

NAVAL CAMPAIGNS OF THE UKRAINIAN COSSACK FLEET TO THE FORTRESS OF SINOP

Ferhad Turanly*

Introduction

The goal of the study is to consider the problem of naval campaigns of Ukrainian Cossack Fleet to Turkish possessions in the Black Sea Area, and particularly to the Fortress of Sinop. On the ground of authentic Turkic-Ottoman and Ukrainian written sources, the author explains the reasons for strengthening of naval forces of the Zaporozhian Host that for a long period of time carried out successful campaigns against towns and fortresses of the Ottoman Empire. In this context, there have been identified the chronology of the mentioned events, as well as their consequences. The author clarifies the area and the routes that occurred to be important for establishing trade relations. The research also concerns the issue and circumstances of establishing political and military unions between the Zaporozhian Host and the Crimean Khanate. Formation and strengthening of Ukrainian Cossack Army at the beginning of the 17th century enabled them to participate in different military campaigns, particularly in the war between Austrian and Ottoman Empires. In this relation, the paper reveals that the Cossack factor was not an additional military support in the external policy of the Habsburgs, but the factor

* Prof. Dr., National University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, Faculty of Humanities, Kyiv / Ukraine, ferhadturanly@gmail.com, Orcid : 0000-0003-4637-7121.

of strategic significance and influence on the external and internal policies of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the struggle for gaining the Polish throne. The Study was conducted observing the principles of the historicism and historic source-studying systematics. The principles of interdisciplinary approach and the norm of authenticity identification of informational value of the data and facts were also identified. The Academic Novelty of the study is a civilisational comprehension of the development of Oriental Studies in Ukraine, primarily that of Historiography and Studies of Sources related to the Turkish-Ottoman written documents concerning the Cossack Period of Ukraine, used for that purpose an adequate methodology. ¹

The topicality of the research lies in the profound historic study of Ukrainian and Turkish relations that developed during Cossack naval campaigns that went along with fierce battles, destruction of fortresses and capturing of Turkish lands by Ukrainian-Cossack fleet. Withing this problem, it is worthwhile to look at the defense measures of naval forces of High Porta aimed at punishing Ukrainian fleet and strengthening of Turkish possessions in the Black Sea area.

The fundamental study of naval campaigns of Ukrainian-Cossack fleet to the Black Sea possessions of Osman Empire, particularly to Sinop and other strategic fortresses was conducted by numerous Ukrainian and foreign history scholars: Oleksands Hurzhyi, Vadym Kornienko “Hetman Petro Konashevych-Sahaidachnyi” (2004) ², Yudzhel Ozturk “Cossacks from Dniro to Danube” (2004) ³, Viktor Brekhunenko

1 Ferhad Turanly, “Persecuted Turkology: The Ukrainian Context Shidnoyevropeyskyi Istorychnyi Visnyk” *East European Historical Bulletin*, 27, 2023, p. 140.

2 Hurzhiy O. I. Korniyenko V. V. *Het'man Petro Konashevych-Sahaydachnyy*, in Ukrainian, Kyiv, Ukrayina 188, 2004. [2] c. : in.

3 Yücel Öztürk, *Özü'den Tuna'ya: Kazaklar*, 1. Baskı, İstanbul, Yeditepe Yayınevi, 2004, s. 383–409.

“Marine Wars of Ukrainian Cossacks” (2007) ⁴, Ferhad Turanly “Formation of Ukrainian and Crimean-Tatar Union and Marine Campaigns of Zaporozhian Cossacks” (2017) ⁵, Vitalii Shcherbak “State Idea in Early Modern Ukraine” (2019) ⁶, etc.

The aim of the publication is the review of available information about the development of relations between Zaporozhian Army, Crimean Khanate, and High Porta in the sphere of marine wars and the prerequisites of Cossack attacks on the Black Sea fortresses and the circumstances of formation of political and military union between Zaporozhian Army and Crimean Khanate.

The First News of Cossack Attacks, Which Strengthened Diplomatic Relations Between the High Porte and the Kingdom of Poland

In the study of Ukrainian naval campaigns, it is worth mentioning that in Ukrainian written sources, particularly in the research by Yevhen Barvinskii titled “Cossack Raid to Ochakiv (1545)” that is based on documentary materials, there is first references about Cossack attacks of Crimean-Tatar possessions and their ships at the end of XV century ⁷. The author mentions that the reason for Tatar raids to Ukrainian lands was the response to aggressive actions from the Cossack side, which means that conflicts between Turkish and Cossack forces were of reciprocal nature ⁸. In this context, there is a mention

4 Viktor Brekhunenko, *Mors'ki vyny ukrayins'kykh kozakiv*, in Ukrainian, Kyiv, 2007. 77, [2] p. : il. – (The victories of Ukrainian Arms).

5 Ferhad Turanly, “Formuvannya ukraïnokozats'ko-kryms'kotatars'koho soyuzu ta mors'ki pokhody zaporoz'kykh kozakiv / Intelihentsiya i vlada. Zbirnyk naukovykh prats’”, Seriya: Istoryia. Vyp. 36, (2017, Odesa: Vyd. «Ekolohiya», in Ukrainian, p. 200–224.

6 Shcherbak V.O., “Derzhavna ideya v rann'omoderniy Ukraini. Monohrafiya. Vinnytsya: TOV”, *TVORY*, in Ukrainian, 2019, p. 220.

7 Barvinsk'ky Yevhen, “Nabih kozakiv na Ochakiv (1545). Zapysky naukovoho tovarystva Shevchenka: vykhodyat' u L'vovi pid redaktsiyeyu Mykhayla Hrushevs'koho”, *Rik VI, Kn. IV, Tom XVIII*, L'viv, 18 [in Ukrainian], 1897, p. 1.

8 Barvinsk'ky Yevhen, “Nabih kozakiv na Ochakiv”, p. 1.

about Cossack origin: in 1492, the ruler of Crimean Khanate Mengli Giray I⁹ complained about the people from Kyiv and Chekrasy that made an attack on a Tatar ship that was near Tighinia¹⁰ and captures 10 (ten) horses. Next follows that in 1494, Cossack troops destroyed fortress Ochakiv¹¹ and with the prey returned to Kyiv; the same actions of the Cossacks were reported also in the chronicles of 1499. Another entry that is worth mentioning is that in 1515, the Cossacks attempted another attack on the Tatar military squad in the southern part of Lithuania, and the same 1515, they set for Bilhorod. These raids happened on regular basis and were of continuous nature, in particular, in 1545, near Ochakiv, Cossack troops brought damages to Turkish merchants¹². The reason for Cossack raids to Crimean Khanate possessions was their way of life – Cossacks were seeking for prey in the Tatar lands. Another reason for the attacks was politics of Polish-Lithuanian State towards Crimean Khanate, which used Cossack military forces as the weapons against the Khanate, which constantly complained because of frequent and continuous raids of Ukrainian Cossacks¹³. From the research by Ye. Barvinskii it becomes clear that these collisions between Cossack and Khanate military forces had regular nature and lasted till mid XVI century.

Yevhen Barvinskii emphasizes on another minor event related to the activity of Cossack Army in 1545. The scholar interprets this event according to the information found in XXIII volume of manuscript titled «Acta Tomiciana» that was compiled in XVI century by the office of Stanislav Gurskii and is stored in Polish museum of Princes Chortoryiskii in Krakiv.

9 1478–1515, the second reign.

10 It is about the fortress of Tighinia on the bank of the Dniester.

11 This fortress is situated in the estuary of the Dnipro on the north bank of the Dnipro-Buh estuary.

12 Barvins'kyy Yevhen, "Nabih kozakiv na Ochakiv", p. 1. About Cossack naval campaigns, also look: Viktor Brekhunenko, The mentioned work, p. 36–42; F. Turanly, The mentioned work, p. 200–224.

13 Barvins'kyy Yevhen, The mentioned work, p. 1–2.

The 22 documents of this collection narrate about Cossack raids to Turkish fortress of Ochakiv. From the available sources, it becomes clear that at the end of reign of Polish king Syhizmund (Zhygmont) I¹⁴, the state power significantly weakened, the King was unable to rule and was going to pass the Throne to his son Syhizmund (Zhygmont) II August¹⁵. In this situation, Poland was most wary of Ottoman Empire, because in case of war, the King was unable to defend¹⁶. The reason for this sudden tension on the background of generally quiet relations, was numerous Cossack¹⁷ raids on Turkish possessions with the view of robbing. On October 13, 1545, Cossack fleet of two ship directed by Isachok from Bratslav, Karpo Maslo and Ivan Derzhko from Cherkasy approached the Turkish fortress of Ochakiv and captured it. The raiders killed 5 (five) people, wounded 4 (four), captivated 32 (thirty-two) people, robbed many material values and returned home. The research also mentions that Slystrian judge Mekhmet-bei informed Osman ruler Sultan Suleiman Kanuni about the attack. This event caused subsequent strengthening of diplomatic relations between the two countries, they both sent their ambassadors to estimate the damages that High Porta suffered as a result of Cossack raid on Turkish possession. During the investigation, the Polish party accused the Cossacks that made another attack on Ochakiv the same year. The document stipulated the reimbursement to the Turkish party and demanded the extradition of Cossack forces from the territory of Polish borderline castles, particularly, from Bratslav, Cherkasy, Kyiv. The document

14 The years of life: 1467 – 1548, the King of Poland and the Great Prince of Lithuania (look: Vashchuk, D. P. Syhizmund I the Old [Elektronnyy resurs]. URL: http://www.history.org.ua/?termin=Syhizmund_I)

15 The years of life: 1520–1572), the King of Poland and the Great Prince of Lithuania, the last representative of the Yahellon dynasty that reigned in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the Kingdom of Poland (look: Blantsa A.V. (2023). Syhizmund II Avhust [Elektronnyy resurs] [in Ukrainian]. URL: http://www.history.org.ua/?termin=Syhizmund_II)

16 Yevhen Barvinskyy, The mentioned work, p. 2.

17 It is about the Cossacks who lived in the step area of Ukraine.

also explains that Cossacks are not the subjects of Poland and accidentally appeared on its lands, and together with Tatars make frequent raids on Polish possessions. One of the raids of the Sultan's subjects happened when Turkish ambassador was in Poland and conducted the mentioned investigation.¹⁸

The data show that the events related to Cossack raids, particularly, the one on Ochakiv in 1545, caused an increasing tension between High Porta and Kingdom of Poland. The Tatar raids on Polish land persisted, and the Kingdom continuously expressed their protest to Turkish party. These stormy events activated the development of diplomatic relations between the states. And the fact of regular raids speaks about the appearance of Cossack military formations, that subsequently gained force and became a powerful political power, that laid the foundation of Zaporozhian Host.

Following the matter in question, let us address to the research of other Ukrainian historians, particularly, O Hurzhii (together with V. Vornienko). Their study investigates the appearance of prerequisites to Cossack movement in the second half of XVI century – beginning XVII century. According to the testimony of magnate Mykola Pototskii, at that time "... began massive increase of the Cossacks by means of fugitive peasants"¹⁹. The scientists point out that Ukrainian cities and towns gladly accepted these settlers with the view of defense against the pursuit of Polish aristocrats. The dynamics of population growth is testified by the fact that in the first quarter of XVII century, the number of communes and households increased from 39 to 70 thousand. Another reason for this demographic process was the consequences of war in 1609 – 1618 between Moscow state and Rzecz Pospolita, which ended with the victory of the latter. In this relation, the Secretary of Polish

18 Yevhen Barvins'kyy, The mentioned work, p. 2–7. About the documents in mentioned work, look p. 7–32.

19 Hurzhiy O. I. Korniyenko V. V., *Het'man Petro Konashevych-Sahaydachnyy*, Kyiv Ukrayina, in Ukrainian, 2004, p. 14–15.

King Stefan Batoria (the years of activity 1576–1586) informed that the part of Polish warriors went unemployed and united with Ukrainian Cossacks. In particular: “To Zaporozhian Host, because of various reasons in 1580 arrived 60 aristocrats, in 1601 – 170, and in 1618 – above 300. Such replenishment of the Cossacks by boyars and nobility was of great importance to the Host”.²⁰

These data confirm the increase of the Cossacks from various layers of population and speak about its reasons, among which were protest movement of Ukrainian peasants against foreign oppression and difficult social condition of military men regardless to their nationality. Zaporoshian Cossacks were the community of free independent people, which was mentioned by the historians who studied the person of Petro Kona-shevych-Sahaidachnyi who was elected as Hetman in approximately 1606, and “was famous as a warrior against Catholicism and spread of Union in Ukraine”.²¹ However, most fame and popularity the Cossack leader gained due to his military talent and brevity. Under his commandment, the Cossacks conquered the city of Varna (1605), Ochakiv, Perekop (1607). In 1608–1609, he by “fire and sword” devastated the coast of Anatoliia, and in 1612–1613, he interfered in inter-prince conflict of Moldova and Valakhiia²² – a Turkish vassal”.²³ The mentioned research also points out that in spring 1618, Ukrainian Hetman “at the head of 20-thousand Cossack Army took part in the campaign of Polish Prince Vladislav to Moscow”.²⁴ Then Cossacks under the command of Sahaidachnyi conquered cities Livny, Slets,

20 Hurzhiy O. I. Korniyenko V. V., The mentioned work, p. 16.

21 Mytsyk Yu. A., Khynchevs'ka-Hennel' T. Lyublińs'ka uniya. Entsyklopediya istoriyi Ukrainy: T. 6. La - Mi / Redkol.: V. A. Smoliy (holova) ta in. NAN Ukrainy. Instytut istoriyi Ukrainy. K.: V-vo «Naukova dumka» [in Ukrainian], (2009). p. 380–382.

22 The western part of contemporary Romania, also the part of the territory of Hungarian Kingdom; in the Turkish sources is called “Erdel” (see F. Turanly, The mentioned work, p. 209).

23 Hurzhiy O. I. Korniyenko V. V. The mentioned work, p. 26–27.

24 About the attraction of Ukrainian Cossacks together with the Army of Recz Polska against Moscow Kingdom, look: Ferhad Turanly, Kozats'ka doba istoriyi Ukrainy v osmans'ko-turets'kykh pysemnykh dzherelakh (druha polovyna XVI – persha chvert'

and surrounded Mykhailiv. In the vicinity of Moscow, Ukrainian squads united with the troops of Prince Vladislav, who entrusted Hetman to manage the city siege”. This information speaks about the acknowledged authority of Hetman as a talented general not only by Ukrainian Cossacks, but also by the Polish side. Another reason for that popularity was the relations of Hetman with an international organization “The Legue of Christian Militia” that aimed at creating a strong European army in order to fight against Ottoman Empire. Hetman Sahaidachnyi at the head of Zaporoshian Army entered this organization in 1621 and with his 40-thousand troops defended the city-fortress of Hotyn. This event was crucial in the victory over the Osman army and defense of Europe against Turkish expansion²⁵. It is also worth mentioning, that with a view of decent food provision of his people, Hetman Sahaidachnyi during his staying in Polish territory, began to carry out Black Sea campaigns against the possessions of Osman Empire. He brought much damage to Tatars, in the vicinity of the fortress of Ochakiv, he attacked Turkish fleet and captured many big galleys, and on the bank of the Samara²⁶, he won Tatar troops who attacked the lands of Ukrainian Cossacks, and conquered city-fortress of Kafa²⁷, Trapezund and Sinop that lay in the southern coast of the Black Sea²⁸.

Additionally to this topic, historian V. Brekhunenko in his study of Cossack naval campaigns, explains that these actions were natural, they had long history and were determined by the mentality of that society. Another factor that contributed to naval campaigns were natural and climatic peculiarities

XVIII stolittya): monohrafiya. Vyd. druhe, vyprav. i dopov. Kyiv : Vydavnychyy dim «Kyevo-Mohylyans'ka akademiya» [in Ukrainian], 2020), p. 174–175.

25 Hurzhiy O. I. Korniyenko V. V., The mentioned work, p. 27–28.

26 The left tributary of the Dnipro River in Ukraine.

27 The city of Kafa Sandjack, later eyalet (province) of Osman Empire in the North of the Black Sea in the territory of Crimean Khanate; the city was one of the significant trading points.

28 Hurzhiy O. I. Korniyenko V. V., The mentioned work, p. 27.

that contributed to the origination of Ukrainian Cossacks in the Southern Kyiv lands and on the territory of Eastern Podillia, which suffered from the persistent attacks of Tatars. These harsh living conditions required the development of warcraft in order to defend their territory against the claims from the Tatars, particularly, Nogais and the Turks.²⁹ Developing their fleet for the campaigns, “Cossacks concerned the interests of other states – Rzecz Pospolita, Crimean Khanate, Moldova, Moscovia. This immediately upgraded their actions to international scale, whether they wanted or not. As soon as they appeared at sea, they were involved in military campaigns in the lower reached of the Dnipro as a part of so-called Dnipro flotilia. It was created by the official power of Ukrainian border area – Cherkasy, Kaniv and other elders...” In the beginning of XVII century, together with strengthening of Cossack movement, that at the time encountered at 40 thousand of military men, its European international relations have also considerably developed when they took part in the Khotyn war and other military campaigns against Osman Empire. Another fact that is worth noticing in military political alliance between Zaporozhian Host and Crimean Khanate in 1624 that strived for state independence during the reign of kalgay Shahin Giray³⁰.

The Geopolitical Aspects of the Maritime Campaigns of the Cossack Fleet are Discussed

The main strategic purposes of military campaigns of Cossack fleet were the Azov and Black Seas. Besides the political reasons of this vector of development, it was facilitated by the “... natural-climatic conditions of river deltas where the

29 Viktor Brekhunenko, *Mors'ki viyny ukrayins'kykh kozakiv, Kyiv* [in Ukrainian], 2007, p. 7.

30 Viktor Brekhunenko, The mentioned work, p. 8–9; About the history of originating and developing the union relations between Ukrainian Cossacks and Crimea Tatars, look also: Chukhlib Taras, *Kozaky i tatory. Ukrayins'ko-kryms'ki soyuzy 1500–1700-kh rokov. K. : Vydavnychyy dim «Kyyevo-Mohylyans'ka akademiya»* [in Ukrainian], 2017, p. 20–36.

Cossacks got into the sea – the Dnipro, Southern Buh, Mius, and Don³¹. The intensification of Cossack naval campaigns, particularly to the Southern coast of the Black Sea, were also determined by the wars between Osman Empire and Azerbaijan State of Sefevid dynasty³² in 1613–1618 and 1623–1639, because these wars exhausted the ability of High Porta to defend its Black Sea Area possessions. Taking advantage of this factor, since 1613, Cossack fleet carried on with thier raids that greatly devastated and made damage to the coast of Crimean peninsula. In 1614, Ukrainian Cossacks reached the southern coast of the Black Sea, siezed and destroyed city-fortress of Sinop. Then Cossack forces set the hostages free and captivated many city dwellers and, having captured big prey, moved back. It is also mentioned, that on the way, “... the Cossack fleet was awaited in Dnipro-Buh estuary by Ibrahim-Pasha with 60 Turkish ships... and later the Tatar squad attacked the Cossacks and made them abandon most of their prey. Twenty Cossacks were captivated”. Despite this end of Sinop campaign, in 1615, Cossack fleet with 80 ships manned with 4,5 thousand sailors, attempted another distant raid, as far as to the capital of Osman Empire, Istanbul³³. Another investigation of early-modern period of Ukraian history that is worth our attention is that by historian V. Shcherbak about the appearance and development of Ukrainian Cossacks in the context of its social status and formation of Ukrainian state. It is mentioned that conclusion of military-political alliance between Zaporoshian Cossacks and Crimean Tatars contributed to the strengthening of Cossacks and enabled Cossack fleet to enter the Black Sea. The scientist emphasizes that Cossack naval campaigns had constant and systematic character. In this relation, the demands of Turkish Sultan Achmed I³⁴ to the rulers of Rzecz Pospolita

