

Problems of Studying the Crimean-Tatar Manuscripts of the Cossack Period on the Ukrainian-Turkish Relations

Ferhad Turanly*

Abstract

In the present article, the Ottoman Turkish and Crimean-Tatar written manuscripts are under studies as sources of the Crimean Khanate History. The authors of the manuscripts used different writing systems, so a text interpretation problem is faced by scholars. The evolution of writing is considered as a source for the objective study of the Crimean Khanate History and its international relations, in particular, those ones with the Ukrainian Cossack State.

Keywords: Turkic Ottoman Crimean-Tatar written monuments, evolution, khanate, a source, interpretation, history

Kazak Dönemi Ukrayna-Türk İlişkileriyle İlgili Kırım Tatar Elyazması Belgelerinin Araştırılması Meselesi

Özet

Çalışmada Osmanlı Türkçesi ve Tatar Türkçesi ile yazılmış metinlerin Kırım Hanlığı tarihinin kaynakları olarak değerlendirilmesi yapılmaktadır. Belgelerde farklı yazı sistemlerinin kullanılmasının araştırmacılar nezdinde yarattığı problemlere de değinilmektedir. Müteakiben, vekayiname türünün evrimi, bu gibi kaynakların Kırım Hanlığı'nın tarihi, uluslararası ilişkileri ve Ukrayna Kazak Devleti'yle kurduğu münasebetlerin nesnel olarak aydınlatılması bakımından önemi üzerinde durulmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Türk, Osmanlı, Kırım, Tatar, yazılı kaynaklar, evrim, hanlık, kazak, kaynak, değerlendirme, tarih.

* Assoc. Prof. Dr., Kyiv-Mohila Akademisi Ulusal Üniversitesi, Ukrayna, turanly@yahoo.com. (Makale gönderim tarihi: 04.02.2017, makale kabul tarihi: 21.02.2017)

When considering the specific features of the Crimean-Tatar written monuments in terms of the evolution of the Turkic writing system, one should bear in his mind that for a long time authors of those monuments practices different writing systems. The most important consecutively among those were the following languages: Gokturkic or Orgun (Orhon), Uigurish, Kypchak, Arabic and Latin which have their own respective graphics². Transferring from the language of the aforementioned period into the classical Ottoman and Crimean-Tatar languages, while the Ottoman State and the Crimean-Tatar Yurt with its acquiring ther status of the Crimena Khanate during 1427–1428 headed by its Ruler – Haji Giray I (ruling years: 1420/1421–1456)³, particularly into the Ottoman Turkic language was accompanying by the development of the Ottoman State and acquiring the status of empire in the second half of the 15th century after conquering Constantinople, the capital of the Byzantine Empire, on 29 May 1453 by Sultan Mehmed II Fatih (ruling years: 1444–1446; 1451–1481, the 2nd ruling)⁴. It should be noted that during the

² Faruk K. Timurtaş, *Osmanlı Türkçesi Grameri*, İstanbul, 1999, Cilt III, 9. Baskı, s. 3–7. On the Trukic runic writing system see in details in: Gabain von A., *Eski Türkçenin Grameri*, Ankara, 2000, s. 5–11; Muharrem Ergin, *Orhun Abideleri*, İstanbul, Boğaziçi Yayınları, 1999, 147, s. 8 il; Туранли Ферхад Гардашкан Оглу. *Кримськотатарські писемні пам'ятки як джерело з історії України козацької доби / Ферхад Туранли // Україна–Туреччина: історія, політика, дипломатія, культура.* — Вид. друге, доповнене / В. І. Сергійчук, Н. О. Татаренко та ін. — К. : Укр. письменник, 2015. — С. 49–61. — 550 с. — (Ferhad Gardashkan Oglu Turanly, *The Crimean-Tatar written monuments as a source of the History of Ukraine of the Cossack period / Ferhad Turanly // Ukraine–Turkey: history, policy, diplomacy, culture*, 2nd edition, enlarged) / В. І. Сергійчук, Н. О. Татаренко та ін. — К. : Укр. письменник, 2015. — С. 49–61. — 550 с. — (V.I. Serhiychuk, N.O. Tatarenko et al., Kyiv : Ukrainian writer, 2015, pp. 49–61, 550 pp.).

³ Абдуллаева Гульнара. *Золотая эпоха Крымского ханства: очерки.* — Симферополь: КРП «Издательство «Крымучпедгиз», 2012. — С. 4–9. — 216 с. — (Abdulayeva Gulnara, *The gold epoch of the Crimean Khanate: essays*, Simferopol : KRP Publishing House “Krymuchpedgiz”, 2012, pp. 4–9, 216 pp.).

⁴ The heroic struggle of the Byzantine and Turkic Armies for Constantinople lasted for two months. According to the data from Historian Hammer-Pugstall, the city was surrounded 29 times. Dozens of thousands people from the

historical development there were taking place transformations of one writing system into ones of another writing system, and the new variant still containing elements of the older language with the peculiar features of the latter one.

During the 12th– 13th centuries the Oguz Turkic language was dominating on the vast geographic area located between Central Asia and Anatolia (nowadays in Turkey). This language naturally got slowly adapted to the new geopolitical medium.⁵ For instance, the alphabet of the Ottoman Turkic language, consisting of 31 letter, is written by means of the Arabic graphics:

ا (آ) ب پ ت ث ج چ ح خ د ذ ر ز س ش ص ض ط ظ ع غ ف ق ك ل م ن و ه ی

The names of the letters as follows: *elif, be, pe, te, se, cim, çim, ha, hı, dal, zel, re, ze, je, sin, şin (şın), lâm, mim, nun, vav, he, ye*⁶. The alphabet of the modern Crimean-Tatar language is based on both Cyrillic, and Latin, and the Crimean-Tatar Latin based alphabet is made up of 31 letter: *Aa, Bb, Cc, Çç, Dd, Ee, Ff, Gg, Ğğ, Hh, İi, İi, Jj, Kk, Ll, Mm, Nn, Ññ, Oo, Öö, Pp, Qq, Rr, Ss, Şş, Tt, Uu, Üü, Vv, Yy, Zz* (usage of the

civilian population, that were in the area of the Aya-Sofia (St-Sophia's Cathedral in Istanbul) were not injured. The great Hakan of the Turks – Sultan Fatih Mehmed II entered the city and arrived in Aya-Sofia. A Christian chronicler, witnessed this event, due to the Turkish Historian Yılmaz Oztuna, wrote, that “when the Sultan arrived in Aya-Sofia, he dismounted his horse and stood in front of the Cathedral. He addressed the Patriarch, priests of the Christian folk, so as from that day their lives became untouchable and free”. He conquered the city, which was a famous capital of the world's empires, and was defended by the last, 74th Emperor Constantine XI. As the Turkish scholars noted, the Sultan declared the moral values (freedom of conscience, immunity of the life of man, justice, etc.), which happened to become the beginning of the New History (*Öztuna, Yılmaz, Büyük Osmanlı Tarihi, İstanbul, 1994, Cilt I, s. 229*).

⁵ *Muharrem Ergin, a.g.e, s. XXXI–XXXII. Туранли Ф. Еволюція турецького письма в світлі розвитку літературної мови / Східний Світ (The Oriental World). — К., 2003. — Вип. 4. — С. 148–155. — (Muharrem Ergin, a.g.e, s. XXXI–XXXII. Turanly F., Evolution of the Turkish writing system in the highlight of the litarary language / Skhidnyi Svit, (The Oriental World), Kyiv, 2003, Issue 4, pp. 148–155).*

⁶ See in details of that in: *Faruk K. Timurtaş, aynı eser, s. 3–7.*

letter *Ââ* with the diacritic sign shows palatalisation of the preceding vowel *i*, and it is not an independent letter), while the Cyrillic-base alphabet is made up of 35 letters and 2 signs: *Аа, Бб, Вв, Гг, Гь/гъ, Дд, Ее, Ёё, Жж, Зз, Ии, Йй, Кк, Кь/къ, Лл, Мм, Нн, Нь/нъ, Оо, Пп, Рр, Сс, Тт, Уу, Фф, Хх, Цц, Чч, Дж/дж, Шш, Щщ, Ъъ, Ыы, Ьь, Ээ, Юю, Яя* (зъ, къ, нъ and дж are separate letters (it is important for sorting out words in the alphabetical order, for example in dictionaries). It should be stressed that there is no adequate correspondence between the Cyrillic and Latin alphabets. Historical manuscripts written by the Crimean-Tatar chroniclers (including here the Ottoman Turkic chroniclers) before the introduction of book printing were first of all intended for reading them aloud. Listening to and discussing historical texts in the respective community was then one of the most important traditions, and those sessions often finished in a discussion aimed at identifying the most objective assessment of the events being described⁷. Correct reading, identification and voicing the vowel phonemes in the Arabic language diacritic marks are of much importance (حركة – /'hareke) – a system of diacritic signs (written above the letters), for instance: medde (◌̣ – the letter *elif* with the medde), fetha (◌̣ – the letter *mim* with the fetha), kesre (◌̣ – the letter *te* with the kesre), shedde (◌̣ – the letter *lem* with the shedde), damma (◌̣ – the letter *kaf* with the damma), gamze (◌̣ – the letter *elif* with the gamze), sukun (◌̣ – the letter *be* with the sukun), tenvin (◌̣ – the letter *gain* with the tenvin), etc. We shall note that, unlike the Arabic language, no similar signs were used in the Ottoman Turkic language, and particularly in the Crimean-Tatar writing system. Though the Ottoman Turkic language includes quite a lot of Arabic words, but, with the purpose of simplification and making easier writing and reading texts, mainly simple forms of the Arabic graphics were used, for

⁷ Lewis V. Thomas, *A Study of Naima*, New York, 1972, s. 148–149.

example – خطی رُقعه. Below we give samples of that graphics⁸ having been borrowed from an original Ottoman Turkic manuscript⁹.

