

**PROF. OMELJAN PRITSAK'S
STRUCTURAL-FUNCTIONAL THEORY APPLIED
TO THE OTTOMAN-COSSACK TREATY 1650-1651**

**СТРУКТУРНО-ФУНКЦІОНАЛЬНА ТЕОРІЯ
ОМЕЛЯНА ПРИЦАКА У ДОСЛІДЖЕННІ
ОСМАНСЬКО-КОЗАЦЬКОГО ДОГОВОРУ
1650-1651 РР.**

Лариса ПРИЦАК*

АНОТАЦІЯ

Історія світової науки ХХ ст. завдячує корифею тюркології Омеляну Прицаку за відкриття методології цілісного підходу до історичного дослідження, а саме до джерелознавства. Я маю на увазі структурно-функціональну теорію О. Прицака історичної візії на базі встановлених дихотомним аналізом історичних фактів у структурах закінчених історичних циклів. Ця теорія дала мені можливість дослідити пакет текстів османсько-козацького договору 1651 р. аналітично-фактологічним

* Prof. Dr., Kyiv-Mohyla Akademisi Milli Üniversitesi / Ukrayna

методом і реконструювати ^сahd-nāme (умови) договору порівняльно-структурним методом. Шляхом застосування методології цілісного підходу до історичних джерел було досліджено османський пакет текстів документів, наданих Османською Портою, про протекторат Богдану Хмельницькому з Військом Запорозьким 1651 р., що сприяло позитивному розв'язанню аналізованих проблем.

ABSTRACT

Professor Omeljan Pritsak, a leading scholar in the field of Turkology, contributed to 20th century world science by way of introducing holistic methods into historical research, namely Source Studies. I refer herein to Prof. Pritsak's structural-functional theory of historical vision based on historical facts reconstructed from the structures of complete historic cycles through dichotomic analysis. This theory gave me the possibility to investigate a set of Ottoman and Cossack Treaty texts of 1651 with the help of the analytic-factologic method and to reconstruct ^сahd-nāme (terms and conditions) of the Treaty applying the comparative structural method. Using the holistic approach to primary sources, I investigated the Ottoman set of documents on the protectorate issued to Bogdan Khmel'nyts'kyj and the Zaporozhian Host by the Ottoman Porte in 1651. The method is fruitful in solving the objectives set before the researcher.

Section I. The Documents and Actions of Bogdan Khmel'nyts'kyj

§1. The Specifics of the background of the Treaty

The instability of Ottoman political structures

The treaties between Khmel'nyts'kyj and Zaporozhian Host and Ottoman Empire have a complex history because of the instability of the political regime in Turkey. The first Ottoman-Cossack treaty of July 1648¹ which foresaw a Cossack-Crimean Treaty and also created a Black Sea Convention, was interrupted by

the 1648 revolution in Turkey. As a result of a court putsch, in which an important role was played by Janissaries, Sultan Ibragim I (1640-1648) and the Supreme Visor Agmed Gazer-para Paša were overthrown and killed. Since the two signatories on the Ottoman side were no more, the treaty was not put into effect. The Janissaries came to power and on the 8th of August 1648 the 7 year old Megmed IV (1648-1687)², the son of a former Sultan Ibragim I, came to the throne.

After the end of the Janissary revolution in 1650 a new text of the treaty between Sultan Megmed IV and Bogdan Khmel'nyts'kyj³ was prepared, but as a result of external political factors the text was never sent out. A new version of the text produced by the Sultan in 1651 between 22 of February and 3rd of March, together with a letter from the supreme Visor Melek Agmed Paša⁴ was delivered to Khmel'nyts'kyj. According to the practices of the day, Khmel'nyts'kyj carried important documents with him. During a battle near Berestechka (28th June-10 July 1651) the Sultan's Charter and the Supreme Visor's letter fell into Polish hands. Thus, Khmel'nyts'kyj only possessed the documents for six months. In December 1651 Khmel'nyts'kyj once again assured the Sultan that he wished to remain under Ottoman protection⁵. It is possible that the Hetman was hoping to obtain a new text of the treaty with Turkey since the first had been taken by King Jan Kazimir. However, the instability of Ottoman political structures⁶, upon which Khmel'nyts'kyj based his political policies, obliged Khmel'nyts'kyj to move closer to Moscow through the treaty of 1654. The treaty of 1654 so threatened the Ottoman Porte that the Sultan insisted that the Hetman withdraw his ties with Moscow⁷. In order to resolve matters, Khmilitsky wrote a letter to Sultan Megamed IV at the end of November 1655-beginning of December 1655. This letter was captured by agents of the Transylvanian ruler, Yuri II Rakoczy. Only a translation into Hungarian has survived. In the letter Khmel'nyts'kyj assures the Sultan that he remains loyal to all the conditions agreed between him and the Sultan in the treaty⁸. However, Khmel'nyts'kyj says nothing about breaking ties with Moscow.

The special two-tier power structure: The Sultan and the Crimean Khan

In Ukrainian academic literature insufficient attention has been paid to the position of the Crimean Khan in the structure of the Osman Empire. Another difficulty is that once the Crimea had been taken by the Turks in the XV century, a two-tier power structure developed. Although the Crimean Khan, Islam Giray III recognized the supremacy of the Sultan, Megmed IV, he had a special place in the Turkish structure of government. He was like a Muslim vassal and, to an extent, a partner in the government of the Ottoman Empire. The Crimean Khan was responsible for guarding the northern borders of the Ottoman State and as such became the direct ruler of the Christian vassal territories in Central Europe⁹: Moldavia, Volakhia and Transylvania. Khmel'nyts'kyj knew this. Therefore, the road to Istanbul went through Bakhchesarai. It is no accident that Khmel'nyts'kyj, at the start of the uprising led by him in 1648, concluded a brotherly union with the Crimean Khan, Islam Giray III. When, through revolution, Khmel'nyts'kyj created the Cossack State, it also fell within the sphere of influence of the Crimean Khan. It is important to take the nature of this two-tiered power structure, involving the Sultan and the Crimean Khan, into account when assessing Khmel'nyts'kyj's policies.

Khmel'nyts'kyj also had to pay appropriate sums to the Tatars which were simultaneously a reward for their support¹⁰. Hetman Khmel'nyts'kyj had the right to contact the Ottoman Porte only through the Crimean Khan, recognizing his superiority. In assessing Khmel'nyts'kyj's policies, it is important to take into account the specific nature of the two-tier power structure involving the Sultan and the Crimean Khan. In the general political context of 1654 Europe, Khmel'nyts'kyj could only get practical support from the Crimean Khan and, therefore, he had to enter the Ottoman political system. Furthermore, for reasons outlined above, contact with the Sultan's government could only be established through the Crimean Khan. The connection between the Ottoman Porte and a Christian ruler was formalized in a so called 'ahd-name, that is a document setting out conditions upon which the Christian ruler undertook to fulfil responsibilities, and the responsibilities of the Porte. The subject of Sultan Megmed IV Charter to Khmel'nyts'kyj of 1651¹¹ is that this 'ahd-name had been sent¹². Unfortunately this 'ahd-name has been lost, or has not yet been found. Therefore, it is necessary to reconstruct it.

