



Osmanlı Mirası Araştırmaları Dergisi

Journal of Ottoman Legacy Studies

ISSN 2148-5704

www.osmanlimirasi.net

osmanlimirasi@gmail.com

Cilt 9, Sayı 23, Mart 2022 / Volume 9, Issue 23, March 2022

DETERMINATION OF THE OTTOMAN-POLISH BORDERS ACCORDING TO THE TREATY OF KARLOWITZ

Karlofça Antlaşması'na Göre Osmanlı-Lehistan Sınırlarının Belirlenmesi

Makale Türü/ Article Types : Araştırma Makalesi/Research Article
Geliş Tarihi/Received Date : 20.05.2021
Kabul Tarihi/Accepted Date : 10.01.2022
Sayfa/Pages : 221-235
DOI Numarası/DOI Number : <http://dx.doi.org/10.17822/omad.2022.211>

Uğur KURTARAN

(Doç. Dr.), Karamanoğlu Mehmetbey Üniversitesi, Karaman / Türkiye, e-mail:
ugurkurtaran@gmail.com, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6394-408X>

Atıf/Citation

Kurtaran, Uğur, "Determination of the Ottoman-Polish Borders According to The Treaty of Karlowitz", *Osmanlı Mirası Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 9/23, 2022, s. 221-235.



Osmanlı Mirası Araştırmaları Dergisi (OMAD), Cilt 9, Sayı 23, Mart 2022.

Journal of Ottoman Legacy Studies (JOLS), Volume 9, Issue 23, March 2022.

ISSN: 2148-5704

DETERMINATION OF THE OTTOMAN-POLISH BORDERS ACCORDING TO THE TREATY OF KARLOWITZ*

Karlofça Antlaşması'na Göre Osmanlı-Lehistan Sınırlarının Belirlenmesi

Uğur KURTARAN

Abstract: The borders that separate the territories between the two states are crucial in the conduct of interstate relations. As a matter of fact, border disputes between states can cause violent conflicts. For this reason, various approaches for determining the borders between states in the historical process have been devised and deployed. Since its founding, the Ottoman Empire, one of the most prominent empires in history, has utilized various methods in determining the borders. These methods, which change periodically, are devised in accordance with the provisions of the treaty with the states to draw borders and the region's geographical characteristics. The content and application of border determination procedures, which are also a diplomatic issue, are essential in understanding the process between the two states. The article focused on the Ottoman-Polish frontiers, which were altered by the Treaty of Karlowitz, to illustrate the Ottoman Empire's border determination processes through a concrete example. With the treaty, the Ottoman Empire lost large-scale land for the first time in its history, forcing it to cede Ukraine and Podolia to Poland-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Following the signing of the treaty, efforts to finalize the new borders established by the treaty began through border restriction commissioners appointed by both parties. After the negotiations, the new borderline was determined and finalized. In this regard, the research aims to answer questions about how the Ottoman-Polish borders were decided, which were altered following the 11 articles signed with Poland in the Karlowitz Treaty. Accordingly, the principles applied in determining the borders between the parties and the determinations and evaluations of the new borders formed after the agreement constitute the main problem of the study.

Key Words: Treaty of Karlowitz, Ottoman, Polish, border, diplomacy

Öz: İki devlet arasındaki toprakları ayıran sınırlar, devletlerarası ilişkilerin yürütülmesinde çok önemlidir. Nitekim devletler arasındaki sınır anlaşmazlıkları şiddetli çatışmalara neden olabilir. Bu nedenle tarihsel süreç içerisinde devletler arasındaki sınırların belirlenmesine yönelik çeşitli yaklaşımlar geliştirilmiş ve yaygınlaştırılmıştır. Tarihin en önemli imparatorluklarından biri olan Osmanlı İmparatorluğu, kuruluşundan bu yana sınırlarını belirlemede çeşitli yöntemler kullanmıştır. Dönemsel olarak değişen bu yöntemler, devletlerle sınır çizmeye yönelik antlaşma hükümlerine ve bölgenin coğrafi özelliklerine uygun olarak tasarlanmaktadır. Aynı zamanda diplomatik bir konu olan sınır belirleme usullerinin içeriği ve uygulanması, iki devlet arasındaki sürecin anlaşılması açısından elzemdir. Makale, Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun sınır belirleme süreçlerini somut bir örnek üzerinden göstermek için Karlofça Antlaşması ile değiştirilen Osmanlı-Lehistan sınırlarına odaklanmıştır. Antlaşma ile Osmanlı İmparatorluğu tarihinde ilk kez büyük ölçekli toprakları kaybederek Ukrayna ve Podolya'yı Lehistan-Litvanya Birliği'ne bırakmak zorunda kaldı. Antlaşmanın imzalanmasının ardından, her iki tarafça atanan sınır belirleme komisyonları aracılığıyla anlaşmayla oluşturulan yeni sınırların kesinleştirilmesine yönelik çalışmalar başladı. Müzakerelerin ardından yeni sınır çizgisi belirlendi ve kesinleşti. Bu bağlamda araştırma, Lehistan ile Karlofça Antlaşması'nda imzalanan 11 madde sonrasında değişen Osmanlı-Lehistan sınırlarının nasıl belirlendiğine ilişkin sorulara yanıt vermeyi amaçlamaktadır. Buna göre taraflar arasındaki sınırların belirlenmesinde uygulanan ilkeler ve antlaşma sonrasında oluşan yeni sınırların tespiti ve değerlendirilmesi çalışmanın temel problemini oluşturmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Karlofça Antlaşması, Osmanlı, Lehistan, hudut, diplomasi

* This article is the expanded version of the study presented as an oral presentation at the "Congress of International Eastern European Studies" symposium held on October 10-12, 2019, in Skopje/Macedonia.

Introduction

The concept of diplomacy is briefly defined as “the work, or art, of conducting international relations through official representatives”.¹ At this point, diplomacy, which is a term that can alter depending on a state’s political and military might and position, expresses a state’s approaches in its relations with other states.² Diplomacy, which is shaped by a state’s foreign policy, has a variety of application areas within itself. There is no doubt that comprehending these areas, which represent the application phase of diplomacy rather than theory, and conducting in-depth analyses will provide a new push to diplomacy research. The present study has been prepared with these thoughts and problems in mind. The subject of demarcation, which is a key application area of Ottoman diplomacy, was highlighted in this study. In this context, replies were given to queries about altering borders between the Ottoman Empire and Poland following the Treaty of Karlowitz, one of the most important treaties in Ottoman diplomacy, and where the new borders were decided by steps taken accordingly. The border demarcation with Poland after the Karlowitz Treaty were stressed within the framework of the general demarcation procedures utilized in the Ottoman Empire in this study, which will use the process of reduction from the general to the specific. By using the data to be obtained within the scope of this question, which forms the basis of the research, the similarities and differences of the Ottoman-Polish border demarcation activities with the general demarcation activities were determined by the comparison method. Finally, in the research, the role of diplomatic activities in the continuation of interstate relations was revealed by determining the positive/negative effects of the Ottoman-Polish borders, which were determined after the Karlowitz Treaty, on the future relations of the two states.

The Treaty of Karlowitz, which was signed as a peace treaty in 1699 with three states (Austria, Venice, and Poland) and as a ceasefire agreement with Russia, ended the Holy Alliance wars that started in 1683.³ This treaty was signed on 26 January 1699, after the negotiations between the Ottoman Empire and the Holy Alliance States, which started on 13 November 1698 and lasted for 72 days and 36 sessions.⁴ In the Karlowitz Treaty, the Ottoman Empire signed a 20-item peace treaty with Austria, a 16-item peace treaty with Venice, and an 11-item peace treaty with Poland. On the other hand, a two-year ceasefire was signed with Russia, which did not agree to peace.⁵ With the treaty, the previously vague borders were determined with definite lines.⁶ The Ottoman Empire suffered significant territorial losses due to the Treaty of Karlowitz, causing the parties’ existing borders to readjust. As a result, with the Treaty of Karlowitz, all Hungary except Transylvania (Erdel) and Banat was left to Austria; Ukraine, Kamieniec (Kamianiec) and Podolia to Poland; Peloponnese and Dalmatia to Venice; and Azov Castle to Russia.⁷ This new situation brought up the determination of the new borders that changed after the treaty between the two states and laid the groundwork for conducting border detection activities within the new borders determined in the treaty. However, although there are many studies on the Karlowitz Treaty⁸ and Ottoman-Polish relations⁹ in the existing

¹ Ali İbrahim Savaş, *Osmanlı Diplomasisi*, (İstanbul: 3 F Yay., 2007), 9.

