



**“BECAUSE THIS ALSO BELONGS TO OUR DIOCESE”:
FORGED CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN STEPHEN
THE GREAT AND ARCHBISHOP DOROTEJ¹**

Victor Alexandrov

The correspondence between Prince Stephen the Great of Moldavia (1457–1504) and Archbishop Dorotej of Ohrid (circa 1466), consisting of two charters, has been used by scholars as primary evidence for the ecclesiastical relations of Wallachia and Moldavia with the Church of Ohrid in the medieval period. The authenticity of this well-known document has been evaluated differently by different scholars. Researching Matthew Blastares, I encountered the problem of the genuineness of the correspondence and had a chance to examine the original manuscript which includes the two charters. The literature concerning the correspondence reveals that not all the features of the manuscript and text of the charters have been taken into account in historiography; some information reported about the manuscript is not accurate. The only reliable palaeographic study on the charters, that of Bogdan,² is written in Romanian and thus most historians are not aware of the details of his argumentation. Here I will provide additional data regarding the correspondence and make several corrections to what has been written about it.

The two charters are held in Moscow in the Russian State Library (the former Lenin Library), Grigorovič collection (*fond* 87), MS 27 (old access number 1707). The Grigorovič MS 27 is a ten-folia fragment which includes the last articles of the *Syntagma* of Matthew Blastares (folia 1–2v.), the afterword of the scribe, Deacon Dmitar (folia 3–8v.), and the two charters, which are the main topic of my discussion here (folia 9–10).³

¹ This article is a revised section of my PhD dissertation on the Slavic *Syntagma* of Matthew Blastares, which I have recently completed at the Department of Medieval Studies of the CEU. It is my pleasure to thank Dan Muresan (Paris-Cluj) for his very helpful cooperation during my work on this topic.

² Ioan Bogdan, “Documente false atribuite lui Ștefan cel Mare” (Forged documents attributed to Stephen the Great), *Buletinul Comisiei istorice a României* 1 (1913): 103–161.

³ I am aware of three descriptions of this fragment: А. Викторов, *Собрание рукописей В. И. Григоровича* (The collection of the manuscripts of V. I. Grigorovič) (Москва: Типография М. Н. Лаврова, 1879), 19–21; Bogdan, “Documente false,” 109; and Radu Constantinescu, *Vechiul drept Românesc scris. Repertoriul izvoarelor. 1340–1640* (Ancient Romanian written law: Inventory of sources, 1340–1640) (Bucharest: Direcția generală a



Victor Alexandrov

The afterword of Deacon Dmītar of Kratovo is his only surviving work.⁴ The text starts with a brief and rhetorically eloquent account of how evil emerges in the world and how man struggles against his nature, which is inclined to evil. Dmītar's writing attracted the attention of scholars primarily due to a detailed account of the circumstances in which this manuscript appeared. According to the afterword, the *Syntagma* was commissioned by Archbishop Dorotej of Ohrid during his visit to Kratovo in the course of a trip around his archbishopric. For the completion of that task, Dorotej promised to put Dmītar and members of his family on the commemoration list of the Church of Ohrid. Dmītar also reports that as a consequence of internal intrigues Dorotej, together with many nobles and clerics from Ohrid, was moved by the Sultan to Constantinople and replaced by "Lord Marko, who was a Patriarch of Constantinople" (Markos Xylokaraves).⁵ That happened after the military campaign of Sultan Mehmed in Albania and after the foundation of the town of Konjuh. Finally, Dmītar asks Archbishop Markos of Ohrid for forgiveness. He reports the date of 1466, although from his account it is not clear whether this date pertains to the campaign of Mehmed or to the events in Ohrid or to both. In any event, the deposition of Dorotej and the arrival of Markos took place around 1466 or 1467,⁶ and thus the afterword could be dated to 1466 or shortly afterwards.

arhivelor statului din Republica Socialistă România, 1984), 240. For unclear reasons, Viktorov considers the Grigorovič MS to be a nine-, not ten-folia fragment.

