The Poetics of Home: Crimean Tatars in Nineteenth-Century Russian and Turkish Literatures
Author(s): Rory Finnin
Source: *Comparative Literature Studies*, Vol. 49, No. 1 (2012), pp. 84-118
Published by: Penn State University Press
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5325/complitstudies.49.1.0084
Accessed: 03/10/2014 09:19

THE POETICS OF HOME: CRIMEAN TATARS IN NINETEENTH-CENTURY RUSSIAN AND TURKISH LITERATURES

Rory Finnin

In the late watercolors of the Russian symbolist Maksimilian Voloshin (1877–1932), Crimea is a double-voiced muse. In radiant blues and vigorous greens, his paintings of the Black Sea peninsula celebrate a muscular natural landscape, a sea and sky bound to jagged peaks and sun-bleached shores. Yet in their paucity of human figures, in their barren trees borne from thin, tremulous brushstrokes, these *akvareli* also lament a troubled human landscape—one that seems afflicted by what Voloshin calls a "desiccation of human cultures" ("prosykhanie liudskikh kul'tur") in the poem "Dom poeta" ("House of the Poet" [1926]):

> Zdes', v etikh skladkakh moria i zemli,
> Liudskikh kul'tur ne prosykhala plesen'—
> Prostor stoletii byl dlia zhizni tesen,
> Pokamest my—Rossiia—ne prishli.
> Za poltorasta let—s Ekateriny –
> My vytoptali musul'manskii rai,
> Sveli lesa, razmykali ruiny,
> Raskhitili i razorili krai.[1]
>
> (Here [in Crimea], in the folds of land and sea,
> Mold had not desiccated the cultures of humankind—
> The expanse of a century was in the end too narrow,
> For we—Russia—had not yet arrived.
> For one hundred and fifty years—since Catherine—

COMPARATIVE LITERATURE STUDIES, VOL. 49, NO. 1, 2012.

> We have trampled upon this Muslim paradise,
> Cut down forests, desecrated ruins,
> Looted and plundered the land.)

For Voloshin, the human victims of this plunder are the Crimean Tatars, a Sunni Muslim Turkic-speaking people whose khanate ruled Crimea and its environs for over three centuries before being incorporated into the Russian Empire in 1783. Catherine II's annexation of the peninsula prompted generations of Crimean Tatars to leave their *yeşil alda* (green island) for the *ak toprak* (white land) of the Ottoman Empire, but what had begun as a stream of emigrants in the late eighteenth century became a flood after the Crimean War (1853–1856).[2] At this time, as Aleksandr Nekrich explains, "Tsarist officials [under the leadership of Aleksandr II] brought wholesale charges against the Crimean Tatars for allegedly having helped Turkey [during the Crimean War]. These charges were meant to divert attention from the inept performance of the tsarist government itself, and its bureaucrats, during the war."[3]

For Voloshin, who spent a part of his childhood as well as the end of his life in Koktebel', on Crimea's southern coast, these charges were nothing less than "barbaric."[4] In his words, they forced a "hard-working and loyal" ("trudoliubivoe i loial'noe") people into a "tragic emigration" ("tragicheskaia emigratsiia") to Ottoman lands.[5] Like Aleksandr Herzen, who in 1861 had exposed and railed against the atrocities committed against the Crimean Tatar people by Russian troops after the war in the pages of the newspaper *Kolokol*, Voloshin issued a scathing indictment of imperial rule of the peninsula over the course of the nineteenth century in an essay entitled "Kul'tura, iskusstvo, pamiatniki Kryma" ("The Culture, Art, and Monuments of Crimea" [1924]).[6] "One hundred and fifty years of crude imperial rule over Crimea," he writes, "has pulled the ground out from underneath the feet [of the Crimean Tatars] [*vyrvalo u nikh pochvu iz-pod nog*]."[7] It also pulled the wool over the eyes of Russian artists, turning them from perceptive observers into myopic "tourists":

> The relationship of Russian artists to Crimea has been the relationship of tourists surveying notable places with a painterly eye [*zhivopisnost'iu*]. This perspective [*ton*] was given to us by Pushkin, and after him, poets and painters over the course of the entire century have seen Crimea only as "O enchanting land! O delight of the eyes!" ["Volshebnyi krai! ochei otrada!"]. And nothing more. Such

> were all the Russian poems and paintings composed throughout the nineteenth century. They all worship the beauty of the southern shores with poems abounding in exclamation marks.[8]

Embedded in this critique is a normative understanding of *home* in the "second Crimea"—what I define, for the purposes of this article, as the Crimea "made of" literary works from the Russian and Turkish traditions.[9] For Voloshin, there is an isomorphic, one-to-one correspondence between Crimean territorial form—what I call "place"—and Tatar cultural content—what I call "personality"—that was shaken over the course of the nineteenth century. This correspondence is a propositional calculus, as it were, stating "Crimea is Tatar" and bonding Crimea to Tatars and Tatars to Crimea in equal measure. Voloshin places blame for the breakdown of this correspondence not only on imperial authorities, whose policies impelled the Crimean Tatars to leave their homeland, but also on Russian cultural figures, whose texts aided and abetted this "tragic emigration" by elevating Crimean "place" at the expense of Tatar "personality."

I use the contested term "place" in the sense employed by the geographer Yi-Fu Tuan, as space endowed with affect and cast as a "center of felt value."[10] The equally fraught "personality"—whose Russian equivalent *lichnost'*, for one, has a vast array of connotations, positive (e.g., *svetlaia lichnost'*), negative (*kul't lichnosti*), and otherwise (*ustanovit' lichnost'*)—denotes here cultural coloring perceived to fix to a space, imbuing it with "felt value," and typically viewed through the representation of an individual person.[11] Personality, to be precise, is neither culture nor identity, two concepts subjected to "terminological chaos"; it does not mean, for instance, a semiotic system in the Geertzian sense or an ambiguous and fluid concept of individual or collective "selfhood" to which, as Rogers Brubaker and Frederick Cooper argue, the social sciences and humanities have "surrendered."[12] Personality instead aligns with place to subtend a visitor's appreciation of the other's *home*. It is the photo in the picture frame or the color of paint on the walls or the arrangement of furniture in a room that attests to a particular human presence in space. For Voloshin, Crimea is the home of the Tatars. Visitors have entered this home, praising its "place" while ignoring, and thereby evacuating, its Tatar "personality." He views this sanctioned blindness—or, as the case may be, deliberate evacuation—as a cultural facilitator of the politics of colonization, the brutal process of seizing a place and substituting the other's personality with one's own.

This article explores Voloshin's insight in greater depth, offering close readings of two seminal Russian poems that dwell on the correspondence between Crimean place and Tatar personality *before* the Crimean War. It then widens the geographical, cultural, and chronological aperture of the study, looking beyond the Russian context and across the Black Sea to the Ottoman Empire *after* the mass emigration caused by the war. In effect, I follow not the Crimean Tatar emigrants themselves but their literary representations as they travel from one shore of the Black Sea to the other. What I seek to demonstrate is that both Russian and Turkish literatures assert this isomorphic correspondence between Crimean place and Tatar personality—claiming Crimea as the home of the Tatars—only to navigate distinct lines of flight away from it at varying points over the course of the "long nineteenth century," each contributing in different ways to a "de-Tatarization" of the Black Sea peninsula. In Russian literature, Semen Bobrov establishes this correspondence in his epic *Tavrida* (1798), whereas Aleksandr Pushkin—as Voloshin claims—disturbs it in *Bakhchisaraiskii fontan* (*The Fountain of Bakhchisarai* [1824]), initiating an elevation of *place* over personality that will be largely perpetuated by his successors. This progressive evacuation of Tatar personality is so successful that two of the most prominent Russian works set in Crimea in the mid-to late nineteenth century, Lev Tolstoi's *Sevastopol'skie rasskazy* (*Sevastopol Sketches* [1855]) and Anton Chekhov's "Dama s sobachkoi" ("The Lady with the Lapdog" [1899]), make virtually no mention of Crimean Tatars at all. In Turkish literature, Namik Kemal testifies to this isomorphic correspondence in the novel *Cezmi* (1880) before staging an elevation of *personality* over place that will be taken in novel directions by Ziya Gökalp (1876–1924) and Mehmet Emin Yurdakul (1869–1944).

What unites these writers despite their differences is an interest in the position of the Crimean Tatar in the world—an other conceived as alien, in the Russian case, and an other conceived as ally, in the Turkish one—as well as an often unspoken turn toward the Black Sea. This article accordingly conceives of the Black Sea as an *Ansatz*—or a unifying, centripetal presence rather than a divisive, centrifugal one—in response to a prevailing academic tendency that, as Charles King notes, situates its shores in several different regional specializations but at the center of none of them.[13] It does not pretend to be exhaustive in its scope or analysis, nor does it wish to impose reductive typologies on two different literary traditions awash in a turbulent time. In the Black Sea region in particular, the long nineteenth century was a period of protean and often confused nation-building projects, restive identity

shopping, and growing political contestation. Navigating this terrain makes for a bumpy ride, so this sustained orientation on representations of Crimea and the Crimean Tatars is meant to steady the journey.

"O enchanting land!": Semen Bobrov and Aleksandr Pushkin

Upon its annexation by Catherine II in 1783, Crimea was primarily displayed to visitors from Western Europe as well as St. Petersburg as the romantic land of the Tatars. Although Catherine also sought to highlight Crimea's classical inheritance, renaming the peninsula Tavrida, it was Tatar architecture, not the myriad ancient Greek ruins in Kerch or Feodosia, that Potemkin ordered restored and refurbished after the annexation; it was the *krik* (cry) of the *adhan* (call to prayer) that framed Catherine's reflections of her sojourn at the khan's summerhouse "v sredine busurman i very musul'manskoi" ("in the midst of Muslims and the Islamic faith") during her visit to the peninsula in 1787; and it was in large part through characters drawn from the Tatar people that Semen Bobrov, with his epic *Tavrida* of 1798, introduced Crimea as a literary topos to readers in the metropole.[14]

Iurii Lotman calls Semen Bobrov (1763?–1810) "a poet of genius"—but a poet of genius whose work is virtually forgotten today.[15] At the turn of the nineteenth century, he stood alongside Mikhail Lomonosov and Gavriil Derzhavin in a triumvirate of Russian literary giants. In fact, Derzhavin himself envisioned Bobrov as his successor—that is, before he reportedly bestowed his poetic mantle on the young Pushkin in Tsarskoe Selo in 1815.[16] Alongside Kondratii Ryleev, Vasilii Zhukovskii, and his close friend Aleksandr Radishchev, Bobrov was a member of the Free Society of Lovers of All-Russian Literature (Vol'noe obshchestvo liubitelei rossiiskoi slovesnosti), actively participating in the publication of its journal *Beseduiushchii grazhdanin* (*The Citizen in Conversation*).[17] In addition to acquiring the French typical of Saint Petersburg, he distinguished himself from many of his counterparts by his love and knowledge of English and German.[18] Yet despite this prominent standing and this influence on the development of Russian literature, Bobrov's work has been republished on its own only once (in 2008) since 1804.

In the words of one Russian critic, Bobrov is Crimea's literary Columbus, its "pervopoet" ("first-poet").[19] After the arrest of Radishchev in 1790, presumably fearing punishment and exile himself, Bobrov entered the service of the Department of the Black Sea Admiralty and traveled

throughout the southern periphery of the Russian Empire for nearly ten years. His sojourns in Crimea led to the composition of what is regarded as his most accomplished work, *Tavrida*; *ili, Moi letnii den' v Tavricheskom Khersonese, liriko-epicheskoe stikhotvorenie* (*Taurida; or, My Summer Day in Chersonesos Taurica, a Lyrico-Epical Poem*), which was published in 1798 and then revised in 1804 under the title *Khersonida* as the conclusion of his four-volume collection *Rassvet polnochi* (*The Dawn of Midnight*).[20] Inspired by the second part ("Summer") of James Thomson's *The Seasons* (1730), the poem has been described as "a comprehensive textbook" of Crimea, an almanac of its history, mythology, zoology, and geology that informs, to varying degrees, each and every subsequent poem featuring the peninsula in the Russian canon.[21]

Bobrov's Crimean ur-text crafts the relationship between Crimean place and Tatar personality as an isomorphism, beginning at the level of form. *Tavrida* is the first poem in Russian literature to use an unrhymed iambic meter—a distinction largely attributable to the influence of Thomson's *The Seasons*, which was written in blank verse—and Bobrov accounts for his sonic experimentation in the poem's foreword thus: "Chitatel'! pozvol' mne priznat'sia v shutku! u menia Tavricheskoe ukho, a Tavricheskie Muzul'mane ne liubiat kolokol'noho zvona" ("Dear reader! Permit me to confess in jest! I have a Crimean ear, and Crimean Muslims do not like the chimes of bells").[22] The attempt at religious humor aside, the poet explains that he must explore a new sound, a "Muslim" sound, in order to render Crimea in verse properly. Here a catalog of assonant and alliterative Crimean Tatar river names serves this project, as the lyrical persona imagines himself one with the clouds, gazing down on the rivers below:

> Zdes' zriu ia Zuiu, Beshterek,
> Indal, Bulganak i Buzuk,
> Chto prygaiut s krutogo kamnia
> Penistoi shumnoi stopoi. (54)
>
> (Here I behold the Zuia, the Beshterek,
> The Indal, the Bulganak, and the Buzuk,
> Which leap off the steep rock
> In a foamy, noisy throng.)

Rushing waters and craggy cliffs, thunder and lightning, gales and squalls—Bobrov's *Tavrida* is frequently overcome at the level of content by the sublime, by images of natural phenomena inspiring awe, terror, and ecstatic joy.

Its sixth song, titled "Groza nad tavricheskimi gorami" ("Thunder above the Mountains of Taurida"), begins with an ominous storm gathering speed and strength in the sky:

> V sei groznoi, bezobraznoi tuche
> I samyi mrak chermneet, rdeet,
> Sokryv v sebe istochnik bedstvii.
> . . .
>
> Letiat protivny vetry v tverdi,
> Spiraiut tuchi mezh soboiu;
> No dolu vse eshche spokoino;
> Bezmolv'e mrachno, rokovoe
> V iudoli tsarstvuet plachevnoi. (197)
>
> (In this terrible, monstrous cloud
> Gloom itself grows crimson-red,
> Concealing within itself the source of disaster.
> . . .
>
> Fierce headwinds fly to the heavens,
> Clouds press in on themselves,
> But below all remains still;
> A morose, fateful calm
> Reigns in the mournful valley.)

The calm quickly gives way to chaos. Dolphins thrash about in darkening waves; birds scatter amid lightning and blistering rains; and mountain elms along the Salgir River begin to buckle and bow in fear before deafening thunder, the "voice of the heavens" ("pred glasom neba" [198]). In *Tavrida*, the Crimean landscape is a window to the awesome power and tumult of the natural world and a crucible through which the lyrical persona—and, ideally, his reader—comes to appreciate the fleeting nature of human existence. Representations of whirlwinds and violent lightning usher in moments for Bobrov to meditate intensely on the encroachment of death—and conversely, on a life made all the sweeter by an understanding of its ephemerality.

If the sublime holds this promise of rebirth and self-renewal, Bobrov does not hesitate long before demonstrating the effects of its power on the once "timid" ("robkii") landscape portrayed in the poem. The storm subsides

to reveal a rainbow. Winds that threatened destruction now bring fresher, cleaner, lighter air. Revived and even strengthened by the tempest, fauna and flora enjoy a new welcome tranquility. Human life emerges from this storm in splendor as well—in the figure of Tsul'ma, a young Crimean Tatar princess intimately linked to the land around her. Sealing a correspondence between Crimean place and Tatar personality, Bobrov places her in a similitive relationship with the flora whose renewal is described only moments before: Tsul'ma is as "slender as a myrtle" ("stroina, kak mirt" [221]) and as "light as chamois" ("legka, kak serna" [221]). She is the "beauty and honor" ("krasa i chest'" [221]) of the Crimean Tatar nobility, a woman of integrity who prays to Allah for the return of her beloved Tatar *mirza* (noble) Selim. She appears in the poem surrounded by handmaidens, who comfort her with songs celebrating her "divine beauty" and reassure her of Selim's imminent arrival.

Bobrov's *Tavrida* thus represents in intricate detail the physical bounty of Crimean place, simulating its power to stir passion by way of the sublime, and explores figures of Tatar personality in form and content whose unique beauty and ardor suggest a human manifestation of the land itself. This bond between the peninsula and a living Tatar culture, between a breathtaking landscape and the Muslim khanate—this vision of Crimea as a home of the Tatars—is offered as an object of aesthetic pleasure to readers in the early nineteenth-century metropole. One of these readers was a certain Aleksandr Pushkin.

Pushkin admitted to "stealing" one or two lines from *Tavrida* for *Bakhchisaraiskii fontan*, which John Bayley calls his "most popular poem."[23] Its popularity was doubtlessly due in part to its exotic setting in the harem of Crimean Tatar Khan Selim Girei, where "young captives" ("plennitsy mladye") frolic in cool pools:

> Raskinuv legkie vlasy
> Kak idut plennitsy mladye
> Kupat'sia v zharkie chasy,
> I l'iutsia volny kliuchevye
> Na ikh volshebnye krasy.[24]
>
> (Having let down their fine hair,
> Off go the young captives
> To bathe in the hot hours,
> The waves of the fountain flowing
> Over their enchanting beauties.)

The scene is highly intertextual with Bobrov's *Tavrida*. Here are Tsul'ma's handmaidens, seeking refuge from the heat:

> Strui srebristy pogruzhaia
> Stydlivye krasy svoi
> Rukami vlagu rassekaiut,
> Igraiut,—pleshchutsia,—smeiutsia. . . .
> Kupal'nia kladna zashchishchaet
> Ot sily solnechnogo znoia. (222)
>
> (Plunging their modest beauties into silvery streams
> [The girls] slash through the water with their hands,
> Playing, splashing, laughing. . . .
> The cool bathing hut offers protection
> From the power of the scorching sun.)

While the male gaze of Pushkin's narrator is invasive, rending ineffectual the walls of the harem meant to maintain the honor of its residents, Bobrov's proves even more salacious and voyeuristic by acknowledging Tsul'ma's fear of being seen but nonetheless refusing to look away:

> Tut—robko Tsul'ma oziraias',
> Posledniu risu nizlagaiet;
> Kakoi krasot vid obnazhilsia!
> Kakoi mir prelestei otkrylsia! (222)
>
> (Here—bashfully Tsul'ma looks around,
> Dropping the last garment;
> What a vision of beauty is exposed!
> What a world of delights is revealed!)

Yet the cool waters of the bath cannot temper the "burning passion" ("znoinaia strast'" [222]) of the Tatar princess for the distant Selim. Bobrov's Tsul'ma is at once desperately passionate and prayerfully modest, offering a source from which the two heroines of Pushkin's *Bakhchisaraiskii fontan* may be seen to spring.

Indeed, one of Pushkin's heroines, the Georgian Zarema, is desperately passionate, while the other, the Polish Mariia, is prayerfully modest. They figure at the center of what might be called a zeugmatic plot at the level of diegesis in *Bakhchisaraiskii fontan*. As with zeugma, the figure of speech in which

one word governs two (or more) others and tends to do so incongruously, Pushkin's text gives us a Crimean Tatar khan who in effect governs Zarema and Mariia and relates to them in incongruous ways. The first is a fiery and amorous woman who returns Girei's affections; the second is a quiet and devout woman who does not. For all her loyalty to Girei, Zarema loses her position as his *haseki*, or principal concubine, to Mariia, who is given separate, secluded quarters far from the activity of the harem and the stern gaze of the eunuch. There Mariia, emotionally distant and romantically immature, grieves openly for the life taken from her: "V tishine dushi svoei/Ona liubvi eshche ne znala" (181) ("In the quiet of her soul/She still did not know love"). Mariia is subsequently visited in the dead of night by Zarema, who begs her to release Girei: "Otdai mne radost' i pokoi,/Otdai mne prezhnego Gireia" (187–88) ("Return to me my happiness and tranquility,/Return my erstwhile Girei").

Just as zeugma combines both parallelism and ellipsis for dramatic effect, Pushkin's text reveals that both Mariia and Zarema die after this encounter—but does not recount fully how or why they do. Mariia and Zarema are simply "no more" ("Marii net"; "gruzinki net" [189–90]), although we do learn that Zarema was drowned by the guards of the harem. Did Zarema really kill Mariia, as the text intimates? Did Girei explicitly order Zarema's execution? What is the message of the inscription in the "strange characters" ("chuzhdymi . . . chertami" [190]) above the heterodoxical fountain erected at the end of the poem by the grieving khan, whose tears are symbolized in its running water? These questions are left open, and the elliptical feel of *Bakhchisaraiskii fontan* has contributed to the notion that it is "hiding something from its readers."[25]

The poem's incomplete, mysterious feel stands in some contrast to its symmetry, which is most evident in the many complementary and contrastive parallelisms oriented around the pairings of Mariia-Zarema and Girei-eunuch. Both Mariia and Zarema, for example, are beautiful captives torn from Christian homes and cast into the role of the khan's concubine. Mariia is a musical woman attuned to the world of spirit and Zarema a woman celebrated in music attuned to the world of the flesh: "Ia dlia strasti rozhdena" ("I was born for passion" [187]). Mariia comes from the Polish lands to the northwest, Zarema from Georgian lands to the southeast. These geographical origins, in fact, are constitutive of the identities of the two women; they define and confine them. Indeed, Pushkin establishes a tight correspondence between place and personality at the diegetic level of *Bakhchisaraiskii fontan*, virtually dissolving territorial form into cultural content and cultural content into territorial form. Mariia's corner of the harem, for instance, is a simulated piece of Poland, a holy refuge where she practices her faith unimpeded and reminisces about her homeland, "an

intimate, better place" ("o blizkoi, luchshei storone" [182]). She never leaves this chamber alive. Zarema, by contrast, does move beyond her sanctioned area in the harem, eluding the eunuch under cover of darkness in order to confront Mariia. Yet this act is not a transgression; it is simple obedience to her fierce, impetuous nature, which she directly attributes to her geographical origins in a threat to her rival: "No slushai: esli ia dolzhna/tebe . . . knizhalom ia vladeiu,/ia bliz Kavkaza rozhdena" (188) ("But listen: if I have to . . . I have a dagger,/And I was born near the Caucasus").

Zarema makes a point of emphasizing that her place of birth is not Crimea—at the beginning of her appeal to Mariia, she explains, "Rodylas' ia ne zdes'" ("I was not born here" [186])—for Crimea is the land of the Tatars, and Girei its metonym. The khan is often considered a "marginal" figure, a foil to the poem's two doomed heroines, but I would argue that he is the main character of *Bakhchisaraiskii fontan*.[26] Compared to Zarema and Mariia, whose traits dictate their actions, he undergoes real change in the poem. After all, Zarema is introduced as unparalleled in her ability to speak the language of "ardent desire" ("plamennykh zhelanii" [180]), and her emotions lead her to Mariia with a dagger in hand. Mariia is introduced as young, meek, and saintly, and her innocence leads her to receive Zarema without a word of protest. Girei, by contrast, defies first impressions and experiences a dramatic transformation from potentate to impotent. In the opening lines of the poem, even when troubled, he is portrayed as the fearsome, scowling scourge of Rus' and Poland. The prominent caesura in the first line distinguishes his position and his station: "Girei sidel, potulia vzor" ("Girei sat, looking downward" [175]). The Crimean Tatar Girei is literally a sitting monarch, and all look up to him, respecting his authority. Yet by the end of the poem, he is a man rendered weak and ineffectual, especially on the field of battle:

> On chasto v sechakh rokovykh
> Pod'emlet sabliu, i s razmakha
> Nedvizhim ostaetsia vdrug,
> Gliadit s bezumiem vokrug,
> Bledneet, budto polnyi strakha,
> I chto-to shepchet, i poroi
> Goriuchi slezy l'et rekoi. (189)
>
> (Often in fateful moments he would
> Hoist his saber, and with a swing
> Suddenly stand motionless,

Look around senselessly,
Grow pale, as if seized with fear,
And whisper something, and now and then
Tears of sorrow would flow like a river.)

These inaudible whispers underscore Girei's complete silence throughout the story. The khan has no voice; silently ("molcha") does he move about the harem. He communicates in glances and gestures, dismissing his court, for example, "with an impatient wave of his hand." Now that he can no longer brandish his sword, Girei has become as mute and emasculated as the eunuch, his counterpart in this symmetrical text. Both Girei and the eunuch are stolid figures of authority who hold the lives of the harem in their hands. Their fates are closely intertwined: the eunuch's every action is determined by a command of the khan, and the khan's rule and lineage are preserved by the eunuch's actions in regulating the harem.

This conflation of Girei and the eunuch at the end of *Bakhchisaraiskii fontan* is key, I would argue, to an interpretation of the diegesis that has been largely overlooked in literary scholarship. Pushkin's text may be read as, inter alia, a tragedy of dynastic succession—or lack thereof. Behind the poem's veil of harem romance and intrigue is a story of the failure of Khan Girei to ensure the survival of his line. Vissarion Belinskii is one prominent critic who asserts the centrality of Girei to the poem but passes over this reading, characterizing *Bakhchisaraiskii fontan* as a simple love story: "Mysl' poemy—pererozhdenie (esli ne prosvetlenie) dikoi dushi cherez vysokoe chuvstvo liubvi" ("The idea of the poem is the rebirth (if not the enlightenment) of a savage soul by way of the lofty feeling of love").[27] Yet the reader never encounters Girei in love per se. Over the course of the poem he shares no intimate moments with Zarema or Mariia and professes no affection for either woman. Only in Zarema's lengthy appeal to Mariia—that is, secondhand—does the reader learn that Girei and his Georgian consort once "breathed happiness in never-ending rapture" ("v bespreryvnom upoen'e/Dyshali schast'em" [187]). Even the narrator is unsure of the khan's feelings, repeatedly investigating the reasons for his deep malaise: "Chto dvyzhet gordoiu dushoiu?/Kakoiu mysl'oi zaniat on?" ("What drives this proud soul?/What thought occupies him?" [175]). Is it unrequited love that has Girei brooding intensely in the poem—or rather fear for the stable perpetuation of his rule?

For all the orientalized and sexualized exoticism it represented for the non-Muslim world, the harem was in reality a circumscribed domain of family politics where the ruler sought to perpetuate his power.[28] Women were

chosen ultimately for the purpose of reproduction, and this consideration may account for Girei's hasty and unexplained abandonment of Zarema. Indeed, for all the descriptions of her beauty, passion, and power of seduction, Zarema is never characterized as a mother. The khan is never characterized as a father. Accordingly, he may be seen to spare Mariia no privilege or courtesy because in Bakhchisarai she represents the hope of the harem, the new prospective *valide* sultan, the future mother of the heir. Her untimely death, however, ends the promise of the harem and spells the dissolution of his rule:

> Zabytyi, predannyi prezren'iu,
> Garem ne zrit ego litsa;
> Tam, obrechennye muchen'iu,
> Pod strazhei khladnogo skoptsa
> Stareiut zheny. (189–90)
>
> (Forgotten, scornfully cast aside,
> The harem does not see [Girei's] face;
> There, doomed and tormented,
> Under the watch of the cold castrato
> The women grow old.)

The "cold castrato" appears to be the eunuch, but Pushkin injects a modicum of ambiguity into this identity with the poem's only use of "skoptsa," which maintains the masculine rhyme with "litsa." The term "skopets'" stands out in a work in which the eunuch is repeatedly and consistently referred to as "evnukh"—whereas Girei is known by a number of epithets ("khan," "povelytel'," "bich," "Tataryn buinyi"). Could the prosodical bond between "litsa" and "skoptsa" imply that the khan and the "castrato" are one and the same?

This identification is ultimately not supported by the progression of events in the diegesis—in subsequent lines it is revealed that Girei is at war while the harem languishes—but the point is that the text of *Bakhchisaraiskii fontan* invites readers to perform an interpretative double take and consider a more profound interchangeability between the figures of the eunuch and the khan. It invites them to read the text as a tragedy of dynastic succession. Indeed, the problem of succession was not insignificant to Pushkin in this period; his historical drama *Boris Godunov* (1825), written very soon after *Bakhchisaraiskii fontan*, centers on the demise of the Riurik line during the "Smutnoe vremia" ("Time of Troubles" [1598–1613]). *Godunov* is a famously fragmentary and "incomprehensible" play that intrigued, even alienated, readers immediately upon its appearance—and that, by Pushkin's own account,

drew its inspiration from Shakespeare.[29] Crises of patrilineal succession, one of which gripped Russia at the time of the Decembrist revolt of 1825, are of course never very far from the center of the Bard's tragedies and historical chronicles; Macbeth, to cite one prominent example, fears that

> upon my head they placed a fruitless crown,
> And put a barren sceptre in my gripe,
> Thence to be wrench'd with *an unlineal hand*,
> *No son of mine succeeding*.[30]

If endowed with voice in *Bakhchisaraiskii fontan*, the Crimean Tatar khan Girei might be heard to speak the same fear. Instead he is shown at the conclusion of the diegesis silently pushing against the irrevocable passage of time and of his dynasty by erecting a monument—the fountain of tears of the poem's title—that is bound to the sorrow of those mourning the absence of children:

> Za chuzhdymi ee chertami
> Zhurchit vo mramore voda
> I kaplet khladnymi slezami,
> Ne umolkaia nikogda.
> Tak plachet mat' vo dni pechali
> O syne, padshem na voine. (190)
>
> (Behind its strange characters
> Water murmurs inside the marble
> And falls in drops like cold tears
> Without end.
> Thus weeps the mother in the depths of grief
> For the son fallen in war.)

In a poem whose diegesis draws an intimate equivalence between place and personality, Girei comes to stand metonymically for the Crimean Khanate itself, a sovereign state no longer able to determine its own future, whose only lasting traces are hand-hewn structures buffeted by the winds of time.

If the diegesis establishes a tight correspondence between Crimean place and Tatar personality only to portend its eventual breakdown through a crisis of reproduction and succession, the elegiac tone of Pushkin's extradiegetical coda, in which the narrator reveals himself as a visitor "from the north" recounting past events, testifies to the accuracy of the prediction.

The correspondence is riven: Crimean place is now absent a living Tatar personality and seems to be accorded aesthetic privilege contingent on that absence. Directing his gaze over the khan's burial grounds, the narrator wonders, "Gde skrylis' khany? Gde harem?" ("Where have the khans gone? Where is the harem?" [191]) He asks these questions with an unspoken knowledge of the answer: namely, that the expanding borders of empire and the centralization of power in the metropole have consigned Girei and the sovereigns of the periphery to obsolescence and extinction.

Indeed, Pushkin's narrator seems struck by an imperial melancholy, a "reflective nostalgia" triggered by the ruins wrought by the advance of empire, by the seizure of a place with an erasure of the other's personality. According to Svetlana Boym, citing Susan Stewart, "reflective nostalgia does not pretend to rebuild the mythical place. . . . It is 'enamored of distance, not of the referent itself.'"[31] In these rhetorical interrogatives, the narrator evokes the absence of the khans, of Tatar personality, not to condemn or mourn it but "to narrate the relationship between past, present, and future"—in other words, to narrate progress.[32] In spite of the absence of a living Tatar personality—or perhaps even because of it—Crimean place stands in full bloom, replete with winding vines ("v'iutsia vinogradny lozy" [191]), playful waters ("igraiut' vody" [191]), and reddening roses ("rdeiut rozy" [191]). Tatar personality is the vanishing past; Crimean place bears the promise of a flourishing future. Progress arrives to the sound of hoof beats:

> Volshebnyi krai! ochei otrada!
> Vse zhivo tam: kholmy, lesa,
> Iantar' i iakhont vinograda,
> . . .
>
> Vse chuvstvo putnika manit,
> Kogda, v chas utra bezmiatezhnyi,
> V gorakh, dorogoiu pribrezhnoi,
> Privychnyi kon' ego bezhit,
> I zeleneiushchaia vlaga
> Pred nym i bleshchet i shumit
> Vokrug utesov Aiu-daga. (192–93)
>
> (O enchanting land! O delight of the eyes!
> Hills, forests, sapphire and amber of the vine:
> Everything flourishes there, . . .

All of it seizes the senses of the rider,
When, in placid morning-tide,
Amid the mountains, along the seashore,
A trusted steed carries him,
And the greening waters
Stir and sparkle before him
Around the cliffs of Aiu-Dag.)

In this scene, which fueled Voloshin's critique, the narrator projects the landscape as an object of desire, a place of beauty and vigor to be celebrated, explored, and occupied. It is open and submissive. Unlike *Kavkazskii plennik* (*The Prisoner of the Caucasus* [1822]), the narrative poem that immediately precedes *Bakhchisaraiskii fontan* in Pushkin's oeuvre and tells the story of the penetration of a Russian soldier into a Circassian mountain community, *Bakhchisaraiskii fontan* casts the dissolution of the Crimean Khanate as an internal matter free of Russian interference.

This elevation of place over personality is, of course, a general tendency rather than a rule after *Bakhchisaraiskii fontan*, but a gradual movement in its direction is evident in Russian poetry later in the century—and particularly in Pushkin's own oeuvre. In "Otryvki iz puteshestviia Onegina" ("Fragments of Onegin's Journey" [1825–1830]), which was initially intended as canto 8 of *Evgenii Onegin*, Pushkin picks up where he left off in the coda to *Bakhchisaraiskii fontan*, portraying Crimea as a locus and object of desire, here with the romantic tone of a serenade:[33]

Prekrasny vy, brega Tavridy,
Kogda vas vidish' s korablia
Pry svete utrennei Kipridy,
Kak vas vpervoi uvidel ia;
Vy mne predstali v bleske brachnom:
Na nebe sinem i prozrachnom
Siiali grudy vashikh gor,
Dolin, derev'ev, sel uzor
Razostlan byl peredo mnoiu.
A tam, mezh khizhinok tatar . . .
Kakoi vo mne prosnulsia zhar![34]

(You are beautiful, O shores of Taurida,
When one sees you from the ship
By the light of the morning Kiprida,

As I first saw you;
You presented yourself to me in nuptial splendor:
Against a blue, pellucid sky
The peaks of your mountains shone brightly,
The design of your valleys, trees, and villages
Was laid out before me.
And there, among the Tatar dwellings . . .
What a fire awoke within me!)

Just as Girei's fountain is all that remains of him, the only vestiges of Tatar personality in this poem are physical structures ("khizhinok") apparently devoid of human life and activity. Similarly, in Vasilii Tumanskii's "Elegiia" ("Elegy" [1824]), no Tatars are found amid the poem's surfeit of vibrant flowers, trees, cliffs, and clouds; only their huts appear, overgrown by the fruits of the land:

Vot zhizn' moia v strane, gde kiparisny seni,
Sred' lavrov vozrastia, primanivaiut k leni,
Gde khizhiny tatar venchaiet vinograd,
Gde roshcha kazhdaia est' blagovonnyi sad.[35]

(This is my life in the land where blue cypresses,
Amid aged laurels, entice one to leisure,
Where grapevines top Tatar huts,
Where every grove is an aromatic garden.)

For Vladimir Benediktov, this virtual absence of personality leads to an anthropomorphization of the land itself. In "Oreanda," which constitutes part of his 1839 cycle *Putevye zametki i vpechatleniia (v Krymu)* (*Travel Notes and Impressions (in Crimea)*), the lyrical persona describes Crimea's many unusual topographical features as natives offering visitors shelter from the rain and relief from the hot sun. He looks admiringly on the "living rock faces" ("zhivykh etikh skal") near Yalta and demands a very human gesture of gratitude and reverence for them:

Prelest' i prelest'! Vgliadites',—
Skol'ko ee na zemle!
Shapku doloi! Poklonites'
Etoi chudesnoi skale![36]

(Charm after charm! Look closely—
How much of it appears in this land!

So off with your hat! Bow before
This stunning cliff!)

The elevation of Crimean place inspires myriad such landscape tableaux executed in meter and rhyme, poetic canvases of glimmering peaks and deep ravines whose grandeur ultimately leads the lyrical persona toward an exploration of the self, an experience of the sublime. Yet when the Crimean War comes to the Black Sea peninsula (1853–1856)—and when the Crimean Tatars emigrate en masse to the Ottoman Empire, seeking refuge from unjust charges of treason and betrayal—these familiar peaks and ravines become less a source of enchantment and awe than landmarks of sorrow and suffering.

Arise! This Is Not Your Place: Namik Kemal and Mehmet Emin Yurdakul

Responding to his critics in 1830, Pushkin likened *Bakhchisaraiskii fontan* to a melodrama, the product of a young, naïve poet prone to an exaggeration of feeling.[37] Of course, Pushkin would develop into a prosodic shape-shifter whose playful fragments and parodies, "lyrical outbursts," and ambiguous narrative poems would defy generic conventions and easy categorization.[38] Excessive emotionality would not become his calling card. Namik Kemal (1840–1888), on the other hand, made a superfluity of passion his literary trademark en route to becoming arguably the most influential Ottoman intellectual of the nineteenth century. In contrast to his polemical essays and position papers, which constitute the central articulation of the so-called Young Ottoman platform advocating European liberalism with an Islamic soul, Kemal's plays and novels—the first successful transplantations of the forms to the Turkish canon—are noted in critical literature more for effervescent and fervent feeling, which occasionally gives itself over to caricature, than stylistic innovation or technical mastery.[39] In an age that saw centuries of status quo fall away with the introduction of the first Ottoman Constitution in 1876, Namik Kemal's passion was in many ways a barometer of societal tumult and upheaval. In his literary works, it was a catalyst of reform, igniting in readers and audiences a powerful new understanding of and loyalty to *vatan* (motherland), an originally localized concept that Kemal helped develop to encompass the entire multiethnic Ottoman Empire.[40] In fact, his best-known work, the Crimean War–related drama *Vatan yahut Silistre* (*Motherland or Silistria* [1873]), electrified the audience at its first performance to such an extent that chants of "Yaşasın vatan!" ("Long live

the motherland!") and "Yaşasın Kemal!" ("Long live Kemal!") echoed outside Istanbul's Gedikpaşa Theater well after the curtain fell.[41]

The chants were inspired by the play's final words, "Yaşasın vatan! Yaşasın Osmanlılar!" ("Long live the motherland! Long live the Ottomans!"), which come after the Ottoman officer İslam Bey and his beloved Zekiye Hanım (posing as a man) succeed in helping hold back the Russian siege at Silistria in 1854, early in the Crimean War. The Ottoman victory prompts Zekiye's father, Sıtkı Bey, to welcome the long-sought marriage of İslam to his daughter and to proclaim that "the honor of Ottomans is to die for the motherland's most trivial need at any time" (71). For Kemal, love for *vatan* is virtually indistinguishable from romantic love—pure, abiding, and indefatigable—and a confluence of and parallel between the two also figures centrally in Kemal's novel *Cezmi* (1880), which holds special importance in this study as a text that attests to the isomorphic correspondence between Crimean place and Tatar personality—in other words, to the status of Crimea as a home of the Tatars—and then disrupts this correspondence, elevating personality at the expense of place.

Originally envisioned as a multivolume work in the vein of Hugo's *Les misérables*, *Cezmi* is the first historical novel in Turkish literature. Kemal only completed the first volume, which leaves the title *Cezmi* somewhat misleading, for the central protagonist of the work left to us is arguably not Cezmi, the handsome young scholar, poet, and equestrian who becomes a *sipahi* (special cavalry officer) in the service of Sultan Murad III and volunteers to participate in military campaigns against Persia in the late sixteenth century. Rather, it is Adil Girei (Giray), heir apparent (*kalgay*) to the khan of Crimea, whom Cezmi meets in battle early in the novel. Sent by his elder brother and sovereign, Khan Mehmed Girei, to support the Ottomans against Persia, Adil Girei arrives at the head of forty thousand Tatar *akıncılar* (light cavalry) just as the Persians are about to rout Cezmi and an undermanned Ottoman infantry. The dramatic entrance of the Tatars empowers the Ottomans, and the Persians soon give up any hope of victory. In their retreat, however, the Persians capture Adil Girei and his brother Gazi, a renowned warrior, and spirit them off to Tabriz. While Gazi languishes in Kahkaha prison, Adil is rather curiously sent to the shah's palace, where he becomes embroiled in imperial intrigue and a poisonous love triangle. The pages of *Cezmi* largely follow Adil Girei as he navigates these political and romantic minefields.

Kemal derives the narrative events and existents of *Cezmi* from *Tarih-i Peçevi* (*Peçevi's History*), the authoritative chronicle of sixteenth-century Ottoman history written by İbrahim Peçevi, but we might be forgiven for thinking that he was inspired in some way by Pushkin.[42] *Cezmi* is a mirror

image of *Bakhchisaraiskii fontan*: instead of a Crimean Tatar khan caught between two women imprisoned in his Bakhchisarai harem, Kemal gives us an imprisoned Crimean Tatar khan-in-waiting caught between two women in a Tabriz palace. The first woman in the love triangle is Şehriyar, the wife of the shah, who falls in love with Adil at first sight and facilitates his comfortable house arrest at the palace. She is beautiful, passionate, and vengeful—Kemal's Zarema. The second is Perihan, the young sister of the shah, who earns Adil's love and attempts to free Adil and Gazi from captivity. She is beautiful, moral, and devout and wears *niqaab*—Kemal's Mariia. Scheming to turn Bakhchisarai against İstanbul, Şehriyar offers Adil full independence for the Crimean Khanate and a position of power in a Crimean-Persian alliance. He spurns her advances in favor of the innocent, pure Perihan. Emboldened by true love—and by Cezmi, who reappears later in the novel to rescue the Crimean *kalgay* in Tabriz—Adil devises a plan to overtake the palace and overthrow the Persian state. Şehriyar learns of his betrayal, however, and orders the execution of Adil and Perihan before taking her own life. Not unlike Pushkin's Zarema, she destroys the happiness of a Crimean Tatar beloved—and dies in recompense for the act.

Adil and Perihan perish united in their love. They also perish as a Crimean Tatar and a Persian princess from the periphery beyond the Ottoman Empire who ultimately sacrifice their lives in service to Istanbul. Although the Crimean Khanate "entered under Ottoman protection" in 1478, it was in practical terms a partially independent sovereign polity with (often loose) control of the Black Sea peninsula and the adjoining northern steppe between the Kuban and the Dniester throughout the sixteenth century.[43] In fact, the Crimean Tatar Khanate "maintained more independence and sovereignty than any other" Ottoman province at this time.[44] The Tatars participated in the Ottoman military campaigns against Persia, for example, not out of blind obligation or subservience to the sultan but by choice and according to their interests, which were undoubtedly swayed by formal, deferential invitations to battle from the Sublime Porte accompanied by opulent gifts and gold coins, the "quiver price" ("terkes bakahsı").[45] For a Young Ottoman like Namik Kemal, who sought to elevate a concept of open Ottoman citizenship founded primarily on allegiance to the state rather than ethnicity or religion, the choice of Adil Girei as the protagonist of *Cezmi* therefore had significant political purchase.

Indeed, Kemal considered imaginative literature a primary means of educating the people of the empire, and his use of Adil's Tatar personality fulfills a didactic function by equating heroism and right behavior with the navigation and transcendence of local affiliations and loyalties in defense of

a multiethnic Ottoman *vatan*.[46] For Kemal, writing *Cezmi* between 1876 and 1880, the very survival of the Ottoman Empire may have appeared to hinge on the lesson of Adil Girei and his decision to transcend the local in defense of the imperial. The Balkans were exploding with nationalist sentiment, and in 1877 Russia declared war on the Ottoman Empire ostensibly over demands for autonomy for the latter's Bulgarian population. On 3 March 1878, with Russian troops only a few miles away from the doors of Topkapı palace, the sultan agreed to the San Stefano peace treaty, which proved an "unmitigated disaster" for the Ottomans.[47] Even after the subsequent Treaty of Berlin of 1878, which helped staunch the excessive bleeding of the sultan's positions in the region, the empire still saw Serbia, Montenegro, and Romania break away as independent states. Whatever the concerns Namik Kemal had as a reformer, one who plied the sultan with calls for a Western-style constitutional and parliamentarian government that would remain true to Islamic tradition, they did not diminish his love for and pride in the Ottoman Empire, whose greatness he trumpeted repeatedly. With the long-standing borders of the *vatan* beginning to crumble before his very eyes, he must have dreamt of an army of Adil Gireis, impervious to the seduction of local affiliations and to the comfort of home, coming to Istanbul's aid.

In *Cezmi*, Kemal does not understate the power of this seduction. He underscores Adil's affinity for his Crimean homeland and Tatar brethren—and does so precisely to extol the heroism involved in the pursuit of an Ottoman "higher calling." Most illustrative in this regard is a long poem written in the voice of Adil Girei, which the preeminent Turkish poet and literary critic Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar calls the novel's "biggest peculiarity" ("en büyük hususiyeti").[48] It is, as it were, a *Bildungspoem* offering psychological insight into the life and upbringing of the Crimean Tatar *kalgay*. In the form of a *Terkibi-bend*, a poem featuring a series of stanzas composed of ten *beyts* (couplets), each of which concludes with a contrapuntal *makta* (a "cutting" or end couplet), Adil begins:

> Mâderle peder olup behâne,
> Sevketti kaza beni cihâne.
> Hanzâde idim velâdetimde. (97)
>
> (My mother and father were just an excuse,
> Fate brought me into this world.
> At my birth I was the son of the khan.)

The meaning of the term "kaza" lies somewhere between its denotations as both "chance" and "calling" (or "divine judgment")—in a word, fate. Namik Kemal was an enthusiastic reader of the romantic works of Victor Hugo during the time he was in self-imposed exile in France from 1867 to 1870, and he casts Adil Girei in this poem-within-the-novel as a "fated" romantic hero caught in the sweep of cosmic forces. In some modest respects, Adil resembles the eponymous hero of Hugo's *Bug-Jargal* (1826), another noble imprisoned in a foreign land who falls in love with a forbidden woman and appears destined to die for a higher cause.

Fate for Adil is not a force vaguely apprehended over time: it is a presence that haunts him from the first days of his existence and speaks to him in the words of a relentless *hatif* or "mysterious voice":

> Bilmem ne sebeple vardı dâim,
> Gûşumda şu hatifî terâna:
> Yüksel ki yerin bu yer değildir,
> Dünyâya geliş hüner değildir. (98)
>
> (I do not know why there has always been
> This mysterious voice in my ear:
> "Arise! This is not your place,
> There is no merit in simply being born.")

Nearly every *makta*—the concluding couplet of each stanza—begins with the imperative "Yüksel!" ("Arise!") and encourages the protagonist to exceed and transcend his present self. After Adil recounts a childhood that passed "like a dream," a time when his status as Crimean *hanzâde* (son of the khan) required that "nursemaids . . . paid attention to [his] every condition" (98), the *hatif* again intrudes on his reminiscences, issuing an urgent call for growth and excellence: "Yüksel ki boyun kadar kalırsın. /Sâyeyle ki bîhüner kalırsın" (98) ("Arise, lest you remain small,/Lest you remain ignorant").

As an adult, Adil achieves inner peace and focus in his maturity, a balanced understanding of strength and weakness, intelligence and wisdom. At the right hand of his brother, Khan Mehmed Girei, Adil turns his attention and focus to the affairs of the Crimean Tatar Khanate: "Hân oldu Kırım'a bir birâder,/Çekti beni tahtına berâber" (99) ("My brother became khan of Crimea,/And drew me to the throne with him"). In his authority, Adil models himself after Ömer ('Umar ibn al-Khattab), whose reign as the second "rightly-guided" Caliph in the seventh century is often hailed by

Muslims as a golden age, and Cafer (Ja'far as-Sadiq), whose role as the sixth imam profoundly shaped the tradition of Shi'ism.[49] By emulating these two notable figures in Islam—one celebrated by Sunnis for a forceful and just rule, the other by Shi'ites for esoteric knowledge and religious mysticism—Adil exhibits a capaciousness of outlook and a harmony in his exercise of power. The Tatars praise him and find "none of [his] orders contemptible":

> Herkesteki hande-i neşâtın
> Aksiyle açardın dilde güller.
> Hükmümde safâ süren raiyyet,
> Evsâfımı virdederdi yer yer. (99)
>
> (Roses bloomed in the hearts of men,
> Reflecting the gay laughter of all.
> Under my authority my subjects lived in bounty
> And always applauded my qualities).

Adil Girei feels a devotion to and an intimate connection with his home, expressing a strong resolve (*azmetmiş idim*) "not to abandon" ("terketmemek") Crimea and his fellow Tatars. His life to this point—the childhood idyll, the adolescent quest for knowledge—has readied him for a position as leader and steward of the Crimean Tatars and the Black Sea peninsula, and Adil fashions himself with his words as a living manifestation of an isomorphic correspondence between Crimean place and Tatar personality. He is at home. But when the *hatif* reappears with a new appeal for ascendance, this correspondence is shaken: "Yüksel ki cihan sefîl ü dundur, /Rağbet ona âdeta cünundur" (99) ("Arise! The world is base and destitute;/It is madness to be inclined toward it").

The *hatif* turns Adil away from place ("cihan") and evokes a higher calling related to personality: allegiance and service to the Ottoman Empire. Namik Kemal, in other words, fashions a new home for this Crimean Tatar. The very next couplet testifies to Adil's submission to the interests of the broader *vatan*: "Harb açtı adûya Âl-i Osman,/Merdim diyene gördünü meydan" (99) ("The Ottoman dynasty declared war against the enemy;/For those who spoke of bravery, here was its arena"). Adil Girei forsakes Crimean place, to which he will never return, and goes forth to fulfill his civic duty as a Tatar noble bound to Istanbul. Here Kemal decouples Crimean place from Tatar personality, elevating the latter as the condition of possibility for the *uhuvvet* (brotherhood) at the heart of this allegiance. In an era when ethnic and confessional differences begin to undermine

the territorial integrity of the Ottoman lands, *Cezmi* mobilizes a Crimean Tatar as a symbol of unity and concord whose loyalty to the Ottoman state is a triumph over division and discord. For Kemal, this loyalty is the hope of his brand of Ottomanism.

Kemal's ideas were of course contested in this turbulent period of mass migrations, fluid borders, and proliferating ideologies, and the most persuasive critique of his Ottomanism arguably came from a member of the Muslim intelligentsia from the Russian Empire. In an influential pamphlet titled *Üç Tarz-ı Siyaset* (*The Three Paths of Policy* [1904]) and published in the Cairo-based journal *Türk*, Yusuf Akçura wonders whether Kemal's Ottomanism accords with the reality of the turn-of-the-century Ottoman Empire. A Tatar from the middle Volga region, Akçura deliberates the pros and cons of three political ideologies each promising to serve the interests of an Ottoman state in crisis—Ottomanism, Islamism, and pan-Turkism—and asks of the first "whether the components belonging to [its] diverse ethnicities [*muhtelif cins*] and religions—which to this point have not stopped warring and struggling with one another [*birbirleriyle kavga ve savaştan halî kalmayan*]—can be joined together amicably ever again."[50] In other words, is the unity and concord espoused by Ottomanism a convenient historical fiction—and therefore an elusive dream? For Akçura, the prospects for Kemal's doctrine are dim, mainly because its platform of open citizenship and equal rights under the law constitutes a losing proposition for many parties: a surrender of political privilege for Turks and Muslims, on the one hand, and a disavowal of a politics of self-determination for non-Muslims, on the other.[51] After considering Islamism, which he argues would alienate and anger European powers with a destabilizing offer of a "more concentrated community" ("daha kuvvetli bir topluluk") of Muslims across borders, he sees a potential upside in a new, less-tested ideology: pan-Turkism.[52]

Akçura describes *Türkçülük* as a policy of ethnic nationalism encompassing "all the Turks found scattered over a large swath of Asia and Eastern Europe and bound by the same language, ethnicity, culture, and to a significant degree, the same religion" ("dilleri, ırkları, âdetleri ve hattâ ekseriyetinin dinleri bile bir olan").[53] At the conclusion of *Üç tarz-ı siyaset*, he admonishes the editors of *Türk* for confining their focus to the "western Turks" ("Garp Türkler") of the Ottoman Empire—the Turks of "Mehmet the Conqueror . . . and Namik Kemal," as Akçura frames it—and for disregarding the other "Turks" who live beyond its borders.[54] In a somewhat exasperated rejoinder, the editor of *Türk*, Ali Kemal, throws water on Akçura's ambitious platform by questioning its practical implications. He does so, in one notable example, by raising the issue of Crimea and the fate of the Crimean Tatars: "My God

. . . we could not protect Crimea when it was inhabited by the Tatars, a type of Turk—and now we are going to work to unify all the Turks in Asia?" ("İlâhi . . . Tatarlar ile, bir nevi Türklerle meskûn iken Kırım'ı muhafaza edemedik de şimdi bütün Asya'nın Türklerini tevhide mi çalışacağız?" [40]).

This "loss of Crimea" evolves into a pregnant poetic trope in turn-of-the-century Turkish literature, albeit not in the way Ali Kemal intended. It becomes an event cited by poets to legitimate versions of Akçura's *Türkçülük* and to stir concern and outrage over the failure of the Ottoman state to protect and shepherd its fellow "Turks" around the world. One such poet is Ziya Gökalp, the influential sociologist and civic activist who defined the concept of the nation according to the bonds of "culture" ("hars") rather than the boundaries of territory in his *Türkçülüğün esasları* (*The Principles of Turkism* [1923]).[55] Called "the founding father of [both pan-Turkism] and Turkish nationalism," he began his career warmly supportive of pan-Turk ideals, which are most evidently expressed in his poetry, and later narrowed the focus of his political program to Anatolian Turkey after the Ottoman defeat in 1918.[56] Gökalp's early poems are meant to deliver the ideas he puts forward in his more scholarly writing in simplified, digestible, and easily repeatable form; they bear the steady cadence of a march and call out for memorization and oral recitation. They also unite the Anatolian present, as it were, with an almost mythical Central Asian past by often taking on the *destan* (epic) form, a variable folk genre traditionally used in the Turkic world to relate acts of heroism, among other things.[57] With abundant internal rhyme, his early poem "Altın Destan" ("The Golden Epic" [1911]) begins by evoking, in almost Johannine fashion, the wider Turkic world as one of both unattended sheep and scattered grapes needing collection and consolidation:

> Sürüden koyunlar hep takım takım
> Ayrılmış, sürüde kalmamış bakım;
> Asmanın üzümü dağılmış, salkım
> Olmak ister, fakat bağban nerede?
> Gideyim, arayım: Çoban nerede?[58]
>
> (One after the other the sheep were separated from the flock
> And those that remained were not cared for;
> Although they wished to come together,
> The grapes of the vine were scattered—
> But where is the vineyard keeper?
> Let me go and look: where is the shepherd?)

The lyrical persona wanders through "Turan," a mythical territory of Turkic peoples extending from Anatolia into Asia, looking for stirrings of a new movement for unity. But instead of this new "Türk yurdu" ("Turkish homeland"), he spies only lands "where the hands of strangers have built principalities" ("Yât eller . . . hanlikar kurdu" [34]), Crimea foremost among them: "'Kırım' nerde kaldı, 'Kafkas' ne oldu?/'Kazan' dan 'Tibet' e değin rus doldu" (35) ("Where was 'Crimea' abandoned, what happened to the 'Caucasus'?/ From 'Kazan' to 'Tibet' the land is stuffed with Russians"). Turan in Gökalp's poem is a landmass so large, so abstract—whose expansive borders reach Crimea, Tibet, and, elsewhere in "Altın Destan," the Tien Shan mountain range—that it renders the concept of "place" meaningless. This is space without a center, with no specific *where* to invest "felt value." It is a home lacking a location. Originally a Persian term for Central Asia, Turan has been described as "an *undefined* Shangri-La area in the steppes of Central Asia."[59] This lack of definition is, notably, territorial. What defines Turan is personality, the cultural "coloring" related to the aggregate of traits and characteristics privileged by Akçura. Its borders are the borders of the Turkic world. For Ali Kemal, responding to Akçura in the pages of the journal *Türk*, the loss of Crimea is instructive *because* of its territorial specificity and proximity to Istanbul; for Gökalp in "Altın Destan," it is instructive because of its *lack* of specificity, its capacity to be emblematic of countless other losses: the Caucasus, Kazan, Kaşgar. These losses, of course, imply a past, primordial unity and legitimate pan-Turkism as an ideology of restoration, even justice.[60] Cataloguing these losses, Gökalp saturates the poem with rhetorical questions—"where is your power?" ("yaran nerede?" [37]), "where is the battlefield?" ("meydan nerede?" [36])—intended to provoke the reader to an answer, one that envisions him taking up the banner for Turan and the irredentist ideology of pan-Turkism. Indeed, the final strophe of "Altın Destan" is a battle cry that cuts to the cognitive dissonance at the heart of nationalism, to what Benedict Anderson describes as its "philosophical poverty and even incoherence":[61]

> Gündüzlerden sapan geceyi bilir,
> Bilmeksizin tapan her şeyi bilir,
> Bilen yapmaz, yapan pek iyi bilir,
> Erenler yolu bu, varan nerede? (37)
>
> (The one who turns from the day knows the night,
> The one who worships without knowing knows all,
> The one who knows does not do, the one who does knows well,
> This is the soldier-saint's path—where are the ones to travel it?)

Gökalp's rhetorical questions ultimately serve to interpellate his readers—be they Turks from Istanbul or Tatars from Bakhchisarai—as compatriots whose home is abstracted beyond Anatolia or the Crimean peninsula and absorbed within the imagined boundaries of Turan. Their particular "locatedness" is rendered irrelevant.

This apotheosis of personality over place is especially evident in the work of the "first nationalist poet of Turkey," Mehmet Emin Yurdakul, for whom the loss of Crimea also figures centrally as an instrument of pan-Turkist mobilization.[62] In "Nifâk" ("Discord" [1912]), an extended apostrophe addressed to political division and disunity, both of which conspire to "make worlds tremble" ("dünyâları titretir"), Crimea is again cited as a lesson and an admonition of history. Here it is pluralized, a floating signifier: "Ey târihin feneri! Sen bizlere ışık ver; . . ./Ve göster ki, . . . kaç zavallı Kırım var?" ("O lamp of history! Give light to us; . . ./And show us . . . how many miserable Crimeas there are").[63]

In his epic "Ey Türk Uyan!" ("Awake, O Turk!"), published in 1914, the year in which the Ottoman Empire entered World War I on the side of the Central Powers, Yurdakul places in a breathtakingly broad mythohistorical context the division and disunity that, in his view, rent asunder an integral premodern Turan. Expanding considerably on Gökalp's "Altın Destan," he begins in the fourth millennium BC in the Altai Mountains, where God called on the "Turkish race" (Türk ırkı") to "fly to the suns like a languid eagle," and then proceeds to imagine a more recent past glory and lost unity:

> Sen her yerde fütûhat türküleri çağırdın;
> Kara Hanlar, Oğuzlar,
> Attilalar, Cengizler, Timurlenkler, Yavuzlar
> Senin geniş göğsünü kabarttıran ecdâdın.[64]
>
> (You sang conquest songs everywhere;
> The Black Khans, the Oğuz,
> Attila, Genghis, Timurlane, Yavuz—
> These are the ancestors who make your broad chest rise with pride.)

In Yurdakul's vision, this vast conquest was a civilizing mission; Turkish power was at once a "burning fire" and "warming sun," bringing learning and the arts and a political pluralism to the lands under its rule in order to strike "a fist at ignorance" ("cehle yumruk urdular" [130]). But with the demise of the Golden Horde in the fifteenth century, a poverty unknown even to "the African desert" consumed the Turkic lands. Yurkadul's lyrical

persona, like Gökalp's, taunts the reader with a proliferation of rhetorical questions meant to stir action directed toward the amelioration of this destitution and suffering:

> Söyle bana, senin fatih altun ordun ne oldu?
> O tahtların, som yaldızlı sarayların ne oldu? . . .
> Ah, ne oldun? . . .
> Felaketli, zalim yıllar senin de
> Dinç ruhunu yıprattı mı, ezdi mi? (132–34)
>
> (Tell me, what happened to your all-conquering Golden Horde?
> To your thrones, to your massive gilded palaces? . . .
> Oh, what happened to you? . . .
> Did these disastrous, cruel years
> Wear out and crush your vigorous soul?)

Salvation from this unbearable present rests with nothing less than a realization of the central tenet of pan-Turkism:

> Bu saf kanı taşıyan
> Herbir insan, aşiret;
> Türk diliyle konuşan
> Herbir şehir, memleket
> Senin birer evladın, senin birer oymağın;
> Senin birer öz yurdun, senin birer bucağın! (136)
>
> (Every person, every nomadic tribe
> Carrying this pure blood;
> Every city, every civilization
> Speaking the Turkish tongue
> Is your descendent, your tribe,
> Your place, your true home!)

The passage explicitly casts place (*yurt*) as wholly contingent on personality ("bu saf kani taşıyan/Herbir insan"). In Yurdakul's formulation, surrendering to the thin bonds of ethnicity, language, and culture among the Turkic peoples will lead to the consolidation of a new home, a new "Türk yurdu" encompassing the Kirgiz, Tonguz, and "wet-browed Tatars" ("alin terli Tatarlar" [136]). This sense of surrender, of submission to the ethno-national, is fundamental to his poetry and his politics; in fact, the pen name "Yurdakul" may be translated as "slave to the homeland."

But how is this submission achieved? For Yurdakul, it is brought about by a manipulation of sentiments, by a new "national spirit" ("milli duygu" [137]) communicated, in eschatological terms, by Sur, the "trumpet" announcing the Holy Kingdom in Qur'an 6:73. Whereas "Yüksel!" incites Namik Kemal's Adil Girei to a higher purpose, "Uyan!" ("Awake!") echoes in Yurdakul's poem as the attendant sound of this trumpet, "blowing like the wind through every door" and "rousing every conscience like divine revelation" ("vahy gibi her vicdanı sarsalar" [138]). Only the most dedicated civic figure, such as the poet, can wield this trumpet and issue the call of national awakening; he is "the shepherd herding his great nation" ("onun büyük milletinin koyun güden çobanı" [138]). Yurdakul legitimates this moment of self-aggrandizement by citing historical precedent and recalling the successes of Giuseppe Mazzini, Adam Mickiewicz, and other national awakeners—those of Russia, in particular. Armed with this "national spirit," after all,

> Tatarlar'a harac veren bir Rusya
> Şark'a varis olmak için canlandi. (138)
>
> (Russia, which once paid tribute to the Tatars,
> Came alive to become heir to the East.)

Among these awakeners, a special place in Mehmet Emin Yurdakul's poetic corpus is reserved for İsmail Bey Gaspıralı (or Ismail Gasprinskii [1851–1914]), the Crimean Tatar educator, journalist, and civic leader based in Bahçesaray (Bakhchisarai) whose journal *Tercüman*, or *Perevodchik* (*The Interpreter*) played a singular role in promoting pan-Turkist ideals in both the Russian and Ottoman empires.

The motto of *Tercüman*—"Dilde, fikirde, işte birlik" ("Unity in language, thought, and action")—encapsulates Gaspıralı's mission, which was nothing less than to consolidate the interests and the resources of the Turkic communities around the world, from the Tatar to the Uzbek and Kirghiz, and ready them for the modern age. Gaspıralı advocated *lisan-ı umumi* (the common language), a hybrid of simplified Ottoman Turkish and Crimean Tatar largely free of Persian, Russian, and Arabic influences and capable of reaching Turkic audiences across borders; he promoted the rights of women and an Islam reconciled to the secular ideals of the European Enlightenment; he called for "usul-i cedid," a "new method" of Muslim educational practices and sought to cultivate the philanthropic and political institutions critical to a vibrant civil society.[65] In "İsmail Gaspirinski'ye," published in 1914 in the collection *Türk Sazı* (*The Saz of the Turk*), Yurdakul hails Gaspıralı not only

as a national awakener—"'Uyan!' diye haykırdın" ("You cried, 'Awake!'")—but also as a unique light-bearer to the Muslim world, one who spread both *nur*, the "light" of religious faith, and *medeniyet güneşi*, the "light of civilization."[66]

Yurdakul wrote "İsmail Gaspirinski'ye" upon the occasion of Gaspıralı's death in 1914. The two had been friends. In 1899, Yurdakul sent Gaspıralı a copy of his first collection of verse, *Türkçe Şiirler* (*Poems in Turkish* [1898]), which the latter received with gratitude, stating that the poems "cheered" ("ferahlandım") and "heartened" ("teselli oldu") him. "May God be pleased with you for this [collection]," wrote Gaspıralı, who offered a copy of *Tercüman* in return.[67] In "İsmail Gaspirinski'ye," in order to mark the death of his friend, Yurdakul offers a prayer for Crimea, "a child of Genghis the Conqueror," among the poem's first stanzas:

> Ta ki fatih Cengizler'in evladı
> İslavlık'ın pençesinden kurtulsun;
> Onun mazlum, sefil olan hayatı
> Hür ve mes'ud bir tali'le can bulsun. (124)
>
> (Let this child of Genghis the Conqueror
> Escape through the talons of the Slavs;
> Let independence and a blessed soul
> Greet his oppressed, wretched life.)

Here the loss of Crimea is, on the one hand, a loss that holds the promise of future discovery, a new "independence" as a part of Turan, and, on the other, a loss framed as an egregious theft by "the Slavs." Under the control of Saint Petersburg, Crimea is a land "kneaded with blood" ("kanlarıyle yuğrulmuş" [123]), "a slave to savages" ("vahşılere esir" [123]). This virulent anti-Russian rhetoric, in which Gaspıralı himself did not engage, appears in a number of Yurdakul's poems from this period: in "Petersburg'a" ("To Petersburg" [1916]), for example, the lyrical persona curses the residents of the imperial city as lumbering, ignorant idol worshippers with imagery evoking the apocalyptic scenes of Qur'an 81, while in "Çar'a" ("To the Tsar" [1917]), he warns the Romanov "Nero of Russia" ("Rusya'nın Neron'u") of the coming resurgence of Crimea, "a daughter of revolution" ("ihtilalci birer kız").[68] In "İsmail Gaspirinski'ye," this Russophobia subsides to make way for an encomium to Gaspıralı, who "dared to do great, sacred work" on behalf of pan-Turkist ideals.

Yurdakul praises Gaspıralı as, above all, "a great Türk" ("ulu Türk" [123]), completely detaching Tatar personality from Crimean place and elevating

the former to such an extent that it loses its distinctiveness, its particular "coloring." This move from "Tatar" to "Türk" is critical to our understanding of the tensions between Crimean place and Tatar personality in Ottoman Turkey at this time, for whereas "the term *Tatar* had a specific territorial component . . . the term *Türk* did not," as Uli Schamiloglu explains.[69] With this terminological shift, the former Tatar residents of Crimea were fashioned a new home, a space so vast that it at once dilated and diluted their personality.

Conclusion

The story of the displacement of the Crimean Tatars does not end after the Crimean War. In May 1944, the descendents of those who did not emigrate to Ottoman lands after 1856 and remained on the Black Sea peninsula for generations to come were given mere minutes to collect their belongings, ordered from their homes at gunpoint, and herded onto the cattle cars of waiting trains bound for destinations in Central Asia and the Ural mountains by thousands of officers of the Soviet secret police, the NKVD. This act of ethnic cleansing came at the prompting of Lavrentii Beriia, who noted on 10 May 1944 the "undesirability [*nezhelatel'nosti*] of the continued residence of the Crimean Tatars in the border areas of the Soviet Union," and at the order of Stalin, whose secret decree 5859ss of 11 May accused "*many* Crimean Tatars" ("*mnogie* krymskie tatary") of collaborating with Nazi occupiers during World War II and then mandated the expulsion of "*all* of them" (*vsekh* tatar").[70]

After Stalin's brutal deportation, activist pan-Turkist literary-cultural journals inspired by the work of Mehmet Emin Yurdakul—journals such as *Özleyiş*, *Toprak*, *Emel*, and *Türk Birliği*—would rail against the injustices endured by their victimized "brothers," referring to them not as "Kırım Tatarları" but as "Kırım Türkleri" ("Crimean Turks"). They underscored the second component of the ethnonym, a signifier of personality. By contrast, Soviet activists cut from the cloth of Maksimilian Voloshin and devoted to the Crimean Tatar cause—who were forced to contend with Politburo decree no. 493 of 1967, which labeled the Crimean Tatars as, notably, "the Tatars formerly resident in Crimea" ("Tatary, ranee prozhivavshie v Krymu")—employ "krymskie tatary" to appeal to the Soviet public and the international community for support. They underscore the first component of the ethnonym, a signifier of place.

Today the legacy of this mixed usage—as well as the divergent conceptions of "home" underlying it—may be seen to complicate the Crimean Tatar campaign for international recognition as an "indigenous people" of the Black Sea peninsula ("korinnyi narod [Ukrainian]; "korennoi narod" [Russian]; "yerli halkı" [Turkish]). According to article 13 of the International Labour Organisation Convention on Indigenous and Tribal Peoples (1989), indigenousness rests on an acknowledgment of "the special importance for the culture and spiritual values of the peoples concerned of their relationship with the lands and territories" that they identify as "home."[71] In other words, it rests on the perception of a fundamental isomorphic correspondence between, in this case, Crimean place and Tatar personality.

Exploring a number of texts constitutive of "the second Crimea" in the long nineteenth century, this article has highlighted moments in the Russian and Turkish literary traditions in which this correspondence is first affirmed, marking Crimea as the home of the Tatars, and then disturbed and recalibrated to presage or attend to changing cultural and political realities. Today, as tens of thousands of Crimean Tatars return from forced exile to an ancestral home that is now an autonomous republic in Ukraine, it is important to come to grips with the origins and implications of such shifts in imaginative geography. They hold a key to understanding the various claims for group rights in a globalizing world.

University of Cambridge

Notes

1. Maksimiliian Voloshin, "Dom poeta," in *Sobranie sochinenii*, vol. 2 (Moscow: Ellis Lak 2000, 2004), 80.
2. Brian G. Williams, *The Crimean Tatars: The Diaspora Experience and the Forging of a Nation* (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 143.
3. Aleksandr Nekrich, *The Punished Peoples: The Deportation and Fate of Soviet Minorities at the End of the Second World War*, trans. George Saunders (New York: Norton, 1978), 105.
4. Maksimilian Voloshin, "Kul'tura, iskusstvo, pamiatniki Kryma," in *Zhizn'—Beskonechnoe poznan'e: Stikhotvoreniia i poemy* (Moscow: Pedagogika-Press, 1995), 340.
5. Ibid., 341.
6. Aleksandr Gertsen, "Gonenie na krymskikh tatar," *Kolokol* 22 December 1861, 966–67.
7. Voloshin, "Kul'tura, iskusstvo, pamiatniki Kryma," 341.
8. Ibid., 342.
9. I borrow here from Brodskii's concept of the "second Petersburg" in Joseph Brodsky, "A Guide to a Renamed City," *Less Than One: Selected Essays* (London: Penguin, 1987), 93.
10. Yi-Fu Tuan, *Space and Place: The Perspective of Experience* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2001), 4.
11. Viktor V. Vinogradov, "Lichnost'," *Istoriia slov* (Moscow: Tolk, 1994), 279.
12. Clifford Geertz, "Ideology as a Cultural System," in *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays* (New York: Basic Books, 1973), 193–233; Rogers Brubaker and Frederick

Cooper, "Beyond 'Identity,'" *Theory and Society* 29 (2000): 1. Walker Conner titles his fourth chapter "Terminological Chaos" in *Ethnonationalism: The Quest for Understanding* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994), 89–117.

13. Charles King, *The Black Sea: A History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004).

14. Andreas Schönle, "Catherine's Appropriation of the Crimea," *Slavic Review* 60.1 (2001): 10–11.

15. Iurri M. Lotman, *Izbrannye stat'i*, 3 vols. (Tallinn: Aleksandra, 1993), 3:305.

16. Ivan N. Rozanov, *Russkaia lirika: Ot poezii bezlichoi k ispovedi serdtsa* (Moscow: Zadruga, 1914), 377.

17. "S. S. Bobrov," in *Poety 1790–1810-kh godov*, ed. Iuri M. Lotman (Leningrad: Sovetskii pisatel', 1971), 68.

18. Aleksandr Liusyi, *Pervyi poet Tavridy* (Simferopol': Oblpoligrafizdat, 1991), 5.

19. Aleksandr Liusyi, *Krymskii tekst v russkoi literature* (Saint Petersburg: Aleteiia, 2003), 32.

20. Liusyi, *Krymskii tekst v russkoi literature*, 40. I refer to Bobrov's poem by its original title, *Tavrida*, which is more widely known.

21. Liusyi, *Krymskii tekst v russkoi literature*, 66.

22. Semen Bobrov, *Tavrida*, in *Rassvet polnochi /Khersonida*, vol. 2, ed. Vladimir L. Korovin (Moscow: Nauka, 2008), 16. Hereafter cited by page number.

23. Mark G. Al'tshuller and Iuri M. Lotman, "Primechaniia," *Poety 1790–1810-kh godov*, 819; John Bayley, *Pushkin: A Comparative Commentary* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971), 85.

24. Aleksandr Pushkin, *Bakhchisaraiskii fontan*, in Aleksandr Pushkin, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, vol. 4 (Moscow: Akademiia nauk SSR, 1949), 177. Hereafter cited by page number.

25. Stephanie Sandler, "The Two Women of Bakhchisarai," *Canadian Slavonic Papers* 29.2–3 (1987): 241.

26. For an example of a view on the khan's putative marginality, see Bayley, *Pushkin*, 83.

27. Vissarion Belinskii, "Sochineniia Aleksandra Pushkina: Stat'ia shestaia," in *Sobranie sochinenii*, 9 vols. (Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1981), 6:318.

28. Leslie Pierce, *The Imperial Harem: Women and Sovereignty in the Ottoman Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 3.

29. Stephanie Sandler, *Distant Pleasures: Alexander Pushkin and the Writing of Exile* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1989), 77.

30. William Shakespeare, *The Complete Works* (London: Collins, 2006), 1062 (3.1.60–64), emphasis added.

31. Svetlana Boym, *The Future of Nostalgia* (New York: Basic Books, 2001), 50.

32. Boym, *The Future of Nostalgia*, 50.

33. Vladimir Nabokov, "Commentary," in *Eugene Onegin*, 4 vols., trans. Vladimir Nabokov (New York: Pantheon, 1964), 3:256.

34. Pushkin, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, 8:28.

35. Vasilli I. Tumanskii, *Stikhotvoreniia i pis'ma*, ed. Sergei N. Brailovskago (Saint Petersburg: Izdanie A. S. Suvorina, 1912), 135–36.

36. Vladimir Benediktov, "Oreanda," *Sochineniia V. G. Benediktova*, vol. 1 (Saint Petersburg: M. O. Vol'f, 1902), 130–31.

37. Aleksandr Pushkin, *Pushkin on Literature*, trans. and ed. Tatiana Wolff (London: Athlone Press, 1986), 253.

38. Monika Greenleaf, *Pushkin and Romantic Fashion: Fragment, Elegy, Orient, Irony* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1994), 2.

39. Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar, *19uncu asır Türk edebiyatı tarihi* (İstanbul: Çağlayan kitabevi, 1976), 441.

40. Bernard Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968), 358.

41. Namik Kemal, *Vatan yahut Silistre*, ed. Kenan Akyüz (İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Basımevi, 1969), 4. Hereafter cited by page number.

42. Tanpınar, *19uncu asır Türk edebiyatı tarihi*, 407.

43. Alan Fisher, *The Crimean Tatars* (Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press, 1978), 14. See also Alan Fisher, *The Russian Annexation of the Crimea: 1772–1783* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970), 15.

44. Alan Fisher, *Between Russians, Ottomans, and Turks: Crimea and Crimean Tatars* (Istanbul: Isis Press, 1998), 79.

45. Fisher, *The Crimean Tatars*, 17.

46. Tanpınar, *19uncu asır Türk edebiyatı tarihi*, 400. See also Ahmet Ö. Evin, *Origins and Development of the Turkish Novel* (Minneapolis, MN: Bibliotheca Islamica, 1983), 11.

47. Erik J. Zürcher, *Turkey: A Modern History*, 2nd ed. (London: I. B. Tauris, 2005), 74.

48. Tanpınar, *19uncu asır Türk edebiyatı tarihi*, 410.

49. Cyril Glassé, *The Concise Encyclopædia of Islam* (London: Stacey International, 1989), 203, 407.

50. Yusuf Akçura, *Üç tarz-ı siyaset* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1976), 28.

51. Akçura, *Üç tarz-ı siyaset*, 28–30.

52. Akçura, *Üç tarz-ı siyaset*, 31.

53. Akçura, *Üç tarz-ı siyaset*, 33.

54. Akçura, *Üç tarz-ı siyaset*, 35

55. In *Türkçülüğün esasları*, Gökalp dismisses those who conceive of the nation primarily according to territory as "geographic nationalists." See Taha Parla, *The Social and Political Thought of Ziya Gökalp, 1876–1924* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1985), 36.

56. Arzu Öztürkmen, "Folklore on Trial: Pertev Naili Boratav and the Denationalization of Turkish Folklore," *Journal of Folklore Research* 42.2 (2005): 203, 211n13; Jacob Landau, *Pan-Turkism: From Irredentism to Cooperation* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995), 38.

57. The *destan* is traditionally recited by an *ozan* (reciter) with the string folk instrument *kopuz*. See H. B. Paksoy, "Chora Batir: A Tatar Admonition to Future Generations," *Studies in Comparative Communism* 19.3–4 (1986): 254.

58. Ziya Gökalp, *Seçme yazılar*, ed. Kâzım Nami Duru (İstanbul: Kenan Basımevi, 1940), 34. Hereafter cited by page number. "Altın Destan" first appeared in the journal *Genç kalemler* (*Young Pens*) in 1911. See Enver Behnan Şapolyo, *Ziya Gökalp: İttihat ve terakki ve meşrutiyet tarihi* (İstanbul: Güven Basımevi, 1943), 257.

59. Landau, *Pan-Turkism*, 1, emphasis added.

60. In *Türkçülüğün esasları* Gökalp asserts that a united Turan under "Genghiz and Tamerlane" had once been a reality. See Ziya Gökalp, *The Principles of Turkism*, trans. Robert Devereaux, (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1968), 20–21.

61. Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, rev. ed. (London: Verso, 1991), 5.

62. Yurdakul is referred to as the "first nationalist poet of Turkey" in Uli Schamiloglu, "Tatar or Turk? Competing Identities in the Muslim Turkic Word during the Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries," in *The Turkic Speaking Peoples: 2,000 Years of Art and Culture from Inner Asia to the Balkans*, ed. Ergun Çağatay and Doğan Kuban (Munich: Prestel, 2006), 240. For the sake of clarity and consistency, I refer to him by his pen name "Yurdakul" in this article, although "Mehmet Emin" or "Emin Bey" is preferred in Turkish sources.

63. Mehmet Emin Yurdakul, "Nifâk," in *Şiirler*, vol. 1 of *Mehmed Emin Yurdakul'un eserleri* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1969), 106.

64. Mehmet Emin Yurdakul, "Ey Türk Uyan!" in *Mehmed Emin Yurdakul'un eserleri*, 129. Hereafter cited by page number.

65. Edward J. Lazzerini, "Ismail Bey Gasprinskii (Gapirali): The Discourse of Modernism and the Russians," in *Tatars of the Crimea: Their Struggle for Survival*, ed. Edward Allworth (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1988), 151.

66. Mehmet Emin Yurdakul, "İsmail Gaspirinski'ye," in *Mehmed Emin Yurdakul'un eserleri*, 123–24. Hereafter cited by page number.

67. Kırımlı Cafer Seydahmet, *Gaspıralı İsmail Bey* (İstanbul: Matbaacılık ve Neşriyat Türk Anomim Şirketi, 1934), 84.

68. Mehmet Emin Yurdakul, "Petersburg'a," in *Mehmed Emin Yurdakul'un eserleri*, 251; Mehmet Emin Yurdakul, "Çar'a," in *Mehmed Emin Yurdakul'un eserleri*, 250–51. For more on Gaspıralı, see also Alan W. Fisher, "A Model Leader for Asia, Ismail Gaspirali," in *The Tatars of Crimea: Return to the Homeland*, 2nd ed., ed. Edward Allworth (Durham, NC: Duke UP, 1998), 34, and Charles Warren Hostler, *The Turks of Central Asia*, rev. ed. (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1993), 101.

69. Uli Schamiloglu, "Tatar or Turk? Competing Identities in the Muslim Turkic Word during the Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries," *The Turkic Speaking Peoples: 2,000 Years of Art and Culture from Inner Asia to the Balkans* (Munich: Prestel, 2006), 238.

70. Lavrentii Beriia, "Tovarishchu Stalinu, 10 maia 1944g," in *Deportasiia narodov Kryma: Dokumenty, fakty, kommentarii*, ed. Nikolai F. Bugai (Moscow: Insan, 2002), 85, emphasis added; Lavrentii Beriia, "Postanovlenie GOKO No. 5859ss, 11 maia 1944g," in *Deportasiia narodov Kryma*, 70–73.

71. "ILO Convention No. 169," in S. James Anaya, *Indigenous Peoples in International Law*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 306–7.