§2. Four letters from Bogdan Khmel'nyts'kyj to Megmed IV

The main sources on the Ottoman-Cossack treaty of 1650 -1651 are four letters written by Khmel'nyts'kyj.

The first letter from Hetman Khmel'nyts'kyj to Sultan Megmed IV is in Ukrainian and dated 26th July (5 August) 1650¹³;

The second letter of March 1651, from Hetman Khmel'nyts'kyj to Sultan Megmed IV, written in Polish¹⁴;

The third letter of 27th November 1651, from Hetman Khmel'nyts'kyj to Sultan Megmed IV, written in Polish¹⁵;

The fourth letter of late November-early December 1655, from Hetman Khmel'nyts'kyj to Sultan Megmed IV which has survived only in translation into Hungarian¹⁶.

Four official Turkish documents have also survived (for details see section II):

The first-a charter by the Turkish Sultan Megmeda IV to Bogdan Khmel'nyts'kyj written 10th August 1650¹⁷;

The second-a charter by The Turkish Sultan Megmed IV to Bogdan Khmel'nyts'kyj written between 22nd February and 3rd of March 1651¹⁸;

The third-a letter from the great Visor Melek Agmed Paša to Hetman Bogdan Khmel'nyts'kyj, written between 22nd of February and 3rd of March 1651 (i.e. at the same time as the Sultan's Charter)¹⁹;

The fourth-a Charter from the Turkish Sultan, issued between the 22nd of February and the 3rd of March 1651, Megamed IV to the Crimean Khan Islam Gireū III concerning Khmelnitski's support given to Khmel'nyts'kyj against the Poles²⁰ from the Turkish Sultan.

Four letters from Bogdan Khmel'nyts'kyj to Megmed IV

In the first letter of 5th August 1650 Khmel'nyts'kyj sets out the condition under which The Zaporozhian Host was prepared to come under the Turkish protectorate²¹:

1. The services of the Zaporozhian Host in exchange for Turkish protection;
2. The Zaporozhian Cossacks would remain in close contact with the Crimean Khan, and Islam Giray III would be obliged to support them;
3. Khmel'nyts'kyj would inform the Sultan of the intentions of the Polish State and the Moscow Tzar;
4. the Ukrainian Cossacks would not attack, either at sea or on land, any property of the Ottoman Empire, including that of its vassals;
5. relations between the Ukrainian Cossacks and the Turks would be based on mutual support.

Interestingly in his **second letter** to the Turkish Sultan, Meged IV, of September 1651, Khmel'nyts'kyj addressed the Sultan as "The Tzar of Anatolia" (That is the Tzar of Asia Minor) and Ruler of All Greece. This is a hint at something expanded on in his **third letter** of 7th of December 1651, where Khmel'nyts'kyj explains that Ukrainian Cossacks "Russian people" (that is Ukrainians) are Orthodox and in the Episcopal hierarchy are under the auspices of the Tzargorod Patriarch. Since this Patriarch was under the auspices of the Sultan, "the Russian people" (that is the Ukrainian people) desired to come under the Sultan's protection along with other Orthodox peoples. This is an attitude which fits in with his concept of orthodox internationalism. It seems to us that, in addressing the Sultan as Tzar of Greece, Khmel'nyts'kyj is displaying a sense of humour.

Khmel'nyts'kyj's **fourth letter** to Sultan Megamed IV written at the end of November 1655-beginning of December 1655. This letter was captured by agents of the ruler of Transylvania, Yuri II Rakoczy-one of the Turkish Empire's Christian vassals-and only a translation into Hungarian has survived in the Hungarian State Archive. The letter concerns the conditions and the responsibilities of the Turkish Protectorate.

§3. The Genesis of the Ottoman Protectorate: The 1648 Agreement between Giray III and Bogdan Khmel'nyts'kyj and The Ottoman-Cossack Agreement together with the Black Sea Convention of July 1648

The beginnings of the Turkish Protectorate over the Zaporozhian Host appear in September 1648 when Khmel'nyts'kyj asked for help in combat with the Poles. He appealed to Islam Giray III who, within the system of the Ottoman

Porte, saw to matters concerning the North of the Empire, in other words problems involving its Christian vassals, and entered into a cooperation agreement with him.

An important factor in the resolution of these problems was the Ottoman-Cossack agreement which included the Black Sea Convention of June 1648. This agreement is a starting point for understanding the reasons behind the success of Khmel'nyts'kyj's revolution in 1648 and also the success of the Turkish Protectorate. A detailed account of this Agreement with a commentary by Na'imi can be found in works by Omeljan Pritsak²⁵. Unfortunately, documents in the Turkish State Archive in Istanbul-the year book of the sittings of the Turkish parliament, the "Divan", under the leadership of the Supreme Visor (1647 -1655)-were destroyed in a fire²⁶. The Ukrainian state archive in Baturin, met with the same fate in 1780. However, information about these agreements exists in the works of the State chronicler Mustaffa Na'imi (1617-1703). Until the end of the Ottoman Empire, Na'imi's wrote on a broad range of topics, covering the years 1592 to 1660, in other words the first 60 years of the second Muslim Millennium²⁷. The State chronicler gives a report about the beginnings of the connection between Khel'nyts'kyj, The Crimean Khan and Turkey-and mention of it is made in two of his many works which together make up "The History of the Millenium", according to Omeljan Pritsak²⁸.

On the basis of information from the 17th century Turkish state chronicler, Na'imi²⁹ and commentaries on his work by Omeljan Pritsak³⁰, we know that when, at the beginning of August 1648, Islam Giray's ambassadors returned from a military attack on "The Russi" with good news for the Supreme Visor, the latter's response was "The Russi have made peace with us (the Turks): *rūs bizimle barişiq etmiş edi*. Why did the Khan take up arms against them (*aqin*)? (This is referring to the former Supreme Visor Agmed Gazer-para- Paşa.-L.P.) By all means bring these captives (except the soldiers for which it would be possible to receive a ransom-L. P.) here, and, in accordance with the agreement (*sulha bināen*), we will release them"³¹.

"[In reply the Visor] sent another order [to the Khan] and a letter (*emir ve mektüb*) of reprimand via the Khan's ambassador (qapu ketkhudasi) Dzhemshid Chaysha and the head the palace guard in Istanbul, by the name of Agmed-aga. They came before the Khan and, having passed on to him the epistle with the

reprimand of the Visor, Islam Giray, showing no emotion, said: we are the Sultan's slave! The unfaithful Russi no doubt give out that they are interested in an agreement. While the cap fits too tight (the Polish forces are putting pressure on them.-L.P.) on their head they (Russi and Cossacks. L. P) lie, feigning a desire to serve [the Ottoman State](*taraf -i sultanate işini arz etmekle firib*). But as soon as it suits them they will take to their boats and lay waste to the coast of Anatolia".

From this passage it is clear that between the Ottoman Empire and Bogdan Khmel'nyts'kyj with the Zaporozhian Host after the agreement of March 1648 a treaty with the Crimean Khan in the meantime was agreed in July 1648. The text of this treaty has not yet been found, but the maritime convention has the title "The Treaty between the Turkish Tzar and the Zaporozhian Host and the Russian (that is Ukrainian-L.P.) people in respect of trade on the Black Sea" and this document was later brought into the field of scientific study by the first Imperial archivist of Moldavian-Ukrainian extraction Bantish-Kamensky and analyzed by Ivan Kripyakevich and Omeljan Pritsak³².