⁴ See Мариана Цибранска, "Дяк Димитър Кратовски и неговият номоканон от 1466 г." (Deacon Dimităr of Kratovo and his *Nomocanon* from 1466), *Palaeobulgarica/Старобългаристика* 19, no. 1 (1995): 91–98 (with references to further literature). Different spellings of the name of the deacon are possible; henceforth, in this text I spell his name as Dmītar. The afterword has been published in full by Боню Ст. Ангелов, "Димитър Кратовски" (Dmităr of Kratovo), in *idem, Из старата българска, руска и сръбска литература* (Essays on Old Bulgarian, Russian and Serbian literature), кн. 2 (София, Издателство на Българската академия на науките, 1967), 259–267. Extensive excerpts of this writing are also found in Викторов, *Собрание рукописей В. И. Григоровича*, 20–21; VI. Каčanovskij, "Njekoliko spomenica za srbsku i bugarsku povijest" (Some documents of Serbian and Bulgarian history), *Starine* 12 (1880): 253–257; Луб. Стојановић, *Стари српски записи и натписи* (Old Serbian notes and inscriptions), књ. 1 (Београд, 1902), no. 328; and Bogdan, "Documente false," 117–120.

⁵ По прѣселеніи же сего прѣдреченнаго архієпискпа вьлгарскаго кѣр Доротеа, прѣемникъ прѣстолѣ охридскомоу ѡстрадет се кѣрь Марко, патріархъ бывшии Константіна града, повелѣніемъ црѣтвующаго. Ангелов, "Димитър Кратовски," 265.

⁶ Concerning Markos Xylokaraves, see Heinrich Gelzer, *Der Patriarchat von Achrida: Geschichte und Urkunden*, Abhandlungen der Königl. Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, philologisch-historischen Klasse, Bd. 20, no. 5 (Leipzig, 1902; reprint, Aalen:



“Because this also belongs to our diocese”

The two charters are found after the colophon of Deacon Dmitar on leaves 9–10. The first is addressed to Archbishop Dorotej by Voievod Stephen the Great, the second is the answer of the archbishop to the voievod.⁷ In the first charter, dating from April 6964 (1456 AD), the prince asks Dorotej to send “his blessing and the persons who will ordain the new metropolitan”⁸ to Moldavia because the incumbent, “Lord Visarion,” has died. In his answer, dating from October of the same year (see the discussion of the dating below), Dorotej complains that he can neither come to Moldavia by himself, nor send his people because of a plot (*крамола*) among the nobles and clergy of Ohrid and, as a result, his transfer to Constantinople. Dorotej encourages Stephen to organise the election and ordination of a new metropolitan by local bishops and in the presence of Metropolitan Makarij (Macarie) of Wallachia. The correspondence implies that in that period the Churches of Moldavia and Wallachia were subject to the archbishopric of Ohrid.

The first eight folia of the Grigorovič fragment are a single quire (*quaternion*), while leaves 9 and 10 are a large folium folded in two. At the moment, all ten folia are bound together, but the binding is modern; a note inside the modern front cover testifies that the manuscript was restored in the 1960s. From the description of Bogdan, published in 1913, it appears that the ten leaves were also sewn together at the beginning of the twentieth century.⁹

The fragment of the *Syntagma* and the afterword of deacon Dmitar, found on leaves 1–8v. and the two charters on folia 9 and 10, are written in different handwritings. The scribe of the *Syntagma* (who was Dmitar himself, as is clear from the text of the afterword) wrote in accurate semi-uncials, quite typical for Balkan Slavic manuscripts, while the script of the charters could rather be defined as cursive.¹⁰ Bogdan dates this cursive to the seventeenth or eighteenth century, and points out that the ink used by the scribe of the charters is also of later origin and could have been produced as late as the nineteenth century.¹¹

Scientia, 1980), 23–24; and Иван Снегаров, *История на Охридската архиепископия* (History of the archbishopric of Ohrid), т. 2 (София, 1924; reprint, София: Академично издателство “Проф. Марин Дринов,” 1995), 184–186 (references are to the reprint editions of these two books).

