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Abstract: Research objectives: This study aims to analyze the reasons, development, and consequences of Şahin Giray Sultan’s Rebellion in the history of the Crimean Khanate, based on data retrieved from Ottoman archival sources.

Research materials: The main sources of data for this research are documents held in the Archive of the Topkapı Palace Museum and the Department of Ottoman Archives of the Presidency of the Republic of Turkey Directorate of State. These documents have been compared with the Ottoman-Tatar chronicles of the period (İzzi Tarihi, Çelebî Akay Tarihi, Tarih-i Said Giray Sultan).

Results and novelty of the research: The most detailed evaluation of the rebellion of Şahin Giray Sultan can be found in Smirnov’s book on the Crimean Khanate which echoes the information given in the Ottoman chronicle, İzzi Tarihi. In the present study, Topkapı Palace Museum Archive documents numbered TSMA-E 408-55, TSMA-E 569-58, and TSMA-E 751-49, as well as the Mühimme Defters and Kalebend Defters held by the Department of Ottoman Archives of the Presidency of the Republic of Turkey Directorate of State Archives, are compared with statements in different sources. In the light of these documents, the rise and progress of the rebellion headed by Şahin Giray Sultan are subjected to a new evaluation. Documents considered important and providing details of the life of Şahin Giray Sultan and the course of the rebellion have been transliterated and presented for the use of researchers.

The Noghays residing in the Bucak region constituted the social base of the Şahin Giray rebellion. The rebellion broke out due to the Porte’s desire to deploy Tatar forces on the Iranian front, the increasing centralization efforts of the Ottoman Empire on the Russian-Polish and Ukrainian borders, and the pressure put on Tatar society for the return of Russian captives of 1736-39 War. The rebellion broke out prematurely after the Porte and Selim Giray Khan conspired to neutralize Şahin Giray Sultan. The extreme measures taken by the Ottoman Empire and the Crimean Khanate prevented the revolt from spreading, and the rebels led by the Şahin Giray Sultan were easily defeated, thus causing the suppression of the rebellion.
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**Introduction:** Collective Violence in the History of the Crimean Khanate

Collective violence used within a political organization to change the regime, rulers of the political community, constitution, or the structure of the administration is defined as political violence or civil strife. Civil wars, rebellions, revolts, mutinies and uprisings are all considered acts of political violence. [1, p. 1107; 2, p. 3–4; 3, p. 133–136]

The historiography of the Crimean Khanate includes studies of the rebellions that can be defined as political violence, and with a few exceptions, they were generally written to document the political history of the Crimean Khanate or the Noghay Tatars [4, 125–146; 5, p.74–113]. Evaluating the rebellions in the history of the Crimean Khanate, which endured for over 300 years as a political entity, can be problematic. Although the Crimean Khanate became a vassal of the Ottoman Empire after 1475, it remained a political structure with its own state organization, ideological legitimacy and ethnic base. Towards the end of the first half of the 17th century, following the dismantling of the Great Noghay Horde, the Noghay tribes began to migrate to the Crimean Khanate and the Ottoman lands, which continued into the first quarter of the 18th century. As a result of the migrations, the tribes and their beys became involved in the political and ethnic structure of the Crimean Khanate as new political actors, and these intertwined facts make it difficult to evaluate the rebellions in the history of the khanate.

The period from 1441 to 1783 saw many outbreaks of political violence in the Crimean Khanate, from major civil wars to small-scale uprisings. Taking into account these examples of political violence as a whole, they reveal two basic forms of rebellion. In the first, the Crimean Khans rose against the Ottoman Porte and rejected the authority of the sultan, while in the second, the Crimean elite, dissatisfied with the administration of the current khan, rebelled to have him changed. The first form of rebellion saw a hostile attitude being taken against the Ottoman Porte, characterized by separatist tendencies. The rebellion of Mehmed Giray II in 1583–1584; the rebellion of brothers Mehmed and Şahin Giray in 1624 and 1627–1628 [7, p.49–91, 149–164; 8, p. 101–116] and the rebellion of İmâyet Giray Khan in 1637 [9, p. 209–224; 8, p. 122–125] serve as examples of this form of rebellion, and all can be considered as part of the phenomenon referred to by Alan Fisher as “Crimean separatism” [10, p.79–92]. In the second category – political violence within the Crimean Khanate – two separate tendencies can be noticed. The first involved members of the Giray dynasty fighting with each other for the throne, which was seen most often at the time of the establishment of the Crimean Khanate, when Ottoman interventions were less obvious than in the later centuries. The struggles between Mengli Giray Khan I and his brother, and Sahip Giray Khan I and İslam Giray Khan I can be given as examples of such conflicts. [11, p.47–68; 12, p.8–14; 13, p. 21–25.]

Within the Crimean Khanate, aside from the struggles for the throne within the Giray dynasty, the second form of political violence that came to prominence surrounded the problems in the internal structure of the Crimean Khanate in which the tribal leaders, who were part of the feudal structure of the khanate, rebelled against the authority of the Crimean Khans. The rebellions of the Karaçi Beys – especially
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1 II. Mehmed Giray emphasized the independent character of the Crimean Khans with these words, “...Ben sâhib-i sîkke ve hutbe pâdisâh iken beni azl u nasba kim kâdir olur ...ve ben başlı başına pâdisâhım ma’zûl olmam ...”, [6, p. 90–91].
the Şirin and Mangut tribes — and those of the tribes of the Great Noghay Horde who became a component of khanate after 1640, can be included in this group. The conflict of the Şirin tribe with the Crimean Khan Adil Giray [16, s.144–145], the rebellion of the Bucak Tatars under the leadership of Gazi Giray Sultan in 1699 [8, p.161–168] and Adil Giray Sultan in 1728 [14, p. 1589–1591], the Baht Giray Sultan rebellion [14, p. 1602–1603] that flared intermittently in the Kuban region in the first quarter of the 18th century, and the Yedisan Noghay Rebellion of 1756–1758 [5, 84–108; 29, p. 151–157] were examples of the political violence that broke out within the khanate.