The Turks added the Arabic alphabet with different letters and diacritic signs, so as to provide the correct and adequate writing of words in their native language. For using the corpus-based linguistics, and particularly – the linguistic and informational analysis of the text is an important precondition for finding and informational analysis of the text, as well as for classifying the source materials, particularly archival documents, and for making an adequate translation of such texts and their objective interpretation¹⁰.

Considering the Crimean-Tatar, especially the Ottoman Turkish History Writing, one should note, that in the Crimean Khanate, and in the Ottoman State, each outstanding person-ruler – سُلطان / sultan; خان / khan; وزیر اعظم / vezîr-i a'zam¹¹; شیخول اسلام / şeyh-ül İslâm¹² – has his

⁸Faruk K. Timurtaş, *Osmanlı Türkçesine Giriş: Eski Yazı ve İmlâ-Gramer-Aruz-Metinler*, İstanbul, Alfa Basım Yayım Dağıtım, 1999, Cilt I, 17. Baskı, s. 1, 22–24.

⁹سامی شمسالدین، قاموس ترکی، استانبول، در سعادت اقدام مطبعه‌سی، ۱۳۱۷، ص. ۶۶۸-۶۶۹. ۱۵۷۴'ص.

¹⁰ Hayati Develi, *Osmanlı Türkçesi Kılavuzu, Ders Kitabı*, 1, Bilimevi Yayınları, İstanbul, 2001, s. 15–16, 232; Туранли Ф. *Методологічні проблеми дослідження османської історії / Матеріали міжнародної наукової конференції «Спадщина Омеляна Прицака і сучасні гуманітарні науки»* (28–30 травня 2008 р.). Національний університет «Києво-Могилянська академія». — К. : Аратта, 2009. — С. 269 – 281. — 328 с. – (Turanly F., *Methodological problems of studying the Ottoman History / Digests of the International Scientific Conference “The Legacy of Omelian Pritsak and modern humanitarian sciences”* (May 28–30 2008), The National University “Kyiv-Mohyla Academy”, Kyiv : Aratta, 2009, pp. 269–281, 328 pp.).

¹¹ The Grand Vizier, the Prime Minister (Ferit Develliğlü, *Osmanlıca-Türkçe Ansiklopedik Lûgat, Eski ve Yeni Harflerle*, Ankara, 1993, 11. Baskı, s. 1150, 1195 s.).

¹² In the Ottoman State “the Sheikh-ul’-Islam” was an officer that due to his official status was the first after the grand Vizier, and that position was in charge of the religious affairs of the state and the Head of the Academic Board (Develliğlü, *a.g.e.*, s. 451, 995).

own Medjlis – مجلس / *meclis*¹³, that is a his own circle of friends, advisers and counsellors, supporters. At the said-type discussions there were also read historical works, chronicles, and discussed the described in them events¹⁴. In this context, the attention should be drawn not only to the ideas and judgements of the authors, who interpreted the respective events and facts, but also to the ideas being expressed during the discussions by other persons present. That enabled finding the sources of respective ideas and conceive roots of some specific assessments of historical events. In this respect, especially important sources for reconstructing historical events are official documents, orders and resolutions issued by rulers, or the Divan / ديوان / *divân*¹⁵ of the Grand Medjlis (on behalf of the rulers of the Ottoman State), and also speeches and the mail of a khan or a sultan mentioned in historical works. Possibly, *vakayiniüvis*¹⁶ tried to get access to the mail of the officials, and to protocols of the State Divan¹⁷ too.

We shall note, that in the 17th century the quality of official historians works were positively affected by an increase of the cultural and educational levels of certain social groups, which, its own turn, contributed not only to the contents, but also to the History writing methods. A paradigm of a scientific perception of specific features of the Turkic Historiography of that time is a method of studying and interpreting texts of historical works and archival documents practiced in works by Agatangel Krymsky, Omelian Pritsak, Yaroslav Dashkevych, Ismail Uzuncharshyly, Galil Inalzhyk, Yujel Oztiurk and by some other scholars, that made it possible to clarify the meaning of the Turkic written sources, so as to study the history of the Ukrainian-Turkish

¹³ The modern Parliament (the Supreme Council) of the Ottoman Empire consisted of two Medjlises, whose member were to be appointed by the Government (Devellioğlu, *a.g.e.*, s. 594–595).

¹⁴ “A Chronicle” (واقيعنامه / *vakâyîc-nâme*).

¹⁵ Devellioğlu, *a.g.e.*, s. 189.

¹⁶ واقعه نويس / *vak'â-nüvîs* – an official palace state historian (Devellioğlu, *a.g.e.*, s. 1134).

¹⁷ See.: Note 14.

relations¹⁸, state-forming processes and for the development of the Oriental Studies in general. Since the Crimean-Tatar factor is very essential in the Ukrainian history of the Cossack period of time, the national Turkic Studies need badly to study the source-documents of Turkic manuscripts¹⁹, including here the Crimean-Tatar manuscripts, whose origin is referred to the historical period of the mentioned era and to the involvement of the scientific circulation of the data from the history of Ukraine available in the said documents.

The key place among the historiographic sources related to the history of Ukraine belongs to "Pechevi's History" (*پچوي تاريخى* / "*Peçevi Târihi*") written by Ibragim Pechevi (life years: 1572–1650); to the "The History Outcome" (*فذلکه ي تاريخ* / "*Fezleke-i Târih*") by Katib Chelebi (Mustafa bin Abdullag – life years: 1609–1657) in which described the 1591–1654 time period of the Ottoman history was described; to "An Armed Bearer's History" (*سلهدار تاريخى* / "*Silâh-dâr Târihi*") by Silahdar Fyndyklyly Mehmed Aga (life years: 1658–1723)²⁰; to "The Chronicle" (*وقايعنامه* / "*Vakâyî-nâme*") by Abdurragman Abdi Pasha in which we find a description of the events related to the 1648–1682; "A capture of Kamyanets [-Podilskiy]" (*قمانیچه فتحنامه سی* / "*Kamânîçe Feth-nâmesi*") by Yusif Nabi (a poet, philosopher-sufi, life years: 1642–1712); to the chronicle-type sources, especially the works by the Crimean-Tatar authors: "History of Khan Islam Giray III" (*تاریخی* / "*Üçüncü İslam Giray Han Târihi*") by Hadji

¹⁸ Сергійчук Богдан, Сергійчук Володимир. *На межі двох світів. Українсько-турецькі відносини у середині XVI – на початку XXI ст.* — К. : ПП Сергійчук М. І., 2011. — 320 с. — (Serhiychuk Bohdan, Serhiychuk Volodymyr, *On the borderline of two worlds, Ukrainian-Turkish affairs in the middle of the 16th – beginning of the 21st centuries*, Kyiv : PP Serhiychuk M. I., 2011).

¹⁹ Under Turkish manuscript sources we imply a complex of written and other monuments of history, whose authors originated from the countries settled by Turkic ethnoses: the Oguz, the Uigur, the Kypchaks, the Ottoman Turkic people, particularly by the Crimean Tatars, etc. More detailed about the Turkic sources see: Zeki A. Velidî Togan, *Tarihte Usûl*, 4-üncü Baskı, Enderun Kitabevi, İstanbul, 1985, s. 206 – 212.

²⁰ P. [Parmaksızoğlu] İ., "Silahdar, Silahdar Memed Ağa", *Türk Ansiklopedisi*, Ankara 1980, Cilt, XXIX, s. 28-29.

