

Nowak, O., Miłosz, E. & Piontek, J. 2013. Anthropological Characteristics of Skeletal Material from the Cemetery of St. Nicholas' Church in Elbląg (13th Century). Poznań: Wydawnictwo Instytutu Antropologii. Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza. 99 p. [In English].

Piontek, J., Iwanek, B. & Czapla, Z. 2004. The Crania from Modern Cemeteries in Jaksice (Kujawsko-Pomorskie Province, Poland) and Craniometric Relationships among Medieval and Modern Central European Populations. *Studies in Historical Anthropology*. Vol. 4. P. 123–135. [In English].

Simalcsik, A., Groza, V.-M., Simalcsik, R.-D. & Miu, G. Sf. 2012. «Nicolae-Ciurchi», The Medieval Necropolis (16th — 18th Centuries) of «Sfântul Nicolae-Ciurchi» Church from Iași City (Romania): Anthropologic Data. *Analele Științifice ale Universității «Alexandru Ioan Cuza» din Iași*. S. Biologie animală. T. LVIII. P. 183–194. [In English].

Strzałko, J. 1966. Propozycje budowy dawnej ludności Kołobrzegu na podstawie szczątków kostnych z cmentarzyska przy kolegiacie kołobrzesckiej (XIV–XVIII w.) [Proposals Regarding the Physical Build of Kołobrzeg's Former Population Based on Skeletal Remains from the Cemetery by the Kołobrzeg Collegiate Church (14th — 18th Centuries)]. *Przegląd Antropologiczny*. T. 32. Poznań. S. 177–191. [In Polish].

Ubelaker, D. 1984. Human Skeletal Remains: Excavation, Analysis, Interpretation. Washington. [In English].

Wokroj, F. 1972. Antropologiczna analiza szczątków kostnych z sredniowiecznego cmentarzyska «Góra Chelmska» [Anthropological Analysis of Bone Remains from the Medieval Cemetery «Góra Chelmska»]. *Materiały zachodniopomorskie*. T. 18. S. 273–303. [In Polish].

UDC 94:341.485(=512.145)(477.75)»17/18»

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.20535/2307-5244.61.2025.347302>

A. Hedo

ORCID: 0000-0003-4151-0747

Borys Grinchenko Kyiv Metropolitan University

O. Ivaniuk

ORCID: 0000-0001-6750-5423

Borys Grinchenko Kyiv Metropolitan University

A. В. Гедьо

Київський столичний університет імені Бориса Грінченка

О. Л. Іванюк

Київський столичний університет імені Бориса Грінченка

**VISIONS OF THE CRIMEA IN THE DIARIES
AND TRAVEL NOTES OF TRAVELLERS
AT THE END OF THE 18th — IN THE FIRST HALF
OF THE 19th CENTURY**

*Візії Криму в щоденниках і подорожніх нотатках
мандрівників кінця XVIII — першої половини XIX ст.*

У статті на основі щоденників, листів і подорожніх записок мандрівників аналізується становище Кримського півострова наприкінці XVIII —

першої половини XIX ст. після його включення до складу Російської імперії. Увага звертається на епістолярії подорожніх які належали до різних народів, станів, культур, мали різні політичні погляди і світоглядні позиції, що дає змогу об'єктивно реконструювати процеси які розгорталися у межах регіону. Наприкінці XVIII ст. Кримським півостровом подорожували: француз Жільбер Ромм, іспанець Франсіско де Міранда, німець Петер-Симон Паллас, росіянин Петро Сумароков. Його також відвідали англійки Елізабет Крейвен і Мері Холдернесс та ін. 1825 р. польські мандрівники Адам Міцкевич і Генрік Жевуський Кілька мандрівок регіоном у 1930–1940-х рр. здійснив Дюбуа де Монпере. У 1940-х рр. Крим побачили український історик Микола Костомаров, німецький барон Август фон Гакстаузен та ін. Встановлено що метою подорожей були цікавість до «екзотики» й іншої культури, бажання відвідати нові землі, які здобула імперія, відпочинок, покращення стану здоров'я й навіть шпигунство. Мандрівники зафіксували спустошення земель, релігійне й соціальне пригноблення місцевого населення, руйнацію архітектурних пам'яток, створення атмосфери страху. Отже, подорожні фіксували занепад «старого» (татарського) Криму, і розвиток нового — російського, який полягав у розбудові стратегічних міст (зокрема Севастополя, який виник на місці невеликого селища Актіар) і шляхів, зведенні фортив і бастіонів, показовості, бутафорності й розкоші замських резиденцій місцевих чиновників й найближчого оточення царів.

Ключові слова: Кримський півострів, подорож, тревелог, Російська імперія, кримські татари.

