

11. See also for details of the disputes on the establishment of the Khanate of Kazan: Acar S. Kazan Hanlığı-Moskova Knezliği Siyasi İlişkileri (1437-1552) / Serkan Acar. – Ankara, 2013. – P. 89-103.
12. Yakubovskiy A.Yu. – ibid. – P. 210.
13. Zaitsev I. Obrazovanie Krymskogo Hanstva / Ilya Zaitsev // Istoriia Tatars Drevneischih Vremen. – Tom IV. Tatarskie Gosudartva XV-XVIII vv. – Kazan, 2014. – P. 132.
14. Ponomarev A.L. Pervye Hany Kryma: Khronologija Smuty 1420-h godov v Schcheta Genuezskogo Kaznacheistva Kaffi / Andrei Leonidovich Ponomarev // Zolotoordynskoe Obozrenie. – Kazan, 2013. – No.2. – P. 182.
15. See also for the coins (sikkes) made in this period by the names of Bek Süfi, Ulugh Muhammad and Devlet Berdi: Vostochnaia Numizmatika na Ukraine. Sbornik Publikatsii. – Chast II. Monety Djuchidov XIII-XV vekov i sopredelnyh gosudarstv / red. K.K. Khromov. – Kiev, 2007. – P. 132.
16. İnalçık H. Hacı Giray I / Halil İnalçık // İA. – C. 5/2. – P. 25; Ürekli M. Kırım Hanlığı'nın Kuruluşu ve Osmanlı Himâyesinde Yükselişi (1441-1569) / Muzaffer Ürekli. – Ankara, 1989. – P. 5-7.
17. Kurat A.N. Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Arşivindeki Altın Ordu, Kırım ve Türkistan Hanlarına Ait Yarlık ve Bitikler / Akdes Nîmet Kurat. – İstanbul, 1940. – P. 80.
18. Acar S. Kâsim Hanlığı (1445-1681) / Serkan Acar. – İstanbul, 2008. – P. 53.
19. Acar S. Sibir Hanlığı (1464-1598) / Serkan Acar // Doğu Avrupa Türk Tarihi / edt. Osman Karatay-Serkan Acar. – İstanbul, 2013 – P. 781-797.
20. See also for more information: Zaitsev I. Astrahanskoe Hanstvo / Ilya Zaitsev. – Moskova, 2004.
21. About Nogais see: Trepavlov V.V. İstoriya Nogaiskoi Ordy / V.V. Trepavlov. – Moskova, 2002; Alpargu M. Nogaylar / Mehmet Alpargu. – İstanbul, 2007.

Отримано: 15.06.2017.

Mustafa Işık
(Antakya, The Republic of Turkey)

TURLA BASIN AS NORTHERN ROUTE IN OTTOMAN GEOPOLITICAL SYSTEM

Introduction

Prior to the Industrial Revolution, transportation opportunities were very limited in the world. Since road construction vehicles, machines and modern transportation vehicles were not available at that time, transportation could usually be carried out on waterways and roads using rivers, seas, flat plains and mountain passes as far as geographical conditions allowed. Therefore, some navigable roads (major or minor) were of great importance both militarily and commercially in the medieval age and the new age.

A triple road system – the Right Arm (Crimean-Black Sea Trade Road), the Left Arm (Via Egnatia-Cânib- I Yesâr) and the Middle Arm (Via Militaris – Tarik-i Evsât) both in Anatolia and in Rumeli – is known to have been constructed by the Roman Empire and also used by the Byzantine Empire in the land before the reign of the Ottoman Empire¹.