² Oral Sander, *Anka'nın Yükselişi ve Düşüşü Osmanlı Diplomasi Tarihi Üzerine Bir Deneme*, (Ankara: İmge Yay., 2008), 13.

³ Uğur Kurtaran, “Karlofça Antlaşması’nda Venedik, Lehistan Ve Rusya’ya Verilen Ahitnamelerin Genel Özellikleri ve Diplomatik Açıdan Değerlendirilmesi”, *Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih Coğrafya Fakültesi Tarih Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 35 (60), (2016): 97-139.

⁴ Johann Wilhelm Zinkeisen, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu Tarihi*, Vol. 5, trans. Nilüfer Epçeli, (İstanbul: Yeditepe Yay., 2011), 147.

⁵ Nihat Erim, *Devletlerarası Hukuk Ve Siyasî Tarih Metinleri*, Vol. I, (Ankara: TTK. Yay., 1953), 26-34; Silahdar Fındıklılı Mehmed Ağa, *Nusretname*, Vol. I, Sad. İsmet Parmaksızoğlu, (İstanbul: MEB. Yay., 1962), 354vd.

⁶ Rıfa’at Ali Abou El Haj, “The Former Closure of Ottoman Frontier in Europe:1699-1703”, *Journal of The American Oriental Society*, 89: 3 (Jul-Sep. 1983), 467.

⁷ Nicalai Jorga, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu Tarihi*, Vol. IV, trans. Nilüfer Epçeli, (İstanbul: Yeditepe Yay., 2010), 231.

⁸ For the main studies on the Treaty of Karlowitz, see. Rıfa’at Ali Abou El Haj, *The Reisülküttab And Ottoman Diplomacy At Karlowitz*, (Princeton: Princeton University, 1963); “Ottoman Diplomacy at Karlowitz”, *Journal of*

literature, the number of studies on the process of determining new borders between the parties after the treaty is less. Nevertheless, border demarcation activities, which are an important application area of diplomacy, are vital for the development of relations between the two states. For this reason, the question of how the issue of determining the Ottoman-Polish frontiers, which changed after the 1699 Karlowitz Treaty, was resolved was addressed in the research. Within this framework, it was determined which regions the new borders crossed through and where the new borders were within the scope of the provisions regarding borders in the first 4 articles of the 11-article agreement signed with Poland in the Karlowitz Treaty. For this purpose, a border restriction report on the determination of the Ottoman-Polish borders determined by the 1699 Karlowitz Treaty in 1703 and the border document sample prepared afterward were examined. The text of the border document, which is not too long, gives information about how the borders between the Ottoman Empire and Poland were determined, the methods used during this determination, and the content of diplomatic negotiations.

1. Border Concept, Border Types, Border Determination Stages and Methods

The term border comes from the Greek “sinoron” and is used conceptually as the line and border/edge separating the territories of two neighboring states.¹⁰ Borders, also expressed with words such as “limit, edge, boundary, frontier”, refer to the line or area that separates one piece of sovereignty from another.¹¹ In this sense, the border is the lines that separate the sovereignty of an independent state from the others and are indicated with fine lines on the map.¹² This feature of the border concept makes it dynamic lines that can change over time depending on interstate relations rather than being static.

Borders have been considered as legal expressions of political sovereignty rather than absolute geographical realities throughout history. For this reason, borders and border relations directly reflect the concepts of state and sovereignty. What is limited or attempted to be determined by artificial lines in this sense relates to the areas where a state can or cannot dominate, rather than the cultural, religious, and social relationships formed by geographical regions or people.¹³

The American Oriental Society, LXXXVII, (1967): 498-512; “Karlofça’da Osmanlı Diplomasisi II”, *Tarih ve Toplum*, trans. Yasemin Saner Gönen, S. 192, (Aralık 1999): 359-365; “The Former Closure of Ottoman Frontier in Europe:1699-1703”, *Journal of The American Oriental Society*, 89: 3 (Jul-Sep. 1983): 467-475; F. Monika Molnar, “Karlofça Antlaşması’ndan Sonra Osmanlı Habsburg Sınırı (1699-1701)”, *Osmanlı*, Vol. I, ed. Güler Eren, (Ankara: Yeni Türkiye Yay., 1999), 472-479; İsmet Parmaksızoğlu, “Karlofça (Carlowicz, Kalowitz)”, *İA*, Vol. VI, (İstanbul MEB. Yay., 1991): 346-351; Abdülkadir Özcan, “Karlofça”, *DİA*, Vol. 24, (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yay., 2001): 504-507; *The Treaties of Carlowitz (1699): Antecedents, Course and Consequences*, (Ed. Colin Heywood-Ivan Parvev), (Leiden: Brill 2020).

⁹ For the main studies on Ottoman-Polish relations, see. Dariusz Kolodziejczyk, *Ottoman-Polish Diplomatic Relations (15th-18th Century): An Annotated Edition of Ahdnâmes and Other Document*, (Leiden: Brill, 2000); Aynı Müellif, “Polonya ve Osmanlı Devleti Arasında Tarih Boyunca Siyasi ve Diplomatik İlişkiler”, *Savaş ve Barış 15-19. Yüzyıl Osmanlı-Polonya İlişkileri*, Yay. Selmin Kagal, (Ankara: TTK. Yay., 1999); Sabire Arık, “Polonya Kralı III. Jan Sobieski Hükümdarlık Dönemi (1674-1696)”, *Tarih Araştırmaları Dergisi*, Vol. 24, Issue: 38, (2005): 213-238; Kemal Beydilli, “Polonya (Tarih, Polonya-Osmanlı İlişkileri)”, *DİA*. Vol. 34, (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yay., 2007): 309-317; Hacer Topaktaş, “XVIII. Yüzyıl Ortalarında Türk-Leh İlişkilerinden Bir Kesit: Kapıcıbaşı Mehmed Ağa’nın Lehistan (Polonya) Elçiliği (1757-1758)”, *Osmanlı Araştırmaları*, XXIX, (2007): 203-226; Musa Şaşmaz, *XVIII. Yüzyıl Osmanlı Lehistan İlişkileri*, (İstanbul: Altınpost Yay., 2013).

¹⁰ Ferit Devellioğlu, *Osmanlıca-Türkçe Ansiklopedik Lûgat*, (Ankara: Aydın Kitabevi, 2001), 307; Osman Gümüşçü, “Siyasi Coğrafya Açısından Sınırlar ve Tarihi Süreç İçinde Türkiye’de Sınır Kavramı”, *Bilgi*, Issue: 52, (Kış 2010): 80.

¹¹ Uğur Kurtaran, “XVIII. Yüzyıla Ait Hudutname ve Sınır Tahdit Örneği: Karlofça Antlaşması’na Göre Belgrad Sınırlarının Belirlenmesi”, *Osmanlı Diplomasi Tarihi Kurumları ve Tatbiki*, ed. Mehmet Alaaddin Yalçınkaya-Uğur Kurtaran, (Ankara: Grafiker Yay., 2018), 122.

¹² Hamza Akengin, *Siyasi Coğrafya İnsan ve Mekân Yönetimi*, (Ankara: Pegem Akademi, 2015), 99.

¹³ Bahadır Apaydın, “5 Aralık 1857 Tarihli Osmanlı Devleti-Rusya Sınır Anlaşması”, *Uluslararası Hukuk ve Politika*, Vol. 5, Issue: 18, (2009): 83-85.

1.1. Border Types

State borders consist of two stages, natural and artificial borders. Natural boundaries are the physical boundaries determined based on physiographic features such as mountain ranges, oceans, seas, lakes, streams, forests, deserts, and swamps. The other type of border is geometric (artificial) borders, which are alternatives to natural borders. These borders are human-made borders without considering the physical geography conditions. These are the borders set at the conference tables.¹⁴ While some of these artificial borders, which have straight lines, lie along the meridians, the other part extends depending on the parallels. On the other hand, the ethnographic borders, which are another type of border, are drawn entirely by taking into account the characteristics of human societies. Accordingly, those who speak the same language and those who belong to the same religion are gathered on one side. In the last group, political borders can be mentioned. Political borders are those that are primarily defined by the influence of other states and are formed through negotiations based on the outcomes of interstate wars. While material gains are prioritized in the determination of such borders, the directions of the borders are shaped entirely depending on the military and political power of the states sitting on the table. For this reason, political borders are always at a sensitive point in interstate relations.¹⁵ The Ottoman-Polish borders, which we discussed in the study, are also included in the political border type.

1.2. Border Determination Stages and Methods

The borders of many states have been determined depending on the agreements made throughout history. However, the fact that new borderlines are specified in any treaty does not mean that the borders have been determined definitively. Definitive border determinations are made after the delimitation procedures carried out by the commissions established between the parties in the border region. Accordingly, the works carried out by the commissions of both sides on the borderline were recorded in the books called border restriction reports or border documents¹⁶, and definite borders were drawn.¹⁷ Border restriction reports are also critical sources in terms of being an essential source of diplomatic relations of the Ottoman Empire and containing several diplomatic rules that Ottoman diplomats carefully applied.¹⁸

At this point, border restriction activities, which means the determination of the borders that change as a result of any agreement between the two states is among the crucial issues of diplomacy. Hence, border restriction reports, which are the documents written by the border restriction commissions assigned to determine the borders as a result of border restriction studies, are among the essential sources of Ottoman diplomacy. In addition to understanding how the borders between the two states are determined, these reports have the characteristics of complementing the embassy duties of the ambassadors who go back and forth between the two states.¹⁹

¹⁴ Akengin, *Siyasi Coğrafya İnsan ve Mekân Yönetimi*, 99-100.

¹⁵ Cevat Korkut, *Siyasi Coğrafya Açısından Devlet Sınırları ve Türkiye'nin Sınırları*, (İzmir: Karınca Yay., 1970), 9.

¹⁶ The concept of border document is used for maps and reports prepared with on-site inspections by the negotiators of the two sides after a war or similar problem. On the other hand, the documents prepared to specify the territories of a farm or a land in the country was called "hududname", Mehmet Zeki Pakalın, *Osmanlı Tarih Deyimleri ve Terimleri Sözlüğü*, Vol. I, (İstanbul: MEB. Yay., 1983): 852; Also see Mübahat S. Kütükoğlu, "Hududname", *DİA*. Vol. 18, (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yay., 1989), 303-304.

¹⁷ Kurtaran, "XVIII. Yüzyıla Ait Hudutname ve Sınır Tahdit Örneği", 121.

¹⁸ Uğur Kurtaran, "Osmanlı Diplomasi Tarihinin Yazımında Kullanılan Başlıca Kaynaklar İle Bu Kaynakların İncelenmesindeki Metodolojik ve Diplomatik Yöntemler Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme", *OTAM*, 38, (Güz 2015): 129-130.

¹⁹ Uğur Kurtaran, "Ottoman-Austria Border Determination Works And Newly Determined Borders According To The Treaty Of Belgrade Of 1739", *Belgrade 1521-1867*, ed. Dragana Amedoski, (Belgrade: Yunus Emre Enstitüsü Yay., 2018), 171.

The Ottoman-Polish borders, which we discussed in the study, fall under the type of political border, and there are some stages in the formation of such borders that are accepted in the international arena. These stages are identification, delimitation, differentiation, and application.²⁰

In the type of political border, the borders are determined primarily at the end of the negotiations between the two states. Sometimes conferences are held by gathering representatives of more than two states to set boundaries. At the end of the negotiations at these conferences, when it was agreed on the areas where the borderline would cross, the situation was put into a text and mapped most clearly. Then, these maps were given to the parties by signing and stamping by the relevant states or the delegates of the states participating in the conference.²¹

The main methods used in the demarcation throughout history are as follows;

1. Demarcation by precise definition: The borderlines were defined in great detail in this method. In this method, the completed definition was arranged in a final report in a way to ensure the separation of borders (with fences, border stones, etc.) rather than a preliminary agreement.

2. Precise definition and determination of deviations: Although it is not possible to define the borderlines exactly in this method, the commission that makes border distinctions in the land is given the authority to make a regulation depending on geographical factors when necessary.

3. Demarcation with important landmarks: This method is based on defining the relevant borders with significant landmarks or significant angles of the borders. In this method, borders are determined according to accurate and important landmarks (latitude, longitude, clear marks in the field) based on map and field data adequacy.

4. Demarcation by routes and distances: Borders are defined like ship routes in this method, which is more suitable for borders in water.

5. Demarcation as a belt: In this method, where both sides of the border are defined as belts, this belt is delimited by two rivers or optionally two maps as another option.

6. Demarcation according to natural features: Natural elements such as mountains, rivers, and seas were used as border markers in natural border demarcation.²² However, artificial markers²³ made of stone or earth were used in areas where these were not available.

7. Demarcation according to the determined principles: In this method, the border determination commission determines the borders between the parties according to the principles mutually formed by the bordering countries.²⁴ In this way, the method most commonly used by the commissions in determining the border is the method of adopting a border called “*Uti possidetis*”²⁵, which has existed for a long time between the two states.

²⁰ Servet Karabağ, *Jeo Politik Açından Sınırlar*, (Ankara: Gazi Yay., 2008), 23-24.

²¹ Korkut, 6-7.

²² Ahmet Emin Dağ, *Uluslararası İlişkiler ve Diplomasi Sözlüğü*, (İstanbul: Vadi Yay., 2016), 56.

²³ In Ottoman documents, stones made of rocks or soil and in some regions, with a pilgrimage on one side and a crescent moon on the other, are called “*hunka*”. Sırça “*Humka*” kelimesinden gelen *Hunka* “*Sınır Tepesi, sınır taşı*” anlamlarına gelmektedir, Ali İbrahim Savaş, “*Takrir-i Ahmed Merami Efendi (Azak Muhaddidi Ahmet Merami Efendi'nin 1740-1741 Sınır Tespit Çalışmaları)*”, *Belgeler Türk Tarih Dergisi*, Vol. XVI. Separate Edition from Issue 20, (1996): 167.

²⁴ Karabağ, 21-22.

²⁵ The *uti possidetis* principle, which is one of the basic principles used in border demarcation processes after international agreements, means that a state owns the land occupied during the war. In accordance with this principle, unless otherwise stipulated in the peace treaties, the conditions and situations that emerged between the parties after the war are preserved as they are. In this way, movable spoils such as war tools and equipment, food, weapons, and money would remain in possession of the warring states, Dağ, 379; This term, which is used in

The Ottoman Empire had political and military relations with many states throughout its history, and accordingly, there was a constant change in its borders. At this point, it is reasonable to conclude that the Ottoman Empire employed the majority of the above-mentioned demarcation methods throughout history. In this context, the Ottoman Empire resolved the border issues mentioned in the treaty articles through diplomatic methods through the representatives it sent to the borders after the agreements made by adhering to the aforementioned methods in the border restriction studies with other states. Thus, determining and arranging the boundaries set after any treaty is crucial for the treaty to be implemented and remain in force.²⁶

2. Historical Process: Ottoman-Polish Relations and Treaty of Karlowitz

The beginning of the relations between the Ottoman Empire and Poland goes back to the XV century. The relations between the two states are related to the endangerment of Poland's lands in Eastern Europe in the face of the Ottoman Empire's expansion of its lands to the north and west since the XV century.²⁷ These developments caused Poland to join the Crusades organized against the Ottoman Empire.²⁸ The first relations between the two countries started with a letter sent by Hungarian King Sigismund to call for assistance from Poland against the Ottoman Empire. Thus, in 1414, the relations between the two states began when the King of Poland, Ladislaus Jagiello, stated that he could act as a mediator instead of aid and sent two envoys to the Ottoman country.²⁹ After the friendly relations, the first official agreement between the Ottoman Empire and Poland was signed on March 24, 1489.³⁰ However, relations between the two countries deteriorated when the Poles attacked Moldavia in 1497. As a result of the war, the Polish forces were heavily defeated with the Cosmin Forest Victory, and a new 5-year pact was made with Poland in 1501 and 1502.³¹ In this way, the new peace process between the two states continued until the XVII century. With the new treaty signed in 1607, Dniester (Turla) became the border between the two states while the friendship process continued. Then, in the new pact made in 1617, the Ochakov (Özü) River was accepted as the border in the Black Sea.³² However, when Poland attacked Moldavia again, Osman II launched Khotyn expedition to Poland. After this expedition, which resulted in the victory of the Ottoman forces, the Treaty of Khotyn was signed on October 9, 1621.³³ Later, the pacts were renewed with the agreements made between the parties in 1634 and 1640.³⁴ The invasion of Ukraine disrupted the peaceful atmosphere established with Khotyn in 1671 by Polish Crown Grand Hetman Jan Sobieski. During the expedition on Poland during the period of Mehmed IV,

contemporary Latin diplomacy, is a principle that allows the peace signatories to hold the lands they previously held according to their current military situation. The principle of *uti possidetis* began to be called the "*status quo*" from the XIX century, F. Monika Molnar, "Karlofça Antlaşması'ndan Sonra Osmanlı Habsburg Sınırı (1699-1701), *Osmanlı*, Vol. I, ed. Güler Eren, (Ankara: Yeni Türkiye Yay., 1999), 472.

²⁶ Kurtaran, "Ottoman-Austria Border Determination", 171.

²⁷ Kemal Beydilli, "Polonya (Tarih, Polonya-Osmanlı İlişkileri)", *DİA*. Vol. 34, (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yay., 2007): 317-320; Hacer Topaktaş, "XVIII. Yüzyıl Ortalarında Türk-Leh İlişkilerinden Bir Kesit: Kapıcıbaşı Mehmed Ağa'nın Lehistan (Polonya) Elçiliği (1757-1758)", *Osmanlı Araştırmaları*, XXIX, (2007): 203.

²⁸ Hacer Topaktaş, "Lehistan'dan Polonya'ya: Polonya Tarih yazımında Türkler ve Türkiye", *Türkiye Araştırmaları Literatür Dergisi*, Vol. 8, Issue 15, (2010): 537.

²⁹ Dariusz Kolodziejczyk, *Ottoman-Polish Diplomatic Relations (15th-18th Century): An Annotated Edition of Ahdnâmes and Other Document*, (Leiden, Brill, 2000), 99-100.

³⁰ Dariusz Kolodziejczyk, "Polonya ve Osmanlı Devleti Arasında Tarih Boyunca Siyasi ve Diplomatik İlişkiler", *Savaş ve Barış 15-19. Yüzyıl Osmanlı-Polonya İlişkileri*, (Yay. Selmin Kangal), (Ankara: T.C. Kültür Bakanlığı Yay., 1999), 21-35; *Yoldaki Elçi Osmanlı'dan Günümüze Türk-Leh İlişkileri*, (Yay. haz. Numan Yekeler vd.), (İstanbul: Osmanlı Arşivi Daire Başkanlığı Yay., Nu: 144), 6-7.

³¹ Beydilli, "Polonya", 311; *Yoldaki Elçi*, 10-12.

³² Rukiye Özdemir, "55/1 Numaralı Lehistan Ahidname-i Hümayun Defterine Göre XVII-XVIII. Yüzyıllarda Osmanlı-Lehistan İlişkileri", *Kafkas Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, Issue: 27, (Bahar 2021): 280-281.

³³ Beydilli, "Polonya", 312.

³⁴ Özdemir, "55/1 Numaralı Lehistan Ahidname-i Hümayun", 282-283.

Kamieniec (Kamaniçe) Castle fell into the hands of the Ottoman forces. Then, with the remaining troops attacking Lemberg, the Treaty of Buchach was signed between the parties in 1672.³⁵ Four years after this treaty, the Treaty of Żurawno was signed in 1676 with Sobieski, who had just ascended to the Polish throne.³⁶ While the lands of Podolia, Kamieniec (Kamaniçe) and Ukraine remained under Ottoman rule, all the articles of the Buchach Treaty were accepted as they were, except the annual 22,000 gold was given.³⁷ However, Sobieski, who wanted to take back the lost lands, made a treaty with Austria in violation of the Treaty of Żurawno, which again deteriorated the relations with the Ottoman Empire. Polish forces sided with Austria and helped abolish the Ottoman Siege of Vienna with the Kahlenberg Intervention in 1683. Then, Poland joined the Holy Alliance, which was formed against the Ottoman Empire in 1684.³⁸ During these struggles, Poland's attack on Kamieniec (Kamaniçe) and then on Moldavia was repelled by the Ottoman forces. However, although the attacks of the Polish forces, which did not give up on taking Kamieniec (Kamaniçe), continued, Poland could not get the desired result from these attacks.³⁹

Because the Holy Alliance Wars did not yield the anticipated outcomes, Poland, together with other states, began negotiations for the Karlowitz Treaty, which ended the battle. In Karlowitz, the Ottoman Empire was represented by Reisülküttab Rami Mehmed Pasha who was appointed as the chief executive officer by Grand Vizier Amcazade Hüseyin Pasha, and Aleksandre Mavrokordatos, who was appointed as the second executive director with the ambassadorial rank.⁴⁰ Poland was represented by Count Stanislaw Malachowsky.⁴¹ The negotiations between the Ottoman Empire and Poland in the Karlowitz Treaty focused on Kamieniec (Kamaniçe) and Moldavia. In this context, the primary demand of the Sublime Porte is that the Kamieniec (Kamaniçe) Castle be destroyed and left to Poland, together with Podolia and Ukraine, in exchange for the evacuation of Moldavia. However, Poland demanded that the attacks coming from the Crimea (Kırım) direction are stopped, the tax demand is removed, Kamieniec (Kamaniçe) is evacuated without being destroyed, and Poland's dominance in the regions occupied by Poland in Moldavia is accepted. Nevertheless, Poland had to abandon these demands in accordance with the prudent stance of the Ottoman representatives and the *uti possidetis* "ala halihi" (preserving the current situation) principle, which was accepted in accordance with the conditions of the Edirne Protocol (January 27, 1698) signed by the Sublime Porte with all the states before the Karlowitz negotiations.⁴²

Thus, an agreement consisting of 11 articles was signed between the two states as a result of the negotiations that started between Poland and the Ottoman Empire in Karlowitz on November 22, 1699.⁴³ This agreement with Poland, which will be valid for 25 years, covers

³⁵ İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Tarihi*, Vol. III, (Ankara: TTK. Yay., 1995), 423; *Yoldaki Elçi*, 164-172.

³⁶ Mehmet İnbaşı, *Ukrayna'da Osmanlılar Kamaniçe Seferi ve Organizasyonu (1672)*, (İstanbul: Yeditepe Yay., 2004), 194; Züleyha Türkoğlu, "55/1 Numaralı Lehistan Ahidname Defterinin Transkripsiyon ve Değerlendirilmesi", (Master Thesis, Gaziosmanpaşa University, 2007), 8.

³⁷ Uğur Kurtaran, *Sultan II. Mustafa (1695-1703)*, (Ankara: Siyasal Yay., 2017), 509-511.

³⁸ Beydilli, "Polonya", 313.

³⁹ Kurtaran, *Sultan II. Mustafa*, 512-514.

⁴⁰ Parmaksızoğlu, "Karlofça", 347.

⁴¹ Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Tarihi*, Vol. III, 590.

⁴² Kurtaran, *Sultan II. Mustafa*, 549-551.

⁴³ T. Cumhurbaşkanlığı Devlet Arşivleri Başkanlığı (BOA), BOA. KK. d. 53, p. 30-34; BOA. A. DVN. DVE. d. *Lehistan Ahidname Defteri*, 55/1, p. 22-26; BOA. A. DVNS. NMH. d. nr. 1, s. 2-5; BOA. Y. EE. nr. 31/29, p. 4-6; BOA. HH. nr. 1427/58425, Tarih 12 Rebiyülahir 1114 (13 Eylül 1702); Raşid Mehmed Efendi-Çelebizade İsmail Asım Efendi, *Târih-i Râşid ve Zeyli*, haz. Abdülkadir Özcan-Yunus Uğur-Baki Çakır-Ahmet Zeki, İzgüer, Vol. I-II, (İstanbul Klasik Yay., İstanbul 2013), 571-575; Defterdar Sarı Mehmed Paşa, *Zübde-i Vekayiât Tahlil ve Metin (1066-1116/1656-1704)*, haz. Abdülkadir Özcan, (Ankara: TTK. Yay., 1995), 662-667; *Yoldaki Elçi*, 184-192.

many issues between the parties, including political, economic, military, and religious issues.⁴⁴ In this context, it was decided to evacuate Podolia and Ukraine in accordance with the treaty.⁴⁵ While it was decided that Poland should evacuate Kamieniec (Kamaniçe) and have it demolished, it was requested that this work be completed no later than May 1700. Similarly, the fortresses of Suczawa (Suçeava), Roman, Njamtzo (Nemce), Soroka, and Kapulek, which Poland occupied, were recaptured in Moldavia. In addition to the same acceptance of Moldavia's old border, the principle of releasing the prisoners and removing the taxes paid by the Poles to Crimea (Kırım) was introduced.⁴⁶ The document, which includes the renewal of the commercial relations between the parties, was signed and sealed by the Ottoman officials Alexandre Mavrokordatos and Mehmed Rami Efendi.⁴⁷

3. Determination of Ottoman-Polish Boundaries According to the Karlowitz Treaty

The first four articles of the 11-article agreement with Poland in the Karlowitz Treaty specify the new borders between the parties. In these articles, the borders between the parties were returned to the pre-war situation, by adhering to the principle of "ala halhi", which was accepted with the Edirne Protocol in 1698 during the Karlowitz negotiations. These articles are as follows:⁴⁸

1. In the first article of the Karlowitz Treaty, the old border between the Ottoman Empire and Poland was accepted as it was. In this framework, the territories under the control of both Moldavia and the Ottoman Empire and the borders of Poland would remain as they were before.

2. According to the second article of the treaty, Polish soldiers within the borders of Moldavia would be removed, and Moldavia would be completely cleared and restored to its pre-war state.

3. According to the third article of the treaty, Kamieniec (Kamaniçe) Castle will be left to Poland, and the Ottoman soldiers in the region will be removed. Ottoman forces from Podolia and Ukraine would be evacuated, and the Ukrainian Hetmanate established by the Ottoman administration in Moldavia would be abolished. Polish soldiers in Moldavia would be evacuated as of the following March. Likewise, the Ottoman soldiers in Kamieniec (Kamaniçe) will be removed from the beginning of March, and these operations will be completed by May 15. Those who want to stay or leave from rayah in the forts evacuated from both sides will be allowed.

4. According to the sixth article of the treaty, Budjak (Bucak) and other Tatar groups who entered Moldavia during the war will be expelled from the region.

The Treaty of Karlowitz is accepted as a significant turning point in Ottoman-Polish relations. As a result, the Ottoman Empire, which was in a superior position against Poland in terms of politics and military until this date in the Ottoman-Polish relations that started in 1414, had to give up the places it had previously taken from Poland with the Treaty of Karlowitz. In this framework, in accordance with the articles of the Karlowitz Treaty with Poland, the borders between the two states were drawn to the borders before Mehmed IV. Moreover, the Karlowitz

⁴⁴ See Uğur Kurtaran, "Karlofça Antlaşması'nda Venedik, Lehistan Ve Rusya'ya Verilen Ahitnamelerin Genel Özellikleri ve Diplomatik Açından Değerlendirilmesi", *Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih Coğrafya Fakültesi Tarih Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 35 (60), (2016), 97-139.

⁴⁵ Oleksandr Sereda, *XVIII. Yüzyıl Osmanlı Belgeleri Işığında Osmanlı-Ukrayna Bozkır Serhatti*, (İstanbul: 29 Mayıs Üniversitesi, 2015), 119.

⁴⁶ BOA. KK. d. 53: 30-34.

⁴⁷ *Savaş ve Barış 15-19. Yüzyıl Osmanlı-Polonya İlişkileri*, (Yay. Selmin Kangal), (Ankara: T.C. Kültür Bakanlığı Yay., 1999), 153.

⁴⁸ BOA. KK. d. 53: 30-33; BOA. A. DVN. DVE. d. *Lehistan Ahidname Defteri*, 55/1: 22-24; BOA. A. DVNS. NMH. d. nr. 1, s. 2-5; BOA. Y. EE. nr. 31/29, p. 4-6; Kurtaran, "Karlofça Antlaşması'nda Venedik, Lehistan", 97-139; *Yoldaki Elçi*, 187-188.

Treaty is also important in terms of ending the war process between the two states and moving to the peace process.⁴⁹

At this point, the Ottoman Empire, which gave importance to the peace process with Poland after the Karlowitz Treaty, supported the anti-Russian Stanislaw Leszczyński, a candidate for the throne in Poland. Meanwhile, in the letter sent to the Ottoman grand vizier by the Archbishop of Poland, it was requested to act under the terms of the Karlowitz Treaty. In the letter sent to Archbishop of Poland by the Ottoman grand vizier Amcazade Hüseyin Pasha, it was stated that the friendship would continue in accordance with the terms of the treaty. In addition, in the continuation of the grand vizier's letter, it was stated that Kamieniec (Kamianiec) Podolski Castle would be evacuated as stated in the treaty.⁵⁰ In addition, in a letter sent by the Ottoman Sultan to the King of Poland, Augustus II, the 11-item agreement in Karlowitz was mentioned, and some conditions were put forward for the continuation of the peace.⁵¹

In this framework, after the agreement, the process of determining and limiting the new borders specified in the agreement was started in order for the peace process between the parties to be permanent. The evacuation of Kamieniec (Kamianiec) Castle, which was first mentioned in the agreement and planned in May, was completed on September 22 due to some delays.⁵² After the evacuation of the Ottoman forces from the castle, the keys of the castle and the city were given by the castle commander, Kahraman Pasha, to the Voivode of Kyiv and also the Polish artillery general Marcin Katki.⁵³ While the city of Kamieniec (Kamianiec), which was destroyed by the Polish forces, passed to Poland 27 years later, the Ottoman-Polish borders took the form they were in 1672. Then, after the Kochara (Koçara), Dubnice (Dubniçe), and Sovrokia castles and some monasteries and churches on the borders of Moldavia, which were agreed upon in the treaty, were emptied, these regions were left to the Moldavian Voivode.⁵⁴

