sup>25</sup>, et farne scacciare il principe regnante; et in suo favore sono venuti molti Bogdani, fastiditi dal governo de' Polachi, et anco questo ambasciator del Tartaro se gli mostra favorevole<sup>26</sup>. Ma la conditione de' tempi gli e molto contraria, come anco contrarissimo se gli dimostra il Bassa luogotenente"<sup>27</sup>. 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 príncipe de Moldavia fuesse restituyendo en su estado"<sup>28</sup>. 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", *Balkanica*, 13-14 (Belgrade, 1982-3), 85-96.

24. Wood, *A History of the Levant Company*, 83-4.

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 Kuyūzū, 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 por la reputación que perdió en no salir con su pretensión, 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<sup>29</sup>.

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<sup>30</sup>. 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<sup>31</sup>. Nectarius's letter clearly mentions that the Moldavian representatives were in Gözlev throughout the month of November<sup>32</sup>, obviously after the failure of Stefan

29. For his wanderings in the West and the appeals made by him and his representatives, see Iorga, "Pretendenți domnesci", *loc. cit.* Cf. Pippidi, *Tradiția Politică*, 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 Báthori, 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 Báthori's opinion, "no avrà quietud en la Moldavia [from the Poles' constant interference], si no se buelve el gobierno a Giancola Bugdano [he obviously means his son], a quien favorece el embaxador de Inglaterra allí residente". On Báthori's efforts in the interest of Bogdan also consult E. Veress, *Documente privitoare la istoria Ardealului, Moldovei și 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 Girây (concerning whom, see below) in the collection of documents published by Tahsin Gemil, *Relațiile țărilor române cu Poarta Otomană în documente turcești (1601-1712)* (Bucharest, 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 ἐδὼ οἱ ἐλτὶ ἡδες 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)<sup>33</sup>. 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<sup>34</sup>.

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, Selāmet Girāy (1608-10)<sup>35</sup>, 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

ὁ χάνης ἦλθε ἐδῶ εἰς τὸ Γγιοσλάβι, παρόντων ἀκόμη τῶν ἐλτζήδων, δευτέρα Δεκεμβρίου).

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).

35. See briefly Kortepeter, *Ottoman Imperialism*, 230, 234 nn. 14, 15.



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<sup>36</sup>.

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<sup>37</sup>, he must first see the necessary sultanic documents ("ἄρξια"), which the sultan's special envoy, Halil Aga, was expected to bring any day. Kyriztis Filippis was thus obliged to seek out other intermediaries capable of influencing the khan. He hastened to "the land of Sivritash" (εἰς τὴν χώραν αὐτῆς, εἰς τὸ 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" (τοῦ Μεεχμέτ σαχ Τζελεπή, οποῦ εἶναι μέγας αγάς του χάνη και ο λόγος του δεῦτερος δεν γίνεται), and who had been sent to Constantinople as Selāmet Girāy'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» (τοῦ Μουσταφά Τζελεπή, βεζίρη του σουλτάνου, του Σαῖν Κερέμ, οποῦ εἶναι γαμβρός του χάνη)<sup>38</sup>, 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 Kyriztis 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 Kyriztis Filippis, which was from your honour to the khan" (Ἐτζι, ἀπεραζόμενος ὁλος ὁ Δεκέμβριος, ἐπῆγε ὁ ἄρχος εἰς τὸν χάνη καὶ ἐπῆρε μαζί του καὶ τὸν Κυρίτζη Φιλίππη, καὶ ἐγὼ ἀνέμεινα εἰς τὸ Γγιοσλάβι. Καὶ ἐδὼ ἔλαβα τὰς γραφὰς τῆς αὐθεντίας σου καὶ ἔστειλά τες εἰς τὸν ἄρχοντα. Καὶ ἐζήτησε καὶ τὴν γραφὴν ἀπὸ τὸν Κυρίτζη Φιλίππη τὴν τουρκικὴν, 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 Palaialogos, 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 Kyriztis mentioned by Iorga (*ibid.*) does not seem to have had any connection with the present Kyriztis, 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 (εις το Ακτζερμένι), the modern Belgorod-Dnestrovsky in the Ukraine, or at the fortress of Özü Qalesi (έως την Οζού), which was later to become the Russian Očakov, at the mouth of the Dniepr<sup>39</sup>.

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)<sup>40</sup>. 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 *sanjak*<sup>41</sup>.