The road system of many Middle Eastern states, such as the Ottoman State, was inherited from the Roman Empire. The construction, maintenance and safety of these roads were assigned to establishments in charge of rear service during the reign of the Ottoman Empire. Especially such groups as derbentçis (pass-guards) and köprücüs (bridge-building specialists) were exempted from taxation in return for constructing, maintaining and repairing roads and bridges². The routes of these roads: The Left Arm; from Istanbul to Ipsala – Gümülcine and from Thessaloniki to Trikala and Skopje. The Middle Arm; from Edirne, Çirmen, Plovdiv and Sofia to Belgrade. Having an important place for the topic of our report, the Right Arm starts from Istanbul, goes through Edirne, passes from Strandzha and Balkan Mountains and reaches the Danube River, from there, it passes through Aydos, Provadia, Dobruja, Babadag and Isaccea, and bifurcates. The road to the east goes through Akkerman, Ochakov (Özi) and reaches the Crimea while the road to the north goes through Iași, Lviv to Poland and reaches the Baltic Sea³. Although the Rumeli Right-Arm was not as active as the military road, which was mainly from Istanbul to Belgrade, it was of great significance for commercial purposes. Especially the demand for grain and meat in Istanbul was met by this road both by land and by water. The presence of ports like Constanța, Varna, Burgas, Akkerman and Ochakov increased this road's importance both militarily and commercially⁴. Connecting to the North Sea through rivers, this road was frequently used by Polish soldiers, merchants and travelers from the North. Moreover, British merchants used to arrive by sea at Gdańsk in the Baltic coast, and then reach Lviv through Warsaw by land. On this route, Lviv was a very important city where all roads from the north met. Following the road first to Iași and then to Ishakjan through the Turla and Prut Rivers, the next destination after Lviv was the Black Sea⁵. In this context, Turla River and Basin was a very important transit route connecting the Black Sea and the Baltic Sea.

Pouring into the Black Sea, the Turla River allowed access to Poland by water and from there, to the Baltic Sea by land and water. There are important for tresses on both banks of the Turla River like rings of a chain. Some of the most prominent ones are Bilhorod-Dnistrovskyi (Akkerman), Bender, Soroca, Ridvanıçse, Khotyn and Kamianets.

The aim of our report is to evaluate the geopolitical importance of the Turla River and Basin which is tied to the Rumeli Right Arm and holds a key position in the North Sea transportation. In this context, the report will firstly address the geographical position of the Turla River and Basin, secondly, the growing importance of the basin following the shrinkage of the Mediterranean trade as a result of the emergence of German Hansa Trade Unions in the North Sea and, finally, the military and economic importance of the prominent cities and ports of the Turla Basin.

Geographical Location and Boundaries of Turla (Dniester) River and Basin

The river called Turla or Dinyester in Turkish has been referred to as by a variety of other names throughout history, such as «Дністер (Dnister)» in Ukrainian, «Днестр (Dnestr)» in Russian, «Nistru» in

Romanian, and «**Tyras**» in Ancient Greek. It is generally accepted that the current name of the Turla River comes from the Sarmat language. Rising in the Ukrainian Carpathians in the Turka region near the Ukrainian-Polish border, the Turla River has many tributaries on its right and left banks⁶. The Turla River flows southward and eastward, passing through Moldavia, and then enters Ukraine again and reaches the Black Sea. Today, the Turla Basin is bounded by Carpathian Mountains to the West, and natural water lines such as Dniester-Bug, Dniester-Prut and Dniester-Black Sea in other directions⁷. The Turla River is 1380 km long and runs through Ukraine for 925 kilometers⁸. The Turla River is also a natural border between Ukraine and Moldova. The area where the Turla Basin is located is 72,100 km⁹.

The Black Sea-Mediterranean Connection and the Prominence of the Baltic Sea

Having been some of the most important centers of the world trade enjoyed by the Byzantine Empire in the first centuries of the medieval age, the Mediterranean and Eastern Mediterranean ports were seized by the Arab-Islamic states from the middle of the eighth century on. In this period, the Western Christian states entered into a major economic depression and underwent significant changes in the political, economic and social order. Despite the Crusades from the West that resulted in bloody wars towards the end of the eleventh century, economic relations between the Christian West and the Muslim East were re-established. In this process, the Italians broke with the uncompromising mentality of the Crusades, and prospered and formed commercial monopolies by launching into maritime trade with the East. In fact, Venetians disregarded the papal ban on trade with Muslims¹⁰. From the beginning of the Crusades to the end of the medieval age, Venice, the Genoese and the Pizalis monopolized first the Mediterranean trade and then the Black Sea trade. Italian traders put new procedures into practice such as banking, credit, commercial letters and paper money that had not been seen in economic life until that day¹¹. All these new methods allowed the Italians to play a leading role in the world trade until the end of the medieval age.

In response to these commercial monopolies of the Italians, German Hansa Commercial Associations emerged and transformed the North Sea and the Baltic Sea into a second «Mediterranean» from the fourteenth century on. The Germans made a breakthrough in the world economy by revolutionizing trade and money operations. They expanded their commercial activities from the Baltic coasts to the inlands of Russia. In the meantime, the economically diminishing Mediterranean trade gradually lost its former significance as it was eclipsed by the trade activities monopolized by the Germans in the North Sea, Baltic Sea and Atlantic coasts, the economies of which significantly revived¹². Shortly after these developments in the north, the Ottoman Empire, as a powerful state, recognized the importance of the Black Sea and the North Sea. For this reason, the Ottoman State began to take an interest in the North.