Mehmed Senayi Kyrymly²¹, and “Prospering of Khans” (گۆلبونى حانان / “*Gülbîn-i Hânân*”, Chapter “Khan Islam Giray III” (اوپنجى اسلام گرای خان / “*Üçüncü İslam Giray Han*” by Galim Giray Sultan; to “The Tatars’ Country due to the Data of Seven Travellers” (استبسیار فی اہبار مولوکل / “*Es-seb’-û’s-seyyâr fi ahbâr mûlûk ûl-Tatar*” by Seyid Mehmed Rıza; “Nayima’s History” (نایما تاریخی / “*Naîmâ Târîh-i*” – a description of

²¹ Hadzy Mehmed Sena’i z Krymu, *Historia Chana Islam Gereja III. Tekst turecki wydal, przelozył i opracował Zygmunt Abrahamowicz*, Uzupełniający komentarz historyczny Olgierd Górka i Zbigniew Wojcik; pod redakcją naukową Zbigniewa Wójcika, Warszawa, 1971, Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, Wydanie pierwsze, Nakład 1500+200 egz., Arkuszy wydawniczych 23,50, Arkuszy drukarskich 17. 25, 204 s., + ۷۲ (72 pp. of appendices); (Hadji Mehmed Senayi from the Crimea, *History of Khan Islam Gerei III*, The text in Turkish was published, translated and worked with by Zygmunt Abrahamowicz, *General historical comments prepared Olgierd Górka i Zbigniew Wojcik*; edited by Zbigniew Wójcik, Warsaw, 1971, Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, Pthe first publication. Circulation – 1500+200 copies, 23. 50 published pages, 17. 26 printed pages, 204 pp. + ۷۲ (72 pp. of appendices).

حجى محمد ثنائى قريملى. اوپنجى اسلام گرای خان تاریخی (British Museum, No. Add. 7870); Зокрема, цей літопис являє собою унікальний пам’ятник кримськотатарської художньої літератури XVII століття з огляду на жанрову особливість цього писемного джерела (Абдуджемилев Р.Р. «Тарих-и Ислам Герай хан» эсери жанр нокътай-назарындан [Жанровая специфика сочинения «Тарих-и Ислам Герай хан»] / Р. Р. Абдуджемилев // ж. Йылдыз. — № 2. — Симферополь, 2013. — С.84–90; Абдуджемилев Рефат Рустем огли. Хроніка Мехмеда Сенаї як пам’ятник кримськотатарської художньої літератури XVII століття / Р.Р. Абдуджемилев. Автореферат дисертації на здобуття наукового ступеня кандидата філологічних наук. — Симферополь, 2014. — 20 с. (Particularly, this chronicle is a unique monument of the Crimean-Tatar belles-lettres of the 17th century in terms of the genre specificity of this written source (Abdudjemilev R. R. “Tarih-i Islam Geray khan» eseri zhanr nok’tay-nazarydan [The genre specificity of the composition “Tarih-i Islam Geray khan”] / R. R. Abdudjemilev // zh. Yildyz, # 2, Simferopol, 2013, pp. 84–90; Abdudjemilev Refat Rustem Ogly, Mehmed Senayi’s chronics as a monument of the Crimean-Tatar belles-lettres of the 17th century / R. R. Abdudjemilev, An author’s abstract of the thesis in seeking awarding the academic degree of the Candidate of the Philological Sciences, Simferopol, 2014, 20 pp.).

the 1591–1659 time period in the Ottoman History by the palace v a k a yi vis Mustafa Nayima Efendi (life years: 1655–1716) and others. Of course, that studying this theme it is difficult to deal without the historical studies by some historians having worked in Europe, and particularly the following ones: “The Ottoman Empire’s History: the rise and decline” / *“Incrementa atque decrementa Aulæ Othomanicae”* by Dimitri Kantemir²² (life years: 1673–1723); “History of the Ottoman Empire” / *“Geschichte des Osmanischen Reiches”* by Joseph von Hammer-Purshall (life years: 1774–1856). We have not beyond our attention the fact, that certain fragments of the above said works have already become known to Ukrainian historians owing to their translations into Ukrainian, Polish, English, German, French, Russian²³. Keeping on the consideration of this study, it is important to stress, that among the Ottoman Crimean-Tatar Turkic manuscripts of the 16th_18th centuries there are of much significance such works, as “The Origin of Countries and the Ascension Phases”

(تباكاتول ميمائىكى و درجآتول مسائىكى) / *“Tabakatü’l-memâlik ve derecâtü’l-mesâlik”*) by Mustafa Chelebi Jelalzade Nishanji (1494?–1567), “Pechervi’s History” (پچوي تاريخى) / *“Tarih-i Peçevî”*) by Ibragim Pechevi

²² Dimitri Kantemir (lived between: 1673–1723) was a distinguished personality: a statesman, a scholar, a chronicler, an 18th-century artist (a composer and a writer). He was born in 1673 році in the city of Yassy (Roumania), originated from the Nogay Tatars, being a lived in his youth in Istanbul where he got good education and deep knowledge in different branches of science; he studied Turkish, Latin, Greek, Slav languages; during 1693–1711 was the War Governor of Bogdan Area: the War Governor of the Moldavian Principality – in 1693 and during 1710–1711; he died in 1723 in Kharkiv (Ukraine). D. Kantemir is the author of the legendary chronical work “The Ottoman Empire’s History: the rise and decline”. For a more detailed biography of D., Kantemir see: Kantemir, Dimitri, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nun Yükseliş ve Çöküş Tarihi* / *Incrementa atque decrementa Aulæ Othomanicae*, 1. Cilt, 2. Bası, Cumhuriyet Kitap Klübü, Cumhuriyet Kitapları, İstanbul, 1998, s. 19–27; Kantemir, Dimitri, *a.g.e.*, 2. Cilt, 2. Bası, s. 869–880.

²³ Ukrainian historians are fragmentary aware of E. Chelebi’s “A travelling book”, Translation and comments, Issue # 1, (The lands of Moldova and Ukraine), Moscow : 1961, (Э. Челеби. «Книга путешествия». Перевод и комментарии. — Вып. 1. (Земли Молдавии и Украины). — Москва : 1961.).

and “An Armed Bearer’s History” (سلهدار تاريخى / *“Silâh-dâr Târîh-i”*) by Silahdar Fyndyklyly Mehmed Aga. Their value as that of sources is not only availability of actual data concerning the political, economic and social problems of the Ottoman Empire and its neighbouring countries, but an authentic manner of the presentation and assessment of the respectively described events, their multi-aspect characterisation. The noticeable point about the said works is also the fact, that their authors did not remain indifferent witnesses of the history, instead, they with pain or, on the contrary, approvingly, share on the pages of the respective manuscripts their impressions, comments, from time to time advising something, which to their mind, could improve the course of the state life. It is worth noting, that in Turkey itself a lot of importance is given to the work “The History’s Outcome” (فذلکه ي تاريخ / *“Fezleke-i Târîh”*) by Katib Chelebi, where events of the 1591–1654 time period were reported.

To specify the source importance of the Ottoman Crimean-Tatar Turkic written sources for studying the history of the political affairs between the Ukrainian Cossack State and the Crimean Khanate, establishment and development of their diplomatic relations in the 17th century, one can address Katib Chelebi’s work / کاتب چلبی / *Kâtib Çelebi: “The History’s Outcome” / فذلکه ي تاريخ / “Fezleke-î Târîh”*) and the work by Mustafa Nayima / مصطفى نایما / *Mustafa Nâima (“Nayima’s History” / نایما تاريخى / “Nâimâ Târîhi”*), in which a significant role was for the “Cossack problem”²⁴. According to the data received from the said works, the most grand-scale marine campaigns made by the Ukrainian Cossacks was a march to Synop in August 1614.

The mentioned authors informed, that the Turkish city of Synop was captured by Zaporozhian Cossacks, its population was killed, the children were taken prisoners, and fire was set to the city itself. There

²⁴ Franz Babinger, *Osmanlı Tarih Yazarları ve Eserleri*, Çeviren Prof. Dr. Coşkun Üçok, Ankara 1982, Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları: 435, Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, s. 11, 502 s.; A. Zeki Velidî Togan, *Tarihte Usûl*, Enderun Kitabevi, İstanbul, 1985, s. 209.

was also said, that the Cossacks returned home with a lot of captured stuff²⁵.

Viktor Ostapchuk – a famous scholar, who studies the History of Turkey of the Ottoman Empire period by studying works by Katib Chelebi²⁶, came to the conclusion of a good number of Cossack military raids made in the first half of the 17th century through the Black Sea, for instance, the marches in 1614, 1616, 1621, 1624, 1625, 1638, 1639.

