Scales of patrimonialization in late imperial Crimea

Between Bakhchisaray and Saint Petersburg

Anna Guboglo (University of Vienna)

Abstract: *Crimean Tatar heritage, a subject featuring a multitude of actors with complementing as well as diverging interests, underwent a centuries-long process of discursive formation prompted by a dialogue between the metropole and the periphery. This essay demonstrates that it was a series of very different factors – including conservation, study, literary depiction, and formation of touristic infrastructure – that allow us to speak of the patrimonialization of a Crimean Tatar architectural heritage specifically between the 1880s and 1920s. Starting with the beginning of the 20th century an increase in the activity of non-state and local actors becomes visible. The various components or layers of this process are schematized in order to show the development of the image of Crimean Tatar culture and identity, and its relation to the architectural heritage.*

Introduction

Patrimonialization as a dynamic historical process inherent to 19th- and 20th-century societies has been a subject of theoretical debate by scholars of heritage and museum studies in recent decades. In a different form, the idea of "heritage in the making" was integrated into the historiography of colonialism in the contexts of Western European nation states,[1] in the context of British colonial rule in the Near East,[2] museum practices of display in the Ottoman Em-

1 Swenson (2013). She uses the term "heritage-making."

2 Sanders (2008).

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839471043-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/page/agb - Open Access - (cc) BY-NC-ND

pire,[3] of Russian colonization of Turkestan,[4] and other contexts. In the present work, patrimonialization is best defined as a process that involves a conscious selection of heritage objects in order to bolster a narrative of the past that is significant for the construction of a community's identity. Its broad spectrum includes acts of discussing, preserving and representing objects. The idea of heritage being *made* (or constructed) allows the writing of a meta-history of national heritage, identity building and national myths. Heritage does not allow for simple historical narratives because it always implies a link with identity, as the heritage of a perceived collective.[5]

The approach used in this work connects the processes in Crimea to the broader spectrum of Muslim heritage in Russia. A valid question to be considered is how particular was this internal dynamic of the Russian Empire and how embedded was it in the European colonial endeavor. The scholarship of global Muslim heritage, and the recently published volume titled *Islam and heritage in Europe* in particular, highlights the idea that the European imagination of Islamic heritage and its position with regard to Europe was shifting throughout time. Sometimes it rejected Islam on civilizational or cultural grounds, and sometimes it accepted it as part of the European heritage mosaic.[6] Crucially, the European perspective on Muslim heritage is founded on Europe's perception of itself. In the same way, the understanding of Muslim heritage in the Russian Empire is fundamentally a discourse of what is Russian heritage and which cultural phenomena should be validated by the dominating political and historical narratives.

Along with establishing the subjects of the history of heritage in Russian colonies, it is necessary to establish its object: does heritage refer to a physical or mental space? If to a physical space, then where do its limits end in the circumstances where not only sites but neighborhoods, cities and landscapes can undergo the process of transformation into heritage? Considering heritage as mental space, in its turn, would require assuming that its representations are designed according to theoretical premises, with only a loose connection to its materiality. But in order to emphasize the social nature of space, in *The production of space*, Henri Lefebvre argued that

3 Shaw (2003).

4 Gorshenina (2014).

5 Shatanawi, Macdonald & Puzon (2021), p. 6.

6 Ibid., pp. 10–1.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839471043-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/page/agb - Open Access - (cc) BY-NC-ND

> between the sixteenth century (the Renaissance – and the Renaissance city) and the nineteenth century, [there did] exist a code at once architectural, urbanistic and political, constituting a language common to country people and townspeople, to the authorities and to artists – a code which allowed space not only to be 'read' but also to be constructed.[7]

These observations on the nature of space can also prove useful for heritage historians. They indicate that the apparent observation, description and museumification of space by specialists, artists or common citizens may as well be contributing to the creation of space and its redefinition, and that the two processes are likely to be occurring simultaneously.

Legislation: The view from the metropole

One characteristic of the process of patrimonialization is selectiveness and classification. Interest in the past of the empire's Muslim peoples, first in the form of collecting antiquities and curiosities, was evident already in the first half of the 17th century, during Peter the Great's reign. Yet only with the later development of Oriental studies did Muslim monuments from different corners of the empire achieve wide attention in scholarly societies, press, and legal decrees. The *Kunstkamera*, as the first Russian museum, institutionalized the collection of 'curious' things starting in 1714. Up until that date, the center of Russian Islam was located in the former Kazan Khanate, and one of the oldest incentives for description of epigraphic material and restoration of buildings came from the Great Bolgar after the emperor's visit in 1722. According to archaeologist and historiographer Alexander A. Formozov, the Petrine time marked the transfer of responsibilities in management of antiquities from the church to the imperial institutions – the museum and the palace.[8] After this date, the next activity connected to the study of historical monuments occurred in 1771, when, during Catherine the Great's reign, a decree concerning the inclusion of "ancient kurgans, ruins, caves, islands and other

7 Lefebvre (1991), p. 7.

8 Formozov (1990), p. 20.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839471043-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/page/agb - Open Access - (cc) BY-NC-ND

landmarks" into topographic plans and economic registers was issued (decree of 9 April 1771).[9]

The beginnings of the formulation of the idea of 'monuments' and 'heritage', rather than mere 'objects of antiquity', lay in the first half of the 19th century. At that time, a category of people dedicated to the study of historical sites gradually emerged. The Ministry of Internal Affairs began to send regular circulars to governors starting in the 1820s, which demanded the identification of all necessary data on monuments (such as location, ground plans, and their state), and which played an important role in collecting information about ancient monuments. As a result of these materials being sent to the statistical department of the Ministry, a work titled *A brief review of old Russian buildings and other monuments of the country* was published in 1840. In the next decades, the Ministry further issued circulars aimed at the accumulation of information about sites related to "national history and life of peoples."[10]

The Rumyantsev Museum, opened by the decree of Emperor Nicholas I of March 22, 1828, and the Moscow Society for the History and Antiquities of Russia, created on June 6, 1804, were among the first organizations that acted as places for the gatherings of societies devoted to the study of history and antiquities. Soon such societies were also created in Odessa, Kiev, Pskov, Kazan and other cities.[11] The Odessa society was focused on the study of Crimea, while the Kazan society was active in the Kazan governorate. These local institutions acted as intermediaries between the sites and the Academy of Sciences and the later Imperial Archaeological Commission, both in Saint Petersburg. During the development of the museum network and initial archaeological institutions in the first half of the 19th century, the antiquities of Siberia and the Northern Black Sea region represented a major interest of the researchers.[12]

An 1826 emperor's decree titled "On the delivery of information about the remains of ancient buildings in cities and the prohibition on destroying them" established that local authorities would enforce the prohibition of the destruction of ancient monuments. This expanded the notion that 'ancient buildings' possessed value beyond the capital to the provinces, and created the prerequisites for the formation of professional or semi-professional groups that would

9 Starostina (2007), p. 16; *Complete collection of laws of the Russian Empire* I (1830–1851, p. 263).

10 Starostina (2007), p. 17.

11 Ibid., p. 22.

12 Shamanaev & Zyrianova (2018), p. 39.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839471043-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/page/agb - Open Access - (cc) BY-NC-ND

engage with their description and study. The decree prescribed the compilation of lists of ancient buildings in all imperial provinces.[13] These lists were also to contain detailed information about construction and reconstruction activities, materials used, original purposes and contemporary use, as well as any intervening destructions, and thus resemble the conservation-restoration documentation assembled for objects today.

Yet, due to the inconsistency of the empire-wide decrees, the initiatives to study and conserve monuments were often carried out by private parties, and therefore were not uniform. Crimea played a significant role as a precedent for the procedure then followed in other regions of the empire. Within the Russian Empire, it represented a pioneering case in terms of monument acknowledgement, research and protection. As a land open to Russian and foreign travelers after its first annexation in 1783, it was attractive as an experience of the 'Orient' on the verge of being transformed by Russian expansion.[14] This resulted in numerous personal endeavors to create descriptions and accounts of Crimean landscape, people, and architecture. Sometimes links between these private actors and the administration of the land were established.

Such was the case of Vasilii Kapnist, who, during his travels in Crimea in 1820, was witness to numerous cases of destruction and looting of historical sites. He saw "remains of ancient buildings and fortresses, which are used for state and private needs," and "considered that if necessary measures of precaution will not be taken, we will be deprived of any means for uncovering domestic[15] antiquities."[16] Based on this, he addressed the Minister of Religious Affairs and Public Education, Prince Alexander Nikolayevich Golitsyn, asking for urgent measures to be taken to save the objects and sites. Kapnist's idea was that the government was more suited than local authorities or private individuals to carry out measures to preserve Crimean antiquities and allocate the funds necessary for this purpose. The initiative was supported by the governor as well as by the president of the Academy of Sciences, Count Sergei Semenovich Uvarov.[17] In this way in 1821, three decades after the annexation of Crimea, academician Egor Egorovich Koehler (also known as Heinrich Karl Ernest Koehler) and architect Evgenii Frantsevich Pascal were sent to the Crimea to inspect the

13 Starostina (2007), p. 19.

14 Jobst (2001), p. 125.

15 In the original, the term *otechestvennykh* is used, thus closer in meaning to 'national'.

16 Tiesenhausen (1872), p. 363.

17 Shamanaev & Zyrianova (2018), p. 40.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839471043-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/page/agb - Open Access - (cc) BY-NC-ND

state of historical monuments, determine measures for their preservation and draw up a cost estimate.[18] Upon the completion of the report on their journey, the decree of July 4, 1822 titled "On the means of preserving the monuments of Taurida" was conceived.

That decree officially classified architectural masterpieces as monuments for the first time in the Russian Empire, and in accordance with the decree's stipulations, the monuments were divided into two classes. The first included "those that can be restored with little cost for a long time," while the second group "belongs to those that are ruins and cannot be helped; but, being protected from destruction, they can stand for ages."[19] According to the committee of ministers, a "ranking" of monuments could be made:

> Of the monuments that have not been destroyed in the Crimea so far, the remains of Turkish and Tatar buildings, which are closest to our time, do not deserve to be saved as much as Greek and Genoese buildings.[20]

Nonetheless, it classified as monuments of architecture the mosques in Yevpatoria and Feodosia, and the fortresses in Balaklava (Cembalo), Sudak and Mangup (Mangup Qale),[21] while Koehler's reports produced much more detailed lists of "Turkish and Tatar" monuments. The restoration of the Khan Saray in Bakhchisaray, as the only example of Crimean Tatar palace architecture, was managed directly by the governor, which underlined its difference from other sites. Koehler, judging from a perspective unrestrained by financial concerns, advocated the importance of all historic sites:

> In my opinion, all ancient monuments in Crimea must be described. Which other work would bring more use to this great Empire? The French, and especially the English, have shown bigger eagerness to make visible the antiquities of their fatherland. But their riches are quite unimportant in comparison to the precious monuments in Crimea, and their monuments are not as many and do not belong to such distant times, as those that are found in the Taurida peninsula.[22]

18 Tiesenhausen (1872), p. 364.
19 Shamanaev & Zyrianova (2018), pp. 40–1.
20 Ibid., literal translation by author.
21 Starostina (2007), p. 19.
22 Tiesenhausen (1872), p. 386, translated by author.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839471043-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/page/agb - Open Access - (cc) BY-NC-ND

This decree of 1822 for the first time in Russian legislation allocated state funds for specific measures to preserve ancient monuments. It is equally important due to the fact that it names the main state institutions that in the 19th and early 20th centuries were active in the protection of cultural heritage: the Ministry of Internal Affairs, the Ministry of Religious Affairs and Public Education, the Academy of Sciences and the Academy of Arts.[23]

The validation of heritage sites by the state occurred through measures taken for their protection, as the regulations are reflective of the expectations and values of the contributing side.[24] The rather disadvantaged position of Crimean Tatar monuments in comparison to Greek ones in particular is important for establishing that in the first half of the 19th century their formal recognition as heritage by the Russian government could not have been achieved. In that time frame, when the displacement of Muslims from the peninsula was deemed preferable, the image of Crimea as the cradle of Russian Christianity and as the remains of ancient Tauris was the discourse that would engage the nobility.[25]

This means that the status of the buildings was achieved by the scholarly systematization of information about them and intense research activity rather than by immediate protection decrees. With the 1839 foundation of the Odessa Society for History and Antiquities, the empire's first archaeological society, intense scholarly activity in the region contributed greatly to awareness of the sites. It was prolific in writing petitions to the emperor, managing the activity of the Museum of Antiquities in Feodosia (Kefe), and publishing notes, drawings and lithographs from sites and objects.

After the Crimean War of 1853–56 and the subsequent emigration waves of the Crimean Tatar population toward the Ottoman Empire, accounts by Russian ethnographers are among the few sources to illuminate the situation of the Crimean Tatar built environment. Most notably, Vasilii Khristoforovich Kondaraki (1834–86) compiled the monumental *Ethnography of Taurida* in 1883. It is highly reliable thanks to his excellent linguistic competence in the Crimean Tatar language. He came from a Crimean Greek family in Simferopol and was a member of the Odessa Society for History and Antiquities, the Russian Geographic Society and the Odessa Society for Agriculture in Sout-

23 Shamanaev & Zyrianova (2018), p. 41.

24 Gorshenina (2014), p. 246.

25 Jobst (2020), p. 26; Schönle (2001).

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839471043-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/page/agb - Open Access - (cc) BY-NC-ND

hern Russia.[26] His *Ethnography of Taurida* is but one example of the interest and professionalization of the study of Crimean Tatar culture, and the separation of its monuments into a category distinct from the previously broad 'Muslim architecture'. Between 1903 and 1908 the so-called Russian Museum of Alexander III in Saint Petersburg also organized ethnographic expeditions that collected material from over 800 Crimean Tatar villages. The textiles, household items and even models of houses emerging from this expedition were eventually displayed in an exhibition in the museum.[27] The objects' museumification conceptually freed them from their physical environment and reimagined them as objects belonging to Crimean Tatar culture. This also supports the statement that – although it is widely considered that the first transfer of Crimean Tatar culture into a museum context occurred in 1917 with the transformation of the Khan Saray in Bakhchisaray into a museum – even before the Revolution, research activity into matters of Crimean Tatar history increased through the efforts of local organizations as well as those outside of Crimea. The ethnographic interest was a sign of the transition to a new environment, or landscape, where the old was being replaced and started to represent a curiosity, but also stood as a symbol for the imagined community. This is an important event because it constitutes one of the earliest cases of systematic display and research by a state institution on the Crimean Tatars as a "people" (*narod*).

One argument that can be made based on analysis of the Russian Empire's classification and conservation policies is that the governing institutions attempted formal unity while integrating the Muslim, in this case Crimean Tatar, heritage. This point of view was promoted by academic Orientalists, for example Vasilii Bartold, who considered that by developing and consolidating the culturally distinct identities of non-Russians, local identities and an awareness of local cultures and histories would create the basis for achieving civic unity.[28] Bartold argued that the question of mosques as "objects of antiquity" (*predmety stariny*) emerged only after the conquest of Turkestan, since on the Volga and in the Black Sea region, conquered in earlier centuries, "the conquerors faced relatively young cultures without outstanding constructions."[29]

26 Aradzhioni (2005), p. 250.

27 Nepomnyashchii (2016), p. 31.

28 Tolz (2010).

29 Ananiev (2016), p. 285.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839471043-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/page/agb - Open Access - (cc) BY-NC-ND



Fig. 1: Cover of Zhivopisnaia Rossiia *V (Semenov 1898).*

He mentioned as significant monuments the Great Bolgar Complex, Suyumbike in Kazan and Khan Saray in Crimea – sites that already benefited from isolated decrees of study and conservation. In this case, Russia's top-down patrimonialization of Crimean Tatar architecture was supported by the ideology of *grazhdanstvennost*, or civic unity. One of the covers of the multivolume edition *Zhyvopisnaia Rossiia: Otechestvo nashe v ego zemelnom, istoricheskom, plemennom, ekonomicheskom i bytovom znachenii* ("Picturesque Russia: Our fatherland and its land, history, tribes, economy and everyday life") transposed this idea into the visual sphere by representing Muslims in the foreground, as part of the Russian Empire's universe, with distinctly Slavic-Orthodox objects

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839471043-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/page/agb - Open Access - (cc) BY-NC-ND

in the background, but also as being located on the fringes, with a visibly alien outlook (Fig. 1).

Depiction of buildings in literature

A second characteristic of patrimonialization is value-associated representation. If selectiveness shows that patrimonialization is defined by existing perspectives on history and involves socio-political acts of consolidation, a side that requires particular attention around 1900 is the public discourse of patrimony. In the Russian imperial context, patrimonialization has been studied predominantly for the case of Turkestan, and largely from a Russian perspective.[30] In Crimea, however, we have evidence to establish a community-driven association between monuments and an identity, based on sources such as travel-writing, the press and literature.

As put by Carel Bertram in her *Imagining the Turkish house*, literature (particularly fiction) positions an object on a memory chain of values and implants it into the public imagination.[31] Via literature, objects enter the collective memory as ideas and undergo a process leading to conceptual monumentalization, which means they begin to take similar meaning in the collective thought, a process similar to patrimonialization. In earlier depictions of Crimea, landscape rather than architecture figured prominently in Russian post-annexation travel-writing. As was shown by Beatrice Teissier in her review of European and Russian travel writing related to Catherine the Great's epic journey from Saint Petersburg to the Black Sea,[32] writers such as the academicians Vasilii Feodorivich Zuev and Peter Simon Pallas, and the traveler Pavel Ivanovich Sumarokov, may have had very different viewpoints, but they were all describing Crimean Tatars and their culture through the description of its ancient and modern ruins, its landscape, or through ethnographic and Orientalist commentary.[33]

Socio-political events like wars and emigrations were not addressed directly. Vassili Feodorivich Zuev and Pavel Ivanovich Sumarokov, for example, do not mention emigration, and instead point to the ruinated state of Crimean

30 Notably works by Svetlana Gorshenina.

31 Bertram (2008), pp. 5–9.

32 Teissier (2017).

33 Ibid., p. 235.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839471043-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/page/agb - Open Access - (cc) BY-NC-ND

towns.[34] Indeed, ruins and wastelands were a recurrent motif in Crimea travel writing – not only with respect to ancient Greek sites, but also concerning more modern settlements such as Sudak, Kefe and Balaklava. The prioritization of classical sites went hand in hand with the official discourse of the Greek Plan, Catherine the Great's project of restoring the Byzantine Empire. It was contributed to by developing the discipline of archaeology and the organization of local scholarly commissions for antiquities with a focus on uncovering ancient Greek sites, thus implicitly confirming Russia's legitimacy in the region as its successor. In the context of Crimean Tatar sites, however, ruins had the implication of destruction and decay. The discourse of the visual representations on the plates of Peter Pallas similarly emphasizes first the religious landscape of the Tatar towns, and second their ruinated condition.

Reviewing the references to the Crimean Tatar built environment reveals a preference toward the use of the 'ruin' metaphor in Russian and European Orientalist writing. Embedded in the history of the decay and reuse of the Tatar post-emigration material heritage, these accounts provide a better understanding of the underlying cultural implications of the emigration for the perception of the architectural surroundings of Crimea.

The war of 1853 created the conditions for a broader acquaintance with Crimea's inheritance among Europeans, after a large influx of people to the peninsula's battlefields.[35] British officers, doctors and soldiers inspired by philhellenic views expressed enthusiasm about the Greek classical artefacts found in Crimea, and depicted the peninsula in terms of its classical topography and imagination. Especially in the areas of Sevastopol and Kerch, preoccupation with the past turned into hasty excavations and looting. Officers like William Munro and Robert Westmacott, and doctors such as Duncan McPherson, had their excavation results published in British newspapers; they also photographed and collected pottery, statues, vases and various antiquities, while producing rough descriptions of the digs. Many of the discovered antiquities were brought to the British Museum.[36]

Newer depictions, delivered by Crimean Tatar intellectuals since the 1880s through publications such as the newspaper *Tercüman* ("The Interpreter"), the literature journals *Yeşil Ada* ("Green Island") and *Vetan Hadimi* ("Homeland's

34 Ibid., p. 238.

35 Richardson (2013), p. 38.

36 Ibid.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839471043-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/page/agb - Open Access - (cc) BY-NC-ND

Servant"), and other publications from the early 19th-century onwards, vigorously integrated the concept of *vetan,* or homeland, into the literary discourse. Historical representations and folk culture motifs played an important role in the construction of the homeland's image. Another prominent component of the literary and poetic discourse was the narrative of enlightenment, introduced through the topics of education, traditionalism vs. modernization, and female emancipation.[37] As will be shown, drawing on the enlightenment vision presented by Ismail Gasprinskii (İsmail Gaspıralı), all of these values and initiatives were translatable into the sphere of historic preservation.

Gasprinskii, writing in different genres from journalistic articles and essays to novels, maintained the topic of enlightenment as his main preoccupation. The ideal of enlightenment through education was presented in polemical positions between promoters of ignorant traditionalism and of progressivism (between *ulema* and the Jadids, the archetypical mullah and the teacher, more general the East and the West). In his 1895 article "The Eastern Question" (*Şark Meselesi*) he proclaimed that: "the Eastern question is in fact the question of education."[38] For Russia's Muslims, rapprochement with Russian culture and recognition of its civilizing potential was, according to Gasprinskii, the way to fight ignorance and illiteracy. In his rhetoric, "the Muslim Turko-Tatars"[39] of the Russian Empire, as a group unified through language and a traditional way of living, should never be considered in isolation, but against the backdrop of Russian socio-political life and in (unflattering) comparison to the Muslims of North Africa and the Ottoman Empire. His publication activity and range of interests covered an area much wider than Crimea.

One of his first publications appeared in the Tiflis newspaper *Ziya-i Kafkasiye* ("Caucasian Light") under the title "A letter sent from Bakhchisaray" *(Bağçasaraydan gönderilen mektub)*. It described the press as an instrument that should be in the possession of all people, to guarantee the right for the discussion of relevant issues.[40] In Crimea Gasprinksii had a long history of collaboration with Ilya Ilyich Kazas, a prominent figure of the (Turkic-Jewish) Karaim community's enlightening. Ismail Bey published articles in the newspaper *Tavrida*, edited by Kazas, and Kazas was the censor of *Tercüman*.

37 Memetova (2018), p. 95.
38 Seydahmet (1934), p. 166.
39 Gasprinskii (1881).
40 Khakimov (2017), p. 11.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839471043-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/page/agb - Open Access - (cc) BY-NC-ND

In contrast to earlier writers and poets from Crimea, in the 1880s Gasprinskii brought forward the idea of a Russian Muslim identity for a community united not only by culture and language but also by its common goal of progress. The new school teaching method *usul-i jadid* (literally "the new method") was intended as a path for the realization of these ideals. Presenting Russian rule as highly beneficial, he argued for a higher degree of involvement by fellow Muslims in the reforms being implemented, rather than having the whole executive and administrative class constituted of Russians.

His famous essay "Russkoe Musulmanstvo" of 1881 provides insight in regard to Gasprinskii's stance towards the problem of Muslim architecture. Here he developed the concept of Islamic monuments as witnesses to the faded glory of its constructors. Ruinated monuments were conceived of along the same lines as epigraphy and manuscripts, as objects demonstrating connectedness to Persian and Arab cultural traditions:

> only half-ruinated, dilapidated monuments of antiquity with their inscriptions, some greasy, dusty books witness that once Tatars had the ability to write and speak beautifully, could ponder upon things needing reflecting, understood the beauty of Hafiz, humaneness of Sheikh-Saadi and the bold thinking of Ibn Sina and other Arabic and Persian writers and philosophers.[41]

In another 1881 essay, titled "The World of Islam," Gasprinskii used the example of Andalusian architecture from the period of the Abbasid Caliphate to illustrate how monuments can bear testimony to a golden age of Islamic civilization, when the richness of the world's artistic and philosophical traditions were syncretized.[42] Another essay, "Muslims and the Land of Comfort" (*Dār er-Rahat Müslümanları*), represents the journey of a 19th century mullah through Europe and his reflections on the relationship between the European and Islamic civilizations; the Alhambra Palace in Granada plays the role of a guide through which he gets introduced to "the land of comfort" – an exemplary progressive Muslim civilization.[43]

The nostalgic, reminiscent tone used in connection to representations of historical monuments is characteristic of these essays of Gasprinskii, and is

41 Khakimov & Salikov (2017), p. 87.

42 Ibid., p. 59.

43 Tuna (2015), p. 152.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839471043-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/page/agb - Open Access - (cc) BY-NC-ND

one of the elements forming his discourse of progress. It is ironic that with the name of the Jadids (from the Arabic term *jadīd* – "new") the literary paradigm of glorifying the past began.

After Gasprinskii, the new generation of socially and culturally active Crimean Tatars came to perceive their identity in a narrower manner than 'Russian Turks,' based on a territorial identification. The turmoil of the First Russian Revolution (1905) allowed for wider political representation and self-organization of Muslims; Crimean Muslims held regular meetings and drafted petitions to the government, sent delegations to all-Muslim Congresses, and formed a political party and a politically active group known as the "Young Tatars."[44] Fin-de-siècle Crimean Tatar literature has been researched in the context of the 1905 revolutionary movement and nation-building process,[45] yet a novel direction in its analysis would be achieved by analyzing the expressions of identity and perception of built heritage in literature. In the timeframe between the Young Turk Revolution in the Ottoman Empire (1908) and the 1917 February Revolution in Russia, new political forces known as the Young Tatars began to form, taking a course toward more independence from the Russian Empire. Tatars from the Ottoman diaspora, notably Cafer Seydahmet and Numan Çelebi Cihan, who became politicized during their time in the Istanbul of the Young Turk Revolution, founded an association called "Homeland Society" (*Vatan Cemiyeti*) in 1908 as a platform for developing a distinct Crimean Tatar national identity.[46] The press and education were the vital factors that allowed the distinctions between the northern steppe Nogays, mountain Tats and southern Yaliboyu to be overcome. Both in the press and in poetry and prose, a dissemination of a "sense of *Kirim Tatarlik* [sic] (Crimean Tatarness), based on secularist principles"[47] by the nationalist intelligentsia can be observed.

In 1899 Osman Nuri Asan-Oglu Akçokraklı published a story titled "The Mausoleum of Nenkecan Hanum" (*Nenkecan Hanum Türbesi*) in Saint Petersburg.[48] It featured two young men who in the 1890s hear the life story of Tokhtamysh Khan's daughter Janika and decide to visit her mausoleum. The framing of the main storyline may have addressed the reality of the author's

44 Kırımlı (1990), pp. 78–99.
45 For example, in Ülgen (2014).
46 Jobst (2020), p. 241).
47 Williams (2015), p. 56.
48 Kurnaz & Çeltik (1993).

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839471043-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/page/agb - Open Access - (cc) BY-NC-ND

time, when young Crimean Tatars were rediscovering their folklore and forming new connections to it, by engaging in touristic activities. Here Akçokraklı referred to Bakhchisaray in the following manner:

> The Khan Palace, located in the central part of this town [Bakhchisaray], whose heart it enslaves, is worthy of being called "the center of the centers," just as the town, famous for its air and water, and their special purity and beauty, occupied the center of the Khanate. But now this palace in which life was seething in former times is empty, abandoned, open to idle onlookers, and probably no repair will be able to restore its roof, ornaments, and decorations. In the broad Khan's garden every day there are now crowds of people walking and thirsting for entertainment.[49]

Akçokraklı translated Crimean Tatar folk literature into Russian and Russian literature into Crimean Tatar. He conducted surveys and in 1917 founded the "Museum of Turk-Tatar Culture" in Bakhchisaray together with the archaeologist Usein Bodadinskii. His experience in the Russian, Crimean and Ottoman framework is exemplary of switching between cultural codes, or, more often, bringing cultural codes into other contexts. In Crimea, Akçokraklı studied in an *usul-i jadid* school and in a Russian school, eventually graduating from the prestigious Zincirli Medrese in Bakhchisaray. He used his knowledge of Arabic and Tatar to work in a publishing house and in the Public Library in Saint Petersburg, together with the Orientalist Vasilii Dmitrievich Smirnov, and with his recommendation undertook two study trips to Istanbul.[50] It was during his last stay in 1899 that he actively took part in the political currents overwhelming the Ottoman capital. Taking a close look at his biography, it is easy to notice that his professional formation and the formulation of his circle of interests were shaped in Saint-Petersburg and in Istanbul. In 1906 he came back to Crimea to work in the newspaper *Tercüman* for several years. This work clearly influenced him into publishing his own newspaper in Orenburg – *Vakt* ("Time").[51]

Asan Çergeyev's poem "The Fountain of Tears" (*Közyaş Han Çeşmesi)*, published in *Vetan Hadimi* in 1908, was directly inspired by Alexander Pushkin's 1820s poem "The Fountain of Bakhchisaray". In this poem, the Khan Saray represents the sad decay from glory to desertion. The crying fountain that main-

49 Originally published in Aqçoqraqlı (1899), p. 1; translated by author.

50 Nepomnyashchiy (2021), p. 156.

51 Ibid., p. 157.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839471043-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/page/agb - Open Access - (cc) BY-NC-ND

tains the hope that life can return to its previous condition personifies that eclipse:

İşidüp çoq namın, çeşme,
Keldim yoqlay, alın nice?
Cümle yuqlay, dök derdini
Kimse duymaz, qara gice […][52]
(Közyaş Han Çeşmesi, 1908)

I heard much about your fame, fountain,
I came to visit you, what is your state?
Everyone is sleeping, pour your troubles,
No one will hear, the night is dark.
(The Khan's Fountain of Tears, 1908)[53]

The literary tradition put the buildings on the mental map of Tatar people as historical monuments, investing them with a fundamental value for Tatarness. Mehmet Niyazi, born in Dobruja in 1878 and moved to Crimea in 1898, was a poet making national pathos a characteristic trait of his writing. His "March to the Medrese of Menli Geray" *(Menli Geray Medresesine Marş)*, written most probably between 1912 and 1931, tied an educational institution and its building, the *medrese*, to the idea of Muslim awakening.

This illustrates that the literary production starting from the 1890s is focused on nurturing the concept of *Tatarlıq* – 'Tatarness'. Moreover, it has an evocative tone, mobilizing historical narratives of rise and decadence, and representing local historical buildings. In line with the contemporary social needs, these narratives were put in relation to enlightenment and a sense of awakening.

Along with literary endeavors and probably based on this ongoing dissemination of knowledge about Crimean architectural monuments, travels to historic sites gained prominence toward the end of the 19th century. In 1890 the Crimean-Caucasian alpine club was created in Odessa. This was a touristic organization that local intellectuals modelled after Western European alpine

52 Kurnaz & Çeltik (1993); Kerim (2019).

53 Translation by author.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839471043-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/page/agb - Open Access - (cc) BY-NC-ND

clubs. It was the first organization of this type in the country and organized three types of excursions: scientific, educational, and touristic. Its regulations defined its touristic activity as "protection of historical monuments, rare types of plants and animals and all kinds of landmarks."[54]

Already during the first years of the club's existence, branches in Yalta and Sevastopol were created, focusing on excursions to medieval monuments. The peak of its activity was reached in 1903, when 39 excursions with over 700 people were organized. The major destinations were the ancient site of Chersonesus and the fortress of Inkerman, but trips to Bakhchisaray palace and the fortresses of Çufut Qale and Mangup Qale were also organized. The overall amount of people who participated in the excursions of the club's Yalta branch was 120,000.[55]

Moreover, it had high visibility in the region, having its advertisements published weekly in local newspapers, creating travel guides, brochures, and even opening a museum in Odessa. The travel guides of the turn of the century – as opposed the descriptions of land, customs, and simply travels produced in earlier decades – were not only a privilege of the higher classes, but were oriented at a vast number of tourists. The issuing of over 300 travel guides before the October Revolution marked the necessity to translate the scientific observations of earlier travel accounts into accessible and compact descriptions of tourist attractions. This type of literature shows the change of focus over the second half of the 19th century from unsystematic collection and transmission of information about the peninsula to active popularization of historical, natural, and cultural sites in a standardized form, with the aim of turning Crimea into a competitive touristic destination.[56]

Conclusion

The elevation of sites to the status of monuments in the 19th and early 20th century in Crimea was expressed through legal formulations, protection practice, validation through official Orientology and history organizations, as well as by literature and popularization through touristic infrastructure. It was characterized by the overwhelming involvement of representatives of the imperial

54 Rudenko (2015), p. 2.

55 Ostapchuk (2016), p. 160.

56 Molochko (2010), p. 137.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839471043-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/page/agb - Open Access - (cc) BY-NC-ND

power, due to the lack of a coherent civil society that would nurture the formation of local Crimean intellectuals, as well as the complete destruction of the earlier social system existing in the Crimean Khanate. It did not, however, turn patrimonialization into a ubiquitously top-down phenomenon. It was often on the private initiatives of imperial subjects, and not decisions of state functionaries, that measures for an organization of knowledge on 'monuments of antiquity' would be created. Due to the specifics of Crimea's annexation and its symbolic meaning to the crown, it created precedence for practices that would later extend to other corners of the empire. With the renaissance of Crimean Tatar literary life after the 1890s, the imagined pantheon of national monuments as formulated by representatives of Crimean Tatar culture is a product of subaltern resistence that departed from the Russian course of representation and followed new ideas of its identity and aspirations. The discussion of patrimonialization cannot be kept at the level of the architectural sites, since the values they are invested with, through processes of discursive transformation, essentially concern the understanding of people's identity and the means for its display.

Works cited

Ananiev, Vitalii. "Okhrana musulmanskikh pamiatnikov: Akademik V. V. Bartold i Institut Istorii Iskusstv v 1917 g.," *Gasırlar avazı – Ekho vekov*, III/4 (2016), pp. 283–8.

Aradzhioni, M. A. & Gertsen, A. G. (eds.). *Krymskie tatary: Khrestomatiia po etnicheskoi istorii i traditsionnoi kulture*. Simferopol: Dolya, 2005.

Aqçoqraqlı, Osman Nuri. *Nenkecan hanum türbesi: Hikaye*. Saint Petersburg: Ilyas Mirza Baraganskiy ve Kompanyasının Matbaası, 1899).

Bertram, Carel. *Imagining the Turkish house: Collective visions of home*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2008.

Complete collection of laws of the Russian Empire I/XIX. St. Petersburg: Printing house of the Second Branch of His Own Imperial Majesty's Chancery, 1830–1851.

Formozov, Alexander A. *Russkoe obshchestvo o okhrana pamiatnikov kultury*. Moscow: Sovetskaia Rossiia, 1990.

Gasprinskii, Ismail. *Russkoe Musulmanstvo: Mysli, zametki i nabliudeniia musulmanina*. Simferopol: Tip. Spiro, 1881.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839471043-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/page/agb - Open Access - (cc) BY-NC-ND

Gorshenina, Svetlana. "Samarkand and its cultural heritage: perceptions and persistence of the Russian colonial construction of monuments," *Central Asian Survey* XXXIII/2 (2014), pp. 246–69.

Jobst, Kerstin S. *Geschichte der Krim. Iphigenie und Putin auf Tauris*. Berlin: De Gruyter Oldenbourg, 2020.

Jobst, Kerstin S. "Die Taurische Reise von 1787 als Beginn der Mythisierung der Krim: Bemerkungen zum europäischen Krim-Diskurs des 18. und 19. Jahrhunderts," *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* XXIII (2001), pp. 121–44.

Kerim, Ismail Asanoglu. "Poeticheskii genii Asana Chergeeva (1879–1946)," *Golos Kryma*, 12 April 2019, http://goloskrimanew.ru/poeticheskiy-geniy-asana-chergeeva-1879-1946-2.html (accessed 22 January 2022).

Khakimov, Rafael S. & Salikov, Radik R. (eds.). *Ismail Gasprinskii. Polnoe Sobranie Sochinenii, II: Ranniaia publitsistika, 1879–1886 gg*. Kazan, Simferopol: Institut Istorii im. Sh. Mardjani AN RT, 2017.

Kırımlı, Cafer Seydahmet. *Gaspıralı İsmail Bey (Dilde, Fikirde, İşte Birlik)*. Istanbul: Matbaacılık ve Neşriyat Türk Anonim Şirketi, 1934.

Kırımlı, Hakan. *National movements and national identity among the Crimean Tatars (1905–1910)*. PhD diss. University of Wisconsin, 1990.

Kurnaz, Cemal & Çeltik, Halil. "Hanlık dönemi yazılı edebiyatı," in: *Başlangıcından günümüze kadar Türkiye dışındaki Türk edebiyatları antolojisi: Nesir – Nazım, Kırım Türk-Tatar edebiyatı XIII*, ed. Nevzat Kösoğlu. Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı, 1993. https://ekitap.ktb.gov.tr/Eklenti/11908,hasancergeyevpdf.pdf?0 (accessed 2 January 2022).

Lefebvre, Henri. *The production of space*. Cornwell: T. J. Press, 1991.

Memetova, Lilia. "Krymskotatarskaia poezia perioda Probuzhdeniia: prosvetitelskii aspekt," *Voprosy krymskotatarskoi filologii, istorii i kultury* 5 (2018), pp. 92–6.

Molochko, Ye. V. "The guidebooks of the second half XIX – early XX centuries as the form popularization of historical and cultural monuments Crimea," in: *Scientific notes of Taurida* V/I [Vernadsky National University, Series Historical Science, History of Ukraine XXIII (62)/1] (2010), pp. 133–9.

Nepomnyashchii, Andrei A. "Maloizvestnye stranitsy deiatelnosti Russkogo muzeia imperatora Aleksandra III: Krymovedenie," *Uchenye zapiski Krymskogo federalnogo universiteta imeni V. I. Vernadskogo*. Istoricheskie Nauki II/68, 2 (2016), pp. 27–38.

Nepomnyashchiy, Andrei A. "Osman Akchokrakly: Neizvestnye stranitsy biografii," *Krymskoe istoricheskoe obozrenie = Crimean Historical Review* 1 (2021), pp. 154–87.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839471043-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/page/agb - Open Access - (cc) BY-NC-ND

Ostapchuk, A. V. "Stanovlenie i razvitie turizma v Kryma: retrospektiva i perspektiva," *Uchenye zapiski Krymskogo federalnogo universiteta imeni V. I. Vernadskogo: Ekonomika i upravlenie* II/68, 1 (2016), pp. 159–163.

Richardson, Edmund. "Of doubtful antiquity: Fighting for the past in the Crimean War," in: *From plunder to preservation. Britain and the heritage of Empire, c. 1800–1940*, eds. Astrid Swenson & Peter Mandler. New York: Oxford University Press, 2013, pp. 31–61.

Rudenko, Elena. "K istorii populiarizatsii srednevekovykh pamiatnikov Kryma vo vtoroi polovine XIX – nachalo XX veka: krymskii gornyi klub." *Aktualnye voprosy obshchestvennykh nauk: Sotsiologiia, politiologiia, folosofiia, istoriia*, III/44 (2015), https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/k-istorii-populyarizatsii-srednevekovyh-pamyatnikov-kryma-vo-vtoroy-polovine-xix-nachalo-xx-veka-krymskiy-gornyy-klub.

Sanders, Paula. *Creating medieval Cairo: Empire, religion, and architectural preservation in nineteenth-century Egypt*. Cairo: The American University in Cairo Press, 2008.

Schönle, Andreas. "Garden of the empire: Catherine's appropriation of the Crimea," *Slavic Review* LX/I (2001), pp. 1–23.

Semenov, P. P. (ed.). *Zhivopisnaia Rossiia*, V. Moscow & St. Petersburg: Izdanie Tovarishchestva M. O. Wolf., 1898.

Shamanaev, Andrei; Zyryanova, Svetlana. *Okhrana kulturnogo nasledia v Rossiiskoi imperii. Uchebnoe posobie*. Ekaterinburg: Izdatelstvo Urlaskogo Universiteta, 2018.

Shatanawi, Mirjam & Macdonald, Sharon & Puzon, Katarzyna. "Heritage, Islam, Europe: Entanglements and directions: An introduction," in: *Islam and heritage in Europe: Pasts, presents and future possibilities*, eds. Katarzyna Puzon & Sharon Macdonald & Mirjam Shatanawi. New York: Routledge, 2021, pp. 1–28.

Shaw, Wendy. *Possessors and possessed: Museums, archaeology, and the visualization of history in the late Ottoman Empire*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003.

Starostina, Yu. N. "Pravovoe regulirovanie okhrany pamiatnikov kultury v Rossii v XVIII – nachale XX vv. Obzor zakonodatelnykh materialov," *Sibirskii iuridicheskii vestnik* II/37 (2007), pp. 15–24.

Swenson, Astrid. *The rise of heritage: Preserving the past in France, Germany and England, 1789–1914*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Teissier, Beatrice. "Crimean Tatars in explorative and travel writing: 1782–1802," *Anatolian Studies*, LXVII (2017), pp. 231–53.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839471043-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/page/agb - Open Access - (cc) BY-NC-ND

Tiesenhausen, Vladimir G. "O sokhranenii i vozobnovlenii v Krymu pamiatnikov drevnosti, i ob izdanii opisaniia i risunkov onykh," in: *Zapiski Odesskago obshchestva istorii i drevnostei*, VIII. Odessa: Tip. Sod. X. Aleksomati, 1872, pp. 363–403.

Tolz, Vera. *Russia's own Orient: The politics of identity and oriental studies in the late imperial and early Soviet periods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Tuna, Mustafa. *Imperial Russia's Muslims: Islam, empire and European modernity, 1788–1914*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.

Ülgen, Erol. "Dobrucalı şair Mehmet Niyazi ve İthâfât adlı eseri," *İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Dergisi* 50 (2014), pp. 137–50.

Williams, Brian Glyn. *The Crimean Tatars: From Soviet genocide to Putin's conquest*. London: Hurst & Company, 2015.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839471043-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/page/agb - Open Access - (cc) BY-NC-ND

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839471043-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/page/agb - Open Access - (cc) BY-NC-ND