It should be clarified here that classification of the political violence in the Crimean Khanate is no easy task, as the rebellions that took place in the history of the khanate were all intertwined in some way.

Who was Şahin Giray Sultan?

Şahin Giray Sultan was the son of Adil Giray Sultan, himself one of the sons of the famous Hacı Selim Giray Khan. During the reign of Saadet Giray Khan II, he was assigned the post of nureddin, and kalgay under the reign of Mengli Giray Khan II. Shortly after being removed from the post of kalgay, he assumed the leadership of the Bucak Noghay rebellion against the Saadet Giray Khan in 1724–1725. After the rebellion was quashed, he was pardoned and resided in the Rumelia for a while. In the third reign of Kaplan Giray Khan I, he was once again appointed as kalgay. Adil Giray Sultan died when Russian forces launched an invasion of the Crimean Peninsula, following the arrival in Crimea of the new khan Feth Giray Khan II [15, p. 81, 83, 87, 89; 17, p. 426–427, 432–440].

The first mention of Şahin Giray Sultan — the son of a dynamic and active father — can be found in the records of French consul A. Yavorka, who served in Crimea for some time, until 1736. A. Yavorka placed Şahin Giray Sultan in sixth place among the members of the Giray family in the order of importance [18, p. 137]. In the Ottoman sources, he is first recorded in 1737 due to a problem with his annual salary (salyane)2. Then there are two different documents, one from 1740 and the other from 1741, describing him as the serasker of Bucak 3. Şahin Giray Sultan, who was appointed to the post of nureddin after 1741, and as kalgay on January 28, 17444, thus becoming the second in command in the Crimean Khanate. In the 18th century, the male members of the Giray dynasty could hold the posts of kalgay, nureddin, and the seraskerliks of the Bucak, Yedisan, and Kuban regions within the Crimean Khanate. Thus, Şahin Giray Sultan held all the highest-ranking offices in the Crimean Khanate and served at all career levels of a Chinggisid prince.

According to Hurremi Abdullah Efendi, the most important act of Şahin Giray Sultan in his role as kalgay was the Circassian Campaign. During this successful expedition, 600–700 slaves were captured, to the great satisfaction of the Ottoman Porte [19, folio 111b]. That said, another chronicler of the period, Said Giray Sultan, put forward a different description of the event, claiming that the chief of the

---

2 Department of Ottoman Archives of the Turkish Presidency State Archives of the Republic of Turkey henceafter BOA. BOA, Ali Emiri, SMHD I (Sultan Mahmud I) 773.
3 BOA, Divan-i Hümayun Sicilati Mühimme Defterleri henceafter, A.DVNS.MHM 147, p. 246/905; p. 329/1157.
4 BOA, Cevdet Eyalet-i Mümtaze henceafter C. MTZ 198.
Kömürköy tribe was invited to Crimea and was arrested upon his arrival to the peninsula. In a subsequent message to the Kömürköy tribe, they were told that their chief would be released on the condition that a thousand captives would be given to the Crimean Khanate. In the ongoing negotiations, it was agreed that the Circassian chief would be released in exchange for 800 slaves. After this agreement was struck, Şahin Giray Sultan went to the Caucasus with his retinue and a military force of 5000 men, and after accepting the captives, he returned the Circassian chief to his tribe. Another important event in this campaign involved the relocation of the Kasay and Kaspulat Noghay tribes. Upon the order of Selim Giray Khan, parts of these tribes were brought to the Crimean Peninsula, where they were settled in the villages devastated by the war [20, 105a-b, 114b].

**The Causes and Expansion of the Şahin Giray Rebellion**

Literature on the rebellion of Şahin Giray Sultan is very limited, with the most elaborate account being found in Smirnov’s book on the history of the Crimean Khanate. Smirnov’s account of the rebellion of Şahin Giray Sultan is a summary of the section of the chronicle Tarih-i İzzî [21, p. 503]. Aside from the work of Smirnov, İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı also provides a concise account of the rebellion. [22, p. 21, footnote 1].

The first events contributing to Şahin Giray Sultan’s decision to launch a rebellion began with the enthronement of Selim Giray II to the Crimean Khanate. Selim Giray Khan II inflicted violent punishments against his opposition in Crimea as a means of strengthening his authority. Even the governors of cities such as Hotin, Bender, and Akkerman on the Black Sea were informed about this policy of the Khan. The Porte issued orders that no Tatars fleeing Crimea to the Ottoman territory should be granted asylum and no one would be allowed to come without the “yarlıg” of khan.5

The problem in the khanate dated back to the reign of Selamet Giray Khan II. The 1736–1739 Ottoman-Russian War concluded with the signing of the Treaty of Belgrade, under which captives taken from Russians were to be returned. Selamet Giray Khan II, however, failed to return the captives and was dethroned. The new khan, Selim Giray Khan II, carried out this task vigorously, leading the Tatars to refer to him as “Katı”, meaning severe and harsh [15, p. 92]. The primary reason for the opposition to the khan was his violent behavior and the issue of returning the captives. It is likely that Şahin Giray Sultan got closer to the opposition groups during this period and became their leader.