We can give you some fragments from chronicle works, which happened to be of much importance for studying the activities of the government of Hetman Bohdan Khmelnytsky. For example, in a work by the Crimean-Tatar author Sheikh Mehmed Efendi [Tugay-bey's son-in-law – Sultan Geldi, who died in battles against the Poles near the town of Zhovti Vody], there is stated the following: “The Seim [of Poland] ... permitted [M.] Pototsky to start a march against Zaporozhians with an Army of 40,000 soldiers. While B. Khmelnytsky collected an army of 80,000 soldiers and appointed his son Commander of a detachment... The Zaporozhian Hetman [B. Khmelnytsky], after finding out that the Poles were going to fight, got worried and called a board meeting at which, having exchanged with opinions in general, it was decided to address the Crimean Khan and ask him for help”²⁷.

²⁵ Yücel Öztürk, *Özüden Tunaya: Kazaklar – 1*, Yeditepe Yayınevi, İstanbul, 2004, 1. Baskı, s. 341–342.

²⁶ Остапчук Віктор, *Козацькі чорноморські походи у морській історії Кятіба Челебі «Дар великих мужів увоюванні морів» / Mappa Mundi. Збірник наукових праць на пошану Ярослава Дашкевича з нагоди його 70-річчя. Studia in honorem Jaroslavi Daškevyč septuagenario dedicata*. ВидавництвоМ. П. Коць. — Львів - Київ - Нью-Йорк, 1996. — С. 341–426. — 991 с. — (Ostapchuk Viktor, *Cossack Black-Sea marches in the marine history of Katib Chelebi “The gift of great men in the fights of the seas” / Mappa Mundi, A collection of academic works to the 70-th Anniversary of Yaroslav Dashkevych, Studia in honorem Jaroslavi Daškevyč septuagenario dedicata*, М. Р. Kots' Publishing House, Lviv-Kyiv-New-York, 1996, pp. 341–426, 991 pp.).

²⁷ Акчокракли О. *Татарська поема Джан-Мухаммедова*. Про похід Ісляма Гірея (II) III спільно з Богданом Хмельницьким на Польщу у 1648 – 49 рр. (за рукописом з матеріалів етнографічної експедиції Кримського НКО по

The mentioned work states, that the Polish Army, that, due to the Seim's resolution, was to start moving, being headed by Mykola Pototsky, to Ukraine; here also was fixed the fact of the arrival of the Cossacks messengers to the fortress of Ferag-Kerman, to Tugay, who, jointly with the envoys, started to move then to Bakhchisarai²⁸. Further, it is written in the above said work, about the benevolent attitude of the Khan to the Ukrainian envoys, and that the Khan agreed to defend the Zaporozhians from the Poles. One can presuppose, that it was then. That the Cossacks, having freed Tugay-bey's son from the imprisonment, brought him to his farther, so Tugay-bey agreed to fight jointly against enemies of the Ukrainian Hertman.

In the mentioned unique Crimean-Tatar written monument "History of Khan Islam Giray III" / اوچنجی اسلام گرای خان تاریخی / "Üçüncü İslam Giray Han Târihi" by Hadji Mehmed Senayi Crimean, there were included data about causes of the occurrence of the National Liberating Revolution (1648–1654) of Ukrainians headed by Hetman Bohdan Khmenytsky against the Polish and Lithuanian Commonwealth (the religious reasons, national ones, economic causes, political ones, etc.), which accounted for the nation-wide character of that Mehmed Senayi described in details the then interstate affairs between the Ukrainian Cossack State and the Crimean Khanate, and underlined, that the respective course of the events was favoured by the Pro-Crimean-Tatar sympathies from the Zaporozhian Hetman himself. The rapprochement between the Crimea and Ukraine was supported by the consent of the Crimean Khan to satisfy the request to him of the Ukrainian ruler to be provided with a multifaceted assistance by the

Криму влітку 1925 року) // Східний Світ, №1. — Київ, 1993. — С. 134–139. Також див.: Софонович Ф. Хроніка із стародавніх літописців / Мицик Ю., Кравченко В. — К., 1992. — С. 226. (Akchokrakly O, Djan-Muhammed's Tatar poem "On the march of Islam Girey (II) III together with Bohdan Khmelnytsky to Poland in 1648 – 49 (according to the manuscript with the materials of the ethnographic expedition of Krymsky NKO around the Crimea in the summer of 1925) // Skhidny Svit (The Oriental World), # 1, Kyiv, 1993, pp. 134–139, Also see: Sofonovych F. *Cronicles from the oldest cronicle-writers* / Mytsyk Yu. Kravchenko V., Kyiv, 1992, p. 226).

²⁸ Акчокракли О. Назв. праця. — С. 134–139. — (Anchokrakly O., ibid, pp. 134–139).

Khan's government, which resulted in concluding a Ukrainian-Crimean Union²⁹ at the end of 1647–1648, and that contributed to a successful scenario of the national-liberating struggle on the territory of Ukraine. Pursuing implementation of the said agreement, the Crimean Khan Islam Giray III personally left for supporting the Ukrainian Hetman B. Khmelnytsky and headed jointly with him the military campaign against the King's army near Zhovti Vody and Korsun in May–June 1648. The gained victories made the positions of the allies still more reliable³⁰. Besides, the Turkic historian mentioned one more victorious battle of Zaporozhian Cossacks in the alliance of the Crimean Tatars³¹ under

²⁹ Due to the opinion of the famous orientalist Professor *Yaroslav Dashkevych*, "...the relations on the Grand Frontier were too tense, and a human life valued very little. Under the circumstances, after the occurrence of a real threat of ethnocide from the Polish Kingdom the Cossack-Tatar union became impossible", See.: Дашкевич Я. Козацтво на Великому кордоні // *Український історичний журнал*. — К., 1990. — № 12. — С. 21–22 (*Dashkevych Ya. The Cossackdom on the Grand Frontier // The Ukrainian Historical Journal, Kyiv, 1990, # 12, pp. 21–22*).

³⁰ Про воєнно-політичний союз України з кримським ханством також див.: Гуржій О., Ісаєвич Я., Котляр М. *Історія України: нове бачення* (За ред. В. Смоля). — К., 1995. — Т. 1. — С. 153–154. — (About the military and political union of Ukraine with the Crimean Khanate also see: Huzhiy O., Isayevych Ya., Kotliar M., *History of Ukraine; a new vision* (Edit. By V. Smoliy), Kyiv, 1995, Volume 1, pp. 153–154.).

³¹ تاتار / "tatar" (in Turkic) – "мамарин" (in Ukrainian), which in translation means "a postman, a post-rider, (AmE) a mailman". As in the old times native Tatars were well known for the velocity of their movement. That is why they took positions of postmen and were dressed in a special uniform. In Istanbul they also executed governmental delegations and assignments. The number of Tatars in servicing viziers amounted to 60 persons, See: *Pakalin, Mehmet Zeki, Osmanlı Tarih Deyimleri ve Terimleri Sözlüğü*, İstanbul 1993, Cilt III, s. 420–422. The famous historian Samoylovych wrote, that "In old times, when peoples of Asia were very little known in Europe, the Europeans considered the word "tatar" (or even "tartar") too a broad meaning using it speaking of both the Tibetans, and to the Japanese, and to the Manchurians...the Tatars covers a whole set of the tribes related to the Turkic nationality..." (Самойлович А.Н. *Избранные труды о Крыме: Сборник* / Ред. – сост. Е. Г. Эмирова, Вступ. Стаття А.А. Непомнящего. — Симферополь: Доля, 2000. — С. 127. – 296 с. — "Бильги чокрагы"). — (Samoylovych A.N., Selected works

Sokolivka in October 1648. The author fixed the fact of the attack and capturing by Ukrainian Cossacks the Polish fortresses of Berezhane and Zhyvotiv, and he described in details the Lviv Battle preceded by a long siege of this city.

It should be noted, that the work of Mehmed Senayi was written due to the chronology of the events whose credibility is proved from other sources. For example, the information about the cooperation between the Hetman's and Khan's governments in 1649, particularly during the Zboriv Battle, the numerical rising of the military forces of the allies, a better coordination of their operations, steps made to guarantee understanding between Bohdan Khmelnytsky and Islam Giray III, who personally took part in the military actions, and other points are confirmed by the materials from the chronicles³² by Samovydet's (*Eye-Witness*), Sofonovych, Hrabynko and Velychko, as well as by studies performed by Mykhailo Hrushevsky and other authors.

Comparison of the evidence in the "History of Khan Islam Giray III" and in the work "Prospering of Khans" (گۆلبینی حانان / "Gülbin-i Hânân"), Chapter ("Khan Giray III") / اوچنجی اسلام گرای خان / "Üçüncü İslam Giray Hân" by Galim Giray Sultan with other documents give the right to state, that the respective authors provided credible data about the chronology of the battle near the town of Zbarazh, about the composition and the quantity of the Polish army and the reconnaissance activity of the Crimean army, the service of Jews in the Royal army, terms and conditions of the Zbarazh Armistice, etc. In addition, the authors stated the heroism and brevity of Zaporozhian Cossacks.

about the Crimea: A collection / Edit. And compiled by E. G. Emirov, Introd. Article by A.A. Nepomniaschiy, Simferopol : Dolia, 2000, p. 127, 296 pp., «Bil'gi chokrag'y»).).

