

MOLDOVA AND FEODORO PRINCIPALITY BEFORE THE FACE OF THE OTTOMAN EXPANSION

Gertsen A. G.

*Taurida National V. I. Vernadsky University, Simferopol, Crimea, Ukraine
E-mail: gertsenag@yandex.ru*

The article is devoted to the events of the last months of the existence of the Principality Theodoro, where an active role was played by the ruler of Moldova Stephen the Great. In a complex political environment, typical for the Northern black sea in the second half of the XV century. there is active diplomatic activity aimed at establishment between the states of the region political relations aimed at creating antiosman coalition. The most active participants of this activity was the Moldovan Principality, Mangup (Theodore) and the Hungarian Kingdom. The conclusion of the marriage union and political union between Suchava and Mangup lead researchers on the assumption about the claims of Stephen, in the case of the expulsion of the Turks, on the throne restored Byzantium or, at least, become the ruler of the principality Theodoro. Trying to find the possibility of combating the increasing threat of Turkish invasion, Mangup prince Isaac in response to the desire of the Northern neighbour on strengthening its Byzantine pedigree, led successful negotiations about marrying princess of Mangup whose name remains unknown, for the son of the great prince of Moscow Ivan III, Ivan the Young. This union prevented the capture by the Turks Mangup. The feeling of the inevitability of the Turkish invasion, the prince Isaac tried to establish friendly relations with Mehmed II. Probably, this was negatively perceived as his subjects, and allies. The most severe was the reaction from the side of Stephen III. According to A. A. Vasiliev, he actually gave rise to the palace coup of Theodoro. Before the Turkish invasion was unstable political situation not only in the principality. Internal political conflict erupted and in the Crimean khanate, was overthrown by Khan Mengli-Girey. His flight to the Genoese and the appeal of the Tatar nobility for help to Mehmed II became the pretext for a military invasion of the Turks on the peninsula. The Turkish Navy with the expeditionary force led by Grand vizier Keduk Ahmed Pasha may 31 appeared in minds Kaffa and June 6, the city opened the gate to the winner. XV century Kaffa capture was to Stephan the Great sign of the strengthening of the Turkish threat to his possessions. He's trying to get help from his suzerain, the Hungarian king Matthew Corvin, shrewdly hinting in his letter about the increase of the common threat of an invasion by the Turks, both for Moldova and Hungary. After the capture of the city, Soldaya and other Genoese fortress on the southern coast, it was the turn of the possessions of Mangup. Turkish siege was the culmination of a life Mangup fortress. The company has identified its strengths and weaknesses. Here there was a meeting of the late Roman fortification with the latest siege weapons. As Constantinople, Mangup met Turkish siege on the borders created in early medieval era. The courage of the city defenders of the city was tested new weapons Turks, which had not only a destructive force, but also a huge psychological impact, especially on those who knew about the guns only by hearsay. Mangup defenders flinched at the sight of guns. Probably, an important role was played by soldiers from the squad sent to Stefan the Great. They already had considerable experience in battles with the Turks, and to be familiar with artillery already widely used on the Balkan theater of operations. During the attacks on the walls remained hour, watching the Janissaries not getting to the walls and unexpected throw seized them. Final events of the siege, not reflected in the written sources are reconstructed on the basis of archaeological materials. The heroic defence of Mangup no doubt, for some time to put the brakes on the Turkish conquest of the most important cities-fortresses in the North-West coast of Black sea. Only in 1484 sultan Bayazid, successor Mehmed II, managed to seize Kiliya and Monkastro (Ackerman). Thus, the action of Stephan the Great in support of the prince Alexander, can be seen not only as a purely political action directed on change of the ruler, but also as an attempt to implement the idea of strategic antiosman defence in the Black sea basin. Military and diplomatic activity of Stephan Great in this field sets out a number of governors of other countries in the region. Unfortunately these steps first have no support, secondly, they are very late before the face of the immensely increased the Ottoman Empire, invaded the Balkan countries and the remains of the Byzantine Empire.

Keywords: Moldova, Feodoro principality, Mangup, Ottoman Empire, Stefan the Great, Mehmed II.

The complex political situation, typical for Northern Black Sea coast in the second half of the fifteenth century, was accompanied by active diplomatic actions aimed at establishment of antiosman coalition. The most active participants of this activity were Moldavian, Mangup (or Feodoro) principalities and Hungarian kingdom [1]. The little Principality in the south-western part of Crimean peninsula found itself in a whirlpool of events that sharply changed the political map of the region. Now some words about biography of Mangup city as it seen according to archaeological and written sources. To make it more vivid I am going to show some slides. There you will be able to see the major sites of our long-term researches.

So we determined the following phases of evolution of the settlement at Mangup plateau.

1. Pre-fortress period: (middle of third – middle of fourth century). Only the upper parts of the valleys were inhabited at the plateau. The population mostly consisted of Goths and Alans. Christianity was gradually spread among them.

2. Early Byzantium fortress period (sixth-eighth century). Construction of powerful defensive system, Grand Basilica was built in the centre of the plateau.

3. Khazars period (end of eighth – first half of ninth century). Khazars captured the fortress for the short period. The local economy strengthened.

4. Thema period (middle of ninth – tenth centuries). The fortress is back under the Byzantine authority.

5. Period of neglect (ninth – thirteenth centuries)

6. Early-Feodoro period (fifteenth century). The town blocks appear at the plateau, citadel is formed at Teshkli-Burun Cape; at the end of the century the town is devastated by Tamerlan's forces.

7. Late Feodoro period (first – third quarter of fifteenth century). Revival of Feodoro principality, reconstruction of citadel, palace and Basilica, the second defensive line was built.

8. Turkish period (end of fifteenth century – seventieth of eighteenth century). After the town was captured by Turks (1475) it gradually falls into neglect and totally abandoned by the residents (karaites) at the very end of eighteenth century [2].

Rise of the Turkish threat caused ideological reaction in neighbouring countries. It was expressed by strengthening of interest to Byzantine legacy. Twenty years after the fall of Constantinople rush for a «purple» bride has started. In a single year, 1472, two marriages took place at the highest state level. Ivan the Third, the great prince of Moscow married Sofia Paleolog the niece of the last Byzantine emperor Constantine the Twelfth. By this Moscow showed claim for role of the Third Rome.

The same year political relations between Feodoro principality and Moldavia were secured by marriage between Stephen the Third and Prince Isaac's sister (?) Maria, known as Maria Mangupian. The bride arrived to the court on September 4th, 1472, and the day after the marriage was concluded [3]. By this act the commander gained relationship to Paleologs and other noble Byzantine families, who were mentioned in the genealogical tree of his bride.

There is still true remark of Romanian historian Banescu (1935) regarding the origin of Mangup ruling dynasty that this subject is not clear up to now [4]. Last years the popular hypothesis that the dynasty had Armenian Byzantine-Trabzond roots is criticised. Ac-

ording to it the origin of the dynasty derives from the noble family of Havras which representatives were exiled to Kherson in twelfth century [5]. However there is no other strong evidence of this version beside the similar pronunciation of this name and Prince's surname Hovr-Hovrin [6].

Austrian philologist H.-F. Bayer relying on Romanian anonymous German-language chronicle where Stephen's the Third wife was called Circassian assumes her Northern Caucasus origin [7]. However that should be considered that in fourteenth-sixteenth centuries Alans which appeared in Taurica at least in the fourth century were called Circassian [8]. Medieval city ruined by emir Nogai horde in the end of thirteenth century and neighbouring village located in the vicinity of Mangup were called Circassian-Kermen. This name was recorded by Martin Bronevsky in 1578 [9]. Alans and Goths were the major ethnic component that formed medieval population of mountainous and coastal areas of peninsula [10]. Information about Goths and Alans in Crimea who preserved their ethnic identity is mentioned many times in the medieval written sources. There is one more important issue to be noted. H. -F. Bayer supposed that offspring of Mangup dynasty prince Ioann who died in Trabzond is the same person Ioann Tsirias it est Circassian, who died in 1435 and buried in George Peristerion monastery near Trabzond. In case the hypothesis about Ioann's nickname is correct, we can suppose carefully the Alanic origin of Maria Mangupian. By the way, Ioann who married Maria Asanina Paleolog Tsambalokonin was the brother of Maria from Feodoro the first wife of Trabzond tsar's son David the Great Comnin [11]. This marriage opened the new epoch of international recognition of Mangup Principality.

The most important source for research of the issue of Mangup dynasty origin is Maria's funeral pall kept in Putna monastery. Emblems of Paleologs and Asens depicted on it suggest kindred relationship of Mangup family and those noble families of the Empire. There are no hints at Hovrs or Havras present on this relic. Indirectly connection of Asens to family tree of Mangup elite is confirmed by fragment of lime-stone slab discovered during excavation of the Virgin church at the centre of Mangup plateau. Unfortunately its top part is missing but obviously there was reared heraldic animal depicted on it, most probably lion that was the emblem of Asens.

Marriage and political union between Suchawa and Mangup suggested to scientists that Stephen had claims for the throne of reconstructed Byzantium in case of Turk's defeat, or at least for ruling Feodoro principality. Probably these intentions were not secret to Mangup and that brought to deterioration of relations between two principalities. It seems there was prerequisite to implementation of Stephen's Crimean plan – the glorious victory over the Turkish army on January 10th, 1475. Inspired by the triumph Stephen entered into negotiations with Genoese Kafa to establish the union to fight against Crimean khan and Prince of Feodoro Isaac. However rising threat of Turkish invasion prevented Genoese from this risky step against two powerful forces of the peninsula. After Feodoro was captured by Turks, Stephen loose interest to Mangup princess and was enamoured by Maria Voychita, daughter of Radu the Beautiful, prince of Walachia, who became the third wife of the commander after the death of Maria Mangupian on December 19th, 1477. We have to admit that marriage to Stephen the Great the victor over the terrible Osmons was the high honour for the small Crimean principality that was the vassal of Tatars' khan. Perhaps

only high and gained in unclear way title of the bride attracted attention of the warlord who like Ivan III wanted to develop Byzantine subject.

Trying to find possibility to resist the rising threat of the Turkish invasion as a response to attempt of the northern neighbour to strengthen his Byzantine genealogy Prince Isaac negotiated successfully on marriage of Mangup Princess whose name is unknown to son of a Tsar Ivan the Young. This alliance was prevented by capture of Mangup by Turks [12]. Let's notice that after this marriage didn't take place Ivan the Third remained bound to the chosen by him south direction of his policy. In 1483 son of a Tsar Ivan became husband of Helen the daughter of Stephen the Third and Princess Eudoxia who was sister of Kiev Prince Semen Olekovich [13]. However according to the legend he became a victim of this policy having been poisoned by stepmother «despina» Sofia Paleolog.

Feeling the inevitability of Turkish invasion the ruler of Feodoro Prince Isaac tried to establish friendly relations with Mohamed the Second. Probably, it was negatively accepted by his citizens and allies. The harshest reaction was from Stephen the Third. It is A. Vasiliev's opinion, that Stephen in fact inspired coup d'etat in Feodoro. The hint is dropped by the embassy report to Hungarian king Matthew Korwin dated June 1475. It says that Stephen sent his wife's brother Alexander to Mango Principality. Genoese ship conveyed him to the point named by Genoese sources «Yaspo». Probably Laspi bay, 20 km south of Mangup is meant. The area was part of Gothia Capitanate – the territorial division of Genoese Gazaria, with Chembalo fortress (Balaclava) as administrative centre. Probably Genoese administration alarmed by pro-Turkish dispositions of the neighbouring ruler, assisted Stephen's the Third in removal of Isaac and his replacement by more radical Alexander. Stephen provided ship and 300 armed Walachians, who helped Alexander to come to the throne. Those warriors probably formed the backbone of the garrison, which protected Mangup. Most likely this mission met support from within the Principality and first of all from elite, otherwise fast overthrow of Isaac is hardly explainable. According to Genoese source, it took only three days for Alexander «to seize the father's legacy» and to subdue it [14].

According to another version Prince Isaac, whose ruling started in 1471, died in spring or in the begging of summer 1475. He was replaced by the ruler, whose name is unknown, probably the nephew of the late Prince. But soon he was overthrown by Isaac's younger brother Alexander, brother-in-law of Moldavian ruler.

It is important that those events occurred just before Turkish expeditionary corps landed in vicinity of Kafa on May 31, 1475. Thus, overthrow and probably concurrent murder of Isaac or his successor, happened in spring 1475.

At the time before the Turkish invasion political situation was unstable not only at the Principality. Internal political conflict broke out also in Crimean Khanat – Mengli Girey Khan was overthrown. His escape to Genoese and request for help from the Tatars elite to Mohamed the Second became the cause for Turkish military invasion to the peninsula. Turkish fleet with expeditionary corps under command of Grand vizier Keduk Ahmed-Pasha appeared at the sight of Kafa on May 31, landing took place on June 1, and on June 6th the city opened the gates to the victors.

The fall of Kafa for Stephen was a signal of rising Turkish threat to his domain. So he tries to meet support from his suzerain Hungarian king Matthew Corwin, making a hint in his letter on rise of common threat of invasion both for Moldavia and Hungary.

After Kafa, Soldaya and several smaller Genoese fortresses at the southern coast were captured, the turn of Mangup domain had come. The sources inform only on Turkish operations against the capital of Principality and give no information on resistance of other fortifications like Kalamita, which was built at mouth of river Chernaya in 1420th to protect the main and probably the only Principality's seaport. Most likely there were no considerable military operations against those settlements, they surrendered soon or were abandoned by inhabitants.

The best European source for reconstruction of events of Mangup siege is an essay of gunsmith George Nuremberg. His destiny connected him to Stephen the Great to whom he was sent by duke of Bosnia in 1456. Later in 1460 George with his family was captured by Turks and worked for Mohamed the Second for 20 years. In a book about his adventures he briefly mentions that after capture of Soldaya and Kafa, Turks approached city Santodoro (Feodoro), three kings (princes) and 15 thousand persons were there [15].

The quick storm of the fortress was not successful, but three months later it surrendered voluntarily, the kings with their people were killed. The later authors, for example canon from Krakow Matthew Mahovskiy mentioned about two princes who were brothers and the last Gothic Konungs. According to Martin Bronevskiy, Polish diplomat who visited Mangup in 1578, they were uncle and nephew, descended from Trabsond or Constantinople ruler's family. This information Martin Bronevskiy received from abbot of one of the two remaining temples in the deserted city [16].

Theodore Spandunis, the author from the end of fifteenth century – beginning of sixteenth century, using sources that are not available today, informs that Prince of Gothia killed the elder brother and came to power. Mohamed send his biglierbey against the Prince. The siege of the fortress made Prince surrender in exchange to promise to save his life and property. However after he was delivered to Constantinople Mohamed ordered to execute him, allegedly saying that «promise given by my official to be kept by his own». Little son of the Prince was turned into Islam and the author saw him in Constantinople already Turkish-like.

Till recently the best review of Turkish source informing on fall of Mangup was contained in monograph of A. Vasiliev [17]. In addition to it – recently published in MAIET new translation of historical essay of Ashik Pashaoglu «Osman dynastic history», written between 1475–1480 [18]. New, the more precise version of the translation allows to determine certain details of the siege. For example, assumption about two stages of the siege is confirmed. There is important information on the fall of the fortress due to use of war ruse – false Turk's retreat and a strike from an ambush. This information is supplemented by data from the book of Saad-ed-Din (1536–1599) the author of «History of Osman Empire».

By the time military actions began the fortress on Mangup plateau represented powerful fortified complex consisting of three major components. Main defence line provided protection to the entire natural contour of the plateau. Its main line 6600 m long followed the natural inaccessible contour of the plateau added with artificial fortification 1500 m

long. The fortified area of 90 hectares had broken defensive line that is typical for mountainous fortifications. The most dangerous areas – valleys – were crossed by the lines of fortress walls, which form re-entering angle on a plan. Rift valleys in the cliffs were blocked by short walls with flanks joining the cliffs. The three major sections of the area fortified by the Main defence line may be determined: the Northern, Southern and Western fronts. Each front differed by landscape and fortification features. This complex was created in the second half of sixth century by Byzantine military engineers. It fully or partially functioned during the entire history of the settlement [19].

During the existence of Feodoro principality (fourteenth – third quarter of the fifteenth century) with Mangup as a capital, the second defence line was created. It represented continuous belt of walls and towers and protected the developed part of the plateau cutting off the two largest in area capes – Chamnu-Burun and Chufut-Cheargan-Burun. Citadel was created at Teshkli-burun cape which served also as a fortified residence for the principality rulers. The total area of this fortification is 1.2 hectares [20].

There was no other medieval fortress in Crimea with such a developed defence composed of three belts strengthened by natural conditions. Its siege became for the Turkish army one of the hardest military campaigns at the Northern Black Sea Coast. Open grounds surrounding Mangup plateau made numerous blockade troops necessary mostly cavalry rather than infantry. The other problem for besiegers was choice of the site for the major strike. Tactics of war in mountains requires operations at the several sectors in that case. Course of events suggests that besiegers had precise information on strong and weak sections of the fortress. And it is not surprising when taking into account presence of deserters – representatives of the ruling dynasty in Turkish camp. This information came from Turkish authors. The archaeological excavations and written sources made it clear that according to classic requirements of fortress war the siege took place at least at two sectors. This allows to disperse defendants and to increase the effect of sudden storm. However in the beginning Turks launched an attack to the fortress from the South, but unsuccessfully. Two centuries later it was still remembered. That noted by Turkish traveller Evlia Cheleby, who mentioned that 7 thousand janissary died here, although this number is undoubtedly too high, nevertheless it suggests to extensive losses of the besieging part [21]. This was an affect of both natural inaccessibility of the slope and ineffective usage of artillery here. Range of effective cannon fire in the second half of fifteenth – sixteenth centuries was limited to 200 meters, beyond this distance dispersion of shells was too high even the total range reached up to 800 m and more [22; 23]. So, the cannon cast by Urban, sent 600 kilogram cannonballs into distance of 4 km. However, during the siege of Constantinople it was placed 500 steps from the gates of Saint Roman. Information that we have on Turkish artillery usage suggests that it was usually placed not far from the target. The distance from emplacement south of Mangup (250 m) exceeded optimal range for aimed fire of artillery that time. Besides angle at sight was close to 45 degrees that increased dispersion of cannonballs and weakened its effect on the walls because of high trajectory.

The necessity to use artillery more effectively forced Turks to start operations also at the northern side of the plateau at Hamam-Dere valley during the second stage of the siege. Clear evidence of this event well preserved as the main point of bombardment and

assault – fortification A. XIV was not reconstructed in Turkish time or used as a source of bricks unlike the fortifications at the southern edge of the plateau. Exactly this site allowed restoring several details of organisation of the siege. There were fragments of granite cannonballs found in the remaining of the walls. About 20 hit points and even 2 cannonballs stuck in the stone-work were detected. That allowed determining azimuth of firing directory equal to 35 degrees and location of the Turkish battery. The only location to place the battery was the opposite western slope of Elli-Burun cape. Two fortifications – A. XIV and A. XV could be fired at from this site concurrently. There are traces of the road remaining. The road led from the bottom of the valley along the western slope of the cape up to two levelled grounds each 25–30 square metres in size. The grounds were used for the placement of cannons.

The types of artillery used at the northern sector of Mangup siege may be determined sufficiently precisely according to arrays of found cannonballs with steady sizes. At that time every cannon had its own calibre and unification started only after implementation of artillery scale developed by Gartmann – mechanic from Nuremberg in 1540 [24]. There are three types of cannons may be determined: the small ones with calibre of 8, 9, 11, 14 and 15 centimetres called by Turks «shaika»; the medium size with only one calibre detected – 26 centimetres (Turkish name «shaklos» or «pranka»); and the large siege cannons «martin», «eiderdehen», «belemez» (the heaviest one also called «shahy») [25]. The large cannons had calibres of 35, 40 and 42 centimetres. This range corresponds well with known method of artillery usage during siege of fortresses in the second half of fifteenth century. Usually the small cannons were used for adjusting the large ones or they formed the batteries for breaking the wall battlements, bringing down defenders or catapults [26]. Then heavy cannons were employed to destroy the walls. This way Turkish artillery was used against Constantinople [27]. There were about 30 small calibre cannonballs found during excavation of fortification A. XIV. They were made of marble and were usually used by Turkish ship artillery. However the majority of finds is fragments of large calibre cannonballs. Number of large fragments (half to quarter of the cannonball) amounts to several hundreds, the smaller fragments are countless. Material for those shells is granite which could not be mined in Crimea at that time because it is covered with heavy cover of sedimentary rocks.

The firing at two directions at fortifications A. XIV and A. XV lasted long enough, it is suggested by few number of heavy cannons due to lack of space for their allocation and by huge number of cannonball fragments. We have to consider also extremely low fire rate of heavy cannons in fifteenth century. They fired no more than ten shots per day. For example continuous bombardment of Constantinople walls continued for six weeks [28]. Even in the first half of sixteenth century fire rate of 10 shots per day was considered good [29]. Besides, the theory of fortification bombardment was not developed well in fifteenth century. They considered it is easier to break down the wall rather than breach it with convenient way for assault troops [30].

Five assaults of Mangup launched by besiegers prove that theirs artillery haven't made necessary demolition at once. During the assault both sides suffered considerable losses: besiegers – from stones, defenders – from arrows. There were more than hundred arrowheads found, two of them were detected stuck in the bricks of the defensive wall.

Turks used mostly narrow, rhomb shaped in section steel arrowheads. Turkish arrows were mostly short and light with small flight range; they rebounded from plate armour but penetrated chain armour. Usually assault was launched after preparatory bombardment combined with archery, then storm troops with ladders rushed to the attack, archers followed them raining the defenders on the walls with arrows.

The Turkish siege was culmination of life of Mangup fortress. It revealed its strong and weak sides to the maximum extent. Here late Roman fortification met modern siege weaponry. The same way as Constantinople Mangup met Turkish siege at the frontier created in the early medieval times. The walls of Byzantine capital, built under Theodosius the Second (408–450) withstand for two months, Mangup walls – about half a year. Siege of Novo Brdo lasted forty days, siege of Smederevo – three months. Against this background operation at Mangup may be considered as the hardest campaign of Turkish army in South-Western Europe after Constantinople was captured. The obstacle for the besiegers was not only the natural and artificial fortifications. We may assert of high morale of the garrison which was undoubtedly supported by local population who gathered for protection of the city walls. Courage of the defenders was tested with new Turkish weapon, which had not only the destructive power but huge psychological effect especially for those who haven't seen cannons before. This way it was in Smederevo [31]. In 1478 after fortress and Turkish ship squadron saluted ambassador of khan Seid-Ahmed Tatars ran away in panic from the walls of Kafa [32].

Defenders of Mangup haven't loose courage at the sight of cannons. Probably, due to important role of the warriors from the troops sent by Stephen the Great. They already had experience of fighting Turks and were familiar with artillery which was widely employed at Balkan battlefields. During the bombardment sentinels remained at the walls to prevent janissaries from sudden attack and capture. Skeleton of a defender was found at the doors of tower A. 4 under the pile of bricks from the wall that was ruined after cannonball hit. Even after large section of the wall A between tower A. 4 and joint with wall B was ruined Turks still haven't managed to enter the city. It is suggested by new wall 1.4 meter wide created of the bricks from the ruined wall and limestone boulders. The bricks in the new wall have no clear traces of cannonball hits. Probably Turks finally managed to overcome it without new bombardment. It is still hard to point out the exact location where they forced their way to the territory of the city in the end of December, 1475. Possibly it happened in the Camp valley due to its weak natural flanks. However the new translation of Ashik Pashaoglu text allows to consider another version of siege development and its final.

Failure of the first assault made Keduk Ahmed-pasha fall back temporarily, leaving relatively small part of the troops to support the blockade. Later he came back with reinforcement and started the operation again. However this hasn't brought enough progress. Then he used ruse by starting false retreat. Part of the warriors remained in an ambush. They waited till defenders came out of the walls, rushed to the attack and entered the city.

Final events, which are not reflected in written sources, are reconstructed based on materials of archaeological excavation. After the main defence line has fallen the city was doomed. The palace of prince Alexey became separate resistance centre on the plateau. Citadel became the last stronghold for the defenders of the fortress. Resistance here was

offered till the last opportunity. Pieces of marble cannonballs and several fragments of granite cannonballs 26 centimetres in diameter were found in the doorway. The cannon («shaklos») that fired them were used little in Hamam-dere valley. Only one cannonball of this calibre was found there. Probably after citadel garrison's refusal to surrender this cannon was delivered to the new location – Teshkli-burun cape. Its shots sounded as a final event in life of Feodoro principality capital. Undoubtedly the envoys of Stephen the Great were among the last defenders of the citadel who did their duty to the very end. It is symbolic that during excavations the last year there was silver coin dated to the period of his ruling found. It was probably a talisman of the warrior who fought at Mangup walls also for the honour and independence of his Homeland. It seems symbolic that namely the year Mangup fell there was church built in Suchawa in the name of Saint Demetrius who was one of the divine patrons of Feodoro.

Undoubtedly carnage over the defeated was violent. There were tombs found at the plateau of Mangup during excavations of basilica held by N. Barmina. The tombs dated to the last period of temple existence were packed with skeletons – up to seventeen per one. Many skulls had traces of a hit with heavy blunt tool. Many skeletons had limbs cut off. Burials were found in many unexpected places. Hollows of winepresses were used as graves, sometimes bodies were just bestrewn with ground and stones. The last representatives of Mangup prince dynasty ended their lives in Istanbul: Prince Alexander and his male relatives except the youngest one were executed, women were taken to sultan's harem [33].

The destiny of the population of captured Mangup may be realised according to «signature» of Keduk-Ahmed-pasha in the similar situation during capture of Otranto city in Southern Italy. After two week siege Turks having breached the fortress wall entered the city. Almost all male population (12 of 22 thousand persons) was killed; 800 persons who refused to adopt Islam were executed, about 8 thousand persons were enslaved [34]. According to Ashik Pashaoglu after the city has fallen census was held and *cadi* was appointed. Mangup *kadylyk* that included considerable number of settlements in the south coast of Crimea existed till 1783.

List of references and literature

1. Гонца Г. В. Молдавия и османская агрессия в последней четверти XV – первой трети XVI в. / Г. В. Гонца. – Кишинев : Штиинца, 1984. – С. 22.
2. Gertsen A. Periodization of History Mangup-Theodoro / A. Gertsen // 31 Annual Byzantine Studies Conference, October 28–30, 2005 / The University of Georgia Athens. – Georgia, 2005. – P. 41.
3. Bogdan I. Cronicile slavo-romane din sec. XV – XVI / I. Bogdan. – București, 1959. – P. 57–58 ; Славяно-молдавские летописи XV–XVI вв. – Москва : Наука, 1976. – С. 27 (Бистрицкая летопись 1359–1507 гг.), 64 (Путнянская I летопись 1359–1526 гг.), 118 (Молдавско-польская летопись 1352–1564 гг.).
4. Slavyano-moldavskie letopisi XV–XVI vv. – Moskva, 1976. – S. 27 (Letopis Bystricy), 64 (Letopis Putny I), 118 (Moldavsko-polskaya letopis 1352–1564 gg.).
5. Băanescu N. Contribution a l'histoire de la seigneurie de Théodoro-Mangoup en Crimée / N. Băanescu // Byzantinische Zeitschrift. – 1935. – P. 26.
6. Vasiliev A. A. The Goths in the Crimea / A. A. Vasiliev. – Cambridge, Mass., 1936. – P. 153–158.

6. Степаненко В. П. Князя Феодоро и византийская аристократия XV в. / В. П. Степаненко // Византия и Крым. Тезисы докладов международной конференции в Севастополе, Симферополь, 1997. – С. 76–77 ; Idem. Легенда о Гаврах и Херсонес в русской и советской историографии / В. П. Степаненко // Историография Балканского средневековья. – Тверь, 1990. – С. 87–95 ; Idem. Владетели Феодоро и византийская аристократия XV в. / В. П. Степаненко // АДСВ. – 2001. – № 32. – С. 335–353.
- Stepanenko V. P. Knyaz'ya Feodoro i vizantiiskaya aristokratiya XV v. / V. P. Stepanenko // Vizantiya i Krym. Tezisy dokladov mezhdunarodnoj konferencii v Sevastopole, Simferopol, 1997. – S. 76–77 ; Idem. Legenda o Gavrah i Hersones v russkoj i sovetskoj istoriografii / V. P. Stepanenko // Istoriografiya Balkanskogo srednevekov'ya. – Tver, 1990. – S. 87–95 ; Idem. Vladeteli Feodoro i vizantiiskaya aristokratiya XV v. / V. P. Stepanenko // ADSV. – 2001. – № 32. – S. 335–353.
7. Байер Х. -Ф. История крымских готов как интерпретация Сказания Матфея о городе Феодоро / Х. -Ф. Байер. – Екатеринбург, 2001. – С. 205, 224–226.
- Bajer H. -F. Istorija krymskih gotov kak interpretaciya Skazaniya Matfeya o gorode Feodoro / H. -F. Bajer. – Ekaterinburg, 2001. – S. 205, 224–226.
8. Кулаковский Ю. А. Аланы по сведениям классических и византийских писателей / Ю. А. Кулаковский. – Киев, 1899.
- Kulakovskii Y. A. Alany po svedeniyam klassicheskikh i vizantiiskikh pisatelej / Y. A. Kulakovskii. – Kiev, 1899.
9. Broniovius Martinus. Tartariae description cum tabula geographica eiusdem Chersonesus Tauricae / Martinus Broniovius. – Coloniae, 1595; Айбабин А. И. Основные этапы истории городища Эски-Кермен / А. И. Айбабин // МАИЭТ. – 1991. – Т. 2. – С. 43–51.
- Ajbabin A. I. Osnovnye etapy istorii gorodishcha E'ski-Kermen / A. I. Ajbabin // MAIET. – 1991. – T. 2. – S. 43–51.
10. Айбабин А. И. Этническая история ранневизантийского Крыма / А. И. Айбабин. – Симферополь, 1999. – С. 230.
- Ajbabin A. I. E'tnicheskaya istoriya rannevizantiiskogo Kryma / A. I. Ajbabin. – Simferopol, 1999. – S. 230.
11. Байер Х. -Ф. Указ. соч. – С. 392. Bajер Н. -Ф. Указ. соч. – С. 392.
12. Малиновский А. Историческое и дипломатическое собрание дел, происходивших между российскими великими князьями и бывшими в Крыму татарскими царями с 1462 по 1533 / А. Малиновский // ЗООИД. – 1863. – Т. 5. – С. 187.
- Malinovskii A. Istoricheskoe i diplomaticheskoe sobranie del, proishodivshih mezhdru rossiiskimi velikimi knyaz'yami i byvshimi v Krymu tatarskimi caryami s 1462 po 1533 / A. Malinovskii // ZOOID. – 1863. – T. 5. – S. 187.
13. Семенова Л. Е. Некоторые аспекты международной политики Молдавского княжества во 2-й пол. XV в. / Л. Е. Семенова // Юго-Восточная Европа в средние века. – Кишинев, 1972. – Вып.1. – С. 219–220.
- Semenova L. E. Nekotorye aspekty mezhdunarodnoj politiki Moldavskogo knyazhestva vo 2-j pol. XV v. / L. E. Semenova // Yugo-Vostochnaya Evropa v srednie veka. – Kishinev, 1972. – Vyp. 1. – S. 219–220.
14. Vasiliev A. A. Op. cit. – P. 244–245.
15. Vasiliev A. A. Jörg of Nuremberg, a righter Sovremennik with the fall of Constantinople / A. A. Vasiliev // Byzantion. – 1935. – Т. 10. – P. 203–210.
16. Broniovius Martinus. Op. cit.
17. Vasiliev A. A. The Goths in the Crimea. – P. 249–266.
18. Хайбуллаева Ф. Х. Новый турецкий источник по истории Крыма / Ф. Х. Хайбуллаева // МАИЭТ. – 2001. – Т. 8. – С. 362–365 ; Герцен А. Г. По поводу новой публикации источника турецкого источника о завоевании Крыма / А. Г. Герцен // Там же. – С. 366–387.
- Hajbullaeva F. H. Novyi tureckii istochnik po istorii Kryma / F. H. Hajbullaeva // MAIET. – 2001. – T. 8. – S. 362–365 ; Gertsen A. G. Po povodu novej publikacii tureckogo istochnika o zavoevanii Kryma / Gertsen A. G. // Tam zhe. – S. 366–387.
19. Герцен А. Г. Крепостной ансамбль Мангупа / А. Г. Герцен // МАИЭТ. – 1990. – Т. 1. – С. 125–138.
- Gertsen A. G. Krepostnoj ansambl' Mangupa / A. G. Gertsen // MAIET. – 1990. – T. 1. – S. 125–138.
20. Герцен А. Г. Оборонительная система столицы княжества Феодоро / А. Г. Герцен // Северное Причерноморье и Поволжье во взаимоотношениях Востока и Запада в XII – XVI вв. – Ростов-на-Дону, 1989. – С. 38–45.

Gercen A. G. Oboronitel'naya sistema stolicy knyazhestva Feodoro / A. G. Gercen // Severnoe Prichernomor'e i Povolzh'e vo vzaimootnosheniyah Vostoka i Zapada v XII – XVI vv. – Rostov-na-Donu, 1989. – S. 38–45.

21. Эвлия Челеби. Книга путешествия : Крым и сопредельные области : извлечения из сочинения турецкого путешественника XVII века / Эвлия Челеби. 2 изд. : исправленное и дополненное. – Симферополь, 2008. – С. 75.

E'vliya Chelebi. Kniga puteshestviya : Krym i sopredel'nye oblasti. Izvlecheniya iz sochineniya tureckogo puteshestvennika XVII vek / E'vliya Chelebi. 2 izd. : ispravlennoe i dopolnennoe. – Simferopol', 2008. – S. 75.

22. Яковлев В. В. Эволюция долговременной фортификации / В. В. Яковлев. – М. : Воениздат, 1931. – С. 52.

Yakovlev V. V. E'voluciya dolgovremennoj fortifikacii / V. V. Yakovlev. – M. : Voengiz, 1931. – S. 52.

23. Арендт В. В. К истории средневековой артиллерии (генезис и развитие пушек XIV в.) / В. В. Арендт // Труды Института истории науки и техники. – М., 1936. – Вып. 7. – С. 306.

Arendt V. V. K istorii srednevekovoj artillerii (genezis i razvitie pushek XIV v.) / V. V. Arendt // Trudy Instituta istorii nauki i tehniki. – M., 1936. – Vyp. 7. – S. 306.

24. Мандрыка А. П. История баллистики (до середины XIX в.) / А. П. Мандрыка. – М. ; Л., 1964. – С. 14.

Mandryka A. P. Istoriya ballistiki (do serediny XIX v.) / A. P. Mandryka. – M. ; L., 1964. – S. 14.

25. Дероко А. Наістарніе ватрено оружје у средњевековној Србији / Дероко А. // Глас САН. – № 246. – Отдельна друштвених наука. – Београд, 1961. – Кн. 9. – С. 31.

Deroko A. Naistariie vatreno oruzhie u sredn'evekovnoj Serbii / A. Deroko // Glas SAN. – № 246. – Otdel'n'a drushtvenih nauka. – Beograd, 1961. – Kn. 9. – S. 31.

26. Иохер А. Осадная война или атака крепостей / А. Иохер. – СПб., 1880. – С. 64.

Ioher A. Osadnaya vojna ili ataka krepostej / A. Ioher. – SPb., 1880. – S. 64.

27. Повесть о взятии Царьграда турками в 1453 г. // Памятники литературы Древней Руси. – М. : Художественная литература, 1982. – С. 227.

Povest' o vzyatii Car'grada turkami v 1453 g. // Pamyatniki literaturi Drevnej Rusi. – M. : Hudozhestvennaja literatura, 1982. – S. 227.

28. Рансимен С. Падение Константинополя в 1453 г. / С. Рансимен. – М., 1983. – С. 93.

Ransimen S. Padenie Konstantinopolja v 1453 g. / S. Ransimen. – M., 1983. – S. 93.

29. Беленицкий А. М. О появлении и распространении огнестрельного оружия в Средней Азии и Иране в XIV – XV вв. / А. М. Беленицкий // Известия Таджикского филиала АН СССР. Сер. : «История и этнография». – Сталинабад, 1949. – Вып. 15. – С. 28.

Belenickii A. M. O pojavlenii i rasprostranении ognestrel'nogo oruzhiya v Sredenej Aziii i Irane v XIV – XV vv. / A. M. Belenickii // Izvestiya Tadzhijskogo filiala AN SSSR. Ser. : «Istorija i etnografiya». – Stalinabad, 1949. – Vyp. 15. – S. 28.

30. Пашкевич В. Стрельба из артиллерийских орудий и ручного оружия / В. Пашкевич. – СПб., 1882. – С. 209.

Pashkevich V. Strel'ba iz artilleriiskih orudii i ruchnogo oruzhiya / V. Pashkevich. – SPb., 1882. – S. 209.

31. Мииятович Ч. Деспот Чурач Бранкович / Ч. Мииятович. – Београд, 1980. – Т. 1. – С. 265 ; Смирнов В. Д. Крымское ханство под главенством Оттоманской Порты до начала XVIII в. / В. Д. Смирнов. – СПб., 1887. – С. 291–292.

Miiyatovich Ch. Despot Churach Brankovich / Ch. Miiyatovich. – Beograd, 1980. – T. 1. – S. 265 ; Smirnov V. D. Krymskoe hanstvo pod glavenstvom Ottomanskoj Porty do nachala XVIII v. / V. D. Smirnov. – SPb., 1887. – S. 291–292.

32. Смирнов В. Д. Указ. соч. – С. 291–292.

Smirnov V. D. Ukaz. soch. – S. 291–292.

33. Vasiliev A. A. The Goths in the Crimea. – P. 262–263.

34. Новичев А. Д. История Турции / А. Д. Новичев. – Л., 1963. – С. 50.

Novichev A. D. Istorija Turcii / A. D. Novichev. – L., 1963. – S. 50.

Герцен А. Г. Молдова и княжество Феодоро перед лицом османской экспансии / А. Г. Герцен // Ученые записки Таврического национального университета имени В. И. Вернадского. Серия «Исторические науки». – 2013. – Т. 26 (65), № 2 – С. 167–179.

Проанализированы события последних месяцев существования княжества Феодоро, в которых активную роль играл господарь Молдовы Стефан Великий. В сложной политической обстановке, характерной для Северного Причерноморья во второй половине XV века, развивается активная дипломатическая деятельность по установлению между государствами региона политических отношений, направленных на создание антиосманской коалиции. Наиболее активными участниками этой деятельности стали Молдавское княжество, Мангуп (Феодоро) и Венгерское королевство. Заключение брачного и политического союза между Сучавой и Мангутом вызывало у исследователей предположение о претензиях Стефана, в случае изгнания турок, занять трон восстановленной Византии или, по крайней мере, стать правителем княжества Феодоро. Пытаясь найти возможность борьбы с растущей угрозой турецкого вторжения, в ответ на желание северного соседа укрепить свою византийскую родословную, князь Исаак вел переговоры о женитьбе сына великого князя Московского Ивана III Ивана Молодого на мангупской княжне, чье имя осталось неизвестным. Чувствуя неизбежность вторжения турок, князь Исаак пытался также наладить дружественные отношения с Мехмедом II. Вероятно, это было негативно воспринято как его подданными, так и союзниками. Самой резкой была реакция со стороны Стефана III. Согласно А. А. Васильеву, он инициировал в Феодоро дворцовый переворот. Нестабильная политическая ситуация до турецкого вторжения была не только в княжестве. Внутривнутриполитический конфликт развился и в Крымском ханстве, где был свергнут хан Менгли-Гирей. Его бегство к генуэзцам и обращение татарской знати за помощью к Мехмеду II стало поводом для военного вторжения турок на полуостров. Турецкий флот с экспедиционным корпусом во главе с великим визирем Кедук Ахмед-Пашой 31 мая 1475 г. появился перед Каффой и 6 июня город открыл ворота победителю. Захват Каффы был для Стефана Великого знаком усиления турецкой угрозы его владениям. Он пытается получить помощь от своего сюзерена, венгерского короля Матиаша Корвина, прозорливо намекая в своем письме об увеличении общей угрозы вторжения турок, как для Молдовы, так и Венгрии. После захвата города, Солдайи и других генуэзских крепостей на Южном побережье Крыма, наступила очередь владений Мангупа. Турецкая осада была кульминацией в жизни крепости Мангуп. Кампания определила ее сильные и слабые стороны. Здесь состоялась встреча поздней римской фортификации с новейшей осадной техникой. Как и Константинополь, Мангуп встретил турецкую осаду на рубежах, созданных в ранне-средневековую эпоху. Мужество защитников города было испытано оружием турок, обладавшим не только невиданной разрушительной силой, но и огромным психологическим воздействием, особенно на тех, кто знал об этих орудиях только понаслышке. Защитники Мангупа не дрогнули при виде пушек. Вероятно, в обороне важную роль сыграли воины, присланные Стефаном Великим. Они уже имели немалый опыт в боях с турками, и были знакомы с артиллерией, уже широко использовавшейся на балканском театре военных действий. Во время обстрелов на стенах оставались часовые, наблюдая, чтобы янычары, неожиданным броском не захватили их. Финальные мероприятия осады не отражены в письменных источниках и реконструируются на основании археологических материалов. Героическая оборона Мангупа без сомнения на какое-то время затормозила турецкое завоевание самых важных городов-крепостей на северо-западном побережье Черного моря. Только в 1484 году султану Баязиду – преемнику Мехмеда II, удалось захватить Килию и Монкастро (Аккерман). Таким образом, действия Стефана Великого в поддержку князя Александра, можно рассматривать не только как чисто политическую акцию, направленную на смену правителя, но и как попытку реализовать идею стратегической антиосманской обороны в бассейне Черного моря. Однако эти действия, во-первых, не получили должной поддержки правителей других стран в регионе, во-вторых они запоздали перед лицом безмерно усилившейся Османской империи, подмявшей под себя балканские страны и остатки Византии.

Ключевые слова: Молдова, княжество Феодоро, Мангуп, Османская империя, Стефан III Великий, Мехмед II.

Герцен О. Г. Молдова і князівство Феодоро перед лицем османської експансії / О. Г. Герцен // Вчені записки Таврійського національного університету імені В. І. Вернадського. Серія «Історичні науки». – 2013. – Т. 26 (65), № 2 – С. 167–179.

Проаналізовано події останніх місяців існування князівства Феодоро, в яких активну роль грав господар Молдови Стефан Великий. У складній політичній обстановці, характерній для Північного При-

чорномор'я у другій половині XV століття, розвивається активна дипломатична діяльність зі встановлення між державами регіону політичних відносин, спрямованих на створення антиосманської коаліції. Найактивнішими учасниками цієї діяльності стали Молдавське князівство, Мангуп (Феодоро) і Угорське королівство. Укладення шлюбного і політичного союзу між Сучавою і Мангупом викликало у дослідників припущення щодо претензій Стефана, у разі вигнання турків, зайняти трон відновленої Візантії або, принаймні, стати правителем князівства Феодоро. Намагаючись знайти можливість боротьби зі зростаючою загрозою турецького вторгнення, у відповідь на бажання північного сусіда зміцнити свій візантійський родовід, князь Ісаак вів переговори про одруження сина великого князя Московського Івана III Івана Молодого на Мангупській княжні, чие ім'я залишилося невідомим. Відчуваючи неминучість вторгнення турків, князь Ісаак намагався також налагодити дружні відносини з Мехмедом II. Ймовірно, це було негативно сприйнято як його підданими, так і союзниками. Найбільш різкою була реакція з боку Стефана III. Згідно А. А. Васильєву, він ініціював у Феодоро палацовий переворот. Нестабільна політична ситуація до турецького вторгнення була не тільки в князівстві. Внутрішньополітичний конфлікт вибухнув і в Кримському ханстві, де було скинуто хана Менглі-Гірея. Його втеча до Генуї і звернення татарської знаті за допомогою до Мехмеда II стало приводом для військового вторгнення турків на півострів. Турецький флот з експедиційним корпусом на чолі з великим візиром Кедук Ахмед-Пашею 31 травня 1475 з'явився перед Каффою і 6 червня місто відкрило ворота переможцю. Захоплення Каффи було для Стефана Великого знаком посилення турецької загрози для його володінь. Він намагається отримати допомогу від свого союзника угорського короля Матіаша Корвіна, прозорливо натякаючи у своєму листі про збільшення загальної загрози вторгнення турків як для Молдови, так і Угорщини. Після захоплення міста Солдайї та інших генуезьких фортець на Південному узбережжі Криму, настала черга володінь Мангупа. Турецька облога була кульмінацією у житті фортеці Мангуп. Кампанія визначила її сильні і слабкі сторони. Тут відбулася зустріч пізньої римської фортифікації з новітньою облоговою технікою. Як і Константинополь, Мангуп зустрів турецьку облогу на рубежах, створених у ранньосередньовічну епоху. Мужність захисників міста була випробувана зброєю турків, що володіла не тільки небаченою руйнівною силою, а й величезним психологічним впливом, особливо на тих, хто знав про ці знаряддя тільки з чуток. Захисники Мангупа не здригнулися при вигляді гармат. Ймовірно, в обороні важливу роль зіграли воїни, прислані Стефаном Великим. Вони вже мали чималий досвід у боях з турками і були знайомі з артилерією, що вже широко використовувалася на балканському театрі військових дій. Під час обстрілів на стінах залишалися вартові, які спостерігали, щоб яничари несподіваним кидком не захопили їх. Фінальні заходи облоги не відображені в письмових джерелах і реконструюються на підставі археологічних матеріалів. Героїчна оборона Мангупа без сумніву на якийсь час загальмувала турецьке завоювання найважливіших міст-фортець на північно-західному узбережжі Чорного моря. Тільки 1484 року султану Баязиду – наступнику Мехмеда II, вдалося захопити Кілію та Монкастро (Аккерман). Таким чином, дії Стефана Великого в підтримку князя Олександра можна розглядати не тільки як суто політичну акцію, спрямовану на зміну правителя, але і як спробу реалізувати ідею стратегічної антиосманської оборони в басейні Чорного моря. Проте ці дії, по-перше, не отримали належної підтримки правителів інших країн у регіоні, по-друге, вони запізнилися перед обличчям Османської імперії, що безмірно посилювалася та підім'яла під себе балканські країни і залишки Візантії.

Ключові слова: Молдова, князівство Феодоро, Мангуп, Османська імперія, Стефан III Великий, Мехмед II.

Поступила в редакцію 01.11.2013 г.

Рецензенти:

д.и.н., проф. А. И. Айбабин

д.и.н., проф. С. Б. Филимонов