What was the motivation behind the rebellion of Şahin Giray Sultan? According to İzzi Süleyman Efendi -the official chronicler of the period- Şahin Giray Sultan had been removed from the post of kalgay and was ordered to return to his manor in the town of Enez. After being notified of the decision, Şahin Giray Sultan, with unfounded fears for his life, opted not to return to Enez, and left his farm stating his intention to visit Selim Giray Khan II, but fled to Poland. Misleading and provocations of his followers and friends and disobeying the orders of the Ottoman administration and the Crimean Khan fueled the fears of Şahin Giray Sultan,
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5 BOA, A.DVNS.MHM 150, p. 201/738. The date of the document is 6–15 January 1.
leading up to the rebellion [23, p. 526–527]. The statements of İzzi Süleyman Efendi were almost found in the same way in the mühimme defters of the period.6

Were Şahin Giray Sultan’s fears groundless, being only empty delusions? Was he really in no danger? The Topkapı Palace Archives contain three documents relating to these events7, among which is the correspondence of Selim Giray Khan II with the Ottoman administration which makes no mention of Şahin Giray Sultan’s name, although there is no doubt that he is the person referred to as "şahs-ı mâhud" (known person) in the document. All of these documents bear the seal of Selim Giray Khan II. In three of these documents, the date is not indicated although one document in the Topkapı Palace Archive (numbered 408/55), gives an exact date of November 5, 1746, which helps us understand the chronological order of the events. The decision to take action against Şahin Giray Sultan in 1746 before Selim Giray Khan II’s visit to Istanbul is clearly stated in these documents, in which it can be further understood that in the first phase of this conspiracy, Şahin Giray Sultan was ordered to go to the Bender. In Bender, in cooperation with Serasker of Bucak Hacı Giray Sultan, Bender Muhaflı Muhsinzade Mehmed Paşa and the commander of the volunteers Ibrahim Aga, the plan was to capture and eliminate Şahin Giray Sultan (ahz u ıstisâli), although state officials close to Şahin Giray Sultan warned the former kalgay about the plan, compelling him not go to Bender, but instead into hiding in the steppe surrounding the Bender.8

Despite the failure of the plan to eliminate Şahin Giray Sultan, at the beginning of 1747, Selim Giray Khan II removed him from the post of kalgay, and the Porte ordered Şahin Giray Sultan to return to the town of Enez. In an edict (ferman), sent by the Porte to the officials on the border of Lehistan (Poland), and to the hospodars of Boğdan (Moldavia) and Eflak (Wallachia), Şahin Giray Sultan was ordered to be taken into custody, but with respect. The edict also stated that if the sultan was captured, he was not be released until a new order came from the Crimean Khan.9 On June 30, 1747, a new edict (ferman) was issued, addressed to Şahin Giray Sultan, stating that he had been dismissed from the post of kalgay, but that his crimes up to that time had been pardoned. Şahin Giray Sultan was reminded that when the descendants of Chinggis Khan were dismissed from their posts, they returned to their farms in the Ottoman Rumelia, where they continued their lives in their manors, and the Porte stated that the same attitude was expected from him, ordering him to go to Yanbolu and to reside on his farm.10

It can be understood from the archival records that Şahin Giray Sultan disobeyed the orders of the Porte, and fled to Poland in the earliest days of November 1747. Thereupon, the Ottoman Porte ordered the state officials in Bender and Hotin, and the hospodars of Boğdan and Eflak, not to allow anyone from the Tatar
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6 BOA, A.DVNS.MHM 153, p.67/205.
7 TSMA-E 408/55; 569/58 and 751/49. In the book Le Khanat de Crimée dans les Archives du Musée du Palais de Topkapı provides a summary of these documents and presents further information. However, these documents were not evaluated in the context of the Şahin Giray Sultan rebellion. [30, p. 217–220]
8 Topkapı Sarayî Müzesi Arşivi-Evrak henceafter TSMA-E 408-55; TSMA-E 569-58, TSMA-E 751-49.
9 BOA, A.DVNS.MHM 153, p. 67, h.205.
10 BOA, A.DVNS.MHM 153, p. 69–70/218.
communities to cross the border into Poland to communicate with or visit the Şahin Giray Sultan. The Porte’s intentions in this regard were to isolate Şahin Giray Sultan by cutting his ties with the Tatar Hordes in Bucak and Yedisan, although it became apparent that the Porte was unable to achieve this goal, as, despite the efforts of the Ottoman administration, the rebellion broke out.

In December 1747, vizier Numan Pasha, who was serving in Bender, reported the developments surrounding the Şahin Giray Sultan situation to Istanbul. The report stated that Şahin Giray Sultan, together with his accompanying Tatars, had been able to cross the frozen Turla (Dniester) River on the border, and had arrived in Hotin. From here, he entered Bucak territory and established his headquarters in the village of Şeklak, where he began gathering people around him. The Serasker of Bucak Hacı Giray Sultan and vizier Numan Pasha in Bender sent messengers to Şahin Giray Sultan to admonish him and suggest he give up the rebellion. After seeing Şahin Giray Sultan continue with the rebellion unabated, Hacı Giray Sultan took action with his forces and defeated the rebels. However, Şahin Giray Sultan together with his retinue, was able to escape to a heavily forested area in Moldavia. Dealing with the captured supporters of Şahin Giray Sultan, The Porte ordered to the local officials to hand the Ottoman-oriented supporters over to Ottoman officials, while the Tatar supporters handed over to the Serasker of Bucak Hacı Giray Sultan [23, p.527].