The Akkerman-Lviv road, one of the most important roads connecting the Black Sea and the Baltic Sea, was largely travelled through the

Turla River. Willing to benefit from the important commercial goods in the region, the Ottoman Empire had to assume authority over the Black Sea to be able to take control of the Crimea-Istanbul and Akkerman-Lviv trade routes travelled both in the East-West and North-South directions through the Black Sea. With the conquest of Istanbul in 1453, the Bosphorus fell under the Ottoman domination and the new target was to seize the northern regions. Mehmed II, also known as Mehmed the Conqueror, began the campaigns for the conquest of the Black Sea to transform it into a «Turkish lake». For this purpose, Mehmed II took over important trade centers and natural harbors in the Black Sea coasts of Anatolia such as Amasra, Sinop and Trabzon between 1459 and 1461. After having defeated the dynasty of the Candaroğulları and Trebizond Greek Empire¹³, he took important steps for the domination of the Black Sea following the subjugation of the Crimea between 1475 and 1477¹⁴.

Bayezid II, the successor of Mehmed II, conquered Chilia and Akkerman during his 1496-8 Moldavian expedition, which completely turned the Black Sea into a «Turkish lake»¹⁵. We believe that it was of great commercial and military significance to take control of the entry and exit of the Danube, Turla and Özi Rivers; three major rivers flowing through Europe and the northern regions and discharging into the Black Sea. The Ottoman Empire seized control of the Chilia Fortress located at the mouth of the Danube River and the Akkerman Fortress located at the mouth of the Turla River in 1484. Having been constructed¹⁶ on the right bank of the Özi River by the Crimean Khanate with the help of the Russians against Poland in 1492, the Cankerman¹⁷ Fortress was also seized by the Ottoman Empire with the annexation of the Crimean Khanate. Since the fortresses located at the mouths of the Tuna, Turla and Özi Rivers pouring into the Black Sea were captured, the Ottoman Empire gained a great advantage both militarily and economically. We believe that these three rivers and the Bosphorus should be considered all together to analyze the Turla Basin and Black Sea economic and military area.

Following these expeditions, the Ottoman State carried out the Expedition to Khotyn¹⁸ in 1621 and Expedition to Kamieniec¹⁹ in 1672 to control the Baltic trade on the Turla River and to prevent the attacks of Poland on Crimea. These expeditions were undertaken for the purpose of ensuring the Turla River's security and launching inland raids on Russia and Poland. The Turla River and Basin served as a critical military base in these expeditions and, therefore, military fortifications in the region were strengthened by the Ottoman State for the security of the Turla Basin.

Military and Commercial Centers of Significance in Turla Basin

As long as the Turla Basin, from the Akkerman in the South to the Kamieniec in the North, was under Ottoman rule, this region witnessed very important political, military and commercial developments. We can tackle the political-military issues in two parts as Ottoman-Polish and Ottoman-Russian struggles. The Cossacks and Tatars surely played an indirect role in these power struggles. For example, the Russians and the Poles sometimes played the Cossacks

off against the Ottoman State while, some other times, the Ottoman State supported the Crimean Tatars in the raids on Russia and Poland. In this context, the most important military expeditions that are directly related to the Turla Basin are the Expedition to Astrakhan in 1569²⁰, Expedition to Khotyn in 1621²¹, Expedition to Kamieniec in 1672²² and Expedition to Çehrin in 1676-1678²³. In these expeditions, the land troops of the Ottoman Army used to enter the Turla Basin soon after they crossed the Danube River by the Isakçı Bridge. They used to move north along the Turla River in northward expeditions while they used to pass from Akkerman to the Dnieper in Eastward or Crimean expeditions. In short, the Ottoman Army used the Turla Basin in any case.

An important part of the commercial activities in the Turla Basin was the Black Sea and Baltic Sea trade, namely the Ottoman-Russian-Polish trade²⁴. The main goods of the North-South trade, which was of vital importance for the Ottoman State, were meat, cereals, captives, salt, fish, fur etc²⁵. While the goods of the South-North trade were olive oil, fruit, wine, silk fabric, etc. For the security of the Turla Basin, which was of vital significance both for military and commercial purposes, the Ottoman State collaborated with the Voivode of Moldavia and Crimean Khanate, which were under suzerainty of the Porte. The Ottoman Empire occasionally made peace or war with its rivals; Russia and Poland, in the Turla Basin. The greatest reason for entente or casus belli in the Ottoman-Russian and Polish struggles was Kazak-Tatar raids. In this context, the Ottoman State supported the Crimean Tatars while Russia and Poland supported the Cossacks. The Registers of Important Affairs contain many ordinances sent by the Port to the flag officers, the Voivode of Moldavia and the King of Poland for the mutual termination of Kazakh and Tatar raids. In these ordinances, the Ottoman State ordered sometimes peace and sometimes raids to maintain the security of the Turla Basin²⁶.

The Turla Basin held a key position not only for the Ottoman State's expeditions to Russia and Poland but also for the expeditions to the West and Central Europe. For example, the Siege of Szigetvár in 1566, the last expedition of Suleiman the Magnificent, is important in this respect as certain tasks were assigned to the vassal governments and the Ottoman Beys (principalities) in the Turla Basin. For example, the Voivodes of Moldavia and Wallachia²⁷ were issued ordinances on March 7, 1566 to supply food on the roads and at the temporary resting places for the Crimean Khan's army that was to participate in the Siege of Szigetvár. Moreover, Bey of Akkerman was issued ordinances that stipulated that he provide the Crimean Khan with cannonballs, rifles, castellans, ships and ketches at the Fortress of Or-Ağzı so that his country could be defended while he was on expedition to Szigetvár²⁸.

It is known that the Turla Basin was also important for the supply of food for Istanbul and Saray-ı Âmire (Palace of Manisa). In this context, meat and grain supply from the Turla Basin was of vital importance for Istanbul. For this purpose, the Voivode of Moldavia was issued an ordinance On May 29, 1566, stipulating the delivery of grain to the Palace²⁹. Chilia and Akkerman Kadis (Muslim Judge)

were issued an ordinance on August 15 1565 stating that they should increase sheep farming in their territories³⁰. The Voivode of Moldavia was issued an ordinance on December 27 1579, forbidding the sale of sheep to anybody other than the licensed butchers in Istanbul³¹.

Due to all these reasons, the Ottoman Fortresses such as Akkerman, Bender, Khotyn, Kamieniec in the Turla Basin³² and administrative units subject to these fortresses were of great importance both in political-military and commercial terms. It will be appropriate to briefly describe these fortresses.

Akkerman

Located in the region where the Turla River flows into the Black Sea, Akkerman fell under the rule of the Mongols in the thirteenth century, of the Genoese in the fourteenth century, of the principality of Moldavia in the fifteenth century and of the Ottoman Empire after Bayezid II's Expedition to Moldavia in 1484³³.

According to the description of Eviya Çelebi, the Akkerman Fortress located on the bank of the Turla River was surrounded by a ditch and the fortress was 3060 steps wide from within and 5600 steps wide from without. There were 500 houses covered with wood in the fortress with three gates. It had 180 large and small cannon-balls and a large store of provisions and gunpowder³⁴.

Akkerman was a very important port for the Black Sea and Northern trade during the Ottoman period and had commercial ties with Istanbul, Edirne, Bursa, Kefe and even Syria³⁵. The port of Akkerman located at the mouth of the Turla River³⁶ was an important customs location for the Ottoman and a gateway for the goods from Poland to the Black Sea³⁷. Although the port of Akkerman became very prominent after the port of Kefe lost its significance, it, nevertheless, served as an alternative port and route in the period when the port of Kefe was still of commercial importance. In this context, the Moscow-Istanbul trade route reached not only from the port of Kefe but also from Lviv-Akkerman route³⁸ through the Turla River and Basin to Istanbul and Bursa. According to the data in the Books of Registry between 1569 and 1574, the annual Muqata'ah income of the Port of Akkerman was 293.837³⁹. The data also show that the very same years, the population of the city center of Akkerman was estimated to be 9833; 7960 being Muslim and 1873 being non-Muslim⁴⁰.