§4 Megmed IV's unsent charter of 10th August 1650 to Bogdan Khmel'nyts'kyj and the reasons why it was not sent

The treaty of March 1648 with the Crimean Khan Islam Giray III and the Ottoman-Cossack treaty of July 1648 are both referred to by the Turkish Sultan Megmed IV in his Charter to Bogdan Khmel'nyts'kyj of 10th August³³. A copy of the imperial Letter of Megmed IV to the then Hetman of the Zaporozhian Cossacks of the 12th shabana 1060³⁴.

The title of the letter in Turkish: Nāme-i hümayūn (that is "A letter of the Supreme Ruler")

"The Pride of Christian Rulers, elected by the empowered Christian citizens, Hetman of the Zaporozhian Host, Bogdan Khmel'nyts'kyj, may his days end well (that is may he convert to Islam,-L.P). Once this letters reaches you, we inform you that we have received the letter from those you chose to bring it to me concerning our help, in which you write that with God's help and the care of the Prophet Mohamed, you have come to us, as to the source of the Khakane refuge, to our court and declared under what circumstances you will maintain your loyalty. The contents of the letter, in accordance with ancient Ottoman traditions have been translated and presented to the Supreme Visor of our throne. Thus the

knowledge of its content and tone has come to be known to us. You earlier informed us that you, together with the Crimean Khan, Giray III, who is our loyal servant, set up a treaty and agreement and that with him you have already performed some duties to my state in areas in the hands of your Cossacks, that they do not attack our borders and do no harm. You also inform me that you would like to come under our authority and we have accepted you. Therefore, we have selected traditional robes (Kaftans.-L.P.) for your emissaries. Our Royal letter will be sent concerning this. On its delivery you should know how long you will remain under our authority and to this you must agree. We will not pay attention to information from the side of enemies and you, on your part, must show constant service and fulfill your duties (but they are not stated. -L.P.) And with this you will be among other Christian peoples concerning your reputation and honour. Date 12 shaban 1060 (10 August 1650)³⁵.

In the Turkish chancellery Charters were classified in two groups-in the Turkish the classifications were 'jazyladżaq'-drafts which were to be written out again; and the other 'jazylan'-those which had been written and sent out. In the heading of the Turkish Sultan's Charter of 10 August 1650, now in the library of the Göttingen University, we find that the word used characterizes a Charter which was not sent out to the addressee. The Professor of Prague University, Yan Rypka, puts it in German thus: "Einige Bedenken wird vor allem die Überschrift aufkommen lassen der gemäss wir es mit der Kopie eines zu schreibenden (jazyladżaq) Aktenstückes zu tun haben". In Ukrainian: "This note preceding the title of the document that it is a copy of a letter, which should be signed, forces us to be cautious". So, this is a draft copy which was not sent out. The question is, why, over such a short period were two Charters of Megmaded IV written on the same matter of the Turkish protectorate, Hetman Bogdan Khmel'nyts'kyj and the Zaporozhian Host: one-from 10 August 1650; the other from 22nd of February-3rd March 1651. The Charter from 10 August 1650 which is stored in the University of Göttingen is classified as having not been sent out,—"jazyladżaq". So why was it not sent?

Both Charters were written at the time when Melek Agmed Paşa was the Supreme Visor (from 5th August 1650 to 21st August 1651)³⁶. So, evidently, changes in the Ottoman court were not the reason. There must have been another reason and it is that in September 1650 the Islamic Turkish Vassal, Islam Giray III in alliance with the potential Turkish vassal, Bogdan Khmel'nyts'kyj attacked the

Turkish vassal Moldavia: at this same moment Khmel'nyts'kyj suggested renewal of the protectorate to Sultan Megmedy IV.

All this created a dangerous situation for the Turkish Empire which never liked to unite its vassal states. It is clear that Khmel'nyts'kyj made his first attack on Moldavia, together with the Crimean Khan, in September 1650, without the knowledge or agreement of the Turkish Sultan and his 'divan'. The Turkish court now found itself in a difficult situation: on the 5th of August 1650 Khmel'nyts'kyj had dispatched Cossack ambassadors with Colonel Anton Zhdanovich to The Turkish Sultan in (Tzargorod) with a letter³⁷, where the Hetman set out the terms under which the Cossack forces would come under Turkish protection and why he had attacked a vassal of the Turkish Empire, the principedom of Moldavia.

The Cossack ambassadors also found themselves in a difficult position since they could not justify this step. The Supreme Visor, Melek Agmed Paša was afraid to start a conflict because the Zaporozhian army was a formidable force in the Black Sea area and also very much needed by the Ottoman Empire. Indeed this is what made the protectorate necessary to them. So, Melek Agmed Paša quickly sent the ambassadors away having bestowed on them kaftans and other garments³⁸ as a sign of the Sultan's affection. The Supreme Visor followed developments in the Cossack's attack on Moldavia and, evidently, decided not to send out the Sultan's Charter of 10th of August 1650. Having made this decision, Melek Agmed Paša asked the Sultan to write and send to the another Charter concerning the protectorate (22 February-3 March 1651) which has a special significance and is the more important document.

Section II. The set of Ottoman documents which confirm the Ottoman Protectorate status of the Zaporozhian Host

§1. The Charter of Megmed IV concerning the protectorate over Bogdan Khmel'nyts'kyj and the entire Zaporozhian Host

"An Imperial Charter to the Cossack Hetman, the Prince of Christian Peoples, who was election from the greater Cossack community, Cossack Hetman, Bogdan Khmel'nyts'kyj, may he end his dies well³⁹ (may he convert to Islam.-L.P.).

As soon as this eminent letter reaches you, may it be known that we have spoken with your ambassadors, who have come to us, and Osman-Chause has passed on to us your faithful letter and in accordance with Ottoman traditions, the Visors and members the State parliament have received a translation of the letter, in which you make it known that you accept our protectorate and wish to be in friendly union with our military forces.

§2 A letter from the Supreme Visor Melek Akhmed Paša to Bogdany Khmel'nyts'kyj⁴⁶

“To the proud Prince of the Christian people, elected by the empowered Christian citizens, who rules all matters of the Christian State and has the title, honour, glory and pride, our friend in the Zaporozhian Host (Hetman Invincible), may his days end well (in other words, may he convert to Islam before he dies.-L.P.)”.

Apart from affectionate greetings the Sultan's letter imparts the following friendly news:

“Your letter, addressed to His Highness, has been received and passed on, as was the letter to our Government in which you state your loyalty to us and accept our protectorate over the entire Zaporozhian Host as before. Therefore, the Sultan, via the same Osman-Chaush, sent his letter to you which we have already sent you. Before your letter arrived, your friend (that is the Sumpreme Visor Melek Agmed Paša.-L.P.) together with all the Government represented you before the Sultan in order to take you under our authority. Also, the afore-mentioned Osman-Chaos's passed on all that you imparted verbally. In accordance with this, the Sultan has instructed the Crimean Khan, that when there should be any act from the side of the Poles, he is obliged with his Tatars to hurry to defend you both. Also the Commander and Emir of Akkerman (Bilgorod.-L.P.) and others in the whole surrounding area have received a letter from the Sultan instructing them to make haste to help you. While you remain loyal to our Sultan you should not take as true any gossip against you. You write that the Polish Government has been called together (between 5 and 24 of December 1650-L.P.)⁴⁷ in which, as you write, your delegate is to take part. We, therefore, ask you, on his return to inform us of their decisions. In order to strengthen our bonds, the Sultan is send-

ing you valuable, garments. You write that you have every faith in Osman-Chaush, so please send him with your information to us. Also, we will send to the Moldavian leader a strict order not to ally himself with the Poles, hoping that you will remain loyal to the Sultan.