Drawing on diaries, letters, and travel notes, this article analyses the situation on the Crimean Peninsula from the late 18th to the mid-19th century following its incorporation into the Russian Empire. Attention is given to the writings of travellers from diverse national, cultural, and political backgrounds with varying world-views, which enables reconstruction of the processes unfolding within the region. At the end of the 18th century, the Crimean Peninsula was visited by Gilbert Romme (French), Francisco de Miranda (Spanish), Peter Simon Pallas (German), and Pavel Sumarokov (Russian), as well as Elizabeth Craven and Mary Holderness (English), among others. In 1825, the Polish travellers Adam Mickiewicz and Henryk Żevuski visited. Dubois de Montpéreux made several journeys to the region in the 1830s and 1840s. During the 1840s, the historian Mykola Kostomarov (Ukrainian), Baron August von Haxthausen (German), and others encountered Crimea. The study reveals that motivations for these journeys included curiosity about the «exotic» and unfamiliar cultures, the desire to visit lands newly acquired by the empire, recreation, health improvement, and even espionage. Travellers recorded observations of devastated lands, religious and social oppression of the local population, destruction of architectural monuments,

and the creation of an atmosphere of fear. They documented the decline of «old» (Tatar) Crimea alongside the development of «new» Russian Crimea, manifested in the growth of strategic cities (particularly Sevastopol, which arose on the site of the small village of Aktiar) and roads, the construction of forts and bastions, ostentatious displays, and luxurious country residences for local officials and the tsarist inner circle.

Keywords: Crimean Peninsula, traveller, diary, correspondence, travel notes, Russian Empire, Crimean Tatars.

After Crimea was annexed by the Russian Empire in 1783, the region aroused the interest of many Europeans. They visited it as researchers, travellers, and tourists who wanted to become acquainted with ancient monuments, study its history, and encounter local customs. The fact that these lands remained a kind of «unknown land» at the end of the 18th century also served as an incentive to travel. The reasons for this state of affairs were explained in detail by the traveller Joseph Marshall (See: Marshall, J. 1772). He explained the lack of a complete and objective picture of these areas due to several factors: outdated official economic reports published by state officials; their remoteness from the main routes chosen by officials moving from European countries to Moscow and St. Petersburg, or further to the East; the use of information that was copied from sources of the 16th and 17th centuries and, to a large extent, no longer corresponded to reality by geographers who described these lands.

The purpose of the travels of the subjects of the empire was curiosity about «exotica» and other cultures, the desire to visit the lands acquired by the empire, recreation, improvement of health, and even espionage.

A significant part of the journeys took place voluntarily, or were financed by the rulers of European countries. However, visits to the Crimean Peninsula were sometimes initiated by the imperial government, which aimed to accelerate the economic development of the annexed lands of the former Crimean Khanate and counted not only on foreign investments, but also on European specialists. Count Mykhailo Vorontsov played one of the main roles in the context of communication with foreign travellers and the organization of their travels through the terrain of southern Ukraine and the Crimean Peninsula.

In particular, at the invitation of the Governor-general, the region was visited by E. Spencer and F. J.-F. Despreaux de Saint-Sauveur.

Travellers chose several routes: by sea to Yevpatoria, and then moving through the cities of the Crimean Peninsula, in particular Sevastopol, Balaklava, and Yalta; the other route was overland through Perekop to Simferopol, with further inspection of Bakhchysarai, Chufut-Kale, Chatyr-Dag, Feodosia, Kerch and other sites. Travellers climbed mountains, got acquainted with the traditions and lifestyle of the local population, talked with Russian military and officials.

At the end of the 18th century, the following people travelled around the Crimean Peninsula: Gilbert Romme, Francisco de Miranda, Peter Simon Palas, Pavel Sumarokov. It was also visited by Elizabeth Craven and Mary Holderness and others. In 1825, Adam Mickiewicz and Henrik Zhevuskyi travelled to Yevpatoria, Simferopol, Bakhchysarai, Chufut-Kale, Balaklava, and Alushta (Громенко, С. 2011, р. 164). The French archaeologist and ethnographer Frederick DuBois de Montperreux made several trips to the region in the 1830s and 1840s. In 1838, the historian Mykola Murzakievich visited the peninsula. He came by steamship from Odessa to Yevpatoria, and then made his way through Simferopol, Bakhchysarai, Sevastopol, South Bank, Feodosia to Kerch (For a detailed description of the travel, see: Мурзакевич, Н. Н. 1837, с. 625–691). In the same year, Crimea was visited by Mykhailo Maksymovych, a Ukrainian scientist and the first rector of the University of St. Volodymyr, and Archimandrite Innokenty, rector of the Kyiv Theological Academy. In the 1840s, the peninsula was seen by the Ukrainian historian Mykola Kostomarov, as well as the German Baron A. Haxthausen and others. During their travels, they wrote travel notes, recorded their impressions in diaries, and wrote letters to acquaintances, relatives, and friends.

The question of introducing the travelogues of travellers who visited the Crimean Peninsula into the scientific circulation attracted the attention of scientists at different times. In the 19th century, a number of publications of notes, letters and diaries of travellers who visited this region appeared. In 1800, P. Sumarokov's travel experiences were made public (Сумароков, П. И. 1800). In 1823, I. M. Muravyov-Apostol's travel letters were published (See: Муравьев-Апостол, И. М. 1823). In the 1830–1840s, descriptions of trips made by Nikolay Murzakievich, Mykola Sementovsky, Nikolay Vsevolozhsky, Apollon Maikov and others were published.

At the same time, from the end of the 18th century, foreign travellers also published their travelogues, which gave impetus to begin their translations and reprints in Russian. For example, «Travels to the Crimea and Constantinople...» by Elisabeth Craven was translated from French by the Russian official Dmytro Runich. The Russian-language version of «Letters about Crimea...» by Charles Pictet de Rochemont appeared thanks to the historian Ivan Snegiriiov, etc. Travelogues continued to be translated even during the Soviet era. In particular, in 1941, shortly before the death of the historian and writer Ksenia Radkevich, her translation of 'Journeys to the Crimea' by Gilbert Romme was published.

Analysis of recent studies. Interest in researching the memoir heritage of travellers, especially travelogues of foreigners, grew significantly at the end of the 20th and the beginning of the 21st centuries. At that time, a number of works by researchers appeared which considered this topic. American researcher Sara Dick-

inson (Dickinson, S. 2002) analysed the ideological component of the annexation of the Crimean Khanate lands by the Russian Empire. Relying on ego-documents, specifically on correspondence and travel notes, she examined the descriptions of Crimea, which were created by Empress Catherine II and her Russian as well as foreign entourage. The research by Petro Bochan¹ was devoted to the analysis of descriptions of the Crimean Peninsula by German and French travellers. Andriy Nepomnyashchiy (Непомнящий, А. 1999) made a significant contribution to the consideration of the problem. A number of the researcher's works are devoted to local history descriptions of the region in diaries, letters and travel notes of travellers.

Special attention is paid by researchers to individual journeys and sources that highlight them. In particular, the analysis of the content of autobiographies, travel notes, correspondence of Polish travellers of the late 18th — early 20th centuries was carried out by Serhiy Gromenko. S. Gromenko proposed the periodization of visits to the peninsula by travellers and substantiated the typology of sources. Travelogues of the end of the 18th century were studied by Nikita Khrapunov (Храпунов, Н. 2009). In particular, a number of his works were dedicated to Elizabeth Craven's trip to the Crimea. N. Khrapunov showed that her letters were significantly edited and some of them were rewritten altogether after returning from her trip. In his work, he drew attention to the almost complete absence of a comprehensive image of Crimea and the retransmission of stereotypes that existed in the European space at that time.

The works of H.-H. Koch were analysed by Tatiana Prokhorova in the context of the description of the sights of the Crimean Peninsula (Прохорова, Т. 2013).

However, the visions of the Russian presence in Crimea and the reaction to it of both travellers and the local population usually remain outside the attention of travelogue researchers.

The purpose of this article is to find out the views of travellers to the Crimean Peninsula from the end of the 18th to the first half of the 19th centuries on the situation in the region at the beginning of the establishment of Russian dominance there.

The basis of our study is the published diaries, letters and travel notes of travellers from different countries who had different political views, positions in society, and religious beliefs, which contribute to the reconstruction of the situation of the Crimean Peninsula in the given period. These sources are distinguished by their informativeness, emotionality, and vividness. They usually contain subjective stories and descriptions that are not found in other sources. However, a significant part of the reports is based on their own analysis, including legal and statistical sources of imperial origin, observations of those who had already travelled to the Crimean Peninsula.

¹ Бочан П. О. Україна в поглядах німецьких і французьких вчених, послів і мандрівників XVII–XIX ст.: автореф. дис. ... к. і. н.: 07.00.01 – історія України. Чернівці, 2008. 20 с.

The selection of travel notes for analysis was based on several criteria:

- Cultural affiliation — the authors included both Europeans and Russians, allowing for a comparative analysis of descriptions shaped by different worldview perspectives;
- Popularity and readership reach — even during the authors' lifetimes, their works were translated into other languages — primarily German, English, and Russian—and were accessible to both Russian and European audiences;
- Bias/impartiality — the analysis takes into account works by European authors that reflect a range of perspectives on the Russian presence in Crimea and its impact on the local population, including pro-imperial/pro-Russian as well as explicitly anti-Russian viewpoints.

Not all travellers who visited the region were interested in politics. Usually, the attention of travellers was attracted by nature, climate, topography, and sights of Muslim culture. However, a significant part of them, though fragmentarily, discussed individual measures of the imperial government regarding the management of the conquered territories. The travelogues of foreign travellers, in particular those of the English and French, are of significant interest. The vast majority of them were not held captive by imperial mythologemes and had the opportunity to freely criticize the annexationist and destructive actions of the autocratic regime, as well as the arbitrariness of officials. The image of the Crimean Peninsula created by foreigners was inconsistent with the statements of Russian subjects, who expressed admiration for the actions of the authorities regarding the annexation of the region, and sometimes showed neglect of the culture and traditions of the conquered peoples.

The approach to the study of travelogues as «literature of fact» was first substantiated by Dmytro Nalivaiko in his work «Through the Eyes of the West: Reception of Ukraine in Western Europe of the 11th — 18th Centuries». In his opinion, «travel books, memoirs, letters and diaries of people who visited and lived in remote and little-known countries introduced their compatriots to the life of different peoples, to their daily life and customs, social structure and culture, and, depicting all this concretely and colourfully, to the extent of literary giftedness, they thus brought remote peoples closer to their readers, who, in addition to exotic views, discovered a lot of «their own», that is, similar, close or analogous, in the life of these peoples» (Наливайко, Д. 1998). It was the «literature of fact» that gave reason for critical analysis, denial of generally accepted norms and dogmas. Moreover, very often the works of «literature of fact» caused the indicated effect with their factual side, with their conscientious sketches from nature, regardless of the worldview horizons of their authors (Коляструк, О. 2008).

The difficulty in processing these sources lies in the fact that the researcher needs to solve two tasks when determining the reliability of «literature of fact».

The first is to reproduce the primary source of monologues and sometimes statistical information, and the second is to determine the method of their source-scientific processing to solve the problem of reliability.

The first task involves the reconstruction of the source base of travelogues. It includes the search for primary sources: 1) diaries; 2) official letters; 3) reports; 4) messages; 5) instructions; 6) records; 7) private letters. However, sometimes the search for primary sources and the conducting of a comparative analysis of travelogues is the most ideal, though this is sometimes difficult.

Second, the researcher is forced to create a way to solve the problem of reliability of historical facts in travelogues. The most typical for this is the reverse path — not from the source to the historical fact, but, on the contrary, from the historical fact to the historical source (Бойко, О. 2000, р. 298).

This path involves the reconstruction of historical facts given in travelogues on the basis of other sets of sources and, accordingly, a diachronic analysis of the reconstructed facts, which will make it possible to solve the question of the reliability probably not of the entire data set of these sources, but at least of the historical facts.

Transport and service

The travellers' image of Crimea was formed gradually and became more vivid the further they delved into the territory of the peninsula. The first thing they had to deal with was transport and infrastructure, which could make the journey either easier or unbearable. Indeed, this had a significant impact on travellers and formed individual impressions.

At the end of the 18th century, in order to move around the Crimean Peninsula, it was necessary to obtain a special order from the local administration to assist the traveller. In particular, the Russian official and writer Pavel Sumarokov recalled: «...I went to the captain and fixer that Murza gave me an order on a stamp paper in the Tatar language, which instructed all the starshinas in all the villages to give me horses, apartments, guides through the coastal mountains, and all kinds of assistance. Such an auxiliary certificate, as well as the translator promised to me for the trip, was all I needed» (Сумароков, П. И. 1800). Elizabeth Craven also received permission. She noted:

«When I was going to leave the Perekop fortress, I sent my servants to the nearest Tatar settlement to get a pass» (Крейвен, Э. 1795, с. 258). Similarly, it was also received by DuBois de Montperreux. He noted: «I had an order from the governor obliging people to provide me with horses in the villages» (Дюбуа де Монпере, Ф. 2009, с. 72). (in a page-by-page reference: Corrector — head of the police in a county of the Russian Empire, subordinate to the governor in his powers. Murza — an aristocratic title in Turkic states, one of the highest strata of the Tatar gentry).

Tatars or Arnauts were guides for travellers to the lands of the Crimean Peninsula. Less often, travellers used the services of Greeks from Russian Greek bat-

talions or Jews. Gilbert Romme notes the following: «Our guide to Chufut-Kale was a Tatar who knew the Bakhchisarai kaimakam¹ Mehmed Agha, who went to Anatolia about six months ago...» (Ромм, Ж. 1941, с. 71). In turn, Apollon Maiakov noted: «Having sent the servants and luggage by mailers to Alupka, in the morning, at 9 o'clock, we got on our horses and left in a cavalcade, accompanied by a Tatar guide, from Yalta along the coast and gardens to Alupka» (Майков, А. Н. 1848, с. 17). For shorter trips, in order to get to know the suburbs, the escort was made up of Russian officers or non-commissioned officers.

Travellers moved on Tatar horses, less often by carts or mail carriages. Thus, while traveling through the Crimea in 1825, Karol Kaczkowski wrote: «Four Tatar horses are waiting in front of our inn. Everything is already collected. Two horses for us, one for the guide, and the fourth — a pack horse, which the Tatar will lead by hand» (Громенко, С. 2011, р. 167–168). In turn, the Swiss statesman and politician Charles Pictet de Rochemont noted: «We left our carriage in Ak-Mechet and travelled by postal carriages, which operate throughout Russia and are called perekladni, to Bakhchisarai itself, eight miles» (Пикте де Рошмон, Ш.-Р. 1810). According to the traveller, it was an open, four-wheeled carriage, drawn by three horses; it was difficult to accommodate two people and shook a lot.

When travellers were accompanied by «high Russian officials» or heads of local administration, travel was more comfortable. In this case, a carriage was usually used. In particular, this type of transport served de Miranda, Elisabeth Craven, and in most cases Pictet de Rochemont. A Spanish traveller wrote: «It was not yet eight o'clock in the morning when we settled in the carriage and in high spirits continued our journey over a very hilly road, covered with snow more than four inches thick...» (Миранда, Ф. 2001, с. 67) and «At noon, we went by carriage 16 versts away to dine at Brigadier Denisov's place, who is stationed with a Cossack squadron six versts from Mr. Anderson...» (Миранда, Ф. 2001, с. 71).

In the absence of European-type hotels, at the end of the 18th and the beginning of the 19th centuries, travellers stopped for the night wherever there was an opportunity. DuBois de Montperreux had an extremely difficult time in the Crimean steppe. He wrote: «... Ombashi (is a military rank in the Ottoman Empire, analogous to the Russian efreytor or the Western corporal) could not offer me any other shelter, except for the poor hut for guests which is in every village and where the community shows hospitality» (Дюбуа де Монпере, Ф. 2009, с. 67). The troubles of the traveller did not end there. He further noted: «There is no ombashi in Chokula, no one answers our appeals, everyone is hiding ... (in Kenegez) there is no ombashi; the guest house is closed; the key in the ombashi's pocket; my guide leaves me at the entrance and goes away. I stop passers-by who take me to the ombashi's residence, knowing full well that he is absent. Finally, one Tatar took pity on me and took me to the mula, who lit a fire from a dry manure fuel and

¹ Kaimakam is the head of the county administration in the Ottoman Empire.

gave me a piece of bread» (Дюбуа де Монпере, Ф. 2009, с. 72–73). However, it should be noted that not all villages hosted the traveller in this way. Sometimes a comfortable overnight stay with good food appeared, in particular in the village of Sececut. However, the transport that was offered to him just struck the foreigner: «Seeing this promised crew, which was extremely praised, I could not believe my eyes — it was a pair of bulls drawn into a two-wheeled cart with trestles! ... I went to Artyn on foot...» (Дюбуа де Монпере, Ф. 2009, с. 78). Only there did he take a mail carriage and reached Feodosia more comfortably.

The Ukrainian historian and writer Mykola Sementovsky also had certain difficulties with overnight stays. He recalled: «I arrived in Demirci almost at midnight. The Tatar guides found for me a rather tolerable hut suitable for the night stay, and only one side of it was made of wood, while for the others, natural stones were used for it, in which a large cave with niches for the dead was carved. In this cave ... I went to sleep calmly, and, as usual, I put a thick felt under me, which protected me from moisture and uninvited guests such as scorpions and other reptiles, which are very numerous here» (Сементовский, Н. М. 1847, с. 33–34).

Travellers also spent the night in a «khan», a type of local hotel. Gilbert Romme had to rest in one of them in Karasubazar. He noted: «The fatigue we felt was so great that we decided that it was luck when we found a room in one of the khans — a kind of hotel where they give room, but no food» (РОММ, Ж. 1941, с. 38). P. Sumarokov described the khan in more detail: «The khans (there are 11 of them in Karasubazar) look like prison castles and are surrounded by stone walls on all sides. The two-tiered storage rooms built in those walls serve as housing for merchants arriving from Anatolia, as well as local Greeks and Armenians...» (Сумароков, П. И. 1800).

But it was more convenient and comfortable to rent an apartment, to stay with private owners, namely Tatars, Greeks, or foreigners who were generously given land after the annexation of the Crimean Peninsula, in the houses of Russian military or officials. In particular, Gilbert Romme recalled: «On the 21st, we left Perekop, which in Tatar is called Or-kape, we spent the night in the Armenian bazaar, which is 6 versts from there, at the kaymakam of Seyid Ibrahim Tahchuglu, who gave us sherbet and fruits. 5 or 6 Tatars slept on the couch in the middle» (РОММ, Ж. 1941, с. 35).

In turn, P. Sumarokov stayed in Kaffa, in the best, according to him, apartment in the city — in the apartment of a wealthy Greek. He noted: «One room in his house survived from the ancient buildings of Kaffa, to which several more rooms in a modern oriental style were added later. Its walls are decorated with custom-made chestnut boards; the ceiling was decorated with carvings from chestnut and walnut wood. In other rooms, there were sofas and galleries» (Сумароков, П. И. 1800, с. 64–65).

The wife of a missionary of the «British and Foreign Society for the Propagation of the Gospel», Mary Holderness, visiting Sudak, stayed in a house that also belonged to a Greek family. The traveller noted: «They often gave accommodation to those who passed through the hell of a miserable and dirty shelter near the Genoese fortress, which was called a «tracteer» and belonged to several Germans, in search of paradise. The house of our Greek friends contrasted with the dwelling I described earlier. Rest with amenities was even more pleasant because of the hospitality of those who, while living a private life, felt their involvement in the affairs of society and had a desire to be useful to other people» (Holderness, M. 1823, p. 155–156).

In the first half of the 19th century, hotels appeared in Crimean cities. Mykola Kostomarov recalled: «I decided to stay in Yevpatoria for two or three days, both to explore the city and to get acquainted with the bathing there, and I stayed in something that resembled a hotel that bore the sonorous name of Athena. This hotel was kept by a Greek from Yevpatoria. The rooms were extremely poor and unkempt, but the host served delicious food made from fresh ingredients and at a reasonable price...» (Костомаров, Н. И. 1990). During his trip, in Yalta, the Russian poet and translator A. Maikov stayed in a hotel called «City of Odessa» (Майков, А. Н. 1848, с. 16).

M. Maksymovych also left mentions of Crimean hotels. In particular, he wrote: «...at 10 o'clock we went by cart to Alupka, where there was a quiet hotel that stood separately on a hill and was kept by Vorontsov's former cook...» (Максимович, М. О. 1871. С. 145–146).

Sometimes travellers pointed to the dubious service provided by transport companies that began to work on the peninsula in the first half of the 19th century. In particular, M. Kostomarov decided to get from Sevastopol to Yevpatoria by sea and used the services of the «Society of Shipping and Trade» on the Black Sea. The Ukrainian scientist soon regretted his decision: «at three o'clock in the afternoon, I hurried to pay at the hotel and ordered to carry my things to the wharf, which was in ruins, but instead of the specified time, I waited for the steamer until six o'clock the next morning and I had to sit for several hours under the hot sun, and then spend the night on bare stones in the open air. When I got on the steamer and began to tell the captain that such carelessness caused great trouble to the passengers, he rudely answered me that the passengers should be thankful that there is something to sail on. When we sailed, I saw that the passengers who had paid in advance for seats in the first class did not find shelter and linen there and were forced either to go to the second class or to camp on the deck... We sailed for two hours to Yevpatoria. I went ashore and, in order not to get into trouble, asked the captain how long the steamer would be here. The captain rudely replied: «That's none of your business; we will stand as much as we want». When the passengers went ashore, they were surrounded by an insolent

crowd of gypsies, who violently snatched things and hurriedly carried them to an unknown place; porters who held this position in the ‘Society of Shipping and Trade’ took their things from them and beat them...» (Костомаров, Н. И. 1990).

A. Maikov had a completely different impression from the sea voyage. About his trip to Sevastopol, he wrote: «The commander of the steamer V. M. M***, with his constant attention and kindness to the passengers in general and to us through acquaintance in particular, knowing Madame D***’s habit of bathing, instantly prepared shields from sails by the team near the gangways and offered to ‘enjoy the coolness of the blessed bath» (Майков, А. Н. 1848, с. 9).

The position of Crimea in the kaleidoscope of travellers’ visions

Along with questions related to the service, the attention of travellers was also attracted by other aspects of life in this region. Accents depended on the purpose of the trip, political views, worldview positions and religious beliefs. Russian subjects mostly expressed admiration for the annexation of Crimea, the nature of the peninsula and antiquities, and an extremely negative attitude towards the Tatar people. This was vividly outlined by the former military man, traveller and publisher M. Vsevolozhsky. He wrote: «I am entering Taurida, or Crimea, this nest, from which for so many centuries predatory Tatars, like locusts, flew into the borders of Russia, burned our villages, cities, robbed and killed civilians of the border provinces, and took wives and babies in captivity. Peace was not possible with them... People who were used to living as robbers, and built their prosperity on robberies, were not able to change. Accordingly, not even talking about the need for Russia to have its own harbours on the Black Sea, only the neighbourhood of untamed robbers could not be tolerated by a powerful state, and, without a doubt, one of the greatest deeds of Catherine is the conquest and annexation of the Crimean Peninsula to Russia» (Всеволожский, Н. С. 1839, с. 23–24). This view of the traveller is due to the fact that he was influenced by the mythologies and ideologies created by the tsarist regime during the military annexation of the Crimean Khanate. The authorities made considerable efforts to dehumanise (the Crimean Tatars) and form an image of the enemy among the population of the Russian Empire. Similar sentiments about the Crimean Khanate and the indigenous peoples of the peninsula were broadcast by the vast majority of the Russian tsar’s subjects.

Unlike Russians, foreign travellers broadcast extremely different views on the Crimean Peninsula and the situation of its inhabitants. In particular, Peter Simon Pallas, like many others traveling in the region, focused his attention on nature and historical monuments, consciously or unconsciously bypassing political and ethno-national issues. Sometimes it seems that the sights that attracted his attention and belonged to Eastern culture caused the author to admire and feel disgust at the same time. He treated the Crimean Tatars with a certain negativity. The position of the traveller and part-time Russian official was due to a kind of gov-

ernment order. His task, against the background of critical reviews of the Russian Empire's actions, was to demonstrate that the region, having become part of the Russian Empire, had become a kind of «paradise on Earth». According to P.-S. Pallas himself, his description was influenced by several other factors, including an estate in the Crimea, presented to him by Catherine II, and the possibility of being sent to Siberia if the content of the travelogues did not satisfy the imperial authorities (Clarke, E.-D. 1898, p. 251, 259).

F. de Miranda made cursory descriptions of the cities of the Crimean Peninsula and generally spoke in a complimentary way about the Russian presence in the region. The same attitude can be traced in the words of Elizabeth Craven, who described the Russian presence in the South and the actions of the local administration in an extremely positive way. In particular, she noted: «I am sure that Prince Potemkin has a lot of professional deputies, because he perfectly manages Taurida and the troops stationed there. And this gives reason for many gossips, with which they want to diminish his fame, although he has every right to it, because he increases the number of possessions of his empress» (Крейвен, Э. 1795).

At the same time, Gilbert Romme critically assessed the new realities of Crimea. His judgments and conclusions were influenced not only by what he saw, but also by a deep understanding of the foreign and domestic policy of the Russian Empire. Providing extensive descriptions of the planning of settlements and characterizing the peoples who lived here, he pointed to the barbaric actions of the invaders. The traveller expressed his attitude towards them quite clearly: «Cities, newly decorated and populated, receive the name of their founder, and later this name passes to the destroyer, who boasts of this new nickname, which only testifies to his great ability to always carry death and horror, to lead to the destruction of industry and agriculture as a result of glorified battles and to destroy the happiness of many thousands of families who become victims of vanity. This is how in 1771 Prince Dolgoruky plundered Perekop, and this bloody success earned him the title of «Crimean» (Ромм, Ж. 1941, с. 7).

A similar vision was broadcast by E. Clark, who visited the Crimean Peninsula in 1800. He emphasized the actions of the imperial administration to preserve the cultural heritage of the former Crimean Khanate. The traveller recorded the facts of the destruction of historical monuments and antiquities, desecration of the memory of the dead, insults to the religious feelings of the Crimean Tatars.

Along with a detailed description of the architectural monuments, F. DuBois de Montperreux noted: «When the Russians occupied the city in 1771 (we are talking about Kerch), they found here 5–6 hundred houses that surrounded the fortress, which was built from sandstone based on a circular plan with projecting corners; the new owners destroyed most of the houses and used stone to give the fortress more solidity ...As a result, Kerch was condemned to oblivion and

poverty» (Дюбуа де Монпере, Ф. 2009, с. 12). The traveller also noted that at the end of the 1770s, the medieval fortress was destroyed and a polygonal square with arcades was built in its place (Дюбуа де Монпере, Ф. 2009, с. 13). Later, while in Feodosia, he wrote: «I do not have the strength to tell what I felt after seeing this wonderful building of the Genoese in such destruction, and in vain. The Russian governor of Feodosia Fenshow (Fensh)¹ ordered to remove the lining of the fortifications and ditches in order to build these terrible barracks'. According to the traveller, this led to the destruction of the city by streams of water coming down from the mountains and losses of 300,000 francs (Дюбуа де Монпере, Ф. 2009, с. 81).

Publications in Europe of travellers' notes, diaries and letters of travellers, which contained critical remarks, caused displeasure to the imperial authorities. In particular,

O. Deremedved, researching the epistolary heritage of the Englishman R. Lyell, noted that Alexander I had a negative perception of his work. She cited the translation of the words of the traveller himself, who tried to convince the reader that he tried to be fair in his assessment of the Russians and, respecting them, also talked about shortcomings, mistakes and vices (Деремедведь, Е. Н. 2002).

Another factor influenced the objectivity of the perception of Crimea by foreigners. Unlike the subjects of the Russian Empire, the vast majority of them had a mandatory escort which tried to exert an ideological influence on the traveller and form beliefs about the free, happy and prosperous life of the local population and the liberating mission of the Tsar regarding the peoples of the former Crimean Khanate. It was desirable to create a kind of «bubble» around the foreigners, from which the Crimean realities of the time would not be visible.

For example, during his trip to the Crimea, F. de Miranda was accompanied by Prince K.-H. Nassau, General P. Rumyantsev and others (Миранда, Ф. 2001, с. 55). In this regard, his journey was full of various entertainments: celebratory lunches and dinners, receptions and balls, communication with Russian officials, military examinations and parades, and reading books. F. de Miranda had particularly vivid memories of visits to the «private party». The traveller wrote: «... together with Mr. Kiselyov and young Ribas, we spent time serving Venus in the house of artillery major Count Valentini (a native of Milan) with three Tatar dancers. They danced in the Turkish style and to the appropriate music, and one can only imagine their lustful movements, because the girls put in a lot of effort. At first, I got the main one — the prima ballerina of the last khan, and on the second time — the third one, a Circassian by origin, who, although she was not particularly beautiful, turned out to be very skilful, just like the first one. My com-

¹ Andriy Semenovych Fensh (Fensh, Fenshow) (1757–1828) was a Russian general, a participant in the Russo-Turkish and Franco-Russian wars. In 1800, he was appointed Kyiv military governor. In 1803, he became the military governor of Feodosia. He held the position until 1808.

panions did not disappoint either. It was a lot of fun... All the fun cost me 13 robes» (Миранда, Ф. 2001, с. 72).