3.1. Border Restriction Negotiations

The Ottoman Empire commissioned Ochakov (Özü) Governor El-Hac Yusuf Pasha for border restraint operations.⁵⁵ Moreover, in the orders sent to the governors of Vlore (Avlonya), Kystendil (Köstendil), Alexandria, Dukagjin (Dukakin), Prizren, Delvina (Delvine), Alacahisar, and Nigbolu (Niğbolu) sanjak, they were asked to go to Yusuf Pasha, who was tasked with determining the Ottoman-Polish border.⁵⁶ Yusuf Pasha assigned El-Hac İbrahim Ağa because of his previous border experiences.⁵⁷ In response, Poland appointed Hieronim Augustyn Lubomirski the overseer and grand hetman of the King of Poland and the castellan of the city of Krakovsky, for the demarcation activities. Baclawcki Palatini (Voivode) Marcin Chomentowski, Jan Koniecpolski, and Stefan Humieski were brought to Lubomirski's entourage as border commissioners. Finally, we can reach the details of the border negotiations in the document prepared in Latin, which the relevant Polish commission gave to the Ottoman representative İbrahim Ağa to sign the details of the negotiations and the decisions taken on the determination of the border.⁵⁸ According to the information in the relevant document, after the establishment of the border commissions of both sides, as is customary, the parties agreed on a common borderline. In this context, border commissions under the supervision of İbrahim Ağa

⁴⁹ Kurtaran, *Sultan II. Mustafa*, 600; Hacer Topaktaş, Karlofça'dan Lozan'a İstanbul'da Leh Diplomatlar 1699-1923", *OTAM*, 37, (Bahar 2015), 314.

⁵⁰ BOA. A. DVNS. NMH. d. nr. 5, 377-380;432-435.

⁵¹ BOA. A. DVNS. NMH. d. nr. 5, 449-46; Kurtaran, *Sultan II. Mustafa*, 601-602.

⁵² Kolodziejczyk, "Polonya ve Osmanlı Devleti", 30.

⁵³ BOA. KK. d. 53, p. 30-34; BOA. A. DVN. DVE. d. *Lehistan Ahidname Defteri*, 55/1, 22-26.

⁵⁴ Kurtaran, *Sultan II. Mustafa*, 606.

⁵⁵ BOA. A. DVNS. MHM. d. nr. 110, p. 636, hk. 2906, 2907.

⁵⁶ BOA. A. DVNS. MHM. d. nr. 114, p. 56-57.

⁵⁷ BOA. KK. d. nr. 60/3: 1; BOA. HH. nr. 14271/58428: 1, Tarih: 3 Cemaziyelahir 1115 (14 Ekim 1703); *Yoldaki Elçi*, 192.

⁵⁸ See BOA. HH. nr. 1427/58428 Tarih: 3 Cemaziyelahir 1115 (14 Ekim 1703).

and Hieronim Augustyn Lubomirski came together in a region of the Kaynar River close to the Dniester (Turla) River. The Ottoman representative İbrahim Ağa participated in the negotiations together with the elders and experts of the people of Crimea (Kırım) and Budjak (Bucak), who knew the relevant regions well, which was a method used in border negotiations before.⁵⁹

The first problem in the border negotiations between the parties between Kaynar and Dniester (Turla) was about where to start the border determination. At this point, the Polish authorities asked for a deed stating that the border determination should be started from the Dniester (Turla) River. Thereupon, the people of Budjak (Bucak) and Crimea (Kırım) stated that the old border between the two states was the Kaynar River. In the meantime, with the representatives of Poland confirming that the border between Hüseyin Ağa and Stanislaw Koniecpolski on behalf of Poland 70 years ago was the Kaynar River, it was decided that the new border would be determined over Kaynar. Thus, after mutual approvals, the area where the Ottoman people lived, located near the region where the Kaynar River connects to the Dniester (Turla) River, and across the village above the river, where the Kazakhs of the Crimean Khan lived before, was accepted as the border starting point. In this way, after the determination of the border starting point, a second debate arose between the border commissions. Accordingly, the representatives of Poland demanded the removal of the villages established later in the region, which was accepted as the starting point of the border. However, the Ottoman representatives replied that if the villages of one side were abolished, the villages of the other side should be removed as well.⁶⁰ With the decision taken, it was decided that in case of cruelty and injustice from the villages of the two sides against each other, both sides would be removed from these regions. However, although the inhabitants of this region could not cause any problems, under no circumstances were either side allowed to build a castle. In this way, in the continuation of the negotiations between the parties, it was decided that the lands of Kaynar and the water of Kaynar were for common use, and it was requested to create a gateway for the Ottoman Empire on one side of the water and for Poland on the other.⁶¹ Thus, after the border determination/restriction negotiations between the parties, a new border pact was signed in 1703. In this way, after 27 years of war, the Polish-Ottoman border was officially reinstated and ratified in 1703.⁶² However, at the same time, with the 1703 Revolt (Edirne Incident) on September 22, 1703, Sultan Mustafa II was dethroned. A new border protocol was signed on October 12, 1703, between Sultan Ahmed III, who came to the throne, and the King of Poland. In this context, the details of the border restriction transactions between the parties and the decisions taken are as follows:⁶³

1. It was decided that the villages where the rayahs of the two states lived on both sides of the Kaynar River would be left in their places and that no new castles would be built in these regions from then on.

2. It was decided that Rashkova and Kamanka Castles would remain in possession of Dumna, the daughter of Vasil voivode, one of the former Moldavian Voivodes. However, when

⁵⁹ This application is a method that the Ottoman Empire used very often in border negotiations; the main reason is that the Ottoman Empire did not have maps indicating where the last borderline passed. However, such verbal determinations can sometimes lead to incorrect/incomplete drawings on the borderline and therefore to restriction processes.

⁶⁰ It is possible to attribute this attitude of the Ottoman representatives to the principle of international equality in diplomacy. If the Ottoman representatives had accepted this condition, they would have violated the principle of "negotiation and discussion on equal terms", which is one of the basic conditions of international diplomacy, and eventually, they would have been defeated at the very beginning of the negotiations.

⁶¹ *Yoldaki Elçi*, p. 193-194.

⁶² Kolodziejczyk, "Polonya ve Osmanlı Devleti", s. 30.

⁶³ BOA. KK. d. nr. 60/3: 1-7; BOA. HH. nr. 1427/58428, Tarih: 3 Cemaziyelahir 1115 (14 Ekim 1703); BOA. HH. nr. 14727/58427, Tarih: 1 Cemaziyellevvel 1115 (12 Eylül 1703); Dariusz Kolodziejczyk, *Ottoman-Polish Diplomatic Relations (15th-18th Century): An Annotated Edition of Ahdnâmes and Other Documents*, (Leiden 2000): 626-630.

it was stated that Sandomiske, one of the Polish voivodes, bought these two regions for a total of 60,000 zlotych, it was stated that these regions could be given to Dumna in return for the payment of the relevant amount.

3. According to the agreement, the attacks of the Moldavians on the Polish villages will be prevented.

4. One side of the place where the Kaynar River flows into Dniester (Turla) was given to the Ottoman Empire, and the other side to the Polish State, and two large hills were built as a sign.

5. In the region where the Kaynar River comes out, opposite hills were built, and separate border signs were placed for the two states on both sides of the Kaynar River. This hill became the starting point of the border, and the representatives of Poland placed the stone on which they had the names of the border deputies engraved together with the date of that year to highlight their mound.

6. Going from the area where the water comes out along the Kaynar Stream, in the appropriate areas on both sides, opposite each other at the water's edge, the signs of the Ottoman Empire on one side and Poland on the other were placed. In this way, after the border marks were placed up to the ridge of the mountain called Ripnuti, two large mounds were built there, which would correspond to each other. Then, another hillock was built on the Polish side by descending from the mountain and passing through the mountains around the Kaynar River. When it comes to the mountain that divides the Kaynar River to the right and left, signs were placed on the right side of the Kaynar River, which splits into two, by the representative of the Ottoman Empire, and on the left side by the Polish border deputy.

7. After the signs were placed on the right and left of the Kaynar River, it was passed to the region called Kubanlıkbaşı by going for about an hour. After crossing the Koçmar-Islak road there, the hill known as İstara (İstara) or Yanuşka Mükine (since there is no other similar hill here) was accepted as a border mark. From there, the road leading to the sea was followed, and the Deliyolbaşı locality was reached. From there, the border deputies, who took the Markyon Forest to the south, went to the north from the Kodama creek on the left side and reached the forests at the end, and these forests were given to Poland. Then, by going from the north of this region, they proceeded from the high sides of the mountains and reached the forest at the end of Deligöl in the south, and this forest was left to the Ottoman Empire. Afterward, a hill was built by the Ottoman Empire in the south of the Kodama Creek from the Polish side, and a little far from the same direction, by making a hill in the direction of the mountain towards the forward north.

8. Two hills were built, one in the name of the Ottoman Empire in the south of the place where Goksu (Göksu) flows into Aksu, and the other in the name of Lehistan in the north direction. Then the border date was written on the hills near Aksu.

In this way, with the border restriction protocol dated October 12, 1703, the borders between the Ottoman Empire and Poland determined by the Karlowitz Treaty were determined and limited. According to Kolodziejczyk, the 1703 border protocols connecting Podolia to Poland were more precise than the border in 1680. The commissioners agreed on a settlement restriction in the border area.⁶⁴ Later, the border signs of both sides were renewed, and doubts were removed. Then, at the request of the Ottoman and Polish sides, mutual border documents were written. In this context, in return for this border protocol given by the Ottoman Empire, the commissioners appointed by the King and the Republic of Poland for border determination

⁶⁴ Dariusz Kolodziejczyk, "Betwen Universalistic Claims and Realty: Ottoman Frontairs in the Early Modern Period", *The Ottoman World*, Ed. By Christine Woodhead, (London an Newyork: Roudledge, 2012): 211.

delivered the document they had written in Latin and signed and sealed, to the border officers of the Ottoman Empire and sent it to Istanbul.⁶⁵

Conclusion

A number of findings have been reached regarding the problems mentioned in the introduction regarding the determination of the Ottoman-Polish borders after the Treaty of Karlowitz. The first of these is that, as was the case after the treaty, delimitation activities were carried out through the border constraint commissions established between the parties. However, it could not be determined when the border commissions started their activities and how long the works lasted. It is seen that only the border protocol regarding the constraint transactions was written on October 12, 1703, and with this, the borders between the two states returned to the condition they were in 1672. At this point, approximately 3.5 years after the Treaty of Karlowitz, signed on January 26, 1699, the borders between the Ottoman Empire and Poland were finalized.

Secondly, it is possible to conclude that the Ottoman-Polish borders belong to the type of political borders, which is the type of border determined according to the results of interstate wars. According to the data obtained from the study, two of the international political border stages (identification, discrimination/markings) were used in the formation of the Ottoman-Polish borders. Accordingly, the commissions of the two sides first defined the borders in the first three articles of the treaty and then marked the borders using natural and artificial elements. At this point, it is seen that the other two stages (demarcation and application) used in the formation of the political border were not employed in the Ottoman-Polish border demarcation process.

Our third finding regarding boundary determination is that 2 out of 7 methods used in general boundary determination methods were used in this case.

The first of these is the method of finalizing the borders according to the determined principles. As a matter of fact, the Ottoman-Polish border was drawn within the principle of “uti possidetis”, or “ala halihi” as it was called in the Ottoman literature, which was determined in the Karlowitz Treaty. On the basis of this principle, which means “preservation of the current situation”, the two states accepted what they owned during the war in the treaty.

The second method used is the use of natural and artificial borders in demarcation. As seen in the text, 5 rivers (Kaynar, Dniester (Turla), Kodama, Aksu, Goksu (Göksu)), 1 named mountain (Ripnuti) and 2 unspecified mountains, 1 unnamed sea, 1 lake (Deligöl), and 2 forests (Markyon, other unnamed) were used as a natural boundary point. In areas where these are not available, artificial border markers built by the commissions of both sides; hills, knolls, and signs were used. In the documents, there are 10 hills that are not mentioned in this way and that both sides built mutually and a hill called istara (Istara) or Yanuçka Mükine. Likewise, although it is stated by the commissions of both parties that 4 signs were placed on the border demarcation, there is no information that neither the hills nor these border signs were made of stone or soil. It is seen that the Polish representatives put a stone with the relevant date and their own names on the Kaynar River, which is considered to be the starting point of the border, just to make the border clear. Apart from these, various regions/locations (Kubanlıkbaşı, Deliyolbaşı), castles (Raşkova, Kamanka), and unnamed villages were also used to determine the border between the two states. Again, as is customary during border demarcation activities, distance and direction signs such as clock, right/left, and north/south (qibla) are used to measure distances between two border regions.

⁶⁵ See BOA. HH. nr. 14271/ 58428: 1, Tarih: 3 Cemaziyelahir 1115 (14 Ekim 1703); *Yoldaki Elçi*, 196; Kurtaran, *Sultan II. Mustafa*, 608-609.

Our fourth finding on the Ottoman-Polish border concerns the details of the border delimitation negotiations between the parties. Again, in these details, it is possible to say that the Ottoman representatives paid attention to the procedures such as diplomatic equality and consulting with the people of the region who knew the old borders used in the previous periods. As a result, although these two issues were the most critical topics of discussion during the negotiations, they were resolved in favor of the Ottomans thanks to the successful representation of the Ottoman representatives.

The last finding related to the study is that mutual border documents were created between the parties regarding the restricted borders, as in general border determinations. However, there is no mention of a map made by the representatives of both parties regarding the new borders. However, it is known that the Ottoman-Polish borders, which were finalized on October 12, 1703, were preserved for many years since there was no new war/treaty process between the parties.

Bibliography

1. Archive Documents

- T.C. Cumhurbaşkanlığı Devlet Arşivleri Başkanlığı Osmanlı Arşivi (BOA)
Bab-1 Asafî Düvel-i Ecnebiye Defterleri (A. DVN. DVE. d.) *Lehistan Ahidname Defteri*, 55/1.
Divan-ı Hümâyûn, Nâme-i Hümâyûn Defterleri (A. DVNS. NMH. d.) nr. 1; 5.
Divan-ı Hümâyûn, Mühimme Defterleri (A. DVNS. MHM. d), nr. 110; 114.
Kâmil Kepeci Defterleri (KK. d.) nr. 53; 60/3.
Hatt-ı Hümâyûn Tasnifi (HH.) nr. 1427/58425, Tarih: 20 Rebiyülahir 1114 (13 Eylül 1702); 1427/58428, Tarih: 20 Cemaziyelahir 1115 (14 Ekim 1703); 14727/58427, Tarih: 1 Cemaziyelevvel 1115 (12 Eylül 1703).
Yıldız Esas Evrakı (Y. EE.) nr. 31/29.

2. Literature

- Abou El Haj, Rıfa'at Ali (1983). "The Former Closure of Ottoman Frontier in Europe:1699-1703", *Journal of The American Oriental Society*, 89: 3: 467-475.
Akengin, Hamza (2015). *Siyasi Coğrafya İnsan ve Mekân Yönetimi*, Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
Apaydın, Bahadır (2009). "5 Aralık 1857 Tarihli Osmanlı Devleti-Rusya Sınır Anlaşması", *Uluslararası Hukuk ve Politika*, Vol. 5, no. 18: 83-103.
Beydilli, Kemal (2007). "Polonya (Tarih, Polonya-Osmanlı İlişkileri)", *İslam Ansiklopedisi*, Vol. 34, İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yay., 317-320.
Dağ, Ahmet Emin (2016). *Uluslararası İlişkiler ve Diplomasi Sözlüğü*, İstanbul: Vadi Yay.
Defterdar Sarı Mehmed Paşa (1995). *Zübde-i Vekayiât Tahlil ve Metin (1066-1116/1656-1704)*, (haz. Abdülkadir Özcan), Ankara: TTK. Yay.
Devellioğlu, Ferit (2001). *Osmanlıca-Türkçe Ansiklopedik Lûgat*, Ankara: Aydın Kitabevi.
Erim, Nihat (1953). *Devletlerarası Hukuk Ve Siyasî Tarih Metinleri*, Vol. I, Ankara: TTK. Yay.
Gümüşçü, Osman (2010). "Siyasi Coğrafya Açısından Sınırlar ve Tarihi Süreç İçinde Türkiye'de Sınır Kavramı", *Bilig*, Kış, Issue. 52: 79-104.
İnbaşı, Mehmet (2004). *Ukrayna'da Osmanlılar Kamañiçe Seferi ve Organizasyonu (1672)*, İstanbul: Yeditepe Yay.

- Jorga, Nicolai (2010). *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu Tarihi*, C. IV, (trans. Nilüfer Epçeli), İstanbul: Yeditepe Yay.
- Karabağ, Servet (2008). *Jeo Politik Açısından Sınırlar*, Ankara: Gazi Kitabevi.
- Kolodziejczyk, Dariusz (2012). “Betwen Universalistic Claims and Realty: Ottoman Frontairs in the Early Modern Period”, *The Ottoman World*, (Ed. By. Christine Woodhead), London an Newyork, Roudledge: 205-220.
- Kolodziejczyk, Dariusz (1999). “Polonya ve Osmanlı Devleti Arasında Tarih Boyunca Siyasi ve Diplomatik İlişkiler”, *Savaş ve Barış 15-19. Yüzyıl Osmanlı-Polonya İlişkileri*, (Yay. Selmin Kangal), Ankara: 21-35.
- Kolodziejczyk, Dariusz (2000). *Ottoman-Polish Diplomatic Relations (15th-18th Century): An Annotated Edition of Ahdnâmes and Other Document*, Leiden: Brill.
- Korkut, Cevat (1970). *Siyasi Coğrafya Açısından Devlet Sınırları ve Türkiye'nin Sınırları*, İzmir: Karınca Yay.
- Kurtaran, Uğur (2015). “Osmanlı Diplomasi Tarihinin Yazımında Kullanılan Başlıca Kaynaklar İle Bu Kaynakların İncelenmesindeki Diplomatik Ve Metodolojik Yöntemler Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme”, *OTAM (Ankara Üniversitesi Osmanlı Tarihi Araştırma ve Uygulama Merkezi Dergisi)*, Güz, 38: 107-139.
- Kurtaran, Uğur (2016). “Karlofça Antlaşması'nda Venedik, Lehistan Ve Rusya'ya Verilen Ahitnamelerin Genel Özellikleri ve Diplomatik Açısından Değerlendirilmesi”, *Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih Coğrafya Fakültesi Tarih Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 35 (60): 97-139.
- Kurtaran, Uğur (2017). *Sultan II. Mustafa (1695-1703)*, Ankara: Siyasal Yay.
- Kurtaran, Uğur (2018). “Ottoman-Austria Border Determination Works And Newly Determined Borders According To The Treaty Of Belgrade Of 1739”, *Belgrade 1521-1867*, (ed. Dragana Amedoski), Belgrade:169-193.
- Kurtaran, Uğur (2018). “XVIII. Yüzyıla Ait Hudutname ve Sınır Tahdit Örneği: Karlofça Antlaşması'na Göre Belgrad Sınırlarının Belirlenmesi”, *Osmanlı Diplomasi Tarihi Kurumları ve Tatbiki*, (Ed. Mehmet Alaaddin Yalçınkaya-Uğur Kurtaran), Ankara: Grafiker Yay.,119-145.
- Kütükoğlu, Mübahat S. (1998). “Hudutname”, *İslam Ansiklopedisi*, Vol. 18, İstanbul: TDV Yay., 303-304.
- Molnar, F. Monika (1999). “Karlofça Antlaşması'ndan Sonra Osmanlı Habsburg Sınırı (1699-1701)”, *Osmanlı*, Vol. I, (ed. Güler Eren), Ankara: Yeni Türkiye Yay., 472-479.
- Özcan, Abdülkadir (2001). “Karlofça Antlaşması”, *İslam Ansiklopedisi*, Vol. 24, İstanbul: TDV Yay., 504-507.
- Özdemir, Rukiye. “55/1 Numaralı Lehistan Ahidname-i Hümayun Defterine Göre XVII-XVIII. Yüzyıllarda Osmanlı-Lehistan İlişkileri”, *Kafkas Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, no. 27, (Bahar 2021): 273-302.
- Pakalın, Mehmet Zeki (1983). *Osmanlı Tarih Deyimleri ve Terimleri Sözlüğü*, Vol. I, İstanbul: MEB Yay.
- Parmaksızoğlu, İsmet (1991). “Karlofça (Carlowicz, Kalowitz)”, *İslam Ansiklopedisi*, Vol. VI, İstanbul: MEB Yay., 346-351.

- Raşid Mehmed Efendi-Çelebizâde İsmail Asım Efendi (2013). *Târîh-i Râşid ve Zeyli*, (haz. Abdülkadir Özcan-Yunus Uğur-Baki Çakır-Ahmet Zeki, İzgüer), C. I-II, İstanbul: Klasik Yay.
- Sander, Oral (2008). *Anka'nın Yükselişi ve Düşüşü Osmanlı Diplomasi Tarihi Üzerine Bir Deneme*, Ankara: İmge Yay.
- Savaş, Ali İbrahim (1996). "Tahrir-i Ahmed Merami Efendi (Azak Muhaddidi Ahmet Merami Efendi'nin 1740-1741 Sınır Tespit Çalışmaları)", *Belgeler Türk Tarih Dergisi*, Vol. XVI. Separate Edition from Issue 20, Ankara: 151-173.
- Savaş, Ali İbrahim (2007). *Osmanlı Diplomasisi*, İstanbul: 3 F Yay.
- Sereda, Oleksandr (2015). XVIII. Yüzyıl Osmanlı Belgeleri Işığında Osmanlı-Ukrayna Bozkır Serhatti, İstanbul: 29 Mayıs Üniversitesi, 2015.
- Silahdar Fındıklılı Mehmed Ağa (1962). *Nusretname*, Vol. I, (Sad. İsmet Parmaksızoğlu), İstanbul: MEB Yay.
- Topaktaş, Hacer (2007). "XVIII. Yüzyıl Ortalarında Türk-Leh İlişkilerinden Bir Kesit: Kapıcıbaşı Mehmed Ağa'nın Lehistan (Polonya) Elçiliği (1757-1758)", *Osmanlı Araştırmaları*, XXIX: 203-225.
- Topaktaş, Hacer (2010). "Lehistan'dan Polonya'ya: Polonya Tarihyazımında Türkler ve Türkiye", *Türkiye Araştırmaları Literatür Dergisi*, Vol. 8, Issue 15: 537-590.
- Topaktaş, Hacer (2015). Karlofça'dan Lozan'a İstanbul'da Leh Diplomatlar 1699-1923", *OTAM*, 37/Bahar: 307-336.
- Türkoğlu, Züleyha. "55/1 Numaralı Lehistan Ahidnâme Defterinin Transkripsiyon ve Değerlendirilmesi", Master Thesis, Gaziosmanpaşa University, 2007.
- Uzunçarşılı, İsmail Hakkı (1995). *Osmanlı Tarihi*, Vol. III, Ankara: TTK Yay.
- Yoldaki Elçi Osmanlı'dan Günümüze Türk-Leh İlişkileri* (2014). (Yay. haz. Numan Yekeler vd.), İstanbul: Osmanlı Arşivi Daire Başkanlığı Yay.
- Zinkeisen, Johann Wilhelm (2011). *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu Tarihi*, Vol. 5, (trans. Nilüfer Eçeli), İstanbul: Yeditepe Yay.