Şahin Giray Sultan managed to escape the pursuing Ottoman-Tatar forces and once again took up refuge in Poland. Thereupon, the governor of Özi, Numan Pa- sha, wrote a letter to the Polish Hetman, demanding that Şahin Giray Sultan and his retinue be resettled in a region far from the Ottoman border. [23, p. 528]. After fleeing the Ottoman lands, Şahin Giray Sultan took up residence in Gorodets in the Kingdom of Poland-Lithuania. According to the information given by the Ottoman authorities to the Crimean Khan, Şahin Giray Sultan, who was not wanted in the country by the Polish rulers, was seeking to continue the rebellion and planned to go to the Caucasus with his 18 men, and amass an army of Noghays and Circassians. Selim Giray Khan II, in his letter to the Zaporog Hetman, stated that, in line with the signed treaties, Şahin Giray Sultan and his companions were to be prevented from crossing the Bug River and should be stopped, dead or alive [24, p. 413–414]. The harsh measures taken by Selim Giray Khan II and the Ottoman Porte against the rebellion forced Şahin Giray Sultan to come to terms with the Crimean Khan. Şahin Giray Sultan whose negotiations with Selim Giray Khan II seem to have begun before March 1748, was permitted at the request of the Crimean Khan to return from Poland on the condition that he would be exiled as “kalebend” on the island of Rhodes. Soon after, however, upon the intervention of Crimean Khan Selim Giray Khan II, the exile location was moved from Rhodes to Chios. Şahin Giray Sultan’s brother, Mahmud Giray Sultan, who had been by his side throughout the rebellion, was permitted to reside in their manor in Yanbolu. Upon the death of Selim Giray Khan II on April 17, 1748 [15, p. 92], Arslan Giray Khan was appointed Khan in Crimea. As a result of the endeavors of Arslan Giray

13 BOA, Divan (Beylikçi) Kalemi Kalebend Deftleri henceafter A.DVNS.KLBd.10, p.23.
14 A.DVNS.KLBd.10, p. 20.
Khan at the Porte, Şahin Giray Sultan was pardoned in August 1749 and was allowed to return to his manor, named Çapakçın, in the town of Zağra-i Atik.15

Was Şahin Giray Sultan's rebellion merely a response to his dismissal from the post of kalgay, or was there a more widespread social base? According to Izzi Süleyman Efendi, aside from his retinue, the gypsy population of Rumelia, and low-class people, nobody acted in support of Şahin Giray Sultan. Information given by Izzi Süleyman Efendi reflected the point of view of the Ottoman administration aimed to play down the importance of the rebellion. Said Giray Sultan, another witness of the period, provided a different perspective of the rebellion. Having assumed the post of Seraskerlik of Bucak 10 years after the rebellion of Şahin Giray Sultan, Said Giray Sultan had a good knowledge of the region's recent history, and wrote that while the Bucak Tatars supported Şahin Giray Sultan, the Yedisan Noghays did not. [20, f. 117a]. In addition to this information, the fact that Şahin Giray Sultan wanted to leave for the Kuban steppes suggests that the rebel sultan also had support from the tribes living in the Kuban region, aside from Bucak Tatars, and Şahin Giray Sultan may have established close relations with the local powers during his Caucasus campaign in his kalgay period. It can thus be understood that Şahin Giray Sultan had support from both the Tatars in the Bucak region and the Noghay communities in the Caucasus, revealing a serious social base to Şahin Giray Sultan's rebellion.

To understand the root causes of Şahin Giray Sultan’s rebellion, it is necessary to look at developments in the Crimean Khanate at that time. First, the Porte constantly made use of, or sought the participation of the Crimean forces on the Iranian front in the ongoing war with Nadir Shah, who ruled in Iran between 1730 and 1745 [25, p. 87–88, 91–92, 97–100]. The main reasons for the 1583–84 rebellion of Mehmed Giray Khan II and that of Inayet Giray Khan in 1637 were the consistent Ottoman demands for the Crimean forces on the Iranian front and their use in this protracted war. In the Ottoman chronicles, the reason given for the enthronement of Mehmed Giray II was his unwillingness to go to the Iranian front16. After his accession to the throne, strict orders were sent to Inayet Giray Khan regarding his participation in the Iran Campaign, and especially after 1636, these orders became more definite. Although Inayet Giray Khan was keen to join the Iran campaign, he was dissuaded by the Crimean aristocracy, who along with people from different classes, spoke with a unified voice about the difficulties on the Iranian front. The consensus was that the involvement would place Crimea in danger and leave it defenseless, and so they opposed the demands of the Ottoman administration for the participation of Tatar forces in the campaign. It was this attitude of the Crimean aristocracy that led Inayet Giray Khan to rebel [26, p.264–265]. As can be seen, the root cause of these rebellions was the Ottoman Porte’s desire to use the Crimean

15 A.DVNS.KLBd.10, p. 253.
16 Gelibolulu Mustafa Ali narrated this event as this, “…Ammâ han-ı mezbâr gâh Cengiz’e münethe olan nesebine mağrur olab eddâ-i hizmetde çâst ü çâhik deprenmениdi. Gâh ben Osmanî’nun ümerâsında muyn ki bana böyle teknifât ederler diyâ Şîrvan’a gitmemi di’i talâ’ilât tar’ikina gitmişdi…Pes üççünci senede ki tekbr Şîrvan’a teveccühi emr olunmu şti. Bu kerre inâd u mubahîlet dâviresinde sahît-kadem bulund. Hatta eddâ-i hizmetteki kustârundan mûadâ bâis-i gayret ve füitur bazi sözler söylediği nakl olund…” [34, p. 1037–38].
The rebellion of Şahin Giray Sultan (1746–1747)

Tatars on the Iranian front, and the Ottoman Porte’s demands in the reign of Selim Giray Khan II, to use the Tatar forces in the war against Nadir Shah led to great unrest in the Crimean Tatar society. It was from this unrest that the social base of the Şahin Giray Sultan Rebellion emerged.