39. Appendix, lines 21-7. I have been unable to find further information about Mustafa Celepi. The "sultan" is probably Şahin Girây, the Kalgây-sultan, the khan's deputy, and frequently serasker-sultan and governor of Bessarabia, Yedisán (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 Girây and his relations, the brothers Mehmed (who became Khan of the Crimea in 1610) and Şahin Girây, high-ranking officials (Hânzâdes, Kalgây, and Nûreddin) 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. Inalcik, "Kırım", *İslam 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 Budapestinensibus asservati, descr. M. Kubinyi* (Budapest, 1956), p. 16: "Epistula Nectarii Archiepiscopi ad voivodam Bogdanum ... Sequuntur monocondylia viridi atramento scripta: εν μηνί μαρτίω ν [sic] ζ''. On the verso is the address: Τῷ ὑψηλωτάτῳ καὶ ἐκλαμπρωτάτῳ αὐθέντῃ, τῷ Μπογδάν βοηθόντῃ, τῷ ἡγεμόνι Δακίας, ὑφ' Ἰωάννου Γιάνκουλα βοηθόντῃ, εἰς οἶκον ἐλτζῆ τῆς Ἐγλιτέρας. εὖ δοθεῖν. The document is published here with the original orthography. Minor interventions have been made only with respect to capitals and punctuation.]

†Νεκτάριος, ἐλέφ Θ(εο)ῦ ἀρχιεπίσκοπος τῆς Πρώτης Ἰουστινιανῆς, Ἀχριδῶν καὶ πάσης Βουλγαρίας, Σερβίας, Ἀλβανίας, <sup>/2</sup> Οὐγκροβλαχίας, Μολδαβίας καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν:-

†Υψηλῶτ(α)τε, Εκλαμπρῶτ(α)τε Αὐθέντη καὶ ἡγεμόν πάσης Δακίας, κύριε Μπογδάν Βοϊβοντα, χάρις εἴη τῇ σῇ <sup>/4</sup> Ἐκλαμπρό(τ)ητι καὶ εἰρήνῃ καὶ ἔλεος παρα Θ(εο)ῦ Π(ατ)ρὸς καὶ Κ(υρίο)ῦ ἡμῶν Ι(ησο)ῦ Χ(ριστο)ῦ, ὑγίαινε μοι τῇ ψυχῇ καὶ τῷ σώματι, οτι καὶ ἡμεῖς καλῶς <sup>/5</sup> ἔχομεν τὸ σῶματι χάριτι Χ(ριστο)ῦ. Ὅμως γράφομεν τὴν σὴν Ἐκλαμπρότητα περὶ τῆς υποθέσεως, κατὰ τὰ γράμματα τα πρώτα, πῶς <sup>/6</sup> πάντοτε ἦτον ἐδῶ οἱ ἐλτζηδαῖς τῆς Μπογδανίας, εἰς ὅλον τὸν Νοέμβριον, καὶ ὁ ἀρχος μελετώντας νὰ παένη <sup>/7</sup> εἰς τὸν χάνι, καὶ ἐμποδηζόμενος εἰς τὸν ταραχανὰ νὰ κόψῃ ἄσπρα καὶ ἄλλα πράγματα, ὅπου εἶχε ἐδικὰ του, <sup>/8</sup> καὶ ὁ χάνις ἦλθε ἐδῶ, εἰς τὸν Γγιοζλάβι, παρόντων, ἀκόμι, καὶ τῶν ἐλτζηδῶν, δευτέρα Δεκε(μ)βρίου, καὶ ἐμνην <sup>/9</sup> ἐδῶ μίαν ἡμέραν. Ὅμως ὁ ἀρχοντας, καθὼς μας λέγει, διότις οὔτε ἐγὼ ἐπηγα, οὔτε ὁ κυρήτζης Φιλληπίς, μόνον μόνος του <sup>/10</sup> ὁ ἀρχος, καὶ λέγει πῶς ἐλάλησε τὸν χάνι, καὶ πῶς ὁ χάνις ἐδέκτικεν μετὰ χαρὰς τὸν λόγον, καὶ υπε του, ὅτι ὅταν ἐλθῇ <sup>/11</sup> ἀπὸ τὴν Πόλιν ὁ Χαλήλαγας, τότε νὰ γράψω καὶ τὰ ἀρζια, νὰ εἶδω καὶ ἐγὼ ποῖοι εἶναι οἱ ἐχθροὶ μου καὶ ποῖοι οἱ

