

Zbigniew Wójcik

SOME PROBLEMS OF POLISH-TATAR RELATIONS
IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY. THE FINANCIAL ASPECTS
OF THE POLISH-TATAR ALLIANCE IN THE YEARS 1654—1666 *

The author of this article has recently drawn attention to the fact that detailed research into Polish-Tatar relations in the seventeenth century is a serious scientific postulate.¹ Without full research into this subject it will not be possible to have a due knowledge and understanding of one of the most important problems in the history of Poland during the seventeenth century i.e. Polish eastern policy.

It must be stated with satisfaction that our knowledge of the subject has been advanced considerably during the past twenty years,² and recently this problem has even provoked a polemic³ which is always an aid to any advance in research. Thus gone are the days when our leading historians underestimated the significance of relations between Poland and the Crimea in the seventeenth century and often treated them as a *quantité négligeable*.⁴

* This article first appeared in Polish in the work *O naprawę Rzeczypospolitej. Zbiór studiów* [*The Repair of Poland. Collected Studies*], Warszawa 1965, presented to the outstanding Polish expert on the seventeenth century, Professor Władysław Czapliński of Wrocław University.

¹ Z. Wójcik, *Mediacja tatarska między Polską a Turcją w roku 1672*, "Przegląd Historyczny", vol. LIII, 1962, No. 1.

² Op. cit., p. 32, notes 1 and 2. To the works mentioned there one ought to add B. Baranowski, *Chłop polski w walce z Tatarami*, Warszawa, 1952 and works published during the past 3 years: W. Majewski, *Podhajce — letnia i jesienna kampania 1667 r.* in: *Studia i materiały do historii wojskowości*, vol. VII, part 1, Warszawa 1961; *idem*, *Najazd Tatarów w lutym 1695 r.*, *ibidem*, vol. IX, part 1, Warszawa 1963, J. Woliński, *Wojna polsko-turecka 1672—1676 w świetle relacji rezydentów austriackich w Turcji*, *ibidem*, vol. VII, part 2, Warszawa 1961, containing a lot of material on Polish-Tatar relations during this period.

³ See M. Horn, *Chronologia i zasięg najazdów tatarskich na ziemie Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej w latach 1600—1647*, *ibidem*, vol. VIII, part 1, Warszawa 1963 together with W. Czapliński controversial work: *Sprawa najazdów tatarskich na Polskę w pierwszej połowie XVII w.*, "Kwartalnik Historyczny", vol. LXX, 1963, No. 3.

⁴ See Czapliński's remarks, op. cit., p. 713. A particularly extreme example was the essay by the outstanding authority on modern Polish history, W. Konopczyński, *Polityka zagraniczna (przyczyny upadku Polski)*, Warszawa 1918. The problems of Polish-Tatar relations in the second

Clearly such an important advance in research does not mean that we have obtained such satisfactory results that we can be content with them. The entire output of Polish and foreign historiography which has in any way touched upon the problem under discussion,⁵ does not permit us to take such a view of the matter; from amongst the research postulates I should like to put forward three questions, two of which are concerned exclusively with the topic under discussion, though the third has wider aspects outside the sphere of Polish-Tatar relations.

The first of these topics is the establishment of the exact chronology and extent of the Tatar raids into Polish territory during the seventeenth century, a theme which has been begun, on the whole successfully, by the previously mentioned Maurycy Horn.⁶

Research is also required into such a basic question as the problem of the so-called Tatar gifts and the financial matters connected with Polish policy with regard to the khanate. One may safely assert that these problems played a more important role in Polish policy towards the Crimea than in any other area of the international relations of our country, not excluding relations with Moscow and Turkey which were also costly.⁷ It was necessary to bribe the Tatars when they were enemies to escape their destructive raids and also when they were allies to maintain their allegiance to Poland.

Finally the third topic, which in my opinion should be investigated by historians from many countries, concerns the international position of the Crimean khanate, but particularly its reciprocal relations with dependence on Turkey. Obviously this research could not be confined to the seventeenth century but should embrace the entire period of the Crimea's vassal age to the Ottoman Empire, i.e. the fifteenth to the eighteenth centuries.

This is not a new theme in historical scholarship,⁸ but the results of research carried on to date have not given any clear answers to such a basic question as

half of the seventeenth century (after 1648) did not, in my opinion, find due understanding in the most recent synthesis of the history of Poland also. See *Historia Polski*, vol. I, part 2, Warszawa 1957 (Instytut Historii Polskiej Akademii Nauk), p. 375 and fol.

⁵ E. g. A. A. Novoselski's valuable work: *Bor'ba moskovskogo gosudarstva s Tatarami v pervoj polovine XVII veka*, Moskva—Leningrad 1948.

⁶ Researches on elemental defeats in early Poland were quite right to consider the problem of Tatar invasions. See A. Walawender, *Kronika kłesk elementarnych w Polsce i w krajach sąsiednich w latach 1450—1586*, Lwów 1935 and S. Namaczyńska, *Kronika kłesk elementarnych w Polsce i w krajach sąsiednich 1648—1696*, vol. I, Lwów 1937.

⁷ I consider those problems more closely in the work *Organizacja dyplomacji polskiej w drugiej połowie XVII w.* (in press).

⁸ See V. D. Smirnov's works, *Krymskoe hanstvo pod verhovenstvom ottomanskoj Porty do načala XVII veka*. S. Petersburg 1887; N. Jorga, *Geschichte des Osmanischen Reiches*, Bd. II, Gotha 1909; N. A. Smirnov, *Rossija i Turcija v XVI—XVII v. v.*, vol. II, Moskva 1946 and others.

whether the khanate was an independent political agent in Eastern Europe or only an obedient executor of the will of Porte.