31 Viktor Brekhunenکو, The mentioned work, p. 12–13.

32 About the mentioned state, look: Tyrarly Ferkhad. Kozats'ka doba istoriyi..., p. 125.

33 Viktor Brekhunenکو, The mentioned work, p. 44–46.

34 The years of reign:1603 – 1617.

to take measures in order to stop Cossack raids on his possessions seem reasonable. Despite the obstacles, the fleet of Zaporozhian Host in 1615 made another raid to Istanbul. V. Shcherbak stipulates that, "... Marine expeditions headed by Petro Sahaidachnyi caused anxiety of the Sultan Palace and contributed to the growth of Cossack number. In the Royal³⁵ instruction of 20 January 1616, the overall number of Cossacks is estimated at 40,000. The same document tells about the persistence of "Cossack arbitrariness" that neither government commissions nor Diet resolutions [Polish] failed to seize ³⁶. According to Osman-Turkish written sources, in the document titled "The Copy of the Eights Letter Written to Crimean Khan concerning Cossack Destroyers", Turkish Sultan condemns the Cossack raids, who together with Moscowites made devastating attacks on the settlements along the Black Sea coast, particularly, on the territories of Crimean Khanate. In the text of this document, there is information about the dispatch of 30 military ships to help the troops of Crimean Tatars in order to strengthen their defense and counterattack³⁷. These data prove the increasing military-political force of Ukrainian Cossacks in the first half of XVII century with the center in the Zaporozhian Host, and also speak about the activization of naval campaigns, particularly, to the city-fortress of Sinop.

The Deploying of Naval Battles

For the profound study of the topic, it is crucial to consider the information from the works of Turkish authors, particularly, Yudgel Ozturk, found in the source-studying series from the history of Ukraine titled "Cossacks: from the Dnipro to the Danube". The author mentions that in 1623, Cossack fleet made

35 The years of reign:1603 – 1617.

36 Shcherbak V. O., *Ukrayins'ke kozatstvo: formuvannya sotsial'noho stanu. Druha polovyna XV – seredyna XVII st. Kyiv : Vydavnychyy dim «KM Academia» [in Ukrainian]*, 2006, p. 19, 38, 43–44.

37 Ferhad Turanly, *Kozats'ka doba istoriyi...*, p. 163–164.

an attack on Istanbul, and in 1624, the Cossack forces of 150 ships appeared in the western coast of the Black Sea and there were the battles between Ottoman-Turkish fleet and the united forces of the Crimean Khanate and Zaporozhian alliance. It is also mentioned that the Cossack forces made a strong attack and approached the defensive line of Bosphorus Strait in Istanbul, destroyed and burnt several merchant objects. However, the Cossack fleet faced the resistance on the Turkish side and retreated. With the view of preventing further attacks of the capital, the Turks blocked the Strait on the northern side with a metal string and placed the ships in a row along the defensive line. In 1625, Cossack forces increased their number to 300 ships and 5,000 sailors, and under the command of Olexiy Safran attempted another raid to the Black Sea coast and destroyed the cities of Tranzon and Sinop. But as a result of this attack, they were beaten by the Turkish fleet and were defeated³⁸. At the same time, the captain of Turkish fleet, that numbered at 42 military ships, Kadyrga (Turkish “Kadırga”) Redjeb Pasha went at sea to defend the Black Sea areas of Ottoman Empire. The marine battles between the sides of conflict lasted till 1624, which is covered in detail in the study of the mentioned historian³⁹.

In the follow of this research, it is worthful to take into account the data contained in the investigated Ottoman-Turkish written sources, particularly, in the manuscript “Cossack era of Ukrainian history in Osman-Turkish written sources (second half of XVI – first half of XVIII century)”. We have conducted source-studying research of Turkish chronicles, particularly, the text titled “The capture of Sinop by the Cossacks” by Katib Chalebi, which has a substantial informative value for the study of the topic⁴⁰. The historic facts and arguments

38 Yücel Öztürk, *Kazaklar*, s. 383.

39 Yücel Öztürk, *Kazaklar*, s. 383–409.

40 فذللكة كاتب چلبى 'الحدلد الاول' استانبول' جريدة حوادث مطبعه سنده طبع اولنمشدر سنه' ۱۲۸۶ 'ص. ۳۵۸' ۴۱۲ ص.

contained in the source prove the frequent marine raids of Zaporoshian Host fleet in the Black Sea. The document tells that at the end of 1604, The Cossack troops made an armed attack on the Turkish port city of Sinop⁴¹. As a result of the attack, the city fortresses were ruined, substantial number of material values were captured and many local residents, including women and children, were captivated. Then, the Cossack forces immediately left the destroyed city and went back. With the view of punishing the Cossacks who made much damage to the Osman Empire, the general of Turkish fleet Ibrahim Pasha was given a corresponding command. He caught the Cossack marine forces in the region of the Dnipro estuary and defeated them. As a result of this marine battle, the biggest part of Zaporozhian troops were destroyed, the rest were captivated and 20 captive Cossacks were brought to Istanbul⁴². Apart from that, in the text of “The news of fortresses building on both banks of the Özi River [Dnipro]” dated by 1604, the chronicler informs about the construction of defense structures in order to prevent the Cossack fleet from entering the Black Sea and making the attacks of the Black Sea possessions of Turkey⁴³. The other chronicle by Ibrahim Efendi Pechevi “The History of Pechevi”, dated 1614, tells about “the seizure by the Cossacks the Fortress of Sinop and the resulting slaughter of Nasukh-Pasha”. The same is mentioned in the “Seizure of Sinop by the Cossacks” and in “The History of Nayimi” by Mustafa Nayimi Efendi. The interpretation of the mentioned historical sources proves that Osman Empire suffered the most destructive marine military attack of Ukrainian Cossacks on the city-fortress of Sinop in August 1614⁴⁴.

41 This city is situated in the central part of the Black Sea southern coast in the area of Indgeburun peninsula.

42 Ferhad Turanly, *Kozats'ka doba istoriyi...*, p. 93.

43 Ferhad Turanly, *Kozats'ka doba istoriyi...*, p. 162–163.

44 Ferhad Turanly, *Kozats'ka doba istoriyi...*, p. 168–169.

At that time, there was a trade route that connected Istanbul with the eastern coast of the Black Sea.

The activity of Zaporoshian Host fleet in the Black Sea was also registered in the following years, for example, in 1625, there was attempted another raid under the command of the abovementioned Ataman Safran. That year, the activity of Zaporozhian Cossacks intrusions in the Black Sea possessions of the High Porta reached the unprecedented level, and there were even the cases when the Cossack leaders agreed there intrusions with the intentions of the Crimean Tatar troops⁴⁵. Nayima in his history dated 1626⁴⁶, also informed about “the destruction of the Cossacks in the battle by Kara-Harman”. Besides that, in the archive document “The Order to the Religious person “Molla of Sinop [concerning the defense of Sinop fortress against the raid of Cossack destroyers]” dated 28 January 1628 and others⁴⁷ there is a testimony about the reinforcement of the Ukrainian Cossacks and the increasing role of Zaporozhian Host in the Black Sea region of Europe. It is also worth mentioning that after the oppression of Ukrainian Cossacks by Recz Pospolita during 1625 – 1626, the activity of military actions of Zaporozhian Army against Osman Empire significantly decreased. The Turkish side, while reinforcing the borderline of their possessions in the North Black sea region during 1627 – 1628 attempted many military campaigns against Zaporozhian Army and finished the construction of fortifications in the region of Ochakiv fortress⁴⁸. Overall, naval campaigns of Ukrainian Cossacks to the city-fortress of Sinop had tough and destructive consequences: the Cossacks slaughtered

45 Ferhad Turanly, *Kozats'ka doba istoriyi...*, p. 217–218.

46 Ferhad Turanly, *Kozats'ka doba istoriyi...*, p. 95–107.

47 100 [118] – Sinob molâsına hüküm ki, Hicrî : 21 Şevval, sene 1037, BOA, MD, Nu : 83 (Hicrî : 1036 – 1037 / Milâdî : 1626 – 1628), T. C. Başbakanlık Devlet Arşivleri Genel Müdürlüğü, Osmanlı Arşivi Daire Başkanlığı, Yayın Nu : 54. *Divân-ı Hümâyûn Sicilleri Dizisi: VII*, Yayına Hazırlayanlar: Hacı Osman Yıldırım, Vahattin Atik, Dr. Murat Cebecioğlu, Ayhan Özyurt, Mustafa Serin, Fuat Yavuz, Numan Yekeler, Ankara, 2001, s. 69.

