

## REVIEW ARTICLE

### **The Publication of Documents on the Crimean Khanate in the Topkapı Sarayı: New Sources for the History of the Black Sea Basin**

VICTOR OSTAPCHUK

LE KHANAT DE CRIMÉE DANS LES ARCHIVES DU MUSÉE DU PALAIS DE TOPKAPI. By *Alexandre Bennigsen, Pertev Naili Boratav, Dilek Desaive, Chantal Lemercier-Quelquejey*. Paris and The Hague: Mouton, 1978. 458 pp., 3 pl. FF 140.

#### I.

For some time now, students of early modern Eastern Europe, recognizing the important role of the Crimean Khanate in the region, have strived to overcome the parochial attitudes that have hindered an objective study of the khanate. Its archives must at present be regarded as lost, although apparently a substantial portion of them survived into the nineteenth century in the Crimea<sup>1</sup> and in Odessa and may still exist somewhere in the repositories of Odessa, Kiev, Leningrad, or Moscow.<sup>2</sup> Most of the Crimean chronicles remain little known or used, for lack of good editions and translations. As a result,

<sup>1</sup> V. D. Smirnov relates that during a visit to the Crimea in 1886, he chanced upon about a hundred local court records (*qādi sigill defters?*) dated from the mid-sixteenth century to the end of the khanate (1783) in the archive of the Simferopol' gubernia. Judging by their code numbers, Smirnov assumes that there must have been many more. V. D. Smirnov, *Krymskoe xanstvo pod verxovenstvom Otomanskoj Porty do načala XVIII veka* (St. Petersburg, 1887), pp. xxxiii–xxxiv. Unfortunately, neither Smirnov nor anyone else has examined these records, and their present location or fate is unknown.

<sup>2</sup> The collection of the former Odessa Society of History and Antiquities also contained some Crimean Tatar documents which may have been remnants of the archive of the Crimean Khanate. After the Second World War, the society's collection was reorganized, the Slavic materials being sent to Kiev and the Oriental materials to Leningrad. See the forthcoming volume by Patricia Kennedy Grimsted, *Archives and Manuscript Repositories of the USSR: The Ukraine and Moldavia*, to be published by the Princeton University Press.

much of the scholarly work done on the khanate to date has been based on the surviving materials of the khanate's neighbors. Although scholars recognize that viewing the khanate through foreign eyes is one reason for the distortions in its history, we have nevertheless been obliged to substitute for the lost or inaccessible Crimean sources with the foreign ones.

Very little new documentary source material has come to light since the monumental source publications of the nineteenth and early twentieth century. Despite the unpublished treasures lying in East European archives, the publication of Russian, Polish, Romanian, and other sources relating to the Crimea is at a respectably advanced stage when compared with the dearth of publications from Ottoman archives. Yet, the latter materials may well be the richest and best sources on the Crimean Khanate, which was so closely connected with the Ottoman Empire.

Happily, the appearance of *Le Khanat de Crimée dans les Archives du Musée du Palais de Topkapı* is a major step towards making Ottoman sources on the history of Eastern Europe accessible to the non-Ottomanist. The book is the product of ongoing work on Ottoman sources by a team of experts at the École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales in Paris. Because the major reason for the underutilization of the Ottoman sources has been their extreme paleographic and philological difficulties, only a team of specialists, such as the one centered in Paris, can be expected to produce a reliable edition of these sources. Since the 1960s, the results of this team's efforts have been made available in its members' occasional publications of documents and commentaries (most often in the *Cahiers du monde russe et soviétique*). Now the present volume incorporates many of their past findings and adds many new ones.

*Le Khanat de Crimée* includes only documents relating to the Crimean Khanate that are preserved in the archive of the museum of the Topkapı Sarayı (*Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Arşivi*), the former residence of the Ottoman sultans in Istanbul. The great majority of these documents are original letters from Crimean khans and notables to the Ottoman Porte. Others are copies of Crimean letters by Ottoman scribes, reports by Ottoman officials in and around the Crimea, communications by viziers to the sultan, etc. The original Crimean letters to the Porte form the largest collection of such documents published thus far; it is very valuable because the documents bear discernible and uniform internal characteristics that have not been treated in the diplomatics literature.<sup>3</sup> On the other hand, when one considers the closeness and importance of the Crimean-Ottoman relationship, which lasted from the middle of the fifteenth to the end of the eighteenth century, it is very surprising that fewer than 200 documents concerned with this relationship are preserved

<sup>3</sup> To date only the diplomatics of writings from the Ottoman Porte to Crimean khans has been analyzed. I am, however, preparing an article on the *arz*-type report and the diplomatics of Crimean writings addressed to the Ottoman Porte.

in the Topkapı, which houses 100,000 documents or more.<sup>4</sup> The actual corpus of Crimean writings to Istanbul must have numbered in the thousands.<sup>5</sup> Haphazard physical preservation of the material, as well as bureaucratic decisions to discard many documents no longer in circulation, undoubtedly resulted in decay or loss. At this juncture, however, when the task of opening the Ottoman archives for East European history has just commenced, it would be premature to estimate the extent of the surviving Crimean-related material, since an undetermined amount of material has been transferred to the Archive of the Turkish Prime Ministry in Istanbul (*Başbakanlık Arşivi*) and other repositories. As for the Topkapı collection, we cannot even be sure whether or not the documents of Crimean provenance were part of a so-called “sultan’s archive” or whether they had formed a part of the records of various other bureaus (such as that of the imperial divan) and merely ended up in the current Topkapı archive.<sup>6</sup> In any event, the Crimean-related materials in the Topkapı cover various periods of the Khanate’s history unevenly, both in number of documents and in the quality of information provided.

While individual documents reveal some important data, the collection as a whole and especially the documents that are here published for the first time do not substantially change our understanding of Crimean Tatar history. Rather they tend to underline the findings of more recent historians (for example, the great degree of autonomy and, at times, even virtual independence of the khanate vis-à-vis the Porte until the second half of the seventeenth century). But because of the vast amount of material pertaining to the Crimea found in the *Mühimme* (see fn. 5) and in other Ottoman archival sources, the collection’s editors have wisely chosen to begin their source

<sup>4</sup> The Topkapı archive has two main divisions, one containing *defter*s (bound registers) and the other containing *evrâq* (plural of *varaqa*, meaning “sheet, document”) — code numbers of documents from the latter division are prefixed by “E.” However, each individual *varaqa* need not have a separate “E-number,” since such numbers often refer to a dossier of as many as a dozen documents.

<sup>5</sup> Evidence for this is the existence of abundant material relating to the Crimean Khanate in the *Mühimme defterleri* (registers of state affairs, a series of yearly draft- or copy-books of outgoing orders and decrees of the imperial divan) preserved in the Archive of the Turkish Prime Ministry in Istanbul (*Başbakanlık Arşivi*).

<sup>6</sup> The majority of the documents that form the Topkapı collection were stored in chests in storerooms and cellars on the palace grounds. See ‘Abd ür-Rahmân Şeref, “Evrâq-i ‘atîqa ve veşâ’iq-i târihiyyemiz,” *Târîh-i ‘osmâni enğümeni meğmû’ası* 1 (1328/1910): 9–19; Tahsin Öz, ed., *Topkapı Şarayı Müzesi Arşivi kılavuzu* (Istanbul, 1938); P. Wittek, “Les archives de Turquie,” *Byzantion* 13 (1938): 691–699. Fekete pointed out that many of these materials were not just assorted miscellany, but rather core collections which should be catalogued as units rather than broken up according to the offices from which they originated; L. Fekete, “Über Archivalien und Archivwesen in der Türkei,” *Acta Orientalia* (Budapest), 3 (1953): 179–205. Perhaps some of the Crimean material was preserved in depositories of the office of the *sir kâtibi*, or confidential secretary of the sultan (later called *mâbeyn kâtibi*).

publication series (*Documents concernant l'Empire ottoman et l'Europe orientale*) with the smaller and more manageable corpus of Crimean-related documents of the Topkapı.

The primary purpose of this review article is to give historians of Eastern Europe, not normally concerned with Ottoman sources, an idea of the usefulness of these documents for broadening an understanding of the history of the region during the period. I also seek to assess, and occasionally emend, the editors' commentaries. In addition I attempt to appraise the usefulness for the historian of the volume's critical apparatus.<sup>7</sup>

## II.

Before proceeding with a survey of the historical import of the material, let me first describe the organization of *Le Khanat de Crimée*. The volume's 197 documents are presented in chronological order and are grouped according to reigns of khans. The documents range in length from 2 to 200 lines; about 70 are between 10 and 20 lines, and over 90 are longer than 20 lines. There are 54 facsimiles, of which 48 are from the group of 71 documents dated from the mid-fifteenth through the seventeenth century. A legend to each document gives the document's code number, date (often hypothetical), origin and destination, number of lines, language (Ottoman Turkish for most; some early ones are in Qıpçaq Turkic, and there is one document each in Arabic and Persian), and miscellaneous information, such as its condition. However, because the editors were working mostly from microfilms, external information, such as description of paper, ink, possible watermarks, and dimensions, are not available. Following the legend comes a rendering of the contents. According to the editors' estimation of the document's importance, either a full translation, an abridged or summary translation, or synopsis is provided. In the translations, technical terms and place-names are rendered in the original language in transliteration, occasionally with the original Arabic script. The commentaries usually identify personal names, attempt to assess the document's significance, and give references to the secondary literature as well as cross references to other documents in the volume. Here one finds a great deal of valuable research into specific events in Crimean and Ottoman, as well as Polish, Ukrainian, and Russian history. These meticulously researched commentaries contribute much to our knowledge of the history of the region. Their use is facilitated by the editors' decision to include the commentaries along with the documents rather than to relegate them to footnotes or appendices in the back of the volume. The paperbound book itself is the offset reproduction of a typewritten text.

<sup>7</sup> In a review article to be published in the *Journal of Turkish Studies* (Cambridge, Mass.) I will critique the philological treatment afforded to these documents and the principles of document publication followed by the volume's editors.

In addition to the excellent layout of the document section, *Le Khanat de Crimée* contains a critical apparatus that makes it a potentially very useful reference work. Included are a key to the transcription system; an introduction to the Crimean Khanate (pp. 1–29); a foldout map of the entire Black Sea and western Caspian region which incorporates many of the place-names that occur in the documents; biographies of thirty-three important khans (including two khans of Kazan) and of other important figures (pp. 315–359); a genealogical chart of the Giray dynasty; a long chronological table of khans with their respective *qalğas* and *nūreddīns* (first and second heirs-apparent), with a listing of the corresponding Ottoman sultans (pp. 361–370); a list of the documents in chronological order, assigning each document a date and noting the contemporary reigning khan (pp. 371–376); a list of the documents according to the archival code numbers, along with the corresponding dates (pp. 377–381); a glossary of technical terms (pp. 383–404); a selected bibliography (pp. 405–423); indexes of personal and place-names, with page references of names occurring in the actual texts of the documents being underlined (pp. 425–454).

### III.

The introduction to *Le Khanat de Crimée* is an important and highly readable essay on themes and interpretations in the history of the Crimean Khanate, which is complemented by quotations from classic travel accounts and from hitherto largely unknown Venetian and other diplomatic reports. It is to be highly recommended to the broader historical community as well as to the specialist. The essay's major thrust is to debunk long-standing misconceptions about the khanate that have passed down to us through the ages: for example, the characterization of the khanate as a primitive, barbaric, plundering, slavery-based entity, or the "Ottomano-centric" depiction of it as an obedient vassal state with Ottoman institutions and ideology (actually applicable in full to the khanate only in the eighteenth century). It deals with issues such as the relations between the Girays and the Golden Horde, the problem of the suzerainty of the Ottoman Porte, the singular nature of the khanate as determined by the relations between the Giray establishment and the nomadic clan aristocracy headed by the Širin clan, and the relations of the khanate with other direct successor states of the Golden Horde (Kazan and Astrakhan), as well as with Poland-Lithuania, Muscovy, and the Ottoman Empire. Great emphasis is placed on the gradual nature of the development of the Ottoman-Crimean relationship. Set forth clearly are the dynamics of the three-way relationship between the Porte, the khan, and the Crimean aristocracy, and the conflict and compromise between the Ottoman and Činggisid political systems. The essay maintains that the khanate did not become a truly loyal vassal of the Porte until the final deposition of Meḫmed Giray IV (1666),

which is amply reflected in the documents, and illustrates the system of the Crimean clans with frequent reference to the documents.

In the discussion of the so-called "struggle for the heritage of the Golden Horde" (in which participants were the Khanate of Kazan, Astrakhan, the Crimea, and Muscovy) the concern is with two errors widespread in the historiography. The first originated in the Russian chronicle tradition and has persisted to the present day in Soviet historiography, namely, that Moscow and the Crimea were always engaged in a national and religious life-or-death struggle. In this essay, pains are taken to show that at the end of the fifteenth and beginning of the sixteenth centuries, the two were in fact closely allied, in pursuit of the common goal of destroying the Golden Horde centered in Saray on the Volga. The second error is the view that the Crimean Khanate was always an obedient instrument of Ottoman foreign policy, particularly in plots of anti-Russian aggression. The essay states somewhat categorically that the Ottomans were not interested in the mortal struggle between Moscow and the Crimea for control of the Volga basin, which ensued after the elimination of the Golden Horde in the early sixteenth century. When, in 1569, the Ottomans undertook to construct a Don-Volga canal and take over Astrakhan, they were supposedly interested only in attacking Safavid Iran from the rear and reviving communications with Turkestan by way of the northern littoral of the Caspian Sea. Although its reaction to Russocentric historiography is quite understandable, it is unfortunate that the essay does not come to terms with the thesis put forth by Halil Inalcik that the Ottomans were aware of and kept close watch on the Crimea's relations with Muscovy *before* the fall of Kazan and Astrakhan (1552 and 1556), and that, in fact, ever since their entry into the north Black Sea region (1475), the Ottomans played an active role in the balance-of-power politics there, to assure that no power totally dominated the region and thereby threatened their own domination of that vital area.<sup>8</sup> Other themes treated in the introductory essay include the continual struggle of the khanate to retain some degree of independence vis-à-vis the Porte, the international significance of the Tatar-Zaporozhian alliances in the seventeenth century, and the final Ottomanization of the khanate in the eighteenth century.

#### IV.

Let us now turn to an overview of the documents in *Le Khanat de Crimée*. The first period of the khanate, from the middle of the fifteenth century to the end of the reign of Khan Mengli Giray (d. 1514 or 1515), is relatively rich in documents, pertaining mostly to the three-way relations between the khan, the Crimean clan aristocracy, and the Ottoman Porte. Of the fifteenth-century documents, all but two have previously been published by Fevzi Kurtoglu<sup>9</sup>

<sup>8</sup> Halil Inalcik, "The Origin of the Ottoman-Russian Rivalry and the Don-Volga Canal (1569)," *Annales de l'Université d'Ankara* 1 (1947): 47-110.

<sup>9</sup> Fevzi Kurtoglu, "İlk Kırım hanlarının mektupları," *Bellekten* 1 (1937): 641-655.

and Akdes Nimet Kurat,<sup>10</sup> and have been treated in the secondary literature dealing with the early Crimean Khanate.<sup>11</sup> Among the previously unpublished documents from the first period of the khanate is a letter from Eminek, *beg* of the Şirin clan, to Sultan Mehmed II, written in 1476, which deals with Eminek's struggle with his brother Hağike and with Khan Ahmed of the Golden Horde (E 3179, pp. 59–64). There is also a 50-line draft for a *feth-nâme* celebrating the conquest of Kaffa (Kefe), written in Persian, which the commentary suggests has some paleographic importance (E 11687, pp. 44–55). There are a number of mostly new documents from ca. 1510–1512 concerning the attempt by *şehzâde* (sultan's son) Selim<sup>12</sup> (then governor of Kaffa) to seize the Ottoman throne. Also included is an undated letter from Mengli Giray to *şehzâde* Süleymân, interesting because in it Mengli Giray addresses the future Ottoman sultan as “my son” (*oğlum hazret-i Süleymân şah kâmbîn*). There exists another Topkapı document concerning *şehzâde* Selim's seditious activities — a report to Sultan Bâyezîd II bearing Mengli Giray's signature — which is not included or mentioned in our volume. According to Selâhaddin Tansel,<sup>13</sup> who published a facsimile, its number is E 6382. It is not the same document as the E 6382 in our volume, but both documents belong to the same dossier (see fn. 4).

In the volume under review, E 6382 is a letter from Mengli Giray to Bâyezîd II (pp. 101–103) reporting on two northern raids undertaken by the Tatars. The relevant passage reads as follows:

previously all the Crimean armies, always glorious in victory, which are only in imperial service, mounted their horses and have been on march in the wilderness and steppe from the beginnings of winter. They were divided into two detachments — one detachment made a raid against the *Rûs* infidel but was routed and their horses and they themselves were in total debility [and so] they returned, having given back to the *Rûs* infidel all of the captives that had been taken and having concluded a full peace. The other detachment has gone against the Muscovite (*Mosqov*) infidel and as yet there is no news from them.

In the translation of this document, *Rûs kâfiri* (*Rûs* infidel) is first rendered as “territoire russe” and then simply as “Russes,” without any explanation of the term *russe*. The commentary suggests that the document should be dated

<sup>10</sup> Akdes Nimet Kurat, *Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Arşivindeki Altın Ordu, Kırım ve Türkistan hanlarına ait yarlık ve bitikler*, Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Yayınlarından Tarih Serisi, 1 (Istanbul, 1940).

<sup>11</sup> See, e.g., Halil İnalcık, “Yeni vesiklara göre Kırım hanlığının Osmanlı tabiliğine girmesi ve ahidname meselesi,” *Belleten* 8 (1944): 185–229.

<sup>12</sup> E 6691/2 (pp. 88–89), E 7159 (pp. 89–91, 93), E 6691/3 (pp. 92, 93–95), E 1308(1301)/1 (pp. 95–97), E 7084 (pp. 97, 99), E 11678 (pp. 98, 99). All except E 6691/2 and E 7084 have facsimiles. However, the facsimile to E 7084 can be found in Selâhaddin Tansel, *Yavuz Sultan Selim* (Ankara, 1969), pl. 7. As the editors point out, E 6691/3 was previously published in Kurtoğlu, “Mektupları.”

<sup>13</sup> Selâhaddin Tansel, *Sultan II. Bâyezîd'in siyasi hayatı* (Istanbul, 1966), pp. 272 ff. and pl. 28.

summer 1512 and must refer to a raid on Muscovy in which one detachment raided the region of Riazan' while another detachment went against the town of Riazan' itself. However, it is well known that until the eighteenth century the Tatars, as well as the Ottomans, denoted by the word *Rūs* the population of the southern territories of the former Galician-Volhynian Rus' state, i.e., the Ukraine and sometimes also the lands of the Don river, while they used the word *Mosqov* to denote Muscovites or Russians.<sup>14</sup> That *Rūs* is not a synonym for *Mosqov* is obvious in the document itself, in which there is the oppositional juxtaposition, "bir bölügi Rūs kāfirine . . . ve bir bölügi Mosqov kāfirine . . . [one detachment against the *Rūs* infidel . . . and one detachment against the *Mosqov* infidel . . .]." The editors overlook the fact that in April of the very same year to which they date this document there was a large and well-attested Tatar raid upon Galicia that was defeated by Crown and Grand Ducal forces at Vyšnyvec'. Polish sources specify that upon the defeat of the Tatar army, all the captives were taken back and many horses were seized as well. Immediately after this setback Mengli Giray dispatched a new expedition, this time against Muscovy.<sup>15</sup> These facts are indeed implied in E 6382.

Among the volume's documents from the same period is a remarkable Ottoman map depicting several rivers, along the largest of which are several

<sup>14</sup> See Omeljan Pritsak, "Das erste türkisch-ukrainische Bündnis (1648)," *Oriens* 6 (1953): 266–298, especially 292–298 (appendix 2, "Excursus on Turkish designations for the Ukraine and Ukrainians"). However, in the seventeenth century, Crimean letters to the tsar call him, for example, "padishah of all the *Ūrūs*" or "of all the *Ūrūs* and *Pūrūs*" (to paraphrase, "the Rus' and Prussians"); V. V. Vel'jaminov-Zernov [and H. Feyzhanoglı (X. Fejzhanov)], *Matériaux pour servir à l'histoire du Khanat de Crimée* (St. Petersburg, 1864), pp. 48, 123, and passim. The same *laqab* (cognomen) is applied to Polish kings in Crimean letters (to whom it was probably applied first). For instance, in a letter from Ğanibeg Giray (1628–1635) to Sigismund Vasa it is written *Uluĝ Ūrūsniñ ve Pūrūsniñ . . . uluĝ pādīšāhi*, 'the great padishah of the great *Ūrūs* and *Pūrūs*,' and in a letter from Selim Giray II (1682–1699, 3rd reign) to Jan III Sobieski, *Ūrūs ve Pūrūs ve Leh grāli*, 'king of the *Ūrūs* and *Pūrūs* and *Leh* [Poles] . . .'; Vel'jaminov-Zernov, *Matériaux*, pp. 26, 768–769, and passim. Fekete maintains that the form *Ūrūs* is derived from the Hungarian *orosz*; L. Fekete, *Die Siyāqat-Sc̄irift in der Türkischen Finanzverwaltung*, 1 (Budapest, 1955), p. 58. However, a Hungarian rendering of *Rus'* need not begin with a vowel, since Hungarian has an initial *r*. More likely is that the Hungarian *orosz* is derived from a Turkic rendition of *Rus'*, since Turkic has no initial *r*. Cf. the passage in *Ta'riḥ-i Mas'ūdī*, written in Persian in the eleventh century, where *Ūrūs* occurs, presumably as a loanword from Turkic: Omeljan Pritsak, *The Origins of Rus'*, vol. 1: *Old Scandinavian Sources other than the Sagas* (Cambridge, Mass., 1981), p. 449. In any case, in the documents in our volume, *Mosqov* and *Mosqovlu* are the designations for Russians even in the eighteenth-century texts for which facsimiles are provided: cf. E 4910 (p. 242); E 12256/2 (p. 256); E 12256/3 (p. 259).

<sup>15</sup> Myxajlo Hruševs'kyj, *Istorija Ukrajinny-Rusy*, vol. 7 (Kiev, 1909), p. 25; Stanisław Herbst, "Najazd tatarski 1512 r.," *Przegląd Historyczny* 37 (1948): 218–226, especially 225.

fortresses (E 12090, pp. 79–80, and foldout). The editors agree with Zygmunt Abrahamowicz, who has argued that it is a map of the Ukraine from the end of the fifteenth or beginning of the sixteenth century (1495–1504 or 1506), that the main river is the Özi or Dnieper, and that the fortresses are those of Čerkez Kermān or Čerkasy, Min Kermān or Kiev, Özi or Očakiv, and Oster.<sup>16</sup> The map also depicts several galleys and smaller boats sailing up the Dnieper past Očakiv toward Čerkasy. The map's inscription indicates that this was a blueprint for an Ottoman expedition to destroy the Dnieper rapids with explosives and thereby allow their large ships to navigate up the Dnieper and capture Kiev.<sup>17</sup> In my opinion, however, some difficulties still remain in dating this map. Abrahamowicz's main reason for dating it before 1504 or 1506 was that these are the dates for the construction and first mention in the sources, respectively, of Islām Kermān, which is not depicted on the map.<sup>18</sup> However, since the map presumably also depicts the Dniester, with Braclav and Lviv noted as large villages but without any indication of Kaniv on the Dnieper or Aqkermān at the mouth of the Dniester, the map must be regarded as a none-too-accurate representation of the region. The depiction of Čerkasy as one of the most strongly fortified points on the map deserves scrutiny. Although it existed already in the fifteenth century, the fortress was refortified at the beginning of the sixteenth century and then in 1549 a new, stronger fortress was constructed. A description of the new fortress mentions a building with a large room and storehouse that was situated next to the wall.<sup>19</sup> This may indeed be the towered building next to the wall depicted in the map. Again, however, one must take care not to take the details depicted on the map too literally.

On the reigns of Meḥmed Giray (1514 or 1515–1523), Sa'adet Giray (1524–1532), and Šāhib Giray (1532–1551), there is a handful of documents, providing information on the intermittent struggles between the tribal aristocracy and the khan and on the relations of each of these parties with the Porte. E 6474 (pp. 106–110; undated, ca. 1523) is an unsigned letter whose author, according to Inalcik, may have been Baḥtiyār, *beg* of the Širins; it contains some important genealogical data on the Širin clan that contradicts information given by Muscovite sources (see below, p. 000). E 1308(1301)/2 (pp. 110–117) is an undated report (ca. 1521) from Khan Meḥmed Giray I to Sultan Süleymān, discussing problems in Crimean relations with Poland and

<sup>16</sup> Zygmunt Abrahamowicz, "Staraja tureckaja karta Ukrainy s planom vzryva dneprovskix porogov i ataku tureckogo flota na Kiev," in *Vostočnye istočniki po istorii Jugo-Vostočnoj i Centralnoj Evropy*, ed. A. S. Tveritinova (Moscow, 1969), pp. 76–97.

<sup>17</sup> See the foldout map between pp. 79 and 80 of the *Le Khanat de Crimée*, and Abrahamowicz, "Karta Ukrainy," pp. 84, 87.

<sup>18</sup> Abrahamowicz, "Karta Ukrainy," pp. 84–86.

<sup>19</sup> *Istorija mist i sil Ukrajins'koji RSR*, vol. 18: *Čerkas'ka oblast'* (Kiev, 1972), pp. 88–89.

Muscovy and the Khanate of Kazan's difficulties with the latter. The khan also discusses an interesting development outside the Crimea, to which I believe the editors have given a somewhat forced interpretation. The text reads as follows:

and to the locality where the Nogay tribe, whom we had previously taken, resides, a numerous group known as *qazaqs* has migrated and settled together with their khan and they continually spy on these parts. If it becomes possible to march in the direction of the king [of Poland], then they will combine with our old enemy, the khan of Astrakhan, and come and lay waste to the land. . . .

The commentary claims that *qazaq* is a reference to the Don Cossacks and that therefore this is one of the earliest mentions of them. However, such an interpretation presents some problems. Khan Mehmed Giray says that this group has a khan. Were this document from the seventeenth century, when Činggisid traditions were already well on the wane, such an appellation for a leader of a non-Turkic and non-Muslim group would be possible;<sup>20</sup> for instance, in seventeenth-century letters from Crimean khans and notables to Moscow the tsar is called "imperial khan and great *beg*."<sup>21</sup> However, this particular document is from 1521, a time when Činggisid traditions were still a vital part of the political life of the region. In this period it would be very surprising for a Činggisid such as Khan Mehmed Giray I to apply to a non-Turkic, non-Muslim, and above all non-Činggisid leader the charismatic imperial title of "khan." To argue that Slavic Cossacks were the referent would require another clear-cut example of a leader of a Christian and non-Turkic group being called khan by another Činggisid. As is well known, *qazaq* was commonly a designation for individuals or groups who were outside the legitimate (i.e., Činggisid) authority, in this context, that of the Crimean khan. Dissatisfied elements — often members of the tribal aristocracy or even Činggisid rivals of the Crimean khan — would leave the latter's domain and go out into the steppe with their followers to make their fortune (an action called *qazaq čiqmaq*). The region of the Lower Don was an age-old refuge for such *qazaqs* from the Crimea and the Caucasus region, and for some from the northern countries. Most likely Mehmed Giray was referring to such Tatar *qazaqs*, although some Slavic elements could well have been among them, as well. What is almost certain is that their leader, i.e., their khan, was a Tatar, perhaps even a Činggisid, and that this group of *qazaqs* was not the Don Cossacks as we know them.

<sup>20</sup> I do not mean to say that being Turkic or Muslim was a prerequisite for Činggisid claims or for the use of the title khan. The originators of the Činggisid traditions, namely the Mongols, were not Turks and often not Muslims. But by the sixteenth century anyone with such claims would also in all likelihood be both a Turk and a Muslim (in the seventeenth century the Kalmyks were, of course, an exception).

<sup>21</sup> "Köp ħiristiyänniñ pädišähī ħan hem ulu beg Mihayla Fidorovič," literally "padishah of many Christians and khan and great beg Mixail Fëdorovič." Vel'jaminov-Zernov, *Matériaux*, p. 34 and passim.

Among the documents from the time of Şāhib Giray I are two important letters to the Ottoman sultan dealing with the dynastic strife and resulting civil war in the Crimea during the beginning of Şāhib Giray's reign (1532–1551): E 1308, 1301/3 (pp. 121–123, 125) by an unidentified Crimean notable, and E 2365 (pp. 127–129) by *qalğa* Islām Giray, rival of Şāhib Giray. The first writing is particularly interesting for its author's skillful combination of Čingisid, Ottoman, and Islamic ideological motifs in explaining the causes for the contemporaneous Crimean time of troubles. Unfortunately, lack of space precludes a detailed analysis of the relevant text here. Another noteworthy document from Şāhib Giray's reign is E 7246 (pp. 131–133), a summary copy of a decree sent to the khan by the Porte concerning an unidentified Cossack attack on Azov (Azak).

From the reign of Devlet Giray I (1551–1557), there are only two documents: E 2082 (pp. 138–141), a *nāme-i hümāyūn* (imperial letter) from Sultan Selīm II bidding the khan to provide safe passage through Crimean-held lands to one of his royal merchants, a certain Christian named Miḥāl, who was on his way to Moscow to acquire luxury furs for the Porte; and E 1247 (pp. 134–138), a report from Qāsım Pasha, *beylerbeyi* (governor) of Kaffa during the 1569 Ottoman expedition to take Astrakhan, which he commanded.<sup>22</sup> The latter contains interesting details concerning Ottoman strategy and planned cooperation with the khan's forces.<sup>23</sup> After the documents from Devlet Giray's reign, the editors present two apparently minor sixteenth-century documents which cannot be definitely placed in any khan's reign. So, whereas for the first period of the khanate (up to 1515) there are 25 documents, for the rest of the sixteenth century there are only sixteen.

Similarly *Le Khanat de Crimée* contains few documents dealing with the first half of the seventeenth century. There are no documents for 1617–1628, the time of the tumultuous careers of Meḥmed Giray III (1610, 1623–1624 and 1624–1628) and his brother and *qalğa*, Şāhın Giray, whose alliances with the Zaporozhian Cossacks altered the political contours of the region. There is an undated letter to the grand vizier from Ḥantemir (Kantemir) (E 1096, pp. 149–155), chief of the Little Noğays, denouncing the khan for allying with the Cossacks (Zaporozhians) against him and, allegedly, against the Porte as well; the editors suggest several possible datings for it, the most probable being, in their view, sometime during the reign of 'Ināyet Giray (1635–1637).

<sup>22</sup> It should be noted that, as regards the Crimea, the *Mühimme defterleri* are very rich for Devlet Giray's reign.

<sup>23</sup> As the editors note, it was previously published in Tayyib Gökbilgin, "L'expédition ottomane contre Astrakhan en 1569," *Cahiers du monde russe et soviétique* 11 (1970): 118–123. However, the editors should also have pointed out that E 1247 as well as the above-mentioned E 1308(1301)/3 and E 2365 have been previously published in facsimiles and in modernized Turkish transcription in Özalp Gökbilgin, *1532–1577 yılları arasında Kırım Hanlığı'nın siyasi durumu* (Ankara, 1973).

From the reign of Bahadır Giray I (1637–1641) there is a series of reports to the Porte from Piyāle Pasha, a *kethüdā* (a kind of deputy or steward) of the admiralty dealing primarily with Cossack affairs (pp. 156–163). These documents give some particulars about the daily life of Cossack banditry on the steppe and sea and about an Ottoman commander's measures to patrol the region with his land and sea forces. These and later documents show the importance of reconnaissance and of intelligence gained from captured informants (*dil*)<sup>24</sup> in protecting the Turkish domains from the Slavic interlopers.

For the reign of Islām Giray III (1644–1654) the volume is relatively rich in data: there are 21 documents from 1645–1654, most of which deal with Ukrainian-Crimean relations during the Xmel'nyc'kyj period. E 5978 (pp. 167–168), dated 22 Reġeb 1055/14 September 1645, is from a certain Mehmed (the editors suppose that he could be the grand vizier Sulţānzāde Mehmed) to an unnamed *sanġaq beyi* in the region (Aqkermān, Bender?). The editors note that the text is badly damaged and so only two marginal annotations have been translated (22 and 9 lines, respectively). The addressee is warned about an imminent Cossack naval expedition that supposedly has been ordered by the Polish king and the Cossack hetman,<sup>25</sup> and he is ordered to make preparations for defense and to give early warning to the Tatars of Buġaq and the Crimea. However, the addressee is cautioned not to undertake any premature counter-expeditions against the Cossacks before the *şayqas*<sup>26</sup> have actually attacked. The commentary tells us that when in 1645 the Ottomans went to war against the Venetians, Władysław IV, king of Poland-Lithuania (1632–1648), refused to get involved in the conflict despite Venetian urgings, but did prudently raise the Cossack register to 20,000 men. The editors suggest that the Ottomans may have interpreted this “preemptive” mobilization as a preparation for a Cossack naval expedition against them. In fact, Władysław's greatest ambition was to bring about a grand anti-Turk crusade, but he was thwarted by the *szlachta*, which was loath to provide the

<sup>24</sup> *Dil* is, of course, used in the same way in Turkish as *jazyk* is in the East Slavic languages. In both cases, the primary meaning is “tongue” and also “language,” but the term can be used to denote a prisoner captured to provide intelligence about the enemy. For lack of a better term in English, I translate *dil* as “informant.”

<sup>25</sup> The editors should have pointed out that between the suppression of the Pavljuk rebellion (1638) and the Zboriv pact (1649), the Zaporozhian Cossacks were deprived of the right to have their own hetman. During this period the highest-ranking Zaporozhian was the *staršyj*, while the former top position of Cossack hetman was held by the Crown hetman. What is translated as “*hetman des Cosaques*” in E 5978 and “*hetman en chef*” (“*bâş hetman*” in the original, according to the editors) in the next document, E 11489 (pp. 169, 171, no facsimile), could refer either to the Polish Crown hetman or Ukrainian *staršyj*, since these two documents both date from before 1649.

<sup>26</sup> *Şayqa*, the Ukrainian equivalent of which is *čajka*, refers to the maneuverable boats used by the Cossacks.

king with a sizable army for fear of augmenting royal power. After the Diet forced him to disband the armies that he had gathered for a Turkish war, Władysław met secretly in April 1646 with three Cossack leaders (including Xmel'nyc'kyj) and supposedly gave them a charter allowing them to muster Cossacks, now his last hope for the realization of his crusading plans.<sup>27</sup> However, no such document has ever been found, and there were many conflicting rumors about the number to which the register could be raised — 20,000 men is only one frequently cited figure. In any event, the plan was never put into effect and there is no evidence that any mustering of Cossacks took place at the time. Furthermore, the plans for the presumed 20,000 register that the editors refer to took place in 1646, so E 5978 cannot possibly be a report in response to it.

E 4391/1 (pp. 170, 171, 173) is an undated report from the *sanğaq beyi* of Qil Burun (Kinburn, on the mouth of the Dnieper, opposite Özi). Although the editors call it a copy, it is obviously an original, since the document has a full protocol and a signature. The editors date it to the end of 1647 or the beginning of 1648. The report tells about a Tatar expedition near the shores of the Dnieper aimed at capturing informants (*dils*) on recent Cossack activity in the region. The mission is successful: from the captured Cossack informants the information is extracted that 120 Cossacks led by a certain “Qanča” have themselves set out in search of Tatar informants in the vicinity of Özi. Furthermore, the Cossack captives report that the Don Cossacks (*Mosqov qazaqları*) are planning an incursion and that a Polish army or more than 20,000 men is ready to come to the aid of the Muscovites. A detachment headed by a certain “Tiškovski” is ready to march. But at this time that detachment has no intention to raid the Black Sea because Poland is at peace with the Ottomans. The Cossacks only intend to capture some informants. If Qanča is not successful, the *polkovnyk* (*pūqūlnīq*), “a chief of 1,000 Cossacks,” is ready to depart on an expedition for the same purpose. Thus goes the report of the captured Cossacks. The editors cannot identify Qanča and Tiškovski. Most likely, Qanča is a Turkish rendering of the Polish “Gandza” or the Ukrainian “Handža,” the name of a Cossack *polkovnyk*<sup>28</sup> who went

<sup>27</sup> V. A. Golobuckij, *Zaporożskoe kazačestvo* (Kiev, 1957), pp. 252–256.

<sup>28</sup> Probably not the same Handža, *polkovnyk* of the Uman' regiment, who is famous for being the leader of peasant rebels and who often cooperated with Kryvonis and with Hira of Bila Cerkva. See [Jakub Michałowski], *Jakuba Michałowskiego wojskiego lubelskiego a później kasztelana bieckiego księga pamiętnicza z dawnego rękopisma będącego własnością Ludwika Hr. Morsztyna*, ed. Antoni Zygmunt Helcel (Cracow, 1864), pp. 95, 148, and Myxajlo Hrušev-s'kyj, *Istoriya Ukrajinny-Rusy*, vol. 8, pt. 3 (Kiev, 1922), pp. 38–40, 49, 52, 72. Cf. references in fn. 220. Also see Xmel'nyc'kyj's grievances, as reported by Koniecpolski's envoys, about the granting of various *slobodas* or settlements with state taxation moratorium to, among others, Handža (whom I consider to be the same Handža named in E 4391/1 who served the Poles and not the *polkovnyk* of

over to the Polish side in 1649 and was eventually ennobled and who is singled out in Polish sources for his exemplary service to the Commonwealth.<sup>29</sup> The Qanča sent to capture informants is undoubtedly this same Gandza-Handža, who made a career of such activity; for example, during the operations around Berestečko in 1651, Polish relations report his informant-capturing activity before the famous battle.<sup>30</sup> As for Tiškovski, he could be the noble cavalryman (*towarzysz*) Tyszkowski in Jeremi Wiśniowiecki's retinue.<sup>31</sup> This supposition is supported by the fact that in October 1647 Wiśniowiecki unexpectedly undertook an expedition deep into Tatar country, as far as Perekop. This controversial and mysterious action by Wiśniowiecki has been variously interpreted by historians, namely, as a reconnaissance mission into the steppes in search of new territory for colonization, as a retaliatory action against the Tatars carried out without the knowledge of the central government, or, as W. Tomkiewicz maintains, as an attempt to provoke a Tatar (and eventually Ottoman) military reaction. This was supposedly done by Wiśniowiecki, an opponent of Władysław's Turkish war plans, as part of a secret concession to the war party. While Wiśniowiecki's forces went in the direction of Moločni vody and Perekop, the standardbearer (*chorąży*) Alexander Koniecpolski went as far as Očakiv or Őzi (on the last day of October) and indeed captured several dozen informants.<sup>32</sup> So it is quite possible that E 4391/1 is an Ottoman view of this enigmatic event on the eve of the Xmel'nyc'kyj revolt.

Another point about E 4391/1: the commentary gives 2 December 1647 (o.s.) as the date of the signing in Moscow of an accord between the Commonwealth and Muscovy aimed at cooperation against the Crimea. But in fact this is merely the date of the reaffirmation of the accord by the Lithuanian delegation which arrived late and with whom the Muscovites refused to negotiate, since an agreement negotiated with Adam Kysil had already been reached. The correct date of signing is 15 (25) September 1647.<sup>33</sup> Since

---

the Uman' regiment). Myxajlo Hruševs'kyj, *Istorija Ukrajinj-Rusy*, vol. 9, pt. 1 (Kiev, 1928), p. 63.

<sup>29</sup> Michałowski, *Księga pamiętnicza*, pp. 507, 520, 521; A. Z. Baraboj et al., comps., and P. P. Gudzenko et al., eds., *Dokumenty ob osvoboditel'noj vojne ukrainskogo naroda, 1648–1654* (Kiev, 1965), p. 478.

<sup>30</sup> Hruševs'kyj, *Istorija*, 9, pt. 1: 277, 278. E.g., in a letter from the Polish camp at Sokal' dated 29 May 1651 "today's *jazyks* were obtained by Janžul, a Zaporozhian Cossack, . . . accompanying him was Handža. Here we understand the usefulness of the Zaporozhian Cossacks: when ours go out in search of informants they cannot capture anything, but Zabuz'kyj, Janžul, Handža — these never go in vain." Hruševs'kyj, *Istorija*, 9, pt. 1: 272–273, fn. 4.

<sup>31</sup> Władysław Tomkiewicz, *Jeremi Wiśniowiecki (1612–1651)* (Warsaw, 1933), pp. 98–99.

<sup>32</sup> Tomkiewicz, *Wiśniowiecki*, pp. 178–179.

<sup>33</sup> A. A. Novosel'skij, *Bor'ba Moskovskogo gosudarstva s Tatarami v pervoj polovine XVII veka* (Moscow and Leningrad, 1948), p. 366, fn. 3. For a discussion of the terms of the accord, with references to a publication of the treaty as well as

E 4391/1 refers to an alliance between the Poles and Muscovites, the editors lean toward dating it to the end of 1647 or even beginning of 1648. Considering that the accord was reached in September and not December, the report could in fact have been issued several months earlier.

Among the most interesting of the documents dealing with the period of Islām Giray and Bohdan Xmel'nyč'kyj are E 3005/2 (pp. 176, 177–178), E 3005/4 (pp. 178–181), and E 2237 (pp. 181–183). All three are undated and addressed to the Porte, with the first two being obviously from Islām Giray and the third being presumably from the *beylerbeyi* of Kaffa (Kefe) if not from the khan himself. The first and third documents have to do with plans, urged by the Crimeans, for a joint Zaporozhian-Tatar expedition against the Don Cossacks, with the aim of putting an end to the depredations of the latter in the Black Sea and around the Crimea, which then jeopardized the security of the Zaporozhian-Crimean alliance. The second document describes a military encounter in which the Tatar-Zaporozhian forces are seemingly victorious over the Poles. In *Le Khanat de Crimée* and elsewhere<sup>34</sup> these documents have been interpreted, respectively, as describing events before, during, and after the Cossack-Tatar victory at Zboriv on 15–16 August 1649. Indeed, the first and third documents, which are concerned with a projected anti-Don campaign, could refer to 1649, although the Crimeans pushed for such a campaign with their Zaporozhian allies in other years as well, e.g., 1650, 1651, and 1652.<sup>35</sup> The crucial document, however, is the second, E 3005/4. After describing the battle, Islām Giray makes a statement which leaves no doubt that the letter was written no earlier than late summer 1651: he announces to the grand vizier the death of his *qalğa*, Qrīm Giray. There is considerable evidence in the Slavic and Turkic sources that Qrīm Giray lived past Zboriv and 1649, and that he survived even after the battle of Berestečko of 28–30 June 1651. Without going into all of the evidence here, I point to letters from Qrīm Giray as *qalğa* dated as late as 1 Ramazān 1061/18 August 1651.<sup>36</sup> Clearly, then, Islām Giray is referring not to the battle of Zboriv and the events of 1649, but rather to the events of mid-1651. In a separate article, I plan to show, on the basis of evidence external and internal to this document, why Islām Giray could have portrayed the events of the summer of 1651, which is known as a time of Cossack-Tatar setbacks, as a time of favorable and even victorious military encounters.

---

manuscripts of it in the USSR and Poland, see Frank E. Sysyn, "Adam Kysil, Statesman of Poland-Lithuania: A Study of the Commonwealth's Rule of the Ukraine from 1600 to 1653" (Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1976), pp. 225–226 and 479, fn. 192.

<sup>34</sup> Chantal Lemerrier-Quelquejay, "Three Ottoman Documents Concerning Bohdan Xmel'nyč'kyj," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 1 (1977): 347–358.

<sup>35</sup> Hruševs'kyj, *Istorija Ukrajinny-Rusy*, 8, pt. 3: 172, 240, 248–249, 251; idem, *Istorija Ukrajinny-Rusy*, 9, pt. 1: 53 ff., 133, 134, 468.

<sup>36</sup> Vel'jaminov-Zernov, *Matériaux*, pp. 446–447 and *passim*.

Of particular significance for the history of the Xmel'nyc'kyj period is E 8548 (pp. 191–196), an Ottoman copy of a letter to the Porte from Bohdan Xmel'nyc'kyj written in Čyhyryn in 1653. While Xmel'nyc'kyj maintained a correspondence with the Ottomans throughout his struggle with Poland, this document is the only known Ottoman translation of one of his letters, although no doubt many others remain in the Ottoman archives. E 8548 was first published by Chantal Lemercier-Quelquejay, and the translation given in *Le Khanat de Crimée* is a reprint, with minor changes, of her translation published in 1970.<sup>37</sup> Since the Ottoman text of this important document has never been published, it is to be regretted that the editors did not include a facsimile in the volume under review.<sup>38</sup> Without Xmel'nyc'kyj's original letter, it is difficult to judge the quality of the Ottoman translation. The language is a relatively straightforward, rather than high-style, literary Ottoman. This, along with the lack of any striking divergence from the diplomatics of Xmel'nyc'kyj's writings, suggests that the translation is a relatively faithful rendition of the original. The letter's main points are as follows: (1) the arrival of a certain Riđvān Ağa with a letter from the grand vizier is acknowledged; (2) the approach of the enemy (the Polish army) is announced and aid is requested in the form of a dispatch of troops with the governor of Silistre and an order to the Crimean khan to come to the support of the Cossacks — in return the hetman promises to render eternal obedience to the Porte and commit all of his forces for any of the Porte's military undertakings; (3) the reinstatement of Ramazān Bey, a friend and supporter of the Zaporozhians, as *sanğaq beyi* of Qil Burun is requested; (4) gratitude is expressed for the freeing of a certain Vasył', who had been seized on his way to Özi to deliver a letter, and a request is made that two other unjustly enslaved Cossacks be freed; (5) reaffirmation of loyal service to the padishah is made; (6) it is requested that an order from the sultan be sent to Qil Burun, Özi, Aqker-mān, and Bender forbidding the taking of Cossack captives in the Ukrainian lands.

The commentary to E 8548 gives a brief overview of Xmel'nyc'kyj's relations with the Porte vis-à-vis his relations with Moscow. Relying on N. Kostomarov's article "Bohdan Xmel'nyc'kyj, tributary of the Ottoman Porte"<sup>39</sup> for references to other pieces in the correspondence between Xmel'nyc'kyj and the Porte, the commentary portrays the Cossack hetman as a shrewd

<sup>37</sup> Chantal Lemercier-Quelquejay, "Les relations entre la Porte ottomane et les Cosaques zaporogues au milieu du XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle: Une lettre inédite de Bohdan Hmelnicki au Padichah ottoman," *Cahiers du monde russe et soviétique* 11 (1970): 454–461.

<sup>38</sup> I would like to thank Dr. Mihnea Berindei for providing me with a reproduction of the Ottoman text which served as a basis for my comments. I plan to publish a facsimile of E 8548 in a forthcoming issue of this journal.

<sup>39</sup> N. I. Kostomarov, "Bogdan Xmel'nickij, dannik Ottomanskoj Porty," *Vestnik Evropy* (St. Petersburg), 13 (December 1878): 806–817.

blackmailer of the two powers, obtaining vassal status from one and then using it to pressure the other into granting him its protection. It is, in my opinion, correct to follow Kostomarov in tracing Xmel'nyc'kyj's repeated pledges of submission to the Porte even past the Treaty of Perejaslav (1654). However, the commentary relies too much on Kostomarov's article, first published over one hundred years ago, which Hruševs'kyj has called "more of a political pamphlet than a historical study."<sup>40</sup> Thus, the editors maintain that the correspondence began in February 1649, and make no mention of Omeljan Pritsak's contention that direct relations between Xmel'nyc'kyj and the Porte were already underway in June–August 1648.<sup>41</sup> Following Kostomarov, a wrong Christian date — December 1650 — is given for the letter from the Porte dated Rebi' I 1061. The correct date is 22 February–23 March 1651. The editors seem unaware that the latter letter was published in a deluxe facsimile edition by Joseph von Hammer-Purgstall.<sup>42</sup> The commentary is also mistaken about the date for Xmel'nyc'kyj's letter to the grand vizier, in which the hetman offers 40,000 Zaporozhians to the service of the Porte. The editors, citing Hammer's *Geschichte des Osmanischen Reiches*, which summarizes the Ottoman chronicler Na'imā, give the date as December 1651. In fact, both Hammer and Na'imā give December 1652 as the date of the letter.<sup>43</sup>

The commentary somewhat complacently accepts a tendentious and polemical commonplace in Soviet historiography — namely, "vossoedinenie," the so-called reunification of the Ukraine with Russia — by stating that after the treaty of Žvanec' (December 1653) "the traditional alliances renewed them-

<sup>40</sup> Myxajlo Hruševs'kyj, "Z pryvodu lystuvannja B. Xmel'nyc'koho z Otoman-s'koju Portoju," *Ukrajina*, 1930, no. 42 (June–August), pp. 3–7, especially p. 5.

<sup>41</sup> Pritsak, "Bündnis (1648)."

<sup>42</sup> Kostomarov got December 1650 from a Polish translation of the original Ottoman text made in 1789 by Antonius Crutta, chief dragoman of eastern languages to the Polish Crown. Hammer repeated Crutta's mistake when he published a giant-sized facsimile of this document (in original dimensions: 70 × 130 cm), along with Crutta's Polish translation, and his own French translation, as a supplement in a Kiev archeographic series: "Gramota Sultana Tureckogo Moxammeda IV, Bogdanu Xmel'nickomu i vsem vojsku Zaporoz'komu. V dekabre 1650," in *Pamjatniki izdannye Vremennoju Kommissieju dlja razroba drevnix aktov* 3 (1852): 436–440. Hammer's deluxe publication seems to have been destined for oblivion. It was overlooked by Kostomarov, Smirnov (who told his readers that the facsimile alone was sent to him by a friend in the Crimea, but that he did not have the faintest idea where and by whom it was published: "gde to i kem to nalitografirovan fac-simile. Po vsej verojatsnosti, on izdan v Vene, sudja po tšcatel'nosti i izjaščestvu litografskoj raboty . . .," Smirnov, *Krymskoe xanstvo*, p. 550, fn. 2), Babinger, and Rypka, among others, and seemingly forgotten until Hruševs'kyj. Having already pointed out the mistaken date in 1928 (Hruševs'kyj, *Istorija*, 9, pt. 1: 136, fn. 1) he brought it to the attention of orientalists in his 1930 article "Z pryvodu." Now it seems to have been forgotten once again.

<sup>43</sup> Joseph von Hammer-Purgstall, *Geschichte des Osmanischen Reiches*, vol. 5 (Pest, 1829), p. 579.

selves: from one side Poland the khanate and Ottoman Empire, from the other side Muscovy and the Zaporozhians.”<sup>44</sup> But the greatest failing in the commentary to Xmel’nyč’kyj’s letter is that twentieth-century contributions to the problem of Xmel’nyč’kyj’s relations with the Ottomans are not taken into account. Since Hammer, Kostomarov, and Smirnov, there have been other important contributions to precisely this problem, not the least of which is the series of articles by the Czech orientalist, Jan Rypka, on copies of Ottoman letters to Xmel’nyč’kyj found in the so-called Göttingen Codex.<sup>45</sup> In these articles, Rypka provided facsimiles, Arabic-script texts, translations, and analyses of a total of seven Ottoman documents relating to Xmel’nyč’kyj.

A consideration of the Ottoman documents treated by Rypka would have added much to our picture of Xmel’nyč’kyj’s relations with the Porte. It so happens that a document in Rypka’s third article on this subject has a direct bearing on E 8548.<sup>46</sup> The document in question is a copy of a letter from the grand vizier to the hetman which, it states, accompanied the return of “accidentally” enslaved Cossack envoys. There can be little doubt that this letter, which stresses the inviolability of all envoys coming to or going from the Porte and whose tone is almost apologetic, is concerned with the same incident as E 8548. The relevant passage is as follows:

. . . since [my, i.e., Grand Vizier Tarḥunḡi Aḥmed Pasha’s (June 1652–March 1653)] coming to the grand vizierate there has been no lack of men coming and going from every direction to the threshold of good fortune with letters of subservience [*‘ubūdiyyetnāme*]. From you, our friend, neither a letter nor a man has arrived. While waiting for news from your direction explaining the reason for this, from Ramazān Beg, who was previously the governor of Qil Burun, it was heard that when men of yours were coming from your side to the gate of the center of imperial good fortune to display subservience, they were seized in the fortress of

<sup>44</sup> Of course, Poland and the Crimean Khanate can be viewed as “traditional allies,” given their close links during the early years of the khanate’s independence. But it is clearly anachronistic to view Muscovy and the Zaporozhians (or the Ukraine) as traditional allies, since, despite Prince Dmytro Vyšnevec’kyj’s brief flirtation with Muscovy (late 1550s to 1561), they were never allies before the advent of the Xmel’nyč’kyj movement. In another commentary (E 12142, p. 190) it is curious what Muscovite source is being referred to in the statement: “Le 1<sup>er</sup> octobre, le *Zemskiy Sobor* de Moscou avait décidé d’accepter la *réunion* [stress added] de l’Ukraine à la Moscovie.”

<sup>45</sup> J. Rypka, “Z korespondence Vysoké Porty s Bohdanem Chmelnickým,” *Sborník věnovaný Jaroslavu Bidlovi, Profesoru Karlovy University k šedesátým narozeninám*, ed. Miloš Weingart et al. (Prague, 1928), pp. 346–350, German résumé, pp. 482–498; the first document in J. Rypka, “Weitere Beiträge zur Korrespondenz der Hohen Pforte mit Bohdan Chmel’nyckyj,” *Archiv Orientální* (Prague), 2 (1930): 262–283, is a draft copy found in the Göttingen Codex of the above-mentioned letter of Sultan Mehmed IV, dated Rebī I 1061; J. Rypka, “Další příspěvek ke korespondenci Vysoké Porty s Bohdanem Chmelnickým,” *Časopis Národního Musea* 105 (1931): 209–231. Hruševs’kyj, “Z pryvodu,” is a reaction to the first Rypka article.

<sup>46</sup> Rypka, “Další příspěvek ke korespondenci,” pp. 220–224.

Özi and sold. When news to this effect was divulged a thorough investigation and search were carried out and within one or two days men of yours named Vasyľ Jurkovan (?) and [ ] were found. And those in whose hands they were, were given their price and they were newly clothed. Together with [ ] who is from among our men, an example to [his] peers and equals, may his power increase, they were dispatched to you and sent off with this letter of friendship. . . .

The rest of the letter promises the punishment of those guilty of enslaving the Cossack envoys and the dispatch of necessary military support from either the Crimean khan or Ottoman forces in the Dobrudja, in case of attack by any of the Cossacks' enemies. It also requests the hetman's acknowledgment of the return of his missing envoys as well as a reaffirmation of his loyalty to the Porte. The date given at the end of the letter is 22 Muħarrem [10]63/23 December 1652. On this basis it can be surmised that E 8548 was written about 30 to 50 days (the length of the journey between Istanbul and Čyhyryn) after this letter from the grand vizier was composed or dispatched. Such a date for E 8548 fits in well with what we know of Xmel'nyc'kyj's relations with the Porte in early 1653. Indeed, a new campaign was being prepared by the Poles against the Ukrainian Cossacks; already in December 1652 a mobilization of the Crown army was initiated by the king.<sup>47</sup> A dispatch by the Austrian resident of Istanbul dated 21 February 1653 reports that he has learned that Cossack messengers on their way to Istanbul have arrived at Silistra and that Xmel'nyc'kyj requests Ottoman and Tatar aid against a greatly strengthened Polish army.<sup>48</sup> And, as the editors suggest, the Ottoman chronicler Na'imā's record of the reception of four Cossack envoys in March 1653 could very well be connected with this event.<sup>49</sup>

However, further comment is required concerning the dating of E 8548. While "1653, au milieu de l'hiver" is given in the translation to E 8548 in *Le Khanat de Crimée*, in fact the original gives a more specific date: *orta qiš ayinūñ üçinde . . . 1653* "on the third day of the middle month of winter . . . 1653." While we do not know the actual designation for day and month in Xmel'nyc'kyj's original, it is likely that the Ottoman scribe transposed the Christian-calendar month-name into a solar-year equivalent that was in use by the Ottomans. Among the names for solar months used by the Ottomans were seasonal names, whereby each season was divided into a first, middle, and last part. According to an almanac of solar and lunar calendars included in a seventeenth-century Ottoman correspondence manual, the month of January was considered the "middle of winter."<sup>50</sup> This would imply

<sup>47</sup> Hruševs'kyj, *Istorija*, 9, pt. 1: 488.

<sup>48</sup> *Žerela do istoriji Ukrajinj-Rusy*, vol. 12, pt. 1 (Lviv, 1911), p. 192.

<sup>49</sup> Muštafā Na'imā, *Ravzat el-ħüseyn fi ħulāsāt aħbār el-ħāfiqayn*, vol. 5 (Istanbul, 1280/1863–64), pp. 274–275. Na'imā does not specify the date of the arrival or reception of the Cossack envoys: his account is between other accounts, dated 15 and 19 Rebī II 1063 [15 and 19 March 1653].

<sup>50</sup> "The month of Kānūn-i šānī [January], that is to say *Yanāris* [January],

3 January 1653 for the date of E 8548. Such a dating is incompatible with the date given at the end of the copy of the grand vizier's letter to Xmel'nyc'kyj — 23 December 1652 — if E 8548 is indeed a response to it. It is possible, of course, that the hetman learned of the release and dispatch of his envoys before they actually arrived with the grand vizier's letter, since Xmel'nyc'kyj was in constant contact with officials in the nearby Ottoman border provinces, as well as with the Crimeans. However, it must be noted that both documents are copies and not originals and therefore one or both of the dates could very well be suspect as far as day and month are concerned.<sup>51</sup> While these two documents cannot be given exact dates with certainty, they doubtlessly belong to the end of 1652–beginning of 1653. Together they help to fill a lacuna in our record of Xmel'nyc'kyj's relations with the Porte during the important time when the hetman, through his son Tymiš, was politically and militarily involved in Moldavia.<sup>52</sup> This gap has existed in part because Ottoman sources have not been readily available to historians of the Xmel'nyc'kyj period.<sup>53</sup> Moreover, these two documents are significant because they help to explain why there has been an apparent break in the record: the incident of the seizure of the Cossack envoys revealed by these documents suggests that the gap is not necessarily due to the attrition of the source base, but rather to an actual break in contact between Xmel'nyc'kyj and the Porte for some time between June and December 1652. As for the actual interference with Xmel'nyc'kyj's envoys, while it might have been no more than an accident, it cannot be ruled out that opponents of the Porte's pro-Xmel'nyc'kyj policy, either

---

the middle of winter [*evsaṭ-i šitā*]," Staatsbibliothek, Berlin Hs. or. oct. 917, fol. 169b. For a description of the manuscript, see Hanna Sohrweide, ed., *Türkische Handschriften und einige in den Handschriften enthaltene persische und arabische Werke*, Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland, vol. 13, pt. 3 (Wiesbaden, 1974), pp. 125–126. I thank my colleague András Riedlmayer for bringing this *inšā*-manual to my attention and for providing me with a copy of the relevant part of this manuscript.

<sup>51</sup> Thus, for example, the date of the grand vizier's letter, the copy of which is a part of the Göttingen Codex (Codex Gött. Turc. 29 fol. 101b–102a), could perhaps be the date when a copy of the original was entered into the codex.

<sup>52</sup> Perhaps E 8548 is the letter to the Ottoman sultan from January 1653 listed by Kryp"jakevyč and Butyč in their appendix which lists unrevealed documents of Bohdan Xmel'nyc'kyj mentioned in the sources and literature: I. Kryp"jakevyč and I. Butyč, eds., *Dokumenty Bohdana Xmel'nyc'koho, 1648–1657* (Kiev, 1961), p. 659.

<sup>53</sup> As Rypka has pointed out, neither Hruševs'kyj nor other historians mention any Cossack missions to the Porte or Ottoman missions to the hetman from June 1652 to February 1653: Rypka, "Další příspěvek ke korespondenci," pp. 211–212. However, if Na'imā's chronology is to be trusted, as indicated above, a Cossack mission arrived in Istanbul in December (Muḥarrem) 1652. It is possible that the grand vizier's letter to Xmel'nyc'kyj complaining of the lack of communications from the hetman was already dispatched before the arrival of this mission.

within the Crimean Khanate or within the Ottoman government, central or provincial, were responsible for a sabotage of communications between Čyhyryn and Istanbul. Indeed, these two documents might be clues to the occurrence of such interference, since earlier some opponents of Xmel'nyč'kyj, such as the hospodar of Moldavia, Vasile Lupu, who was cooperating with the Poles, had intercepted letters and envoys from the hetman on their way to Istanbul.<sup>54</sup>

For the rest of the seventeenth century (from the death of Islām Giray in 1654 to the beginning of the third reign of Hāġi Selīm Giray in 1692), the volume has no documents. Turning to the eighteenth century (including the third reign of Selīm Giray (1692–1699), we find that the nature of the presentation changes. Although 126 documents are covered (as compared with 71 for the fifteenth through the seventeenth centuries), there are only four full translations and only seven facsimiles. Here we have more of a detailed annotated catalogue than a document publication (there are 112 pages for these 126 documents, as compared to 167 pages for the first 71 documents): the text of the documents is presented only in summary form, although the commentaries remain rather extensive. Many of the documents for the first half of the eighteenth century are concerned with minor affairs, such as property claims by robbed merchants, skirmishes with Cossacks in the steppes, and denunciations of the ruling khan by disaffected Girays. However, several events are abundantly documented and are of interest to historians of the period. The first reign of Arslān Giray (1748–1755) has 22 documents, mostly concerned with incidents in the steppe involving the Zaporozhian Cossacks (cattle theft, murder of merchants, etc.). This includes more than a dozen letters, dated 1750 and early 1751, involving the governor-general of Kiev, M. I. Leont'ev, the khan, and the Porte, and concern the fate of some Cossacks who disappeared in the vicinity of Özi or Očakiv and were allegedly murdered or sold into slavery. There is an exchange of recriminations and a demand of compensation for lost property.<sup>55</sup> The commentary should have mentioned that 1750 was the year of a massive *hajdamak* uprising in the Right-Bank Ukrainian lands under Polish rule, in which the Zaporozhian Sich, then subject to Russia, also had a part. The unusually high level of Cossack-Tatar confrontation on the frontier that year may have been a reverberation of this bloody jacquerie, since many *hajdamak* units eventually fled to the Sich as well as into Crimean and Ottoman territory beyond it.

<sup>54</sup> Hruševs'kyj, *Istorija*, 9, pt. 1: 62, 132 ff.

<sup>55</sup> A letter in this correspondence, from Arslān Giray to Leont'ev, is preserved in the collection of the former Kiev Archaeographic Commission, now housed in the Central State Historical Archive of the Ukrainian SSR (Kiev). The same archive contains a letter dated 22 July 1745 from Khan Selīm Giray II to Leont'ev concerning border skirmishes between Zaporozhians and Noġays. See Ja. R. Daškevyč, ed., *Kataloh kolekciji dokumentiv Kyjivs'koji arxeohrafičnoji komisiji 1369–1899* (Kiev, 1971), pp. 104, 101.

The commentary points out that among the documents from the reigns of Arslān Giray and Qrīm Giray (1758–1764) are several that were known to Smirnov (apparently from copies in Russian archives) and are referred to in his history of the khanate in the eighteenth century.<sup>56</sup> However, the commentary makes several incorrect statements about references to the Ukrainian Cossacks occurring in these documents. While no explanation is given of “pays de Barabaš” in connection with E 737/11 (p. 231), the entry “Barabaš” in the index refers the reader to “Cosaques zaporogues.” Although without a facsimile of the document we cannot be sure of the exact usage of the term there, we know that “Barabaš” was the conventional Ottoman designation for the Left-Bank Hetmanate (1663–1764).<sup>57</sup> In E 737/14 (p. 223) *qošavi* is first rendered correctly as “chef des Cosaques.” In the résumé to E 737/15 (p. 233), however, it is first rendered as “Cosaques Qošâvi . . . , de ‘Koševoy,’ Zaporogues” and later in the same document it is given as “Le chef de ‘Qošâvi.’” The entries “Qošavi (Koševoj)” and “Cosaques Qosavi (Kosevoj) [sic]” in the index refer the reader to “Cosaques zaporogues.” The term in question derives from the Ukrainian *košovyj* (Russian *koševoj*); in general, it referred to the head of a Zaporozhian unit called “kiš” or “koš,” but in the Hetmanate (1648–1775) the *košovyj otaman* was the head of the Zaporozhian Sich.<sup>58</sup> Presumably, the Ottoman “qošavi” has the latter meaning in these documents, unless, of course, its original meaning was corrupted to mean Zaporozhians. Again, without the original text we have no way of knowing the actual Ottoman usage of this term.

In the résumés of E 737/9 (p. 230) and E 737/11 (p. 231), both allegedly translations of letters in Russian from governor-general Leont’ev, Ottoman renditions of the names of two Zaporozhian *kurens* — “Plastunski” and “Sečrenboyski” — are cited. These Ottoman renditions correspond to the Plastunovs’kyj and Ščerbynovs’kyj *kureni* (platoons).<sup>59</sup> In E 3813/2 (p. 226) a place-name “Miknā” occurs which could not be identified. Since it was on the path of a Crimean envoy traveling from Baxčysaraj (Bāğčesarāy) to Kiev it probably refers to Mykytyn’ located on the Mykytyn’ Rih (on the Dnieper, opposite present-day Nikopol’), the location of a former sich, mentioned by Erich Lassota, and, at the time of this document, a ford and Zaporozhian outpost.<sup>60</sup>

<sup>56</sup> See Smirnov, *Krymskoe xanstvo*, pp. 76–77, 87–88, 88, for references to E 3076/1, E 3811/1 and 2, and E 3811/3, respectively.

<sup>57</sup> Pritsak, “Bündnis (1648),” p. 295.

<sup>58</sup> Pritsak, “Bündnis (1648),” p. 294.

<sup>59</sup> D. I. Èvarnickij, *Istoriĵa zaporožskix kozakov*, vol. 1 (St. Petersburg, 1892), pp. 199–200.

<sup>60</sup> D. I. Èvarnickij, *Vol’nosti zaporožskix kozakov* (St. Petersburg, 1898), pp. 104–106; A. P. Nepokupnyj, O. S. Stryžak, K. K. Cilujko, eds., *Slovnyk hidronimiv Ukraĵyniv* (Kiev, 1979), p. 361.

From the short first reign of Devlet Giray III (April 1769–February 1770) and from the even shorter reign of Qaplan Giray II (February–November 1770) there are 27 and 15 documents, respectively, most of which are concerned with the Russo-Ottoman war of 1768–74. Battle accounts from May 1769 to September 1770 give a good picture of Ottoman-Crimean military coordination.<sup>61</sup> They also contain many Ottoman place-names from Moldavia and the Ukraine, of which few are identified in the commentaries.<sup>62</sup> Of particular import for those interested in this war is a nearly day-to-day correspondence covering the Xotyn siege and the Moldavian campaign from 5 August to 16 December 1769.

The rest of the document-survey for the eighteenth century includes a handful of documents relating to the reign of Šāhīn Giray (1777–1783), his relations with imperial Russia, and the elimination of the Crimean Khanate. The editors have also included seven documents from the reigns of Šāhbāz Giray (1787–1789) and Baḥt Giray (1789–1792) as Ottoman-appointed khans of the Kuban. In addition there are seven documents from the eighteenth century that were unidentifiable or undateable — among these is a list of gifts and payments presented to the khan and other Girays for their military assistance to the Ottomans (1736?), which has been translated in full.

## V.

Turning now to the additional critical apparatus in the appendices, it is appropriate to stress again that besides being a document publication, *Le Khanat de Crimée* is a useful reference work on the Crimean Khanate. The section “notices biographiques” provides us with compendia of much of what is known about thirty-three important figures in the khanate’s history. They include references to relevant documents in this volume as well as to chronicles, and by virtue of their detail serve as a good supplement to the introductory essay. Cited extensively in the biographical summaries is Ananiasz Zajączkowski’s edition of Riḍvānpašazāde’s *Tevārīḥ-i Dešt-i Qipčaq*, an especially valuable

<sup>61</sup> Note that in E 12256/3 (pp. 257–260) and E 12256/4 (p. 260) the khan tries to minimize the full extent of Ottoman losses at Xotyn (1769). In another instance, letters of the khan are accompanied by marginal notes, presumably by the grand vizier, warning the sultan to disregard the contents of the khan’s letter because, according to him, the khan is trying to create confusion in favor of his own interests: E 3811/1 and 2 (pp. 236–238); E 3811/3 (pp. 238–239).

<sup>62</sup> E.g., in E 12255/3 (p. 261) there is a description of a Tatar retaliatory raid into the Ukraine in 1796. There is no identification of “Grande Ternovqa” and “Petite Ternovqa.” These two rivers are probably the Velyka Ternivka and the Mala Ternivka, both right-bank tributaries of the Samara River: Èvarnickij, *Vol’nosti*, p. 161 and Nepokupnyj, *Slovnyk hidronimiv*, p. 560. In the same document, what the editors cite as “Kildjinqa (Kilčinqa)” is either the Kil’čenka, a left tributary of the Oril’, or the Kil’čen, a right tributary of the Samara, but in any event not a tributary of the Dnieper, as the index maintains (p. 448); Èvarnickij, *Vol’nosti*, p. 161, and Nepokupnyj, *Slovnyk hidronimiv*, p. 250.

contemporary narrative source for the early seventeenth century. Regrettably, however, a severely abridged eighteenth-century French summary of the chronicle done by a *jeune de langues* attached to the French embassy in Turkey is cited, even though Zajączkowski also gives a facsimile and critical edition of the Turkish text.

Besides important khans of the Crimea, the biographical summaries includes articles on Eminek, *beg* of the Širins, and Mehmed Emīn, khan of Kazan. These two articles also have genealogies of the Širin *qaraču* begs and the khans of Kazan, respectively. The Širin genealogy is based mainly on the reports of Muscovite diplomats and scribes, who in dealing with the Tatars became very well informed on clan politics in the Crimea.<sup>63</sup> While some of the documents in this volume confirm the data of the Muscovite and other outside sources,<sup>64</sup> Inalcik has pointed out that at least one document of Crimean origin, E 6474 (pp. 106–110) (perhaps from Bahtiyār, *beg* of the Širins), contradicts the information in the given genealogy. On the basis of this document and a special section on the Širin clan's genealogy in *‘Umdet üt-Tevāriḥ* by ‘Abd ül-Ğaffār (who was himself a Širin), Inalcik has proposed a substantially different genealogy of the Širin *qaračius*.<sup>65</sup> Without pretending to have resolved the contradictions in the sources, I can say only that more work needs to be done on this problem and that probably some of these differences will remain, given the limitations of the present source base.<sup>66</sup>

Those doing research on the Crimea and related regions will find very useful a detailed chronology of the reigns of khans (pp. 361–370), which gives their respective *qalğas* and *nūreddīns* (when these latter two are known). There is also a large foldout genealogy of the Giray dynasty, which includes Giray

<sup>63</sup> The Širin genealogy seems to be based on the following materials: G. Th. Karpov, ed., *Pamjatniki diplomatičeskix snošenij Moskovskogo gosudarstva s Krymskoju i Nagajskoju ordami i s Turciej*, vol. 1: *S 1474 po 1505 god, epoxa sverženija mongolskogo iga v Rossii*, Sbornik Imperatorskogo russkogo istoričeskogo obščestva, 41 (St. Petersburg, 1884); G. Th. Karpov and G. Th. Štendman, eds., *Pamjatniki diplomatičeskix snošenij Moskovskogo gosudarstva s Krymom, Nagajami i Turcieju*, vol. 2: *1508–1521 gg.*, Sbornik Imperatorskogo russkogo istoričeskogo obščestva, 95 (St. Petersburg, 1895); Kazimierz Pułaski, *Stosunki z Mendli-Girejem chanem Tatarow Perekopskich (1469–1515): Akta i listy*, *Stosunki polski z Tatarszczyzną od połowy XV. wieku*, 1 (Cracow and Warsaw, 1881).

<sup>64</sup> E.g., in E 3179 (p. 61), Eminek clearly indicates that Hağike is his full brother; this is corroborated by Muscovite sources.

<sup>65</sup> Halil Inalcik, "The Khan and the Tribal Aristocracy: The Crimean Khanate under Sahib Giray I," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 3/4 (1979–1980) = *Eucharisterion: Essays presented to Omeljan Pritsak on his Sixtieth Birthday by his Colleagues and Students* (Cambridge, Mass.): 445–466, especially p. 454.

<sup>66</sup> There are some misprints in the Širin genealogy: for "Bağürgân" read "Bağürgân," and for the reign of Ağıš instead of "1508–1593" read "1508–1523."

princes that never became khans, *qalgas*, or *nüreddins*. Certain gaps or doubtful points in the genealogy and chronology of reigns will surely be filled or resolved as new documents on the Crimea become available.<sup>67</sup>

The glossary contains about 200 terms, most of which occur in the documents, although some are relevant Slavic and other terms that come up in the commentaries. The non-Ottomanist will find the glossary most helpful for understanding the documents and commentaries.

The annotated bibliography at the end of the volume is one of the more extensive on the Crimean Khanate published to date. Especially useful are the annotated survey of source guides and publications and the annotated list of Crimean and relevant Ottoman chronicles. There is also a rare section listing travel accounts by European visitors to the Crimea. However, these features notwithstanding, the value of the bibliography as a reference aid is greatly undermined by its technical shortcomings. The majority of the German entries are garbled in one way or another.<sup>68</sup> Polish titles, besides also often being

<sup>67</sup> We can resolve some points in the chronology of reigns and some doubts in the genealogy noted by the editors and also fill some gaps by using new documents. For example, about Khan 'Ädil Giray (1665 or 1666–1670 or 1671) there is a question in the *nüreddin* (second heir-apparent) column of the chronological table (p. 365). However, Devlet Giray (b. Feṭḥ Giray), in a letter dated Rebi' I 1077/October 1666, refers to himself as the *nüreddin*; see Josef Matuz, *Krimtatarische Urkunden in Reichsarchiv zu Kopenhagen. Mit historisch-diplomatischen und sprachlichen Untersuchungen* (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1976), pp. 166, 170 and pl. X. In the same row doubt is expressed about whether 'Ädil Giray is the son of Aḥmed Giray or Devlet Giray (not the same Devlet Giray as above), and in the genealogy 'Ädil Giray is presented as the son of Aḥmed Giray and the brother of Devlet Giray. However, information in another letter by 'Ädil Giray (b. Devlet Giray) (Matuz, *Krimtatarische Urkunden*, pp. 158, 160 and pl. VIII) is in line with what we already know from Seyyid Muḥammed Rızā, *Es-seb' üs-seyyār fī aḥbārī mülūki Tatar*, ed. Kazem-Bek (Kazan, 1832), pp. 174, 178, 179: namely, that 'Ädil Giray and Feṭḥ Giray were sons of Devlet Giray, and that Feṭḥ Giray had a son also named Devlet Giray. Another addition to the chronology of reigns is Toqtamış Giray (b. Şafā Giray), who at one time was *qalga* to Murād Giray (1677–1683) (Matuz, *Krimtatarische Urkunden*, pp. 227, 230 and pl. XXI); he, too, should be added to the genealogy under Şafā Giray (b. Selāmet Giray). These are only a few additions and corrections. It would be useful to revise and update the genealogy of the Giray dynasty on the basis of new as well as old sources. One example of underutilized material in an old source is Vel'jaminov-Zernov's *Matériaux*, which has many letters from 'Ädil Giray b. Mübārek Giray (a *nüreddin* to Islām Giray III and Meḥmed Giray IV), who is not given in the genealogy. Also, note that "Şaqay" was the cognomen of Rezmī Selāmet Giray's brother Mübārek Giray, and not that of Rezmī Selāmet's son Mübārek as incorrectly indicated on the genealogical table. Finally, a line connecting Mengli Giray I to his sons has been overlooked.

<sup>68</sup> For example, the bibliography gives Rypka, "Brief Wechsel" instead of "Briefwechsel" (p. 406); Babinger, "*Geschichsschreiber*" and "*Geschichtesschreiber*" instead of "*Geschichtsschreiber*" (pp. 410, 411, 416); Zettersteen, "*persischë . . .*" instead of "*. . . persische . . .*" (p. 409). In the short bibliography attached to

garbled, lack diacritics,<sup>69</sup> and some Russian and Ukrainian titles are incorrect.<sup>70</sup> Turkish entries, too, are marred by inconsistent citations.<sup>71</sup> The section listing important chronicles contains several inaccuracies and omissions. It is stated that Zajączkowski's edition of Rıdvanpaşazâde's *Tevârih-i Deşt-i Qıpçaq* is in Qıpçaq Turkic, whereas it is actually in straightforward Ottoman Turkish (the author was the son of the former Ottoman governor of Keefe, and not a Tatar). Furthermore it is claimed that Zajączkowski's edition provides a French critical translation (p. 411); in fact, as stated above, it contains an eighteenth-century abridged translation. For *Târih-i Moḥammed Giray* it is stated that Moḥammed Giray is the son of Hâḡî Selim Giray, whereas he was in fact the son of Mübârek Giray (p. 410).<sup>72</sup> Inalcik has already pointed out that two important Crimean chronicles are not listed, namely, 'Abd ül-Ġaffâr, *Umdet üt-Tevârih*<sup>73</sup> and Ötemiş Hâḡî, *Târih-i Dost Sulṭân*.<sup>74/75</sup> In addition, Zygmunt Abrahamowicz's edition of Meḥmed Senâ'î's chronicle of the reign of Islâm Giray III is not given.<sup>76</sup> Although the bibliography was not intended to be exhaustive, the following works should have been included together with the above-mentioned publications by Ö. Gökbilgin (fn. 23), Hammer (fn. 42), Inalcik (fn. 8), Pritsak (fn. 14), Pułaski (fn. 63), Rypka (fn. 45): Zygmunt Abrahamowicz, ed., *Katalog dokumentów tureckich 1. Dokumenty do dziejów Polski i krajów ościennych w latach 1455–1672*, Katalog rękopisów orientalnych z zbiorów polskich, vol. 1, pt. 1 (Warsaw, 1959); D. Dorošenko and J. Rypka, "Hejt-

---

the glossary we have Hammer, *Staat verfassung und Staat verwaltung*, instead of *Staatsverfassung und Staatsverwaltung* (p. 404).

<sup>69</sup> For example, Zajączkowski is given instead of Zajączkowski (p. 409); Baitosewicz, J., *Poglad na stosunki Polski z Turcja . . .*, instead of Bartosewicz, J., *Poglad . . . Turcja . . .* (p. 416); Aleksander Dubinski, Stanisława Plaskowicka-Rymkiewicz . . . *Księga Pordozy Ewliji Czelebiego (Wybor)* . . . Książka i Wiedza . . ., instead of . . . Dubiński, Stanisława Plaskowicka-Rymkiewicz . . . *Księga Podróży . . . (Wybór)* . . . Książka . . . (p. 416).

<sup>70</sup> The only Ukrainian title is badly distorted. In the transcription system used in *Le Khanat de Crimée*, "Krymskij, A. E. 'Studii z Krimu' . . . in: *Istorično Filigino viddilu Vseukrainoskoj Akademii Nauk . . . Filologična Katedra, Turkologečeskaja Komissaja . . .*" should read ". . . Zbirnyk Istoryčno-Filolohičnoho viddilu Vseukrajins'koji . . . Filolohična Katedra, Tjurkolohična Komisija . . ." (p. 420).

<sup>71</sup> Why, for example, "Tavârikh," but "Dešt" (stress added), in "*Tavârikh-i Dešt-i Qıpçaq*" (p. 411).

<sup>72</sup> See Smirnov, *Krymskoe xanstvo*, p. xvi.

<sup>73</sup> 'Abd ül-Ġaffâr, *Umdet üt-Tevârih*, ed. Neḡîb 'Aşim, *Türk târih enḡümeni meḡmü'ası*, supplement (Istanbul, 1343/1925–1926).

<sup>74</sup> Still in manuscript form. See Zeki Velidi Togan, *Tarihte usul* (Istanbul, 1969), p. 224.

<sup>75</sup> Inalcik, "Tribal Aristocracy," fn. 5.

<sup>76</sup> Qırımli Hâḡî Meḥmed Senâ'î, *Üçünḡü Islâm Giray târihi*, ed., trans. and with commentary by Zygmunt Abrahamowicz, with additional commentary by Olgierd Górka and Zbigniew Wójcik (Warsaw, 1971).

man Petr Dorošenko a jeho turecká politika," *Časopis Národního Musea* (Prague), 107 (1933): 1–55; D. Dorošenko and J. Rypka, "Polsko, Ukrajina, Krym a Vysoká Porta v první pol. XVII. stol.," *Časopis Národního Musea* 109 (1935): 19–49; Evlija Čelebi, *Kniga putešestvija. Izvelečenija sočinenija tureckogo putešestvennika XVII veka: Perevod i komentarii*, no. 1: *Zemli Moldavii i Ukrainy*, ed. A. S. Tveritina (Moscow, 1961); Walther Hinz, "Zwei Steuerbefreiungs-Urkunden," in *Documenta Islamica Inedita*, ed. J. W. Fück (Berlin, 1952), pp. 211–230; Fuad M. Köprülü, "Altın Ordu'ya ait yeni araştırmalar," *Belleten* 5 (1941): 397–436; S. E. Malov, "Izučenie jarlykov i vostočnyx gramot," in *Akademiku Vladimiru Aleksandroviču Gordelevskomu k ego semidesjatiletiju: Sbornik statej* (Moscow, 1953), pp. 187–195; Kazimierz Pułaski, "Machmet-Girej, chan Tatarów perekopskich i stosunki jego z Polską (1515–1523)," in *Szkice i poszukiwania historyczne*, vol. 2 (St. Petersburg, 1898), pp. 281–350; Helmuth Scheel, "Ein Schreiben des Krim Giraj Khan an den Prinzen Heinrich, den Bruder Friedrichs des Grossen," *Jean Deny Armağanı*, ed. János Eckmann et al. (Ankara, 1958), pp. 213–220; Abdullah Zihni Soysal, *Z dziejów Krymu: Polityka — kultura — emigracja*, *Prace Młodzieży Krymskiej na emigracji*, 1 (Warsaw, 1938).

The indexes of personal names and geographical names are rather extensive and cover both the document translations and the commentaries. Occasionally entries in the geographical index are incorrectly or misleadingly identified. Thus, for example, under Arad the reader is referred to Varad, correctly identified as a town in Transylvania. However, Arad is a town 100 km. south of Várád, an abbreviation for the Hungarian Nagyvárad, today in Romanian called Oradea-Mare. A key fortified town of the region, Várád was held by the Ottomans from 1661 to 1692. The commentary in which Várád is mentioned refers to the Habsburg siege of 1692 (p. 303), whereas Arad had already been taken by the Habsburgs seven years before, in 1685. Referring to the same context, the index identifies the fortress of Yanova as a locality in Moldavia, which would put the Habsburg armies somewhere east of the Carpathians. In fact, Yanova was the Turkish name for the castle of Jenő (Romanian Ineu) on the edge of the Great Hungarian Plain, halfway between Várád and Temesvár (Timișoara). For another example, in the index Ujvar is identified merely as "ville de Hongrie," a designation which would make it very difficult to locate on modern maps. A short name for the old Hungarian fortress Érsekújvár (held by the Ottomans 1663–1685), Újvár can be located on modern maps as the town of Nové Zámky in Czechoslovakia, which the index should have indicated.

On the whole, the volume could have been more carefully proofread and edited, given the reputation of the publisher, Mouton, and its price.<sup>77</sup> I have

<sup>77</sup> The following is a partial list of misprints, excluding the ones already mentioned in the course of this review: on the fold-out map of the Black Sea region

drawn attention to inconsistencies and inaccuracies because they defeat the purpose of a critical apparatus as extensive as that in *Le Khanat de Crimée*. However, such objections and criticisms aside, it is unquestionable that the appearance of this volume has done much to fill a void in Crimean and Ottoman as well as East European historical studies. Considering the difficulties in deciphering and interpreting documents such as these, in the future even greater cooperation will be necessary between Turkish and Slavic specialists.<sup>78</sup> For the present, scholars should very much appreciate the great service rendered by the French team in bringing us closer to finally opening the Ottoman archives and unraveling their secrets for the general historical community. We can hardly overestimate the great patience, perseverance, and command of paleography, as well as the familiarity with the history of the region, that made it possible for the editors to sort out and identify most of these barely legible, mostly undated, and often nondescript documents. As both a source publication and reference work, *Le Khanat de Crimée* will

---

there are two dots for cities that are not labeled — presumably the one immediately west of Kaffa is supposed to be Eski Qrım, while the one immediately northeast of Bâğçesarây (Baxçysaraj) is supposed to be Aq Masğid (Simferopol’); on p. 1, for “vezhovenstvom” read “verhovenstvom”; on p. 7, fn. 8, for “Ts.A.G.A.D.A.” read “Ts.G.A.D.A.”; on p. 103, for “E. 6639” read “E. 6398”; on p. 109, for “E. 1301” read “E. 1308(1301)/2”; on p. 130, for “E 991” read “E 9991”; on p. 156, for “juin 1635–octobre 1641” read “juin 1637–octobre 1641”; on p. 231, for “1063 (decembre 1752–novembre 1753” read “1163 (decembre 1752–novembre 1753)”; on p. 251, for “Yağtiqdjizâde” read “Yağliqdjizâde”; on pp. 387–88, the glossary entry “dîl” is interrupted by the entry “djiziye”; on p. 393, for “iltiram” read “iltizâm”; on p. 410, for “1327(1911)” read “1327(1909)”; on p. 445, for “Cosaques Qosavi (Kosevoj)” read “Cosaques Qošavi (Koševoj)”; on p. 448, for “Kilâfâv localité du Budjaq 26” read “Kilâfâv localité du Budjaq 266”; on p. 449, for “Kölenli-Irdje” read “Kökenli-Irdje”; on p. 454, for “Yapunca” read “Yapunča.”

<sup>78</sup> Under preparation is a volume of Ottoman and Venetian documents concerning the activity of Prince Dmytro Vyšnevec’kyj and the rise of the Zaporozhian Cossacks, under the editorship of Alexandre Bennigsen, Mihnea Berindei, Halil Inalcik, Chantal Lemerrier-Quellejay, Omeljan Pritsak, Frank Sysyn, and Gilles Veinstein. Other volumes being planned include Ottoman documentation on the Black Sea raids of the Cossacks and Ottoman sources for the Xmel’nyč’kyj movement. These works are to be published jointly by the Groupe de recherche sur l’histoire médiévale de l’Europe orientale et de l’Empire ottoman at the École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales (Paris) and the Ukrainian Research Institute at Harvard University.

certainly occupy an important place in the sorely neglected field of Crimean and North Black Sea history.\*

*Harvard University*

\* In July 1983, after this review had been prepared for publication, I had the opportunity to work in the Topkapı Palace Museum Archives and to examine the originals of most of the documents published in *Le Khanat de Crimée*. I found that in many cases the editors, perhaps because they were working from microfilms, had missed important information contained on the reverse side of the documents. Such information includes full or partial identification of the author, addressee or date of the document, in the form of short invocatory inscriptions, seals or both. In many cases this shows the editors' attempts at contextual attribution and dating of these documents to have been either superfluous or mistaken. The missing information will be included in my forthcoming review of *Le Khanat de Crimée* in *The Journal of Turkish Studies* (Cambridge, Mass.).