³² Бовгрия Андрій. *Козацьке історіописання в рукописній традиції XVIII ст.* / А. Бовгрия. — К. : Інститут історії України НАН України, 2010. — 304 с. — (Bovgriya Andriy. *The Cossack History-Writing in the manuscript-writing manner of the 18th century*/ A. Bovgriya. — Kyiv : The History Institute within the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, 2010. — 304 с.).

In some places of the said work³³ there is given substantial evidence of the military-political relations of Ukraine with the Crimean Khanate and the Polish and Lithuanian Commonwealth. For instance, in the text part titled “The Arrival of [B.] Khmelnytsky to the Happiest Lord of the State, Always the Winner, Highly Honorable Ruler [Islam Giray III] and his kind attitude to the request of [B. Khmelnytsky] of providing him with a support”, there are given the causes of the national-liberating movement in Ukraine, whose assessments almost coincide with the conclusions made in other works by European and other national authors³⁴.

The author of the above mentioned chronicle pledged a hostile attitude of Poland to Ukraine and on trying to conquer its population to the interest of the Polish nobility. There is also written about the arrival of Hetman Bohdan Khmelnytsky with his envoys to the Crimea at the end of November 1647, and about addressing of this Hetman the Ruler of the Crimean Khanate – Islam Giray III, with the request to provide help to the Ukrainian Cossacks³⁵. The chronicler characterises

³³ Туранли, Ферхад. *Тюркські джерела до історії України* /Ф. Туранли. —К.: Видавництво Інституту української археографії та джерелознавства ім. М. С. Грушевського НАН України. —К. : 2010. —С. 84–116. — 368 с. (умов. друк. арк. 21, 38). (Turanly Ferhad. *Turkic sources in terms of the History of Ukraine* /F. Turanly, Kyiv: Publishing House of M.S. Hrushevsky Institute of the Ukrainian Archeography and Source Studies within the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Kyiv : 2010, pp. 84–116, 368 pp.).

³⁴ Туранли, Ф. *Назв. праця*. — С. 148–159 (*Turanly F.*, *ibid*, pp. 148–159).

³⁵ According to V. Serhiychuk “...Bohdan Khmelnytsky sent his official envoys to Bakhchisarai proposing alliance to the Crimean Khan”. (Сергійчук Володимир. *Іменем війська запорозького* / В. Сергійчук. — К., 1991. — С. 142. Serhiychuk Volodymyr, *The name of the Cossack Army* / V. Serhiychuk, Kyiv, 1991, p. 142). He also informs us about other envoys: “At the end of the March other Cossack envoys arrived in Bakhchisarai including *Bohdan Khmelnytsky*, his son *Tymosh* and *Kindrat Burliay*”. (Сергійчук В. *Назв. праця*. — С. 146 (Serhiychuk V., *ibid*, p. 146). Concerning the said issues, another famous scholar studying historical past, *Yu. Mytsyk*, states, that “... some messengers were sent to the Danube Cossacks, Turkish Sultan, Crimean Khan...” (Мицик Юрій, Плохій Сергій, Стороженко Іван. *Як козаки воювали: історичні розповіді про запорозьке козацтво* / Ю. Мицик, С. Плохій, І. Стороженко. — Дніпропетровськ, 1991. — С. 223) — (Yu. Mytsyk, S. Plokhii, I.

the Ukrainian Hetman with piety as a person who deserved honour from Islam, and called him the Chief of the Dnieper Cossacks.

In the text of the said work titled “The Decision of His Majesty, the Happiest Lord of the State, Always the Winner, the Highly Honorable Ruler [Islam Giray III], to make a [military] march against the heretic Poles, and a narration about the wind-like Tatar brave-hearts, who during the battle with Polish soldiers too their enemies at advantages and defeated them”, there is informed of the first joint campaign of Zaporozhian Cossacks with the Crimean army, the march at the beginning of May 1648, that is about the actual implementation of the terms and conditions of the agreement having been made between them, particularly, concerning the personal participation of the Crimean Ruler Islam Giray III jointly with the Ukrainian Hetman Bohdan Khmelnytsky in the war against the Polish and Lithuanian Commonwealth.

Touching upon this issue, Hadji Mehmed Senayi underlined the following: “Just at that that a grand board meeting took place with a discussion...In the morning the tulumbases started to beat, and the Army set on the march.... (15a*). Then we read, that “yet on the eve 3,500 (three thousand five hundred) Zaporozhian Cossacks arrived by Dnieper in their chaikas. They arrested 80 (eighty) Polish worrier with their commanders and beheaded those with the sabres. Comparing the given testimonies with the data from the ones stated by Samiylo Velychko, and namely, “ that on 16 (26) May [1648], on the seventh day after the Easter,... it seemed that a Cossack Army of about one hundred worriers was approaching, but in fact in the camp there was only fifteen thousand soldiers. On that early morning Khmelnutsky boldly attacked the Poles with his army jointly with the Horde’s Army... Then Khmelnytsky with Tugay-bey, having been sure of them being the winners, left the battle field themselves, but they ordered their infantry and artillery unit obligatory to put the enemy to complete rout... The Cossacks cut off the Polish noble heads with their sharp sabres, and the majority of the Polish army licked the dust having

Storozhenko. *How Cossacks fought: historical narrations about the Zaporozhian Cossacks* / Yu. Mytsyk, S. Plokhyy, I. Storozhenko, Dnipropetrovsk, 1991, p. 223).

failed to stand such a deadly blow³⁶”, and on that ground one can come to the conclusion of a certain authenticity of the facts, reported by Hadji Senayi in his work of the joint actions of the Ukrainian Cossacks and Crimean Tatars, which resulted in defeating the Polish and Lithuanian Commonwealth.

In the text of the next part of the work titled “The return of the Always the Winner, the Highly Honorable Ruler [Islam Giray III] from the march into his residence in Bakhchisarai with a rich trophy stuff, owing the help of the Most High God and Prophet Mohammed (His Mercy and Blessing)³⁷”, some data are given about the return from the military march of Islam Giray with the victory, and there is also said, that on 30 May of the current year “the Khan’s army reached the fortress of Korsun’, that belonged then to the Poles...The next day Khan Tugay-bey arrived, where he was received with festively. Only two hours later in front of the Fortress of Bila Tserkva (a Polish army was then around that fortress) military detachments were organised for fighting” (21a)³⁸.

In the same text data from Hadji Mehmed Senayi are provided about the 2nd joint military campaign against the Polish and Lithuanian Commonwealth, the arrival of B. Khmelnytsky to the headquarters of the Crimean army. It was recorded there too, that the military camp of the Ukrainian Hetman was located not far from the fortress of Salle. Bohdan Khmelnytsky together with authorised commanders and his army of 10,000 (ten thousand) warriors arrived in the headquarters of the Tatar army. The Cossack Hetman was received festively then; he and his captains were given precious kaftans to wear, while all the warriors of the Hetman were presented with valuable gifts. After discussing a plan of their military actions, due to the words of the

³⁶ Туранли, Ф. *Назв. праця.* — С. 86–91 (17а, 15а–19б) – (Turanly F., *ibid*, pp. 86–91 (17a, 15a–19b)).

³⁷ Про це докладно див.: *Назв. праця.* — С. 85–90 (14б–19б) – (About that see: *ibid*, pp. 85–90 (14b–19b)).

³⁸ Величко С. *Літопис.* — Т. І. — К, 1991. — С. 69, 70, 71. Також див. Туранли, Ф. — *Назв. праця.* — С. 93–94 (21а–21б) – (Velychko S., *A chronicle*, Volume I, Kyiv, 1991, pp. 69, 70, 71. Also see: Turanly F., *ibid*, pp. 93–94 (21a–21b)).

author, they "...set off together to the main city of the Polish King – Ilbava³⁹. On Friday of the 23rd day of blessed month of Ramadan⁴⁰, the army, like a sea, surrounded the large fortress of Lviv". While at the same time Zaporozhian Cossacks together with Tugay-bey warriors, blocked the fortress of Sokoliv and, after a 3 to 4-day battle, defeated the enemy's forces⁴¹.

There are very important the evidence about the siege of Lviv that lasted for 22 days. Messengers from the enemy addressed Hetman Bohdan Khmelnytsky with the following proposal: "WE shall give you two hundred (200) thousand gold pieces into the treasury, and we shall also the poll (head) tax". The hetman informed of that Islam Giray III, the proposal of the Poles was accepted, and the siege of the city was cancelled. After completing that victorious campaign at the end of October of the same year Islam Giray III met Bohdan Khmelnytsky and Tugay-bey and awarded them with sabres and valuable presents. Considering the above said work of Hadji Mehmed Senayi, it is worth paying attention to the place, where the author wrote about the observation by Hetman B. Khmelnytsky of all the terms and conditions provided in the agreement with the Crimean Ruler on the organisation of a joint army. Particularly, the author fixed the fact of the attack and conquer by the Ukrainian warriors of the fortresses of Berezan' and Zhyvotyn. Besides, in the chronicler's opinion, inhabitants of the last Polish citadel were Jewish people, who got prisoners of the Zaporozhian Cossacks and were transferred to the Khan, as a proof of

³⁹ Йдеться про м. Львів (There is implied the city of Lviv.).