It is clear that there can be no single answer for all three centuries of the period mentioned earlier. This historian held that the role of the Crimea was, during the course of the fifteenth to the eighteenth centuries, confined exclusively to that of Turkey's obedient vassal.⁹ The most recent opinions in historiography dealing with the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries clearly tend to agree with Smirnov's thesis,¹⁰ but as to the seventeenth century, or more strictly speaking, to the fifth, sixth and seventh decades of this century they are completely different.¹¹

So much for the question, which in my opinion, is the chief problem to be considered by the researches of the history of Polish-Tatar relations, those of the seventeenth century. But another point occurs forcefully when we study the literature dealing with the above problems. Polish works on this theme are often exclusively based on Polish, Moscovite, Ruthenian and other Christian sources and generally disregard Moslem, and thus Tatar and Turkish sources. This fact has been pointed out very frequently by Professor Olgierd Górka¹² who even suggested the publishing of *Monumenta islamitica res gestas Poloniae illustrantia*. A reading of the Tatar chronicle from the years 1664—1650 convinced the author of this article that Turko-Tatar sources are an indispensable complement to the European materials, though one should obviously not magnify their significance out of all proportion.

In this connection student encounters difficulties which one may generally sum up under the head — the inaccessibility of the Oriental sources. By this I mean both physical and linguistic inaccessibility. And thus we must welcome the initiative of Polish orientalists in publishing a catalogue of Oriental manuscripts in Polish collections which, as the volume of Turkish Mss.¹³ indicates, will undoubtedly be of great usefulness in this research.

Knowledge of the history of relations between Poland and the Crimean khanate during the period of the long alliance (1654—1666) chiefly aimed

⁹ V. D. Smirnov, op. cit., p. XXXI.

¹⁰ See e. g. I. B. Grekov, *Očerki po istorii meždunarodnyh otnošennij Vostočnoj Evropy XIV—XVI v.v.*, Moskva 1963, p. 154—155.

¹¹ B. Baranowski, *Tatarszczyzna wobec wojny polsko-szwedzkiej w latach 1655—1660 (Polska w okresie drugiej wojny północnej 1655—1660)*, vol. I, Warszawa 1957, p. 453, 455. Baranowski's views are fully shared by the author of this article (*Z. Wójcik, Zmiana w układzie sił politycznych w Europie środkowowschodniej w drugiej połowie XVII wieku*, "Kwartalnik Historyczny", vol. LXVII, 1960, No. 1, p. 31 and also *Mediacja...*, p. 32.

¹² Recently — O. Górka, *Nieznana kronika tatarska lat 1644—1650*, "Kwartalnik Historyczny", vol. LXII, 1955, No. 3, p. 107—108 and also in the extended introduction to Hadsh Mehmed' chronicle.

¹³ Z. Abrahamowicz, *Katalog dokumentów tureckich. Dokumenty do dziejów Polski i krajów ościennych w latach 1455—1672*, Warszawa 1959. See my review in "Archeion", XXXV, 1961, p. 165—170.

against Russia,¹⁴ has recently been advanced considerably thanks to the research of Bohdan Baranowski and the author of this article.¹⁵ Thus the political background of the alliance is already well known though one ought to go into its origins somewhat more closely, to catch them *in statu nascendi*, since quite clearly the pact between Poland and the Crimea did not come into being in Pereiaslavl Agreement in 1654 but considerably earlier. The Tatars were in mortal fear of Russo-Polish co-operation which could bring disaster to the khanate and which was a real enough menace after 1644,¹⁶ but particularly after pact concluded by the Voivode Kisiel in Moscow in 1647.¹⁷ Historiography and my own research show quite clearly that the Tatars put forward concrete plans for an alliance with Poland and united action against Russia even during the negotiations at Zborów and also during the post-Zborów period.¹⁸

The matter was only finally concluded after the Pereiaslavl Agreement when, in July, 1654 the terms of the alliance were formulated¹⁹ the alliance which was, in spite of vacillations of one kind or another, to constitute one of the most important factors in the development of the political situation in Eastern Europe for more than twelve years. This alliance fell into decay at the end of 1666 when, in the face of the Russo-Polish agreement already taking concrete form, the Tatars broke the treaty and together with the Cossacks of Hetman Dorošenko, made raids on the Polish army in the Ukraine.

In this essay we wish to deal with a positive aspect of this alliance, so far unexplored except for peripheral and accidental mentions, but — as is clear from the introductory comments to this article — nevertheless a basic and important aspect, i.e. the financial matters connected with the origins and existence of the alliance between Poland and the Crimean khanate.

But some notes on the question of the methodology. Primarily one must state that in spite of the fact that the figures quoted in this article are grounded

¹⁴ See Z. Wójcik, *Traktat Andruszowski i jego geneza*, Warszawa 1959, p. 20, 90 and others; *Mediacja* . . . , p. 33.

¹⁵ Baranowski, op. cit., Wójcik, op. cit. and *Feudalna Rzeczpospolita wobec umowy w Perejaslawiu*, „Kwartalnik Historyczny”, vol. LXI, 1954, No. 3 and *Rywalizacja polsko-tatarska o Ukrainę na przełomie lat 1660—1661*, „Przegląd Historyczny”, vol. XLV, 1954, No. 4.

¹⁶ Baranowski, op. cit., p. 457—458.

¹⁷ *Očerki istorii SSSR, Period feodalizma XVII vek*, Moskva 1955, p. 479; W. Czermak, *Plany wojny tureckiej Władysława IV*, „Rozprawy PAU, Wydz. Hist.-Filozoficzny”, ser. 2, vol. XXXXII, 1930, No. 6, p. 69; Nowosielski, op. cit., p. 366.

¹⁸ Baranowski, op. cit., p. 459; Wójcik, *Feudalna Rzeczpospolita* . . . , p. 93. Already in the negotiations at Zborów the Tatars put forward the view that the king's friends would be the allies of the khan and the khan's enemies — enemies of the king and that the Poles should assist the Tatars when they request it (“that you should assist us with troops”). See the interesting and valuable document — a letter from khan Islam Girey to king John Casimir of August, 1649, the original Tatar and Polish translation in *Archiwum Główne Akt Dawnych w Warszawie* (abbr. AGAD), *Archiwum Koronne Warszawskie* (abbr. AKW), Tatar section, box 62, file 4, No. 335.

¹⁹ Wójcik, op. cit., p. 102—103.

in basic sources, i.e. on acts from the Archives of the Crown Exchequer, they do not give an ideal picture of the problem for two reasons. In the first place, because of the treasury system of Poland and exchequer problems during this period, it was impossible to include every single item of expenditure which Poland incurred in the sphere we are considering. Certain items in the "book-keeping" of that time are general or are in cipher so that it is responsible, even if we analyse them in a most exact way, to learn their true content.²⁰ We must therefore assume that amongst these items a certain, though small percentage spent on Tatar policy.

One must also assume that certain sums (not very considerable) did not reach the account books of the Crown Exchequer since they were paid by Polish diplomats on missions to the Crimea from their own pockets. Using as a basis our own observations made in the course of some other research,²¹ we may assume, fairly correctly, that the expenditure in this category did not exceed 5% of the sum shown in the Exchequer accounts designed for the same purpose.

Let us now proceed to the second reason. The Polish historian of today has at his disposal the acts from the Archives of the Crown Exchequer; but there is no corresponding Lithuanian record. In the work on diplomacy already cited²² I made a careful comparison between the size of the contribution of the Exchequer of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania towards diplomatic expenses and similar expenditure on the part of the Crown Exchequer. The percentage obtained amounted to 20% after I had included in my calculations the expenditure on all Poland's legations and on the provision of all the foreign embassies whose stay was financed by the State treasury. Nevertheless the Lithuanian contribution towards the costs of the various kinds of diplomatic relations with the Crimea was much lower; the Grand Duchy was chiefly involved in contacts with Muscovy and Lithuanian Exchequer contributions were mainly connected with this sphere. We know²³ that in principal the Exchequer met the costs of Poland's legations by allotting certain sums for the members of the embassies who were of Lithuanian origin. In the period under consideration Lithuanian's participation in diplomatic missions to the Crimea was insignificant,²⁴ and

²⁰ I also raise those problems in connection with a discussion of expenditure on Tatar policy in the work *Organizacja dyplomacji...* (in press).

²¹ Op. cit.

²² Op. cit.

²³ Op. cit.

²⁴ We know quite definitely of one Lithuanian who went on a mission to the Crimea, namely: Samuel Węslawski (See A. Zajęczkowski, J. Reychman, *Zarys dyplomatyki osmańsko-turckiej*, Warszawa 1955, p. 122). I should like to take this opportunity to point out that the doubtlessly valuable and pioneering work of Zajęczkowski and Reychman cannot be used as a basis for the determination of a number of Polish legations visiting Moslem countries in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The list of envoys in the above mentioned work (p. 115—124) is far from being full, particularly in the sphere of Polish-Tatar relations.

therefore the Lithuanian Exchequer's financial contribution to the expenditure connected with these was correspondingly negligible. Thus with a large measure of certainty we may assume that Lithuania's contribution to Tatar expenditure, let us call it for the sake of simplification, did not exceed 5% of the costs borne by the Crown i.e. Poland.

We shall need the above notes and reckonings to correct the final sums we obtain from calculations made on the basis of Crown Exchequer acts. Our considerations do not include the sums for Tatar gifts themselves since these appeared only in the accounts of the Crown Exchequer.

Let us now consider more closely the accounts connected with Poland's Tatar policy during the time of the alliance with the Crimea, presented by the Crown Treasurer in the various Diets during the years 1654—1666. One immediately observes that this expenditure increased quite sharply after 1654 in comparison with the preceding period when, both during the reign of Władysław IV (1637—1648) and at the time of the Ukraine Uprising until the peace of Zborów (1649), Poland refused to pay the Tatars these gifts.²⁵ But later when it was clear that there would be changes in Polish-Tatar relations on both sides, it was realised in Poland that one of the basic conditions, *conditio sine qua non* for gaining the Crimea's co-operation was the settlement not only of old Tatar monetary claims but also of many new ones.

And so, for example, in the accounts of the Crown Exchequer during the first Diet of 1652 we read the note that there was given for "debts owed to His Majesty and for the appeasement of various leading Tatars after the peace of Zborów apart from the usual gifts distributed in Lwów — 6,624 Polish zloty."²⁶ At the same time large sums were paid for the reception of Tatar diplomats. For example a total of 17,999 P. zl. and 15 gr.²⁷ was paid for the ostentatious reception²⁸ of the great envoy, Mustapha aga, who came from the khan Islam Girey with precise propositions for a joint expedition against Russia during a period critical for Polish-Russian relations, i.e. at the time of Puškin's important mission to Warsaw.²⁹

In both Diets of 1654 there were presented various accounts connected with the liquidation of debts to the Tatars, sums for the purchase of prisoners and current diplomatic costs — in all 52,650 P. zl. and 29 gr.³⁰

Quite considerable sums paid for Tatar gifts and other activities aimed at

²⁵ J. Pastorius, *Bellum scythico-cosacicum seu de coniuratione Tartarorum Cosacorum et plebis Russicae contra Regnum Poloniae...*, Dantisci 1652, p. 68.

²⁶ AGAD, Archiwum Skarbu Koronnego (abbr. ASK), section II, Diet Accounts (RS), No. 49, f. 72.

²⁷ AGAD, ASK, II, RS, No. 47, f. 70; *ibidem*, No. 49, f. 74.

²⁸ L. Kubala, *Poselstwo Puzhkina w Polsce w roku 1650, Szkice historyczne*, series I—II, 5th e., Warszawa 1923, p. 145, 146.

²⁹ Kubala, loc. cit.

³⁰ AGAD, ASK, II, RS, No. 51, f. 65 and fol.; *ibidem*, No. 52, f. 20 and fol.

satisfying the needs and demands of the valuable, and recently acquired ally, appear in the Diet accounts for the year 1658. This is readily understood when we remember the importance the alliance with the khanate had for Poland during the years 1654—1657 but particularly at the climax of the Swedish invasion of Poland, when “the Swedish victory upset the balance of power in Europe, unusually convenient for the Tatars.”³¹ This forced the Crimea to support Poland in her tragic military and political situation and, in turn, had a considerable influence on the course of events.³²

Thus the huge sum of 450,000 P. zl. was set aside during this Diet for such expenditure: this sum was paid to the Tatars under the heading of usual gifts during the five-year period, ending on June 24th, 1655.³³ This was not sufficient for, at the same time, the Tatars were paid an additional “appeasement” of 83,000 P. zl., not counting the 51,600 P. zl. which the Master Crown Custodian, Mariusz Jaskólski, received when he twice served as envoy to Bagčeserai and which were intended to conclude the alliance with the Tatars.³⁴ The note written against the above mentioned sum is typical: “Given to Master Crown Custodian Mariusz Jaskólski *iuxta senatus consultum* for the appeasement of various mirzas and to the same for travelling expenses...”³⁵ The expenditure connected with Jaskólski’s embassy did not, however, end here, or in the same accounts there appears one more large sum of 36,000 P. zl. handed “to the same Master Crown Custodian [...] sent to the Crimea for the second time to win the Tatars.”³⁶

In all, the vast sum of 705,597 P. zl. and 10 gr.³⁷ was paid out during this five-year period for gifts for the Tatars. These gifts were given very liberally in connection with the conclusion of the alliance and liquidated old “debts.” But the expenditure of the 1658 Diet on Crimean affairs did not finish with this, for the Crown Exchequer spent the large sum of 13,805 P. zl. and 24 gr.³⁸ on the reception of the khanate envoy, Sulaiman aga who visited Warsaw in June,

³¹ Baranowski, op. cit., p. 471.

³² Baranowski, op. cit., p. 489 does not seem to give true value to the aid which the Tatars afforded Poland against the Swedes. Nearer the truth, in our opinion, is O. Górka, *Legenda a rzeczywistość obrony Częstochowy w roku 1655*, Warszawa 1957, p. 148, 149 though he tends to overestimate the problem.

³³ Biblioteka Zakładu Narodowego im. Ossolińskich we Wrocławiu (abbr., Oss.), rps. 9532/II, Rachunki sejmu koronnego 1658, f. 58.

³⁴ On Jaskólski’s mission see Wójcik, *Feudalna Rzeczpospolita...*, p. 9.

³⁵ Oss., loc. cit., f. 58.

³⁶ *Ibidem*, loc. cit.

³⁷ Loc. cit.

³⁸ Oss., 9532/II, f. 59. In connection with the splendid reception of Sulaiman aga see the interesting document (a bill) presented by the Warsaw taylor, Raniszewski for the sum of 4,593 P. zl. and 24 gr. *Odprawa posła wielkiego tatarskiego na imię Suliman agi i innych mniejszych spólnie z nim na sejmie warszawskim in Anno 1654 będących i odprawionych* — AGAD, ASK, III, Rachunki Królewskie (RKr), No. 5, f. 671 and fol.

1654 to administer an oath to king John Casimir on the newly concluded alliance.³⁹ Rather smaller sums were spent on the couriers and other minor diplomatic functionaries travelling constantly between Poland and the Crimea at that time.⁴⁰

For the expenses of Poland's legations to the Tatars during the period 1655—1658, the Crown Exchequer paid an additional 20,050 P. zl. of which the largest amounts were swallowed up by Szumowski's mission⁴¹ 14,500 P. zl.,⁴² and by those of the Novogrodek Stantard-bearer vexillifer Krzysztof Korycki and Stanisław Druszkiewicz,⁴³ Seneschal of the Halicki District — 2,000 P. zl. each.⁴⁴

Two interesting items close this kind of expenditure in the Crown Exchequer accounts during the 1658 Diet. Thus we read: "Paid to Master Hieronim Lanc-koroński, the voivode's of Ruthenia son staying in the Crimea *pro obside* for half a year *a die* 1 July 1654 — 5,000 P. zl., and for a further half year *a die* 1 Januarii 1655 — 5,000 P. zl."⁴⁵ The same sum, 10,000 P. zl., appears with an identical note with the name of a second hostage, Stanisław Oleśnicki, the Sandomierz chamberlain's son.⁴⁶

And finally there are certain small sums which, although they are not directly concerned with questions of important policies, nevertheless prove the liveliness of contacts between Poland and her south-eastern ally therefore, we consider it proper to include these into our calculations. By this we mean the small sum of 100 P. zl. paid to the Armenian Piotr Romaszkievicz for his journey to the Crimea where he went "to polish up his Tatar."⁴⁷

The sums we find in the Diet accounts for 1659 are already considerably smaller. This is quite understandable when we consider that the Diet of the preceding year had to liquidate the debts not only of the period 1654—1658, but even of earlier years and that the years 1654—1658 constituted the period of perhaps the greatest liveliness on the Warsaw—Bagčeserai axis. Between

³⁹ Wójcik, op. cit., p. 101—103.

⁴⁰ *Ibidem*, f. 59 and fol.

⁴¹ For this legation see Baranowski, op. cit., p. 473—475 and Z. Wójcik, *Polska i Rosja wobec wspólnego niebezpieczeństwa szwedzkiego w okresie wojny północnej 1655—1660*, Warszawa 1957, p. 19 and fol. (taken from: *Polska w okresie wojny północnej 1655—1660*, Warszawa 1957, vol. I).

⁴² Oss., *ibidem*, f. 62—63.

⁴³ It is a fact worthy of note that Druszkiewicz served as envoy from the Crown hetmans to the Tatars in the autumn of 1655; the chief purpose of his mission was to win for the Swedes whom the hetmans at that time served. See K. Marcinkowski, *Stefan Czaniecki w dobie potopu szwedzkiego*, Kraków 1935, p. 97 and also Baranowski, op. cit., p. 470.

⁴⁴ Oss., *ibidem*, loc. cit.

⁴⁵ Loc. cit.

⁴⁶ Loc. cit., this Oleśnicki had already received 5,000 P. zl. for the same purpose in the first diet of 1654 — AGAD, ASK, II, RS, No. 51.

⁴⁷ Loc. cit., for closer references to Romaszkievicz see B. Baranowski, *Znajomość Wschodu w dawnej Polsce do XVIII wieku*, Łódź 1950, p. 142—143, 150 and by the same author, *Ormianie w służbie dyplomatycznej Rzeczypospolitej*, ("Myśl Karaimska", 1941).

1658 and 1659 the most expensive items were the receptions of the Tatar envoys, Sefer Gasi aga and Ali bey — the first amounting to 2,195 P. zl. and 15 gr., and the second to 2,264 P. zl.⁴⁸ In addition debts were paid off to the Tatar translator of the Crown Grand Chancellory, the Armenian Zachariasz Piotrowicz who, during a relatively short period of time, travelled to the Crimea as many as eight times. The sum paid to Piotrowicz amounted to 6,800 P. zl.⁴⁹

In the acts of the 1659 Diet there are certain sums which are very difficult to decipher completely. Thus to the citizens of Lwów were returned 4,269 P. zl. which “the city of Lwów spent on the reception of various Tatar and Cossack envoys at the ordinance of His Majesty.” In addition 15,724 P. zl., 7 gr. and 9d, borrowed by Poland for state needs, were also given back to the citizens; but apart from this Chancellor Prażmowski received 3,000 P. zl. for expenses connected with various embassies. How much of this money went to forward Tatar policy? There is obviously no possibility of formulating any exact answer, even with the help of accounts other than the acts of the Common Exchequer, e.g. the royal or embassy accounts which contain material interesting for us to some degree. We can speak here of an approximate estimate only.

There can be no doubt that, since the first of these figures concerns chiefly the period after 1654, the costs connected with the reception of the Tatar envoys must have been considerably higher than the sums spent on Cossacks envoys. In the first place, Tatar couriers and envoys were at that time entertained more frequently than the Cossacks and, secondly, their reception was considerably more expensive. Therefore we may assume that, in all probability, some 70—75% of the 4,269 P. zl. i.e. about 3,000 P. zl. went to meet Tatar expenses.⁵⁰

In my opinion it is quite certain that most of the money received by Prażmowski found its way into the pockets of the Crimean diplomats in one way or another. If we limit the sum to 2,000 P. zl. we may be certain of only a small margin of error. However, we feel that attempts at a closer estimate of what percentage of the 15,742 P. zl. contributed by Lwów towards Poland's various needs was spent on what we call Tatar policy, are bound to fail: there are too few objective premises on which we could base our calculations. And therefore we shall be able to include this sum only into the framework of the general increase in expenditure which we spoke of in the introduction to the present essay.⁵¹

The Crown Treasurer in the Diet of 1661 which sat from May 2nd to July 18th, noted the large sums which found their way in various forms to the Crimea. Heading these accounts is the sum of 450,000 P. zl. spent on Tatar gifts during the five-year period ending on St. John's Day, 1660 (there was no Diet in 1660).

⁴⁸ AGAD, ASK, II, RS, No. 54, f. 56.

⁴⁹ *Ibidem*, f. 55.

⁵⁰ *Ibidem*, f. 56, 59.

⁵¹ See above, p. 91.

In addition to this huge sum there went another 75,000 P. zl. (25,000 thalers) against which there was the note: "Separately for the same number of years (i.e. five) to preserve *iuxta pacta*, calculating for each year 5,000 P. zl. in thalers..." In all the usual Tatar gifts amounted to the sum of 583,200 P. zl.⁵²

1660 was the year of the Cudnowo campaign against Russia during which Poland was again very dependent on Tatar aid.⁵³ Amongst many other expenses connected with this campaign we find the sum 10,403 P. zl., 7 gr. and 9d paid to the marshall and field hetman Lubomirski "to appease the Tatar hordes taken out into the field against Šeremetev (Russian commander on Ukraine in 1660) given in silk cloth and material."⁵⁴

In the years 1659—1661 30,306 P. zl.⁵⁵ were spent on the provision of Tatar envoys; on the sending of Polish missions to the Crimea, on Polish residents with the Horde living in the Ukraine and similar matters — 11,7000 P. zl.⁵⁶ In this group of expenditure there were especially high costs in connection with another reception of the great Tatar envoy, Sulaiman aga (8,988 P. zl.) and with the Polish embassies to the Crimea of Szmeling (4,000 P. zl.) and Horain (3,200 P. zl).⁵⁷

In all 19,832 P. zl. and 6 gr.⁵⁸ were spent on the entertainment of unspecified Cossack and Tatar envoys including those who came at the time of the siege of Toruń in 1658. At this time the ratio between the expenditure on Cossacks and Tatars will be somewhat different, for this is the period of the Hadyach Union, of Tetera's stay in Toruń etc.; and thus I think it is possible to assume that the ratio will be 1 : 1 or, in other words, the provision of the Tatar envoys would amount to roughly 9,500 P. zl.

The 1662 Diet was an exception during the years 1654—1666 in that the joint total of the expenditure with which we are concerned amounted to only 1,436 P. zl. These were spent exclusively on the provision of three Tatar envoys.⁵⁹

The position during the autumn-winter Diet of 1664/1665 was quite different. This was after unsuccessful expedition against Muscovy when Tatar aid had failed and there had occurred during the campaign quite serious mis-

⁵² AGAD, ASK, II, RS, No. 55, f. 61v—62.

⁵³ A. Hniłko, *Wyprawa cudnowska w 1660 roku*, Warszawa 1931, *passim*.

⁵⁴ AGAD, *ibidem*, f. 67.

⁵⁵ *Ibidem*, f. 62—64.

⁵⁶ *Ibidem*, f. 65—66.

⁵⁷ For reference to Sulaiman aga's mission in 1658 (since this is the mission meant here) see Baranowski, *Tatarszczyzna wobec wojny...*, p. 485—486; L. Kubala, *Wojny duńskie i pokój oliwski 1657—1660*, p. 441, 461. For Szmeling's mission see Z. Wójcik, *Rywalizacja polsko-tatarska o Ukrainę na przełomie lat 1660/1661*, "Przegląd Historyczny", vol. XLV, 1954, No. 4, p. 629—632.

⁵⁸ AGAD, *ibidem*, f. 64.

⁵⁹ AGAD, ASK, II, RS, No. 56, f. 27.

understandings which in some degree brought about John Casimir's defeat at the Dnieper.⁶⁰ On the other hand, however, alliance with the Crimea against Russia was less necessary since the Poles had ceased to believe in the possibility of Russia's military conquest; but the Polish court counted on the support or at least the friendly neutrality of Bagčeserai in connection with the civil war in Poland i.e. Lubomirski's rebellion.⁶¹ The fear that the Grand Marshall of the Crown might win khan Mehmed Girey and the Crimean aristocracy⁶² was perhaps one of the chief reasons why the Polish court poured gold into the Crimea, undoubtedly the best argument in all the negotiations and discussions with its Crimean ally.

At the same time in spite of the fiasco of the Dnieper campaign, it was necessary to settle the obligations to the Horde in accordance with the provisions of the special commission which on 23rd June, 1663, made in Lwów a pronouncement on the matter of payments to the allied Tatar troops.⁶³

Thus the Diet of 1664/1665 made a series of payments, the cost of Tatar friendship. And thus "for Tatar gifts for the three years ending with St. John's Day in anno 1663, the Exchequer paid 270,000 P. zl. for the Tatar troops *iuxta pacta* at a rate of 90,000 P. zl. per year."⁶⁴ Further in accordance with a promise made to the khan, 45,000 P. zl. were paid to him as "appeasement" during the three-year period, while 90,365 P. zl. were given to the Tatar troops so that "the people in His Majesty's states should not be carried off into slavery and captivity."⁶⁵ Apart from the khan, his Grand Vizier Sefer Gasi aga also received gifts amounting to 21,000 P. zl., while after his execution 7,449 P. zl. were remitted to the new Vizir, Kaytas aga on the special decision of the council of the senate.⁶⁶

The considerable sum of 13,237 P. zl. was again swallowed up by the reception of the Tatar envoy, the experienced diplomat Dedesh aga⁶⁷ who, at the same time, either at the end of June, 1664 or at the beginning of July, accepted gifts

⁶⁰ See de Lumbres, French envoy to Poland, to minister de Lionne, Warszawa, 7 December, 1663, Oss. Teki Lukasa 2983/II, f. 228—229; the same to the same, Warszawa 30 November, 1663, Oss. Teki Lukasa 2983/II, f. 225; *Diariusz wojny na Zadnieprzu*, Oss. 228, f. 201 and fol.; Wójcik, *Traktat Andruszowski...*, p. 149—151; A. Kersten, *Stefan Czarniecki 1599—1665*, Warszawa 1963, p. 510.

⁶¹ On these problems see Wójcik, *Traktat andruszowski...*, p. 214—215.

⁶² This fear was expressed by John Casimir in his instructions to the Polish envoy to the Crimea, Aleksander Petrykowski, who was sent to the Khan in November, 1664. See instruction AGAD, AKW, Tatar section, box 61, f. 109. See also Wójcik, *Traktat andruszowski...*, p. 195.

⁶³ *Declaratio de summa trecentorum millium florenorum exercitu tartarico enumeranda 1663*, AGAD, ASK, III, RKr. No. 4, f. 62—63.

⁶⁴ Oss. 9533/II, p. 103 and the fol.

⁶⁵ Loc. cit.

⁶⁶ King John Casimir promised Sefer Gasi aga 30,000 P. zl. of which "the Exchequer made up" the above sum.

⁶⁷ Loc. cit.

mentioned earlier of the value of 90,000 thalers (270,000 P. zl.) under the entry of various gifts covering a three-year period.⁶⁸

The monetary sum cited earlier does not include the numerous additional expenses connected with Poland's legations to the Crimea or the normal provision for various kinds of Tatar diplomat who came to Poland at this time. These are quite large sums which we have included in our final calculations in the table.⁶⁹

The accounts of the first Diet of 1666 (the Crown Exchequer did not present its reports in the second as in the Diet extraordinary of 1665), did not, it is true, include the settlement of such large sums as are to be found in the 1664/1665 Diet; but in spite of this even here we can find quite considerable sums. Thus to the Crown Grand Treasurer, Jan Kazimierz Krasiński, "the Exchequer paid 80,000 P. zl. *ad rationem* of the sum of 123 *millia* for Tatar gifts contracted with various creditors in *fidem publicam*" while the king also received 3,900 P. zl. in return for money spent on gifts in 1660.⁷⁰

Of the cost of legations to the Crimea borne by the Exchequer one ought first to mention the sums which were given to Aleksander Petrykowski whom we have already mentioned, for his stay in the Crimea. He received 7,930 P. zl.⁷¹

The expenditure on the reception of embassies is again headed by Dedesh aga, whose provision cost 7,508 P. zl.⁷² Large sums were swallowed up by gifts and the appeasement of various Tatar dignitaries. Sadet Girey sultan also received by order of the senate as much as 14,405 P. zl. "to remain in the Ukraine in *opere belli*," though he also obtained a further 8,320 P. zl. in addition.⁷³ Shyryn bey and the Shyryn mirzas accepted 3,000 P. zl. from the Crown Exchequer to remain in Poland's service as did other Crimean dignitaries — making a total of 21,537 P. zl.⁷⁴

A large number of Tatar settlements also appear in the Exchequer record of the Abdication Diet of 1668. This was a period when the Polish-Tatar alliance had ceased to exist *de facto* for two years, since neither the Tatars nor Porta could forget the Polish "betrayal" as they considered the conclusion of the truce between Poland and Russia in Andrušovo.⁷⁵ We may consider as the end of the period of allied cooperation between Poland and the Crimea, the attack by Tatar and Cossack troops on Colonel Machowski's troops stationed in the Ukraine: this took place in December 1666. The formal renewal of the

⁶⁸ Dedesh aga's receipt, AGAD, ASK, Rachunki poselskie, No. 22, f. 36.

⁶⁹ Oss. 9533/II, p. 110 and the fol.

⁷⁰ AGAD, ASK, II, RS, No. 59, f. 51.

⁷¹ *Ibidem*, f. 41.

⁷² *Ibidem*, f. 48.

⁷³ *Ibidem*, f. 53.

⁷⁴ *Ibidem*, loc. cit.

⁷⁵ Khan Aadil Girey clearly presented the matter in this way in the letter to John Casimir of July 6th, 1667. See Wójcik, *Mediacja...*, p. 34.

Polish-Tatar alliance of 1654 which was, in a certain sense, contained in the treaty of Podhajce, for all practical purposes had no significance.⁷⁶

As far as the chief question we are interested in is concerned, settlements of expenses connected with the maintenance of the alliance appeared in the Diet of 1668, and again in the Diet of 1672.

In the first of these the chief item is the liquidation of Poland's debts contracted with the king and "various creditors" since a punctual payment of Tatar gifts was necessary. Settlements of 3,900 P. zl. were made to the king and of 114,912 P. zl., 25 gr. and 3d to the Treasurer Krasieński to meet a debt of 123,000 P. zl.,⁷⁷ which was discussed earlier.⁷⁸ These sums had, however, already appeared in the accounts of the previous Diet with the exception of the 114,913 P. zl., 23 gr. and 3d which constituted a further repayment of Poland's debts to the above mentioned Treasurer; 80,000 P. zl.⁷⁹ had already been paid out for this purpose.

The new Crimean khan, Aadil Girey, placed by the Turks on the throne of Bagčeserai after the dethronement of Mehmed Girey in March 1666, received in connection with the comedy of the renewed alliance with Poland, gifts to the value of 10,375 P. zl. while the Crown Exchequer paid out a total of 44,903 P. zl. to Tatar dignitaries for services they had rendered Poland at an earlier date, but mainly to keep them faithful to their ally (we know this was not successful).⁸⁰ As always, in the last moments of the existence of the alliance, the most accomplished Crimean diplomat of that epoch, Dedesh aga proved a heavy expense for Poland's Exchequer. Apart from two large provisions received somewhat earlier (5,624 P. zl. and 7,508 P. zl.) Dedesh aga was given 88,581 P. zl.⁸¹ for his stay in Warsaw at the end of 1666 when he came from Aadil Girey to confirm the treaty of friendship with Poland.⁸²

As we can see from the figures presented in the Abdication Diet amongst Poland's embassies to the Crimea, the most expensive were the missions of Petrykowski in 1666 (9,930 P. zl.) and Zbigniew Bliskowski in 1664 (1,000 P. zl.).⁸³

The Abdication Diet of John Casimir in essence closed the Crown Exchequer's settlements of expenses incurred in connection with the Polish-Tatar alliance.

⁷⁶ Op. cit., p. 35.

⁷⁷ AGAD, ASK, II, RS, No. 61, f. 105—106.

⁷⁸ See above, p. 98.

⁷⁹ 114, 912 P. zl. were finally paid to them; therefore we are not including the sum of 80,000 P. zl. into the accounts of the previous Diet (1666) but are taking the whole into consideration only in the Diet accounts of 1668.

⁸⁰ AGAD, *ibidem*, f. 109.

⁸¹ AGAD, ASK, II, RS, No. 61, f. 102.

⁸² See the oath sworn by Dedesh aga in the name of the new khan and Tatar dignitaries to confirm the old treaty in Warsaw September 3rd, 1666 — AGAD, AKW, Tatar section, box 60, f. 7. On Dedesh aga's mission — Wójcik, *Traktat Andruszowski...*, p. 221—222.

⁸³ AGAD, ASK, II, RS, No. 61, f. 99.

But, as we may observe from the acts presented in this essay, the normal Tatar gifts were paid only until St. John's Day, 1663. In the course of the following five years before the end of which (i.e. before June 24th, 1668) it was necessary to pay the Tatars the next instalment, the alliance was broken. This clearly did not mean that all contacts, except those of war, were broken off between the two countries, or that the Poles ceased to present gifts. And, therefore, despite the fact that the instalment for the above mentioned period was paid only after 1666 and its clearances are to be found in the acts of the 1672 Diet, we must include this sum into our calculations.

During the above mentioned period 525,000 P. zl. in *bona moneta* at the rate of 105,000 P. zl. a year were due to the Tatars;⁸⁴ according to the accounts of the 1672 Diet however, the former allies were paid only 451,089 P. zl., 13 gr. and 9d, of which 418,051 P. zl., 22 gr. and 9d were delivered in good currency and 33,037 P. zl. and 21 gr. in current money, while 293,850 P. zl. only were paid out for the gifts themselves, though the whole was in *bona moneta*.⁸⁵ From such a statement of the facts one can see that during the period 1663—1668, the yearly total of money spent on Tatar gifts amounted to 58,770 P. zl. We are of the opinion that we should include into our calculations only the three-year period (1663—1666); on this assumption between 1663 and the breaking of the alliance in 1666, a total of 176,310 P. zl. was spent on Tatar gifts.

With this we shall end the general review of expenditure on Tatar policy during the period of co-operation between Poland and the Crimea at the middle of the seventeenth century. To sum up our deliberations and to obtain a picture of the whole of the problem defined in the title of this paper, we feel it necessary to draw up a table which will give us a computation of the expenditure of the Crown Exchequer. This can be divided into three distinct groups: gifts and so-called appeasements, the costs of Poland's legations to the Crimea or to the leaders of the Tatar troops stationed chiefly in the Ukraine and, finally, sums spent on the reception of Tatar diplomats visiting Poland (so-called provisions). We must also have as a separate group, though a smaller one, other expenditure which cannot be included into our three basic groups.

⁸⁴ AGAD, ASK, II, RS, No. 62, f. 53.

⁸⁵ For the problem of *bona* and *currans moneta*, a phenomenon connected with contemporary inflation see R. Rybarski, *Skarb i pieniądz za Jana Kazimierza, Michala Korybuta i Jana III*, Warszawa 1939, p. 390—447. We can find the explanation as to why in 1668 the sums intended for gifts were reduced almost by half, in the document "Summariusz upominków tatarskich in anno 1668 oddawanych". — AGAD, ASK, III, Rachunki Królewskie [RKr], No. 5, f. 970. This resulted from long negotiations with Dedesh aga who came for these gifts and finally agreed to a reduction in the sum owing to the Tatars. He agreed to this for a "provision" of 10,000 hard thalers which was included into the total costs. In the quoted document there appears the figure 292,500 P. zl. spent on gifts and not the 293,850 P. zl. which we find in the same accounts. This difference probably arises from the fact that at the last moment there was added a further sum namely 1,350 P. zl. which had been spent and which had still not been recorded in "Summariusz wydatków tatarskich".

The most important of the expenses in which we are interested, were the Tatar gifts and appeasements. These had a separate legal title and were generally financed by the Jewish poll-tax.⁸⁶ This was not always sufficient and at such times it was necessary to resort to other sources.⁸⁷

In contrast with other periods,⁸⁸ during the years of the alliance with the Tatars (1654—1666) the gifts as one would reasonably expect were, on the whole, paid regularly. They were chiefly in kind⁸⁹ but also probably in the form of provisions.⁹⁰ Thus we have the following table.⁹¹

After we have totalled up all the individual items in this table, taken into the consideration the 10% by which one must increase Poland's expenditure⁹² and brought the sum to round figures, the alliance with Tatars at the middle of the seventeenth century cost Poland about 2,530,000 P. zl.

Was it a lot, or a little? We shall not try to give any final answer to this question; it would require a thorough analysis in which it would be necessary to consider many factors, amongst them the question of the devaluation of money at that time.

⁸⁶ Rybarski, op. cit., p. 480.

⁸⁷ *Ibidem*.

⁸⁸ Rybarski, op. cit., p. 479.

⁸⁹ Rybarski, loc. cit.; AGAD. ASK, III, RKr, No. 5, f. 912, f. 1099 — "Gifts for the khan handed to Master Kobylecki in Warsaw *die 3 Novembris 1665 Anno*". It is worthwhile quoting this document: "... And first of all a chest with silver in which there is a pitcher with bowl, two half-gallonx flasks, two quart flasks, candlesticks no. 4, candle-snuffers no. 2, spoons no. 12, two small beakers, one large beaker, salt-pot, pipkin with handles, a bowl, all of silver, frequently gilded. In addition to all this into the hands of His Highness the khan one thousand red zloty in *specie* for which *obiie* he will bring a receipt from the Exchequer of His Highness the khan To Kalga-sultan who will be found there therefore a present is assigned to him namely a smaller chest but with silver as the first, which he will leave in Lwów with Mr. Anczowski and will take a receipt from him to Nurradin-sultan large silver bowl with a pitcher richly gilded. To the Vizier a pitcher with a silver bowl gilded in places. Other monetas distributa: 1° to Kalga-sultan 200 red zloty which he will leave with Mr. Anczowski as well as the casket with silver described above having taken a receipt for this from him. 2° to Nurradin-sultan he will give 150 red zloty. 3° To the one whom he considered closet to the khan he will give a hundred red zloty and a silver bowl of Augsburg workmanship. 4° To Cegielski, the secretary, 50 red zloty. 5° To the khan's interpreter 25 red zloty. To the wife of the khan women's haberdashery and clothes in accordance with a special register given to him to be given to the wife of the khan in the name of Her Majesty the Queen. Then silk cloth and cloth also in accordance with the specific register given to him to be distributed to various mirzas and Tatars whose friendship he thinks we should seek as His Excellency's wisdom *committitur*. And finally in addition to the first 5,000 which he took because he lost them travelling on his journeys he is given *ex senatus consulto* a hundred red zloty and in addition to this *incurrenti moneta* 3 thousand 400 zloty and another 300 zloty. N. B. Three sticks i. e. two set in gold and the third in ivory which Master Kobylecki collected for the future khan, he will leave in Lwów and give into the hands of Mr. Anczewski.

⁹⁰ See e. g. AGAD, ASK, Rach. poselskie, No. 22, f. 28—46.

⁹¹ Sources: AGAD, ASK, II, RS, No.No. 51, 52, 54—56, 59, 61, 62; Oss. 9532/II, 9533/II.

⁹² See above, p. 102.

Diet	Tatar gifts and appeasements	Polish legations to the Tatars	The provisions of Tatar diplomats	Other expenditure
1654 I	—	—	—	29,268.—
1654 II	—	3,000.—	4,846.29	14,936.—
1658	705,597.10	27,642.—	62,261.—	25,230.—
1659	—	6,900.—	9,715.15	1,597.—
1661	594,223.7.9	11,700.—	30,306.—	— *
1662	—	—	1,436.—	—
1664	450,350.6	16,100.—	45,370.—	12,475.—
1666	51,162.—	8,830.—	30,289.—	—
1668 Abd.	145,287.25.3	13,230.—	14,851.—	—
1672	176,310.—**	—	—	—
Total	2,122,930.18.2	87,402.—	199,074.44	83,506.—

* In this Diet there appear accounts for the payment of quite undefined debts to various townspeople amounting to a total 756,133 P. zł, 20 gr. and 16 1/2 d. (AGAD, ASK, II, RS, No. 55, f. 67—69). We are not in a position to say what expenditure on Tatar affairs was included in this sum. This is one of the indecipherable items which we can consider only in the increase of the total sum of expenditure.

** Of the Diet accounts of 1673 we are taking into account only the sums spent on gifts since other expenses are connected with the period after 1666 and mainly the Abdication Diet of 1668.

Was Poland's financial outlay on Tatar policy worthwhile? Considering that expenditure on the army alone at some Diets of this period was often several times as high as the sum quoted earlier (the first Diet of 1654 spent 13,783,000 P. zł., the 1661 Diet — 4,997,891 P. zł.),⁹³ and that for example in the Diet of 1658 the total Tatar expenditure amounted to 820,730 P. zł., i.e. the highest in the period under consideration, while total expenditure of the Crown Exchequer in this Diet amounted to 12,076,420 P. zł., 16 gr. and 6 3/4d, then the conclusion may be reached that the sums spent on the Tatar alliance were not exorbitant.

Even after a consideration of all the drawbacks of the Tatar alliance we cannot deny its military, but mainly political value. With reference to this period I would question Rybarski's statement that "it would undoubtedly have been better to use the money (i.e. the money for the gifts — *Z. W.*) on the army."⁹⁴ I would rather incline to agree with khan Aadil Girey when after the breaking of the treaty with Poland he wrote on July 6th, 1667 to John Casimir: "It is clear that on many occasions the Crimea was very helpful to you, for example, against the Swedes, the Hungarians and against Muscovy or when Šeremetev attacked you and they (the Tatars) fought very bravely on many other occasions."⁹⁵

(Translated by Andrzej Gać)

⁹³ Rybarski, op. cit., p. 522, table II.

⁹⁴ Rybarski, op. cit., p. 480.

⁹⁵ AGAD, Metryka Koronna 206, f. 703v—705v; *ibidem*, Arch. Radziwiłłów, section II, book 22, p. 75—77, 1027—1028, Wójcik, *Mediacja...*, p. 34—35.