In the 18th century rebellions that occurred in the Crimean Khanate, the ending of the raids intensified during the times of war, the efforts of the Ottoman Empire to increase its control over its borders and over the nomadic Tatars, and its demands for the return of the captives after the war were other factors leading to the rebellions, including those of Gazi Giray Sultan in 1699 and the Devlet Giray Khan in 1702 following the signing of the Treaty of Karlowitz (1699) and the Istanbul Treaty (1700). The strict control of the borders and the return of the captives were addressed in the Treaty of Karlowitz in the following way:

“The fourth article: None of the troops dependent on the high state, and especially the Tatars, should attack Polish subjects and transgress the Polish borders under any kind of excuse, pretext, or title, nor should they drive any captives or animals nor should they cause any other damage. And it will be clearly command- ed and confirmed by noble orders. To the viziers and beylerbeyis, to the felicitous Crimean khan, kalga, nureddin, and the other princes and to the hospodar of Moldovia that they should respect and preserve with the utmost care the order on the frontiers and the provisions of this peace...The ninth article: The prisoners taken during the war from among the Poles will be set free after the price of their purchase, confirmed legally or revealed by their owners with an oath, is repaid in the manner described in the ahdnames given in the past.”  

[27, p. 587–593; 595, 597] and brought about events that led to the rebellions of both Gazi Giray Sultan and Devlet Giray Khan.

After the end of the Ottoman-Russian War of 1736–39, the Crimean Khan, and the Porte sought to increase their control over the border regions with the Russian Tsardom (such as the Caucasus-Kuban Line and the Özi/Dnieper area) [25, p.79–80] and to bring about the return of the captives of war by putting pressure on the Tatar society. These developments led to a severe loss of income and gradual centralization, especially along the Russian border, and could have been a secondary motivation for the Şahin Giray Sultan Rebellion. The Tatar communities suffered significant losses, both human and economic, at the hands of the Russian forces on the Crimean Peninsula, the Kuban region, and even around Özi [28, p. 90–92], and this was another cause of unrest that led to the rebellion of Tatar society.

A final reason for the rebellions in the Crimean Khanate in the last days of the 17th century is related to the Noghays. Since the second half of the 17th century, the Noghay population within the Crimean Khanate had gradually been increasing, and in parallel to this population increase, the importance of the Noghays [politically and militarily] gained ground within the Crimean Khanate [29, p. 115–131]. The Crimean Khans developed a system named “seraskerlik” to keep the Noghay

17 II. Selim Giray Han II’s predecessor, II. Şelamet Giray Khan II was dethroned due to his failure to return the captives of war taken in the 1736–1739 Ottoman-Russian War. In contrast, Selim Giray Khan II was rewarded for his success in this matter. [15, p. 91–92].
groups under control, and the Seraskerlik of Yedisan, Bucak and Kuban subsequently emerged. In this system, a male member of the Giray family was appointed serasker, that is, governor, of the Noghay Hordes [8, p.198–200; 31, p.18; 33, p. 114; 32, p.14].\footnote{BOA, Ali Emiri, (Sultan Mustafa III) SMST III 29050, a sample document addressed to the serasker of Yedisan; BOA, Ali Emiri, (Sultan Mahmud I) SMHD I 6461, a sample document addressed to the serasker of Kuban.} Despite the establishment of the Seraskerlik system, the Noghays could not be fully controlled, and rebelled under the leadership of the Giray Sultans, whom they considered close to them, and reacted strongly against the Crimean Khans and to the Porte. The rebellions in the Crimean Khanate, from the rebellion of Gazi Giray Sultan in 1699 to the 1756–1758 Yedisan Noghay Rebellion, all emerged as a result of the Noghays’ search for political influence within the khanate, or in their reaction to the khanate or the Ottoman Porte [33, 114–115]. In a way, the Rebellion of Şahin Giray Sultan can be considered a reaction of the Bucak Noghays to the khanate’s administration. Consequently, all these combined reasons contributed to the social basis of the rebellion.

One last question remains about the rebellion of Şahin Giray Sultan, and that is “Why did the rebellion fail?” Taking a general overview, the main reason was Şahin Giray Sultan’s inability to gain the support of the Yedisan Noghays, which limited the military strength of the rebels considerably, as well as their geographical depth. In addition, the Zaporog Cossacks, acting in accordance with the wishes of the Crimean Khan, prevented Şahin Giray Sultan from uniting with the Tatar communities in the Kuban and the Caucasus, thus preventing the continuation and spread of the rebellion. Upon this, because of the conspiracy of the Porte and Crimean Khan toward the Şahin Giray Sultan, the rebellion occurred prematurely. Şahin Giray Sultan could not focus the support of all the dissidents in the organization of a rebellion. The strict attitude and uncompromising acts of the Porte can be given as the final reason for the failure of the rebellion. While this rebellion, limited to the Bucak area, was quelled, the tensions in the socio-economic structure of the khanate continued, culminating in Yedisan Nogay Rebellion in 1756–1758, on a much larger scale.
Fascimile and Transliteration of Selected Documents  
on the Life and Rebellion of Şahin Giray Sultan


