



GENEL TÜRK TARİHİ

ARAŞTIRMALARI DERGİSİ

Cilt/Volume 6, Sayı/Issue 11, Ocak/January 2024, ss. 77-84.

Geliş Tarihi–Received Date: 28.11.2023 Kabul Tarihi–Accepted Date: 30.12.2023

ARAŞTIRMA MAKALESİ – RESEARCH ARTICLE

ON THE IDENTITY OF THE TATAR HANZADE AT THE CIRCUMCISION CEREMONY OF SÜLEYMAN I'S SONS

 10.53718/gttad.1397115

 UMUT YOLSEVER*

ABSTRACT

One of the homelands of the Turks in the world is the plains north of the Black Sea. The Crimean Khanate, which has existed in these plains for about 350 years, is the last of the independent Turkic states that dominated in the north of the Black Sea. Since its establishment, the Crimean Khanate established political, social, cultural and economic relations with other states and communities in and around the Black Sea. One of the main features that distinguishes the Crimean Khanate, which was one of the heirs of the Golden Horde State like the Kazan Khanate and the Astarhan Khanate, from other khanates is that the fact that this state endured longer. The most important factor for this is that the Khanate accepted the Ottoman Empire's subordination from its early period. All the Tatar Khanates that emerged from the Golden Horde State continued the tradition of their rulers being descended from Genghis Khan. Being of Genghis lineage ensured that all *hanzades* had a say in the state administration. Unable to ascend to the throne on their own, the *hanzades* needed the support of various states, which were their enemies. These states supported the *hanzades* in line with their own interests, and groupings emerged within the khanates. These groupings led to internal conflicts in time and Tatar Khanates did not last long. In the early period of the Crimean Khanate, as in other khanates, internal conflicts threatened the state with collapse soon after its foundation, but the state was prevented from collapse when it came under Ottoman rule in 1475. The Crimean khans, with the exception of Mehmet Geray Khan I, began to sit on the throne with the approval of the Ottoman sultan. However, in time, the Crimean khans desire for independence from the Ottoman Empire emerged. In order to prevent possible independence attempts, the Ottoman Empire implemented the tradition of having a *hanzade* of the Geray dynasty reside in their territory as a pledge.

The splendid circumcision ceremony held for the *şehzades* in the Ottoman Empire have found a place in the works of Ottoman authors. In addition to the state officials, representatives of the states affiliated to the Ottoman Empire also attended these magnificent ceremonies. The Crimean *hanzade* living in the Ottoman lands also took their places in the protocol at official state ceremonies. One of these ceremonies was the circumcision ceremony of Süleyman I's sons in June-July 1530. The works of Celâlzâde Mustafa Çelebi's *Tabakâtü'l Memâlik ve Derecâtü'l Mesâlik*, Nişancızâde Mehmet Efendi's *Mir'âtü'l Kâinât*, Gelibolulu Mustafa Ali's *Kühû'l Ahbâr*, Peçevi İbrahim Efendi's *Peçevi Tarihi* contain valuable information about this circumcision ceremony. In our study, we think that the Crimean *hanzade*, who participated in the circumcision ceremony held in 1530 and was named as the son of Tatar Khan according to the authors, is a name contrary to what is written in Turkic sources. As a result of the researches conducted by us, it has been seen that the *hanzades* claimed in Turkic sources were not in Istanbul at the date of the circumcision ceremony.



* Dr., Eskişehir/TÜRKİYE, E-Posta: umutyolsever44@gmail.com, ORCID ID: 0000-0002-7035-4328.

In this study, we have tried to determine the name of the *hanzade*, whose name could not be determined in Ottoman sources, based on Russian sources, and it was understood that Himmet Geray Sultan and Baba Geray Sultan could have been in Istanbul on the days of the circumcision ceremony. However, as a result of the analysis of the existing sources, it is stated that Himmet Geray Sultan may have died at a date before Baba Geray Sultan's arrival in Istanbul.

Keywords: Crimean Khanate, Ottoman Empire, Ottoman Ceremonies, Geray Dynasty, Tatar.

I. SÜLEYMAN'IN OĞULLARININ SÜNNET DÜĞÜNÜNDEKİ TATAR HANZADESİNİN KİMLİĞİ ÜZERİNE

ÖZ

Türklerin dünya üzerinde hayatlarını sürdürdükleri yurtlarından birisi de Karadeniz'in kuzeyindeki düzlüklerdir. Yaklaşık 350 yıl bu düzlüklerde varlığını sürdüren Kırım Hanlığı da Karadeniz'in kuzeyinde hâkimiyet sürmüş bağımsız Türk devletlerinden sonuncusudur. Kuruluş yıllarından itibaren Kırım Hanlığı Karadeniz ve çevresindeki diğer devletler ve topluluklarla da siyasî, sosyal, kültürel ve ekonomik ilişkileri kurmuştur. Kazan Hanlığı ve Astarhan Hanlığı gibi Altın Orda Devleti'nin varislerinden olan Kırım Hanlığını diğer hanlıklardan ayıran başlıca özelliklerden birisi de devletin ömrünün uzun sürmesidir. Bunun en önemli faktörü Hanlığın erken dönemlerinden itibaren Osmanlı Devleti tabiiyetini kabul etmesidir. Altın Orda Devleti içerisinde çıkan Tatar Hanlıklarının hepsi yöneticilerinin Cengiz Han soylu olma geleneğini devam ettirmişlerdir. Cengiz soylu olma durumu, tüm hanzâdelerin devlet yönetiminde söz sahibi olmasını sağlamıştır. Tek başlarına tahta çıkacak gücü bulamayan hanzâdeler, düşmanları olan çeşitli devletlerin desteğine ihtiyaç duymuşlardır. Bahsi geçen devletler kendi çıkarları doğrultusunda hanzâdeleri desteklemişler ve hanlıklar içerisinde gruplaşmalar yaşanmıştır. Bu gruplaşmalar zamanla iç çatışmalara sebebiyet vermiş ve Tatar Hanlıklarının ömrü uzun sürmemiştir. Kırım Hanlığı'nın erken dönemlerinde de tıpkı diğer hanlıklarda olduğu devleti, kuruluşundan kısa süre sonra yıkılma tehlikesine sokan iç çatışmalar yaşansa da 1475'te hanlığın Osmanlı tabiiyetine girmesiyle yıkımın önüne geçilmiştir. Kırım Hanları, -I. Mehmet Geray Han hariç- Osmanlı padişahının onayı ile tahta oturmaya başlamıştır. Ancak zaman içerisinde Kırım Hanlarının Osmanlı Devleti'ne karşı bağımsızlık isteği ortaya çıkmıştır. Osmanlı Devleti de yaşanabilecek olası bağımsızlık girişimlerinin önüne geçmek adına Geray Hanedanlığına mensup bir hanzâdenin rehin olarak kendi topraklarında ikamet etme geleneğini uygulamışlardır.

Osmanlı Devleti'nde şehzâdelere yapılan görkemli sünnet düğünleri Osmanlı müelliflerinin eserlerinde kendisine yer bulmuştur. Bu görkemli düğünlere devlet ricali dışında Osmanlı Devleti'ne bağlı devletlerin temsilcileri de katılmıştır. Osmanlı topraklarında yaşayan Kırım hanzâdeleri de resmî devlet törenlerinde protokoldeki yerlerini almışlardır. Bu törenlerden biri de Haziran-Temmuz 1530'daki I. Süleyman'ın oğullarının sünnet düğünüdür. Osmanlı'nın önemli müelliflerinden olan Celâlzâde Mustafa Çelebi'nin *Tabakâtü'l Memâlik ve Derecâtü'l Mesâlik*, Nişancızâde Mehmet Efendi'nin *Mir'âtü'l Kâinât*, Gelibolulu Mustafa Ali'nin *Künhü'l Ahbâr*, Peçevi İbrahim Efendi'nin *Peçevi Tarihi* isimli eserlerinde bu sünnet düğünüyle ilgili kıymetli bilgiler yer almaktadır. Çalışmamızda 1530 yılında düzenlenen sünnet düğününe katılan ve müelliflerin ifadesiyle Tatar Han oğlu adıyla yer alan Kırım hanzâdesinin Türk kaynaklarında yazılan aksine bir isim olduğunu düşünmekteyiz. Türk kaynaklarından iddia edilen hanzâdelerin, tarafımızca yapılan araştırmalar sonucunda sünnet düğünü tarihinde İstanbul'da bulunmadıkları görülmüştür. Bu çalışmamızda Osmanlı kaynaklarında ismi belirlenemeyen hanzâdenin Rus kaynaklarından hareketle isminin tespitine çalışılmış ve sünnet düğününün yapıldığı günlerde Himmet Geray Sultan ve Baba Geray Sultan'ın İstanbul'da olabileceği anlaşılmıştır. Lakin mevcut kaynakların tahlil edilmesi neticesinde Himmet Geray Sultan'ın, Baba Geray Sultan'ın İstanbul'a gelmesinden önceki bir tarihte ölmüş olabileceği ihtimali belirtilmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Kırım Hanlığı, Osmanlı İmparatorluğu, Osmanlı Merasimleri, Geray Hanedanlığı, Tatar.

INTRODUCTION

According to various historical texts such as Celâlzâde Mustafa Çelebi's *Tabakâtü'l Memâlik ve Derecâtü'l Mesâlik*, Nişancızâde Mehmet Efendi's *Mir'âtü'l Kâinât*, Gelibolulu Mustafa Ali's *Künhü'l Ahbâr*, and Peçevi İbrahim Efendi's *Peçevi Tarihi*, it is documented that in the period of June-July 1530, a circumcision ceremony was held for three *şehzades*, namely 12-year-old *Şehzade* Mustafa, 8-year-old *Şehzade* Mehmet, and 6-year-old *Şehzade* Selim. These *şehzades* were the sons of Süleyman I (1520-1566). A grand banquet was organized during the ceremony, with the attendance of government dignitaries. The individuals in attendance at the banquet were documented as *Sadrâzam* İbrahim Pasha, *Ayas Pasha*, *Kasım Pasha*, *Beylerbey* of Rumelia *Behram Pasha*, *Yakup Pasha*, *kazaskers*, the son of Tatar Khan, *Piri Pasha*, *Zeynel Pasha*, *Ferruḫşad Bey*, a

ON THE IDENTITY OF THE TATAR HANZADE AT THE CIRCUMCISION CEREMONY OF SÜLEYMAN I'S SONS

former member of the Akkoyunlu *ulama*, Murat Bey, the son of Bayındır, Mehmet Bey, the son of the Egyptian ruler Sultan Gavri, and Abdüllatif Bey from Dulkadir.¹ While the majority of names, with their corresponding titles, are explicitly listed, one notable omission is the identification of the son of the Crimean Khan, referred to as the son of Tatar Khan. The identification of this name holds significant importance in the historical trajectory of the pledging practice between the Crimean Khanate and the Ottoman Empire.

In the year 1475, Gedik Ahmet Pasha organized a campaign to Crimea. As an outcome of the voyage, he successfully captured the Genoese cities and fortresses, including Kerch, Sudak, Balıklava, and Mangup. These settlements were strategically positioned along the peninsula's coastline and served as key nodes within a lucrative commerce network. Subsequently, he incorporated these territories into the Ottoman Empire, establishing direct ownership over them. After this voyage, the Crimean Khanate was incorporated into the Ottoman Empire.² Following a period of 37 years during which the Crimean Khanate was under the subordination of the Ottoman Empire, the latter expressed a desire to forestall any potential endeavours towards independence by the Crimean khans. Consequently, tradition of having a potential candidate for the throne, namely a *hanzade* of the Geray dynasty descended from Genghis Khan, reside in the Ottoman lands as a pledge to act as a deterrent against the current Crimean Khan was initiated.³ According to Evliya Çelebi, following to the incorporation of the Crimean Khanate into the Ottoman Empire in 1475, Mengli Geray I, the Khan of Crimea, dispatched one of the brothers to the Ottomans as a pledge.⁴ However, based on historical sources, it is known that the first *hanzade* who was held a pledge in the Ottoman palace was Saadet Geray I, the son of Mengli Geray I (1478-1515), who arrived in Istanbul with Selim I in 1512.⁵

According to various Turkic sources, including *Es-Seb'ü's-Seyyar Fi Ahbâr-ı Mülûki't-Tatar* and *Çelebi Akay Tarihi*, Mehmet Geray Khan I (1515-1523), who succeeded Mengli Geray Khan I, along with his son Bahadır Geray Sultan, were killed by the Nogays in October/November 1523.⁶ The exact timing of their deaths differs among these sources. *Gülbün-i Hanan* states that they were killed in January 1523,⁷ while the Grand Principality of Muscovy envoy Ivan Koliçev, who personally witnessed the period, claims that their deaths occurred in March 1523.⁸ Afterwards, Saadet Geray Sultan, who had lived in the Ottoman lands⁹ since 1512, was appointed to Crimea as a khan by Süleyman I in mid-June 1523.¹⁰ So, since Saadet Geray (1523-1532), who resided in the Ottoman lands, went to Crimea as a khan in 1523, who is the son of Tatar Khan mentioned in the circumcision ceremony in 1530? Four potential *hanzade* names were identified through an examination of Turkic sources and Russian embassy reports in an effort to provide an answer to this inquiry.

1. Identification of the Son of Tatar Khan

On the 10th of April in the year 1516, Nebolsa Kobayakov, acting as the envoy of Vasiliy III, the ruler of the Grand Principality of Muscovy, undertook a journey from Crimea to Moscow. The purpose of this journey was to deliver and present the report of Ivan Mamanov, who had been serving as the envoy of the Grand

¹ Funda Demirtaş, *Celâl-Zâde Mustafa Çelebi, Tabakâtü'l Memâlik ve Derecâtü'l Mesalik*, Erciyes University Institute of Social Sciences (Unpublished PhD Thesis), Kayseri 2009, p. 274; Nişancızade Mehmet Efendi, *Osmanlı Tarihi 1299-1566 Mir'âtü'l Kâinât*, pre. Göker İnan, Bilge Kültür Sanat Pub., İstanbul 2022, p. 333; Gelibolulu Mustafa Ali, *Künhü'l Ahbâr*, pre. pub. Ali Çavuşoğlu, TTK, Ankara 2019, p. 579; Peçevi İbrahim Efendi, *Peçevi Tarihi I*, pre. Bekir Sıtkı Aysal, Kültür Bakanlığı Pub., Ankara 1981, p. 155-156; On ceremonies in Turkic culture, see also Oktay Berber, "Türk Kültüründe Eğlence ve Birlik Unsuru Olarak Dügünler", *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, I. 10, 2009, p. 1-11.

² Yücel Öztürk, *Osmanlı Hâkimiyetinde Keçe (1475-1600)*, Bilge Kültür Sanat Pub., İstanbul 2014, p. 65-70; Sonay Ünal, "Kuruluşundan Çarlık Rusya Tarafından İşgal Edilişine Kırım Hanlığı", *Karadeniz Araştırmaları Dergisi*, V. 20, I. 79, 2023, p. 622.

³ Hakan Kırımlı, *Geraylar ve Osmanlılar. Kırım Hanlık Hânedânının Osmanlı Devleti'ndeki Hikâyesi*, Ötüken Pub., İstanbul 2022, p. 204; Yavuz Söylemez, "Kırım Hanlığı-Osmanlı Devleti Siyasi İlişkilerinde Rehin Usulü", *Türk Tarihi Araştırmaları Dergisi*, V. 4, I. 2, 2019, p. 91.

⁴ *Günümüz Türkçesiyle Evliyâ Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi*, V. 2, Book 7, pre. Seyit Ali Kahraman, YKY, İstanbul 2011, p. 478.

⁵ Serkan Acar, "Kırım Hanı Mehmed Giray'ın Sebeb-i Mevti", pre. Yücel Öztürk, *Doğu Avrupa Türk Mirasının Son Kalesi Kırım*, Çamlıca Pub., İstanbul 2015, p. 108.

⁶ Seyyid Mehmed Rızâ, *Es-Seb'ü's-Seyyar Fi Ahbâr-ı Mülûki't-Tatar (İnceleme- Tenkitli Metin)*, pre. Yavuz Söylemez, TTK, Ankara 2020, p. 117; Aykut Can, *Hurremî Çelebi Akay Tarihi*, Marmara University Institute of Turkish Studies (Unpublished PhD Thesis), İstanbul 2022, p. 119.

⁷ Halim Giray, *Gülbün-i Hanân*, pre. İbrahim Gültekin, T. C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Pub., Ankara 2019, p. 57.

⁸ RGADA, Fond 123 Snoşeniya Rossii s Kırımom, Opis1, No 6, Dokument 1, list 2- 8, s. 2ob.

⁹ The expression "in the Ottoman lands" is especially preferred because the gramota sent by the envoy of the Grand Principality of Muscovy in Azov, Tretyak Gubin, with the Kosak Yakushburusun of Ryazan, and received in Moscow on 18 October 1521, states that Saadet Giray was in Kili, so it is understood that he also resided outside Istanbul. RGADA, Fond 89 Snoşeniya Rossii s Turtsey, Opis 1, No 3, Dokument 3, list 190ob-192, s. 191ob.

¹⁰ RGADA, Fond 123 Snoşeniya Rossii s Kırımom, Opis1, No 6, Dokument 1, list 2- 8, s. 4ob-5.

Principality of Muscovy in Crimea. According to the report, it was found that Mubarak Geray Sultan, who was also a son of Mengli Geray Khan, resided in Istanbul during that period.¹¹ In a report from the Russian embassy dated 22 June 1515, it is indicated that Mubarak Geray Sultan was present in Crimea during that time.¹² Based on the available information, it can be inferred that Mubarak Geray Sultan likely undertook a journey to Istanbul within the period spanning from 22 June 1515 to 10 April 1516. Therefore, it appears that both Saadet Geray Sultan and Mubarak Geray Sultan were concurrently pledges within the Ottoman Empire. Nevertheless, as indicated by *Gülbün-i Hanan*, it is documented that Mubarak Geray Sultan died while participating in Selim I's military expedition in Egypt in the year 1517. There is no subsequent mention of Mubarak Geray Sultan in any documented source. There is a lack of evidence contradicting the content presented in *Gülbün-i Hanan*. Consequently, it has become evident that the individual identified as Mubarak Geray Sultan at the ceremony can not be the son of Tatar Khan.

According to many Turkic historical sources such as *Tarih-i Sahib Giray Han*, *Es-Seb'ü's-Seyyar Fi Ahbâr-ı Mülûki't-Tatar*, *Çelebi Akay Tarihi*, and *Gülbün-i Hanan*, there is mention of Kazan Khan Sahib Geray I (1521-1524), another son of Mengli Geray Khan, departed from the Kazan Khanate in 1524 under the guise of embarking on a hajj to Istanbul and stayed there until 1533 when he ascended the Crimean throne.¹³ When examining the aforementioned four sources, the impression emerges that the son of the Tatar Khan at the circumcision ceremony was Sahib Geray who came to Istanbul in 1524. Upon analysis of the records provided by the Russian and Lithuanian-Polish ambassadors during the specified period, it becomes evident that Sahib Geray, contrary to previous assumptions, did not travel to Istanbul upon his return from the Kazan Khanate. Instead, he remained in Crimea until 1532 and sometimes fulfilled the role of Saadet Geray Khan's kalgay.¹⁴

The main reason for this misconception is probably a misinterpretation of an incident. The historical text titled *Es-Seb'ü's-Seyyar Fi Ahbâr-ı Mülûki't-Tatar* was authored during the second quarter of the 18th century,¹⁵ *Çelebi Akay Tarihi* was likely written in the year 1753,¹⁶ while *Gülbün-i Hanan* was composed in 1811.¹⁷ The main basis on which these sources probably obtained this information is the work titled *Tarih-i Sahib Giray Khan*, written between 1552-1553 by Remmal Hoca, who was personally closest to Sahib Geray Khan. In 1532, Remmal Hoca encountered Sahib Geray in Istanbul for the first time. It was told to Remmal Hoca by an individual that Sahib Geray had previously held the position of Khan of Kazan, but had willingly relinquished his authority in the khanate, then Sahib Geray embarked on a journey to Istanbul with the purpose of ultimately reaching the Kâbe.¹⁸ The underlying factors contributing to the occurrence are distinct. Sahib Geray emerged as the primary supporter of the Crimean Khan Saadet Geray. Certain *beys* who were in opposition to Saadet Geray Khan expressed their demand for Sahib Geray to be surrendered to them as a means to diminish his influence. In contrast, Saadet Geray Khan, being aware of the imminent threat to his brother's life, refrained from surrendering Sahib Geray to the *beys*, instead opting to dispatch him to Istanbul to Süleyman I.¹⁹ It is likely that Saadet Geray Khan expressed his decision to send Sahib Geray on a hajj as a means to preempt any potential backlash from the *beys*. This information has spread among the people of Istanbul and has been documented in writing as a result of Remmal Hoca's hearing. In conclusion, the reports from the Russian and Lithuanian-Polish embassies provide evidence that the individual identified as the *hanzade* during the ceremony was not Sahib

¹¹ *Pamyatniki Diplomaticheskikh Snoşeniya Moskovskago Gosudarstva S Krimom, Nagayimii Turtsieyu 1508-1521 gg.*, Tom II, Sbornik İmperatorskago Russkago İstoričeskago Obşçestva, XCV, St. Peterburg 1885, p. 272.

¹² *Pamyatniki Diplomaticheskikh Snoşeniya*, p. 131.

¹³ *Tarih-i Sahib Giray Han*, pre. Özalp Gökbilgin, Baylan Pub., Ankara 1973, p. 20; *Es-Seb'ü's-Seyyar Fi Ahbâr-ı Mülûki't-Tatar*, p. 120; *Çelebi Akay Tarihi*, p. 123; *Gülbün-i Hanan*, p. 64.

¹⁴ RGADA, Fond 123 Snoşeniya Rossii s Krimom, Opis1, No 6, Dokument 5, list 80ob-84, s. 80ob-81; RGADA, Fond 123 Snoşeniya Rossii s Krimom, Opis1, No 6, Dokument 5, list 80ob-84, s. 82-82ob; RGADA, Fond 123 Snoşeniya Rossii s Krimom, Opis1, No 6, Dokument 7-2, list 126ob-127; RGADA, Fond 123 Snoşeniya Rossii s Krimom, Opis1, No 6, Dokument 7-2, list 128ob-129ob; RGADA, Fond 389 Litovskaja Metrika, No 7, s. 1187-1193 using this document Dariusz Kolodziejczyk, *The Crimean Khanate and Poland Lithuania*, Brill, Leiden-Boston 2011, p. 665-676.

¹⁵ Yavuz Söylemez, "Kırım Hanlığı Tarihine Müteallik Mühim Bir Kaynak: Es-Seb'ü's-Seyyâr Fî Ahbâr-ı Mülûki't-Tatar", pre. Yücel Öztürk, *Doğu Avrupa Türk Mirasının Son Kalesi Kırım*, Çamlıca Pub., İstanbul 2015, p. 388-397; Alper Başer, "Kırım Hanlığı Tarihini Konu Alan Müstakil Eserler ve Yeni Bir Kaynak, Tarih-i Mevküfati", *Turkish Studies*, V. 6, I. 1, 2011, p. 749-750.

¹⁶ Aykut Can, "Müstakil Bir Kırım Hanlığı Tarihi: Çelebi Akay Tarihi", *MUTAD*, V. 9, I. 2, 2022, p. 208; Alper Başer, Kemal Gurulkan, "Anonim Bir Kırım Hanlığı Tarihi (1475-1778)", *MUTAD*, V. 8, I. 2, 2021, p. 404.

¹⁷ Muzaffer Ürekli, "Gülbün-i Hânân", *TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, V. XIV, İstanbul 1996, p. 235-236; Ufuk Aykol, *Müstakil Kırım Hanlığı (1772-1783)*, Hacettepe University Institute of Social Sciences (Unpublished Master Thesis), Ankara 2019, p. 1.

¹⁸ *Tarih-i Sahib Giray Han*, p. 20.

¹⁹ RGADA, Fond 123 Snoşeniya Rossii s Krimom, Opis1, No 6, Dokument 19-1, list 363-365.

ON THE IDENTITY OF THE TATAR HANZADE AT THE CIRCUMCISION CEREMONY OF SÜLEYMAN I'S SONS

Geray. While acknowledging the lack of available Turkic sources, the relevant material shedding light on the matter may be discovered within the reports of the Russian embassy.

Following the demise of Mengli Geray Khan, Mehmet Geray Khan I, ascended to the throne and, adhering to customary practices, appointed his brother Ahmet Geray Sultan, the eldest member of the dynasty after him, as the *kalgay*.²⁰ Despite Mehmet Geray Khan's initial preference for Bahadır Geray Sultan to become *kalgay* instead of Ahmet Geray Sultan, he ultimately adhered to the established protocols to avoid provoking the Crimean *beys* and *mirzas*. In order not to go against this tradition, he found another solution and made Bahadır Geray Sultan an unofficial *kalgay*. Although officially the *kalgay* was Ahmet Geray Sultan, Bahadır Geray Sultan's name was written before Ahmet Geray Sultan in the correspondence with the Grand Principality of Muscovy in March 1516 and with the Lithuanian-Polish State in May/June 1517, contrary to the protocols.²¹ This shows that Ahmet Geray Sultan's title of *kalgay* was only nominal. Ahmet Geray Sultan, while holding the formal position of *kalgay*, was disregarded by Mehmet Geray Khan. Subsequently, Ahmet Geray Sultan departed from the Crimean Peninsula following the conclusion of the summer season in 1517, and established residence in the neighborhood of the Ozi Fortress.

Later, Ahmet Geray Sultan decided to depose Mehmet Geray Khan and sit on the throne himself. However, Ahmet Geray Sultan, who knew that he could not depose such a powerful figure as Mehmet Geray Khan alone, negotiated with the Grand Principality of Muscovy and the Lithuanian-Polish State in order to gather support for him, but he could not achieve success.²² Ahmet Geray Sultan, feeling a sense of disillusionment due to his consecutive disappointments, directed his attention to Selim I, the sovereign of the Ottoman Empire, who harbored personal animosity against Mehmet Geray Khan.²³ Based on accounts from Russian envoys, it is likely that Ahmet Geray Sultan dispatched his son, Himmet Geray Sultan, to Istanbul during the spring of 1519 with the intention of persuading Selim I to overthrow Mehmet Geray Khan from the throne and place himself as the successor.²⁴ Soon after Himmet Geray Sultan was sent to İstanbul, Mehmet Geray Khan appointed his sons Bahadır Geray Sultan and Alp Geray Sultan to kill Ahmet Geray Sultan, who was openly threatening his throne, and Ahmet Geray Sultan was killed in early spring 1519.²⁵ There is a lack of information on Himmet Geray Sultan, the son of Ahmet Geray Sultan, who arrived in Istanbul, as evidenced by the absence of relevant data in Turkic, Russian, and Lithuanian-Polish sources. There is a strong likelihood that he did not return to Crimea and instead stayed as a pledge alongside Saadet Geray Sultan, who was resident in the Ottoman territories at that period, until his demise. Hence, there exists a potentiality that the *hanzade* during the ceremony was Himmet Geray Sultan.

Another *hanzade* sent to Istanbul as a pledge was also identified by us. Following the killing of Mehmet Geray Khan at the hands of the Nogays, the Crimean Khanate experienced a period of anarchy characterized by a significant disruption in the established order of the state. Significantly, Gazi Geray Khan I, the son of Mehmet Geray Khan, assumed control of the khanate without notifying the Ottoman Empire and appointed Baba Geray Sultan, another son of Mehmet Geray Khan, as the *kalgay*.²⁶ Nevertheless, due to the absence of a structured governance system within the state, Memeş Bey, the leader of the *Şirin* tribe and one of the four *Karaçi Beys* in the Crimean Khanate, knew the impropriety of ascending to the throne without the explicit consent of Süleyman I, the reigning monarch of the Ottoman Empire during that period. Consequently, Memeş Bey undertook a journey to Istanbul with the purpose of informing the Süleyman I of the occurred events and seeking an audience with him. After his arrival in the capital, he demanded from Süleyman I with the suggestion of Saadet Geray, who was there, that Saadet Geray be placed on the throne.²⁷ Subsequently, as mentioned above, Saadet Geray Khan was sent to the throne of the Crimean Khanate in June 1523. On 7 August 1523, Mehmetbeykulu, probably *Dizdar* of Azak, arrived in Moscow; and on 9 September 1523, Hüdayaroğlu, Saadet Geray Khan's envoy to Moscow, reported that even before Saadet Geray Khan left Istanbul, Süleyman I ordered him to kill Gazi Geray

²⁰ *Pamyatniki Diplomaticheskikh Svoşeniý*, p. 131.

²¹ *Pamyatniki Diplomaticheskikh Svoşeniý*, p. 239-242; RGADA, Fond 389 Litovskaja Metrika, No 7, s. 621/622-629/630 using this document Kolodziejczyk, *ibid.*, p. 624-632.

²² Oleksa Gayvoronskiy, *Poveliteli Dvuh Materikov*, Tom I, Oranta, Maysterniya Knigi, Kiev-Bahçisaray 2007, p. 125-127.

²³ Acar, *ibid.*, p. 108-109.

²⁴ *Pamyatniki Diplomaticheskikh Svoşeniý*, p. 607.

²⁵ *Pamyatniki Diplomaticheskikh Svoşeniý*, p. 636.

²⁶ *Es-Seb'ü's-Seyyar Fi Ahbâr-ı Mülûki't-Tatar*, p. 117.

²⁷ *Çelebi Akay Tarihi*, p. 120.

for taking the throne without his knowledge, and to arrest Baba Geray Sultan and Mehmet Geray Khan's other son Çoban Geray Sultan and send them to Istanbul.²⁸ Saadet Geray Khan fulfilled the orders of Suleiman I, who had put him on the throne, and had Gazi Geray strangled after he became the head of the state. He had Baba Geray Sultan and Çoban Geray Sultan imprisoned and also Buğra Geray Sultan, another son of Mehmet Geray Khan, although it was not written in the order of Süleyman I, imprisoned in Kırkyer, However, Çoban Geray Sultan and Buğra Geray Sultan managed to escape from Kırkyer and went outside Or Kapı.²⁹ Soon after, Baba Geray Sultan, the last remaining *hanzade*, was sent to Istanbul.³⁰ Therefore, another identified *hanzade* is Baba Geray Sultan.

CONCLUSION

On the question of who the son of the Tatar Khan at the circumcision ceremony of Süleyman I's sons in 1530 might have been, four possible *hanzade* can be identified. The first of these is Mubarak Geray Sultan. Nevertheless, after examining alternative sources, it can be conclusively determined that his demise occurred in the year 1517. Sahib Geray can be identified as another *hanzade*. In contrast to the version presented in Turkic sources, it is worth noting that Russian and Lithuanian-Polish archives and data suggest that he did not travel to Istanbul, but rather remained in Crimea. Given the absence of evidence supporting the identification of the aforementioned individuals as Mubarak Geray Sultan and Sahib Geray Sultan, the potential candidates for consideration are Himmet Geray Sultan, the son of Ahmet Geray Sultan, who arrived in Istanbul in 1519, and Baba Geray Sultan, the son of Mehmet Geray Khan, who was apprehended and then sent to Istanbul in 1523. In *Tabakâtü'l Memâlik ve Derecâtü'l Mesâlik, Mir'âtü'l Kâinât, Künhü'l Ahbâr, Peçevi Tarihi*, the name of the *hanzade* at the ceremony is repeatedly emphasised as the son of Tatar Khan. Himmet Geray Sultan's father Ahmet Geray Sultan never became the head of the Crimean Khanate, he only held the position of kalgay, and even he could not fully fulfil this duty because of Mehmet Geray Khan. On the contrary, Baba Geray Sultan's father was Mehmet Geray Khan. In addition, when Saadet Geray took over the Crimean Khanate, one of the first things he did was to arrest Baba Geray Sultan and Çoban Geray Sultan to send them to Istanbul by order of Süleyman I. However, only Baba Geray Sultan could be sent to Istanbul because Çoban Geray Sultan deserted. However, since Çoban Geray Sultan deserted, only Baba Geray Sultan could be sent. Since the reigns of Saadet Geray Sultan and Mubarak Geray Sultan, it has been observed that two *hanzade* were held pledge at the same time in the Ottoman Empire. Perhaps, prior to Saadet Geray Khan's appointment as the leader of the Crimean Khanate in 1523, Himmet Geray Sultan had already passed away, there were no *hanzade* held pledge in Istanbul, and therefore two *hanzade* were ordered to be sent as in the past. Based on the aforementioned sources and a thorough examination of the sequence of events, it is our contention that the individual identified as the son of Tatar Khan is Baba Geray Sultan, who is the son of Mehmet Geray Khan and was dispatched to Istanbul in 1523. Thus, it is understood that from Saadet Geray onwards, at least one *hanzade* of the Geray dynasty was always held as a pledge in Istanbul against a possible rebellion and disobedience in the Crimean Khanate.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ACAR, Serkan, "Kırım Hanı Mehmed Giray'ın Sebeb-i Mevti", pre. Yücel Öztürk, *Doğu Avrupa Türk Mirasının Son Kalesi Kırım*, Çamlıca Pub., İstanbul 2015, p. 103-120.

AYKOL, Ufuk, *Müstakil Kırım Hanlığı (1772-1783)*, Hacettepe University Institute of Social Sciences (Unpublished Master Thesis), Ankara 2019.

BAŞER, Alper, "Kırım Hanlığı Tarihini Konu Alan Müstakil Eserler ve Yeni Bir Kaynak, Tarih-i Mevkûfati", *Turkish Studies*, V. 6, I. 1, 2011, p. 747-762.

BAŞER, Alper, GURULKAN, Kemal, "Anonim Bir Kırım Hanlığı Tarihi (1475-1778)", *MUTAD*, V. 8, I. 2, 2021, p. 402-462.

²⁸ RGADA, Fond 89 Snoşeniya Rossii s Turtsey, Opıs 1, No 4, Dokument 1, list 259-261, s. 260ob; RGADA, Fond 123 Snoşeniya Rossii s Kırımom, Opıs1, No 6 dokument 1, list 10-12, s. 11-11ob.

²⁹ RGADA, Fond 123 Snoşeniya Rossii s Kırımom, Opıs1, No 6, Dokument 1, list 2- 8, s. 4ob-5.

³⁰ RGADA, Fond 123 Snoşeniya Rossii s Kırımom, Opıs1, No 6 dokument 1, list 10-12, s. 11-11ob; *According to Es-Seb'ü's-Seyyar Fi Ahbâr-ı Mülûki't-Tatar and Çelebi Akay Tarihi*, Baba Giray was killed together with Gazi Giray. *Es-Seb'ü's-Seyyar Fi Ahbâr-ı Mülûki't-Tatar*, p. 119; *Çelebi Akay Tarihi*, p. 120; In our previous study, we had stated that Baba Giray was killed with reference to these sources. Umut Yolsever, "I. Saadet Giray Han Dönemine Ait Rus Arşivlerinde Bulunan İki Ahidnamenin Tercümesi ve Tahlili", *Selçuk Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, V. 55, Konya 2022, s. 442; However, as a result of the Russian embassy reports, this information turned out to be untrue.

ON THE IDENTITY OF THE TATAR HANZADE AT THE CIRCUMCISION CEREMONY OF SÜLEYMAN I'S SONS

BERBER, Oktay, "Türk Kültüründe Eğlence ve Birlik Unsuru Olarak Düğünler", *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, I. 10, 2009, s. 1-11.

CAN, Aykut, "Müstakil Bir Kırım Hanlığı Tarihi: Çelebi Akay Tarihi", *MUTAD*, V. 9, I. 2, 2022, p. 202-225.

CAN, Aykut, *Hurremî Çelebi Akay Tarihi*, Marmara University Institute of Turkish Studies (Unpublished PhD Thesis), İstanbul 2022.

DEMİRTAŞ, Funda, *Celâl-Zâde Mustafa Çelebi, Tabakâtü'l Memâlik ve Derecâtü'l Mesalik*, Erciyes University Institute of Social Sciences (Unpublished Doctoral Thesis), Kayseri 2009.

GAYVORONSKİY, Oleksa, *Poveliteli Dvuh Materikov*, Tom I, Oranta, Maysterniya Knigi, Kiev-Bahçisaray 2007.

Gelibolulu Mustafa Ali, *Künhü'l Ahbâr*, pub. pre. Ali Çavuşoğlu, TTK, Ankara 2019.

Günümüz Türkçesiyle Evliyâ Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi, V. 2, Book 7, pre. Seyit Ali Kahraman, YKY, İstanbul 2011.

Halîm Giray, *Gülbün-i Hânân*, pre. İbrahim Gültekin, T. C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Pub., Ankara 2019.

KIRIMLI, Hakan, *Geraylar ve Osmanlılar. Kırım Hanlık Hânedânının Osmanlı Devleti'ndeki Hikâyesi*, Ötüken Pub., İstanbul 2022.

KOLODZIEJCZYK, Dariusz, *The Crimean Khanate and Poland Lithuania*, Brill, Leiden-Boston 2011.

Nişancızâde Mehmet Efendi, *Osmanlı Tarihi 1299-1566 Mir'âtü'l Kâinât*, pre. Göker İnan, Bilge Kültür Sanat Pub., İstanbul 2022.

ÖZTÜRK, Yücel, *Osmanlı Hâkimiyetinde Kefe (1475-1600)*, Bilge Kültür Sanat Pub., İstanbul 2014.

Pamyatniki Diplomaticheskikh Snoşeniyy Moskovskogo Gosudarstva S Krimom, Nagayimii Turtsieyu 1508-1521 gg., Tom II, Sbornik İmperatorskago Russkago İstoričeskago Obşçestva, XCV, St. Peterburg 1885.

Peçevi İbrahim Efendi, *Peçevi Tarihi I*, pre. Bekir Sıtkı Aysal, Kültür Bakanlığı Pub., Ankara 1981.

RGADA, Fond 89 Snoşeniya Rossii s Turtsey, Opus 1, No 3, Dokument 3, list 190ob-192.

RGADA, Fond 89 Snoşeniya Rossii s Turtsey, Opus 1, No 4, Dokument 1, list 259-261.

RGADA, Fond 123 Snoşeniya Rossii s Krimom, Opus1, No 6, Dokument 1, list 2-8.

RGADA, Fond 123 Snoşeniya Rossii s Krimom, Opus1, No 6 dokument 1, list 10-12.

RGADA, Fond 123 Snoşeniya Rossii s Krimom, Opus1, No 6, Dokument 5, list 80ob-84.

RGADA, Fond 123 Snoşeniya Rossii s Krimom, Opus1, No 6, Dokument 7-2, list 126ob-127.

RGADA, Fond 123 Snoşeniya Rossii s Krimom, Opus1, No 6, Dokument 7-2, list 128ob-129ob.

RGADA, Fond 123 Snoşeniya Rossii s Krimom, Opus1, No 6, Dokument 19-1, list 363-365.

RGADA, Fond 389 Litovskaja Metrika, No 7, s. 1187-1193.

RGADA, Fond 389 Litovskaja Metrika, No 7, s. 621/622-629/630.

Seyyid Mehmed Rızâ, *Es-Seb'ü's-Seyyar Fi Ahbâr-ı Mülûki't-Tatar (İnceleme- Tenkitli Metin)*, pre. Yavuz Söylemez, TTK, Ankara 2020.

SÖYLEMEZ, Yavuz, "Kırım Hanlığı Tarihine Müteallik Mühim Bir Kaynak: Es-Seb'ü's-Seyyâr Fî Ahbâr-ı Mülûki't-Tatar", pre. Yücel Öztürk, *Doğu Avrupa Türk Mirasının Son Kalesi Kırım*, Çamlıca Pub., İstanbul 2015, p. 388-397.

SÖYLEMEZ, Yavuz, "Kırım Hanlığı-Osmanlı Devleti Siyasi İlişkilerinde Rehin Usulü", *Türk Tarihi Araştırmaları Dergisi*, V. 4, I. 2, 2019, p. 84-109.

Tarih-i Sahib Giray Han, pre. Özalp Gökbilgin, Baylan Pub., Ankara 1973.

ÜNAL, Sonay Ünal, "Kuruluşundan Çarlık Rusya Tarafından İşgal Edilişine Kırım Hanlığı", *Karadeniz Araştırmaları Dergisi*, V. 20, I. 79, 2023, p. 620-638.

ÜREKLİ, Muzaffer, "Gülbün-i Hânân", *TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, V. XIV, İstanbul 1996, p. 235-236.

YOLSEVER, Umut, "I. Saadet Giray Han Dönemine Ait Rus Arşivlerinde Bulunan İki Ahidnamenin Tercümesi ve Tahlili", *Selçuk Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, I. 55, Konya 2022, p. 425-436.

 GTTAD	
Makale Bilgileri:	
Etik Kurul Kararı:	<i>Etik Kurul Kararından muaftır.</i>
Katılımcı Rızası:	<i>Katılımcı yoktur.</i>
Mali Destek:	<i>Çalışma için herhangi bir kurum ve projeden mali destek alınmamıştır.</i>
Çıkar Çatışması:	<i>Çalışmada kişiler ve kurumlar arası çıkar çatışması bulunmamaktadır.</i>
Telif Hakları:	<i>Çalışmada kullanılan görsellerle ilgili telif hakkı sahiplerinden gerekli izinler alınmıştır.</i>
Article Information:	
Ethics Committee Approval:	<i>It is exempt from the Ethics Committee Approval</i>
Informed Consent:	<i>No participants.</i>
Financial Support:	<i>The study received no financial support from any institution or project.</i>
Conflict of Interest:	<i>No conflict of interest.</i>
Copyrights:	<i>The required permissions have been obtained from the copyright holders for the images and photos used in the study.</i>