Date: 22 February-3 March 1651

§3 A Letter from Megmed IV to Islam Giray III⁴⁸

Considering the highly rhetorical and elaborate style of the sultan's letter, we will confine ourselves to the translation of that part which deals with Tatar support for Bogdan Khmel'nyts'kyj:

“In this letter Sultan Megmed IV attends to the fact that the Crimean Khan Islam Giray III has already helped the Zaporozhian Cossacks, and apart from that is well informed about the actions of the Poles. Therefore, he is bound, according to his heroism which is characteristic (of the provincial ruler), to constantly keep his eyes and ears open in the direction of Polish lands. If they (the Poles) were to act against the Zaporozhian Cossacks, vassals of our great state, you are obliged to try to punish them (the Poles) with your unbeatable warriors and your lightning fast Tatar army.”

Date: *Reci-ül-evvel* 1061 (22nd February-3rd March 1651)

It is clear from the above documents that Bogdam Khmel'nyts'kyj and the entire Zaporozhian Host became a Turkish protectorate in 1651. In the Sultan's Charter of 1651 it is stated that Bogdan Khmel'nyts'kyj, having recognized the supremacy of the Sultan was sent a document where the conditions for the agreement were clearly stated. In Ottoman-Turkish terminology it is called *‘ahd-nāme*⁴⁹. Unfortunately this fourth document, the *‘ahd-nāme*, has not survived. The documents concerning Cossack-Ottoman diplomacy which have come down to us cannot answer the question as to the Turkish Sultan's terms regarding the Ottoman-Cossack protectorate treaty of 1651. Concerning the many diplomatic missions it is hardly possible to add to what Mikhailo Hrushevskyj⁵⁰ has said in his works. What is more, that is not theme of the current work where the focus is on the diplomatic documents, that is the relevant documents from the Turkish Sultan, Megmed IV, the Great Visor, Melek Agmed Paša and of Bogdan Khmel'nyts'kyj himself.

Section III. An attempt to reconstruct elements of the Ottoman 'ahd-nāme of 1651

§1. A letter from Bogdan Khmel'nyts'kyj to Megmed IV from the end of November-beginning of December 1655

We do not have the text of documents by Bogdan Khmel'nyts'kyj concerning the protectorate, only letters from the Hetman of the Zaporozhian Host, especially at letter from Bogdan Khmel'nyts'kyj to the Sultan Megmed IV from the end of November 1655⁵¹. In this letter Khmel'nyts'kyj confirms that the Zaporozhsky forces remain in agreement with the Ottoman Empire on the terms which had been agreed between them. This means that those terms were, in principal, the same both in the 1651 and 1655:

-Brotherly concord remains with the Crimean Khan;

-The Zaporozhsky forces, as before, are loyal to the Sultan;

-The Hetman does not allow the Cossack to enter the Sultan's territory neither over land, nor via the River Dunai, nor by sea will a single vessel sail there and no harm will be done to that land;

-The Hetman will prevent maritime attacks by the Don Cossacks (which the -Moscow Tzar rules): "If they do not listen to our Cossacks, then they will suffer and they will become our enemies"⁵²;

-In return for the service of the Zaporozhsky forces, the Sultan will protect -Bogdan Khmel'nyts'kyj from all his enemies.

To live in peace with all the Christian vassals of the Ottoman empire: Moldavia, Valakhiya, Transylvania, but not to pay the Sultan's levy.

However, Khmel'nyts'kyj makes no mention of his attitude to Moscow. On the basis of the existing documents and later development in Ottoman-Cossack relations it is possible to assume that the terms which Khmel'nyts'kyj accepted afforded the Zaporozhian Host complete autonomy without the need for the Cossacks to pay a levi⁵³, just as for Moldavia, Voloshchina (Multania) and Transylvania (Semigorod). In return, Khmel'nyts'kyj and the Zaporozhian forces had to help with their army if the Ottoman army was fighting in the area of the Cossack State's borders. Khmel'nyts'kyj understood the necessity of remaining in a brotherly union with the Crimean Khan "Kardash-kazagi"(Brother Cossack), indeed, for the Hetman this was the most important factor in the Ottoman-Cossack treaty

because, without the Tatar horsemen Khmel'nyts'kyj could not have fought against such a strong opponent as Poland and he had to give in to the Khan sometimes, in order to maintain friendly relations. These terms remain constant in later ties between the Ukrainian Hetmen and the Ottoman Empire, as is evident from the documents of the Ottoman-Ukrainian treaties agreed to by Hetman Petra Doroshenko on 1st May 1669 and by Philip Orlik on 28 December 1711⁵⁵.

§2. A comparison of the materials of the two Ottoman 'ahd-nāme, one for Hetman Petra Doroshenko of 1669⁵⁶ and the other for Hetman Philip Orlik of 1711

This document also has a special history. Hetman Petro Doroshenko sent it to Mikhail Khanenko, a candidate for Hetman, in order to make peace with him. This was not the Sultan's Charter, but a copy of it translated into Latin which Mikhailo Khanenko sent on the 27th of August 1669 to the Commandant⁵⁷ of Bila-tzerkov. A copy of the Russian translation of the document is kept in the RGADA⁵⁸. The Turkish draft of this Charter was found by Yan Ripka in the library of Göttingen University⁵⁹.

The peculiarities of the Charter of Sultan Megmed IV of the 1 May 1669

1) It is addressed, not only to Hetman Doroshenko, but to the colonals, osavuls, centurions, and all the seniors and folk of the Zaporozhian Host.

2) The Cossacks asked for protection on the terms of the Moldavian, and Voloskian Lords – Christian rulers. In taking them under his protection and sending Doroshenko an orb and flag, "not as a sign of your subordination, but as the sign of a bond and to frighten your enemies". "This letter I wrote-the Sultan states-and also I take an oath (this is what the Moscow Tzar did not want to do.-L.P.). We must treat this letter with great respect and I give you my word and my promise. Hetman Doroshenko must hold to his oath and not turn away from it. And the Sultan will protect you and all the Zaporozhian Host as his own. The Tatars will not attack Ukraine and you must not attack them either. The Crimean Khan, who is my servant, is obliged, as before, to be in a brotherly union with Doroshenko. And this must be confirmed by a shaking of hands. The Crimean Khan must not get involved with matters concerning the Zaporozhian Host and the Zaporozhian Host must send a resident (to Tzargorod.-L.P.)".

The original Turkish treaty of 28th of December 1711⁶⁰ was found in Istanbul, in the Turkish State Archives.

The Charter of Sultan Agmed III to Philip Orlik

From 28th December 1711

This is the text of the treaty between Hetman Philip Orlik and the Ottoman Empire at the end of 1711, an Ottoman 'ahd-nāme:

“The Cossacks of Ukraine and Zaporozhian are subject to my eternal rule [under the following conditions]⁶¹:

[1] The election and overthrow of the Hetman will be in their (Cossack) hands.