48 Ferhad Turanly, *Kozats'ka doba istoriyi...*, p. 218.

local inhabitants, captivated children, burnt cities and returned with big prey. In response to the attacks, High Porta took measures to punish Zaporozhian Cossacks, and simultaneously reinforced the defense of their possessions in the Black Sea region. During the marine campaigns of Ukrainian Cossack fleet in the Black Sea, particularly to Sinop fortress, the relations between Zaporoshian Host, Crimean Khanate and High Porta in the first half of XVII century greatly deteriorated on the background of the military and political situation in the Eastern Europe. Therefore, according to the information presented in Osman-Turkish written sources concerning the marine campaigns of Ukrainian Cossacks, it becomes clear that establishing of military-political alliance between Zaporoshian Host and Crimean Khanate was one of the factors that caused the activization of Cossack marine campaigns against the possessions of Osman Empire, particularly, the fortress city of Sinop.

Conclusion

In conclusion of our research, it is worth emphasizing that the raids of Zaporozhian Army to the possessions of Osman Empire at the Black Sea, and particularly, naval campaigns to the fortress city of Sinop, were primarily determined by the geopolitical, economical, and social factors.

We have established the chronology of the events related to the beginning of formation and development of Zaporoshian Host and Cossack attacks of Ochakiv in 1545, which brought about the increase of tension between High Porta and Polish Kingdom. Besides that, the infringement to Polish territories from the Crimean Khanate became the ground for the accuses of Polish side. These and other events speak about intensive diplomatic relations between the countries in question, and shed light on the geographic areal of international trade ways.

The research also emphasizes on the prerequisites and reasons of replenishment of Cossacks as a community of free

independent people. In this context, one of the factors of destructive naval campaigns of Ukrainian Cossacks to the fortress-city of Sinop in the first half of XVII century was the establishment of military-political alliance between Zaporozhian Host and Crimean Khanate.

The intensiveness of these raids did not decrease until the oppression of the Cossacks by *Recz Pospolita*, and their termination was related to the reinforcement of the Turkish side the defensive fortifications on the attacked territories and the defeat of Cossack fleet in the marine battles.

The significance of this historic research gains weight in the conditions of wide-scale moscow-russist invasion in Ukraine on 24 February 2022, which is accompanied by the confrontation in the Black Sea. This research requires continuation and attracting various cartographic and historiographic source materials.

The List of Bibliographic References

1. Барвінський Євген. Набіг козаків на Очаків (1545). Записки наукового товариства Шевченка: виходять у Львові під редакцією Михайла Грушевського. Рік VI, Кн. IV, Том XVIII. Львів, 1897. С. 1–32.
2. Туранли Ф. Формування українокозацько-кримськотатарського союзу та морські походи запорозьких козаків / Інтелігенція і влада. Збірник наукових праць. Серія : Історія. Вип. 36. Одеса: Вид. «Екологія», 2017. С. 200–224.
3. Turanly, F. (2023). Persecuted Turkology: the Ukrainian Context. *Shidnoyevropeiskyi Istorychnyi Visnyk* [East European Historical Bulletin], 27, 140–155. DOI: 10.24919/2519-058X.27.281555; Web of Science-Emerging Sources Citation Index (ESCI).
4. Гуржій О. І. Корнієнко В. В. Гетьман Петро Конашевич-Сагайдачний. Київ: Україна, 2004. 188, [2] с. : іл.
5. Yücel Öztürk, Özü'den Tuna'ya: Kazaklar – 1, 1. Baskı, İstanbul, Yeditepe Yayınevi, 2004, s. 383–409.

6. Брехуненко, Віктор. Морські війни українських козаків. Київ: [б. в.], 2007. 77, [2] с. : іл. – (Перемоги української зброї).
7. Ващук Д.П. Сигізмунд I Старий [Електронний ресурс] . URL: http://www.history.org.ua/?termin=Syhizmund_I (ostanniuy perehlyad: 20.07.2023).
8. Блануца А.В. Сигізмунд II Август [Електронний ресурс] . URL: http://www.history.org.ua/?termin=Syhizmund_II (ostanniuy perehlyad: 20.07.2023).
9. Мицик Ю.А., Хинчевська-Геннель Т. Люблінська унія. Енциклопедія історії України: Т. 6. Ла - Мі / Редкол.: В. А. Смолій (голова) та ін. НАН України. Інститут історії України. К.: В-во «Наукова думка», 2009. С. 380–382. 790 с.
10. Туранли Фергад. Козацька доба історії України в османсько-турецьких писемних джерелах (друга половина XVI – перша чверть XVIII століття) : монографія. Вид. друге, виправ. і допов. Київ : Видавничий дім «Києво-Могилянська академія», 2020. 622 с.
11. Щербак В. О. Українське козацтво: формування соціального стану. Друга половина XV – середина XVII ст. Київ : Видавничий дім «KM Academia», 2006. 300 с. : іл.
12. Щербак В.О. Державна ідея в ранньомодерній Україні. Монографія. Вінниця: ТОВ «ТВОРИ», 2019. 220 с.
13. Чухліб Тарас. Козаки і татари. Українсько-кримські союзи 1500–1700-х років. К. : Видавничий дім «Києво-Могилянська академія», 2017. 274 с.
14. 100 [118] – Sinob molâsına hüküm ki, Hicrî : 21 Şevval, sene 1037, BOA, MD, Nu : 83 (Hicrî : 1036 – 1037 / Milâdî : 1626 – 1628), T. C. Başbakanlık Devlet Arşivleri Genel Müdürlüğü, Osmanlı Arşivi Daire Başkanlığı, Yayın Nu : 54. Dîvân-ı Hümâyûn Sicilleri Dizisi: VII, Yayına hazırlayanlar: Hacı Osman Yıldırım, Vahattin Atik, Dr. Murat Cebecioğlu, Ayhan Özyurt, Mustafa Serin, Fuat Yavuz, Numan Yekeler, Ankara, 2001, s. 69.
15. فذلکة کاتب چلبی 'الجلد الاول' استانبول 'جریده حوادث مطبعه 15. سنده طبع اولنمشدر سنه '۱۲۸۶' ص. ۳۵۸ '۴۱۲ ص.

References

1. Barvins'kyy Yevhen. (1897). Nabih kozakiv na Ochakiv (1545). Zapy-sky naukovoho tovarystva Shevchenka: vykhodyat' u L'vovi pid redaktsiyeyu Mykhayla Hrushevs'koho. Rik VI, Kn. IV, Tom XVIII. L'viv, 18 [in Ukrainian].
2. Turanly, Ferhad, (2017). Formuvannya ukrajinokozats'ko-kryms'kotars'koho soyuzu ta mors'ki pokhody zaporoz'kykh kozakiv / Inteli-hentsiya i vlada. Zbirnyk naukovykh prats'. Seriya : Istoriya. Vyp. 36. Odesa: Vyd. «Ekolohiya» [in Ukrainian].
3. Turanly, F. (2023). Persecuted Turkology: the Ukrainian Context. Shid-noyevropeiskiy Istorychnyi Visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin] 27. Web of Science-Emerging Sources Citation Index [in in English].
4. Hurzhii O. I. Korniyenko V. V. (2004). Het'man Petro Konashevych-Sa-haydachnyy. Kyiv: Ukrayina [in Ukrainian].
5. Öztürk, Yücel (2004), Özü'den Tuna'ya: Kazaklar – 1, 1. Baskı, İstan-bul, Yeditepe Yayınevi [in Turkish].
6. Brekhunenko, Viktor. (2007). Mors'ki viyny ukrajin's'kykh kozakiv. Kyiv [in Ukrainian].
7. Vashchuk D.P. (2023). Syhizmund I Staryy [Elektronnyy resurs] [in Ukrainian].
8. Blanutsa A.V. (2023). Syhizmund II Avhust [Elektronnyy resurs] [in Ukrainian].
9. Mytsyk Yu. A. (2009). Khynchevs'ka-Hennel' T. Lyublyns'ka uniya. Ent-syklopediya istoriyi Ukrayiny: T. 6. La - Mi / Redkol.: V. A. Smoliy (holova) ta in. NAN Ukrayiny. Instytut istoriyi Ukrayiny. K.: V-vo «Naukova dumka» [in Ukrainian].
10. Turanly Ferhad. (2020). Kozats'ka doba istoriyi Ukrayiny v os-mans'ko-turets'kykh pysemnykh dzherelakh (druha polovyna XVI – persha chvert' XVIII stolittya) : monohrafiya. Vyd. druhe, vyprav. i dopov. Kyiv : Vydavnychy dim «Kyevo-Mohylyans'ka akademiya» [in Ukrainian].
11. Shcherbak V. O. (2006). Ukrayins'ke kozatstvo: formuvannya sotsi-al'noho stanu. Druha polovyna XV – seredyna XVII st. Kyiv : Vy-davnychy dim «KM Academia» [in Ukrainian].
12. Shcherbak V.O. (2019). Derzhavna ideya v rann'omoderniy Ukrayini. Monohrafiya. Vinnytsya: TOV «TVORY» [in Ukrainian].

13. Chukhlib Taras. (2017). Kozaky i tatory. Ukrayins'ko-kryms'ki soyuzu 1500–1700-kh rokiv. K. : Vydavnychyy dim «Kyievo-Mohylyans'ka akademiya» [in Ukrainian].
14. BOA, (2001), MD, Nu : 83 (Hicrî : 1036 – 1037 / Milâdî : 1626 – 1628), T. C. Başbakanlık Devlet Arşivleri Genel Müdürlüğü, Osmanlı Arşivi Daire Başkanlığı, Yayın Nu : 54. Dîvân-ı Hümâyûn Sicilleri Dizisi: VII, Ankara [in Ottoman-Turkish].
15. Çelebi, Kâtib, (1869/1870), Fezleke-i Kâtib Çelebi, 1. Cilt, İstanbul, Ceride-i Havadis Matbaasında tıb⁶ olunmuşdur [in Ottoman-Turkish].