⁷ The charters are printed in Каџановскиј, “Nјekoliko spomenica,” 253 and 254. The facsimile is published in Bogdan’s study and reprinted in Снегаров, т. 2, attachment 25. I used the reprint.

⁸ *ДА ПОСЛЕШИ НАМЪ ТВОЕ БЛАВЕНІЕ И УЛКЕ, КОИ ДА НАМЪ МИТРОПОЛИТА СЪСТАВЕНІЮ* (sic!). See Снегаров, т. 2, attachment 25.

⁹ Bogdan, “Documente false,” 109.

¹⁰ Cf. *ibid.*, 109.

¹¹ *Ibid.*



Victor Alexandrov

Bogdan and Constantinescu assert that the paper of the last two leaves of the Grigorovič fragment is different and of a much later provenance than the rest of the manuscript (leaves 1–8).¹² Constantinescu also states that the charters in question are written on paper with a nineteenth-century Ottoman watermark—a crescent on three mountains, the tops of which are cut off.¹³ The information of Bogdan and especially of Constantinescu is not quite accurate. First, the appearance of folia 9 and 10 is quite the same as of folia 1–8. In my opinion, such a thick and matte paper could hardly have been produced in the nineteenth, eighteenth or seventeenth century. Secondly, Constantinescu misidentified the watermark on leaf 10 (it is the only watermark in the Grigorovič fragment). The tops of the mountains are not cut off. In addition, two centimetres above the crescent is a centimetre-long horizontal line. A search for parallels in the album of Briquet leaves no doubt that the present watermark is a variant of a watermark attested on the Italian paper and dating from 1463.¹⁴ The major difference between the two watermarks is that in Briquet the aforementioned line is the horizontal line of the cross raised upon the crescent, while in the Grigorovič fragment the vertical line of the cross is absent (or cannot be discerned). Thus, folia 9 and 10 are authentic fifteenth-century paper.

The authenticity of the charters, however, appeared suspicious at first glance into their content. A discrepancy between the data provided by these letters and the evidence of other sources has been discussed in detail by Bogdan.¹⁵ Firstly, Metropolitan Visarion of Moldavia is unknown. According to information based on many different sources, from 1453 until 1478 the metropolitan see of Moldavia was occupied by Teoktist I.¹⁶ Secondly, Metropolitan Makarij (Macarie) of Wallachia is mentioned in the sources later, in the 1480s, but in a document dating from 1464 a certain Iosif appears as occupying that see.¹⁷ Thirdly, the title of Dorotej used in both charters is not the usual one. In the letter of Stephen, Dorotej is called “the Most Blessed Archbishop of the First Justiniania and the Lord of all Bulgarians, Serbs and

¹² *Ibid.*, 109 and 114; and Constantinescu, *Vechiul drept*, 240.

¹³ Constantinescu, *Vechiul drept*, 240.

¹⁴ C. M. Briquet, *Les filigranes. Dictionnaire historique des marques du papier dès leur apparition vers 1282 jusqu'en 1600. A facsimile of the 1907 edition with supplementary material contributed by a number of scholars*, ed. Allan Stevens, vol. 3 (Amsterdam: The Paper Publication Society, 1968), no. 11734.

¹⁵ Bogdan, “Documente false,” 110–116.

¹⁶ Cf. Mircea Păcurariu, *Istoria Bisericii Ortodoxe Române* (History of the Romanian Orthodox Church), 2d ed., vol. 1 (Bucharest: Editura Institutului Biblic și de Misiune al Bisericii Ortodoxe Române, 1991), 351–353.

¹⁷ Păcurariu, *Istoria Bisericii Ortodoxe Române*, vol. 1, 349 and 350.



“Because this also belongs to our diocese”

Dacian lands,” whereas in Dorotej’s answer his title reads as “the Archbishop of the First Justiniana, all Bulgarians, Serbs, northern countries and others.”¹⁸ Mention of Moldavia and Wallachia occurs in the title of the archbishops of Ohrid, although these cases are late, dating from the last decades of the sixteenth and the first decades of the seventeenth century.¹⁹ The clauses “Dacian lands” and “northern countries” have never been attested.²⁰

The dating of the charters constitutes a special problem. The date of the first charter, the year 6964 “from the creation of the world” (that is, 6964–5508=1456 AD), is an impossibility. Firstly, Stephen ascended the throne in 1457,²¹ a year after the time when his letter is said to have been written; secondly, the plot in Ohrid and deposition of Dorotej took place around 1466, as follows from the afterword of Dmítar. The date of the second charter is also 6964. In the Balkan Orthodox countries, in the Middle Ages, the calendar year began in September.²² Thus, year 6964 lasted from 1 September 1455 until 31 August 1456. Given that the answer of Dorotej dates from October 6964, this corresponds to 1455 AD (6964–5509=1455). That means that the answer would have been written before the letter of Stephen, which is nonsense. To receive the letter in the same year, 1456, one must infer that the calendar year began in March, as was the case in Rus’ until the end of the fifteenth century.²³ The date 1456 is not authentic, which was established as early as the study of Bogdan.²⁴ In both charters the date has been corrected. One can see that even on the facsimile.

In the first charter, the date reads as “*сц̄ѣа* [6964-5508=1456], April, *indiction* *ѿ* [14],” but the letter *ѣ* is clearly a correction made on the place of another, original, letter. The *indiction* 14 does not correspond to the year 1456.

¹⁸ Kačanovskij, “Njekoliko spomenica,” 253 and 254.

¹⁹ Снегаров, *История на Охридската архиепископия*, т. 2, 379 and 380.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, т. 2, 379–383. Cf. Bogdan, “Documente false,” 115 and 116.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 111.

²² Куйо Кувев, “Летоброене,” in *Кирило-методиевска енциклопедия*, т. 2 (София: Университетско издателство “Св. Климент Охридски,” 1995), 534 and 535.

²³ Р. А. Симонов, “Об особенностях цифровой системы, употреблявшейся в кириллических рукописях X–XV веков” (Concerning the peculiarities of the number system used in Cyrillic manuscripts from the tenth to the fifteenth century), in *Методическое пособие по описанию славяно-русских рукописей для Сводного каталога рукописей, хранящихся в СССР* (Methodological instructions for the description of Russian Slavic manuscripts for the *Union Catalogue* of the manuscripts kept in the USSR), выпуск 1 (Москва, 1973), 208–210.

²⁴ For the detailed analysis of the dating, see Bogdan, “Documente false,” 111–112.



Victor Alexandrov

Next to the *indiction*, number 4, corresponding to 1456, is placed in brackets, written in Arabic numerals, in a different handwriting, and in another ink.

In the answer of Dorotej, the date is “ $\overline{\text{SU}}\overline{\text{Z}}\overline{\text{A}}$ [6964-5509=1455], October, *indiction* 6,” but the letters $\overline{\text{Z}}$ and $\overline{\text{A}}$ are, again, corrections. The number of the *indiction* has deteriorated slightly. Probably the letter of *indiction* is $\overline{\text{S}}$ (6), but it could also be misread as $\overline{\text{Z}}$ (7) (as published by Kačanovskij).²⁵ Below the date, the number $\overline{\text{S}}\overline{\text{U}}\overline{\text{Z}}\overline{\text{E}}$ (6965) is written in brackets, and next to the *indiction* correction $\overline{\text{E}}$ (5) is found, also in brackets. Kačanovskij erroneously publishes this correction as $\overline{\text{IE}}$ (15).²⁶ A note written in pencil, presumably by Grigorovič himself (f. 10), reports that the *indiction* was corrected in Wallachia to correspond to the dates of the charters.²⁷

It is evident, Bogdan concludes,²⁸ that the original date of the first charter is $\overline{\text{SU}}\overline{\text{D}}\overline{\text{A}}$, 6974, which corresponds to 1466 AD: the *indiction* of this year is 14. The original date of the second charter should be $\overline{\text{SU}}\overline{\text{D}}\overline{\text{E}}$, 6975: October 6975 corresponds to 1466 AD. The *indiction* of the second charter, whether it is 6 or 7, is wrong. The correct *indiction* of year 6975 would be 15.²⁹ The corrections in brackets below the dates were made either by Grigorovič or by someone else in Wallachia, but it is not clear who corrected the dates themselves.