φίλοι μου, /<sup>12</sup> τότε νά γράψω, καί νά πάρης καί τόν ἀν(θρῶπ)ον αὐτόν, νά τόν φέρης εἰς τὸ Μπαχτζά Σαράϊ. Ἐτζη ἀπεραζόμενος ὅλος ο Δεκέ(μ)-βρις, /<sup>13</sup> ἐπηγε ο ἄρχος εἰς τὸν χάνι, καί ἐπηρε μαζή του καί τὸν κυρήτζη Φιληππί, καί ἐγὼ ἀνέμεινα εἰς τὸ Γγιοζλάβι. Καί ἐδῶ ἔλαβα /<sup>14</sup> ταις γραφαις της αὐθεντία(ς) σου, καί ἐστειλά ταις εἰς τὸν ἄρχοντα, καί με μεγάλην χαράν ἐδέκτεικεν αὐταις, καθὼς μὲ λέγει /<sup>15</sup> ο κυρήτzhς Φιληππίς. Τότε ἐζήτησε καί τὴν γραφήν ἀπὸ τὸν κυρήτzh Φιληππί, τὴν τούρκικην, οπου εἶχε ἀπὸ τὴν αὐθεντία σου /<sup>16</sup> εἰς τὸν χάνιν, μὲ τουτ(ο) νά τὴν δώση τὸν χάνι, καί αὐτὸς δὲν τὴν ἔδωσε, μόνον πάλαι υπε, ὅτι ἐσήντυχε δεύτερον τὸν χάνι, /<sup>17</sup> καί πάλαι τὸν αὐτόν λόγον τὸν υπε, ὅτι ο Χαλήλαγας ἐνυηκε ἀπὸ τὴν Πόλιν, καί εἰς ὀλίγαις ἡμέραις ἐρχεται, καί ο κυρήτzhς Φιληππίς /<sup>18</sup> τὸν υπε, πως νά δώσωμεν τὴν γραφήν τὸν χάνι, καί ο ἄρχος υπε, δὲν κάνει χρία, μόνον, ὅταν ἔλθῃ ο Χαλήλαγας, τότε καί τὴν γραφήν νά δώσωμεν. /<sup>19</sup> Υπε καί ἐτούτ(ο), πως τὸν υπε ο χάνις, πως ἰξεύρει τὴν αὐθεντία σου ο χάνις εἰς τὴν Πόλιν, ὁμως αὐθέντη, τὰ πράγματα ἕως αὐτοῦ ἔχουν. /<sup>20</sup> Καί ο κυρήτzhς Φιληππίς ἦτον εἰς μεγάλη λύπην: Εὐρέθη με ἕναν Τζορκέζη, καί μετ' αὐτοῦ ἀπο λόγον εἰς λόγον, καί λέγοντας περὶ τοῦ /<sup>21</sup> γαμβροῦ σου, ὅπου εἶναι εἰς τὴν Λεχίαν, καί αὐτὸς τὸν υπε ὅτι ἔχει ἐδῶ ἀδελφή χριστιανοί, τοῦ ὄνομα αὐτῆς Ἀλμπαγγέ. Καί ὅσάν ἤκουσε /<sup>22</sup> ο κυρήτzhς Φιληππίς, ἐσεκόθει ἀπεζός, καί ἐδιάβει εἰς τὴν χώραν αὐτῆς, εἰς τὸ Συβρητάς, καί ἐπηγε καὶ ἦρε μίαν μεγάλην ἄρχοντησα, /<sup>23</sup> καί ὅσαν τις υπε, ὅτι εἶναι ο γαμβρός της αὐθεντία(ς) σου ο ἀδελφός της, μεγάλην χαράν ἐχάριν, καί πως ἦλθε δι αὐτὴν τὴν υπόθεσιν, /<sup>24</sup> καί πως ο ἄρχος ἐτζη υπε ἀπὸ τὸ στόμα τοῦ χάνι, καί μεγάλην λύπην ἐλυπήθηκεν, ὅτι δὲν ἐπηγε πρωτα εἰς αὐτὴν, /<sup>25</sup> ὅτι ἔχει δύο γ(α)μβροὺς, τὸν Μεεχμέτ Σάχ Τζελεπη, ὅπου εἶναι μέγας ἄγας τοῦ χάνι, καὶ ο λόγος τοῦ δεύτερος δὲν γίνεται, καί αὐτόν /<sup>26</sup> ἐστειλεν ο χάνις αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν Πόλιν, πρου τοῦ Χαλήλαγα, καί ἀκόμι δὲν ἦλθε, καί ο ἄλος, ο Μουσταφά Τζελεπις, εἶναι βεζήρις /<sup>27</sup> τοῦ σουλτάνου, τοῦ Σαήν Κερέμ, ὅπου εἶναι γαμβρός τοῦ χάνι, καί αὐτὸς λείπει μὲ τὸν σουλτάνο εἰς τὸ Ἀκτζερμενι, καί υπε /<sup>28</sup> ἡ ἄρχοντησα, πω(ς) νά εἶναι υπομονήν, ἕως νά ἔλθουν οἱ γαμβροὶ της, καί αὐτοὶ κάνουν τη δουλιὰ γλήγορα, διατι καί αὐτοὶ λείπουν /<sup>29</sup> καί ο χάνις λείπει, καί αὐτὸς ἐδιάβει, ἕως τὴν Οζου, καί ἐμάθαμεν, ὅτι ἐγύρησε, καί ἐρχονται καί οἱ ἄρχονταις οἱ γαμβροὶ της, καί ὅταν /<sup>30</sup> ἔλθουν, ἐγὼ παένω εἰς αὐτουνοὺς, ἢ ο κυρήτzh(ς) Φιληππίς. Ὅμως τὸ γράμμα ἐγράφετον καί ο χάνις ἐγύρησε, /<sup>31</sup> καί ο Αλεξανδρής, ἦγουν ο ἄρχοντας, ἤθελε νά παένη εἰς τὸν χάνι, καί εἶπαμεν πως νά παένη καί ο κυ(ρήτzh)ς /<sup>32</sup> Φιληππίς, καί λέγει δὲν μας (κάνει) χρία, μόνον ὅταν ἔλθῃ ο Χαλήλαγας. Καί ἡμεῖς δὲν τοῦ ἐδειξαμεν περὶ τοὺς ἀγάδαις /<sup>33</sup> ἐκεινοὺς, ὅς νά τοὺς ἐσμήξομεν, νά ἴδουμεν τὴν γνώμην τοὺς.

Ετζη ἐγὼ εἶπα τὸν ἄρχον πως ἔχω δουλιὰ εἰς τὸ /<sup>34</sup> Μπαλοκλαβὰ, νὰ σμή-  
 ξω τὸν μ(ητ)ροπολίτην της Γωτθίας. Ἐτζη καὶ ἤλθαμεν ἐδῶ, καὶ τόρα στέλω  
 τὸν κυ(ρήτς)η Φιληππὶν εἰς /<sup>35</sup> τὴν ἄρχοντησα, τὴν ἀδελφὴν του γαμβροῦ  
 σου, μὴ ἰξεύροντας ὁ ἄρχος ὁ <Α>λεξανδρῆς, καὶ εἰς τοὺς ἀγάδαις τοὺς  
 γαμβροὺς της, /<sup>36</sup> νὰ ἴδουмен καὶ αὐτονων τὴν γνώμην, ἐὰν δυνηθουν νὰ  
 στρέψουν τὴν γνώμην του χάνι νὰ δώση τὸ ἄρξη /<sup>37</sup> πρωτῆτερα, παρὰ νὰ  
 ἐλθῇ ὁ Χαλήλαγας. Καὶ εἰς τὸ δεύτερον καράβι, ἡ <ο> κυ(ρήτς)ης Φιληπ-  
 πὶς ἐρχεται, ἡ πάλαι γράμματα στέλλομεν, /<sup>38</sup> καὶ ἡ αὐθεντία σου αὐτὸ μὴν  
 τὸ ἀμελεις, μόνον ἡ τι δύνασε κάμε, ὅσο που νὰ ἐλθουν καὶ τουτα τὰ ἄρζια.  
 Στέλει καὶ ὁ ἄρχος γράμμα /<sup>39</sup> στήν αὐθεντία σου, ὡς καθὼς ἐγείναν τὰ  
 πράγματα, ἕως τόρα. Ταῦτα μὲν διὰ τὴν ὥραν, ὁ δὲ Θε(ός) της εἰρή(νης) καὶ  
 τὸ ἀπειρον αὐτοῦ /<sup>40</sup> ἔλεος, καὶ ἡ εὐχὴ, καὶ ἡ εὐλογία της ἡμων μετριότη-  
 τος, εἴη μετὰ της σης Ἐκλαμπρότητος ἐν βίῳ παντί. — Ἐν μηνὶ Μαρτίῳ ζ'.

Μηνὶ Μαρτίῳ ιν(δικτιῳ)νος ζ'ς:

