

“A BRIDGE BETWEEN US”:

LITERATURE IN THE UKRAINIAN–CRIMEAN TATAR ENCOUNTER

Rory Finnin

ABSTRACT

At a time of geopolitical instability in the Black Sea region, the question of the solidarity between two ethnically, religiously, and linguistically divergent peoples—Ukrainians and Crimean Tatars—will influence the extent to which Crimea remains a global flashpoint for the foreseeable future. Despite its significance, however, this solidary relationship has been either overlooked as a discrete object of inquiry or dismissed as a mere political “marriage of convenience” in research literature. This article seeks to delve more deeply into the dynamics of Ukrainian–Crimean Tatar relations and to direct special attention to its cultural drivers, particularly in the realm of literature.

Representing the first comparative study of Ukrainian and Crimean Tatar literatures in the English language, this article posits that works by such prominent figures as Lesia Ukraïнка and Şamil Alâdin have actively engaged in intricate, mutual processes of “nominal metaphorization” since the late nineteenth century. These processes, which center on representations of experiences of victimization, help account not only for the practical and political nature of the Ukrainian–Crimean Tatar alliance, but also for its affective and empathic power.

Keywords: Ukrainian literature, Crimean Tatar literature, solidarity, Black Sea studies

On the early morning of March 18, 2015, exactly one year after Russia’s annexation of Ukraine’s Autonomous Republic of Crimea, a group of three men placed a “frozen monument” measuring at least six feet high near the building of the Administration of the President in Ukraine’s capital

Kyiv (Kiev).¹ Encased within a tower of ice were two national symbols, the Ukrainian *tryzub* (trident) and the Crimean Tatar *terek-tamga*, suspended in tense relation. Each emblem was positioned obliquely relative to the other. Viewed from a distance, they appeared to overlap; viewed at close proximity, they revealed themselves separated by inches of ice. In this way, the monument invited the spectator's engagement and interactivity: from the one side, it showcased a Ukrainian *tryzub* nested in the trace of the *tamga*; from the other, it showcased a Crimean Tatar *tamga* nested in the trace of the *tryzub*.

Journalists reported that the structure “symbolized the frozen conflict in Crimea” one year after the annexation,² but they overlooked another, more basic message: an articulation of solidarity between Ukrainians and Crimean Tatars founded on metaphor, on a play of predication leveraging difference to impart similarity. Metaphors are instrumental in the conceptualization of relations of solidarity, and the metaphor in Kyiv was powerfully ambivalent, even admonitory. In a lustrous, transparent medium signifying at once permanence and impermanence, the ice monument suggested that *Ukrainians are Crimean Tatars* and *Crimean Tatars are Ukrainians*—but not quite, and perhaps not for long.

At a time of increasing geopolitical instability in the Black Sea region, the question of the solidarity between these two ethnically, religiously, and linguistically divergent peoples—one a predominantly East Slavic nation numbering over forty-two million in Ukraine, the other a Sunni Muslim Turkic-speaking nation numbering approximately 300,000 in Ukraine—bears considerable strategic import. It also has a long, entangled history. As Orest Subtelny remarks, “when the Ukrainians sought to defend their political individuality [in the early modern period], it was to the Crimean Tatars that they turned most often for support.”³ Similarly, legendary dissident and leader of the Crimean Tatars Mustafa Dzhemiliev (Cemiloğlu) notes that, following the collapse of the Russian Empire in 1917, “the main allies of the Crimean Tatars were Ukrainian organizations in Crimea and in Ukraine itself.”⁴ In more recent decades, the

relationship has flourished further. Scholars such as Svetlana Chervonnaia describe the “firm [ustoichivyi] alliance” between the Ukrainian state and the elected representatives of the Crimean Tatar people after the dissolution of the Soviet Union as a “unique, almost singular example in the entire post-Soviet ethno-political space of a small nation’s loyalty to a young independent state.”⁵ Crimean Tatar poet Samad Şukur expresses this loyalty in dramatic terms in “İqrarlıq” (“Declaration”), written in 1993:

Ukraina—qardaşım, soyum!
Sensiñ doğmuşım.
Eger maña rastkelgen
Duşman
Saña apansızdan
Intılsa,
Meni çağır,
Men sağım [. . .]
Seniñ serbest
Olmañ için
Men ölümge de azırım!⁶

(Ukraine—my brother, my kin! / I am your family. / If facing me / The enemy / Suddenly sets / Upon you, / Call on me, / I am by your side [. . .] / For your freedom / I am prepared to die.)

This “firm alliance” is a manifestation of a solidary bond that has defied sociocultural gravity. It has surmounted centuries of mutual stereotyping and historical antagonism, which can still resonate today. Indeed, in some currents of Ukrainian cultural memory, stories of Crimean Tatars raiding Ukrainian homes for slaves in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries have had

lasting resonance.⁷ In some currents of Crimean Tatar cultural memory, meanwhile, stories of Ukrainians participating in the dismantling of the Crimean Tatar khanate in the eighteenth century and in the dispossession of Crimean Tatar families in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries have left a deep scar. Yet the Ukrainian–Crimean Tatar political alliance has succeeded in overcoming such stories by privileging and promoting a compelling narrative of solidarity in their stead. Today, in the wake of the 2014 Russian annexation of Crimea, this alliance continues to surprise. It is experiencing unprecedented visibility in world headlines but encountering sustained pressure on the ground in Crimea and throughout Ukraine.⁸ For activists associated with the elected assembly of the Crimean Tatar people, known as the *Mejlis*, it is also coming at great political and personal cost.

In accordance with international law, Crimea is sovereign Ukrainian territory under Russian military and political occupation. In 2016, the International Criminal Court made this point clear, referring to an “ongoing state of occupation” and to “a situation within the territory of Crimea [amounting] to an international armed conflict between Ukraine and the Russian Federation.”⁹ The Crimean Tatar *Mejlis* is the most vocal and organized nonstate actor enunciating the term “occupation” and contesting it in word and deed both inside and outside the peninsula. Its “primary aim is the return of Crimea to the Ukrainian state,” according to its Chair, Refat Chubarov, who is forbidden to set foot in Crimea by de facto Russian authorities.¹⁰ Its members regularly endure displacement and exile, like Chubarov, or arrest and imprisonment, like Il’mi Umerov, Deputy Chair of the *Mejlis*. Interrogated by Russian Security Services in May 2016, Umerov stated that “I do not consider Crimea part of the Russian Federation.”¹¹ Months later, he was subjected to forced treatment in a psychiatric hospital.¹² The *Mejlis* has pushed back against such measures, and not without controversy. In late 2015, for instance, Crimean Tatar activists launched an economic and energy blockade of Crimea, which caused power outages

across the peninsula and prompted a state of emergency. The *Mejlis* was subsequently banned as an “extremist” organization by the Russian Supreme Court.¹³

Such events make clear that the direction of Ukrainian–Crimean Tatar solidarity will influence the extent to which Crimea remains a global flash point for the foreseeable future. Yet despite its significance, this relationship has been either taken for granted and overlooked as a discrete object of inquiry or dismissed casually as a mere political “marriage of convenience” in research literature.¹⁴ This study seeks to delve more deeply into the dynamics of Ukrainian–Crimean Tatar relations and to direct special attention to its cultural drivers, particularly in the realm of literature. In part, it is meant as a modest intervention in the field of Ukrainian Studies, which has largely neglected *kryms’kotataroznavstvo* (Crimean Tatar Studies) and Crimean Tatar–language literature since the groundbreaking scholarship of Ukrainian polymath Ahatanhel Kryms’kyi (1871–1942) in the early Soviet period.¹⁵ This neglect has been less intentional than situational, emblematic of the long aftermath of Stalinist state violence that suffocated Ukrainian national culture and cast Crimean Tatars as Orwell’s “unpersons” after their brutal 1944 deportation from Crimea at the hands of Stalin’s NKVD, which claimed the lives of tens of thousands of victims. Overcoming the demographic, political, and cultural consequences of the deportation in the second half of the twentieth century was a mission for the entire Crimean Tatar people, who after decades of organized pacifist action began to return *en masse* to their ancestral homeland in the late 1980s.

The figure of Ahatanhel Kryms’kyi will help introduce the two parts of this study. The first is an analysis of emblematic Ukrainian literary representations of the Crimean Tatars; the second, an analysis of emblematic Crimean Tatar literary representations of Ukrainians. In 1919, Kryms’kyi argued that a “complete, multisided history of Ukraine is impossible” without a knowledge of the Crimean Tatars.¹⁶ Nearly seventy years later, the Crimean Tatar poet Nuzet Umerov put the matter more poignantly: “In thousands of unseen threads, the fate and tragedy of

the Crimean Tatar people are bound up with the tragedy and fate of the Ukrainian people.”¹⁷

Among the charges of a comparatist in the field of Ukrainian Studies is to trace such threads in Ukrainian and Crimean Tatar cultures and to stitch together part of the patchwork that has often been a vibrant Ukrainian–Crimean Tatar interliterary community.

Informing my examination of these selected texts are two key presuppositions. The first is that the term “solidarity” itself deserves clarification. Philosophers such as Richard Rorty, for instance, use it to refer to nearly all prosocial action and behavior,¹⁸ while the EU constitution, to cite another example, attaches it to disaster relief and collective self-defense.¹⁹ In this article, I define solidarity as *an active convergence of interests and fellow feeling between groups that bridges a distance*. What conditions this convergence at a fundamental level is something I term *nominal metaphorization*, a process of aligning divergent identity positions through allusions to and projections of simultaneous resemblance and difference, through a language of “seeing-as” and “seeing-not-as.”²⁰ We need only think of some of the most memorable and most public declarations of solidarity—among them, John F. Kennedy’s 1963 statement “Ich bin ein Berliner” or *Le Monde*’s headline on September 12, 2001, “Nous sommes tous américains”—to see the prominent position of nominal metaphors in the rhetorical dynamics of social identification and integration. Today, in the wake of terrorist attacks around the world, we routinely default to the formulation of “x is y” or more specifically “we are all y” in professing solidarity between groups. In homage to the 2001 *Le Monde* headline, for instance, Barack Obama proclaimed “Nous sommes tous Français” after the Paris attacks of November 2015; in March 2016, after the attacks in Brussels, a *San Francisco Chronicle* editorial bore the headline “We are all Belgians.” Similar examples populate Twitter feeds and Facebook profiles around the world. In Ukraine, a nominal metaphor has circulated with reference to the Crimean Tatars for decades in political and public discourse, at times with a tongue-in-cheek tone: “Naibil’shymy ukrainsiamy v Krymu ie kryms’ki tatory.” (“The greatest Ukrainians in Crimea are Crimean Tatars.”)²¹

My second presupposition is that the efficiency of a nominal metaphor—in solidarity work as in all figurative expression—hinges on an apprehension of ground between tenor (“Ich”) and vehicle (“ein Berliner”). This ground is rarely smooth or even. It breaks with customary patterns of categorization and embraces fresh, even unusual possibilities of affiliation. Indeed, in the *Poetics*, Aristotle notes the importance of the “foreign” (*allogriou*) in metaphorical transference, the way in which the tenor must be conventionally estranged from the vehicle for the relation to pursue new horizons of signification.²² The ground of Kennedy’s famous metaphor, for example, is somewhere between a pronounced incongruity—that of a war veteran American President and a resident of Berlin less than two decades after German surrender—and a newly professed congruity—that of “free men” living on the “front lines” of liberty.

As I conceive it here, nominal metaphORIZATION is a *process* by which the reader is invited to assemble and produce a nominal metaphor—for example, *Ukrainians are Crimean Tatars*—that cultivates a solidary relation “in the lair of the skull,” to use Benedict Anderson’s memorable turn of phrase.²³ In the pages ahead, I wish to show that Ukrainian-language and Crimean Tatar-language literary texts have actively engaged in intricate, mutual processes of nominal metaphORIZATION for many decades, particularly from the late nineteenth century. I argue that, to cultivate metaphorical ground, these texts represent and explore particular experiences of *victimization* that invite empathy for the Other. To be clear, these texts do not engage in an indulgent nationalist rhetoric of collective self-suffering or a reductive two-way competition of victimizations. Rather, this literary corpus is explicitly Other-directed; it simulates and often models an empathic response to the suffering of the out-group, a *feeling with* rather than a mere *feeling for*.

Ukrainian as tenor, Crimean Tatar as vehicle

Ahatanhel Kryms'kyi was not only a Ukrainian polymath—Orientalist, Turkologist, translator, philosopher—who cast the Crimean Tatars as pivotal to a “complete, multisided” history of Ukraine. He was also a talented modernist poet who enjoyed a lifelong friendship, even a remarkable “spiritual affinity,” with a fellow luminary of the *fin-de-siècle*, Lesia Ukraïнка, or “Notre Dame d’Ukraine,” in the words of one prominent Ukrainian intellectual.²⁴ Although they saw each other infrequently, Kryms'kyi and Ukraïнка maintained for decades an epistolary relationship rich in erudite reflections on classical history and biblical literature and in constructive criticisms of their respective literary works. They corresponded with each other until the very last days of Ukraïнка’s life in 1913. Of all the tributes Kryms'kyi paid to Ukraïнка, perhaps none stands out as clearly as this concise remark he made to her sister only months before his own death: “Lesia was very much a person of principle.”²⁵

One of these principles was respect for indigeneity. Ukraïнка is one of a number of leading Ukrainian writers who, in privileging the bond between peoples and their ancestral territories, buck a prevailing cultural trend in the region of the Black Sea in the *fin-de-siècle*. At this time, as I have shown elsewhere, Russian and Turkish writers participate in a rhetorical “de-Tatarization” of Crimea after its annexation by Catherine II in 1783, disrupting and then severing what had been represented in the arts as a long-standing isomorphic correspondence between Crimean territorial form and Tatar cultural content.²⁶ This rhetorical “de-Tatarization” accompanied a physical one over the course of the nineteenth century, as many thousands of Crimean Tatars were compelled to leave their *yeşil ada* (green island) for the *ak toprak* (white land) of the Ottoman Empire, particularly after the Crimean War (1853–1856).²⁷ Like her colleague Mykhailo Kotsiubyns'kyi, Ukraïнка does not play along. Instead, she engages in a rhetorical “re-Tatarization” of the Black Sea peninsula. She advances a counter-discourse that implicitly acknowledges the Crimean Tatars as the indigenous people of Crimea and condemns the failure in Russian literature to represent their unique culture as place-bound.

Ukraïnka's personal relationship with Crimea was fraught. Stricken with tuberculosis of the bones, she often left Kyiv to convalesce along the Black Sea coast, where the warmer climate had palliative potential. It was a place whose distance from home could provoke feelings of intense loneliness, but whose natural beauty and complex history stoked the fire of her literary talent. Her short story "Nad morem" ("At the Sea"), which was prepared for publication in the journal *Literaturno-naukovyi visnyk* in 1901 by Ivan Franko, features a nameless first-person narrator on a visit to Crimea who similarly finds pleasure on the shores of a "lonely" (*samisin'kyi*) Black Sea.²⁸ Interrupting this pleasure, however, are her fellow holidaymakers, who parade a willful ignorance of the distinctive culture of the peninsula. Their only desire is to create a simulacrum of the imperial center on the Black Sea. She complains that their ships toss "corks, peels, old shoes, and all kinds of human misery" (*zatyckhy, lushpynnia, stari cherevyky, i vsiaki zlydni liuds'ki*) against the shore, while their military orchestras disrupt the tranquility of the natural environment with intrusive horns.²⁹

The plot of "Nad morem" revolves around a relationship—and eventual conflict—between this highly introspective Ukrainian narrator and one of these holidaymakers, a Russian aristocrat from Moscow named Alla Mykhailivna (Mikhailovna), who is drawn to the pretensions of high society. The two spend time together sewing and strolling around Yalta's parks and promenades, but the narrator joins Alla Mykhailivna only reluctantly, unable to decline her invitations with conviction. Ukraïnka casts the Muscovite debutante as a superficial, self-absorbed Francophile who mistreats her servants, considers Ivan Turgenev's "Bezhin Lug" ("Bezhin Meadow")³⁰ a lightweight children's story, and falls for a womanizer (*sertseïd*) seeking a casual tryst. Alla Mykhailivna is Chekhov's Anna Sergeevna without redeeming qualities—or a dog.³¹ She and the narrator fall out toward the conclusion of "Nad morem," when the latter can no longer stand the pettiness of their conversations and the charade of their acquaintance.

Beneath this relatively banal plot lies not only a study of divergent conceptions of womanhood at the *fin-de-siècle* but also a quietly searing portrait of colonialism on the Black Sea peninsula. The short story pivots on a moment in which a Crimean Tatar boy bumps into Alla Mykhailivna and the narrator on the street, carrying a bucket of paint in one hand and a large brush in the other. Reacting so suddenly that she nearly pushes the narrator off the sidewalk, Alla Mykhailivna screams for the boy to move and mutters an insult (“muzhlan,” dolt). What transpires is a scene that will haunt the narrator:

Khlopets' trokhy zbochyv i ruku z kvachem zalozhyv za spynu, shchob ne zachepty panna, ale pry tomu kynuv takyi pohliad u nash bik, shcho meni stalo niyakovo. Ne znaiu, chy zavvazhyla toi pohliad Alla Mykhailivna i chy vmila vona prochytaty v n'omu i zrozumity toi strashnyi, fatal'nyi antahonizm,—temnishyi, nizh chorni ochi molodoho robitnyka. Ne znaiu, chy i khlopets' pobachyv toi pohliad, shcho panna kynula iomu vkupi z prezyrlyvymy slovamy. Ale ia bachyla obyдва pohliady, i meni stalo strashno . . .³²

(The boy got out of the way somewhat and put the hand with the brush behind his back so as not to touch the young lady, but with this, he cast such a gaze at us that I felt ill at ease. I do not know whether Alla Mykhailivna noticed this gaze or whether she could read it and understand that terrible, fatal antagonism—darker than the black eyes of the young worker. I do not know whether the boy caught sight of the gaze that [Alla Mykhailivna] cast at him as well with her contemptuous words. But I saw both gazes, and I was horrified . . .)

Ukraïnka frames this specular confrontation, which underscores the role of sight in the production of cultural difference, as a psychological representation of the colonial relation. Alla

Mykhailivna's *pohliad* is what Frantz Fanon, expanding on Freud's work on the formation of the gendered subject, identifies as the racial "gaze" in *Peau noire, masques blancs* (*Black Skin, White Masks*),³³ the look of the white colonizer that reifies and fixes the black colonized as dye does a chemical substance ("dans le sens où l'on fixe une preparation par un colorant").³⁴ For Fanon, the gaze of the colonizer objectifies the colonized and triggers a process of identification through which the latter "recognizes" himself as lacking, deficient, inferior. The *pohliad* of the Crimean Tatar boy, meanwhile, is nothing less than what Homi Bhabha, referring to the work of Fanon, describes as "the threatened return of the look," a gesture of resistance to this colonial identification that manifests "a potentially conflictual, disturbing force."³⁵ Ukraïнка's narrator respects the violent power of this resistance and envisions Alla Mykhailivna as "Little Red Riding Hood" chasing motley-colored butterflies into a forest, oblivious to what happens to the colonizer when "the bloody scarlet of the sky overtakes the forest, the birds grow quiet . . . and amid the dark brush, the eyes of the wolf ignite with a wild fire" ("kryvava zahrava rozilliet'sia po lisi, ptashky zamovknyt' . . . a sered temnykh kushchiv zasvitiat'sia dykym vohnem vovchi ochi").³⁶

In this moment, Ukraïнка not only captures the "particular regime of visibility deployed in colonial discourse" but also dramatizes an encounter that exposes the narrator's identification and solidarity with the Crimean Tatar people.³⁷ This identification is abstract, implicit, and painful:

Khlopets' davno vzhe pomynuv nas, a ia vse dumala pro ioho temnyi pohliad, i, mozhe, cherez te pusti rechi, bezzhurne shchebetannia moieï besidnytsi robyly na mene iakes' tiazhke, slyve trahichne vrazhennia . . .³⁸

(The boy had long ceased taking notice of us, but I could not stop thinking about his dark gaze, and perhaps because of this, the vacuous affairs and carefree ramblings of my conversation partner evoked in me a kind of oppressive, almost tragic impression . . .)

Toward the end of the story, while engaging in a heated argument with Alla Mykhailivna that finally spells the end of their contrived friendship, the narrator feels a building sense of frustration and anger that she cannot control. After impulsively proclaiming to Alla Mykhailivna that their conversations have been vapid and pointless, she remarks in an aside: “Ia ne povtoryla i spustyla ochi dodolu, bo chula, shcho u mene buv ‘temnyi pohliad,’ povnyi neprymyrymoho, fatal’noho antagonizmu” (“I did not say another word and cast my eyes to the floor because I sensed that I had ‘the dark gaze,’ full of an irrepressible, fatal antagonism”).³⁹ Like the Crimean Tatar boy, she harbors an unrealized, deep-seated antipathy to the Muscovite debutante and identifies with his “dark gaze.” Explicit reasons for this identification are never given.

Here we can discern a process of nominal metaphorization in action. It invites the reader to see that, in the context of colonialism, *Ukrainians are Crimean Tatars*. More often than not, this process operates in the realm of the implicit. It not only privileges the connotative above the constative but also derives force from intertextual play. Years before the publication of “Nad morem,” for instance, Ukraïnka enlists the works of Aleksandr Pushkin and Taras Shevchenko in a network of subtexts and allusions to identify and align with the Crimean Tatars in her verse. Her cycle *Kryms’ki spohady* (*Crimean Reminiscences*, 1893)⁴⁰ is, in fact, a powerful retort to Aleksandr Pushkin’s *Bakhchisaraiskii fontan* (*The Fountain of Bakhchisarai*, 1824)⁴¹ fashioned and articulated in the language of Taras Shevchenko’s *Try lita* (*Three Years*, 1843-45)⁴² collection.

Bakhchisaraiskii fontan, which John Bayley deems Pushkin’s “most popular” work, welcomes the reader into the palace and the harem of Crimean Tatar Khan Selim Giray, an

exoticized site of a love triangle between the khan and two women, Mariia and Zarema.⁴³ The poem bears an extradiegetical coda in which Pushkin’s lyrical persona surveys what have become the ruins of Crimean Tatar power in Bakhchisarai, the former capital of the Crimean Tatar khanate. He wanders among the passages of a palace enveloped in silence: “All is quiet around me” (*Krugom vse tikho*). He asks a series of rhetorical questions marked by a reflective nostalgia and imperial melancholy: “Gde skrylis’ khany? Gde garem? Ch’iu ten’, o drugi, videl ia?” (“Where are the khans? Where is the harem? Whose shade, o friends, do I see?”)⁴⁴ These feelings eventually give way to the lyrical persona’s enthusiastic embrace of the future, which becomes symbolized in the form of an anonymous horseman riding along the shore in sea spray.

Ukraïinka responds directly to these nostalgic questions in “Bakhchysarais’kyi dvorets” (“The Palace of Bakhchisarai”), the second sonnet in her *Kryms’ki spohady* cycle, which was first published in her debut collection of verse *Na krylakh pisen’* (*On the Wings of Song*)⁴⁵. Her lyrical persona also roams the seat of power of the Giray dynasty and contemplates the significance of its ruins—but perceives that these ruins are, as it were, “not ruined” (*khoch ne zruinovana*). She gestures to the presence of Pushkin’s lyrical persona, referring to him as a “singer” (*spivets’*) from a foreign land searching in vain for “the apparition of a beloved captive girl” (*tin’ branky liuboï*). She then issues her counterpart a warning. What resides amid these Crimean Tatar burial grounds, she claims, is instead a “bloody apparition” (*tin’ kryvava*):

Ni, tuta ne lezhyt' krasa harema,
 Mariia smutna chy palka Zarema,—
 Tut spochyva bakhchysarais'ka slava!⁴⁶

(No, here lies not the beauty of the harem, / Mournful Mariia or fiery Zarema, / Here rests the glory of Bakhchysarai!)

Ukraïinka's lyrical persona laments the decaying monuments of Crimea's past, but unlike Pushkin, she does not temper this grief by subsequently hailing the promise of the Russian imperial future. Rather, her mourning elicits, especially for the Ukrainian reader, a premonition of a return of Bakhchysarai's lost Tatar glory, a "re-Tatarization" of the Black Sea peninsula.

What makes this reading possible are a series of intertexts with Taras Shevchenko, the greatest Ukrainian poet of the Romantic period. In the early 1890s, when *Kryms'ki spohady* was composed, Ukraïinka frequently emulated Shevchenko's passion for apostrophe and concern for Ukraine as the site of a moral community, not to mention his affinity for desperate interrogatives and frustrated exclamations. Here is Ukraïinka's "Sl'ozy-perly" ("Tear-pearls"):

O liude mii bidnyi, moia ty rodyno,
Braty moi vbohi, zakuti v kaidany!
...
Koly zh se mynet'sia? Chy zhynem bez doli?
Prokliattia rukam, shcho spadaiut' bez syly!
Navishcho rodytys' i zhyty v mohyli?⁴⁷

(O my poor people, you, my family, / My wretched brothers, fettered in chains! / . . . / When will it ever change? Will we perish without good fortune? / A curse upon the hands that weakly shrink away! / Why were we born only to live in the grave?)

The image of the grave mound or *mohyla* deployed in the last line is a prominent motif in the poetry of Shevchenko, and here Ukraïinka seizes on its paradoxical meaning for him as a site of life, especially life-in-potential, as well as death. For example, in his elegy to an old capital of the

Cossack Hetmanate, “Chyhryne, Chyhryne” (“O Chyhyrn”), Shevchenko’s lyrical persona observes the decomposition of the high *mohyly* scattered across the steppe and locates in them Cossack glory:

Rozsypaiut’sia mohyly,
Vysoki mohyly—
Tvoia slava . . . ⁴⁸

(The grave mounds crumble, / The tall grave mounds— / Your glory . . .)

This decomposition does not necessarily portend a disappearance or destruction of the contents of these grave mounds; as George Grabowicz astutely observes, it can spell a revelation and resurrection of what had been concealed in them.⁴⁹ The conclusion of Shevchenko’s “Rozryta mohyla” (“The Plundered Grave Mound,” 1843)⁵⁰ highlights this mysterious promise most vividly, as his lyrical persona alludes to the immanent emancipative powers of “that which was buried” (*te, shcho tam skhoronyly*) in a grave ransacked by outsiders in search of treasure.

Ukraïnka’s reference to Crimean Tatar glory must be read with this Shevchenkian intertext in mind. The Tatar culture embedded deeply and literally in Crimean territory is not gone but dormant, awaiting excavation and release. The reason for this subterranean existence is given elsewhere in *Kryms’ki spohady*: the grave mound offers protection from suffering and victimization. In “Nehoda” (“Foul Weather,” 1891), the fifth poem in Ukraïnka’s cycle, the land of the Crimean Tatars is described as languishing in slavery, crippled like a valiant steed in a desert whirlwind. Against all odds, the horse endures:

V n’omu sertse zhyveie shche b’iet’sia,
V n’omu krov ne zastyhla zhyvaia . . . ⁵¹

(A living heart still beats in his chest, / the living blood does not congeal in his veins)

Besieging the fallen horse, however, is a “black band of birds of prey” (*ptastva khyzhoho chornaia zhraia*), creatures highly evocative of the symbolic crows responsible for Ukraine’s misery in Shevchenko’s “Velykyi l’okh” (“The Great Vault,” 1845)⁵² and of the eagle that tears the flesh of Prometheus in his “Kavkaz” (“The Caucasus,” 1845). In the latter poem, a fierce indictment of colonialism and cultural chauvinism, the slavery and torture perpetrated by such winged tormentors (symbolizing imperial power) cannot overcome the strength of the righteous:

Rozbyvaie, ta ne vyp’ie
Zhyvushchoï krovi—
Vono znovu ozhyvaie
I smiiet’sia znovu.⁵³

([The eagle] rips [the flesh of Prometheus] to pieces, but does not drain / the living blood, / which comes alive and rejoices once more.)

These refrains from Shevchenko’s verse resound through Ukraïnka’s *Kryms’ki spohady* and offer her salient codes to suggest that the Crimea of the Tatars, also sustained by a “living blood,” may be ultimately capable of a similar rejuvenation and return.

The function of Shevchenko’s poetry as an intertextual facilitator of nominal metaphorization conjoining Ukrainians and Crimean Tatars continues well past Ukraïnka and the *fin-de-siècle*. In the twentieth century and beyond, the tropes, ideals, and lexis of his Romantic verse become fodder for Soviet Ukrainian dissident poets like Ivan Sokul’s’kyi, who was

artistically and politically active in the cause of Ukrainian–Crimean Tatar solidarity. Born near Dnipropetrovs’k in 1940, Sokul’s’kyi was arrested in 1969 for coauthoring “Lyst tvorchoï molodi Dnipropetrovs’ku” (“Letter of the Creative Youth of Dnipropetrovs’k”), a political critique written under the influence of Ivan Dziuba’s *Internatsionalizm chy russifikatsiia?* (*Internationalism or Russification?*)⁵⁴ and Oles Honchar’s novel *Sobor (Cathedral)*.⁵⁵ He was sentenced to four-and-a-half years in the Gulag and released in 1973. Shortly after joining the Ukrainian Helsinki Group (UHG) in 1979, Sokul’s’kyi was arrested again. His second sentence was more severe: ten years in Chistopolsk prison and five years of exile for “the anti-Soviet content of his verse.”⁵⁶ It was only in 1988, upon a pardon by Mikhail Gorbachev, that he returned home to Dnipropetrovs’k and entered public life. In 1989, three years before his death, he became a member of the political party *Narodnyi Rukh Ukraïny* (People’s Movement of Ukraine, or Rukh), which was born from UHG principles and remains to this day a key ally of the Crimean Tatar *Mejlis*.⁵⁷

In 1968, at the same time as he was composing “Lyst tvorchoï molodi Dnipropetrovs’ku,” Sokul’s’kyi worked on a poem entitled “Bakhchysarai (Tsykl)” (“Bakhchysarai [A Cycle]”).⁵⁸ His friend Viktor Savchenko, a prolific author of prose fiction, vividly remembers the first time he encountered the work. During a trip to Crimea, he recalls how he and Sokul’s’kyi “were making our way down a winding road from (the mountain peak) Ai-Petri on the side of Bakhchysarai. It was raining, the asphalt was slippery [. . .] and behind me Ivan was reading [‘Bakhchysarai’], a poem dedicated to the deported Crimean Tatars. The fate of the Crimeans was as painful to him as the fate of Ukrainians (*dolia krymtsiv iomu tak samo bolila, iak i dolia ukraïntsv*).”⁵⁹ Yet the identification of these two “fates,” which is evident to Savchenko in this episode, does not find explicit expression in the poem.

Sokul’s’kyi’s “Bakhchysarai” begins with a homage to the strength and constancy of mountains like Ai-Petri, which are a site of origin for the Crimean Tatars, a cradle of their

civilization and culture—a “zone of the spirit,” in the words of Neal Ascherson.⁶⁰ This homage suddenly turns to grief, however, as Sokul’s’kyi’s lyrical persona begins to mourn the mass deportation of the Crimean Tatars in May 1944:

Hory syrotily, hory dalenily . . .
Pelenaly hory vidchai i plachi.
I za nich ostanniu materi syvily,
I krychaly dity—otodi vnochi! [. . .]

Pustkoiu tsi hory, tykhi i chuzhi.
«Zemle predkiv, shcho tebe ne znaiem!» –
Holos dalnii chuiet’sia meni—
Krov tatars’ka vdalyni rydaie . . .
Sertse v tuzi—tam, na chuzhyni!

(The mountains are orphaned, the mountains are deserted . . . / They are enveloped in tears and despair. / On that fateful night mothers went gray, / And the cries of their children pierced the night! [. . .] / Silent and strange, the mountains now stand empty. / “O ancestral land, we do not know you!” / I hear a distant voice— / The Tatar people lament from afar . . . / A heart in anguish—out there, in a foreign land!)

Sokul’s’kyi’s focus on “graying” women and screaming children reflects the particular demographics of the deportation operation, which claimed the lives of tens of thousands of victims who were mostly women, children, and the elderly. In the middle of the night on May 18, 1944—after the ordeal of a three-year occupation of Crimea by German forces during World War

II—Crimean Tatar families 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 Soviet NKVD officers.⁶¹ In villages like Tav-Bodrak (today’s Skalistoe), they were permitted only four kilograms of baggage a person; in villages like Kul-Seit (today’s Tat’ianovka), they were dragged from their homes half-dressed and permitted no personal items at all.⁶² According to witnesses, the sick and injured not fit for transit were “liquidated.”⁶³ Those who openly defied the deportation order were shot.⁶⁴

Sokul’s’kyi’s lines describing this tragedy abound in Shevchenkian intertexts. The peculiar evocation of a “heart in a foreign land” is a direct quotation from Shevchenko’s “Do Osnov’ianenka” (“To Osnov’ianenko”),⁶⁵ while the diacopic repetition of *hory* (mountains) in the line “Hory syrotily, hory dalenily . . .” nods to the famous opening of Shevchenko’s “Kavkaz” (“The Caucasus”)⁶⁶: “Za horamy hory, khmaroiu povyti, / Zasiiani horem, kroviiu polyti” (Mountains upon mountains, covered in cloud, / Sown with woe, soaked in blood”). Like Shevchenko, Sokul’s’kyi employs a skilful paronomasia in which the word *hory* (mountains) finds itself connected with *hore* (woe) to imply, through a close phonetic association, that Ai-Petri and the peaks near Bakhchysarai are a place of torment and tragedy by their very nature:⁶⁷

Hory, hory! . . . Ia shukav rozpady –

Hore liute! Vichne, iak voda . . .

(O mountains, mountains . . . I search for comfort— / O bitter woe! As eternal as water . . .)

These allusions to Shevchenko’s “Kavkaz” (The Caucasus)⁶⁸ in Sokul’s’kyi’s “Bakhchysarai” are not incidental genuflections to tradition or a canonical precursor. “Kavkaz” advances nothing less than an international solidarity of the subaltern, a global fellowship of the victim of imperial

power and conquest. It both condemns the victimization of the Muslim peoples of the Caucasus at the hands of imperial colonizers and casts Ukraine as a fellow victim bearing witness for the Other—but without any mention of Ukraine at all. Shevchenko draws an implicit parallel between the Caucasus and Ukraine, between the mountains and the steppe, by casting the former in imagery he deploys throughout his *oeuvre* to describe the latter—that is, as a landscape of suffering where justice and freedom are crippled yet not entirely overcome.⁶⁹ In “Kavkaz,” the Caucasus is a land of blood (“krov”), tears (“sl’ozy”), and woe (“hore”) forsaken by God (“Za koho zh ty rozpiavsia, / Khryste, syne bozhyi?”) where widows weep (“v sl’ozakh udov’ikh”) and their sons languish in fetters (“kaidany [kuiut’]”). In “Son” (“A Dream,” 1844),⁷⁰ Ukraine is the same land of blood, tears, and woe forsaken by God (“Chy Boh bachyt’ iz-za khmary / Nashi sl’ozy, hore?”) where widows are abused (“rozpynaiut’ vdovu”) and their sons languish in fetters (“syna kuiut”).

By employing such well-known Shevchenkian intertexts from the start, Sokul’s’kyi is able to speak a uniquely Ukrainian language of solidarity even before he evokes the victimization of the Crimean Tatars. At the conclusion of “Bakhchysarai,” his lyrical persona looks upon the ancient Crimean Tatar capital with cognitive dissonance and declares:

Ia bachu Bakhchysarai—

Ia ne bachu Bakhchysaraia!

Svit pochuiie nekhai

Pro zlochynstvo bezkraie . . .

Ia bachu Bakhchysarai—

Ia ne bachu Bakhchysaraia!

(I see Bakhchysarai— / I do not see Bakhchysarai! / Let the world hear / about this immense
crime . . . / I see Bakhchysarai— / I do not see Bakhchysarai!)

Sokul's'kyi's "Bakhchysarai" does not document the suffering of the Crimean Tatars; in fact, to a significant degree, it "resists demands for closure" by way of coded language and pregnant imagery.⁷¹ Yet it nonetheless invites an empathic response to their suffering. Through formal cues embedded in the text—particularly via intertextual allusions to Shevchenko's "Kavkaz," a work uniquely influential in the development of a Ukrainian national identity positioned as object of imperial aggression—the poem facilitates a journey of discovery toward an apprehension of the nominal metaphor, *Ukrainians are Crimean Tatars*.

Crimean Tatar as tenor, Ukrainian as vehicle

As a scholar, Ahatanhel Kryms'kyi published prolifically on Islam, Persian literature, Turkish literature, and Arabic literature, but arguably none of his academic works had more lasting resonance than *Studii z Krymu* (*Crimean Studies*), a collection of articles and resources related to Crimean Tatar culture, history, and demography released under his editorship by the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences in 1930.⁷² Today it still stands as the most groundbreaking and impactful contribution to *kryms'kotataroznavstvo* (Crimean Tatar Studies) as well as a landmark partnership between Ukrainian, Russian, and Crimean Tatar scholars. One of Kryms'kyi's Crimean Tatar collaborators in *Studii z Krymu* was the ethnographer, archaeologist, and philologist Osman Akçokraklı, who contributed a small anthology of Crimean Tatar poetry in Ukrainian translation, to which he even appended one of his own verses.

In his essay on Crimean Tatar literature in *Studii z Krymu*, Kryms'kyi makes reference to a remarkable "surprise" for which Akçokraklı was responsible: the discovery of a seventeenth-

century *destan* or epic by Crimean Tatar poet Canmuhammed (Dzhan-Mukhammed). “Soon this Crimean poem, which is so interesting for Ukrainians,” Kryms’kyi observes, “will get to see the world.”⁷³ What made the poem undoubtedly “interesting” was its distinctive subject matter: namely, the military alliance between the Crimean Tatar khanate and the Ukrainian Cossacks of the Zaporizhian Host, which helped produce out of the territory of the Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth an autonomous Ukrainian Cossack proto-state in 1649. Assuring the reader of the eventual publication of Canmuhammed’s text, Kryms’kyi remarks in a footnote: “The People’s Commissariat for Education of Crimea has given its approval.” He was correct, at least in part: only months later, a gloss of Akçokraklı’s discovery appeared in the journal *Skhidnyi svit* (*World of the East*) sandwiched between articles on the class struggle of the nineteenth-century Nogai people and the dialects of the Greeks in the southeastern Ukrainian city of Mariupol.⁷⁴

Its appearance in *Skhidnyi svit* proved to be a sensation. What made it possible was an expedition that Akçokraklı and his colleague Üsein Bodaninskiy had conducted five years earlier. In 1925, they visited Tatar villages throughout Crimea on the hunt for *cönkler*, traditional anthologies of folk and devan poetry from the era of the Crimean Tatar khanate often preserved in family homes.⁷⁵ Their expedition had only modest success until they arrived in the village of Kapsykhör (today: Morskoe) in the Sudak region, where they stumbled upon an untitled handwritten manuscript written in a Turkic language approximating the Crimean Tatar vernacular.⁷⁶ At first, Akçokraklı sought to purchase the manuscripts from its owner, a village elder named Haji Ali Efendi, but he was rebuffed. Akçokraklı and his expeditionary team were instead given a few hours to transcribe hundreds of the poem’s lines.

In introducing his gloss in *Skhidnyi svit*, Akçokraklı notes one of Canmuhammed’s most notable offerings: a vivid, detailed glimpse of Ukrainian–Crimean Tatar solidarity from a seventeenth-century perspective. In fact, Akçokraklı tussles with Russian historian Vasilii Smirnov in an effort to counter a myth of perpetual enmity between Ukrainians and Crimean

Tatars: “Historian of the Crimean Khanate V. D. Smirnov claims that ‘Crimean historians did not utter one word about the friendship of [Crimean Tatar Khan] İslâm-Giray II with the Cossacks, the eternal enemy of the Tatars’; obviously he knew nothing about Canmuhammed’s poem.”⁷⁷ Here Akçokraklı gestures to the sensitive political nature of his discovery, which recalls periods of both Ukrainian and Crimean Tatar independence and cooperation outside the orbit of Russian geopolitical space. Sadly, years after the revelation of the poem in *Skhidnyi svit*, the Stalinist regime would politicize his work more directly. In 1938, Akçokraklı was arrested under charges of Pan-Turkism, counterrevolutionary activity, and espionage. He insisted upon his innocence, calling the accusations absurd. But on April 17, 1938, Akçokraklı was shot in Simferopol’ by the NKVD alongside Üsein Bodaninskiy, his partner on the 1925 expedition, and dozens of other members of the Soviet Crimean Tatar intelligentsia.

Only a number of excerpts of Canmuhammed’s *destan* appear to have survived Akçokraklı’s death. Written loosely in a 4+4+3 meter, the extant fragments recount the heroic exploits of Tuğaybey (or Tugai-Bey, Tuhai-Bey), the military commander of Crimean Tatar Khan İslâm Giray III whom Ukrainian historian Mykhailo Hrushevs’kyi calls “the genuine soul of the Crimean-Ukrainian union.”⁷⁸ Tuğaybey joins the Ukrainian Cossack fight against the Poles, forging a strong bond of friendship with Hetman Bohdan Khmel’nyts’kyi, or “Meleske” in Canmuhammed’s rendition.⁷⁹ In lean, economical language, they are seen to lay waste to the enemy “infidel” together, presumably at the critical Battle of Zhovti Vody of 1648:

Em semaden qudret oqun attılar,
Bir saatte ol kâfiri qırdılar,
Çoq askerler anda telef odılar.⁸⁰

(And they shot powerful arrows from the sky, / In one hour alone they annihilated the infidel, /
Many warriors perished there.)

The violent discourse of “annihilation”—the verb *qırmak* has the connotation of “scraping”—is to be expected for the *destan* genre. What sets Canmuhammed’s epic apart, however, is its exposition of episodes in which both the Ukrainian Cossacks and Crimean Tatars are depicted as highly reluctant to fight in the first place. Here is a pivotal moment that precedes the clashes on battlefield, in which Khmel’nyts’kyi’s emissaries first petition İslâm Giray III for assistance:

Didiler ki, yey bizim sultanımız,
Baş urıp, selâm qıldı atamanımız.
Batavskiy seksen biñ asker ile,
Kelmek için tedrik idti bize.
İlimizi, köyimzi yıqsa kerek,
Cümlesini ep ota yaqsa kerek.
Kelecek yıl em Qırıma kelse kerek,
Qırım halqın qoymayıp alsa kerek.⁸¹

(They said: “O great Sultan, / Our ataman [Khmel’nyts’kyi] sends greetings, bowing his head. /
Batavskiy [i.e., Polish commander Stefan Potocki], with eighty thousand troops, / Is slowly
advancing upon us. / He seeks to tear down our villages and provinces, / He seeks to lay waste to
everything and everyone. / He seeks also to invade Crimea in a year, / He seeks to storm and
enslave Crimea’s people.”)

These are the first words spoken by Ukrainians in extant Crimean Tatar literature, and they are admonitions of mutual suffering. For amplificatory and dramatic effect, Canmuhammed makes extended use of a *redif*—literally, “a warrior who rides on the back of another’s saddle”—a word (*kerek*, in this case) that “rides on the back” of the rhyme *yıqsa-yaqsa, kelse-alsa* to build momentum.⁸² The prominent epistrophe turns a Ukrainian entreaty for Crimean Tatar help into something akin to a prayer.

Profound emphasis is also placed on the identity of the prospective victims of the violent conflict: the people (*halq*, the folk) whom both the khan and the hetman presume to protect. In Canmuhammed’s epic, war is not simply politics by other means; for the Ukrainian Cossacks and Crimean Tatars, it is not a geopolitical venture to extend influence, extract tribute, and enrich elites. It is a struggle for survival. The poet’s ventriloquy of these Ukrainian voices in the Crimean Tatar vernacular facilitates a mingling of the first-person plural and, by extension, the fates of both groups. Indeed, when the warning of Poland’s planned invasion of Crimea is issued at the end of the passage, any distinction between *you* and *us* is largely irrelevant. In other words, Canmuhammed casts both groups as objects of foreign aggression who forge an alliance based on an understanding of the human costs of their inaction and on their mutual self-identification as victim.

In the twentieth century, Canmuhammed’s poem becomes rich source material for Şamil Alâdin, who is celebrated as the “brightest star” (*eñ parlaq yıldız*) in Crimean Tatar literature.⁸³ He is also the Crimean Tatar writer most intertextual with Ukrainian culture. His lifelong fascination with Ukraine began shortly after the publication of his first book of poetry, *Topraq küldi, kök küldi* (*The Earth Laughed, the Sky Laughed*).⁸⁴ At the end of 1932, he joined a Red Army cavalry regiment in Starokostiantyniv in western Ukraine, not far from the site of the Battle of Pyliavtsi of 1648 in which the Ukrainian Cossacks, under Khmel’nyts’kyi’s command and supported by Tuğaybey and his Crimean Tatar allies, scored a key victory against Polish

forces. While in Starokostiantyniv, Alâdin reflects upon Ukraine and its past and future in a poem of 1934 entitled “Ey, Büyük Ukraina” (“O, Great Ukraine”):

Ey, büyük Ukraina,
Keçmişñ añılsa
Susasıñ, lakinde
Yüregiñ kederli.
Panlarğa qulluqçün
Eşkence tubinde
Yanğan ve kul olğan
Çok mujık evleri. [. . .]

Nice yıl topraqsız
Çekişken koylü de
Zincirdan qutulğan—
Yaşarğan cehresi. [. . .]

Ey, Çervonnyılar!
Sizlerge yazam men
Yürekte cırpınğan
Yaş kazak yırlarını.
Men de şay—siziñday
Cuvurdum o çölde,
Qışımli ayazda

(O, great Ukraine, / If you mention your past, / You are silent, yet your heart grieves. / In slavery to the *pany* [i.e., Polish nobles] and / Under their yoke / Many peasant homes / Burned to ash. [. . .] Long bereft of land / The tormented farmer / Was finally released from his shackles— / His face brightened once more. [. . .] O Red Army / I am writing to you / Lively Cossack songs / Ringing in my heart. / I also—just like you, / Rush across the steppe, / And in the cold of winter / I catch up to your horses.)

Alâdin was a cavalry officer, and his poem is rendered at times with a breathless enjambment that gives the lines a gallop. He traverses centuries of Ukrainian history marked by the suffering of peasants to arrive at a moment of putative Soviet liberation and rejuvenation (*yaşarğan cehresi*). While the sustained focus on Ukraine's victimization flirts with a reduction of the country and its people to an object of pity, the poem's final stanza sees Alâdin's lyrical persona turn object into subject: *Men de şay—siziñday* (I also—just like you). What begins as an exploration of a Ukrainian legacy of victimization, in other words, culminates in a Crimean Tatar declaration of mutual identification.

Alâdin's discourse in "Ey, Büyük Ukraina" recalls that of a poet already central to this study: Taras Shevchenko. In fact, the references above to draconian *pany*, grieving hearts, burning peasant settlements, and oppressive shackles all appear in Shevchenko's "Haidamaky" ("The Haidamaks," 1841),⁸⁶ an epic poem based on the eighteenth-century Ukrainian peasant revolts against Polish power in Right-Bank Ukraine, not far from Alâdin's station in Starokostiantyniv. Indeed, Alâdin was no stranger to Shevchenko's verse. In 1939, less than five years after the composition of "Ey, Büyük Ukraina," he received a medal at a meeting of the

Soviet Union of Writers in Moscow for his translation of Shevchenko's *memento mori* "Zapovit" ("Testament," 1845).⁸⁷ Written to commemorate the 125th anniversary of Shevchenko's birth, "Vasiet" was recited at the meeting in the Crimean Tatar language not by Alâdin, but by the prominent Ukrainian poet Pavlo Tychyna, who had been long interested in Crimean Tatar language and culture. In fact, when Tychyna made one of his first visits to Crimea's southern coast in 1925, he marked the beginning of his study of the Crimean Tatar language in an aside in a letter to his future wife: "Today I was at a Tatar club; in the bookstore I bought a few Tatar books. Although I still understand very little, I am reading all the same" ("khoch i malo shche rozumiiu, a chytaiu").⁸⁸

Alâdin's celebrated translation of "Zapovit" is only one indication of what might be called "Shevchenko-centrism" in twentieth-century Crimean Tatar literature. Indeed, before the advent of World War II, Shevchenko's poetry was frequently translated into the Crimean Tatar language, culminating in the publication of a selection of his poems under the title *Sailama şiiirler* in Simferopol' in 1940. Yet it was after the war—and more specifically, after the mass deportation of the Crimean Tatars in 1944—that Shevchenko took on a pointed relevance for the Crimean Tatar people. He became a literary touchstone in postwar Crimean Tatar culture due to his biography—not because of his remarkable rise from serf to painter and poet, but because of his punishment and endurance as a forced exile in Central Asia.

For decades after the 1944 deportation, Crimean Tatar-language literary texts largely avoid explicit representation of the event itself. They steer clear of direct references to the misery of the Soviet "special settlement camps" or to the hardships of displacement in Central Asia. Yet in the figure of Taras Shevchenko, who himself withstood years of harsh exile in Central Asia, Crimean Tatar literary figures found a safe metaphorical frame through which to articulate and process the pain and suffering of their own exile and to project the possibility of survival and return to their homeland. One of these figures is Riza Halid, who in 1965 meditates on

Shevchenko’s resilience in exile despite “the bitter howl of the wind amid Caspian sands” (“Kaspîi qumunda aĵi el uluvı”) and declares that “your fire gives me strength” (“küç bergen alevsin”).⁸⁹

Another is Yunus Temirkaya (1914–2004), whose career as a writer, editor, and teacher in Simferopol’ was interrupted by war and by the deportation, which he remembered in this way: “Every day in the cattle car someone died. Hunger was a torment, the heat was a burden, but it was the sadness that was the most unbearable.”⁹⁰ In 1961, he published a poem entitled “Taras Şevçenkoğa” (“To Taras Shevchenko”) in the Tashkent-based Crimean Tatar–language newspaper *Lenin baıraĵı* (*The Banner of Lenin*):

Ömür—kömür, qayĵı—buĵav olĵan zaman
Erlık solĵan, yaşlıq, gençlik elâk olĵan.
Çoq şey körgen ĵarip topraq tapmay aman,
Köz yaşına, ah-fiĵanĵa, qanĵa tolĵan.

Lâkin aziz ürlüklerniñ yol feneri,
Küneş kibi parıldıĵan, iç sönmegen.
Zalımlıqniñ, zulumluqniñ temel yeri—
Rusiyede esirlikke halq könmegen. [. . .]

Şuña sıltav etip olar quvdı seni,
Uzaqtaki yat-yabancı ölkelerge.
Yaş başıñdan bahıtsızlıq urdı seni,
Meşakhatlı qara künde kirdiñ yerge. [. . .]

Serbestlikniň azamatlı büyük oğlu,
Saňa yaňı nesillerden bin bir ürmel!⁹¹

(When life turned dark and sorrows became shackles, / Courage departed, and youth withered away. / Encountering a foreign land and witnessing so much, / Eyes filled with tears, cries, and blood. / But the sacred lantern of freedom lit the way, / Shining like the sun, never to be extinguished. / The people did not consent to this slavery in Russia, / Home of tyranny and violence [. . .] / The [tyrants] sentenced you and drove you / To strange, alien, far-flung lands. / Grief beat the youth from your face, / But you survived in gruelling conditions, in black sands. [...] / Great, courageous son of freedom, / New generations will pay you one thousand and one tributes!)

Temirkaya begins with what we can now discern, after our discussion of Lesia Ukraïнка's work, as a move typical of Shevchenko's so-called "political" poems: to paint in dark, downcast tones while leaving a hopeful ray of light in the corner of the canvas. Temirkaya describes a crippling displacement in a "foreign land" before taking solace in the enduring light of freedom. Yet the context is vague and underspecified here. Because the deictics in the text are devoid of chronological specificity, there is little to connect it to the world of Shevchenko's nineteenth century; only the title of the poem, "Taras Şevçenkoğa," invites a reading of the lines as bound to a particular historical moment or individual. Temirkaya, meanwhile, peppers the strophes with allusions to "people" (*halq*) and "nation" (*millet*), intimating that the displaced and dispossessed are many, not only one. His mention of "survival" against the odds "in black sands," as in Halid's poem, reminds the reader that the displacement in Central Asia is only temporary. In other words, Temirkaya deploys Shevchenko as a device for metaphorical identification between the Ukrainian exile and the Crimean Tatar deportee, who come to be understood as one and the same, as a

tortured but resilient victim of tyranny jettisoned to “far-flung lands” but destined to return. As the late Crimean Tatar poet and scholar Yunus Kandym observes, “when you read Shevchenko, you touch intimately the joys and the pains not only of the poet himself, but of every Ukrainian. And not only of every Ukrainian, but of every Tatar as well.”⁹²

The medal earned by Şamil Alâdin for translating Shevchenko’s “Zapovit” stood proudly in his office in Simferopol’ until he volunteered again for Soviet military service in 1941. He was never let in the building to see the medal again.⁹³ During the war, Alâdin commanded a Red Army platoon on the southwestern front, and after the Nazi retreat from Crimea, he deserved a joyous homecoming. What he experienced instead was a nightmare. In the late spring of 1944, he made his return to Simferopol’ only to find strangers living in his home. His wife and young daughter had been rounded up in the deportation and exiled to Central Asia, and a Slavic family had taken their place. Alâdin evaded imprisonment and fled from Crimean authorities, setting off eastward to find his family. He later discovered them in Uzbekistan, near death from hunger in a special settlement camp. As with so many other Crimean Tatar writers, his poetry and prose avoid representations of these experiences. When asked in 1971 why he had not used the deportation as fodder for a short story or novel, he shrugged his shoulders in exasperation and replied: “What for? And who would publish it? We are forbidden not only to write but also to think about the past” (“Nam zapreshcheno ne tol’ko pisat’, no i dumat’ o perezhytom”).⁹⁴

Thinking about the past, however, defines the very last work of Alâdin’s career. It is a text written in the wake of the dissolution of the Soviet Union and in a genre capable of manipulating, revising, and upsetting fixed historiographic paradigms and nurturing alternative sites of memory: historical fiction. Alâdin worked on the novel, entitled *Tuğay-Bey*, until his death in 1996; it was published posthumously in an incomplete form in 1999.⁹⁵ He had Osman Akçokraklı to thank for his source material—Canmuhammed’s seventeenth-century poem about the Ukrainian–Crimean Tatar campaigns against Poland, which is quoted in an opening epigraph.

Alâdin's *Tuğay-Bey* seeks to transport the reader to a period when a Ukrainian–Crimean Tatar alliance changed the map of Europe. Guided by a first-person narrator named Sahib, who identifies himself as an aide to Tuğay-Bey, the novel begins as a journey through a vibrant, diverse Crimean Tatar society under the Giray khans. Rendering snapshots of such diversity in prose was one of Alâdin's literary passions, evident in a companion historical novel entitled *İblisniñ ziyafetine davet (The Devil's Invitation to the Feast)*,⁹⁶ which finds inspiration in the life of the progressive *fin-de-siècle* poet, teacher, and activist Üsein Şamil Toktargazy (1881–1913). Alâdin's Toktargazy travels across Crimea against the backdrop of bustling markets and ivy-covered minarets, from the capital Bakhchisarai to the cosmopolitan Karasuvbazar. His itinerary plots the coordinates of a diverse, contested, but fully coherent Crimean Tatar society at the twilight of the Russian Empire.⁹⁷

In *Tuğay-Bey*, we encounter this robust society in the seventeenth century under threat from abroad. The novel's centerpiece, at least in its incomplete form, is an elaboration on Canmuhammed's depiction of the Ukrainian entreaty to Khan İslâm Giray for military assistance. Given the novel's title, Alâdin clearly planned to focus the remainder of the narrative on the famed friendship between Ukrainian Hetman Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi and Tuğay-Bey, but he died before doing so. Instead, in his version of the entreaty scene, he attends to the warm relationship between Khmel'nyts'kyi and the khan himself, who briefly focalizes the narrative and welcomes "Bogdan" (Bohdan) to this inner sanctum: "Bogdanğa arbiy işteki ustalıǵı ve zekkiliǵı için ürmeti büyük. Yigirmi beş daqqa evelsi Hmelnitskiy, han azretleriniñ qabul odasına ayaq basqanda, İslâm-Girey Bogdannı yüksek nezaketle tebrikledi. Hmelnitskiy ise hanğa ürmet ile türk ve tatar tillerinde cevap berdi" ([The khan] had great respect for Bohdan's military command and mastery. After twenty-five minutes, Khmel'nyts'kyi entered into the khan's sacred reception quarters, and İslâm Giray greeted him warmly. The hetman respectfully responded to him in the Turkish and Crimean Tatar languages).⁹⁸

Alâdin casts such linguistic exchanges not only as evidence of mutual “respect” but also as testament to a deeper mutual intelligibility and identification. Between the leaders of the Crimean Tatar and Ukrainian peoples, no translation is needed.⁹⁹ Here, for instance, is Khmel’nyts’kyi’s direct plea to the khan for military aid: “İzzetli ve saadetli İslâm Girey han! Ukraina halqı Polonya esareti altında iñlemekte. Adamlar pek ezildi . . . aç, çıplaq qaldılar,—dedi tatar tilinde, soñra ukraincege keçti. Han getmannı tercimesiz diñledi” (“Venerable and blessed Khan İslâm Giray! The Ukrainian people are groaning from Polish oppression. The people are crushed . . . hungry, naked,” he said in the Tatar language before moving into Ukrainian. The khan listened to the hetman without translation).¹⁰⁰

Here Alâdin echoes Canmuhammed’s source text and frames the Ukrainian *casus belli* as the self-defense of a “crushed,” “hungry,” “naked” victim against a foreign aggressor. He also echoes his own message of “Men de say—sizin day”—“I also, just like you”—from his early poem “Ey, Büyük Ukraina” by foregrounding a Crimean Tatar khan and a Ukrainian hetman who understand the language of the other fluently. Their mutual comprehension extends beyond *realpolitik* into the realm of speech and identity. In fact, at one pivotal moment, it produces an almost spiritual mingling of their languages and cultures. To underscore the purity of his intentions, Alâdin has Khmel’nyts’kyi swear before the khan in the name of Allah *in the Ukrainian language* before kissing the Quran three times. From this moment, a solidary bond between Ukrainians and Crimean Tatars is forged. “At a time of such tense circumstances, Ukrainians and Crimeans Tatars should be united,” remarks Alâdin’s narrator. “The two peoples . . . should desire to be always at the ready to help each other” (“vaziyet böyle kergin vaqıtta qırımtatarları ve ukrainalılar birlik olmaq, bu eki halq . . . biri-birlerine daima yardımda bulunmaları arzu etildi”).¹⁰¹

Conclusion

Şamil Alâdin's *Tuğay-Bey* may have relied on another key source text beyond Canmuhammed's poem: Pavlo Zahrebel'nyi's historical novel *Ia, Bohdan (Spovid' u slavi) (I, Bohdan [A Confession in Glory])*,¹⁰² which is also set amid the tumult of the seventeenth-century campaigns against Poland. Zahrebel'nyi was one of Soviet Ukraine's most popular and prominent official writers; he was first secretary of the Union of Writers of Ukraine from 1979 to 1986 and winner of both the Shevchenko Prize and the State Prize of the USSR. Marko Pavlyshyn describes Zahrebel'nyi's intimate psychological portrait of Khmel'nyts'kyi in the novel as "sui generis," "a broad and motley kilim of facts, events, ideas, and personages" which, in the context of Soviet literature, cannot but be called "innovative."¹⁰³ Khmel'nyts'kyi is a fully realized character in the novel, a man of gifts and faults caught in the sweep of history.

Like Alâdin's Khmel'nyts'kyi, Zahrebel'nyi's Khmel'nyts'kyi is knowledgeable of and sensitive to Crimean Tatar culture and history. He speaks Crimean Tatar fluently, translating on occasion for his fellow Cossacks and for the reader, who learns, for instance, that the name of the iconic Cossack capital Chyhyryn is a Crimean Tatar word for "many paths in the snow" (*bahato stezhok u snihu*).¹⁰⁴ He goes to great lengths, both in his personal "confession" to the reader and in his conversations with other characters, to shake his compatriots free of stolid, inaccurate, or shortsighted perceptions of the Crimean Tatars. He praises their culture and education, not to mention their noble character.¹⁰⁵

In such passages, Zahrebel'nyi's Khmel'nyts'kyi relates to Crimean Tatar society with sensitivity but also with a certain rationality, observing and underscoring linguistic, physiognomic, and historical-cultural correspondences between the two groups from a distance. Emotion, by contrast, marks his personal relationship with Tuğay-Bey. In Zahrebel'nyi's vision, Khmelnytsky sees Tuğay-Bey as an "adopted" (*nazvanyi*) brother.¹⁰⁶ They converse in Crimean Tatar, exchange gifts, and risk their lives in battle for each other:

<QO>Tuhai-bei skazav meni «brat». Ia vidzaiemnyv iomu tym samym. I na Sichi sered kozakiv ie tatory. [. . .] V iakoho boha viriat'—nikhto ne pytaie, bo v kozaka boh—shchastia i dolia, muzhnist' i vidvaha. Buvalo, shcho kazaky prosily pomochi v krymtsiv. Buvalo, shcho i sami prykhodyly v Krym ne til'ky z viinoiu, a i z pomichchiu.</QO>

(Tuğay-Bey has called me “brother.” I have called him the same. In the [Zaporozhian Cossack] Host, there are Tatars among the Cossacks. [. . .] No one asks which God [the Tatars] believe in, because for the Cossack, God is happiness and luck, stoutness and daring. Indeed, the Cossacks have asked the Crimean [Tatars] for assistance. It has also been the case that we [Cossacks] have gone to Crimea not only to wage war but also to offer assistance ourselves.)¹⁰⁷

Zahrebel'nyi suggests that this “brotherhood” will not die with Tuğay-Bey and Khmel'nyts'kyi. It promises to live on in their sons: “My z Tuhai-beiem ziishly z konei. Stupyly odyn odnomu navstrich i obnialysia. Obydva stari, iak toi mist pozadu. A poriad stoialy nashi syny, mov mist mizh namy, usmikhalysia odyn odnomu, pokyvuvaly veselo, maizhe po-brats'ky” (“Tuğay-Bey and I came down from our horses. We walked toward one another and embraced. Both of us were old, much like the bridge behind us. And *our son stood abreast like a bridge between us*, smiling at one another and carrying on happily, almost like brothers [Emphasis mine]”).¹⁰⁸

A “bridge between”, a means of suture that does not conceal a site of rupture—this has been a prominent function of literature in the modern history of the Ukrainian–Crimean Tatar encounter. This study has sought to show how a host of works in poetry and prose in the Ukrainian and Crimean Tatar languages has helped facilitate a dynamic of contemplation and reflection in which the readers from one nation are invited to see themselves in the other's representation. At the center of this process of nominal metaphorization—which submits that

Ukrainians are Crimean Tatars, Crimean Tatars are Ukrainians—are intricate, often highly intertextual meditations on the victimization of the Other.

To be sure, these literary texts have intersected for decades with human rights petitions, government decrees, and a vast array of socioeconomic, cultural, and historical forces to help develop a committed solidarity between Ukrainian national-democrats and long-standing Crimean Tatar activists. Yet as the crises in Crimea and eastern Ukraine look likely to persist in the years ahead, we would do well to study the cultural predicates of the Ukrainian–Crimean Tatar relationship in greater detail and in a more comparative context, as they can help account not only for the practical and political nature of the alliance but also for its affective and empathic power.

RORY FINNIN is University Senior Lecturer (Associate Professor) in Ukrainian Studies at the University of Cambridge. He is Founding Director of the Cambridge Ukrainian Studies programme and former Head of the Department of Slavonic Studies at the University of Cambridge.

Acknowledgment

The author would like to thank the anonymous reviewers of this article as well as Serhii Plokhii, George Grabowicz, and the staff of the Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute for their generous feedback on the lecture upon which this article is based. He also extends his gratitude to Idil Izmirli, Hakan Kırımlı, Sait Ocaklı, Victor Ostapchuk, Zenife Seydametova, and Maria Sonevytsky for their comments on his translations and analyses of Crimean Tatar literature.

NOTES

¹ Sevhil' Musaieva and Alim Aliiev (eds.), *Mustafa Dzhemiliev: Hezlamnyi* (Kharkiv: Vivat, 2017), 85. All translations from the Ukrainian, Russian, and Crimean Tatar languages are my own. Translations of poems seek to guide understanding of the original texts; they have no aesthetic pretensions. For quotations from Ukrainian- and Russian-language texts, I follow the Library of Congress transliteration system. The modern Crimean Tatar language has two (often competing) orthographical systems: Cyrillic and Latin. For quotations from Cyrillic-based Crimean Tatar-language texts, I convert to the Latin-based system.

² Anna Sergeeva, "Ukrainskii trizub i tatarskuiu tamgu zamorozili vozle Verkhovnoi Rady," *Novyi Region 2* (March 18, 2015), accessed January 2016, http://nr2.com.ua/News/politics_and_society/Ukrainskiy-trizub-i-tatarskuyu-tamgu-zamorozili-vozle-Verhovnoy-Rady-92472.html.

³ Orest Subtelny, "The Ukrainian-Crimean Treaty of 1711," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 3/4 (1979–1980): 809.

-
- ⁴ Mustafa Cemiloglu, “The Beginning of the Crimean Tatar National Liberation Movement,” in *Crimea: Dynamics, Challenges and Prospects*, ed. Maria Drohobycy (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 1995), 91.
- ⁵ S. M. Chervonnaia, “Krymskotatarskoe natsional’noe dvizhenie (1994-1996),” in *Issledovaniia po prikladnoi i neotlozhnoi etnologii* (Moscow: Rossiiskaia akademiia nauk, 1997), no. 101, 16.
- ⁶ Samad Şukur, “İqrarlıq,” in *Küneşten bir parça / Okruşhyna sontsia: Antolohiia kryms’kotatars’koï poezii XIII-XX st.*, eds. M. Miroschnychenko and Iu. Kandym (Kyiv: Holovna spetsializovana redaktsiia literatury movamy natsional’nykh menshyn Ukraïny, 2003), 659–60.
- ⁷ Serhii Plokhly, *The Gates of Europe* (London: Basic Books, 2017), 75.
- ⁸ See, for example, Noah Sneider, “Crimean Tatars Ponder the Return of Russian Rule,” *New York Times*, March 1, 2014, accessed January 2016, <https://nyti.ms/2jVzzyC> and Neil MacFarquhar, “Sentencing of Tatar Leader in Crimea Is Called a Sham,” *New York Times*, September 11, 2017, accessed August 2017, <https://nyti.ms/2jVzzyC>.
- ⁹ The Office of the Prosecutor of the International Criminal Court, *Report on Preliminary Examination Activities 2016* (2016), 35, accessed June 2017, https://www.icc-cpi.int/iccdocs/otp/161114-otp-rep-PE_ENG.pdf.
- ¹⁰ Irena Taraniuk, “Lider Medzhlisu: ‘Krym povernit’sia ranishe, nizh dumaiut’ u Kremli,” *BBC Ukrainian* (March 25, 2016), accessed August 2016, http://www.bbc.com/ukrainian/politics/2016/03/160324_refat_chubarov_ie_it.
- ¹¹ “Povtoriu na dopyti shche raz: Krym – tse Ukraïna’ – zastupnyk holovy Medzhlisu,” *24 kanal* (May 15, 2016), accessed August 2016, http://24tv.ua/povtoryu_na_dopiti_shhe_raz_krim_tse_ukrayina_zastupnik_golovi_medzhlisu_n686073.
- ¹² “Crimean Tatar Activist Confined in Psychiatric Hospital,” *Human Rights Watch* (August 26, 2016), accessed August 2016, <https://www.hrw.org/news/2016/08/26/crimean-tatar-activist-confined-psychiatric-hospital>.
- ¹³ Tanya Cooper, “Crimean Tatar Elected Body Banned in Russia,” *Human Rights Watch* (September 29, 2016), accessed November 2016, <https://www.hrw.org/news/2016/09/29/crimean-tatar-elected-body-banned-russia>.
- ¹⁴ See, for instance, Ivan Katchanovski, *Cleft Countries: Regional Political Divisions and Cultures in Post-Soviet Ukraine and Moldova* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2006), 98.
- ¹⁵ For a critique of the lack of scholarship on the Ukrainian-Crimean Tatar literary encounter after the work of Ahatanhel Kryms’kyi, see Mykola Miroschnichenko, *Brama skodu: zoloti storinky kryms’kotatars’koï poezii* (Kyiv: Holovna spetsializovana redaktsiia literatury movamy natsional’nykh menshyn Ukraïny, 2004), 175.
- ¹⁶ *Zapysky istorychno-filolohichnoho viddilu ukrains’koï akademii nauk*, vol. 4, Kyiv, 1919, ix; cited in Solomiia Pavlychko, *Natsionalizm, seksual’nist’, orientalizm: Skladnyi svit Ahatanhela Kryms’koho* (Kyiv: Osnova, 2000), 158.
- ¹⁷ Quoted in Oleksandr Hubar, “Obnimites’, braty moi,” in *Uzaq ve yaqın Şevçenko*, ed. Valerii Basyrov (Simferopol: Dolia, 1999), 34.
- ¹⁸ Richard Rorty, *Contingency, Irony, and Solidarity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 190.
- ¹⁹ European Union, “Treaty Establishing a Constitution for Europe,” *Official Journal of the European Union*, C 310, 47 (December 16, 2004): 41.
- ²⁰ Paul Ricoeur borrows Wittgenstein’s language of “seeing-as” to emphasize the visual imaging involved in metaphorical processing in “The Metaphorical Process as Cognition, Imagination, and Feeling,” *Critical Inquiry* 5, no. 1 (Autumn 1978): 143–59, 150.
- ²¹ Oksana Shevel, “Kryms’ki tatary ta ukrains’ka derzhava: pytannia polityky, pravozastosuvannia ta znachennia rytoryky,” *Kryms’ki studii* 7 (January 2001), 22.

-
- ²² Aristotle, *Aristotle's Poetics* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1997), 150.
- ²³ Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, rev. ed. (London: Verso, 1991), 35.
- ²⁴ Oksana Zabuzhko, *Notre Dame d'Ukraine: Ukraïнка v konflikti mifolohii* (Kyiv: Fakt, 2007), 74.
- ²⁵ Olha Kosach-Kryvyniuk, *Lesia Ukraïнка: Khronolohiia zhyttia i tvorchosty* (Luts'k: Vyd-vo "Volynska oblasna drukarnia," 2006), 55.
- ²⁶ Rory Finnin, "The Poetics of Home: Crimean Tatars in Nineteenth-Century Russian and Turkish Literatures," *Comparative Literature Studies* 49, no. 1 (2012), 84–118.
- ²⁷ Brian G. Williams, *The Crimean Tatars: The Diaspora Experience and the Forging of a Nation* (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 143. See also Finnin, 85.
- ²⁸ Lesia Ukraïнка, "Nad morem," in *Zibrannia tvoriv u dvanadtsiaty tomakh*, vol. 7 (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1976), 159.
- ²⁹ *Ibid.*, 160.
- ³⁰ Ivan Turgenev, "Bezhin Lug" ["Bezhin Meadow"] in *Zapiski okhotnika* (Moskva: Universitetskaia tip., 1852).
- ³¹ Ukraïнка wrote "Nad morem" in 1898, a year before Chekhov's "Dama s sobachkoi" ("Lady with a Lapdog").
- ³² Ukraïнка, "Nad morem," 169.
- ³³ Frantz Fanon, *Peau noire, masques blancs [Black Skin, White Masks]* (Paris: Seuil, 1952).
- ³⁴ Frantz Fanon, *Peau noire, masques blancs* (Paris: Seuil, 1965), 108.
- ³⁵ Homi Bhabha, "The Other Question: Stereotype, Discrimination, and the Discourse of Colonialism," *The Location of Culture* (New York: Routledge, 1994), 116.
- ³⁶ Ukraïнка, "Nad morem," 169.
- ³⁷ Bhabha, "The Other Question: Stereotype," 115.
- ³⁸ Ukraïнка, "Nad morem," 169.
- ³⁹ *Ibid.*, 187.
- ⁴⁰ Poems from the *Kryms'ki spohady* cycle were first published in Lesia Ukraïнка, *Na krylakh pisen' [On the Wings of Song]* (L'viv: Nakladom avtorki, 1893).
- ⁴¹ Aleksandr Pushkin, *Bakhchisaraiskii fontan [The Fountain of Bakhchisarai]* (Moskva: Tip. Avgusta Semena, 1824).
- ⁴² The poems of the *Try lita* collection were first published in Aleksandr Pushkin and Taras Shavchenko [sic], *Novye stikhotvoreniia Pushkina i Shavchenki [sic]* (Leiptsig: Volvoreniiia Pushk, 1859).
- ⁴³ John Bayley, *Pushkin: A Comparative Commentary* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971), 85.
- ⁴⁴ Aleksandr Pushkin, "Bakhchisaraiskii fontan," in *Sobranie sochinenii v desiati tomakh*, vol. 3 (Moskva: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1975), 126–40.
- ⁴⁵ Lesia Ukraïнка, *Na krylakh pisen' [On the Wings of Song]* (Lviv: Nakladom avtorki, 1893).
- ⁴⁶ Lesia Ukraïнка, "Bakhchysarais'kyi dvorets'," in *Zibrannia tvoriv u dvanadtsiaty tomakh*, vol. 1 (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1975), 101.

- ⁴⁷ Lesia Ukraïнка, “Sl'ozy-perly,” in *Zibrannia tvoriv u dvanadtsiaty tomakh*, vol. 1 (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1975), 74.
- ⁴⁸ Taras Shevchenko, “Chyhryne, Chyhryne,” in *Povne zibrannia tvoriv u dvanadtsiaty tomakh*, vol. 1 (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 2001), vol. 1, pp. 254-56.
- ⁴⁹ George Grabowicz, *The Poet as Mythmaker* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982), 41.
- ⁵⁰ Taras Shevchenko, “Rozryta mohyla” [“The Plundered Grave Mound”] in *Povne zibrannia tvoriv u dvanadtsiaty tomakh*, vol. 1, pp. 252-53.
- ⁵¹ Lesia Ukraïнка, “Nehoda,” in *Zibrannia tvoriv u dvanadtsiaty tomakh*, vol. 1, 104.
- ⁵² Taras Shevchenko, “Velykyi l'okh” [“The Great Vault”] in *Povne zibrannia tvoriv u dvanadtsiaty tomakh*, vol. 1, pp. 314-28.
- ⁵³ Taras Shevchenko, “Kavkaz” [“The Caucasus”] in *Povne zibrannia tvoriv u dvanadtsiaty tomakh*, vol. 1, pp. 343-47.
- ⁵⁴ Ivan Dziuba, *Internatsionalizm chy russifikatsiia? [Internationalism or Russification?]* (Munich: Suchasnist', 1968).
- ⁵⁵ Oles Honchar, *Sobor [The Cathedral]* (Kyiv: Radians'kyi pys'mennyk, 1968).
- ⁵⁶ Ivan Sokul's'kyi, “Kil'ka sliv pro sebe,” in *Oznachennia voli* (Dnipropetrovs'k: Sich, 1997), 11.
- ⁵⁷ Andrew Wilson, “Politics in and Around Crimea: A Difficult Homecoming,” in *The Tatars of Crimea: Return to the Homeland*, ed. Edward A. Allworth (Durham: Duke University Press, 1998), 292.
- ⁵⁸ Ivan Sokul's'kyi, “Bakhchysarai (Tsykl)” [“Bakhchysarai (A Cycle)”] in *Oznachennia voli* (Dnipropetrovs'k: Sich, 1997), 48–50.
- ⁵⁹ Viktor Savchenko, “Khronika odnoho kryminal'noho protsesu,” *Suchasnist'* 9 (1993), 153–63.
- ⁶⁰ Eric Kodusov, “Ethnogenez korenogo naseleniia Kryma,” *Kasavet* 24, no. 1 (1995): 16. Neal Ascherson, *Black Sea* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1995), 21. In Ascherson's eloquent framework, the Crimean coast is the “zone of the mind,” and the inland steppe the “zone of the body.”
- ⁶¹ Most of the Crimean Tatar deportees were sent to the Uzbek SSR and the Ural mountain region. Other destinations included the Kazakh SSR and various oblasts of the eastern Russian SFSR. Refat Chubarov, “Perednova,” *Kryms'ki studii: Informatsiinyi biuleten'* no. 5–6 (September–November, 2000): 7. See also V. E. Vozgrin, *Istoriia krymskikh tatar*, vol. 4 (Simferopol: Tezis, 2013), 180.
- ⁶² V. E. Vozgrin, *Istoriia krymskikh tatar*, vol. 4, 181.
- ⁶³ *Ibid.*, 181–82.
- ⁶⁴ *Ibid.*
- ⁶⁵ Taras Shevchenko, “Do Osnov'ianenka” [“To Osnov'ianenko”], in *Povne zibrannia tvoriv u dvanadtsiaty tomakh*, vol., pp. 119-21.
- ⁶⁶ Shevchenko, “Kavkaz”.
- ⁶⁷ Rory Finnin, “Mountains, Masks, Metre, Meaning: Taras Shevchenko's ‘Kavkaz,’” *Slavonic and East European Review* 83, no. 3 (July 2005): 396–439, 407.
- ⁶⁸ Shevchenko, “Kavkaz”.
- ⁶⁹ Finnin, “Mountains, Masks, Metre, Meaning,” 426.
- ⁷⁰ Taras Shevchenko, “Son” [“A Dream”], in *Povne zibrannia tvoriv u dvanadtsiaty tomakh*, vol. 1, pp. 265-78.

⁷¹ Wolfgang Iser, *Prospecting: From Reader Response to Literary Anthropology* (Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1989), 134.

⁷² A. E. Kryms'kyi, ed., *Studii z Krymu I-IX* (Kyiv: Filolohichna katedra pid keruvanniam akad. A. E. Kryms'koho, 1930).

⁷³ A. E. Kryms'kyi, "Literatura kryms'kykh tatar," *Studii z Krymu I-IX*, 168.

⁷⁴ O. Akçokraklı, "Tatars'ka poema Canmuhammedova pro pokhid Islıam-Hireia II spil'no z Bohdanom Khmel'nyts'kym na Polshchu 1648-49rr," *Skhidnyi svit* 12/3 (1930), 163–71.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 163.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 164.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*

⁷⁸ Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi, *Istoriia Ukraïny-Rusy*, vol. 8 (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1995), part 3, section 13, 171.

⁷⁹ Akçokraklı, "Tatars'ka poema Canmuhammedova," 165.

⁸⁰ Canmuhammed, "Tuğaybey," in *Küneşten bir parça / Okrushyna sontsia: Antolohiia kryms'kotatars'koï poezii XIII-XX st.*, eds. M. Miroschnychenko and Iu. Kandym (Kyiv: Holovna spetsializovana redaktsiia literatury movamy natsional'nykh menshyn Ukraïny, 2003), 110.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 108.

⁸² J. Deny, "Redif," in *Encyclopaedia of Islam, First Edition (1913-1936)*, ed. M. Th. Houtsma et al. Accessed on April 3, 2016, http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2214-871X_ei1_COM_0106.

⁸³ Seitumer Emin, "Eñ parlaq yıldız," in *Saylama eserler*, ed. Ş. Alâdin (Simferopol: Qırımdevoquvpedneşir, 1999), 12.

⁸⁴ Şamil Alâdin, *Topraq küldi, kök küldi* [*The Earth Laughed, the Sky Laughed*] (Aqmescit, 1932).

⁸⁵ Şamil Al'adin, "Ey, Büyük Ukraina" ["O, Great Ukraine"] in *Qъъъ kazakъъъ jьrlarъ* (Simferopol: Qъъъ ASSR Devlet neşr., 1935), 5–6.

⁸⁶ Taras Shevchenko, *Haidamaky* [*The Haidamaks*] (Sanktpeterburg, 1841).

⁸⁷ Taras Shevchenko, "Zapovit" ["Testament"], in *Povne zibrannia tvoriv u dvanadtsiaty tomakh*, vol. 1, p. 371.

⁸⁸ Pavlo Tychyna, *Zibrannia tvoriv u dvanadtsiaty tomakh*, vol. 12 (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1983–1990), 50–51.

⁸⁹ Rıza Halid, "Taras Şevçenkoğa," in *Küneşten bir parça / Okrushyna sontsia: Antolohiia kryms'kotatars'koï poezii XIII-XX st.*, 446.

⁹⁰ Quoted in *Brama skhodu: zoloti storinky kryms'kotatars'koï poezii*, ed. and trans. Mykola Miroschnichenko (Kyiv: Holovna spetsializovana redaktsiia literatury movamy natsionalnikh menshyn Ukraïny, 2004), 159.

⁹¹ Yunus Temirkaya, "Taras Şevçenkoğa," *Lenin bayrağı* (March 9, 1961), 3.

⁹² Quoted in Oleksandr Hubar, "Obnimites', braty moi'," in *Uzaq ve yaqın Şevçenko*, 42.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, 16.

⁹⁴ Quoted in Timur Pulatov, "Vsem mirom – pomoch bratiam" in *Tak eto bylo: natsional'nye repressii v SSSR 1919-1952 gody*, ed. Svetlana Alieva (Moscow: Rossiiskiy mezhdunarodnyi fond kul'tury "Insan," 1993), 127.

⁹⁵ Şamil Alâdin, "Toğaybey," in *Saylama eserler* (Simferopol: Kyrym devlet okuv-pedagogika neshriyaty, 1999).

⁹⁶ Şamil Alâdin, *İblisniñ ziyafetine davet [The Devil's Invitation to the Feast]* (Tashkent: G"afur G"ulam adyna Edebiyat ve sanat neshriaty, 1979).

⁹⁷ Ibid.

⁹⁸ Şamil Alâdin, "Toğaybey," 364.

⁹⁹ Historical evidence of the khan's knowledge of Ukrainian and the hetman's knowledge of Crimean Tatar can be found in the works of Cossack chronicler Samiilo Velychko. See Samoil Velichko, *Letopis' sobytii v Iugo-zapadnoi Rossii v XVII veke* (Kyiv, 1858), 44.

¹⁰⁰ Alâdin, "Toğaybey," 360.

¹⁰¹ Ibid., 354.

¹⁰² Pavlo Zahrebel'nyi, *Ia, Bohdan (Spovid' u slavi) [I, Bohdan (A Confession in Glory)]* (Kyiv: Radians'kyi pys'mennyk, 1983).

¹⁰³ Marko Pavlyshyn, "Ia Bohdan (spovid' u slavi) Pavla Zahrebel'noho," in *Kanon ta iconostas* (Kyiv: Chas, 1997), 63.

¹⁰⁴ Zahrebel'nyi, 133.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., 152.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid., 148, 153.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid., 154.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid.