

13. Бантыш-Каменский Д. Н. *История Малой России от водворения славян в сей стране до уничтожения гетманства* / Д. Н. Бантыш-Каменский. – К. : Тип-я И. И. Чоколова, 1993. – 653 с.
14. Шабульдо Ф. *Україна в державотворчих процесах у Криму в кінці XIV – першій половині XV ст.* / Ф. Шабульдо // *Сучасність*. – 1996. – № 5. – С. 85–87.
15. Іналджик Г. *Боротьба за Східно-Європейську імперію. 1400–1700 рр. Кримський ханат, османи та піднесення Російської імперії* / Г. Іналджик // *Україна в Центрально-Східній Європі (з найдавніших часів до XVIII ст.) : наук. вид.* – К. : Ін-т історії України НАНУ, 2002. – Вип. 2. – С. 119–135.
16. Новосельский А. А. *Борьба Московского государства с татарами в первой половине XVII в.* / А. А. Новосельский. – М. ; Ленинград : Изд-во АН СССР, 1948. – 452 с.
17. Скрынников Р. Г. *Иван Грозный* / Р. Г. Скрынников. – М. : Наука, 1975. – 248 с.
18. *Акты, относящиеся к истории Западной России.* – Т. 2. – С.Пб. : Тип-я имп. вел. канц., 1848. – 440 с.
19. Черкас Б. В. *Україна в політичних відносинах Великого князівства Литовського з Кримським ханством (1502–1540) : автореф. дис. ... канд. іст. наук : спец. : 07.00.01* / Б. В. Черкас. – К., 2003. – 20 с.
20. Черкас Б. В. *Політичні відносини Великого князівства Литовського з Кримським ханством у 1533–1540 рр.* / Борис Володимирович Черкас // *Україна в Центрально-Східній Європі (з найдавніших часів до XVIII ст.) : наук. вид.* – К. : Ін-т історії України НАНУ, 2003. – Вип. 3. – С. 117–128.
21. Див. : Черкас Б. *Політична криза в Кримському ханстві й боротьба Іслам-Гірея за владу в 20–30-х рр. XVI ст.* / Борис Черкас // *Історія України*. – 2001. – № 4. – С. 3–5.
22. Кулиш П. А. *История воссоединения Руси* / Пантелеймон Александрович Кулиш. – С.Пб. : Изд-во т-ва «Обществ. польза», 1874. – Т. 1. – 363 с.

Natalia Zemzulina, Daruna Fisun

THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE IN THE POLITICAL CONFRONTATION OF THE EUROPEAN STATES (XVIII CENTURY): PLANS AND REALITIES

Among the important tasks of domestic historiography is the study of the past international position of Ukraine. It is important to study the historically established complex of relations between our country and the East (Russia including Kuban, Tatarstan, Kalmykia, Bashkortostan, Udmurtia, the Caucasian republics, etc.), the West (Poland, Hungary, Austria, Czech Republic, Slovakia, Germany, Italy, France, England, the Netherlands, etc. (the North) (Belarus, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Sweden, Finland, Denmark, etc.) and the South (Moldova, Romania, Bulgaria, Turkey, Georgia, etc.). Of particular note is the importance of the southern geopolitical direction for Ukraine, which in the late Middle Ages and early modern times was

represented by the Ottoman Empire with its many vassals, the chief of which was the Crimean Khanate.

The Ottoman Empire - a powerful medieval state located on three parts of the world, became the successor and the bearer of many features of previous Eastern despots. It united more than 60 peoples and the largest tribal unions, which differed both in terms of socio-political development and ethno-confessional affiliation. The lack of an equivalent economic system between peoples and religious confrontation complicated the prospects for the preservation of Ottoman society as a historically strong, unified organism.

The purpose of this publication is to study the international situation of the Ottoman Empire and the struggle of European states for influence in the Middle East and the Ottoman Empire directly, in the second half of the XVIII century.

Representatives of the national school of geopolitics noted that the South-North direction has always been the main axis of the Ukrainian space, and the desire of Ukrainians to master the shores of the Black and Azov Seas has become their most important task in history. At the same time, a well-known Ukrainian Ottoman historian A. Krymsky in the foreword to his current book "History of Turkey" (1924) wrote about the global interest in the history of the Ottomans since they "ruled over Constantinople and the Mediterranean Sea. ». Yaroslav Dashkevych emphasized that the neighborhood of such giant country as the Ottoman Empire was not only important, but in some periods even a decisive political and military factor for the existence of Ukraine during the XV - XVIII centuries.

Since the end of the XIV century. The progress of the world historical process largely depended on the long-term confrontation between the countries of Central and Eastern, Eastern, and Southeastern Europe and the Ottoman Empire. Not only Ukraine but also the peoples of Turkey, Italy, Poland, Lithuania, Russia, Crimea, Austria, Hungary, Slovakia, Slovenia, Bulgaria, Greece, Romania, Moldova, Georgia, Armenia, Albania, Serbia, Croatia, Bosnia, Macedonia, Montenegro and others were involved in this international conflict. As noted by modern researchers of international diplomacy, since then the final "eastern question - the problem of relations between European states and the great Ottoman Empire" [2]. In addition, in the second half of the XVII century there was a special situation where in connection with the next offensive of the Turks deep into the European continent in a military-political alliance against them united Vienna, Warsaw and Venice with the support of the Vatican, and Moscow.

At the beginning of the XVIII century the Ottoman Empire conquered vast territories, the population of which was at different stages of socio-economic development.

The second half of the XVIII century was a difficult period for the internal development of the Ottoman Empire. The multinational state began to lean to the west. This was primarily due to the transformation of the military-feudal system, in addition, domestic political confrontations were

getting complicated. The crisis of the Ottoman Empire, its military-political weakness and economic backwardness later manifested itself in lagging behind other European states [3. P. 187]. The Ottoman Empire was gradually losing its independence in foreign policy and coming under the influence of European states.

Since eighteenth century, Western powers took the Ottoman Empire under their protection using it for their own interests, brought it closer to destruction. The policy of European states in the Middle East until the middle of the XVIII century becomes more persistent, increasing colonial expansion into the Middle East. During this period, France, England, Austria and Russia were aggressive towards the Ottoman Empire. The most active were Austria and Russia, and France and England acted differently - through trade and diplomacy, assuring the Turks of friendship and loyalty [4. P. 34].

France was the first one that started the colonial expansion among all these European countries. Remaining in the XVII century an absolute monarchy, France became the most powerful state in Western Europe. During the reign of Louis XIV, France won great military victories over Spain and Austria. All lands inhabited by the French were annexed, and projects for the division of the lands of the Ottoman Empire were developed. The French have already owned large rich trade factors of East Asia in the XVIII century. During its offensive policy, France did not have serious contradictions with the Ottoman Empire, but is also did not exclude it from its political tasks, so it was able to establish friendly relations with the empire. However, the internal situation of France itself until the middle of the XVIII century was getting complicated in anticipation of a revolutionary explosion. Unlike France, England in the second half of the XVIII century did not have a strong economic position in the Middle East with the Ottoman Empire, as it was occupied by India and North America. More precisely, the attention of England was diverted by the creation of the great British Empire, which included many parts of the world. England has had certain plans since the end of the XVI century. In 1583 the English trading company "Levantine Company" was formed, which carried out economic penetration into various provinces of the Ottoman Empire. It was the second largest (after the East India) trading company in Great Britain, whose shareholders included prominent politicians and diplomats [4. P. 34].

For England, France was the main opponent. During the XVIII century England waged colonial wars with France. In the 80s of the XVIII century the Anglo-French confrontation in the Middle East was formed, which became the basis for the struggle of the two largest European powers for world hegemony. The search for allies in this struggle forced Britain to seek rapprochement with Russia [4. P. 35].

Austria's policy was less consistent and volatile. Unlike England and France, Austria did not have a clearly defined program, often changing its plans depending on the international situation. The Austro-Turkish controversy over the growing problems with the border forced the Habsburgs

to often turn to Russia in their Middle East policy. At the same time, Austria opposed Russia's plans and, in particular, linked its diplomacy on the Ottoman Empire to that of France. Having no clear program, Austria at the same time and later was ready to reject from the Ottoman Empire the territories bordering it [5. P. 86].

As for the Russian Empire, it is important to note that the Ottoman Empire feared the strengthening of the powerful northern neighbor. Relations with Russia in the period XVII-XVIII centuries become one of the main things in the country's foreign policy. From time to time, Russia and the Ottoman Empire found themselves on the brink of armed conflict. Although the nature of open military confrontation between Russian and Turkish relations acquired only in the eighteenth century, acute conflict situations also occurred in the early periods of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. At that time, diplomatic relations between the states were maintained through a fairly regular exchange of embassies. And yet, the peace period could not continue. Military action against the Ottoman Empire and the Crimea was carried out by the successors of Peter I, but nothing decisive was achieved.

The Peace of Constantinople of 1700, concluded between the Ottoman Empire and its northern neighbor, gave a long-awaited respite in a series of failed wars. Russia not only had the opportunity to concentrate efforts in the struggle for access to the Baltic Sea, leaving the Black Sea issue open, but also prophetically formulated a century and a half ahead of its program in resolving the Eastern question [3. P. 32].

The Ottoman Empire was considered a threat to Europe, so a ruler who could break that confidence in military power was needed.

Thus, during the eighteenth century, the main conflicts between European powers were the struggle of England and France for maritime and colonial hegemony, Austria and Prussia - for supremacy in Germany, Russia - for access to the Baltic and Black Seas, which pushed it to clash, above all, with Sweden and the Ottoman Empire. Western powers were alternatively using the Ottoman Empire to their advantage involving it to their international relations and were making the empire an involuntary participant in their mutual quarrels, thus complicating and confusing its foreign relations. The more actively The Ottoman Empire itself was seeking to get engaged in European politics, the deeper it was involved in the struggle of European groups. Although the most far-sighted Turkish statesmen were well aware of the danger of a collision with the empire's neighbors, trying to avoid it, but at the same time the very logic of the Ottoman Empire's European policy made conflict inevitable. This was evidenced by the war of the Ottoman Empire against Russia and Austria in 1735-1739 [6. P. 213], and the Russo-Turkish wars of the second half of the XVIII century. After the conclusion of the Belgrade Peace in 1739 between the Ottoman Empire, on the one hand, and Austria and Russia, on the other, the Ottoman ruling elite reaffirmed its course of active participation in European affairs.

This is evidenced by the fact that bilateral agreements were concluded: first the Turkish-Swedish Defense Union, then - the Turkish-Neapolitan (with the Kingdom of both Sicily) treaty of friendship and trade [7. P. 190]. Although European states were not inviting it to peace talks after the end of the military conflict, the Ottoman Empire still took part in European political events.

1. Кримський А. *Історія Туреччини : звідки почалася Османська держава, як вона зростала й розвивалася і як досягла апогею своєї слави й могутності / Ін-т сходознавства імені А. Ю. Кримського НАН України. – [2-ге вид., випр.]. – Київ ; Львів: Олір, 1996.*
2. Галіл Іналджик. *Османська імперія. Класична доба 1300 – 1600 / Перекл. О. Галенка. – К., 1998; Османская империя и страны Центральной, Восточной и Юго-Восточной Европы в XVII в./ Отв. ред. Г. Литаврин. – Ч.2. – Москва, 2001. – С.3 – 4; История Османского государства, общества и цивилизации / Под. ред. Э. Ихсаноглу (пер. с турецкого В. Феоновой под ред. М. Мейера). – Т.1. – Москва, 2006. – С.27 – 28; Khadouri M. *War end Peace in Islam.* – Baltimore, 1955; *Jacov M. Europa i Osmanie w okresie Lig Swietych. Polska pomiędzy Wschodem a Zachodem.* – Krakow, 2003 та ін.*
3. *Історія дипломатії / Сост. А. Лактионов. – Москва, 2005.*
4. Ангели Ф. А. *Страницы истории Османской империи.* Кишинев. 2002.
5. Дегоев В. В. *Внешняя политика России и международные системы: 1700-1918 гг.* Москва, 2004.
6. Мейер М. С. *Османская империя в XVIII в. Черты структурного кризиса.* Москва : Наука, Главная ред. вост. литературы, 1991.
7. *Восточный вопрос во внешней политике России. Конец XVIII – начало XX в.* Москва : Наука, Главная ред. вост. литературы, 1978.

Павло Хоменко

РОСІЙСЬКО-ПОЛЬСЬКІ ВІДНОСИНИ КІНЦЯ XVIII ст.: МІЖНАРОДНИЙ АСПЕКТ

Відомо, яку вагому роль у політичному і суспільному житті Російської імперії відігравало польське питання, в основі якого лежав свого роду сплав усталених у суспільстві стереотипів щодо Польщі і поляків. Під час політичних криз воно набувало особливої гостроти, принагідно лишаючись об'єктом уваги та наукових досліджень істориків. Їхні намагання дати неупереджену історичну оцінку «фатальному питанню» є предметом гострих дискусій, які водночас є свідченням наукової актуальності, що часто трансформується в політичне бачення минулого України, Росії та Польщі.

Метою статті є дослідити зміст і еволюцію «польського питання» в російській історичній полоністиці, до якої звертаються в дослідженнях М. Карєєв, О. Гільфердінг, М. Коялович та ін. Специфіка теми має на увазі, що історичні праці одночасно можуть використовуватися і як джерела, і як історіографія.