Sahh  
Buyrułu  
Nişan-ı hümâyûn oldur ki  
Çûn mâlik-i memâlik-i kudret ve hûdâvend-i ekâlim-fitrat celle şanûhûl alâ ve âmmê nevâlûhû ve tevâlî kemâl-i inâyet-ulyâ ve nihayet-i mevhibet-i ulûâyû ve tevâlî kemâl-i inâyet-ulyâ ve nevâlühû ve tevâlî kemâl-i inâyet-ulyâ ve nihâyet-i mevhibet-üzmaşâ yaâl imûl-i hëvâkîni'l-izâm  

Alper Başer. The rebellion of Şahin Giray Sultan (1746–1747)  

681
Buhrulu sûreti Han-ı âlisân taraflına tesiyr kilınımsdır.
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Bender Muháfizî Vezir Numan Paşa'ya hükûm ki, Kalgay-ı sâbûk Şahin Giray Sultan'ın bundan akdem bâ'zi efkar-ı fâsideye teba'iyyet ile Leh cânibine fîrâr eyleldikden sonra Hotin cânibinden memâlik-i mahrumî toprağına duhûl idib rizâ-ı hûmâyûnuma mügâyir tavr u harekete ıctîsâr ve Buçak Seraskeri Hacî Giray Sultan'ınî mühârebe ve cidâle ibtîdar ve esnâ-ı yi bi-kârda bîrkaç nefer adem ile münhezizmen Boğdan toprağında vâki' Mişe-zâr taraflına fîrâr eyleldiğîn sen ki vezîr-i müşarûnileyhîn tarafîndan ve Kırım Hani cenâb-ı emâret-mê'âb eyalet-nisâb saâdet-ıktisâb Selim Giray Han dâmât me'âliyehu cânibinden Dersâadetime i'ân ve i'sâr olunmuştur öteden berî rizâ-ı hûmâyûnuma mühâlif vaz' u harekete cesarett idenlerîn keder ve vahâmîti yine kendarîler âid ve râci' olageldiğî ma'lûm ve bâ-husûs Sultan-ı müâmâleyh şâh-ı dûdmân-ı Cengizîye'ye irâs-ı kesr u ta'yîs edecek böyle bir emr-i nâ-mülâmî mukadder olmak hasebiyle cümle beyindendende ma'lûm ve mezmûm olmağla bundan sonra bir ferd kendarîye şâhip çıkmayaçığî bir dürül yardum ve i'ânet itmeyeceğî zahir ve hüsâan bundan mukaddemce sâdîr olan evâmîr-ı âliyeyem muceberînî taraflına bir kimsî vârmak ve ann etbâ'indenden berî cânibe fîrâr-ı vâhid gelmemek üzere sedd-i bendi ıktizà iden mahaller tahassun ve teşdîd olunduğu eğerçî meczum ve bâhîrdîr lakin sultan-ı mezbûr ber-minvâl-î mestûr hem Devlet-î Aliyeme ve hem Kırım Hamma ve hamedan-ı Cengizîye'ye bir günê habâset ve adem-i itâat itdikleri için tecessüs ve tefahhûs olunarak Memâlik-i Mahrûsem hudûdûn dahîlîrinden bir yerde olduğu haber alunur ise derhâl bulunduğu mahalde kendüsü ve yalnız ma'îyeyet olan hânîler yakalatduruîlub alâ eyyi hâl ahz ve ele getirülmeve sultan-ı mercûm ve yalnız bulunan Tatar taifesi ahz olunduğla Bucak Seraskerine teslîm ve Osmanlıdan olan ma'îyyetleri ma'rifetinize ile muhekkem habs ve tazyik ve keyfiyetleri in lâm ve te’hîm olunmak fermâmîn olub ve husûs-ı mezbûr Hotin ve Özi mûtahâfizlêrînîn ve Boğdan Voyvodasîna başka başka evâmîr-ı âlisânmla tenbih olunamğla sana dahi işbu emr-i şerîfim ısdâr ve ( ) ile irsâl olunmuşdur. İmdî vüsûlünde sultan-ı mezbûr dâhîl-ı hudûd-ı Memâlik-ı hûsrevînêmede olanlîrân bundan böyle herkîm î'ânet ider ise ol dahi âşi ve bâği olacağîm ifâmî ıktizà idenlerîn izhâr ve ve i'sâât ve ele girdiklerinde bîlî-eman hakkîrânîn gelineceğiî derhâl i'lâm ve i'sâät iderek Bender hudûdi dahîlîrîn olan memer ve mu'berleri mukaddâmî sâdîr olan emr-i şerîfîn mantûkî üzere muhekkem sed u bend ve Memâlik-ı Mahrûsem hudûdu dahîllîrînî kendûsüne ve mai'yetlerini daima tecessüs ve tefahhûsînden bir an hali olmayarak ve memûr olan mumâmâyêyümî ile haberleşerek ve Han-ı müşarûnileyhîn tarafîndan dahi eğer bir haber wârd olur ise mütkezûsîyla hareket eyleyerek dâhîl-ı hudûd-ı Memâlik-ı Mahrûsêmede bir yerde olduğu haber alunur ise bağteten cûmûsînî ahz ve sultan-ı müâmâyêyî ve ele gîrên Tatar ta'îfesîni serasker sultâna teslîm olunudukdan sonra Osmanlı makûlesînî tarafîndan muhekkem habs ve keyfiyetî arî ısdab lakin bu bâbda ziyade tahirîr ve basîret ve kemîl-î ıhtiyat ve dikkat üzere hareket ve nâ-mülâyîmîr bir nesne hudûsûndan be-gayet tehâşi mübâbadet eylemen bâbdûna fermân-1 âlisânîm sâdîr olunmuşdur.

Fi Evahir-i Z 1160/24 December 1747-1 January 1748

Bir sûreti Özi kalesî Muháfizîna ve Yeniçeri Zâtîtine

Bir sûreti Hotin Muháfizîna ve Ayâbêğîsîne ve Yeniçeri zâtîtine

Bir sûreti Boğdan Voyvodasnâna, Bir sûreti Bender Muháfizî Beyi Yunus Beye ve Yeniçeri Zâtîtine
Document 3: TSMA. E. 569/58.

Benim saâdetlü mekremetlü semâhatlü birâder-i cellîlüş-şânum düstûr-ı âli-unvân hazretleri

Hemvâre masûn vikâyetül-avn-i samedâni olmakda deymûmûyetleri duâsından sonra şahs-ı ma’hûda tarafimizdan re’y verilmek musammem idiğü bundan mukaddemce Divân efendileri bendeleri vürudunda kendiye tefhîmen cânîb-i şeref-i câlib-i vezîrânelerine ifâde olunmuşdu.

Hâlâ merkûm-ı ma’hûda tasmîm olunduğu üzere re’y virilüb tarafimiza vürûd eylediğinden fimâba’d Bender’e duhûlden teneffûr ve tevahhus eylememesi zâhir ve bedîhi olmaga ba’d-ezin muhîl-i bi-müberrâlari Devlet-i Aliyye’ye varub avdet idinîce merkûmun hakkinda menvi ve derkîr olan emrin infâz ve ıcrâsi ta’vîk ve fîmaba’d muhîlîsîzî ile meyânede tekrâr muhâbîre oluncaya dek teennî ve tehîr buyurub ol taraflara vardikça kendüden de’f-i-vahsete bâdî ve min küllîl vücûh selâmît ve emniyîyeti mü’eddi muâmeleleri müsâhêdesine ve bu misûlûl istimâle haline himmet-i aliyyeleri derkîr buyrulmak muktezâ-yi halden olmaga bu husûs ma’lum-ı saâdetleri buyrulub ve keyfiyet şimdilik iktizâ-yi hale göre cenâb-ı saâdete bu siyâkda tavsiye olunduğu inşällah teâlâ Devlet-i Aliyyeye vusûlümüzde irâd ve ifâde olunacağı dahî karîn-i ilm-i şerif buyrulmak için kâime-i muhabbet-hitâm tahririne ibtidâr oldundi. Bi avnillahi teâlâ ahvâl muhât-ı ilm-i saâdetleri outlooka merkûm ol caniblere verdadka kendüye tahsil-i emniyîyeti mü’eddi muâmîle olunarak hakkında bundan evvel derkîr olan husûs ıcrâsi muhîlîsîzî Devlet-i Aliyyeye varup avdet idinîceye dek te’hîr ve tekrâr cenâb-ı saâdetleriyle meyânede muhâbîre olunmasına ta’lîk buyruluması me’müldür. Şimdilik iktizâ-yi hal bu vech üzere olmaga İnshallah bundan sonra lâzîme-i ahvâl yine savb-ı pür-şerefe ifâde olunur
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Document 3: TSMA. E. 569/58.
Kalgay-1 sâbık Şahin Giray Sultânâ ve dergâh-1 mu’allâm gediklülerinden olub mukaddemâ müümâileyhî Rodos’a isâle mübâşîr ta’yîn olunan Abdurrahman zîde mecdûhüya hükûm ki;

Sen ki sultan-î müümâileyhsin dürûm-î Cengizye’nin ulûvvü’ kadr u şân semmû-rîf’ât ünvânî ne derecede idi’î ma’lûm ve hanedân-ı merkûmeyeye müntesib olanlar dahi Devlet-ı Aliyemin kullanğına ve Kırm Hanlarının itâ’telerinde ne rûbede sebat-kadem üzere oldukları mecmûm olmakdan naşî sen dahi ol hanedân-ı aliân ve ol dürûm-î meûî-unvânın keşide rişte-i silsilelerinden olman hasebiyle tabî’iyyet-i asliyênin pâk ve mücellâ ve şîme-i himiten nâ-hemvâr vaz’ u hareket irtikâbından beri ve mukarrer hod be hod senden na-marzî hâlet zuhûr deîîl belki zelle sudûrû hile vuku’ bulmak emr-i mûhâl olunub ve hatta mukaddemâ tarafindan hudûs iden ba’zi ânke ná-mûnsëb vaz’-1 mcûrerd sû-i karîn beliyyesi idi’î vázh ve aşikør olduğuni ve sen zâtinda asîl ve nesib olmâgla her halde ribka-1 itâati zîver-kerden rizâ ve ubûbîyet ideçeğini bi’l-fiil Kırm Hani cenâbî emaret-meâb eyâlet-nisâb saâdet-iktisâb Selim Giray Han dâmet me’âliyehê cenâbleri mukaddemâ tahrîr ve inîhâ ve afvîn husüsû iltimâs ve ricâ eyledidiklerine binân ta’yîn olunan sâlyânîn ile gelüb Rodos Cezirésinde ikämêt eylemen bâbunda Han-1 aliân -1 müsârûnîleyhin iltimâsleri karîn-î kabûl ve bu veçhîlê emr-1 şerifîm isdârîyla mübâşîr-î müümâileyh me’ûrîn olmuş idi. El hâletû hâzîhî vârdî olan tahrîrât muktezâsinca zâtinda olan rûşûd’û kiyâset ve asâlet ve necâbeti icrâ ve dürûmûnunun revmak ve iizzeti olan madde-i itâat ve inkûyûdû icrâ ve ni’âm-1 afv ü inâyêt-i hüsrevanêm teşekkûrûni icrâ zimnında bilâ-tehîr emr-1 şerifîm itâat ve mübâşîr-î müümâileyh ma'yîyeti ile savb-1 memûre azîmet eyledidin sem’-î hümâyûnûmâ vâsil olmak hasebiyle bu gûne vaki olan hüsûn-ı hareket ve emr-1 şerifîm sûr’at-î imtisâl ve mutâvaatnh hakkinda olan gerdûn-ı dân ve îğûhûrû bi’l-külîyle izâle idûb karîben müsâade-i hümâyûnuma zuhûru ile yine çiftilêgine gelüb ikâmêtê sühullê ve medûr olmak için çenemîyetin Sakiz Cezirésine sarf ve tahûl ve sebat iden afv ve inâyêt-i müükûnên şemîdîk bu veçhilê teyzêli olunûndan mâdâda sana vesîle-i mahûzûziyet ve bâis-î teselliyet olmak için yannda olan karndaşâm Mahmûd Giray zîde mecdûhü gelüb Yanbolû’dâ senin çiftilêgine ikâmêt eylemek üzere izn-î hümâyûnuma erzi’i kilmûnîzgla ısbu emr-1 şerifîm isdâr ve ( ) ile irsîl olunmuşdur. İmdî tarafî hümâyûnuma olan mutâvaat ve inkûyûndan ıcaletûl-ı vakt bu veçhîlê semere ve fâdîsis zuhûr eyledidin ma’lûmîn olunbda bundan böyle dahi hüsûn-î hareket ve etvûrmîn mesmû’ oldukça hakkinda olan mekârîm-î müükûnên mütemerakî ve müzدد ve müddet-1 kalîle zarfinda çiftilêgine gelüb ikâmêtê müsâade-i hümâyûnuma sudûrûyla mesrûrûl-ı faad olacağımı fîkr ve mülûhaze iderek şemîdilik doğru Sakiz’a gelüb anda ikâmêt ve ta’yîn olunan sâlyânîzgî ahz birle devâm-1 ıör-ı devlet-1 şâhânem de’avûtîna mûvâzabet eleyûcob ve karndaşâm Mahmûd Giray’în Yanbolû’dâ olan çiftilêgine gönderüb ol dahi anda meks itmesi tavslêye ve tenbih eyleyesin ve sen ki mübâşîr-î müümâileyhsin bercevî-ı muharrer sultan-î müümâileyhî doğru Sakiz’a isal ve vûsûntûnî müş’îr senedat ile Dersâdatêmê avdet eylemen bâbunda fermân-1 aliân sâdr olunmuşdur.
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ВОССТАНИЕ СУЛТАНА ШАХИН-ГИРЕЯ (1746–1747)

Альпер Башер
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Афьонкарахисар, Турция
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Цель исследования: анализ причин, развития и последствий восстания султана Шахин-Гирея в истории Крымского ханства.

Материалы исследования: документы, хранящиеся в архиве дворца-музея Топкапы и в Департаменте османских архивов Государственного управления при Президенте Турецкой Республики. Эти документы сопоставляются с османско-татарскими хрониками того периода (Иззи Тарихи, Челеби Акай Тарихи, Тарих-и Саид-Гирей Султан).

Результаты и научная новизна: наиболее подробную оценку восстания Шахин-Гирея Султана можно найти в книге В. Д. Смирнова о Крымском ханстве, которая перекликается со сведениями, приведенными в османской хронике Иззи Тарихи. В настоящем исследовании архивные документы дворца-музея Топкапы под номерами TSMA-E 408-55, TSMA-E 569-58 и TSMA-E 751-49, а также дефтеры (Mühimme и Kalebend), хранящиеся в Департаменте османских архивов Управления государственных архивов при Президенте Турецкой Республики, сравниваются с другими источниками. В свете этих документов дается новая оценка восстанию под предводительством султана Шахин-Гирея. Документы, считающиеся важными и содержащие подробности жизни Шахин-Гирея в ходе восстания, были транслитерированы и представлены к публикации.

Ногайцы, проживающие в Буджакском районе, составляли социальную базу восстания Шахин-Гирея. Восстание вспыхнуло из-за желания Порты развернуть татарские силы на иранском фронте, нарастающих усилий Османской империи по централизации на русско-польской и украинской границах, а также давления на татарское общество с целью возвращения русских пленников войны 1736-1739 гг. Восстание вспыхнуло преждевременно после того, как Порта и Селим-Гирей-хан сговорились нейтрализовать Шахин-Гирея. Крайние меры, предпринятые Османской империей и Крымским ханством, предотвратили распространение восстания, и повстанцы во главе с султаном Шахин-Гиреем были легко разбиты, что привело к подавлению восстания.
Ключевые слова: султан Шахин-Гирей, восстание, Османская империя, Крымское ханство, ногайцы
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