One must agree with the conclusions of Bogdan and Constantinescu that the two charters are forgeries, despite the fact that these documents are written on authentic fifteenth-century paper, probably from the same manuscript as the rest of Grigorovič's fragment. The presumption that the charters are forgeries gives an easy and convincing explanation for all the peculiarities of the content. Evidently, the compiler of the charters had a vague idea of Romanian ecclesiastical history in the 1460s. He borrowed information about the plot in Ohrid and about the deposition of Dorotej from the afterword of Dmítar. As the original year and *indiction* of the first charter coincide with those of Dmítar's

²⁵ Kačanovskij, “Njekoliko spomenica,” 254.

²⁶ *Ibid.*

²⁷ Последняя поправка сделана в Валахии для уравнения индиктиона.

²⁸ Bogdan, “Documente false,” 114.

²⁹ To define the *indiction*, one should divide the number of the year from the creation of the world (*anno mundi*) by 15. The remainder is equal to the *indiction*. If the remainder is zero, the *indiction* is fifteen. For the *indiction*, see Nicolas Oikonomides, “Indiction,” in *Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, vol. 2, ed. Alexander Kazhdan (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), 993.



“Because this also belongs to our diocese”

afterword,³⁰ it is clear that the author of the forgery copied the date, including the *indiction*, from the afterword.³¹ If the *indiction* of the second charter is not a later alteration but was calculated by the compiler, he was unable to define the *indiction* correctly (although he needed only to add one to the *indiction* of the first charter). Such a lack of knowledge about the calculation of the *indiction* would be an argument in favour of a late origin of the charters, namely in a period when the *indiction* was not used. Finally, the compiler inserted inauthentic (at least for the fifteenth century) clauses into the title of the Archbishop of Ohrid.

The wish to produce a seemingly genuine document testifying to the canon law subordination of the Moldavian and Wallachian Churches to the Church of Ohrid in the middle of the fifteenth century was the main reason for the compilation of the charters. It is not accidental that, referring to Metropolitan Macarie of Wallachia in the second charter, “Dorotej” argues thus: “because this [Wallachia] also belongs to our diocese.”³²

As mentioned above, Bogdan dates the script of the charters to the seventeenth or eighteenth century.³³ So far I would refrain from a final conclusion on the date of these documents. On the one hand, what is known about the attempts of the high clergy of Ohrid to expand the boundaries of their Church north of the Danube in the second quarter of the sixteenth century (under Archbishop Prohor)³⁴ does not rule out the origin of the charters in this

³⁰ See Ангелов, “Дмитър Краговски,” 265, and Викторов, *Собрание рукописей В. И. Григоровича*, 20. Influenced by the aforementioned correction in the charter, Каџановскиј (p. 255) erroneously published the *indiction* in the afterword as 4.

³¹ Cf. Bogdan, “Documente false,” 113 and 114.

³² **призѡвавше къ себѣ и митрополита ѡгровъ влахїйскаго брата нашего и съслабжѡвника квр Макаріа · занеже и тѣ власти нашею естъ.** See Каџановскиј, “Njekoliko spomenica,” 254, and cf. Снегаров, т. 2, attachment 25.

³³ Bogdan, “Documente false,” 109 and 110.

³⁴ For this issue, see the following works: Ђорђе Сп. Радојичић, “О књиже Птоломеја. Два стара српска географска ‘такованија’” (About the *Book of Ptolemy*: Two Old Serbian geographical commentaries), *Историски часопис* 6 (1956): 55–65; Tit Simedrea, “Unde și cînd a luat ființă legenda despre atîrnarea canonică a scaunelor mitropolitane din Țara Românească și din Moldova de arhiepiscopia de Ohrida (From where and when the legend of the dependence of the metropolitan sees of Wallachia and Moldavia from the archbishopric of Ohrid emerged), *Biserica Ortodoxa Română* 85 (1967): 975–1003; Branislav Đurđev, “Odnos između Ohridske arhiepiskopije i srpske crkve od pada Smedereva (1459) do obnavljanja Pečke patrijaršije (1557)” (Relations between the archbishopric of Ohrid and the Serbian Church from the fall of Smederevo, 1459, until the restoration of the Patriarchate of Peć, 1557), *Radovi akademije nauka i umjetnosti Bosne i Hercegovine* 38 (1970): 184–209; Mihai Maxim, “Les relations des Pays Roumains avec



Victor Alexandrov

period. On the other hand, if the compiler of the charters made the evident mistake in the calculation of the *indiction*, these documents come from a very late period, perhaps the eighteenth or nineteenth century. The issue could be clarified through further palaeographic analysis of the script of the charters. Some clues to the origin of the correspondence could be obtained through the study of the diplomatic features of the documents issued by the chancery of the Archbishops of Ohrid and through a more detailed examination of the titles used by these archbishops in the Late Middle Ages and Early Modern Period.

In 1931, among the documents which were transferred from the Romanian monasteries secularised in the nineteenth century to the dependency (*metochia*) of the Holy Sepulchre in Constantinople, a copy of the charters was found, made by Grigorovič himself. A facsimile of this copy was published by Paul Mihail.³⁵ In the note found below the charters, Grigorovič writes that he copied these documents from “his manuscript” in 1845 in Bucharest. In the second note, he asserts that he received the originals of the charters in the monastery of St. John of Rila (in modern western Bulgaria) and that they were found at the end of the *Syntagma* of Matthew Blastares. Incidentally, one can assume from the latter note that Grigorovič had the whole manuscript of the *Syntagma* at his disposal.³⁶

This copy is interesting evidence of Grigorovič’s methods of work. In the copy, the date of the first charter is 6964 (1456), *indiction* 14. One can see an attempt to calculate the alternative date under the number of the year: two or three unfinished figures are written and crossed out. The date of the second charter is also 6964 (1456), but the *indiction* is 1. Again, below the number of the year an alternative number, 6969 (1461), is found in brackets. Mihail considers the latter correction as Grigorovič’s hypothesis that the charter dates from 1461 and, what is surprising, finds this conjecture to be convincing.³⁷ However, the charter, were it authentic, could not have come from 1461, because the events in Ohrid referred to in the charter only took place in 1466. Probably the alternative dates in brackets indicate Grigorovič’s understanding, at least with regard to the second charter, that the date 1456 is not correct.

l’archévêché d’Ohrid à la lumière de documents turcs inédits,” *Revue des études sud-est européennes* 19 (1981): 653–671.

³⁵ Пауль Михаил, “К вопросу о переписке молдавляхийского воеводы Стефана Великого с архиепископом Первой Юстинианы Дорофеем” (On the issue of the correspondence of the Moldo-Wallachian Voievod Stephen the Great with the Archbishop Dorotej of the First Justiniana), *Revue des études sud-est européennes* 4, no. 1–2 (1966): 239–246.

³⁶ For the text of the notes, see Михаил, “К вопросу о переписке,” 245.

³⁷ Михаил, “К вопросу о переписке,” 242.



“Because this also belongs to our diocese”

As compared to the Grigorovič MS 27, the copy of 1845 contains minor variant readings which are of interest. Because of the poor quality of the facsimile in Mihail’s edition, I limit myself to comments on those alterations which have been pointed out by Mihail himself. The variant readings of the 1845 copy include a *rusism* (ВЪЛАГАРАМ instead of ВЛЪГАРАМ), two corrections of the unusual spelling of the original for a more common one (МОЛДОВАХІНСКОИ instead of МОЛДОВАХІНСКОИ and МІСЛАМАНСКАГО instead of МІСЛОМАНСКОГО), one omitted clause (и съ нѣколко болгари и клирики нашея цркви),³⁸ and nine evident misspellings of the original (in particular ѿсе instead of ѿспе, оного instead of иного, рѣкоположишь instead of рѣкоположитъ, овьдръжили instead of овьдръжили and so on).³⁹ Mihail attributes great importance to the variant болгари found in one more place of the copy of 1845 instead of болгари in the Grigorovič MS 27, arguing that the болгари should be the original reading. He did not notice that the clause cited (въздвиге некою крамола междѣ болгари нашего града и клироса црковнааго) is based on the information of Dmitar (нѣкоторѣи крамолы междоусовнѣи подвигши се тоу ... и съ множаншиими вѣтъ болгарь вхрїдскыхъ и причѣтниківъ црковныхъ ...). In addition, the reading болгари makes no sense in the context. The present variant is no more than a corruption made by Grigorovič, and acceptance of this reading leads to a complete jumble.⁴⁰ In general, the great number of misspellings which are evident and sometimes senseless casts a serious shadow on Grigorovič’s accuracy. One has the impression that the copies were made in a great hurry. It may also be that some of the changes are not unconscious corruptions, but Grigorovič believed that he was permitted to alter the text of his original slightly. It is amusing that he finishes the second note following the charters with the following sentence: “Victor Grigorovič, Master of Arts of the Kazan’ University, testifies to the correctness of this copy.”⁴¹

³⁸ According to Mihail, (*ibid.*) this omission testifies to the presence of the word болгари instead of болгари in the original, but it is difficult to understand how the absence of something in the copy could testify to the presence of anything whatsoever in the original.

³⁹ Михаил, “К вопросу о переписке,” 241

⁴⁰ For a piece of such a mess, see Gelzer, *Der Patriarchat von Achrida*, 22.

⁴¹ Михаил, “К вопросу о переписке,” 245.



Victor Alexandrov

Constantinescu argues that Grigorovič himself was involved in the falsification of the correspondence.⁴² In my opinion, Grigorovič was just an enthusiast who disseminated the forgery, but who was neither responsible for it nor aware of the real nature of these documents. In one more misunderstanding of the Grigorovič MS 27, Constantinescu maintains that the first eight folia of the Grigorovič MS 27 are the last *quaternion* of the Egorov MS 65 (Russian State Library, Moscow), which is a copy of the *Syntagma* of Matthew Blastares.⁴³ This is an absolutely improbable conjecture, since everything in the two manuscripts (paper, watermarks, handwriting, ink, and orthography) is different. For example, the Egorov manuscript uses Bulgarian orthography,⁴⁴ while the Grigorovič fragment uses Serbian. The Egorov codex dates from the period between the 1510s and the 1530s,⁴⁵ while the Grigorovič fragment comes from 1466 or shortly thereafter. The paper of the two manuscripts is of different quality. Finally, even on the basis of extant publications one can discover that in the Egorov MS 65 the *Syntagma* is interrupted at a different place than where the Grigorovič fragment begins. There is a difference of about 135 letters between the end of the Egorov MS and the beginning of the Grigorovič fragment. Given that the length of lines in the Egorov MS is approximately 26 to 28 letters,⁴⁶ the Grigorovič MS 27 starts about five lines below the point at which the Egorov MS 65 is interrupted. Accepting the hypothesis of Constantinescu, one is not able to explain how these five lines have disappeared. In short, the Egorov MS 65 and Grigorovič MS 27 are two different codices.

⁴² Constantinescu, *Vechiul drept*, 240.

⁴³ *Ibid.* For a description of the Egorov MS 65, see Magdalena Georgescu, “Glosele Bogdan” (The glosses of Bogdan), in *Texte românești din secolul al XVI-lea* (Romanian texts of the sixteenth century), ed. Ion Gheție *et al.* (Bucharest: Editura Academiei, 1982), 367–375.

⁴⁴ See facsimiles in Georgescu, “Glosele Bogdan,” 452–464.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 374–375.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 452–464.



“Because this also belongs to our diocese”

Table 1. A comparison of texts showing that the first eight folia of the Grigorovič MS 27 are not the last quaternion of the Egorov MS 65.

<i>Syntagma</i>	<i>Egorov MS 65 ends</i>	<i>Grigorovič MS 27 starts</i>
<p>РЕКШЕ БЛАГОСЛОВЕНІА И ВЪНУАНІА БРАКА, И ЕЖЕ ЗАПИСОВАТИ ПРИПАДАЖЦѦ ВИНЫ, НЕ СЖЦѦ ЖЕ ЕМѦ ТОУ, ИПОМНИМАТОГРАФЪ СІЕ НАЗНАМЕНШЕТЪ, РЕКШЕ ЗАПИСШЕТЪ, ДАСТЬ ЖЕ [С] ДІАКОНѦМЪ ВЪ ГЪ ГЛАТИ. ДІАКОНЪ ЖЕ НЕ СЖ ЦѦ, ГЛАТЕ И Ѡ УЪТЪЦА ТАКО ЖЕ И АНТІФѦНИ. КОНЕЦЪ СЪ ВМЪ ЗАКОННИКА⁴⁷</p>	<p>РЕКШЕ БЛАГОСЛОВЕНІА И ВЪНУАНІА ...⁴⁸</p>	<p>...ШѦ, ГЛАТЕСЕ И Ѡ УЪТЪЦА, ТАКО ЖЕ И АНТІФѦНИ. КОНЕЦЪ СЪ ВЪМЪ ЗАКОННИКА⁴⁹</p>

On the basis of all that has been said above, the question of whether the correspondence of Stephen the Great and Dorotej of Ohrid is authentic should be answered in the negative. Unaware of Bogdan’s arguments and of details of Moldavian and Wallachian history, several historians have referred to the two charters as authentic.⁵⁰ Matkovski defends the authenticity of the charters, stating that in these documents the information on the events of 1466 in Ohrid

⁴⁷ В. Н. Бенешевич, “Два списка славянского перевода Синтагмы Матвея Властаря, хранящиеся в СПб. Синодальной библиотеке” (Two copies of the Slavic translation of the *Syntagma* of Matthew Blastares which are kept in the Synodal Library in St. Petersburg), *Известия отделения русского языка и словесности императорской академии наук* 4, no. 4 (1901): 227.

⁴⁸ Georgescu, “Glosele Bogdan,” 368.

⁴⁹ Викторев, *Собрание рукописей В. И. Григоровича*, 19.

⁵⁰ Снегаров, т. 2, 15, 16, 185 and 186; Ђоко Слијепчевић, *Историја српске православне цркве* (History of the Serbian Orthodox Church), књ. 1 (Munich: Iskra, 1962), 318; Александар Матковски, “Односите помеѓу Охридската архиепископија и османската држава” (Relations between the archbishopric of Ohrid and the Ottoman state), *Гласник на институт за националната историја* 16, no. 2 (1972): 114 and 115 (n. 12); and Тодор Събев и Трендафил Кръстанов, “Охридската архиепископија-патриаршија” (The Archbishopric-Patriarchate of Ohrid), in *Българската патриаршија през вековете* (Bulgarian Patriarchate through the centuries) (София: Синодално издателство, 1980), 11.



Victor Alexandrov

coincides with the evidence of Dmítar.⁵¹ The charters, however, are not an independent account but borrow the data from the afterword of Dmítar. The authenticity of the correspondence has also been argued by Elian, who refers to a workshop paper in which he allegedly refuted the arguments of Bogdan,⁵² but to the best of my knowledge that paper has been never published and thus one is unable to evaluate his refutation of Bogdan. The correspondence of Stephen and Dorotej cannot be used as an argument in favour of the jurisdictional subordination of the Moldavian and Wallachian Churches to the archbishopric of Ohrid in the middle of the fifteenth century. The existence of such a dependence in the Middle Ages is a different problem which should be discussed separately.

⁵¹ Матковски, “Односите помеѓу,” 114–116 (especially n. 12).

⁵² Alexandru Elian, “Legăturile mitropoliei Ungrovlahiei cu Patriarhia de Constantinopol și cu celelalte Biserice Ortodoxe” (Relations of the Metropolitanate of Wallachia with the Patriarchate of Constantinople and with other Orthodox Churches), *Biserica Ortodoxa Română* 77 (1959): 910.