

Karlovice Treaty Of 1699: Reasons For That And Its Consequences

Ferhad Turanly**

Abstract

The study purpose – to analyse the historical events which caused the conclusion of Karlovice Treaty and consideration of “the Ukrainian problem” in it, as well as the consequences of that one. The Polish and Lithuanian Commonwealth and the Tsardom of Muscovy tried to divide the Cossack-Hetmanic Ukraine. However, the military and political union with the Ottoman Empire valid in the beginning of the last quarter of the 17th century was an impediment for the implementation of those tries. As the steps aimed at the occupation of Ukrainian lands by the said states were opposed by the Ottoman Empire. Besides, the efficiency of that opposition depended directly on the international situation of the ally of the Cossack-Hetmanic Ukraine.

But, as the Polish and Lithuanian Commonwealth and the Sublime Porte lost their power, Muscovy increased its presence in Eastern Europe. Combined endeavors of the Polish and Lithuanian Commonwealth and those of the Swedish Kingdom in their struggling against the Tsardom of Muscovy in the beginning of the 18th century were also insufficient to stop completely the military and political activity of Muscovy because of the availability of acute contradictions between the above said enemies of the state. As for the Ottoman Empire is concerned, after signing Karlovice Treaty in 1699, despite the Polish and Lithuanian Commonwealth’s suffering from running attacks of Muscovy, it kept on being in peace with Muscovy and even supported that one, “the Ukrainian problem” was unsettled, and it was very actual in the international policy of the Ottoman Empire.

Hence, the purpose of this study is to interpret some data from Turkish-Ottoman and Ukrainian written sources, particularly from the historiography, which contain the principal aspects, as well as preconditions and consequences of separate events that took place during the respective historical process. The set up purpose of the study was achieved by studying the level of the Karlovice Treaty effect on the process of the international relations between the above aid countries and of rising of a geopolitical

* D. Sc. (History), Professor, Faculty of Humanites at the National University «Kyiv-Mohyla Academy», ferhadturanly@gmail.com.

system in Eastern Europe. **The study methodology** is based on the principles of historicism, objective analysis, interdisciplinary of making a study, identification of the authenticity and informational value of the identified data and facts, as well on the application of interpreting the respective historical events with taking into account the data available in Turkish-Ottoman and Ukrainian written sources and historiography. In the study there were applied methods of the historiographic, terminological, typological and comparativistic analyses. **The scientific novelty of the study** is a civilisational comprehension of the history of relations between the states-parties to Karlovice Treaty, and also that of “the Ukrainian problem” reflected in that treaty. The Treaty resulted in a rise of a new geopolitical system in Eastern Europe in general, and on the Balkans in particular.

Keywords: the Balkans, geopolitics, Karlovice Treaty, international relations, Eastern Europe

The basic unit. The grounds for our study of the Ukrainian History at the background of the Karlovice Treaty of 1699 were Turkish-Ottoman written sources, particularly the Defterdar Sary Mehmed Pasha’s chronicle “The contents of the past events”, where information about the Turkish History of 1656–1703 is provided¹, “The Chronicle”², “History from Rashid”³, “History from an Armour-bearer”⁴; “The Polish document of the Karlovice Treaty”⁵, “The Ottoman Document of the Karlovice Treaty”⁶, as well as data from Turkish

¹ *Defterdar Sarı Mehmed Paşa*, Zübdetü’l Vekay-î, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Esad Efendi 2382, İstanbul.

² *Fahri Çetin Derin*, Abdurrahman Abdi Paşa Vekâyinamesi, Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi, İstanbul Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul 1993, 431 s.

³ محمد راشد افندی، تاریخ راشد، الجلد الثاني، استانبول، مطبعة عامره، ١٢٨٢، ٥٩٥ ص.

⁴ *Mehmed Ağa Fındıklılı Silahdar*, Nusretname IV, Sadeleştiren: İsmet Parmaksızoğlu, Cilt II, Fasikül I, Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Talim ve Terbiye Kurulunun 3 aralık 1964 tarih ve 264 sayılı karariyle bastırılması uygun görülmüş, İstanbul, Milli Eğitim Basım Evi, 1966, 184 s., 1703–1721 yy.

⁵ *Kołodziejczyk Dariusz*, Ottoman-Polish diplomatic relations (15th – 18th century): an annotated edition of ‘ahdnames and other documents. Document 58, 26 January 1699. Leiden, Boston, Köln : Brill 2000, p. 581–586.

⁶ *Kołodziejczyk Dariusz*, op. cit., Document 59, 26 January 1699. p. 587–593.

Historiography works, such as “The Ottoman History”⁷, “The Great Ottoman History”⁸ and others. They clear up the preconditions and circumstances of concluding the Karlovice Treatment (*Karlofça Muahedesi*), as well as its consequences, partially the ones for Ukraine⁹.

It should be underlined, that the Ukrainian Historiography in relation of the Karlovice Treaty, when signing which “the Ukrainian problem” was taken into account too, states, that the work of a congress in the town of Karlovice¹⁰ between October 1698 and January 1699 a peaceful treaty was signed to stop the war between the states-members of the Solemn League: the Austrian Empire, Venice, the Polish and Lithuanian Commonwealth, the Czarland of Muscovy – from on hand, and the Ottoman Empire – from the other hand. It must be clarified, that this treaty was initially signed three states – the members of the above said League and the Sublime Porte happened on 16 January 1699. While the Czarland of Muscovy and the Ottoman Empire on 14 January that year made an armistice for two years; then in 1700 the Constantinople Peaceful Treaty was exercised¹¹. It was also said, that signing the above mentioned treaties determined legally

⁷ *İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı*, *Osmanlı Tarihi*, II. Selimin Tahta Çıkışından 1699 Karlofça Andlaşmasına Kadar, Cilt III, I. Kısım, 5. Baskı, Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1995, s. 585–595.

⁸ *Yılmaz Öztuna*, *Büyük Osmanlı Tarihi*, Osmanlı Devleti’nin Siyasî, Medenî, Kültür, Teşkilât ve San’at Tarihi, 10 Cilt, Dördüncü Cild, İstanbul, Ötüken Neşriyat A. Ş., 1994, s. 352–353.

⁹In particular, the Ukrainian Historiography tells us about that in the section “The Karlovice Treaty and further subdivision of the Ukrainian land” in the monography “The Cossacks period in the History of Ukraine in Turkish-Ottoman written sources (the second half of the 16th century – the first half of the 18th century)” by F. Turanlı. Kyiv : Publishing House “Kyiv-Mohyla Academy”, 2016. pp. 376–392. 606 pp; See also: *Stanislavskyi V. V.* The Karlovice Congress. An Encyclopedia of the History of Ukraine, in 8 volumes. Vol. 4 : Ka–Kom / Editorial Board: V.A. Smoliy (the Head) and others. Київ : Naukova Dumka. 2007. pp. 114–115; *Turanly F.* “The Ukrainian problem” in the Karlovice Treaty (1699): the Turkish retrospection. *Skhidnyi Svit*. 2012. Issue 3. pp. 32–40.

¹⁰ Karlofça (*Türk*), Сремски(-)Карловци / Srijemski-Karlovci (*Serb*); Karlowitz (*Germ*). Nowadays it is a town of Sremski Karlovci in Serbia on the Balkans.

¹¹ *İlber Ortaylı*, *İlber Ortaylı Seyahatnamesi*, Bir Tarihinin Gezi Notları, 7. Baskı, İstanbul, Timaş Yayınları, 2015, 304 s.

a new arrangement of the political forces in the regions of the location of the said states.¹².

But the Turkish historiography concerning the said problematic theme informs the following: “The Ottoman state between 1683¹³ and 1699¹⁴ has been at war for 16 years first with three and then with four states. After the execution of the [the Chief Vizier] Merzofoglu Kara Mustafa Pasha and appointment of new viziers and commanders at the Austrian front the Turks were defeated a few times. The enemy’s forces¹⁵, that reached the Balkans, endangered the situation for the city of Edirne. The situation got still more aggregated, because the pressure of the enemy provoked uprisings of the population in Moravia, Albania and Serbia. Later, when Köprülüoğlu Fazıl Mustafa Pasha became the Great Vizier, who had got in his hands the power levers, the internal safety was restored, and the enemy’s forces were made to leave the Balkan countries for Hungary. The further struggling against the states-enemies was of no success. The Austrians found themselves in a similar position, as they were fighting at that time against the French”¹⁶. When analysing this information, one can identify the chronological sequence of reasons, why the Ottoman Empire’s army was getting weaker, though it had itself organised military actions with a sporadic success in the north of the Black Sea and on the Balkans, as well as the rise of a problem in the defense system, a severe punishment of the Commander-on Chief of the Ottoman Army and the appointment on that position of another person, and also the role of the religious factor.

The available sources clearly show, that a large-scale and long-lasting character of the war was accounted for occurrence of social

¹² *Stanislavskiy V. V.* The Karlovice Congress. An Encyclopedia of the History of Ukraine, in 8 volumes. Vol. 4 : Ka-Kom / Editorial Board: V.A. Smoliy (the Head) and others. Київ : Naukova Dumka. 2007. pp. 114–115; *Kinder H., Higelman W.* The World History / Transl. from German; Designed by Harald and Ruth Bukor; Scientif. Supervisor, Edit. By A.H. Sliusarenko, O. F. Ivanov. – Kyiv : Znanntia-Pres. 2001. p. 265.

¹³ 1094 due to Hijri Calendar.

¹⁴ 1110 due to Hijri Calendar.

¹⁵ The Austrian troops are meant.

¹⁶ *İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı*, aynı eser, Cilt III, I. Kısım, 5. Baskı, s. 585.

problems in the army and among the population of the Ottoman Empire. To identify the consequences of these processes there are important the facts fixed in the following data: "The most important at that time military events taking place at the Austrian front, where the Commander-in-Chief [Köprülüoğlu Fazıl Mustafa Pasha] was personally, the cutting edge military forces and military facilities were sent just to that front. Hence, the provision of the Venetian and Polish fronts was poor, even though a considerable help was given by the Crimean Khanate¹⁷. Under such circumstances the Poles failed to conquer the town of Kamyanets[-Podilskiyi], although they had been dreaming of that for a long time. Therefore, the venetians invaded Bosnia¹⁸, Dalmatia¹⁹ and Moravia²⁰, and advanced up to the central Greece"²¹. Information from this text made it possible to characterise in more detail the scenario of the military actions, which took place at the four fronts with the states-enemies²², that resulted in the Ottomans losing their positions on the Balkans which was very essential as for the consequences were concerned, especially in the north of the Black Sea.

When analysing the international relations of the Sublime Porte with the states-members of the Sublime Porte, one should say, that the introduction of the military actions at four fronts resulted in a weakening of the Ottoman Empire, and as a result, the opposite party got some victories. The Turkish forces have got to properly face the necessity to get prepared to the next military actions, that is according to requirements of the new time. The long-lasting war with the Austrian [Empire] weakened the Tatar military forces [of the Crimean Khanate], which were hopped from one front onto another one, which resulted in weakening their strength. While on the northern fronts

¹⁷ There is meant the active participation of the Crimean Khanate troops at the Turkish-Polish front.

¹⁸ The historical and geographic region located in the Dinaric Alps and bordering in the north with the Pannonic Plain, while in the north and in the south – by the rivers of Sava and Dnyana. Its southern, Medieval area is sometimes called Herzegovina.

¹⁹ A historical area in the north-west of Balkan Peninsula.

²⁰ A historical area in Czechia.

²¹ *İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı*, aynı eser, Cilt III, I. Kısım, 5. Baskı, s. 585.

²² The states-members of the "Solemn League" are meant. .

lines the Muscovites jointly with Poles were becoming stronger, and they already threatened to both the Crimean Khanate, and to the Ottoman state. It should be stressed, that owing to Gadji Selim Giray [I]²³, who headed the Crimean Khanate for the third time, a lot was achieved in the sphere of the internal and external policy²⁴. It is also worth to pay attention to the point, that the Turkish Army won at the fronts mainly owing to the heroic participation in the military campaign of the Crimean-Tatar Army under the head of Selim Giray I, who four times ruled the Crimean Khanate for 23 years. We should note, that it was at that phase of the then world war, that the Solemn League got advantages over the Ottoman Empire at all the above mentioned fronts. Because of that the Ottoman Empire offered to make peace. The diplomatic activities of the Ottoman Empire aimed at making a peaceful agreement is evidently especially rising during the ruling in the Ottoman Empire of Sultan Suleiman II²⁵. Taking in consideration the situation of the Sublime Porte at the then stage of the development of its foreign relations, conclusion of a peaceful agreement would have meant a transfer, in particular, to Ukraine the Kamyanets-Podilskyi Area under the ruling of the Polish and Lithuanian Commonwealth. It should be underlined, that the long-lasting war resulted in its participants getting more and exhausted, so they had to agree on an armistice. In this relation the above said chronicle 'The content of the past events' states, that during 1696–1697, as the war outcome, in all areas, especially in the far away regions of the Ottoman Empire, a civil mess was dominating accompanied with the political and social problems.²⁶

When tracing the reflection in Turkic sources the development process of diplomatic relations between states-participants of military events at the end of the 17th century, it should be noted, that the Ottoman State in the "world war" was alone to lead the military campaign. In sources the following is stated about that: "As both the Ottomans, and the Austrians were going through difficult times, which

²³ Period of the third ruling: 1692 – 1699.

²⁴ *İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı*, aynı eser, Cilt III, I. Kısım, 5. Baskı, s. 586.

²⁵ Ruling period: 1687–1691.

²⁶ *Defterdar Sarı Mehmed Paşa*, *Zübdetü'l-Vekay-î*, İstanbul, Süleymaniye kütüphanesi, Esad Efendi 2382, Vrk. 340, 344.

was accounted for by the long-lasting war, then they from time to time addressed each other with offers to come to a peaceful agreement on an armistice. The Ottoman State had to fight at three fronts at the same time²⁷, when Melek Ibragim Pasha and Sary Suleiman Pasha were commanders. The Ottomans advanced a lot in approaching an armistice with the Austrians, but they always faced unacceptable proposals from the Emperor [Leopold I], who had got a number of victories by that time, so the respective commanders were unlucky in getting their positive results²⁸. The data we received from our analysis of the said text prove the respective war to have been long-lasting and multi-vectorial on the Ukrainian territory too, and that tries of the Ottoman State to come to agreements with the opposing parties, particularly with the Austrian Empire, on an armistice, for a long time did not result in positive outcomes.

