

UDC 94(477.7):929

THE GUIZOLFI FAMILY: BROKERS IN THE MEDIEVAL BLACK SEA SPACE

E. Khvalkov

PhD (History), Associate Professor

Higher School of Economics, Dept. of History

17, Promyshlennaya Str., Saint Petersburg, 198099, Russia

ekhvalkov@hse.ru

This paper focuses on the Guizolfi family and showcases the aftermath of the Genoese colonization of the Black Sea area, highlighting the complex and entangled multiple identities that resulted from more than two centuries of the Genoese presence there. The Guizolfi were a Genoese patrician clan that was integrated into both the life of the Genoese Black Sea colonies and the local environment of Circassian and Zikh nobility. The prominent role it played in Eastern Europe went far beyond the Genoese Gazaria in the course of the late Middle Ages and early Modernity. Guizolfi intermarried with the local Circassian nobility and were quite successful in playing on double identities. One of the last representatives of this family in the area, Zaccaria Guizolfi, took measures to resist the Ottoman threat, but later on he began considering moving to the Russian Principality of Moscow, where Ivan III Vasilyevich was happy to accept the Christians who were fleeing from the Ottomans from the South. Zaccaria Guizolfi negotiated the terms of his potential service at the court of Ivan III, but finally failed to travel to Muscovy and found his way at the service of the Khans of Crimea. What is more interesting is a supposed link between Zaccaria and certain events in the religious life of Russia. Since long time ago, Zaccaria Guizolfi, Prince of Taman, also known as Zaccaria Skara from the above-mentioned correspondence with Ivan III, was identified by some scholars as a Jew Scharia, who was a heresiarch of the Judaizing heresy in Novgorod and Moscow. This point is a matter of ardent debate in historiography for decades, and till now there is little certainty on this matter.

Keywords: Black Sea, Caffa, Circassians, colonies, Genoa, Ivan III Vasilyevich, Khanate of Crimea, Matrega, Zaccaria Guizolfi

The case study of the Guizolfi family provides an illustration of the aftermath of the Genoese colonisation of the Black Sea area, underlining the multiculturalism of the region and highlighting the complex and entangled multiple identities that resulted from more than two centuries of the Genoese presence there. This article is dedicated to the Guizolfi family (also spelled as Gisolfi, Ghisolfi, Giexulfis, Guigursis, and Guil Gursis), a Genoese patrician clan that was integrated into both the life of the Genoese Black Sea colonies and the local environment of Circassian and Zikh nobility. The prominent role it played in Eastern Europe went far beyond the Genoese Gazaria in the course of the late Middle Ages and early Modernity.

The Guizolfi are known to have been connected to the eastward movement of Genoese politics and trade, since in the thirteenth century their ancestor Buscarello de Guizolfi went as Genoese ambassador to the Ilkhanate and is mentioned in the documents of 1289–1290. His nephew Corrado served the Ilkhans directly. The Guizolfi family was mentioned several times with relation to Caffa already in the initial stages of the history of the Black Sea colonies (e.g. Leonel de Ghisolfi was a *massarius*¹ in Caffa in 1370s). However, our story only begins as late as in the fifteenth century, when Simone de Guizolfi arrived in Gazaria, more precisely in the Eastern Black Sea area, and became in

© 2019 E. Khvalkov; Published by the A. Yu. Krymskyi Institute of Oriental Studies, NAS of Ukraine on behalf of *The World of the Orient*. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

1419 a ruler of Matrega² (known in the Russian sources as Tmutarakan; Matrega was respectively the Genoese name for the city). It was an important centre of trade and had been a key point from the strategic point of view since time immemorial (at least from the times of Greek colonization), since its possessor controlled the Strait of Kerch from its eastern bank. Guizolfi's rights were secured in a special treaty between him and the Republic of Genoa concluded in 1424 with the brokerage of his brother Giovanni Galeazzo.

Simone de Guizolfi died in 1446, and for two years Matrega was ruled by the fiduciaries of his heirs, who presumably had not yet reached the age of maturity. These fiduciaries could be of either Italian or Circassian background; the only thing that we know about them is that they gave a falcon to the consul of Caffa as a sign of their loyalty to the Genoese authorities of Gazaria. This shows us that in any case Matrega remained within the jurisdiction of the consul of Caffa. Already in 1448, Simone's son, Vincenzo Guizolfi, married a Circassian princess Bikhakhanim, daughter of Berzoch from the dynasty of the rulers of the Taman Peninsula [Löwe 1896, 42]. Berzoch was most probably a ruler of Lo Copa (otherwise known as Copario) known for its fisheries, and this marriage, besides strengthening the Guizolfi's connections to the local nobility and the clan's integration into it, brought the area of Lo Copa to the appanage of the family, which they continued to control even after losing Matrega in the fifteenth century. There is no need to mention that in becoming the rulers of the place the Guizolfi also became the brokers between the Genoese colonial authorities and the autochthonous Circassian and Zikh nobilities³. Thus the Genoese family of Guizolfi was, at the same time, the feudal lords of an Adyghe principality on the Taman Peninsula and the Genoese representatives in the land that were legally conceived of as a part of Gazaria within the jurisdiction of the consul of Caffa.

The next ruler of Matrega was one of Simone de Guizolfi's grandsons and the son of Vincenzo Guizolfi and Bikhakhanim [Brun 1880, 234]. His name was Zaccaria (in different sources he is known as Zaccaria de Guizolfi, Zaccaria de Ghisolfi, Zaccaria Guigursis, Zaccaria Guilgursis, and Zaccaria Prince of Taman). The first source mentioning about him is rather unfortunate – in 1457, being apparently still a child not older than eight years, he was expelled from his inherited appanage of Matrega by the Zikh or Tatar Prince Kadibeldi (*Cadibeldi*); however, he soon returned and won his principality back with a support of the Genoese soldiers, who were sent by the authorities to the castle of Matrega for the defence and support of Guizolfi, as well as some armour was sent there [Atti della Società Ligure... 1871, 846; Corpus inscriptionum... 1978–1987]. Zaccaria Guizolfi is mentioned in Caffae Massaria ad annum 1461 [Archivio di Stato di Genova, Sala 34, 590/1225, San Giorgio, Massaria Caffè 1242 (1461), 180r, 407r end / 408v reg]. In 1472, Zaccaria Guizolfi, already a young man of about twenty years or a bit more, successfully negotiated a special ten-year long tax exemption for the transportation of wine in his realm, and arguably was even involved into the struggle between Meñli Geray and Nur Devlet Geray in 1468 in the Khanate of Crimea.

The next menaces to the princely dignity of Zaccaria Guizolfi were the Ottomans. However, the fall of Caffa and most of other Genoese colonies of Gazaria in 1475 did not result in the immediate fall of Guizolfi as a princely ruling house. Zaccaria asked for help against the Ottomans both the Genoese and the local rulers. On August 12, 1482, Zaccaria wrote a letter to Genoa to the protectors of the Bank of St. George asking for a loan of 1000 ducats in order to buy in this way the loyalty of the local Circassian princes – he claimed that this way he would have retained them as allies. Zaccaria also underlines in this letter that he tried to go to Genoa personally, but was captured by Stephen III the Great, Prince of Moldavia (*Ștefan cel Mare și Sfânt*, 1433–1504), who was proposing him some time before service, castle, and feud (or at least previously Zaccaria pretended in his letters to Genoa that Stephen did so), but then robbed and tortured his guest. Zaccaria came back to his land and tried to resist the Ottomans. He finally lost his coastal

possessions to the Ottomans in 1482 and had to leave Matrega for the neighboring settlement Lo Copa, having there friends and relatives from the local Circassian nobility and being one of the prominent feudal overlords in Zikhia himself. Indeed, his letter states that his vassals counted for 180 households.

At that point Zaccaria began considering moving to the Russian Principality of Moscow, where Ivan III Vasilyevich, married to Sophia Palaiologina (Ζωή Σοφία Παλαιολογίνα), had claimed the Byzantine legacy, and was happy to ally himself with anybody from the Black Sea area who would be eager to resist the Ottoman expansion, or even to accept the Christians who were fleeing from the Ottomans from the South. A good example of Muscovite hospitality is represented by the case of a part of the Greek Orthodox dynasty of Gabras from the Principality of Theodoro, which moved to Moscow and became princes Khowriny⁴. Initially, Zaccaria turned to Ivan III, sending him a letter through a certain Russian merchant (*gost'*) Gavril Petrov⁵. Some letters of their correspondence are preserved and are a perfect example of negotiating multiple identities. Zaccaria is called in these letters *interchangeably* “Jew Zaccaria Skara”, “Zaccaria the Hebrew”, “Circassian”, “Fryazin”⁶, or “Prince of Taman Zaccaria Guil Gursis” (the latter was, actually, how Zaccaria is called in the Russian translation of his letter to Ivan III).

The letter to Zaccaria sealed with a golden seal from Ivan III Vasilyevich was carried to Caffa by his envoy to the Khan of Crimea Meñli I Geray Prince Vasili Ivanovich Nozdrevatyj-Zvenigorodskij and podyachy Luka, and was dated March 14, 1484 [Sbornik Imperatorskogo... 1884, doc. 10, 41]. Ivan III expressed the willingness to accept Zaccaria, to show his favour towards him, to keep him at the service if he would wish so, and to let go freely without any expenses if he would wish to leave Ivan's lands. The addressee of the letter was called “Zaccaria the Hebrew” in the main text and “Zaccaria the Jew” in the later *regestae* written by the scribes of the Foreign Office in Moscow. The fact that the letter was sent with a golden seal (which elevated its status to the *bullae aurea* or chrysobull) unequivocally demonstrates the high princely dignity that Ivan III recognized in Zaccaria. However, Zaccaria was not in Caffa at that point, and therefore the letter was brought back by the podyachy. We can note that in this letter and in the others Ivan III's chancery uses the word “gospodar” standing in Old Russian for “Sire”, i.e. a sovereign ruler (unlike the *gospodars* of Wallachia and Moldavia); in this letter, however, Ivan III also styles himself a Czar, which is in the essence an imperial title deriving from the same Latin *caesar* and being identical to German *Kaiser* and Byzantine Greek βασιλεύς. Ivan III was never crowned as a Czar, the first Russian Czar being his grandson Ivan IV. Nonetheless, he often assumed this title, like in this case.

What is interesting here is this fact of Zaccaria's absence. He was not just absent in Caffa; he was “overseas” (*за морем*). He might have been doing a voyage to Genoa or elsewhere; nonetheless, this is a clear proof that this prince was highly mobile in securing support to his politics. This completely destroys all arguments that Zaccaria could not have been in this or that geographical point within several years or one year. In the light of that the idea that he, a young Genoese nobleman and Circassian prince, could travel in 1470–1471 to Kiev and Novgorod (see below) does not look unfeasible.

Ivan III sent one more letter to “Zaccaria the Hebrew”, dated October 18, 1487 with his ambassador to Crimea Dmitriy Shein and podyachy Mitya (i.e. Dmitriy) Nardukov [Sbornik Imperatorskogo... 1884, No. 19, 71]. From its text we know that between this letter and the previous one there was a reply from Zaccaria, which is not extant, but which was sent by Zaccaria with Senka (i.e. Semen, Simon) Khoznikov. In general terms it was identical to the previous one – Ivan III promised to accept Zaccaria, to show his favor towards him, to keep him at the service if he would wish so, and to let go freely without any expenses if he would wish to leave Ivan's lands. The reply of the Prince of Taman, a “letter written in Latin letters” in Lo Copa, dated June 8, 1487, was sent with an Armenian with a Slavic name Bogdan and a certain Gribets Klementiyev, stated that

Zaccaria was willing to accept the offer and that he began moving towards Moscow. We should not be surprised by the name of the Armenian; apparently, “Bogdan” is a mere translation of a wide-spread in Caffa, but not very handy Armenian name “Asdvadzadour” with the same meaning, i.e. “God-given”. E.g. in Caffa in 1381 there were at least seven people with the name Asdvadzadour (*Asfazador*). In 1423, there were at least two: *Asfasador armenus* [Archivio di Stato di Genova, Sala 34, 590/1225, San Giorgio, Massaria Caffè 1231 (1423), 16v, 55v, 208v], and *Asfasador Ianim Ogli* [Archivio di Stato di Genova... 446r, 208v].

The original Latin (or, less likely, vernacular Genoese) text of the letter is not extant, so we have to rely on its translation into Old Russian. Even in a Russian translation, the letter reveals features of a Genoese official communication. It begins with addressing Ivan III “most Honorable gospodar” and a reference to the other two letters sent by Guizolfi to the Grand Prince, one from Taman, and another one from Caffa. Further, Zaccaria points at that “this man”, Bogdan the Armenian, who can tell more on Zaccaria’s troubles, and says that on his way to Russia he was captured by Stephen III the Great, Prince of Moldavia, who robbed and tormented him almost to death and let him go away naked, for which reason he did not arrive to Ivan III. Notably, in a letter that he wrote at that time to the Bank of St. George to Genoa, he claimed that he was moving to Genoa rather than to Moscow, while being captured by Stephen III. Zaccaria was surely going to Genoa rather than to Moscow, and therefore his letter to Ivan III looks slightly hypocritical, whereas the actions of Stephen III look in this light more understandable. Son of Ivan III, Ivan Ivanovich the Young (1458–1490), was a future son-in-law of Stephen III; therefore the ruler of Moldavia would not impede Zaccaria from going to Moscow. However, Stephen III was not in good terms with the Republic of St. George and thus had grounds to capture a Genoese patrician travelling to the West.

Thus, following his release, Guizolfi came back to Taman, but still was willing or pretended that he still was willing to travel to Moscow with his people. He very much relies not just on the words on the letter, but on something that Bogdan the Armenian had to tell to Ivan III personally: “And you will be ascertained even more true from this our reliable man”. An interesting point is that he uses the rhetoric of a panegyric speaking about Ivan III, who, according to Zaccaria, had a good fame and a broad renown “through the whole earth”. These words were understandable, since on the one hand, the reputation of Ivan III in the Crimean Khanate was particularly good; on the other hand, the Grand Prince of Moscow broadly attracted Westerners, and especially people from Italy, to his court; one can just recall a galaxy of famous Italian Renaissance architects working in Russia in the times of Ivan III and afterwards like Ridolfo “Aristotele” Fioravanti (1415–1486), Pietro Antonio Solari (ca. 1445–1493), Antonio Gislardi (active in Russia in 1469–1488), Marco Ruffo (active in Russia in 1485–1495), Aloisio da Carezano (active in Russia in 1494–1519), and Aloisio the New (active in Russia in 1504–1531). Besides that we know that the Italian doctors and other professional people found occupation at the court in Moscow. Finishing his letter, Zaccaria also asks Grand Prince to send a man to show him the way to Russia and enquires if he was invited to come just himself with some few people of his retinue, or together with all his people.

Ivan III replied on March 18, 1488 [Sbornik Imperatorskogo... 1884, doc. n. 20, 71–73], again with Bogdan the Armenian acting as middleman, that he had passed the Guizolfi’s case to his boyar Dmitriy Vasilyevich Shein, envoy to the Khan of Crimea. In general terms, this letter repeats the words of the previous ones in the epitomized manner and stressing that Zaccaria would happily serve and would be favoured by Ivan III “if God allows”. In another letter, equally sent with Bogdan the Armenian [Sbornik Imperatorskogo... 1884, doc. n. 20, 73], Ivan III instructed boyar Shein to ask Khan Meñli I Geray (styled “Czar”, as it was common in the diplomatic correspondence) to send to Zaccaria in Circassia two Tatar guides “who know the way from Circassia to Moscow

through steppe (lit. ‘field’)) and some Tatars from the boyar’s suite to escort him to Moscow. Alongside with that, Ivan III sent the letters to Meñli Geray warning him about potential dangers that can come if Ivan releases his brother Nur Devlet Geray and yet another letter to the Prince of Taman, i.e. Zaccaria Guizolfi, dated September 6, 1489 and passed by Mikifor Michura Domanov [Sbornik Imperatorskogo... 1884, doc. n. 21]. This letter was very short, lacked even the invitation formulae of the previous ones. It looks like either the Grand Prince was for some reason cautious and preferred not to write much, relying on his middleman Domanov, or, although he still wanted to have Zaccaria at his service, as the latter failed to arrive, the Ivan’s enthusiasm was slowly wading. Anyway, the Grand Prince writes to Zaccaria that he should believe to everything that Mikifor will tell him, because these are the speeches of Ivan himself. This letter was accompanied by an instruction to Mikifor Michura Domanov [Sbornik Imperatorskogo... 1884, doc. n. 21, 75–77]. This instruction informed about the technicalities of sending the escort from Moscow to pick up Zaccaria. The guides and guards had to arrive to the embouchure of river Miuss in the area of Tajgan to meet there Zaccaria and his people. They had dispositions to meet Zaccaria four weeks after the feast of Easter, or, if one side is in delay, to wait till Pentecost, or, if needed, even till the Day of St. Apostles Peter and Paul⁷.

In 1491 the arrangements were made and the plan was fulfilled, however, only from the Russian part. According to the letter to Ivan III by Russian ambassador at the Crimean court Prince Romodanovsky [Sbornik Imperatorskogo... 1884, doc. n. 29, 114], Ivan’s Tatars were lingering waiting for Zaccaria, whereas Mikifor Michura Domanov and Danilko the villager informed the Grand Prince on the following: the Tatar guides and guards whom Ivan III sent to meet Guizolfi waited him till the Easter, then till St. George’s Day, and then till St. Nicholas Day. In the Orthodox tradition there are two days of both saints. St. George’s Day in spring is April 23 and St. George’s Day in autumn is November 26. St. Nicholas Day in spring (Translation of the Relics of Saint Nicholas from Myra to Bari) is May 9 and St. Nicholas Day in winter is December 6. Did the author of the source mean that the guides and guards waited till May or till December? In theory it could be either way, since in both cases St. George’s Day is followed by St. Nicholas Day. Finally, the guides and guards were informed that Zaccaria cannot come, because he had a big disturbance in his lands and was stagnant (lit.: “Zaccaria is heavy”), his family and the community he ruled being huge and difficult to move.

Since at that point Zaccaria Guizolfi did not move to Moscow, Prince Romodanovsky reported to Ivan III that Khan Meñli I Geray could offer to Guizolfi his protection, and the Grand Prince could help him with it due to Ivan’s friendship with the Khan [Sbornik Imperatorskogo... 1884, 114]. However, this was kind of a problematic issue and probably Meñli Geray would not dare to do it, since Guizolfi was obviously in bad terms with the Khan’s suzerain, the Ottoman sultan (according to the Prince Romodanovsky, Guizolfi was “an immense ribald / offender to the Turkish [sultan]”). However, in April 1500 Guizolfi is mentioned in Ivan III’s instructions to his ambassador Ivan Kubensky as being enrolled to the Khan’s service; nonetheless, Ivan was still wishing to hire him [Sbornik Imperatorskogo... 1884, 309]. Kubensky had to negotiate a Khan’s permission for Zaccaria to leave.

However, Zaccaria seemed to have made a good career at the Khan’s court. In 1504–1505 Zaccaria is mentioned among the nobility of the Khanate of Crimea that was receiving the tribute commonly paid by the Great Duchy of Lithuania to the Tatars [Tyszkiewicz 1989, 167]. On June 17, 1504, the sources list three princes, Zaccaria, Yakumit, and Khutlubey, each of whom received a sabre fur coat covered with *оксамиты* (a special type of expensive textile), other textiles, and some other gifts, whereas Zaccaria’s son Vincenzo, who lately sent to the Khan some gifts consisting of a golden coin and a Cossack-style or Circassian-style lash (*плеть черкаскую*), got in return from the King twenty kops of the Groschen for one type of fur coat, four kops of the Groschen for

another type of fur coat, a piece of textile of very high quality and two pieces of lower quality, then ten kops of the Groschen, and yet then he was given secretly [*sic*] ten kops of the Groschen [Dovnar-Zapol'skiy 1898, 47]. In 1505 again three Khan's officers, Chekumet, Khutlubey, and Zaccaria receive each a fur coat and some textiles [Dovnar-Zapol'skiy 1898, 43, 49]. Thus, Zaccaria is mentioned among the Tatar highest aristocracy called *morzalar*, being naturally a *morza*, i.e. a prince, himself even before he enrolled to the Khan's service. His son Vincenzo Guizolfi retained the father's dignity and went several times to the court of the Grand Duke of Lithuania [Khoroshkevich 2001, 110–111]. In 1507, the ambassadors of Meñli I Geray who were sent to Sigismund I the Old, King of Poland and Grand Duke of Lithuania, brought from “*morza* Vincenzo son of Zaccaria” to the King a lash, and from his sister – a white piece of clothing with golden embroidery [Dovnar-Zapol'skiy 1898, 55], while the ambassadors of the Grand Duchy in the same year brought to Vincenzo in return two pieces of cloth, one red and one blue [Dovnar-Zapol'skiy 1898, 60]. The last mention of Vincenzo Guizolfi is found in the letter of Sigismund I the Old, King of Poland and Grand Duke of Lithuania, to the Crimean Khan Mehmed I Geray dated September 21, 1521 [Dovnar-Zapol'skiy 1898, 84].

There is no surprise that a Genoese patrician found his way at the service of the Khans of Crimea. Some of the Italians remained (rather involuntarily) to live in Crimea after the conquest of their colonies by the Ottomans in 1475. Some of them could enrol into military, civil, and diplomatic service [Le Khanat de Crimée... 1978, 322–324]. Besides Vincenzo Guizolfi, there were other high officers of the Khanate who had Latin background: thus, Agostino Garibaldi was the Khan's treasurer; Jacob from Lithuania was his cellarer [Khoroshkevich 2001, 110–111].

What is more interesting is a supposed link between Zaccaria and certain events in the religious life of Russia. It worth noting that a Genoese person with some kind of Jewish background used to be a feudal lord in the Circassian lands (although local population could preserve some memory about the existence of Khazar Khaganate that controlled their lands between the late seventh and tenth centuries, and a considerable part of its political elite converted to Judaism). It is even more notable that the Russian Grand Prince Ivan III Vasilyevich willingly called Zaccaria to move to Moscow, albeit considering him a Jew (the letters both address Guizolfi as “a Hebrew”, *евреянинъ*, and “a Jew”, *жидовинъ*). Having Jews at Russian service in Moscow was not something impossible – thus, for instance, in 1489 Ivan III invited from Venice a Jewish doctor maestro Leone. Moreover, we know the case of a Caffiote Jew Kozja Kokos, who was a diplomat and a broker between Ivan III and the Crimean Khan Meñli I Geray. What is peculiar is the point that Guizolfi was invited not as a doctor, intellectual, or middleman, but rather as a foreign prince to be part of Russian political and military elite. This could often be the case with the Muslim Tatars – they came and enrolled the military service of the Principality of Moscow with all their clans and retinues, but the only supposedly “Jewish” case we know is the one of Zaccaria. In any case, we can be sure that Zaccaria Guizolfi was socially perceived as a Jew by the Russian Grand Prince; however, the Grand Prince repeatedly called him to move to Moscow and enter his service, and Guizolfi was willing to come to Moscow together with his large extended family and numerous retinues.

Guizolfi apparently had multiple identities: in the correspondence with Ivan III he is called “a Hebrew” (*евреянинъ*), “a Jew” (*жидовинъ*), “a Circassian” (*черкасинъ*), and finally “an Italian” (*фрязинъ*⁸). Since long time ago, Zaccaria Guizolfi, Prince of Taman, also known as Zaccaria Skara from the above-mentioned correspondence, was identified by some scholars as a Jew Scharia, who was a heresiarch of the Judaizing heresy in Novgorod and Moscow. One of the most active defenders of this point of view was Ogorodnikov. To briefly describe the background of the heresy, extensively discussed in Russian historiography, I will give here a brief account written by the Israeli scholar Moshe Taube:

“According to the two main figures of the Russian Church who persecuted the heretics, Archbishop Gennadii of Novgorod and Iosif Sanin, also known as Volotskii, abbot of Volokolamsk, the Judaizing movement started in Novgorod in 1470, shortly before the annexation of Novgorod by Grand Prince Ivan III of Moscow. In that year, at the invitation of the pro-Lithuanian party in Novgorod, Prince Mikhailo Olelkovich of Kiev visited the city-state of Novgorod in the company of several nobles and merchants, including the learned Jew Scharia, described by Volotskii as a man knowledgeable in astrology, astronomy, necromancy, and magic. This Scharia succeeded in ‘leading astray’ several priests of the lower ‘white clergy’, some of whom were later invited – surprisingly enough, by Ivan III himself – to Moscow, where two of them were appointed to churches in the Kremlin. There they continued their efforts to spread the heresy, under the protection of Fedor Kuritsyn, chief diplomat of Ivan III, as well as the prince’s daughter-in-law, the Moldovan princess Elena, whose son Dmitrii was crowned in 1498 with the cap of Vladimir Monomach and pronounced heir to the throne of Russia in the presence of his grandfather. In 1487, Gennadii, the newly appointed archbishop of Novgorod, discovered the heresy in his city and began persecuting the heretics, though without strong backing from either the secular power – Ivan III, who had named him archbishop – or the ecclesiastical authorities in Moscow. Because the Church lacked the conceptual and institutional tools to carry on a serious discussion with the heretics, it chose the judicial path and accused them of being ‘Judaizing apostates’, hoping to eradicate the heretics along with the heresy. After several delays, the heretics were finally brought to trial and punished severely. This was done in two phases. In the 1490 trial, the reforming Novgorod clerics were decimated. Elena and her son Dmitrii were imprisoned in 1502. But it was only in 1503, after Ivan III was forced to alter his ecclesiastic policy, that the Muscovite functionaries and clerics were tried, although some of the more powerful ones, first and foremost their leader Fedor Kuritsyn, escaped persecution. By 1504 the heresy had been crushed” [Taube 2010, 330–332].

Iosif Volotsky depicted “Scharia the Jew” in the most pejorative words, documenting his arrival to Novgorod [Moskovskaya politicheskaya literature... 1914, 55]. According to Iosif Volotsky, Zaccaria converted to the heresy two priests from Novgorod, Alexey and Denis. Once they were appointed by the Grand Prince to the cathedrals of Moscow in 1480 (apparently, not without having protection in some powerful personal networks), the heresy began spreading there, the above-mentioned diplomat Fedor Kuritsyn being one of its main protectors and promoters.

Now the question arises: were Zaccaria Guizolfi, Prince of Taman (also referred to in the above-mentioned letters as Zaccaria Skara), and ‘learned’ Jew heresiarch Scharia, father of a heresy, one and the same person? Another option could be a learned Jew Zachariah from Kiev. This was the hypothesis of Brutzkus and Taube: heresiarch Scharia is Zechariah ben Aaron ha-Kohen, who lived in Kiev and later in Damascus [Brutzkus 1932, cols. 520–522; Taube 2010, 315–353. Ref. to: Taube 1995, 168–198; Taube 2005, 185–208]. If, however, the first option is correct, how come that Ivan III Vasilyevich, Grand Prince of Moscow, who allowed trial and decimation of the heretics, invited Zaccaria to Russia before it and kept inviting him well after 1490? And how come that Zaccaria lived (at least for a certain while) in Kiev and then travelled to Novgorod in 1470–1471 in the entourage of Prince Mikhailo Olelkovich of Kiev? Zaccaria Guizolfi at that point was about twenty years old. Potentially he could be looking for patronage in Kiev, engaging into negotiations having faced the Ottoman threat. However, why would a real Jew, moreover a Rabbi, travel from Kiev to Novgorod in a retinue of Prince Mikhailo Olelkovich of Kiev? From this point of view Zaccaria Guizolfi is a more feasible candidate – a prince with a prince looking for support against the Ottomans. However, the question remains open.

First of all, there is no contradiction in the fact that Ivan III could invite a Jew on the apex of fight with the heresy. His high dignitary and one of the proselytes into the Judaizing heresy Fedor Kuritsyn was a part of the party of Prince Semen Ivanovich Ryapolovsky and Prince Ivan Yur'evich Patrikeev, who supported the issue of Ivan III from his first marriage (Dmitry Ivanovich the Grandson and his mother Elena Stephanovna Voloshanka, daughter of Stephen III the Great, Prince of Moldavia) against Ivan's second wife and their son, future Vasiliy III Ivanovich, and his mother Sophia Palaiologina, who was opposing the heresy of Judaizers. This party favoured the Judaizing heresy and had a great influence on the Grand Prince in terms of dynastic and political matters, particularly in 1480s – 1490s⁹, when Dmitry and Elena were for a while explicitly preferred to Vasiliy and Sophia, who were even for a while sent to exile. Moreover, it is often argued that Zosimas the Bearded, metropolitan of Moscow in 1490–1494, himself belonged to the Judaizing heresy. In such circumstances, it is pretty clear that, albeit persecuting the heretics under the pressure of such hierarchs as Archbishop Gennady of Novgorod, the Grand Prince actually was inclined to favour somebody connected to the Dmitry – Elena party and could disregard the references of Gennady stating that the heresy began from the point when Zaccaria visited Novgorod in 1470.

Further, a major proof that Zaccaria Guizolfi is indeed this “learned Jew” Scharia brought forward by Ogorodnikov can be found in the epistle dated 1488 against the Judaizing heresy written to the above-mentioned boyar Dmitry Vasilyevich Shein by monk Sava, who was according to Belokurov appointed the metropolitan of Kiev in 1475 and then returned to Moscow in 1482. This epistle explicitly quotes Zaccaria Skara – and this was the name of Guizolfi in the Russian sources. Sava visited Kiev and met there learned Jews; at the same time, he knew that Dmitry Shein contacted Zaccaria Guizolfi for a long time on the personal level, and apparently seemed very much worried about it. He says that even if “a man makes a lot of good deeds, but [also] makes one villainy, one vice can prevail over many virtues” [see: *Poslaniye inoka Savvy...* 1902], and further elaborates on how one vice of heresy can prevail over them, and as much as one imperfection destroys the pulchritude of the royal crown, one abomination can destroy the whole pious life of a Christian, like it was the case with the priests of Novgorod who embraced the “Jewish” doctrine. Apparently, both knew Zaccaria personally and Sava noticed that after a certain period of contact with Zaccaria in Caffa, Dmitry Shein fell under the influence of the ideas of the “Jew”¹⁰. Therefore, the monk warns Dmitry Shein against Guizolfi and admonishes him to abandon “from his heart and from his lips” everything that was ever said by Guizolfi as an abomination, since the “Jews” believe in Father and do not believe in Son. Moreover, Sava refers to the priests of Novgorod, who already professed the Judaizing heresy.

This identification of “Jew” Scharia with Zaccaria Guizolfi was many times debated in historiography resulting in the polar points of view. Moreover, these debates brought in certain misconceptions. It is often taken for granted in the Russian historiography that Zaccaria was the creator of the heresy, who designed an elaborated syncretic teaching. Contrary to that, the sources associate with his name just the first semi-legendary stage of the development of this religious movement, and they do not show any Zaccaria's involvement into it in Novgorod in 1480s – 1490s. Another misconception common to Russian authors is that Zaccaria himself was a scholar, a magician, or a Kabbalist (*mekubal*, מְקוּבָּל). It is pretty understandable that the Orthodox hierarchy portrayed Zaccaria in the sources as an evil sorcerer, astrologer, necromancer, wizard, and warlock capable of and knowledgeable in all kinds of witchcraft. However, this does not mean that Zaccaria was either a warlock or an intellectual. He did not need to be one to bring some doubts and ideas to the vibrant and somewhat vagabond spiritual life of Novgorod, which was shaken by another heresy of *strigolniki* just one century before¹¹. Even less he had to be proficient in any field of knowledge to seduce a Russian boyar in Caffa and to imbue

to him some doubts about the Christian faith. Some Russian scholars (S. J. Luria and R. G. Skrynnikov) actually suggested that the figure of heresiarch Scharia was actually invented by the clergy and there was no such person whatsoever (indeed the mentions of his engagement with wizardry appear only in the treatise of Iosif Volotsky called “The Enlightener” and composed around 1504, that is about thirty-four years after Zaccaria came and brought the heresy in). This seems to be a very strong claim; however, the sources really refer to the visit of this person to Novgorod that happened more than twenty years ago, and it therefore looks more plausible that albeit having a real prototype in the person of Zaccaria Guizolfi, necromancer, warlock and necromancer Scharia is more a fruit of imagination of the clergy fighting the Judaizing heresy in late fifteenth – early sixteenth century and portraying the heresy, which from the side of Jewish influence (if it had any Jewish origins whatsoever) possibly looked more like contemporary Noahidism than like an occult Kabbalistic or Gnostic sect. Indeed, given that we know from the sources that the proselytizing Jews often did not advise the new converts to make circumcision can be a sign that the heretics of the fifteenth century could be either the precursors of *B'nei Noah* (בְּנֵי נֹחַ), or a heretical movement not connected to Judaism. The interpretations of the Judaizing heresy were always problematic:

“While there is general agreement regarding... chain of events, the nature of the heresy, its ideology, and especially its affinity to Judaism are a subject of ongoing controversy. Different scholars have described the Judaizers variously as Anti-Trinitarians, Arians, Bogomils, Humanists, Hussite, Rationalists, and Waldensians. The most balanced and persuasive analysis of the heresy is that offered by the philosopher Thomas M. Seebohm. His interpretation, based on an extensive study of all the relevant published texts, may be summed up as follows. The heresy was a sui generis Russian phenomenon, for which only very partial analogies can be found in the West. It started in Novgorod as a movement among the white clergy to reform the Church from within. After its transfer to Moscow, however, it became a *Bildungsbewegung* espoused mainly by the newly emerging diachestvo class, the educated lay functionaries who administered the Muscovite state. Their keen interest in worldly and scientific literature was greater than their interest in religious issues, which had a political cast. However, the underlying ontological concepts of the translated literature, echoed in the original literature of the heretics, reflect a strict prophetic monotheism incompatible with central notions of Christian dogma – the Trinity, the Incarnation, and the Resurrection. The heretics assigned sovereignty to reason, which was posited as the foundation of any religion, and asserted the legitimacy of exploiting every possible source in the search for truth, including the pagan Aristotle, compared in their literature to a prophet. The Church justifiably saw this as a threat to its monopoly on the literary canon. Since the translated texts were of Jewish origin and displayed a pronounced monotheistic bent, which can easily and with good cause be interpreted as anti-Trinitarian, the Russian Church had every reason to suspect the heretics of ‘Judaizing’ ” [Taube 2010, 332–334].

Coming back to the figure of Zaccaria Guizolfi, we can find one argument in favour of his identification with the heresiarch Scharia. Two other Jews who came to Novgorod after him and were believed to spread the heresy both demonstrate some kind of connection to the Mediterranean, or Near East, or Black Sea area. Their names were Joseph Shmuel Skarabej (*Иосиф Шмойло Скарявей*; *Скарявей* being Latin *scarabeus*) and Moses Ghanoush (*Моисей Хануш*; Arabic “Ghanoush”, غنوج, means “pestle”). What can be said for sure is that these two people did not originate from Polish-Lithuanian community or any other area of Ashkenazi Jewry. They could be Sephardi Jews from one of the said regions, perhaps from Latin Romania or Genoese Gazaria; they could equally be people from the entourage or at least social environment of Guizolfi – a very mixed environment with Italian, Jewish, and Caucasian elements¹².

Obviously, it seems not very likely that a Genoese patrician from the Guizolfi family could profess Judaism, not to say that surely Zaccaria could not have been a Jew ethnically, being of mixed Genoese-Circassian origin. At least formally, he had to be a Roman Catholic, unless he or his ancestors Simone or Vincenzo embraced some form of Karaite Judaism from their Oriental environment (in fact we know very little about the religion of the Circassians that they ruled as princes). However, in order to be called “Jewish” by the Russian clergy, Zaccaria’s teaching did not need to be Orthodox Judaism. Indeed, in the Orthodox Church the pejorative adjective “Judaic” was often applied to any kind of emerging heresy from Late Antiquity onwards [Khoulett 1993, 64], whereas if we have a closer look at what was the heresy of the Judaizers, we will not find that much of Judaism in it.

In his “Word against the new heresy of the heretics from Novgorod” Iosif Volotskii lists the main aberrations of the heretics, among which one finds antitrinitarianism, non-recognition of Jesus Christ as the Son of God and His Resurrection and Ascension, rejection of Redemption, blasphemy against Christ and Virgin Mary, rejection of the Ecumenical Councils and the teaching of the Fathers of the Church, rejection of veneration of the Holy Cross and the icons, desecration of icons and iconoclasm in general, rejection of fasting, veneration of Saturday over Sunday, general anticlericalism, rejecting monasticism, blaspheming the works of St. Ephraim, rejection of the Eucharist because of the simony of the clergy, celebrating the mass after having a heavy breakfast¹³, praying using their own books, denying Christian eschatology, ridiculing the millenaristic and chiliastic ideas of the day¹⁴, and studies in astrology – that is pretty much everything we find inside this doctrine.

Thus, “in all teaching of Judaizers one does not find any traces of Talmud” [Panov 1877, 14]. After a closer examination the heresy actually does not seem that Judaizing; it looks strikingly similar to the anticlerical religious movements of the Middle Ages like Bogomils, Cathars / Albigeois, Waldensians, Beguines and Beghards, Lollards, Hussites, and other pre-Reformation (and sometimes proto-Humanistic) urban religious movements, propelled by a strive rather to secular knowledge, astronomy, occultism, etc. The Judaizers read philosophical, astronomic and occult literature like the books of Moses Maimonides (1135 or 1138–1204), Johannes de Sacrobosco (c. 1195 – c. 1256) and Immanuel ben Jacob Bonfils (c. 1300–1377).

Russian and Soviet historiography normally refused to treat the heresy of Judaizers as first of all and predominantly Jewish, as well as a certain elaborated and unified doctrine. It was traditionally linked to either the proto-Protestant pre-Reformation movements or to the rationalist and humanistic trends in the Russian society, with different ratio of Western influence versus the autochthonous inherent developments. Rev. George Florovsky denied that there was even some structured community of the heretics, considering the heresy to be just a stochastic free-thinking of the wandering minds [Florovskiy 1988, 15]. Dmitry Sergeevich Lihachjov considered the Judaizers to be a Humanistic movement [Likhachev 1973, 159]. At the same time, while the humanistic and rationalistic implications of the teaching of the Judaizers cannot be denied, it is rather interesting to focus on the possible connection between the heresy and the contemporary religious movements in the neighbouring states as well as in the Western Europe. In previous historiography, there were already justifiable attempts to see the roots of the heresy in the teachings of the Hussites [Kras 1998], and a monograph of de Michelis, arguing for its Waldensian roots [de Michelis 1993].

In the latter case we can assume with a certain degree of certainty that Zaccaria Guizolfi, Prince of Taman, and “learned” Jew Scharia, father of a heresy, could be one and the same person. One remaining hitch is the following: how did Guizolfi move to Kiev and further to Novgorod in 1470? We really do not know much about his performance as a Prince of Taman in the sources of 1460s – 1470s, but in this case unless some new

source finds will follow we cannot take this silence either to claim that he visited Russian lands and sowed there the first seeds of heresy, or that he did not. However, we know that the connections between the Jewry of Kiev and the one of Caffa were intensive. It is often highlighted that following the Tatar devastations of Kiev a number of Jews fled there; however, there it also worked other way round: both Jews and Armenians from Asia Minor and Near East were spreading throughout the Eastern Europe, populating Russian and Polish lands, and their gateway to these lands was Caffa. That is why, *pace* Brutzkus and Taube, I cannot agree that Zaccaria Skara is Zechariah ben Aaron ha-Kohen, who lived in Kiev and later in Damascus [Brutzkus 1932, *cols.* 520–522; Taube 2010, 315–353; Ref. to: Taube 1995, 168–198; Taube 2005, 185–208], and was never ever seen in the Northern and North-Eastern Russia like Novgorod or Moscow.

Arguing with Luria, Taube says: “Contrary to Luria’s assertion, Zaccaria is not a common name among Jews, but (except among Yemenite Jews) as extremely uncommon one. The ‘coincidence of the rather common name’ is thus a very imprecise characterization on Luria’s part. A coincidence of such magnitude seems very unlikely indeed” [Taube 1995, 172]. However, Taube does not notice that these words can be used against his point. Zaccaria is a rare name among the Jews, and Zaccaria is not a particularly widespread name among the Genoese, and still we know that there was Zaccaria Guizolfi, who was considered to be a Jew, and a certain heresiarch Scharia the Jew; this might be a coincidence that they had the same name and both were considered Jews, but, using Taube’s words, “A coincidence of such magnitude seems very unlikely indeed” [Taube 1995, 172]. From the point of view of probability of coincidences, Scharia the Jew could be Zaccaria Guizolfi or Zechariah ben Aaron ha-Kohen from Kiev; from this prospective both views are equally plausible / arguable; and other arguments convince us that Zaccaria Guizolfi and Scharia the Jew is one and the same person.

Taube argues that “the Muscovite Principality in the second half of the fifteenth century may well have been on the brink of succumbing to a Jewish conspiracy to proselytize Muscovy from the top, a plan orchestrated by learned Jews from the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth with mystic inclinations, with the perhaps unsuspecting collaboration of highly placed officials in the court of Ivan III, and with the sovereign himself hesitant for a while and playing his cards both ways” [Taube 2005, 185]. We can agree with it, but if this conspiracy was ever designed in Kiev or elsewhere in Polish-Lithuanian community long before the heresy was noticed, we would expect the conspiring Jews to have people that would act as “missionaries for the elites”, that is equals to the Russian princes and nobles. *Pace* Brutzkus and Taube, it is hard to imagine that some learned Jews, scholars and translators like Zechariah ben Aaron ha-Kohen, whom they consider to be a real Zaccaria Skara, could be of any help in proselytizing Russian elites, who would not even consider these humble people worth their attention¹⁵.

Indeed we do not have any grounds to say that this Jewish intellectual has anything to do with Zaccaria Guizolfi, Zaccaria Skara, and heresiarch Scharia the Jew; no grounds besides mere coincidence of names and imagination of certain scholars tracing the footprints of Jewish medieval intellectuals. I indeed doubt that a Russian boyar sent as an ambassador to Crimea would spend his time discussing with a Jewish intellectual some theological matters, because it was not the point of his stay there. Vice versa, it is quite probable that he met in Caffa the Prince of Taman for political or military affairs, and this prince shared with him some of his views (perhaps very wage and home-bred). Thus, if there was a conspiracy, as Taube suggests a figure of a ruler from the Black Sea area, the enemy of the Ottomans and the potential ally of Ivan III, who could communicate with boyar Shein as an equal and write to the Grand Prince considering moving to his service, could be a perfect lot to play. In the light of all this, the version that Zaccaria Guizolfi could travel to Kiev and then to join Prince Mikhailo Olelkovich in his trip to Novgorod does not look impossible. The point is that calling him “heresiarch” we should imagine

neither a scholar nor an encyclopedist / translator, but a feudal lord professing either some version of Judaism (Rabbinic, or Karaite, or being a member of some para-Judaic sect) or some non-Judaic heresy, possibly the teaching of Waldensians, who familiarized some people whom he contacted with his ideas (perhaps not necessarily particularly orthodox from the point of view of Judaism).

Finally, the fact that Zaccaria had Italian background does not necessarily mean that he, the grandson of the first immigrant, had to be still a Roman Catholic in good standing. Genoese Caffa was a world of multiculturalism, hybridity and cosmopolitan eclecticism, and mixed marriages like the one between Vincenzo Guizolfi and Circassian princess Bikhakhanim were just one of the dimensions of these hybridity and eclecticism; another dimension was the dynamics of religious life. The bishops of Caffa often complained that the Genoese who married Greek women often converted to Greek Orthodoxy. Same could be the case with those marrying Armenians, Jews, and Circassians. If this happened in Caffa and Tana, the colonial centres, so even more on the colonial periphery like Taman. So logically we should rather expect that Zaccaria, whose mother was a Circassian lady Bikhakhanim, and who lived faraway from Genoa and even outside such centres of Latin Christendom as Caffa and Tana with most probability was *not* a hundred per cent orthodox Roman Catholic, instead of thinking naively that since he had a Latin family name he must have been a loyal son of the Latin Church.

Summarizing, we can infer with a certain degree of probability that Zaccaria Guizolfi, Prince of Taman, and “learned” Jew Scharia, father of a heresy, could be one and the same person. If Zaccaria Guizolfi indeed brought to Russia some kind of heresy, could it be a form of Judaism, teaching of Waldensians or, even more likely some home-brewed ideas, pretty much as the ones of the more famous but less fortunate heretic Domenico Scandella, also known as Menocchio, from the book of Carlo Ginzburg “The Cheese and the Worms”?

¹ *Massarii* were the officers responsible for the treasury of the administration of the commune of Caffa. They were of crucial importance in all spheres of governing not limited to the treasury or even only to the financial affairs. Each year two *massarii* were elected in to go to Caffa with a new consul, who was also annually rotated. Their term of office lasted for six months. Each of them acted for three months as a senior *massarius* with the guardianship of the seal and three months as a junior *massarius*. *Massarii* left their books of accounts (*massariae*) to their successors. Their books are kept in double entry bookkeeping system and they were sent to Genoa in order the metropolis could control the situation in the colony. A good deal of them is preserved in Archivio di Stato di Genoa. *Massarii* were more than treasurers – they also acted as syndics, and had to meticulously control all the activity of their predecessors.

² Matrega was situated on the Taman Peninsula on the site of the Ancient Greek *Ερμώνασσα*. In the 10th – 11th centuries it was owned by the Russian princes and later fell under the Cuman authority. The population mainly consisted of Zikhs and Circassians with some Greeks and Russians. Genoese were interested in Matrega because of wax, leather, grain, fur, fish and slaves. Matrega was important for the Genoese, since it secured connection between the Crimean and the Caucasian Genoese colonies; it also allowed controlling the access to the Sea of Azov together with Vosporo situated on the opposite side of the Kerch Strait.

³ The situation did not change much after the fall of Constantinople, when the Republic of Genoa ceded its Black Sea colonies to the Bank of St. George. The Guizolfi princes remained rulers of Matrega, although after this point they began sending their reports to the Bank of St. George rather than to the Republic.

⁴ Initially they migrated as a foreign sovereign house and even called themselves in the official documentation the lords of the city of Theodoro and the Seaside that is what Genoese called Gothia (αὐθεντής πόλεως Θεοδορίου καὶ παραθαλασσίας). Russian genealogical records mention some Prince of Gothia Stephan Vasilyevich Khowra and his son Gregory, who moved to Moscow

to the court of Prince Dmitry Ivanovich Donskoy as early as in the fourteenth century and became treasurers of the Prince of Moscow.

⁵ “Petrov” here is more likely to be a typical non-noble patronym standing for “son of Peter” rather than a family name.

⁶ Often erroneously understood as “Italian”, *frijag* or *frijazin* derives from “Frank”, and indeed initially it most likely sounded in Old Russian like *frengin*. This term stands for the Romance-speaking people from Europe (German-speaking people being called *nemtsy*) and it was used in the Russian lands as broadly and non-discriminatively as the word “Frank” in the Islamic world.

⁷ Notably, the Tatar guides and warriors were aware of the dates of the Christian religious feasts.

⁸ This medieval Russian word rather means any Western European who spoke Romance languages and professed Roman Catholicism; the point is that the people from Italy were the speakers of these languages whom the Russians encountered most frequently.

⁹ Regarding this favour and support, Taube in his article states that the heretical clerics were “invited (surprisingly enough, by Ivan III himself) to come to Moscow, where two of them were appointed to churches in the Kremlin”. What follows is the quotation of Taube’s footnote: “Ivan III himself apparently was sympathetic, for some time at least, to the heretical circle... The indications of this patronage are: 1. It was Ivan himself who invited the two heretical Novgorod priests, Aleksey and Denis, to Moscow, and had them appointed there to the Kremlin churches; 2. His protégé Fedor Kuritsyn, head of the Moscow heretics, was never brought to trial; 3. The unusually formulated oath was given in 1488 by Ivan to his brother Andrei: Князь жѣ вѣликии кляется ему земли и небом и богом сильным, творцом всея твари”. This oath sounds very strange, not quite Orthodox and most likely heretical, “especially if we compare it to the usual verbal formulations accompanying the kissing of the cross: one renounces, in case of perjury, ‘God’s Grace, that of His most holy Mother, and that of the great miracle workers’: нѣ будѣт ми милости божиѣ и прѣчистой вѣо матери и вѣликих чюдотворцѣвъ” [Taube 2005, 185–186].

¹⁰ A Russian historian Sobolevsky tried to argue that Zaccaria Skara of the epistle of Sava actually lived in Kiev, where boyar Dmitry Shein stopped by on his way from Moscow to Caffa. This point is, however, very weak. First, it is unlikely that two different persons, one in Kiev and one in the Black Sea area, were called the same – Zaccaria Skara. Second, the way from Moscow to Caffa does not pass through Kiev, and Shein anyway did not have any instructions concerning this city.

¹¹ The religious movement of strigolniki appeared in Pskov and further spread to Novgorod. It was chiefly a schism opposing the practice of simony in the Orthodox Church, which resulted in contempt towards and rejection of the church hierarchy. It also had anti-monastic direction. Its correlation to the contemporary religious movements of the Western Europe, or rather Latin Christendom as a whole, is problematic and causes a lot of debates, pretty much alike the Judaizing heresy.

¹² Notably, there is one more parallel that can be drawn here: Archbishop Gennady of Novgorod familiarized himself with the experience of Spanish inquisition in 1486, and in fact during his struggle with the Judaizing heresy, applied methods similar to the Western ones; his writings and the ones of Iosif Volotsky testify it. His sources of knowledge on the Spanish inquisition were Georg von Turn, the ambassador of the German emperor Friedrich III and a Dominican friar Benjamin.

¹³ The Orthodox rite implies fasting before taking the Holy Communion from the midnight before the mass.

¹⁴ The approaching 1492 was 7000 year from the Creation of the world.

¹⁵ Taube, however, acknowledges that most likely the person whom Shein met in Crimea for his envoy’s business was Zaccaria Guizolfi, but denies his identity as Jew Scharia of the Russian sources, suggesting that perhaps Shein could also meet another person with the same name (e.g. Zechariah ben Aaron ha-Kohen from Kiev, who, nobody knows why, by chance happened to be in Caffa at this point – is not it a strange coincidence?), or that the author of the epistle, monk Sava, made a mistake. (“We do not know, but since Dmitrij was there on official business on behalf of Ivan, we may assume that he met the Crimean prince Zaccaria, with whom Ivan was corresponding at that time. This does not exclude, however, the possibility that he had also met a Jewish Zaccaria... Ivan’s mistake in considering Zaccaria Gujgursis a Jew was shared by Savva”, and on the same page he quotes Brutskus: “There could have lived in Crimea, at the same time, both Zaccaria the prince of Taman and Zaccaria the Jew”) [Taube 1995, 170].

REFERENCES

- Archivio di Stato di Genova*, Sala 34, 590/1225, San Giorgio, Massaria Caffè 1231 (1423).
Archivio di Stato di Genova, Sala 34, 590/1225, San Giorgio, Massaria Caffè 1242 (1461).
Atti della Società Ligure di Storia Patria (1871), Vol. 8/1, Genoa.
- Brun F. (1880), *Chernomor'ye. Sbornik issledovaniy po istoricheskoy geografii Yuzhnoy Rossii*, Odessa. (In Russian).
- Brutzkus J. (1932), "Judaisierende", in Jacob Klatzkin (Ed.), *Encyclopaedia Judaica: Das Judentum in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, Bd. 9, Verlag Eschkol A.-G., Berlin, cols. 520–522.
- Corpus inscriptionum medii aevi Liguria* (1978–1987), Vol. 1–3, Centro Storico, Genoa.
- Dovnar-Zapol'skiy M. V. (1898), "Litovskiye upominki tatarskim ordam. Litovskiy skarb i tatarskiye ordy v 1502–1509 gg. Skarbovaya kniga Metriki Litovskoy 1502–1509 gg. (tekst)", in *Izvestiya Tavricheskoy Uchenoy Arkhivnoy Komissii*, Vol. 28, Simferopol, pp. 1–91. (In Russian).
- Florovskiy G. (1988), *Puti russkogo bogosloviya*, YMCA-PRESS, Paris. (In Russian).
- Khoroshkevich A. L. (2001), *Rus' i Krym: Ot soyuza k protivostoyaniyu. Konets XV – nachalo XVI vv.*, Editorial URSS, Moscow. (In Russian).
- Khoulett Ya. R. (1993), "Svidetel'stvo arkhiepiskopa Gennadiya o eresi 'novgorodskikh eretikov zhidovskaya mudr'stvuyushchikh'", in *Trudy Otdela drevnerusskoy literatury Instituta russkoy literatury (Pushkinskogo Doma)*, Vol. 46, Dmitriy Bulanin, Saint Petersburg, pp. 53–73. (In Russian).
- Kras P. (1998), *Husyci w piętnastowiecznej Polsce*, Towarzystwo naukowe katolickiego uniwersytetu Lubelskiego, Lublin.
- Likhachev D. S. (1973), *Razvitiye russkoy literatury X–XVII vekov. Epokhi i stili*, Nauka, Leningrad. (In Russian).
- Le Khanat de Crimée dans les Archives du musée du palais de Topkapi* (1978), École des hautes études en sciences sociales, Mouton, Paris, La Haye.
- Löwe R. (1896), *Die Reste der Germanen am Schwarzen Meere*, Halle.
- de Michelis C. G. (1993), *La Valdesia di Novgorod*, Claudiana, Torino.
- Moskovskaya politicheskaya literatura XVI veka* (1914), M. Kovalensky (Ed.), Tipo-lit. Energiya, Moscow. (In Russian).
- Panov I. (1877), "Eres' zhidovstvuyushchikh", in *Zhurnal ministerstva narodnogo prosveshcheniya*, Vol. 189/2, Saint Petersburg, No. 1, pp. 1–40; No. 2, pp. 253–295; No. 3, pp. 1–59. (In Russian).
- "Poslaniye inoka Savvy na zhidov i na eretiki" (1902), in *Chteniya v Obshchestve istorii i drevnostey rossiyskikh*, Book 3, Part 2, Moscow, pp. 1–94. (In Russian).
- Sbornik Imperatorskogo Russkogo Istoricheskogo Obshchestva* (1884), Vol. 41, Saint Petersburg. (In Russian).
- Taube M. (1995), "The Kievan Jew Zechariah and the Astronomical Works of the Judaizers", in W. Moskovich et al. (Eds.), *Jews and Slavs*, Vol. 3, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, pp. 168–198.
- Taube M. (2005), "The Fifteenth-Century Ruthenian Translations from Hebrew and the Heresy of the Judaizers: Is there a Connection?", in V. V. Ivanov and Julia Verkholantseva (Eds.), *Speculum Slaviae Orientalis: Muscovy, Ruthenia and Lithuania in the Late Middle Ages*, OGI, Moscow, pp. 185–208.
- Taube M. (2010), "Transmission of Scientific Texts in 15th-Century Eastern Knaan", *Aleph: Historical Studies in Science and Judaism*, Vol. 10, No. 2, Indiana University Press, Bloomington, IN, pp. 315–353.
- Tyszkiewicz J. (1989), *Tatarzy na Litwie i w Polsce. Studia z dziejow XIII–XVIII w.*, Państwowe Wydawn. Nauk., Warsaw.

Є. О. Хвальков

Сім'я Гізольфі: посередники в середньовічному чорноморському просторі

Ця стаття присвячена родині Гізольфі і наслідкам генуезької колонізації Причорноморського регіону. Стаття акцентує складні ідентичності, які виникли там в результаті більш ніж двох століть генуезької присутності. Гізольфі були генуезьким патриціанським кланом, інтегрованим як в життя генуезьких причорноморських колоній, так і в середовище місцевої черкеської та зіхської знаті. Протягом пізнього Середньовіччя та Раннього Нового часу

Гізольфі відігравали значну роль у Східній Європі, в тому числі і за межами Генуезької Газарії, злившись із місцевою черкеською знаттю і досить успішно граючи на подвійних ідентичностях. Один із представників цієї сім'ї в регіоні, Заккарія Гізольфі, вживав заходів для протидії Османській загрози, але пізніше почав розглядати можливість переїзду у Велике князівство Московське, де Іван III Васильович приймав християн із півдня, що втекли від османів. Заккарія Гізольфі вів переговори про умови своєї потенційної служби при дворі Івана III, але врешті-решт не зміг поїхати в Московію і осів на службі у кримських ханів. Ще цікавіше передбачуваний зв'язок між Заккарією і певними подіями в релігійному житті російських земель. Заккарія Гізольфі, князь Таманський, також відомий як Захарія Скара з вищезгаданого листування з Іваном III, ототожнювався деякими вченими з євреєм Схарією, засновником ереси жидовствующих у Новгороді і Москві. Ця проблема викликає в історіографії жваві дискусії протягом десятиліть, і крапку в них досі не поставлено.

Ключові слова: Генуя, Заккарія Гізольфі, Іван III Васильович, Каффа, колонії, Кримське ханство, Матрега, черкеси, Чорне море

Е. А. Хвальков

Семья Гизольфи: посредники на средневековом черноморском пространстве

Эта статья посвящена семье Гизольфи и последствиям генуэзской колонизации Причерноморского региона. Статья акцентирует сложные идентичности, которые возникли там в результате более чем двух столетий генуэзского присутствия. Гизольфи были генуэзским патрицианским кланом, интегрированным как в жизнь генуэзских причерноморских колоний, так и в среду местной черкесской и зихской знати. В течение позднего Средневековья и Раннего Нового времени Гизольфи играли значительную роль в Восточной Европе, в том числе и за пределами Генуэзской Газарии, слившись с местной черкесской знатью и довольно успешно играя на двойных идентичностях. Один из представителей этой семьи в регионе, Заккарія Гизольфи, предпринимал меры по противодействию османской угрозе, но позже начал рассматривать возможность переезда в Великое княжество Московское, где Иван III Васильевич принимал христиан с юга, бежавших от османов. Заккарія Гизольфи вел переговоры об условиях своей потенциальной службы при дворе Ивана III, но, в конце концов, не смог поехать в Московію и осел на службе у крымских ханов. Еще интереснее предполагаемая связь между Заккаріей и определенными событиями в религиозной жизни русских земель. Заккарія Гизольфи, князь Таманский, также известный как Захарія Скара из вышеупомянутой переписки с Иваном III, отождествлялся некоторыми учеными с євреєм Схаріей, основателем ереси жидовствующих в Новгороде и Москве. Эта проблема вызывает в историографии оживленные дискуссии на протяжении десятилетий, и точка в них до сих пор не поставлена.

Ключевые слова: Генуя, Заккарія Гизольфи, Иван III Васильевич, Каффа, колонии, Крымское ханство, Матрега, черкесы, Черное море

Стаття надійшла до редакції 3.07.2019