[2] The resolution of their (Cossack) issues will be a matter for themselves.

[3] They (the Ukrainians) have the status of subjects. They are not burdened by any taxes and no levys will be demanded of them.

[4] The named population must strictly abide by the terms agreed.

[5] As long as they keep their word, no demands will be made of them (by the Turkish Authorities), nor will their land or rights be attacked (by the Turkish forces).

[6] When (the Ukrainian) tradesmen come to trade in the well protected (by God) (Ottoman) regions, taxes will be levied only on their goods and (other mobile) property, but they should make no other payments.

Apart from this, they (the Ukrainian Ambassadors) kindly requested confirmation (of the above points), that they may be a true conveyor which will add happiness to our activities. Khan of Crimea, Davlet Giray-may his rule continue, is also obliged to take heed of the matters concerning the Cossacks of Ukraine and Zaporozhia, stated above.

He (the Khan) also asked to state a condition that the son of the Hetman, which his named people (the Ukrainians) have elected, remains as a hostage to the Crimean Khan. I have given my kingly assent to them (the Ukrainians) on the condition that:

[a] As soon as my (the Turkish) unassailable army joins in battle in a region not far from them, the named people (the Ukrainians) must send from their side as many soldiers as possible.

[b] They (the Ukrainians and Turks) must help and support each other.

As a result, I have given and ordered (the implementation) of this happy Charter.

The above named conditions, as they are explained and laid out above and made clear concerning the named people (Ukrainians) may remain in force forever, if they (the Ukrainians) are unstinting and decisive in the (carrying out of) conditions.

None of our happy servants, from the Supreme Visor to the worthy ministers or other (dignitaries of my country) have the right to turn around (the text of the agreement) or by their actions destroy the desire (of the Ukrainians) and the declaration (of the Khan). They themselves and their children must remain within the shadow of true affection of this (Ottoman) family (dynasty), known for its generosity and charity.

Be it known. You are obliged to trust the noble (Tugra) (the Sultan's monogram) ⁶² (Tugra).

(Completed at the residence in Constantinople) in the middle decade (of the month) zilca'de (year of the Hijri) [1] 123".

On the basis of analysis of existing agreements between the Ukrainian Hetman and the Turkish Sultan and this dispatch of the 28 December 1711, it is very clear that the Ukrainian side constantly achieved these terms and maintained them:

-The election of the Hetman and the general senior ranking persons remain in accordance with the concept of the rights and freedom of the Zaporozhian Host (in other words complete internal autonomy).

-The Ukrainian population has the same rights as the population of Christian states which were under the protection of the Turks, i.e. Moldavia, Voloshchina in that they do not have to pay any taxes (tekālif) or levies (khārāg). Only if the Turks are fighting near the borders of Ukraine do the Cossacks have to support them.

-The Cossacks are to remain on friendly terms with the Crimean Tatars and may not attack Crimean territory while the Crimean Khan is obliged to help the Hetman in battles against his enemies.

-The Ukrainian population of the Zaporozhian Forces are obliged to abide by the agreements made (in other words, both sides have friendly relations with the other). In the text of the Sultan's Charter to Hetman Philip Orlik there is the promise from the Turkish side that none of the Sultan's subordinates or the Supreme Visor or other dignitaries has the right to change the text of agreement or break the agreement by acting against it.

On the basis of all these documents-the Sultan's Charter and letters from Bogdan Khmel'nyts'kyj-it is possible to draw the conclusion that during the time of Ukrainian-Ottoman accord in the XVII-XVIII centuries the central points were those listed above.

§3. An overview of the character of Ottoman Cossack agreements from the Hetman era

Returning to the agreements between Bogdan Khmel'nyts'kyj and the Ottoman Port and the Crimean Khan, it can be stated that at the time when, in 1648, the Hetman began the revolution this was the only possible help against the Poles. Khmel'nyts'kyj was not a member of a dynasty and in international matters he could find no other partner to help stand up against against the Rich Pospolit. However, after the battle of Zhvantza (December 1653) relations between Islam Giray III and Khmel'nyts'kyj cooled. When Isam Giray III fell ill and died in June 1654 and his successor Megmed Giray immediately concluded an agreement with Poland, Khmel'nyts'kyj saw that further ties with the Crimean Khan and the Ottoman Porte⁶³ would bring no further advantage. Therefore the Hetman concentrated on relations with Moscow from where he could get help to fight the Poles. As has been underlined, the union with the Ottoman Empire only made sense while its vassal, the Crimean Khan could be of help in the struggle against the Poles. With the death of Islam Giray III, The Crimean Khanate lost its attraction as did the Ottoman State.

Sources and Literature

(In the original Language)

1. *Pritsak Omeljan*. Das erste türkisch-ukrainische Bündnis (1648) // *Oriens.-Leiden*, 1953.-Т. 6.-№ 2.-С. 266–298.
2. *Воссоединение Украины с Россией: Документы и материалы: В трех томах /* Ред. Ф. П. Шевченко и др.-М., 1954.-Т. 2.-Док. №43.-С. 93.
3. *Rypka J.* Aus der Korrespondenz der Hohen Pforte mit Bogdan Chmelnickij // *Z Déjin Vychodni Evropy a Slovanstva (Festschrift Jaroslav Bidlo)*.-Прага, 1928.-С. 488–489.
4. *Rypka J.* Weitere Beiträge zur Korrespondenz der Hohen Pforte mit Bogdan Chmelnickij // *Archiv Orientální*.-Прага, 1930.-Т. 2.-№ 2.-С. 268–272.
5. ЦДА.-Ф. Колекція грамот російських царів та універсалів українських гетьманів.-Оп. 2.-Спр. 25а.-Арк. 1–2 із заголовком: «Kopia listu Chmielnickiego do cesarza tureckiego de data z Czehryna, die 27 novembris 1651» (копія).
6. *Shaw Stanford J.* History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey.-Cambridge, London 1976.-Т. 1.-С. 203–207, див.: с. 205: *The Regime of Tarhoncu Ahmet Paşa: 20 Червня, 1652; 31 Березня, 1653.*
7. РГАДА.-Ф. 210. Севский стол.-Столб. 179.-Л. 479–480.
8. *Документи Богдана Хмельницького (1648–1657) (ДБХ)*.-Док. № 345.-С. 461–463.-Дата помилкова. Із змісту видно, що Лист написаний після повернення Богдана Хмельницького із походу на Львів, тобто не раніше кінця листопада 1655 р. Див. прим. 1, с. 46. Лист знаходиться в Угорському державному архіві в перекладі угорською мовою. Опубліковано: *Monumenta Hungariae. Historica. I. Diplomacizai emlékek*.-Т. 23.-Budapest, 1903.-С. 254–257.
9. Fisher Alan W. *The Crimean Tatars*.-Stanford, 1978.-С. 14–16, 19, 45.
10. Гвоздик-Прицак Л. *Економічна і політична візія Богдана Хмельницького та її реалізація в державі Військо Запорозьке*.-К., 1999.-С. 118.
11. РГАДА.-Ф. 89. «Сношения России с Турцией».-Оп. 2. 1651 г.-№ 26. Оригінал Грамоти турецького султана Мегмеда IV гетьману Богдану Хмельницькому зберігається в Москві у РГАДА, але неправильно датований упорядниками 1647 р., тоді як Б. Хмельницький був чигиринським сотником і ще не починав повстання. Омелян Прицак у 1991 р. допоміг виправити каталог РГАДА. Прочитавши з турецької мови XVII ст. Грамоту, вчений встановив дату, написану султаном: *Rebî'ül-evvel* 1061 h (року від Гіджри); у перекладі на християнський календар це декада

від 22 лютого до 3 березня 1651 р. В документі пишеться, що турецький султан Мегмед IV приймає під свій протекторат козацького гетьмана Богдана Хмельницького з усім Військом Запорозьким, так зване *ahd-nāme*-договір, а умови й обов'язки будуть вислані окремим Листом.