⁴⁰ 11 жовтня 1648 року (11 October 1648.).

⁴¹ Туранли, Ф. *Назв. праця*. — С. 96 (29a), 99 – 101 (28b – 31a) – (Turanly F., *ibid*, pp. 96 (29a), 99–101, (28b–31a). Concerning this point, the above said historian Volodymyr Serhiychuk states the following: "On 26 September a Cossack Council was in Starokostiantyniv, in which Tugay-bey took part, and where the decision was approved to continue the military march to Western Ukraine. Four days later, after surrounding Lviv, B.Khmelnytsky, aiming to avoid ruining that city, sent his messenger to the city population and required to give him "the main initiators" – Yarema Vyshnevetsky and Olexandr Konetspolsky, and also to stop the opposition" (Сергіійчук В. *Назв. праця*. — С. 156 – (Serhiychuk V., *ibid*, p. 156.).

the Cossacks being loyal and observing their agreement with the Crimeans.

The next part of the works we have analysed is titled “The Military march of the Always the Winner, Highly Honorable Ruler [Islam Giray] against Poland”, and that includes data, that the Zaporozhian Hetman’s messengers came to the Crimean Khan. So as to persuade him of their devotedness to the Khan, and so as to declare, that they were the Khan’s loyal nationals and ready for a war with the Poles. The author presented quite a detailed chronology of the military events related to 1649 and their development; highlighted a set of details about the Zbarazh Battle; described the meeting of Hetman B.Khmelnysky with Turkic commanders, organised with the purpose of discussing a tactics of their joint actions, as well as in relation of the consideration of the proposals on making an armistice, and which on which the Polish King Yan Kaziemierz gave his consent.⁴² To confirm the authenticity of the facts, we gave in the said chronicle in regard of the above mentioned problem, let us pay attention to another written source, whose author was of the Crimean-Tatar origin, and namely – to “Vedjihi’s History” (تاریخی و جیهی / “*Târîh-i Vecîhî*” by Vedjihi Hasan Chelebi (life years: about 1622–1661); for example, according to the data from F. Babinger, the Turkic historian and chronicler of the 17th century – Husein Vedjihi / “*Hüsein Vecîhî*”⁴³ in his chronicle “Vedjihi’s History” (تاریخی و جیهی / “*Vecîhî Târîh-i*”⁴⁴, in which there are described the events that took place during the period of 1047–1069 according to Hidjri Calendar (A.D.: 1637–1659), in relation of the above formulated problem said the following: “Yet before the Zaporozhian Cossacks

⁴² Туранли, Ф. Назв. праця. — С. 100 (30а), 102 – 116 (32а – 48б) – (Turanly F., *ibid*, pp. 100 (30a), 102 – 116 (32a – 48b).

⁴³ Хусейн Веджігі – родом з Криму; переїхавши до Стамбулу, обіймав посаду довіреного секретаря Великого візиря Кари Мустафи Паші. Помер 06. IX. 1660 р. в Стамбулі (Franz Babinger, *Osmanlı Tarih Yazarları ve Eserleri*. Çeviren Prof. Dr. Coşkun Üçok, Ankara 1982, Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları: 435, Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, s. 229, 502 s.;

تاریخی و جیهی / *Vecîhî Târîhi*, Arşiv, Nu. 1307, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, İstanbul (16 – 876), s. 72a).

⁴⁴ تاریخی و جیهی / *Vecîhî Târîhi*, Arşiv, Nu. 1307, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, İstanbul (16 – 876), s. 72a.

rebelled against their oppression by the King of Poland and united with the Crimean Khan Islam Giray III (1647). During the six years (1648–1654) a set of military marches against the Poles was made, and the lands of the Poles themselves were captured, while the Poles themselves were punished⁴⁵.

We received a more detailed information about the said Turkic or Crimean-Tatar historian and chronicler from the Encyclopedia of the Turkic Language and Literature⁴⁶, where the following is stated: “Vedjîhi Hasan Chelebi / *Vecîhî Hasan Çelebi* (born in the 1620s in thjer city of Bakhchisarai – the capital of the Crimean Khanate; died in 1661 in Istanbul) was a palace poet, but he got famous as a historian”.

He participated in the Baghdad campaign during 1638–1639, that finished in the victory of Sultan Murad IV (ruling years: 1623–1640) and concluding between Iran and the Ottoman State a peaceful agreement (to sing the end of the 16-years lasting war), which was called “*Kasr-î Şîrîn*” / «قصرى شیرين»⁴⁷. After that Vedjîgi wrote the book “A History of Conquering Baghdad” / «تاریخی فتھی باغدات» / “*Târîh-i Feth-i Bağdat*”. Since Vedjîgi originated from the Crimean Tatars, he wanted to write a history of his own Motherland under the title “A History of the Crimea” / “*Kırım Târîh-i*” / «قیریم تاریخی», which is now known better as “Vedjîgi’s History” / “*Vecîhî Târîh-i*” / «وجیهی تاریخی»⁴⁸. This chronicle is a unique work in terms of its contents, includes significant data about the historical events, of which there is no information available in other chronicles. We can explain this fact by a specific status of Vedjîgi in the ottoman government, where he was in charge of the seal of the above mentioned Grand Vizier and the Chancellery of the latter one. That

⁴⁵ Там само.

⁴⁶ *Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Ansiklopedisi: Devirler, İsimler, Eserler, Terimler* / Yayın Kurulu: Ezel Erverdi, Mustafa Kutlu, İsmail Kara, Cilt 8, İstanbul, Dergah Yayınları, 1998, s.522, 52, 30 s.

⁴⁷ İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Tarihi*, Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, Ankara 1995, III. Cilt, I. Kısım, 5. Baskı. (II. Selimin Tahta Çıkışından 1699 Karllofça Andlaşmasına Kadar), s. 202 – 206.

⁴⁸ *Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Ansiklopedisi: Devirler, İsimler, Eserler, Terimler* / Yayın Kurulu: Ezel Erverdi, Mustafa Kutlu, İsmail Kara, Cilt 7, İstanbul, Dergah Yayınları, 1998, s.287, 564, 24 s.

point accounted for the personal participation of Chelebi in the events he described, which provided him the personal access to the primary sources and other corresponding documents; hence the data included in the chronicle “A History of the Crimes” are a unique sources for studying the relations that were between the Ukrainian Cossacks and the Crimean Tatars in the 17th century. It should be noted, that the said chronicles by Hasan Vedjigi became a very useful source for writing his historical works by such above mentioned authors in the Ottoman Empire, as Mustafa Nayima Efendi (“Nayma’s History”) and Silahdar Fyndyklyly Mehmed Aga (life years: 1658–1723) “An Armed Bearer’s History” / سلهدار تاريخی / “*Silâh-dâr Târihi*”. The latest chronicle issued in two volumes in 1928 in the Ottoman Turkic language is kept in academic libraries of Turkey, while one copy of this two-volume book is located in the Librarian-Archival-Museum Fund – Omelian Pritsak’s office in the Academic Library of the National University “Kyiv-Mohyla Academy”⁴⁹. The said chronicle of the 17th century. “An Armed Bearer’s History” deserved to be paid special attention as one of the most important written monuments associated with the history of the hetman Ukraine, and particularly, it is related to the period of the second half of the 17th century, for the said chronicle includes most amount of specific information about the diplomatic activities of Hetman Petro Doroshenko.

Another work, which is an object of great rarity, by Rashid Mehmed Efendi is “A History”, or “A Chronicle”⁵⁰ issued in three volumes during 1740–1741, and in five volumes during 1865–1866, that is kept in the Library of the Istanbul University. The work is a highlight of the events during the 1660–1722 time period, and it is supposed to be a

⁴⁹ Финдиклили Мехмед Ага, *Сілахдар*. Історія зброєносця (سلهدار تاريخی) (سلهدار فندقلیلی مهمد اغا). «Книги товариства тюркської історії». — Стамбул: «Державне видавництво», 1928. — Том I. (~1654/1655 – 1682/1683). — С. 565–570. — 763 с. — (Findıklılı Mehmed Ağa, *Silahdar*, An Armed Bearer’s History (سلهدار تاريخی) (سلهدار فندقلیلی مهمد اغا). “Books of the Turkic History Society”. — Istanbul: “Derzhavne Vydavnytstvo”, 1928. — Volume I. (~1654/1655 – 1682/1683). — pp. 565–570. — 763 pp.).