A tendency to a possible peaceful ending the war can also be traced, when Sultan Suleiman II became the head of the Ottoman State²⁹. When he was announcing his taking the throne, he wanted to demonstrate something new in the state policy. With that in his view, he sent a delegation headed by Zulfigar Efendi to the city of Vienna, so as to conclude there a possibly armistice. When this delegation arrived in the capital of Austria, a message was received about the conquest of the city of Belgrad by the Austrian military forces. This fact made Emperor Leopold I feel very arrogant, and he began to demand from the envoys of the Sultan very serious cessions. For instance, he required to give back some fortresses and cities and towns. Finally, after negotiating for a long time, the said peaceful initiative of the Ottoman Empire occulted to be futile³⁰. As we can see, despite the tries of the new Turkish ruler aimed at strengthening his positions in the said war, he had still larger losses (of cities and fortresses). This fact aggravated the socio-political position if the Solemn Porte.

²⁷ Battles at the Austrian, Venetian and Polish fronts are meant.

²⁸ *İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı*, aynı eser, Cilt III, I. Kısım, 5. Baskı, s. 586–587.

²⁹ Ruling period: 1687 – 1691.

³⁰ The negotiations in Vienna lasted for four months and ended in the autumn of 1689 with no results, which was stated by another Yurkish historiographer: *Yılmaz Öztuna*, aynı eser, Dördüncü Cild, s. 352–353; *İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı*, aynı eser, Cilt III, I. Kısım, 5. Baskı, s. 586.

However, the war between Austria and France had already turned into a long-lasting and still more exhausting one. For those reasons an opportunity to stand for the city of Belgrad³¹, which Commander Fazil Mustafa Pasha did. In particular, he displaced Austrians back to the rivers of Danube and Sava. The Emperor of Austria was very dissatisfied with such a development of events, and the respective parties wished their desires to come to an agreement on the base of other terms and conditions. England and Holland, which were allies of Emperor I, tried in fact to settle the acute contradiction between the Austrian Empire and the Solemn Porte. For that purpose the French ambassador in the Ottoman Empire together with the former ambassador of France in the Ottoman Empire, Mr. Shatanov (*Şatanof Turk*), together with the former ambassador Ferriol (*Feriol Turk*) arrived in Istanbul, so as to prevent making a union between the Polish and Lithuanian Commonwealth and the Austrian Empire, so as to make a treaty with the Ottoman Empire, but that plan failed. Endeavours of the Crimean Khan Selim Giray I to attain an armistice failed too. But, from one hand, England and Holland, which were opponents of France, tried to act in the way, so as to delicately promote the achievement of certain understanding in this matter. Therefore, the parties to the conflict started step-by-step to give in one to another on mutual claims. The scope of the war were increasing, and its stopping became a problem for a whole Europe, that is why diplomatic efforts of the other countries were directed primarily at the reconciliation of belligerent parties, as well as at the protection of their own political interests. At that difficult, especially for the Ottoman Empire time, in 1695³² Mustafa II³³ became the new sultan, who made two successful marches against the Austrian Empire. He suspected, that success would stay with him later on too, however, the third military march of this sultan against Austria ended in 1697 a failure for his army in the battle near Zenta (*Turk Zanta*) and with the

³¹ About the conquest of Belgrad (6–8 September 1688) see in more detail in *Yılmaz Öztuna*, aynı eser, Dördüncü Cild, s. 346–348. About the liberation of Hungary (1686–1687) after the conquest of Belgrad in 1688 see: *Kinder H., Hilgeman W.* Ibidem, p. 265; *İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı*, aynı eser, Cilt III, I. Kısım, 5. Baskı, s. 586–587.

³² 1106 due to Hidji Calendar. In the text we studied this date is stated as 1006, which should be considered mistaken.

³³Ruling period: 1695–1703.

conquest of Sarajevo with the Austrian troops. Our study of Turkish-Ottoman written sources enables making the conclusion, that the diplomatic efforts made to settle the military conflict between the Solemn League and the Sublime Porte and such European states, France, England and Holland, did not bring the expected efficiency, because each participant of this military conflict set up claims which contradicted the interests of the other allies of the Coalition. Hence, the preconditions that were focused on the settlement of the armed conflict could not be efficient without mutual compromises and cessions.

It should also be noted that, after the victory over the Austrian Army in the battle near Zenta, the situation for the Ottoman Empire got still more complicated almost at all the fronts. For instance, the war between Austria and France stopped; the Austrian Empire won, but that victory was not the final one. Besides, Emperor Leopold I wanted to transfer his troops from that front to fight against the Ottoman Empire. There should be also taken in account such factors, as the revolt of the Christian population³⁴ in the western area of the Ottoman Empire, and the conflicts which existed or regularly occurred between the European states. These circumstances significantly pushed the conflict parties to discussing the armistice terms and conditions³⁵.

İsmail Hakkı Uzuncharshly wrote about this the following: "After the two parties [the Austrian Empire and the Ottoman one] decided to make a peaceful agreement between themselves³⁶, on 24 April 1698 their representatives gathered in Vienna and began to define the possible terms and conditions of such an agreement.³⁷ Emperor Leopold [I] was proud of his military achievements, so he insisted on the necessity of making peace, but he wanted to grab additional

³⁴ Kinder H., Hilgeman W. Ibidem, p. 265; İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, aynı eser, Cilt III, I. Kısım, 5. Baskı, s. 587.

³⁵ İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, aynı eser, Cilt III, I. Kısım, 5. Baskı, s. 587–588.

³⁶ Yılmaz Öztuna, aynı eser, Dördüncü Cild, s. 407–414. İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, aynı eser, Cilt III, I. Kısım, 5. Baskı, s. 589.

³⁷ The protocol was under discussion for 20 days, and the conference started on 13 November 1698. (Yılmaz Öztuna, aynı eser, Dördüncü Cild, s. 407–414). See also: İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, aynı eser, Cilt III, I. Kısım, 5. Baskı, s. 589–591.

territories which were not yet under the governing of the Polish and Lithuanian Commonwealth or the Czardom of Muscovy. Finally, the participants of the meeting did not like such a process of the negotiations, particularly the inclination of the Austrian Emperor to making peace. Hence, to come to an agreement, Tsar Peter [I] and king August [II the Strong]³⁸ even met personally, but anyway they failed to come finally to a certain agreement. The Muscovy, besides the Fortress of Azov it had occupied, wanted to get the Kerch Fortress too, while the Poles wanted to conquest the Fortress of Kamyanets-[Polilskiy] they had been fighting for quite a long time.³⁹ All wanted to settle the problem sitting at the table of peaceful negotiations. Therefore the Poles addressed the Pope⁴⁰, so as he would become a mediator in those complicated negotiations⁴¹. Venice was satisfied that there was to get regulated the point of the front line after occupation by it of Moravia. Those were the positions the states, which were eager to achieve an armistice, stood on during the respective negotiations.”⁴². According to the Turkish historiographer Yılmaz Öztuna, on 18 December 1698 the Muscovy envoys announced, that they would not sign the said treaty on the terms and conditioned they had been offered to, but they agreed to sign on 24 January 1699 a “mütareke”⁴³ for 2 years and approved the decision to meet in Istanbul to hold specific peaceful negotiations⁴⁴. According to the proposal of the Ottoman Government, to make the treaty the town of Sremski

³⁸ The first ruling period: 1607–1704, the second ruling period: 1709–1733.

³⁹ Due to the data from *Yılmaz Öztuna*, at these negotiations (on 2 December 1698) the Turkish ambassadors announced the transfer of Kamyanets-Podilskiy under the jurisdiction of Poland and declared their demands of getting back the Fortress of Azov (which really happened). See: *Yılmaz Öztuna*, aynı eser, Dördüncü Cild, s. 414.

⁴⁰ It should also be noted, that the ambassadors of the Polish and Lithuanian Commonwealth demanded to transfer under their jurisdiction two monasteries located in Moldova. See: *Yılmaz Öztuna*, aynı eser, Dördüncü Cild, s. 414.

⁴¹ Cardinal Climent XI is mean (Pope of Rome: 1700–1721).

⁴² *İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı*, aynı eser, Cilt III, I. Kısım, 5. Baskı, s. 593.

⁴³ This term means a ceasefire between two opposing parties at a definite period of time, that is “an armistice”, for that a respective agreement shall be concluded (*Ferit Devellioğlu*, *Osmanlıca-Türkçe Ansiklopedik Lûgat*, Yayına Hazırlayan: Aydın Sami Güneçal, 11. Baskı, Ankara, Aydın Kitabevi Yayınları, s. 757, 1993). Due to *İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı*, the expiration of that agreement was to be 3 years.

⁴⁴ *Yılmaz Öztuna*, aynı eser, Dördüncü Cild, s. 414.

Karlovci was chosen, located near Belgrad, on a bank of the river of Danube, where the border line between Turkey and Austria was set. The decision to make a peaceful treaty having been made, the person authorized by the Ottoman Empire, and namely the Great Vizier Amjazade Gusein Pasha, to be on a safe side, set off with his army (to be secured from any possible repetition of the war) to Belgrad. On the way to Sofia he got a written message from the persons authorised by Austria and Venice about the principal text of the planned treaty. The delegation sent to Sremski Karlovci from the Ottoman party also included Rami Mehmet Efendi, the Minister on Foreign Affairs, and Isketzade Alexander Mavrokorkat, the Divan interpreter. Among the participants of the negotiations process, besides representatives from the Sublime Porte, from one side, and those from Austria, Poland, Venice and the Czardom of Muscovy, from the other side, envoys from England (Bachet) and Holland (Hemsberke, or Jakob Konte Kaler) were also included). In 1699 (1110 due to the Hijri Calendar) negotiations on making a peaceful treaty were started. The Austrian Empire was represented at the Karlovice negotiations such authorised persons, as Counts Ortingen and Shiging, from Venice there was Chevalier Ruzzini (or Signor Cavalier Carlotto), from Poland Польшу – Count Malachovski, while the Czardom of Muscovy was presented by Prokop Bogdanovych as an observer.⁴⁵

When analysing the information available in our respective written sources in relevance of the scenario of the said events from the point of view of their cause-and-effect relationships, we have found that the Karlovice negotiation p[rocess lasted for four months, and during that time its participants held 36 meetings. At last, after complicated discussions of the terms and conditions for the armistice, on 26 January 1699⁴⁶ a peaceful treaty was signed for 25 years between the states that had been at war, except for the Czardom of Muscovy, which the above said “mütareke” was made with – an agreement on a ceasefire for three years.⁴⁷ After completing the official ceremony of

⁴⁵ *İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı*, aynı eser, Cilt III, I. Kısım, 5. Baskı, s. 590.

⁴⁶ 24th in Rejep Month in 1110 due to Hijri Calendar.

⁴⁷ Due to *Yılmaz Öztuna*, this agreement was signed on 24 January 1699 for period of 2 years (*Yılmaz Öztuna*, aynı eser, Dördüncü Cild, s. 416; *İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı*, aynı eser, Cilt III, I. Kısım, 5. Baskı, s. 590.

signing the Karlovice Treaty the states-participants, after long-lasting negotiations, announced the beginning of a peaceful period and the end of the conference⁴⁸. The basic principles of the treaty text were represented in the form of the below given provisions. For instance, the terms and conditions of the treaty with the Austrian Empire consisted of 20 articles, which provided the following: Temeshvar Area with the territories adjoining to the rivers of Tisza, Danube and Maros, was to remain under the power of the Ottoman Empire. The territory of Hungary, including Ergel⁴⁹, that had been under Turkey since 1526, was to be transferred to the territory of the Austrian Empire, while the rivers of Tisza and Maros were to stay free for using by both of the countries for the needs of their national shipping industry, fishing, etc. The text also said about the necessity to observe the terms and conditions of the concluded treaty by the Crimean khanate and other countries⁵⁰. The terms and conditions of thee treaty with the Polish and Lithuanian Commonwealth consisted of 11 articles, which proclaimed the following: the Ottoman Empire was to leave Ukraine, particularly Kamyanets-Podilskyi (with the eparchy), Lviv (with the central eparchy), which under the Buchach Agreement of 17 October 1672 had been transferred to the power of the Sublime Porte. As for the Sublime Porte was concerned, it was to cancel the state office of the Hetman, who was appointed for governing the Ukrainian Cossacks, and his residency in Moldova. Under Article 4 the Government of the Ottoman Empire undertook the obligation to stop the military advance of the Crimean Khanate to the Polish and Lithuanian Commonwealth and cancel the yearly tribute from that country in favour of the Crimean Khan. The Turkish border was set along the river of Dnister, therefor the other Ukrainian lands, and particularly Bukovyna, Besarabia, Khotyn with the adjoining areas were to remain under the

⁴⁸ *Yılmaz Öztuna*, aynı eser, Dördüncü Cild, s. 416.

⁴⁹ The other name is "Transilvania" (*Türk Erdel*) – the western territory of the modern Romania. II. György Rakoczi II was its prince (Ruling period: 1648–1657). A part of the territory of the Hungarian Kingdom. In 1919 it was divided between Yugoslavia (1/3 of the area) and Romania (2/3 of the area); *Mehmet Zeki Pakalın*, *Osmanlı Tarih Deyimleri ve Terimleri Sözlüğü*, Cilt I, İstanbul, Milli Eğitim Basım Evi, 1993, s. 543. These three regions are under the protectorate of the Sublime Porte.

⁵⁰ *İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı*, aynı eser, Cilt III, I. Kısım, 5. Baskı, s. 591–592; *Yılmaz Öztuna*, aynı eser, Dördüncü Cild, s. 417 .

power of the Ottoman Empire⁵¹. The above mentioned historian D. Kołodziejczyk, concerning the participation of the Polish and Lithuanian Commonwealth in the negotiating processes regarding the conclusion of the Karlowice Treaty and its approval in particular, underlines its precondition, that is the unconventional victory of the allied states in 1683 and on the formation in 1684 of the Solemn League. The Polish and Lithuanian Commonwealth failed to receive back its Fortress of Kamyanets-Podilskyi as long as the conclusion of the said treaty. In particular it is said that the Polish military expeditions took place in 1686 and in 1691 against Moldavia, turned out to be also unsuccessful. On 26 January 1699 the respectively appointed ambassadors of Austria, Venice, Poland-Lithuania and Muscovy signed a few treaties with the Ottoman Empire⁵². The terms and conditions of the treaty with the Austrian Empire included 20 articles, that one with the Polish and Lithuanian Commonwealth did 11 ones, and that one with Venice consisted of 16 articles. The tribute having been set up after the conquest of the Fortress of Zenta by the Ottoman Turks were to be cancelled. The Venetians were to return all the cities/towns and villages/settlements that they had occupied in the north of the gulf, while the fortresses and the cities/towns in the north of the gulf, as well as Inebahty⁵³, and Mora Peninsula were to become included under the reigning of the Ottoman Empire. As for the treaty with the Czarism of Muscovy, it should be taken in consideration, that Peter I, having conquered the Fortress of Azov, wanted to provide himself with an outlet to the Black Sea, as the Kerch Vent belonged then to the Sublime Porte.⁵⁴ We should also note that after analysing the text of the chronicle by Mehmed Rashid Efendi, where there are data in relation of the problems under our study, such as the following ones: "Discussion of the agreement and making a peaceful treaty with Austria, Poland, Venice and Muscovy" dated from

⁵¹ *Yılmaz Öztuna*, aynı eser, Dördüncü Cilt, s. 418.

⁵² *Dimitri Kantemir*, Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun Yükseliş ve Çöküş Tarihi / Incrementa atque decrementa Aulæ Othomanicæ, İkinci Cilt, 2. Bası, İstanbul, Cumhuriyet kitap klübü, Cumhuriyet kitapları, 1998, s. 828–829; *Kołodziejczyk Dariusz*, op. cit., p. 153–158.

⁵³ İnebahtı (Turk).

⁵⁴ *İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı*, aynı eser, Cilt III, I. Kısım, 5. Baskı, s. 593.

the year of 1110 according to the Hirji Calendar (1698/1699)⁵⁵; “Article One of the Agreement concluded with the Austrian Emperor” dated from the year of 1110 according to the Hirji Calendar (1698/1699)⁵⁶; “Articles of the agreement of the Polish kafirs with the Ottoman State”⁵⁷; “Articles of the treaty of the Venetian community” dated from the year of 1110 according to the Hirji Calendar (1698/1699 року)⁵⁸; “Arrival of the Minister for Foreign Affairs Rami Mehmed Efendi with the texts of the agreement to the [city of] Edirne” dated from the year of 1110 according to the Hirji Calendar (1698/1699)⁵⁹; “Arrival of the Polish envoy with the demand of making a treaty with the Sultan” dated from the year of 1111 according to the Hirji Calendar (1699/1700)⁶⁰; “Arrival of the envoy of the Tsar of Muscovy for a bilateral discussion обговорення of the peaceful treaty” dated from the year of 1111 according to the Hirji Calendar (1699/1700)⁶¹; ‘Arrival of the envoy from Venice to the Ottoman State’ dated from the year of 1111 according to the Hirji Calendar (1699/1700)⁶²; “Discussion of the peaceful treaty with the Muscovy envoy”, “Article One of the peaceful treaty with Muscovy” dated from the year of 1112 according to the Hirji Calendar (1700/1701)⁶³; “A Transfer of the Polish Kingdom to the unfortunate Nalkyran”⁶⁴; “Rebuilding of the Fortress of Ochakiv” dated from the year of 1114 according to the Hirji Calendar (1702/1703)⁶⁵; “Meeting of the Muscovy envoy with the Great Vizier” dated from the year of 1114 according to the Hirji Calendar (1702/1703)⁶⁶ and others. This analysis makes it possible to show in more detail the events connected with the Karlovice Treaty between the above mentioned states. Particularly,

⁵⁵محمد راشد افندى، تاريخ راشد، الجلد الثاني، استانبول، مطبعة عامره، ١٢٨٢، ص. ٤٤٨-٤٤٩، ٥٩٥ ص.
⁵⁶محمد راشد افندى، تاريخ راشد، الجلد الثاني، استانبول، مطبعة عامره، ١٢٨٢، ص. ٤٤٩-٤٦٠، ٥٩٥ ص.
⁵⁷محمد راشد افندى، تاريخ راشد، الجلد الثاني، استانبول، مطبعة عامره، ١٢٨٢، ص. ٤٦٠-٤٦٧، ٥٩٥ ص.
⁵⁸محمد راشد افندى، تاريخ راشد، الجلد الثاني، استانبول، مطبعة عامره، ١٢٨٢، ص. ٤٦٧-٤٧٣، ٥٩٥ ص.
⁵⁹محمد راشد افندى، تاريخ راشد، الجلد الثاني، استانبول، مطبعة عامره، ١٢٨٢، ص. ٤٧٤-٤٧٥، ٥٩٥ ص.
⁶⁰محمد راشد افندى، تاريخ راشد، الجلد الثاني، استانبول، مطبعة عامره، ١٢٨٢، ص. ٤٨٣، ٥٩٥ ص.
⁶¹محمد راشد افندى، تاريخ راشد، الجلد الثاني، استانبول، مطبعة عامره، ١٢٨٢، ص. ٤٨٥-٤٨٦، ٥٩٥ ص.
⁶²محمد راشد افندى، تاريخ راشد، الجلد الثاني، استانبول، مطبعة عامره، ١٢٨٢، ص. ٤٨٦، ٥٩٥ ص.
⁶³محمد راشد افندى، تاريخ راشد، الجلد الثاني، استانبول، مطبعة عامره، ١٢٨٢، ص. ٤٩٤-٥٠٣، ٥٩٥ ص.
⁶⁴محمد راشد افندى، تاريخ راشد، الجلد الثاني، استانبول، مطبعة عامره، ١٢٨٢، ص. ٥٠٥، ٥٩٥ ص.
⁶⁵محمد راشد افندى، تاريخ راشد، الجلد الثاني، استانبول، مطبعة عامره، ١٢٨٢، ص. ٥٣٧، ٥٩٥ ص.
⁶⁶محمد راشد افندى، تاريخ راشد، الجلد الثاني، استانبول، مطبعة عامره، ١٢٨٢، ص. ٥٥٠-٥٥١، ٥٩٥ ص.

the chronicler lets us know, that the Czar of Muscovy, after signing by the Ottoman State of the peaceful agreement with the Austrian Empire, sent his authorised ambassador to Karlovice, where that signed on behalf the Czar of Muscovy “the mürateke” – an agreement on ceasefire for three years. In July 1700, with mediating of the Ukrainian Hetman Ivan Mazepa and owing to his diplomatic efforts, a peaceful treaty for 25 years was concluded between the Czardom of Muscovy and the Ottoman State. Under Article 4 of this treaty, the Fortress of Azov with the adjoining areas, including the secured structures and fortresses, were to be transferred to the power of the Czar of Muscovy. Due to Article 7, the Czardom of Muscovy was to get in possession the lands located at a distance of up to 10 hours of movement from the river of Kuban. Under Article 2 of the Treaty, the fortresses built over the river of Dnipro, and namely Dogan, Gazi-Kerman, Shgin-Kerman, Nusret-Kerman, were transferred to the domination of the government of the Ottoman Empire with the precondition of demolishing the surrounding fortifications. Also due to the terms and conditions of the “the mürateke”, the Government of the Czardom of Muscovy got the right to have in Istanbul his permanent official representative, that is a plenipotentiary ambassador. According to Article 8, Piotr Tolstyj was appointed the Ambassador of Muscovy in the capital of the Sublime Porte. During the negotiations the person authorised by the Czar of Muscovy with the Minister Rami Mehmed Efendi the possibility of setting up communication way between Azov and Istanbul. However, as the Black Sea was supposed an internal sea of the Ottoman Empire, the positive settlement of this problem was declined by the Turkish party. The said should be added with, that the Karlovice peaceful Treaty was concluded resulting from long-lasting and exhausting wars, that were taking part as follows: between the Ottoman Empire and the Austrian Empire – for 15 years and 9 months, between the Polish and Lithuanian Commonwealth versus the Ottoman State – for 15 years and 4 months, between Venice and the Ottoman State – for 14 years and 6 months, between the Czardom of Muscovy and the mentioned states – for 9 years and 7 months. Because of the considered peaceful treaty, the territories that were in possession of the Ottoman Empire, were transferred to the other countries: to Austria (about 249,000

km²), Venice (about 32,000 km²), Polish and Lithuanian Commonwealth (about 45,000 km²), the Czarism of Muscovy (about 20,000 km²). Due to the data from Dimitri Kantemir, the Karlovice Treaty was signed by the extraordinary and authorised ambassadors of the states-participants in the negotiating process on 28 January 1699 (the 26th day of Rejep month in the year of 1110 according to the Hirji Calendar) ⁶⁷.

Considering “the Ukrainian problem” in the context of the archival document “The Polish document of the agreement of Karlovice (Document 58, 26 January 1699)”, we suppose it would be reasonable to present the text of the respective article of the treaty in Latin, for the document having been then an original informational source, and it was used for providing a joint control of the rightness in the observation of the terms and conditions of the said treaty by the countries which signed that one:

“Articulus III: Intra veteres quoque ante postrema duo bella versus Poloniae limites situm Cameneci fortalidum, eductis inde musulmanicis militiis evacuetur et integrum relinquatur, et Podoliae atque Ukrainae provinciarum, nulla deinceps ab Excelsio Imperio fiat praetensio, et Ukrainae Kozakorum hetmani nomine substitutus, qui modo in Moldavia residet, hetmanus amoveatur. Cumque, limites antiqui Poloniae et Moldaviae manifesti sint, si commodum fuerit tempus ab initio futuri Martii inchoetur evacuatio, et quam citius fieri poterit, quamprimum Polonica milicia e Moldavia educatur, et munimenta et loca illius evacuentur, et Moldavia maneat libera. Simulque ab initio Martii Camenecensis fortalitii evacuatio inchoetur, et evacuationis negotium ubi prius perfici poterit, sine haesitatione ac sine tarditate ac negligentia in executionem deducatur. Et Camenecensis fortalitii evacuatio ad summum usque in decimam quintam mensis Maii ad finem perducatur; et quo cum facilitate et celeritate dicti fortalitii fiat evacuatio, ad onera imponenda et transvehenda, quo ad fieri potest, curribus et iumentis transportationem coadiuvent Poloni; et ubique evacuationis negotium cum securitate et salva re peragatur, in quibus evacuationibus

⁶⁷ *Dimitri Kantemir*, aynı eser, İkinci Cilt, 2. Bası, s. 827; *Yılmaz Öztuna*, aynı eser, Dördüncü Cild, s. 417.

fortalitorum et aliorum locorum, quoquo pacto munitorimi, e subditis quicunque voivuntarie exire velint, cum propriis rebus et suppellectili exeant tuto et secure, et quicunque remanere velint, item tuto remaneant, et utrinque nullatenus impediatur. Et cum evacuatio fortalitorum et locorum a principio Martii mensis utrinque inchoari debeat, instantiam de tormentorum Cameneci relictione, scilicet ex propriis atque ibi repertis, ablegatus Polonus quam primum ad Fulgidam Portam expediendus, afferat ad solium imperatoris”⁶⁸. In the Ukrainian translation it means the following: “The fortified walls of Kamyianets-[Podilskyi], erected by our ancestors before the two wars against Poland, were ruined after coming of the Turkish warriors, and they remained in that condition, so as in the future under no pretext of the Highest Lord⁶⁹ nobody could appear in Podillia provinces and in regions of Ukraine. On the other hand, the Deputy to the Hetman⁷⁰ of the Ukrainian Cossacks, who was in Moldavia, could be replaced only by the Hetman. If whenever the old borders of Poland and Moldavia were found, let from March their destruction will begin, if a respective time for that is found, and, for that to happen as soon, as the Polish troop and the Moldavian troop have been activated, while their fortifications and military settlements have been destroyed, Moldavia will be free. At the same time, if in the beginning of March, when a destruction of the walls of Kamyianets-[Podilskyi] is started, let the problems associated with their demolishing, be overcome without any signs and carelessness. A complete ruining of the said walls of Kamyianets-[Podilskyi] took place quickly and easily on the 15th day of May. Those who can, have to pay taxes and resettle to another place. While resettling, may the Poles help one another with carts and sumpters; and may all the difficulties at any circumstances resulting from ruining the walls, be passed over successfully, while let making the business become easier. And if any of the homagers, after ruining all those walls and the other fortified places in any place due to the agreements, wanted to leave voluntarily with his own possessions and riches, then let him leave with peace and without fear, and if he wished to stay, let him stay without fear, and may never forcing be

⁶⁸ *Kołodziejczyk Dariusz*, op. cit., p. 581–586.

⁶⁹ Sultan Mustafa II is meant (Ruling period: 1695–1703).

⁷⁰ Ivan Mazepa is meant (Ruling period: 1687–1709).

applied in any way in favour of this or in favour of that way. In the beginning of May, when demolishing of the walls and fortifications was to be started, after Kamyanets[-Podilskyi] had been left because of attacking it by military machines, the ones bought on the own money, the Polish envoy be sent to the Famous and High Palace of the Sultan, and I have informed of that in front of the Emperor's throne". The outcomes of the analysis of the text we have made shows , that as a matter of fact the territory of Ukraine, which was at that time under the protectorate of the Sublime Porte, was "untouchable". Partially, the residency place of the Ukrainian Hetman still remained in Moldavia on. To provide fulfillment of the terms and conditions provided in an article of the Karlovice peaceful Treaty, the fortifications and military settlements of the Polish and Lithuanian Commonwealth were to be liquidated, while the territories of Ukraine and Moldavia were to be freed from the troops. The document also informs us about overcoming the consequences of the war and the time for implementing the terms and conditions of the said treaty. After the interpretation of the respective text we found proofs of the fact of availability of "the Ukrainian problematic issue" during the negotiating process of concluding the Karlovice Treaty. We believe it is necessary to provide the contents of one more document, and namely it is a transliteration in Latin of that document by Dariusz Kołodziejczyk and its translation into English from the Turkish-Ottoman: "The Ottoman document of the Karlovice Treaty"⁷¹. So, the respective provisions of the said treaty relating to Ukraine are as follows: 1) Kamyanets-Podilskyi Fortress, that before was located within the border limits of Poland, was to be left, while the Ottoman Army, that was located in the said fortress, was to be withdrawn; 2) the Sublime Porte was to have no relations with the Podillia and Ukrainian areas; 3) the residency place of the Ukrainian Cossacks Hetman in Bohdan Country (Moldova) annulled; 4) there are given deadlines for fulfilling the terms and conditions of the said treaty. Therefore, the represented texts were the same as their contents are concerned, but it was important for us that they both included the same facts and events. And the equivalence of the texts contents of

⁷¹ *Kołodziejczyk Dariusz*, op.cit., Document 59, 26 January 1699, p. 587–593.

the two written sources proves the described there historical facts to have been authentic.

To prove the authenticity of the described facts in the study of the “Ukrainian problem” in the context of the mentioned treaty, we believe it is necessary to add to that the data obtained directly from Turkish-Ottoman documents. For example, the document under the title “The Karlovice Treaty”, that was in due time signed between the Ottoman Empire and the Polish and Lithuanian Commonwealth, consist of an introductory part and 11 articles. The document was dated from 26 December 1699. The text of the treaty was in Latin, so as it could be used jointly. The document is kept in the fund “Books of foreign states” of a Turkish Archive⁷². Hence, under this Treaty, the Polish and Lithuanian Commonwealth obtained what it had been fighting for for 50 years. Especial attention should be paid to the data relating to the theme of our study. The said document informs us, that Podillia and other lands of Ukraineя, particularly Kamyanets-Podilskyi were transferred under the power of the Polish and Lithuanian Commonwealth.

Conclusion of the Karlovice peaceful Treaty caused weakening the relations between the Crimean Khanate and the Sublime Porte, while after making the Constantinople Treaty the government undertook the responsibility for preventing attacks of the Crimean-Tatar Army on the southern territories of Muscovy and Polish and Lithuanian Commonwealth.⁷³

So, the Ukrainian lands turned out under control of the Czardom of Muscovy and of the Polish and Lithuanian Commonwealth. That situation lasted as long as the Prut War (1711), which resulted in the

⁷² Karlofça Antlaşması, BOA, Düvel-i Ecnebiye Defterleri, Nu : 055 / 1, s. 22–26.

⁷³ Канגיעва Э. М. Крымоведение на страницах тюркоязычных периодических изданий крымскотатарской диаспоры / под ред. А. А. Непомнящего. Киев ; Симферополь: ОАО «Симферопольская городская типография», 2007. С. 74–75. – (Kangiyeva E. M. Krymvedeniye na stranitsakh tiurskoyazychnykh periodicheskikh izdaniy krymskotatarskoy diaspori / pod red. A. A. Nepomniashego. Kiev, Simferopol : ОАО “Simferopol’skaya gorodskaya tipografiya”. 2007. s. 74–75 (Rus). – (Kangiyeva E. M. The Crimean Studies on pages of Turkic periodicals of the Crimean-Tatar Diaspora / Edited by A. A. Nepomniaschiy. – Kyiv, Simferopol : OSC “Simferopol City Publishing House”. 2007. pp. 74–75 (Eng).

Ottoman Empire's restoration the rights, which it had lost according to the Karlovice Treaty, and it again began to keep Ukraine under control, particularly the Ukrainian Cossack community. Possibly, the most important achievement for the Polish party the cancellation of paying any taxes, including the *garaj*⁷⁴, and a tribute. Such a position of the Polish and Lithuanian Commonwealth meant its complete independence on the Ottoman Empire and, in particular, upon the Crimean Khanate (this fact is in a special focus). The said treaty determined the way for settling one of the fundamental problems, and namely – the one is liberation of the prisoners for a certain repayment "fidye"⁷⁵. An important place in the Treaty being under our consideration also belongs to the problem of undertaking measures aimed at the restoration of trade relations between the Polish and Lithuanian Commonwealth and the Ottoman Empire, which were also implemented through the Ukrainian lands and cities/towns. It should be noted, that because of the military actions, the trade between the said countries had decreased noticeably by that time. Finally, to provide the validity of the said treaty, a few proposals were formulated. Ambassadors from the both states were to inform the highest officials of their countries of – the king and the sultan, and let them know the respective terms and conditions of the said treaty (article by article), so as to make all separate articles agreed between themselves. The last step in the procedure of making the treaty was an agreement about the exchange of the governors with official letters, that proved the fact of the final approval of the treaty.

NEGOTIATING AND MAKING THE KARLOVICE TREATY

Negotiating and making the treaty was progressing in the following way: 1) ceasing the fire between the belligerent parties was to become an important factor for starting the negotiation process; 2) for all the participants in the military actions (parties to the winner, to the

⁷⁴ There is meant a tax or a tribute to have been paid by the non-Muslims of the population in the Ottoman Empire for using by them of a plot of land.

⁷⁵ *Fidye* – payment of a certain amount of money for giving freedom to arrested people or to hostages (*Ferit Devellioğlu*, aynı eser, s. 266).

defeated party and the parties that were wishing to join the group of the countries-winners) there was to be prepared a text of a treaty on making peace; 3) one of the two parties that had an advantage, on provision of recognizing this fact by the rest of the parties to the corresponding negotiating process, was to enjoy the right of having the decisive voice during the treaty text preparation; 4) the war outcomes were to be the decisive principles during the discussion of the treaty text; 5) the party-winner to settle some issues to its favour during the negotiations made an accent at its victory as the main argument; 6) for the participants of the negotiating process that were neither winners, nor defeated ones, there were taken in consideration provisions of the previous state treaties; 7) each article of the treaty was to be formulated only after its thorough discussion, and after all the participating parties to have come to a complete agreement in relation of this article, the final version was to be sent to the Sultan and to the King to affirm that one; 8) after discussing and affirmation of all the articles of the future document at last a final version of the whole treaty was to be supposed to have been prepared as a draft of an integral document.

We should note that all the international treaties and agreements were concluded resulting from complicated of negotiating processes. The final version of each article in a respective treaty or a document was affirmed in the form of separate official documents and was agreed by the parties involved. At the final stage these parties sent to one another notes of the final approval of the text of a treaty or an agreement to have been under consideration. After that those ones became effective.

Treaties of the Ottoman Empire were prepared, as a rule, in three copies: one copy in the Turkish Ottoman Language, the other one – in the language of the state the relative treaty was to be signed, while the third one – in Latin so as to provide a joint usage of the text (it was the first informational source to keep under control the correctness of fulfilling the treaty terms by its participants). It is the latter fact, that was fixed in the final part of the treaty we have analysed.

Different versions of the Karlovice Treaty have some differences. For example, the compiler of the document "A copy of the Karlovice

Treaty” (in Turkish – *Karlofça Andlaşmasının sureti*) dated from 1699 A.D., and it proves the facts obtained from the above said document to be authentic, however we should note that the archival book that document being included in, was prepared in 1768 pouçı. We repeat that different versions of the Karlovice Treaty texts have some differences. The compiler, instead writing about Sultan Mustafa II who reigned during the times the said treaty being prepared, wrote about Sultan Ibragim I who reigned between 1640 and 1648. It is a mistake, for, as we have noted, the document was dated from 1111 of the Hijri calendar (1699 A.D.).

The studied written sources make it possible to obtain from the general conditions and circumstances of the Karlovice Treaty to have been prepared the fact related to Ukraine, and particularly the following points: the division of the Right-Bank territory of Ukraine between the Ottoman Empire and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth; the transfer under the power of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth of the Lviv city and the Kamyanets-Podilskyi town; the liquidation of the residence place of the Ukrainian Hetman in Moldova who was to be appointed by the Turkish Sultan fort that one to exercise the government of Ukraine’s military and political affairs; the delimitation of the Polish-Turkish border along the river of Dniester which resulted in keeping the rest of Ukraine’s territory under the jurisdiction of the Ottoman State.

Hence, Turkish-Ottoman written sources include important data concerning “the Ukrainian problem” against the background of the Karlovice Treaty and its historical consequences. It should be noted that the Karlovice Treaty came into force as a legal document after signing that one by the states-participants of the negotiating process, so it included the legal and regulatory framework. That defined the terms and conditions, the validity term and the legal and regulatory actions. Particularly, this treaty contributed to a renovation of the diplomatic relations between the states-participants in the negotiating process, while the Tsardom of Muscovy set up its office in Istanbul. Signing of the Karlovice Treaty became a sign of ending in Europe of ruling of the Ottoman Empire, and the sign of a beginning of its gradual decline. We note once more that the terms and conditions of

the Karlovice Treaty directly concerned the historical destiny of Ukraine, as its lands were in the epicenter of the counteractions between the Ottoman State, the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, the Austrian Empire and the Tsardom of Muscovy.

The Ottoman Empire did not make peace with the terms and conditions of the Karlovice Treaty. At the beginning of Sultan Ahmed's III ruling (1703–1730) the course was taken at returning the lands having been lost by the Sublime Porte. The result was that the Fortress of Azov the above mentioned Mora Peninsula were reconquered. Vienna and Muscovy lost all their territories transferred to them according to the Karlovice Treaty. Regardless all the endeavours "the policy of returning" failed in relation of the Austrian Empire. It should be noted that this policy was not practiced in relations with the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, on the contrary – the Sublime Porte got concentrated on preventing the Austrian Empire and Tsardom of Muscovy from invading the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, while preventing the Muscovy from invading Ukraine.

Conclusion

On a base of a source-studying consideration of the data available in the Turkish-Ottoman and Ukrainian written documents and in Historiography, primarily of the archival documents having been originated from the historical period covering from the last quarter of the 17th century to the first quarter of the 18th century, we may come to the following conclusions in relation of the evolution of the military and political relations between the Cossack-Hetmanic Ukraine and the Ottoman Empire in the system of the international relations in the Central and South-Eastern Europe, where the contemporary Republic of Macedonia is situated.

Signing of the Karlovice Treaty signified the end of ruling in Europe of the Ottoman Turkey and the beginning of the period of its gradual degradation, especially in relation of losing that of the Fortress of Azov, while the Tsardom of Muscovy achieved its victory owing to an essential aid of the Ukrainian Cossack Army headed by Hetman Ivan Mazepa on the side of that czardom. However, the treaty between the

Polish and Lithuanian Commonwealth and the Tsardom in fact determined a participation of the Hetmanic Ukraine in the membership of the Solemn League against the Ottoman Empire. The provisions and terms and conditions of the Karlovice Treaty concerned directly the historical destiny of Ukraine, as its lands were in the epicentre of counteractions between the Ottoman Empire, Polish and Lithuanian Commonwealth, Austrian Empire and the Tsardom of Muscovy.

Turkish archival documents reflect a special importance of the diplomatic activity of the Ukrainian Hetman Ivan Mazepa in regard of settling peaceful relations between the Czardom of Muscovy and the Ottoman State after the end in 1699 of the war between the Solemn League countries, and namely: the Austrian Empire, Vienna, Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, Czardom of Muscovy – from one side, and the Ottoman Empire – from the other side, and in reference of signing a peaceful treaty between the Muscovy and Turkey on 3 July 1700.

We note that such a scenario of the events development shows that the international policy of Hetman Ivan Mazepa clearly demonstrated the priority of the Black-Sea orienting points aimed at strengthening the positions of the Ukrainian Cossack State in the said region and at the needs to provide a protection of its lands from an external expansion.

The facts fixed in the studied Turkish-Ottoman and Ukrainian written sources and in Historiography manifest the geopolitical changes, which had taken place on the relative territorial area at the above said time period, and they were connected with the setting-up of the Cossack-Hetmanic Ukraine as a subject of the international relations.

Bibliography

BOA, Düvel-i Ecnebiye Defterleri, Nu : 055 / 1.

Defterdar, Mehmed Paşa, Sarı, Zübdetü'l Vekay-î, İstanbul, Süleymaniye kütüphanesi, Esad Efendi 2382.

Derin, Fahri Çetin, (1993) Abdurrahman Abdi Paşa Vekâyinamesi, Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi, İstanbul Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.

Devellioğlu, Ferit, (1993) Osmanlıca-Türkçe Ansiklopedik Lûgat, Yayına Hazırlayan: Aydın Sami Güneşal, 11. Baskı, Ankara, Aydın Kitabevi Yayınları.

İlber Ortaylı, (2015) İlber Ortaylı Seyahatnamesi, Bir Tarihçinin Gezi Notları, 7. Baskı, İstanbul, Timaş Yayınları.

Kangiyeva E. M. (2007) Krymvedeniye na stranitsakh tiurkoyazychnykh periodicheskikh izdaniy krymskotatarskoi diaspory / pod red. A. A. Nepomniashchego. Kyiv, Simferopol' : OAO "Simferopol'skaya gorodskaya tipografiya".

Kantemir, Dimitri, (1998) Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun Yükseliş ve Çöküş Tarihi / Incrementa atque decrementa Aulae Othomanicae, 2 Cilt, 2. Bası, İstanbul, Cumhuriyet kitapları.

Kinder H., Khil'heman V. (2001) Vsesvitnia istoriya / per. z nim. ; khudozh. Haral'd i Rut Bukor; nauk. red. : A. H. Sliusarenko, O. F. Ivanov. Kyiv : Znannia-Pres.

Kotodziejczyk Dariusz, (2000) Ottoman-Polish diplomatic relations (15th – 18th century): an annotated edition of 'ahdnames and other documents. Leiden, Boston, Köln.

Öztuna, Yılmaz, (1994) Büyük Osmanlı Tarihi: Osmanlı Devleti'nin Siyasî, Medenî, Kültür, Teşkilât ve San'at Tarihi, 10 Cild, Dördüncü Cild, İstanbul, Ötüken Neşriyat A.Ş.

Pakalın, Mehmet Zek, (1993) Osmanlı Tarih Deyimleri ve Terimleri Sözlüğü, Cilt I, İstanbul, Milli Eğitim Basım Evi.

Silahdar, Fındıklılı, Mehmed Ağa, (1966) Nusretname IV, Sadeleştiren: İsmet Parmaksızoğlu, Cilt II, Fasikül I, Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Talim ve Terbiye Kurulunun 3 aralık 1964 tarih ve 264 sayılı kararıyla bastırılması uygun görülmüş, İstanbul, Milli Eğitim Basım Evi.

Stanislavs'kyi V. V. (2007) Karlovyts'kyi konhres. Entsyklopediya istoriyi Ukrayiny : v 8 t. T. 4 : Ka-Kom / redkol.: V. A. Smoliy (holova) ta in. Kyiv : Nauk. Dumka.

Turanly Ferhad. (2012) "Ukrayins'ke pytannya" v Karlovets'komu dohovori (1699 r.): turets'ka retrospektsiya. Skhidnyi svit.

Turanly Ferhad. (2016) Kozats'ka doba istoriyi Ukrayiny v osmans'ko-turets'kykh pysemnykh dzherelakh (druha polovyna XVI –persha chvert' XVIII stolittia). Kyiv: Vyd. dim "Kyyevo-Mohylyans'ka akademiya", 2016. Ukr.

Uzunçarşılı, İsmail Hakkı, (1995) Osmanlı Tarihi. II. Selim'in Tahta Çıkışından 1699 Karlofça Andlaşmasına Kadar, Cilt III, 1. Kısım, 5. Baskı, Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.

Mehmed Efendi, (1282) Râşid, Târih-i Râşid, El-Cild Es-Sâni, İstanbul, Matbaa-ı Âmire.