12. Рурка J. *Weitere Beiträge...*-С. 268–272. Факсиміле оригіналу (турецький текст) і німецький переклад турецької Грамоти 1651 р.

13. РГАДА.-Ф. 124. Малороссийский приказ.-Столб. 7/5819.-Л. 207–209. Копія Листа Б. Хмельницького від 5 серпня 1650 р. писана українською мовою із заголовком: «Список с Листа, каков послан от гетьмана к турецькому царю».

14. Archiwum Głównie Akt Dawnych.-Warszawa.-Ф. Коронний Варшавський архів. Козацькі справи.-Папка. 42.-Спр. 27.-№ 6. Копія Листа Богдана Хмельницького від вересня 1651 р., писаного польською мовою до турецького султана.

15. ЦДІА.-Ф. Колекція грамот російських царів та універсалів українських гетьманів.-Оп. 2.-Спр. 25а.-Арк. 1–2. Копія Листа Богдана Хмельницького від 27 листопада 1651 р., писаного польською мовою турецькому султану із заголовком: «Kopia listu Chmielnickiego do cesarza tureckiego de data z Czehryna, die 27 novembris 1651».

16. ДБХ.-Док. № 345.-С. 461–463. Переклад угорською мовою Листа Богдана Хмельницького турецькому султану, писаного в кінці листопада-на початку грудня 1655 р.

17. Göttingen Universitäts Bibliothek. Збірник копій турецьких документів. Копія Грамоти турецького султана Мегмеда IV гетьману Богдану Хмельницькому від 10 серпня 1650 р.: *Kodex Gött. Turc.* 29.-Арк. 87а–87b, видав факсиміле оригіналу (турецький текст) і німецький переклад Рурка J. *Aus der Korrespondenz...*-С. 488–489.

18. РГАДА.-Ф. 89. «Сношения России с Турцией».-Оп. 2. 1651 г.-№ 26. Оригінал Грамоти турецького султана Мегмеда IV козацькому гетьману Б. Хмельницькому від 22 лютого-3 березня 1651 р. знаходиться в Москві у РГАДА. Проблемою цієї турецької грамоти в історіографії займалися кілька вчених: Буцинський П. Н. у монографії: *О Богдане Хмельницком*.-Харьков, 1882.-С. 114–117. Джерельною базою автора були мемуари тогочасного подільського судді, видані у: *Pamiętniki do rapanowania Zygmunta III, Władysława IV, Jana Kazimierza*.-Ч. II.-С. 54; Костомаров М. І. у монографії: *Богдан Хмельницкий-данник Оттоманской Порты // Собрание сочинений*.-СПб., 1905.-Т. XIV.-С. 605; Грушевський М. *Історія України-Руси*.-Т. 9.-Ч. I.-С. 60–64, 134–137;-Т. 9.-Ч. II.-С. 1540–1544, доповнення до с. 60, 135–137; Смирнов В. Д. *Крымское ханство под верховенством Оттоманской Порты*.-СПб., 1887.-С. 550. Вчені мали польські переклади XVII ст. Грамоти

турецького султана Мегмеда IV гетьману Богдану Хмельницькому з неправильно відчитаними датами. Факсиміле оригіналу Грамоти був виданий разом із польським перекладом XVIII ст., завіреним перекладачем *Antonius Crutta* в королівській канцелярії в 1789 р.: *Памятники...*-Т. 3. Також спеціально для «*Памятников...*» був підготовлений французький переклад турецької Грамоти провідного тогочасного османіста *Josef-a Hammer-a* (Гаммера-Пургшталя). Остаточний переклад турецької Грамоти від 1651 р. німецькою мовою видав чеський сходознавець Ян Рипка на підставі копії із Геттінгенського університету. Це факсиміле оригіналу (турецький текст) і німецький переклад: Рупка J. *Weitere Beiträge...*-С. 268–272. Ян Рипка знайшов у копіярії Геттінгенського університету вищезгадані копії турецьких Грамот і видав їхній текст у фотокопії, транскрипції і німецькому перекладі. Вчений написав низку статей про українсько-турецькі взаємини: одна, до часів Богдана Хмельницького, написана разом із Дмитром Дорошенком: *Dorošenko D., Rypka J. Polsko, Ukrajina, Krym a Vysoká Porta v první pol. XVII stol. // Časopis Národního Musea.-Praha, 1936.-С. 1–32.* Три статті з часів Богдана Хмельницького: Рупка J. *Aus der Korrespondenz...*-С. 482–498; *Weitere Beiträge...*-С. 262–283; *Dalsi příspěvek ke korespondenci Vysoké Porty s Bogdanem Chmelnickým // Časopis Národního Musea.-Praha, 1931.-С. 209–231,* і одна стаття з часів гетьмана Петра Дорошенка, написана Яном Рипкою разом із Дмитром Дорошенком: *Dorošenko D., Rypka J. Heitman Petr Dorošenko a jeho turecká politika // Časopis Národního Musea.-Praha, 1933.-С. 1–55.*

19. Лист великого візира Мелек Агмед Паші у справі протекторату гетьману Б. Хмельницькому, писаний того самого дня, що й Грамота султана, в оригіналі зберігається в архіві кн. Чарторийських у Кракові (Музей.-Код. № 609); *Göttingen Universitäts Bibliothek. Kodex Gött. Turc. 29.-Арк. 95b* (копія). Факсиміле оригіналу (турецький текст) і німецький переклад (таблиця 38) видав: Рупка J. *Weitere Beiträge...*-С. 273–279.

20. Грамота турецького султана Мегмеда IV кримському хану Іслам Гірею III від 1651 р. написана тієї самої дати, між 22 лютого до 3 березня, про допомогу Б. Хмельницькому проти Польщі. Факсиміле оригіналу (турецький текст) і німецький переклад видано з копії *Göttingen Universitäts Bibliothek.-Kodex Gött. Turc. 29.-Арк. 94b–95a.* Опубліковано: Рупка J. *Weitere Beiträge...*-С. 279–282.

21. Лист Богдана Хмельницького турецькому султану Мегмеду IV від 5 серпня 1650 р. Копія знаходиться в РГАДА.-Ф. 124. Малороссийский приказ.-Столб. 7/5819.-Л. 207–209, із заголовком: «Список с Листа, каков послан от гетьмана к турецкому царю». Опубліковано: *АЮЗР.-Т. 8.-С. 354; Восоединение...*-Т. 2.-С. 438; *ДБХ.-Док. № 107.-С. 177–178.*

22. Лист Богдана Хмельницького турецькому султану Мегмеду IV від вересня 1651 р. зберігається у копії: Центральний архів давніх актів у Варшаві.-Ф. Коронний

Варшавський архів. Козацькі справи.-Папка. 42.-Спр. 27.-№ 6, 45; ЦДІА.-Ф. Колекція фотокопій документів про визвольну війну українського народу (1648–1654 рр.)-Оп. 1.-Спр. 112.-Арк. 2–3, фотокопія. Оpubліковано: ДБХ.-Док. № 147.-С. 225–226; Буцинский П. Н. *О Богдане Хмельницком*.-Харьков, 1882.-С. 126–127.

23. Лист Богдана Хмельницького турецькому султану Мегмеду IV від 7 грудня 1651 р. Копія Листа зберігається у ЦДІА.-Ф. Колекція грамот російських царів та універсалів українських гетьманів.-Оп. 2.-Спр. 25а.-Арк. 1–2, із заголовком: «Koria listu Chmielnickiego do cesarza tureckiego de data z Czehryna, die 27 novembris 1651». Оpubліковано: ДБХ.-Док. № 153.-С. 233–234.

24. Там само.-Док. № 345.-С. 461–463. Оpubліковано: *Monumenta Hungariae. Historica*.-Т. 23.-С. 254–257.

25. *Пріцак Омелян*. Ще раз про союз Богдана Хмельницького з Туреччиною // УАЩ.-Вип. 2.-К., 1993.-Т. 5.-С. 177–192.

26. *Midhat Sertoğlu*. Muhteva bakımdan. Başıvekalet Arşivi.-Ankara 1955.

27. На'іма. *Na'ima Tapixi*. (BOA).-У 6 тт.-Вид. 3-тє.-Істамбул, 1280–1283 (1863–1866); Pritsak Omeljan. *Das erste türkisch-ukrainische Bündnis (1648)* // Oriens.-Т. 6.-С. 266–298.

28. *Пріцак Омелян*. Ще раз про союз Богдана Хмельницького з Туреччиною // УАЩ.-С. 177–178.

29. На'іма. *Na'ima Tapixi*. (BOA).-Т. 4.-С. 279–280.

30. *Пріцак Омелян*. Ще раз про союз Богдана Хмельницького з Туреччиною // УАЩ.-С. 189.

31. Pritsak Omeljan. *Das erste türkisch-ukrainische Bündnis (1648)* // Oriens.-Т. 6.-С. 288. Чому великий візир Агмед Газер-пара Паша виніс догану кримському хану Іслам Гірею III? Тут На'іма добре відчув проблему татарського і турецького договорів 1648 р. з Богданом Хмельницьким, яка все ж була взаємною. З однієї сторони, татарська кіннота-це важливий компонент військових операцій, з іншої-як хан далі пише, татари не займаються ані хліборобством, ані торгівлею, а тільки здобичництвом. І тут хан особисто не міг цієї ситуації змінити. Очевидно, Б. Хмельницький це знав, мусив брати до уваги, і одначе гетьман намагався щось змінити, мабуть, поскаржився турецькому правлінню, і воно винесло кримському хану догану за те, що він напав на союзника. Проте через революцію в Туреччині і страту султана Ібрагіма I та великого візира Агмед Газер-пара Паші цей епізод згодом На'іма назвав «закиди колишнього візира».

32. Договір між Портою і Військом Запорозьким від липня 1648 р., одна його складова-Чорноморська Конвенція-був виданий у Москві у 1822 р. в офіційному російському збірнику: СГГД.-С. 444-447. Оскільки документ написаний польською мовою, академік І. П. Крип'якевич у 1939 р. надрукував свій український переклад з коментарем. Див.: Крип'якевич І. П. *Відвічна вісь України* // Сьогодні й минуле.-Львів, 1939.-Т. 1.-С. 24-29. На турецько-український договір першої половини XVII ст. звертає увагу учень І. П. Крип'якевича Омелян Прицак, котрий опублікував його з німецьким перекладом у міжнародному журналі «*Oriens*», який був спонсорований турецьким урядом, у статті: *Das erste türkisch-ukrainische Bündnis (1648)* // *Oriens.-Leiden*, 1953.-Т. 6.-С. 266-298. Омелян Прицак присвятив її своєму приятелю, тодішньому міністру закордонних справ Туреччини, Mehmet Fuad Köprülü, щоб тим самим звернути увагу турецьких учених на цей невідомий факт з їхньої історії. У такий спосіб учений ввів до наукового обігу турецько-український договір і Чорноморську Конвенцію, встановивши правильну дату-липень 1648 р. Через сорок років О. Прицак знову повертається до цієї проблеми, і в Україні виходить його нова стаття: «Ще раз про союз Богдана Хмельницького з Туреччиною», в якій він обґрунтував ту подію турецькими й українськими джерелами: *УАЩ.-Вип. 2.-Т. 5.-С. 177-192.*

33. Грамота турецького султана Мегмеда IV гетьману Богдану Хмельницькому з усім Військом Запорозьким від 10 серпня 1650 р.: збірник копій турецьких документів: *Kodex Gött. Turc.* 29.-Арк. 87а-87b; факсиміле оригіналу (турецький текст) і німецький переклад вид.: Рурка J. *Aus der Korrespondenz...*-С. 488-489. Обидві праці Яна Рипки були позитивно рецензовані М. Грушевським: *З приводу листування Б. Хмельницького з Оттоманською Портою* // *Україна.-1930.-№42.-Липень.-С. 3-7.* Рецензія на другу працю Яна Рипки призначалася тому ж таки журналу «*Україна*» у 1930 р., але номер не вийшов. Цю рецензію через сімдесят років опублікували П. Сохань, В. Ульяновський, С. Кіржаєв у книзі: *Михайло Грушевський і Academia: ідея та змагання.-К., 1993.-С. 314-316.*

34. Дата турецької Грамоти написана 12 saban 1060 р. від Гіджри, що відповідає 10 серпня 1650 р. за християнським календарем. Див.: *Wüstenfeld-Mahlersche. Vergleichungs-Tabellen*; 3-тє видання здійснив: Bertold Spuler.-Wiesbaden, 1961.-С. 23.

35. Рурка J. *Aus der Korrespondenz...*-С. 489. Цей та інші османські документи подано тут у вільному перекладі, без східних риторичних прикрас.

36. *Shaw Stanford J. History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey.-Т. 1.-С. 204.*

37. РГАДА.-Ф. 124. Малороссийский приказ.-Столб. 7/5819.-Л. 207-209. Копія із заголовком: «Список с Листа, каков послан от гетьмана к турецкому царю».

38. *Жерела до історії України-Руси* / Видав Мирон Кордуба.-Львів, 1911.-Т. 12, 1913.-Док. № 128.-С. 139. Ренігер до цісаря Фердинанда III. Царгород, 10 жовтня 1650 р. Оригінал Листа знаходиться у Державному архіві у Відні, Turcsica.

39. *Kodex Gött. Turc.* 29.-Арк. 101-в. Факсиміле (турецький текст) і німецький переклад вид.: Рурка J. *Weitere Beiträge...*-С. 268–272. Оригінал турецької Грамоти 1651 р. зберігається у РГАДА.-Ф. 89. «Сношения России с Турцией».-Оп. 2. 1651 г.-№ 26.

40. Рурка J. *Weitere Beiträge...*-С. 272.

41. РГАДА-Ф. 89. «Сношения России с Турцией».-Оп. 2. 1651 г.-№ 26. Оригінал турецької Грамоти від 1651 р.

42. *Памятники, изданные Временной комиссией для разбора древних актов.*-К., 1898.-Т. 3.-С. 438.

43. Архів кн. Чарторийських у Кракові.-Музей.-Код. № 609. Оригінал Листа великого візира Мелек Агмед Паші від 1651 р.

44. *Kodex Gött. Turc.* 29.-Арк. 94b–95a. Копія Грамоти султана Мегмеда IV кримському хану Іслам Гірею III.

45. Рурка J. *Weitere Beiträge...*-С. 262–283. Див. також: Грушевський М. *Історія України-Руси.*-Т. 9.-Ч. I.-С. 131–138; -Т. 9.-Ч. II.-С. 1539–1541, 1543–1549.

46. Рурка J. *Weitere Beiträge...*-С. 273–279. Історія цього Листа, що під Берестечком дістався в руки полякам, а звідти потрапив до архіву кн. Чарторийських у Кракові, правдоподібно, тієї самої дати: 22 лютого-3 березня 1651 р.

47. Рурка J. *Weitere Beiträge...*-С. 277–278.

48. *Kodex Gött. Turc.* 29.-Арк. 94b–95a. Факсиміле (турецький текст) і німецький переклад вид.: Рурка J. *Weitere Beiträge...* Текст арабським письмом.-С. 279–280; факсиміле (тур. текст).-С. 281; переклад нім. мовою.-С. 282–283.

49. Лист султана Мегмеда IV кримському хану Іслам Гірею III від 22 лютого-3 березня 1651 р. про протекторат Війську Запорозькому. В османській політичній термінології *‘ahd* означав договір на зразок договору Бога з ізраїльтянами, поданому у Старому Заповіті: *Islam Ansiklopedisi.*-Т. I.-Istanbul, 1950.-С. 156.

50. Грушевський М. *Історія України-Руси.*-Т. 9.-Ч. I.-С. 60, 64, 131–138; -Т. 9.-Ч. II.-С. 1539–1541, 1543–1544, 1549.

51. ДБХ.-Док. № 345.-С. 461–463. Переклад угорською мовою Листа Богдана Хмельницького Мегмеду IV від кінця листопада-початку грудня 1655 р. про умови протекторату зберігається в Угорському державному архіві.

52. ДБХ.-Док. № 345.-С. 462.

53. Kolodziejczyk Dariusz. *Ejalet Kamieniecki*.-Warszawa, 1994.-С. 51 «W odróżnieniu od (hospodarów moldawskiego i wołoskiego) Doroszenko nie musiał jednak płacić daniny, a jedynie służyć sultanowi z wojskiem zaporoskim».

54. Дорошенко Дмитро. Гетьман Петро Дорошенко: огляд його життя і політичної діяльності.-Нью-Йорк, 1985.-С. 261.

55. Османський архів Головного управління Кабінету міністрів (Турецької Республіки), Vaşbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi (VOA).-V. 6, Bâb-i^c Alî, Nâme-i hümayûn, 6-227. Зберігається оригінал турецького договору з гетьманом Пилипом Орликом від 29 грудня 1711 р.

56. Dorosenko D., Rypka J. *Hejtmán Petr Dorosenko a jeho turecká politika* // *Časopis Národního Musea*.-С. 1–55.

57. Ostrowski Zameyszowicz Jan. *Svada latina*.-Lublin, 1747.-Epistolae.-С. 49–50; див. прим. 54.-С. 260.

58. АЮЗР.-Т. 9.-С. 173–174.

59. Dorosenko D., Rypka J. Op. cit.-С. 40; *Kodex Gött. Turc.* 29.-Арк. 212b–213a. Копія грамоти султана Мегмеда IV гетьману Петру Дорошенкові від 1 травня 1669 р.

60. Оригінал турецького договору з гетьманом Пилипом Орликом від 28 грудня 1711 р. знаходиться в Османському архіві Головного управління Кабінету міністрів (Турецької Республіки), див.: прим. 55. Оригіналу латинського тексту договору поки що не знайдено. Документ видав Омелян Прицак із транскрипцією тексту турецького оригіналу договору і коментарем до нього: *УАЩ.-К.*, 1992.-Вип. 1.-Т. 4.-С. 307–320. Назву статті див. у прим. 61.

61. Прицак Омелян. Один чи два договори Пилипа Орлика з Туреччиною на початку другого десятиліття вісімнадцятого століття // *УАЩ.-Вип. 1.-Т. 4.-С. 307–320. Договір див. на с. 310.*

62. Там само.-Див. прим. 61; Див. також: Борщак Ілько. *Гетьман Пилип Орлик і Франція* // *ЗНТШ*.-Львів, 1924.-Т. 134–135.-С. 85–87, 133–134; Крупницький Б. *Гетьман Пилип Орлик*.-Варшава, 1938; крім того: *Гетьман Пилип Орлик*.-Мюнхен, 1956.-С. 31–53. Інструкція Пилипа Орлика була видана Осипом Бодянським. Див.: *Переписка и другие бумаги шведского короля Карла XII, польского Станислава*

Лещинского, татарского хана, турецкого султана, Генерального Писаря Ф. Орлика... // Чтения в Императорском обществе истории и древностей российских.-М., 1847.-Кн. 1.-С. 61–66. Основні ідеї умов турецького договору погоджені з дев'ятою статтею Інструкції П. Орлика. В Інструкції Україна знаходиться по обох сторонах Дніпра, і також в ній говориться про Військо Запорозьке і народ Малої Росії. Особливу увагу приділено українській православній церкві під зверхністю Константинопольського патріарха.

63. Н. Яковенко подає, що «пізніше [османське] посольство 1653 р. привезло гетьману санджаки-клейноди правителя, що визнав зверхність султана: булаву, шаблю, бунчук і кафтан». Яковенко Наталя. *Нарис Історії України з найдавніших часів до кінця XVIII століття*.-К., 1997.-С. 195. Див. також: Смолій В. А., Степанков В. С. *Богдан Хмельницький. Хроніка життя та діяльності*.-К., 1994.-С. 161; Крип'якевич І. П. *Богдан Хмельницький*.-Вид. 2-е.-Львів, 1990.-С. 152–153. Тому що про це посольство не залишилося ніякого офіційного документа ані з козацької, ані з османської сторони, я не можу займатися тут тим сюжетом.

Notes

Pritsak Omeljan. Das erster Türkisch-ukrainische Bündnis (1648)//Oriens. –Leiden, 1953. Т. 6. –№2. –Pgs. 266-298

Rypka J. Aus der Hohen Pforte mit Bogdan Chmel'nickyj//Z Dějin Vychodni Evropy a Slovanstva (Festschrift Jaroslav Bidlo). –Prague, 1928. Pgs. 488-489

Rypka J. Weitere Beiträge zur Korrespondenz der Hohen Pforte mit Bogdan Chmel'nickyj// Archive Orientální. –Prague, 1930. –Т.2. –№2. Pgs268 272. Paša Paša