Before the Moldavian road from Akkerman to Lviv came into prominence, eastern goods, especially expensive silkworms and spices reached Kiev and Kamieniec through Kefe and then to the North Sea⁴¹. Non-Muslim Ottoman subjects and Turkish and Tatar traders in Akkerman were prominent in the international trade between the north and south⁴². The Ottoman State felt the need to take measures in the face of a significant increase in Tatar population in the Özi and Turla Basins that could jeopardize the security of the Lviv-Akkerman trade route. For this purpose, the Ottoman State established the Yali Ağalığı (command in charge of protecting the coasts) to ensure the security of the Turla Basin and region extending from Akkerman to Kamieniec⁴³. Yali Ağası (commander) resided sometimes in Bender and sometimes in Akkerman to make sure about the security of the region⁴⁴.

Due to its strategic importance as well as the abundant grain and meat production around it, the Akkerman Fortress had a very important role in providing the Ottoman army with necessary food during its expeditions to the North. Therefore, during such expeditions, the Bey and kadis of Akkerman were issued ordinances to supply sufficient quantities of food on the roads and places where the army was to pass, and to keep a record of these provisions on a book and report them⁴⁵.

Bender

Located on the banks of the Turla River in the north of Moldavia, the Bender, formerly known as Tighina, was an important border fortress in the north during the reign of the Ottoman Empire. The fortress was rebuilt after its conquest by Suleiman the Magnificent in 1538⁴⁶. The Bender is said to have been built as a quadrangle on the edge of the Turla River by Mimar Sinan during the reign of Suleiman the Magnificent by request of Tatar Khan. The perimeter of the fortress was 2500 steps. The fortress had a deep ditch, two solid walls and three thousand soldiers. The Russian and Cossack ships stood no chance of passing through the Turla River as the fortress had many towers and balyemez cannons⁴⁷. Although Evliya Çelebi stated that there were 3,000 soldiers in the Bender Fortress, the data on 1569-70 years in the Books of Land Registry indicate that there were 263 regular and dismissed soldiers, consisting of 115 guards of the fortress, 85 marine troops, 29 cavalries and 8 cannoneers. 18 of the remaining 26 soldiers belonged to other military groups and the last 8 soldiers were discharged but still enlisted in the Bender Fortress⁴⁸.

The Bender and Turla Basin had diplomatic significance as well as commercial and military significance. Embassy delegations between the Ottoman State and its neighbors in the North; Poland and Russia, passed through the Turla Basin. In the meantime, the Bey of Bender and the Voivode of Moldavia were issued a provision on 16 August 1572 for the secure passage of the embassy delegations⁴⁹.

Khotyn

The first information regarding the Khotyn Fortress on the right bank of the Turla River in Northern Moldavia goes back to the fourteenth century. The Khotyn, which was a medieval fortress during that period, was under the administration of the Moldavian lords. The exact construction date of the stone structure fortress is unknown. The Khotyn Fortress is located on historic trade routes from Central Europe and the Baltic Sea to Istanbul. The Khotyn Fortress also served as an important military base in the struggle between the Ottoman State and Poland for domination of Moldavia. Although the Ottoman army first came to Khotyn during the reign of Mehmed II, the fortress could not be captured. With the treaty of October 9, 1621 following the Expedition to Poland in 1620 by Osman II, the Khotyn Fortress was left to the dominion of the Voivode of Moldavia, which was a vassal of the Ottoman State. Soon after, recognizing the military and economic importance of the fortress, the Ottoman State built an extremely powerful defense line by building ditches and bas-

tions around it⁵⁰. Evliya Çelebi states that the Khotyn Fortress located on the bank of the Turla River is a thousand and five hundred steps round and has quite a deep ditch. The Khotyn Fortress had about sixty houses and fifty shops⁵¹. The conquest of Kamieniec by the Ottoman State in 1672 made the Northern Moldavia a battlefield again. Afterwards, the focus of the Ottoman conquest turned northward, which made the Khotyn Fortress an important base for military operations. The Khotyn Fortress, which fell under the rule of the Ottoman Empire at intervals, became the most important military and economic center of the Ottoman State in Eastern Europe due to the loss of Kamieniec as a result of the Treaty of Karlowitz signed in 1699.

Kamieniec

The history of the Kamieniec Fortress, which is located on the edge of Smotric water, one of the left arms of the Turla River, can be traced back to the eleventh century⁵². The word «Kamieniec» means «stone» in Polish language, which signifies that the fortress was made of stone⁵³. The Kamieniec Fortress was located on the trade route that reached India and China through Crimea from the north of Italy and Germany through the Baltic Sea. Kamieniec, the center of Podolia, was conquered on August 27, 1672 as a result of a 9-day siege by the Ottoman Army headed by Mehmet IV. With the conquest of this region, the Ottoman State consolidated its power over Moldavia and the Crimean Khanate and began to prevent the Cossacks from attacking the Black Sea. Having contained 6000 soldiers and more than 200 cannons until 1699, the Kamieniec Fortress was one of the most fortified fortresses of the Ottoman Empire together with Baghdad, Budin, Belgrade and Khandi⁵⁴. Evliya Çelebi describes the impressiveness of the fortress in a bit of an exaggerated way by stating that it is a very strong fortress the likes of which cannot even be seen in Czech, Polish and German lands⁵⁵.

Iași

The city of Iași, located in the north-east of Romania today, was founded on the banks of Bahlui creek, one of the arms of the Prut River. Iași was an important trading center of Eastern Europe due to its location. With the conquest of Suceava, the center of Moldavia during an expedition by Suleiman the Magnificent in 1538, the center of Moldavia was transferred to Iași. The close relationship between Iași and the Danzig port on the Baltic Sea shows that Iași was an important center on the trade route starting from the North-South, that is, from the Baltic to the Black Sea and Istanbul. An officer from the Swedish embassy delegation, who visited Iași in 1657, described the place as having an active commercial life especially with Greek and Jewish merchants and expressed the existence of many churches and one minaretless mosque. Iași was, however, destroyed by the conflict between Tatar-Kazakh and the Polish in 1513 and later in 1538 and 1686⁵⁶.

Conclusion

The Turla Basin, situated between the Turla and Prut Rivers, was of great importance for the northern policies of the Ottoman State.

Since the Turla Basin has a very strategic position that links the Black Sea and the Baltic Sea, the Ottoman State and its northern adversaries; Poland and Russia, had struggled for many years for the domination of the region. Other than military significance, this region has rich commercial resources, steadfast fortresses and passages. A great part of the grain and meat consumed in Istanbul and Saray-ı Amire was supplied from this region. Since Istanbul was at the risk of a serious meat and cereal shortage in case of any reduction in the production in this region, the Supreme Court often used to send ordinances to the Beys and Voivods in the region to take measures to ensure the continuity of production. For all these reasons, the Black Sea and the northern regions aroused interest during the reign of Mehmet II and conquest movements advanced in this direction. After the establishment of the Turkish dominion in the region, retaining the Turla Basin and the Northern provinces was very important for the military, economic and commercial interests of the Ottoman State.

Reference:

1. Halaçoğlu Y. Osmanlı larda Ulaşım ve Haberleşme (Menziller) [Transportation and Communication in Ottomans (Halting Places)] / Yusuf Halaçoğlu. – İstanbul : İlgî Kültür Sanat Yayınları, 2014. – P. 95-138.
2. Dingeç E. Osmanlı'da Ulaşım ve İletişimde At'ın Yeri / Emine Dingeç // CIEPO – International Committee of Pre-Ottoman and Ottoman Studies 6. Midterm Symposium Reports (14-16 April 2011). – Uşak, 2011. – P. 517.
3. Doğru H. Osmanlı Devleti'nin Rumeli'de Fetih ve İşkan Siyaseti / Halime Doğru // Encyclopedia of Turks. – Ankara : Yeni Türkiye Yayınları, 2002. – Vol. 9. – P. 165-166; Taştemir M. Klasik Devirde Osmanlı'da Kara Ulaşımı ve Yollar / Mehmet Taştemir // Osmanlı'da Ulaşım (Kara-Deniz-Demiryolu) / ed. Vahdettin Engin, Ahmet Uçar, Osman Doğan, Çamlıca Yayınları. – İstanbul, 2013. – P. 14-15.
4. Ibid. – P. 166.
5. Ibid. – explanation in footnote 13. – P. 174.
6. Access mode: <https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dnister>.
7. Buijs P. Transgranicchny Monitoring Reki Dnestr / Paul Buijs // Analiz i Otsenka. – August 2010. – P. 9.
8. The length of the Turla River is 1352 km in another source. – Access mode: <https://ru.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D0%94%D0%BD%D0%B5%D1%81%D1%82%D1%80>. – Accessed 01.04.2017.
9. UNECE (United Nations Economic Commission for Europe) and OSCE (Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe) – November 2005 – Report «Transgranicnoe Diagnosticheskoe Issledovanie Basseyna r. Dnestr». – P. 4.
10. Mustafa Akdağ M. Türkiye'nin İktisadi ve İctimai Tarihi / Mustafa Akdağ. – İstanbul : Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2014. – Vol. I, II. – P. 480-481.
11. Ibid. – P. 482-483.
12. Ibid. – P. 483-489.
13. Uzunçarsılı I.H. Osmanlı Tarihi / İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarsılı. – Ankara : Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1998. – Vol. II – P. 47-57.
14. Ibid. – P. 132; Öztürk Y. Kırım Hanlığı / Yücel Öztürk // Türkler. – C. IX. – Ankara, 2002. – P. 486.
15. Halil İnalçık H. Kili ve Akkerman'da Ticaret / Halil İnalçık // Osmanlı Devleti'nde Nehirler ve Göller / ed. Şakir Batmaz and Özgen Tok. – Kayseri : Not Yayınları, 2015. – Vol. 1. – P. 193.
16. Karamzin N.M. İstoriya Gosudarstva Rossiyskogo. C. IV-VI / Nikolay Mihayloviç Karamzin. – Moscow, 2001. – P. 510.

17. About the Fortress of Cankerman, see also : Işık M. XVI. Yüzyılda Bir Osmanlı Kalesi: Cankerman (Özü) / Mustafa Işık // Uluslararası Karadeniz İncelemeleri Dergisi. – Issue 5. – Fall 2008. – P. 55-76.
18. Uzunçarsılı I.H. Osmanlı Tarihi / İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarsılı. – Ankara : Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 2003. – Vol. III. – Ch. I. – P.128-131.
19. Ibid. – P. 423.
20. One of the ordinances issued for the Expedition to Astrahan (Ejderhan) on December 16, 1568 and recorded in the Registers of Important Affairs, demands that the Voivode of Moldavia send provisions and 800 horses to Kefe together with his men on Newroz. See : Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivleri (B.O.A). – MD. 7. – Hüküm No:24-25.
21. For the Expedition to Hotin, see also: Kazalak K. II.Osman'ın Hotin Seferi (1621) / Kadir Kazalak, Tufan Gündüz // OTAM. – Issue 14. – P. 129-144.
22. For more information on the reasons for the Expedition to Kamanic and the route itinerary, see: İnbaşı M. Kamanice Seferi ve Sefer Güzeğâhi / Mehmet İnbaşı // Anadolu'da Tarihi Yollar ve Şehirler Semineri Bildirileri – İstanbul : Globus Dünya Basımevi, 2002. – P. 133-153. 82 years before the conquest of the Kamanice Fortress in 1672, the Imperial Council issued an ordinance to the Governor of Rumeli on 24 February 1590 to conquer the Kamanice Fortress on the border of Moldavia and be ready for the Expedition to Poland to be held in the spring on the grounds that Poland was not willing to pay tribute to the Ottoman State. See: B.O.A. – MD.66. – Hüküm No:424.
23. For more information on the Expedition to Çehrin against Russia, see: Uzunçarsılı. – Op. cit. – P. 429-433.
24. The commercial affairs between the Ottoman State and Poland were mostly determined by geographical and geopolitical factors. The Baltic System to which Poland was subject connected to the Black Sea through rivers such as Turla, Özi and Prut. The Ottoman Black Sea was connected to the North Sea through these rivers. The authority of the Ottoman Empire over the fortresses and ports at the mouths of these rivers is of vital importance for the Ottoman commercial and military activities. See: Öztürk Y. Osmanlı-Lehistan İlişkilerinin Esasları, Unsurları ve Aktörleri: Diplomasi, Savaş ve Ticaret / Yücel Öztürk. – Soon to be published. – P. 12.
25. Mehmed Aga, one of the Palace merchants, was sent to Moscow to buy sable fur and similar goods. The Voivode of Moldavia, the King of Poland, the King of Moscow, the Tatar Khan and all the Beys and port bailees on the way to Moldavia were issued strict ordinances on March 25, 1566 to make sure that Mehmed Aga and his men do not suffer a loss, are facilitated and also exempted from customs and tribute (Bac) taxes. See: B.O.A. – MD.5 – Hüküm No: 1311, 1312,1313,1314,1315,1316.
26. For the Imperial Letter (Name-i Hümâyün) sent to the King of Poland on 15 January 1566, see: B.O.A. – MD.5. – Hüküm No: 819; For the ordinances sent to the Akkerman Bey on 6 and 7 September 1567, see: B.O.A. – MD.7. – Hüküm No:151, 168.
27. B.O.A. – MD.5 – Hüküm No: 1192.
28. B.O.A. – MD.5 – Hüküm No: 1199 and 1211.
29. B.O.A. – MD.5 – Hüküm No: 1739.
30. B.O.A. – MD.5 – Hüküm No: 127.
31. B.O.A. – MD.39 – Hüküm No: 149.
32. In addition to these fortresses, Evliya Çelebi mentions a «Soroka Fortress» on the Turla River. He states that this fortress is six hours north of Hotin and subject to Poland and has one thousand houses with gardens. However, he does not give detailed information about it. See: Çelebi M.Z.E., Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi / Mehmed Zülioğlu Evliya Çelebi / compl. Mümin Çevik. – İstanbul : Üçdal Nesriyat, 2011. – Vol. IV. – P. 2495.

33. Bilge M.L. Akkirman / Mustafa L. Bilge // Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi. – İstanbul, 1989. – Vol. 2. – P. 269-270.
34. Çelebi E. – Op. cit. – P. 2474-2477.
35. Bilge M.L. – Op. cit. – P. 269-270.
36. For the Customs of Akkerman, see also: Bulunur K. İ. Osmanlı Dönemi Karadeniz Ticaret Tarihine Katkı: Akkirman Gümüşüğü (1505) / Kerim İlker Bulunur // Omeljan Pritsak Armağanı – A Tribute to Omeljan Pritsak. – Sakarya : Sakarya Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2007.
37. Öztürk M. – Op. cit. – P. 13.
38. Ibid. – P. 12-13.
39. B.O.A. – T.T. 483. – Vrk. 50-51; B.O.A. – T.T. 701. – Vrk. 48-49.
40. Işık M. 701 Nolu Tapu Tahrir Defterine Göre Akkirman Sancağı / Mustafa Işık. – Sakarya : Sakarya University, Institute of Social Sciences, Unpublished Master Thesis, 2008. – P. 51.
41. Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun Ekonomik ve Sosyal Tarihi 1300-1600. – C. I / ed. Halil İnalçık and Donald Quataert, transl. Halil Berkay, Eren Yayıncılık. – İstanbul, 2000. – P. 333.
42. Ibid. – P. 196.
43. Öztürk M. – Op. cit. – P. 15.
44. Çelebi E. – Op. cit. – P. 2494.
45. B.O.A. – MD.19. – Hüküm No: 612.
46. Eyice S. Bender Kalesi / Semavi Eyice // Diyanet İslâm Ansiklopedisi. – İstanbul, 1992. – Vol. 5. – P. 431-432.
47. Çelebi E. – Op. cit. – 2484-2486.
48. B.O.A. – T.T. 483. – Vrk. 158.
49. B.O.A. – MD.19 – Hüküm No: 715 and 717.
50. Kolodziejczyk D. Hotin / Dariusz Kolodziejczyk // Diyanet İslâm Ansiklopedisi. – İstanbul, 1998. – Volume 18. – P. 253-254.
51. Çelebi E. – Op. cit. – P. 2493-2495.
52. Kolodziejczyk D. Kamaniçe / Dariusz Kolodziejczyk // Diyanet İslâm Ansiklopedisi. – İstanbul, 2001. – Vol. 24. – P. 274-275.
53. Çelebi E. – Op. cit. – P. 2498.
54. Kolodziejczyk D. – Op. cit. – P. 274-275.
55. Evliya Çelebi E. – Op. cit. – P. 2498.
56. Maxim M. Iași / Mihai Maxim // Diyanet İslâm Ansiklopedisi. – İstanbul, 2013. – Vol. 43. – P. 342.

Отримано: 15.06.2017.

Борис Черкас
(Київ)

ТУРЕЦЬКО-УГОРСЬКЕ ПРОТИСТОЯННЯ В 20-Х РР. XVI СТ. ЯК ОДНА З ТЕМ ЛИТОВСЬКО-КРИМСЬКИХ ВІДНОСИН

Реконструкція історії татарських держав доби Відродження за допомогою деталізації тих чи інших сюжетів на сьогодні є дуже перспективною. За великим рахунком, мова йде про деталізацію подій за роками, а, за можливістю, і місяцями, а також усіх складових історичної канви татарських країн. В даній статті представлений саме такий мікросюжет, що розкриває контакти Кримського ханату з представниками династії Ягеллонів (Королівство Угорщина, Королівство Польща і Велике князівство Литовське).