⁵⁰ *Büyük Türk Klâsikleri: Başlangıcından Günümüze Kadar. XVII. Yüzyıl Dîvân Nazmı* / Hulûk İpekten, Mustafa İsen, Turgut Atabey, Metin Akkuş, Râşid, Cilt 6, İstanbul, Ötügen Neşriyatı A.Ş., 1987, s. 322–323, 414 s.

continuation of the chronicle “Nayima’s History”, or “A History of Events” / “*Naimâ Târîhi*”, or “*Târîh-i Vekâyî*”⁵¹, where events of the 1574–1659 period are described (according to the Christian chronology). The said book by Nayima (he himself arrived in Istanbul in 1680, worked as a secretary to the “Sultan’s Grand Medjlis” / “*Dîvân-î Hümâyün*” in Topkapy Palace, died in 1716, and he had access to the respective documents needed for writing his history). “Nayima’s History” re-issued in the Ottoman Turkic language 4 times (in 1734, 1843, 1863) and in the modern Turkish language – in 6 volumes during the 1967–1969 period; the said source is kept in academic libraries of Turkey, particularly – in the Library of the Istanbul University⁵². The above said period is also associated with the historical work by Dimitri Kantemir (life years: 1673–1723) “The Ottoman Empire’s History: the rise and decline” / “*Incrementa atque decrementa Aulæ Othomanicæ*”, which we can consider to have been a historical study of the Ottoman Empire and that of the neighbouring countries⁵³. His work was translated into a few foreign languages, including Russian. Unfortunately, so far there is no Ukrainian version.

Conclusion

When summing up our consideration of historical works related to the Ottoman State time, as well as that of their specific features, one can come to the conclusion, that the said sources, by their nature, were of a transferring character according to their contents: from traditional chronicles of the 15th – 16th centuries to the history writing

⁵¹ *Büyük Türk Klâsikleri: Başlanıgıcdan Günümüze Kadar, XVII. Yüzyıl Dîvân Nesri*, Hulûk İpekten, Mustafa İsen, Turgut Atabey, Metin Akkuş, Naîma, Cilt 7, İstanbul, Ötüken Neşriyatı A.Ş., 1988, s. 153–155, 423 s.

⁵² *Ibidem*; Na’ima, Mustafa Efendi, *Târîh-i Na’ima*, İstanbul 1863, Cilt IV, s. 278–281.

⁵³ Dimitri Kantemir, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nun Yükseliş ve Çöküş Tarihi / Incrementa atque decrementa Aulæ Othomanicæ*, 1 Cilt, 2. Bası, Cumhuriyet Kitap Klübü, İstanbul 1998, s.19–27; Kantemir, Dimitri, *ibid*, 2. Cilt, 2. Bası, s. 869 – 880.

*Enumeration of the pages (13b, 14a, 14b, 15a, 15b...) of the text of the Ukrainian translation is maximally close to the enumeration of the pages of the original text.

of a higher level, which was typical for the period of the 17th – 18th centuries. There are all grounds to consider the said chronicles to be historical documents, for which typical is not only fixation and chronologication of events and facts, but the authors make tries to describe and interpret the respective data and facts, to assess them personally. In some places the authors touched upon the point of the reason of this or that event, as well as they were interested in the causes of their consequences. These historical sources of the Ottoman-Turkic origin are important as both historical, and history-writing sources for studying the History of Ukraine of the Cossack period, and also for the documenting the data about the affairs between the Ukrainian Cossack State, the Crimean Khanate, the Polish and Lithuanian Commonwealth, Muscovia, etc., and the information about the liberating war of the Ukrainian people in the middle of the 17th century.

Therefore, we may confirm, that writing of written monuments by authors, among those there were Crimean Tatars too, during the 17th – 18th centuries is based on the sources, which are considered and called historical works and cover not only the history of the events occurring within the territory of the said empire, but also the history of the international relations, particularly the ones, associated with the relations with the Ukrainian Cossack State. Speaking that in other words, we can make the conclusion, that the chronicles, especially the ones in the Crimean Tatar language, during the above said time period reached its perfectness and it was historiographical by nature.

Kaynaklar

Babinger, Franz, *Osmanlı Tarih Yazarları ve Eserleri*, Çev. Prof. Dr. Coşkun Üçok, Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, Ankara 1982.

Büyük Türk Klâsikleri: Başlangıcından Günümüze Kadar: XVII. Yüzyıl Dîvân Nazmı, Hulûk İpekten, Mustafa İsen, Turgut Atabey, Metin Akkuş, Râşid, C. 6-7, Ötüken Neşriyatı A.Ş., İstanbul 1987.

Develi, Hayati, *Osmanlı Türkçesi Kılavuzu*, c. 1, Bilimevi Yayınları, İstanbul 2001.

Develliğlü, Ferit, *Osmanlıca-Türkçe Ansiklopedik Lûgat, Eski ve Yeni Harflerle*, Ankara 1993.

Ergin, Muharrem, *Orhun Abideleri*, Boğaziçi Yayınları, İstanbul 1999.

Gabain von A., *Eski Türkçenin Grameri*, Ankara 2000.

Hadzy Mehmed Sena'i z Krymu, *Historia Chana Islam Gereja III*, Tekst turecki wydal, przelozył i opracował Zygmunt Abrahamowicz. Uzupełniający komentarz historyczny Olgierd Górka i Zbigniew Wojcik; pod redakcją naukową Zbigniewa Wójcika, Warszawa 1971. (Hadji Mehmed Senayi from the Crimea, *History of Khan Islam Gerei III*, The text in Turkish was published, translated and worked with by Zygmunt Abrahamowicz, Genral historical comments prepared Olgierd Górka i Zbigniew Wojcik, edited by Zbigniew Wójcik, Warsaw 1971).

Kantemir, Dimitri, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun Yükseliş ve Çöküş Tarihi*, Incrementa atque decrementa Aulae Othomanicae, 1. Cilt, Cumhuriyet Kitapları, İstanbul 1998.

Lewis V. Thomas, *A Study of Naima*, New York 1972.

Na'ima, Mustafa Efendi, *Târih-i Na'ima*, c: 4, İstanbul 1863.

Öztuna, Yılmaz, *Büyük Osmanlı Tarihi*, Cilt I, İstanbul 1994.

Öztürk, Yücel, *Özüden Tunaya: Kazaklar-1*, Yeditepe Yayınevi, İstanbul 2004.

P. [Parmaksızoğlu], İ., "Silahdar, Silahdar Memed Ağa", *Türk Ansiklopedisi*, Cilt. XXIX, Ankara 1980, ss. 28-29.

Pakalın, Mehmet Zeki, *Osmanlı Tarih Deyimleri ve Terimleri Sözlüğü*, C. 3, İstanbul 1993.

Timurtaş, Faruk K., *Osmanlı Türkçesi Grameri*, Cilt III, Alfa Basım Yayım Dağıtım, İstanbul 1999.

Timurtaş, K. Faruk, *Osmanlı Türkçesine Giriş: Eski Yazı ve İmlâ-Gramer-Aruz-Metinler*, Cilt I, Alfa Basım Yayım Dağıtım, İstanbul 1999.

Togan, A. Zeki Velidî, *Tarihte Usûl*, Enderun Kitabevi, İstanbul 1985.

Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Ansiklopedisi: Devirler, İsimler, Eserler, Terimler, Yayım Kurulu: Ezel Erverdi, Mustafa Kutlu, İsmail Kara, C. 7-8, Dergah Yayınları, İstanbul 1998.

Uzunçarşılı, İsmail Hakkı, *Osmanlı Tarihi*, с. 3 (II. Selimin Tahta Çıkışından 1699 Karlofça Andlaşmasına Kadar), Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, Ankara 1995.

Абдуджемилев, Р.Р., «Тарих-и Ислям Герай хан» эсери жанр нокътай-назарындан [Жанровая специфика сочинения «Тарих-и Ислям Герай хан»], Р. Р. Абдуджемилев, ж. Йылдыз, № 2, Симферополь 2013, с.84–90. (Abdudjemilev, R.R., "Tarih-i Islam Geray khan" eseri zhanr nok'tay-nazarydan [The genre specificity of the composition "Tarih-i Islam Geray khan"]", R. R. Abdudjemilev, Simferopol 2013, pp. 84–90).

Абдуджемилев, Рефат Рустем огли, *Хроніка Мехмеда Сенаї як пам'ятник кримськотатарської художньої літератури XVII століття*, Р. Р. Абдуджемилев, Автореферат дисертації на здобуття наукового ступеня кандидата філологічних наук, Сімферополь 2014. (Abdudjemilev, Refat Rustem Ogly, *Mehmed Senayi's chronicles as a monument of the Crimean-Tatar belles-lettres of the 17th century*, R.R. Abdudjemilev, An author's abstract of the thesis in seeking awarding the academic degree of the Candidate of the Philological Sciences, Simferopol 2014)

Абдуллаева, Гульнара, *Золотая эпоха Крымского ханства: очерки*, КРП «Издательство «Крымчупедгиз», Симферополь 2012. (Abdulayeva, Gulnara, *The gold epoch of the Crimean Khanate: essays*, KRP Publishing House "Krymuchpedgiz", Simferopol 2012).

Акчокракли, О., "Татарська поема Джан-Мухаммедова. Про похід Ісляма Гірея (II) III спільно з Богданом Хмельницьким на Польщу у 1648 – 49 рр. (за рукописом з матеріалів етнографічної експедиції Кримського НКО по Криму влітку 1925 року)", *Східний Світ*, №.1. Київ 1993, с. 134-139. (Akchokrakly, O., "Djan-Muhammed's Tatar poem "On the march of Islam Girey (II) III together with Bohdan Khmelnytsky to Poland in 1648 – 49 (according to the manuscript with the materials of the ethnographic expedition of Krymsky NKO around the Crimea in the summer of 1925)", *Skhidny Svit (The Oriental World)*, no. 1, Kyiv 1993, pp. 134-139.

Бовгрия, Андрій, *Козацьке історіописання в рукописній традиції XVIII ст*, Інститут історії України НАН України, К. 2010. (Bovgriya, Andriy, *The Cossack History-Writing in the manuscript-writing manner of the 18th century*, The History Institute within the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Kyiv 2010).

Величко, Самійло, *Літопис*, Т. I, К. 1991. (Velychko, S., *A chronicle*, Vol. I, Kyiv 1991.

Гуржій, О., Ісаєвич, Я., Котляр, М., *Історія України: нове бачення*, (За ред. В. Смолія), Т. 1, К. 1995. – (Huzhiy, O., Isayevych, Ya., Kotliar, M., *History of Ukraine; a new vision*, (Edit. By V. Smoliy), Vol. 1, Kyiv 1995, pp. 153-154).

Дашкевич, Ярослав, "Козацтво на Великому кордоні", *Український історичний журнал*, № 12., К. 1990, с. 21–22. (Dashkevych, Ya., "The Cossackdom on the Grand Frontier", *The Ukrainian Historical Journal*, Kyiv 1990, No. 12, pp. 21–22.).

Мицик, Юрій, Плохій, Сергій, Стороженко, Іван, *Як козаки воювали: історичні розповіді про запорозьке козацтво*, Дніпропетровськ 1991, (Yu. Mytsyk, S. Plokhii, I. Storozhenko, *How Cossacks fought: historical narrations about the Zaporozhian Cossacks*, Dnipropetrovsk 1991).

Остапчук, Віктор, *Козацькі чорноморські походи у морській історії Кятіба Челебі «Дар великих мужів увоюванні морів» / Mappa Mundi. Збірник наукових праць на пошану Ярослава Дашкевича з нагоди його 70-річчя. Studia in honorem Jaroslavi Daškevyč septuagenario dedicata*. Видавництво М. П. Коць. — Львів - Київ - Нью-Йорк, 1996. — С. 341–426. — 991 с. — (Ostapchuk Viktor, *Cossack Black-Sea marches in the marine history of Katib Chelebi "The gift of great men in the fights of the seas" / Mappa Mundi, A collection of academic works to the 70-th Anniversary of Yaroslav Dashkevych, Studia in honorem Jaroslavi Daškevyč septuagenario dedicata*, M. P. Kots' Publishing House, Lviv-Kyiv-New-York, 1996, pp. 341–426, 991 pp.).

Самойлович, А. Н., *Избранные труды о Крыме: Сборник*, Ред.–сост. Е. Г. Эмирова, Вступ. стаття А.А. Непомнящего, Симферополь: Доля 2000. (Samoylovych, A. N., *Selected works about the Crimea: A collection*, Edit. and compiled by E. G. Emirov, Simferopol: Dolia 2000).

Сергійчук Богдан, Сергійчук Володимир, *На межі двох світів. Українсько-турецькі відносини у середині XVI-на початку XXI ст.*, К.: ПП Сергійчук М. І., 2011. (Serhiychuk Bohdan, Serhiychuk Volodymyr, *On the borderline of two worlds: Ukrainian-Turkish affairs in the middle of the 16th – beginning of the 21st centuries*, Kyiv: PP Serhiychuk M. I. 2011).

Сергійчук, Володимир, *Іменем війська запорозького*, К. 1991. (Serhiychuk, Volodymyr, *On behalf of the name of the Zaporozhian Army*, Kyiv 1991).

Софонович, Ф. *Хроніка із стародавніх літописців*, Мицик Ю., Кравченко В., К. 1992. (Sofonovych, F., *Cronicles from the oldest croniclers-writers*, Mytsyk Yu. Kravchenko V., Kyiv 1992).

Туранли Ферхад Гардашкан Оглу, *Кримськотатарські писемні пам'ятки як джерело з історії України козацької доби*, Ферхад Туранли, "Україна, Туреччина: історія, політика, дипломатія, культура", В. І. Сергійчук, Н. О. Татаренко та ін., К.: Укр. письменник 2015, с. 49–61. (Ferhad Gardashkan Oglu Turanly, *The Crimean-Tatar written monuments as a source of the History of Ukraine of the Cossack period*, Ferhad Turanly, "Ukraine–Turkey: history, policy, diplomacy, culture", V. I. Serhiychuk, N.O. Tatarenko et al., Kyiv: Ukrayinskyi pys'mennyk 2015, pp. 49–61).

Туранли, Ф., "Еволюція турецького письма в світлі розвитку літературної мови", *Східний Світ (The Word of the Orient)*, Вип. 4, К. 2003, с. 148–155. (Turanly F., "Evolution of the Turkish writing system in the light of development of the literary language", *Skhidnyi Svit (The Oriental World)*, Issue 4, Kyiv 2003, pp. 148–155).

Туранли, Ф., "Методологічні проблеми дослідження османської історії", *Матеріали міжнародної наукової конференції «Спадщина Омеляна Прицака і сучасні гуманітарні науки» (28–30 травня 2008 р.)*, Національний університет «Києво-Могилянська академія», К.: Аратта, 2009, с. 269–281. (Turanly F., "Methodological problems of studying the Ottoman History", *Digests of the International Scientific Conference "The Legacy of Omelian Pritsak and modern humanitarian sciences" (May 28–30 2008)*, The National University "Kyiv-Mohyla Academy", Kyiv: Aratta 2009, pp. 269–281).

Туранли, Ферхад, *Тюркські джерела до історії України*, К.: Видавництво Інституту української археографії та джерелознавства ім. М. С. Грушевського НАН України, К. 2010, с. 84–116. (Turanly, Ferhad, *Turkic sources in terms of the History of Ukraine*, Kyiv Publishing House of M. S. Hrushevsky Institute of the Ukrainian Archeography and Source Studies within the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Kyiv 2010, pp. 84–116).

Челеби Эвлия, *Книга путешествия. Перевод и комментарии*, Вып. 1. (Земли Молдавии и Украины), М.: 1961. (E. Chelebi's *A travelling book, Translation and comments*, Issue. 1 (The lands of Moldova and Ukraine), Moscow 1961).

وحيهى تاريخى / Vecîhî Târîhi, Arşiv, Nu. 1307, Süleymaniye Kütübhanesi, İstanbul (16 – 876).

حجى محمد ثنائى قريملى. اوچنجى اسلام گراى خان خى (British Museum, No. Add. 7870).

سامى 'شمسالدين' قاموس تركى 'استانبول' در سعادت اقدام مطبعهسى '۱۳۱۷' ص. ۶۶۸-۶۶۹. ۱۵۷۴ ص.

سلهدار فندقليلى مهمد آغا ' سلهدار تاريخى ' تورك تاريخ انجمنى كلياتى ' عدد : ۱۰ ' برنجى جلد ' سلهدار فندقليلى مهمد آغانك حياتته دائر احمد رفيق بكك بر مقدمهسى ايله نوظلرينى حاويدر ' ۱۰۶۵ - ۱۰۹۴ ' دولت مطبعهسى 'استانبول' 1928 ' ۷۶۳ ص.

سلهدار فندقليلى مهمد آغا ' سلهدار تاريخى ' تورك تاريخ انجمنى كلياتى ' عدد : ۱۴ ' ايكنجى جلد. سلهدار فندقليلى مهمد آغانك حياتته دائر احمد رفيق بكك بر مقدمه سى ايله نوظلرينى حاويدر (۱۰۶۵ - ۱۱۰۶) ' دولت مطبعهسى ' استانبول ' 1928 ' ۸۰۵ ص.