However, the escort of the majority of foreign travellers was not so representative from the end of the 18th to the first half of the 19th centuries. Such a mission was entrusted to local governors, police chiefs, or military and officials who were on duty. In particular, the former wife of the English admiral, Elizabeth Craven, who visited the Crimea in 1786, noted: «At six o'clock in the morning, I arrived in the Tatar city of Karasubazar... and stayed in the governor's house, which was built for the empress to rest. The governor, General Kakhovsky, together with his brother gathered all the officers, who were dressed in uniforms. Tired, wearing a cap, I went up to the porch to the well-dressed people in powdered wigs. I was immediately surrounded by a crowd of knights with insignia, coloured ribbons and award chains. This atmosphere reminded me of the traditional receptions at the Saint-Germain Palace... The governor does not live in Karasubazar. His residence is in Ak-Mechet. He came here to meet me and organize this trip to Crimea» (Крейвен, Э. 1795, с. 266, 269). And finally, at the end of the trip, she concluded: «I was sad to say goodbye to the governor, who, despite the importance of his position, treated me very well. He made sure that my memories of the trip were nothing but pleasant. I will not forget the correctness of the Russian officers who gave me a map of the Peninsula with the necessary information for the trip...» (Крейвен, Э. 1795, с. 298).

In turn, Baron A. Haxthausen recalled: «In the company of the Chief of Police, who had free access everywhere, I visited houses belonging to people of all these nations...». Describing him, the traveller noted: «...unfortunately, my companion took me only to the best and richest houses, in which only European habits and modern luxury could be traced,... This is one weakness of Russian officials, they acquire great dexterity in showing the inquisitive eyes of their boss the brightest side of everything, and hiding all the defects, they do the same for travellers...» (Haxthausen, A. 1856, p. 101).

Other aspects of reality only occasionally broke through the veil of the Russian escort and were fragmentarily recorded in the diaries of some of the travellers. In these cases, Crimea appeared devastated by military actions and oppressed. Francisco de Miranda wrote: «We arrived at the city (Karasubazar), which is located, like the others, on the plain, near the river, and is largely destroyed»; «we also visited the mosque. In this place, according to stories, there used to be a library, which was burned by the Russians during the invasion of Crimea by General Laszi. What a barbarity!» (Миранда, Ф. 2001, с. 65).

Gilbert Romme depicted Crimea even more realistically. In his travel notes, traveling from Perekop (Or Qapi) to the depths of the peninsula, he noted: «There is nothing more sorrowful than this journey through an area devastated by war. Time also leads to destruction, but they do not cause such horror and longing.

When you see the magnificent ruins of buildings upon which centuries have laid their hands, in addition to the melancholy, you feel the understanding of fate and the will of the creator, who established eternity only in relation to his own laws and denied it to men who are the derivative of these laws. But when one contemplates the devastated houses, destroyed by the warrior's hand, contemplates nature, which seems to have lost its energy due to the lack of hands to support its efforts, one's imagination is suppressed by sadness» (Ромм, Ж. 1941, с. 36). Gilbert Romme also observed the ruins in the cities of the Crimean Peninsula. While in Feodosia, he noted: «There were several wonderful buildings in the city, of which two large mosques and an elegantly decorated marble bathhouse have survived to this day. But the Russians, skilled in the destruction, destroyed this exquisite building as well and are cultivating taverns» (Ромм, Ж. 1941, с. 79).

M. Murzakievich casually recorded the destructions and outlined their causes. Recalling his stay in Bakhchysarai, he wrote: «In 1736, Bakhchysarai and its palace were burned by the troops of Count Minikh. In 1788, Bakhchysarai was devastated by General Lassi for the second time; in 1771, Bakhchysarai once again suffered from Prince Dolgoruky, who was later nicknamed Crimean. After that, can we expect everything to remain intact?» (Мурзакевич, Н. Н. 1837, с. 636).

The newly arrived residents destroyed what was destroyed by time and Russian troops. Apollon Maikov, visiting Tauric Chersonese, complained: «All-destroying time destroyed everything, and the people who lived sacrilegiously stole from here all they were able to: not a single whole wall or at least part of any building remained. It is disgusting to hear that the residents of Sevastopol destroyed what was preserved by time and dragged from here materials carved thousands of years ago for the arrangement of their houses. And now in Sevastopol — as is said — many owners of houses are proud of the exquisite marble balconies and pediments with ancient Hellenic inscriptions and mythological sculptures...» (Майков, А. Н. 1848, с. 28–29).

DuBois de Montperreux recorded the decay of the former flourishing lands. Describing his journey through the steppe, he noted that the horses «which were given to me in Opuk were so weak that we could only go slowly. My Tatar guide, who was nothing less than a village ombashi, apologized as best he could, saying that they had no oats, hay, or grass in the village»; «Unzular (vineyard) ... I found here only a tired horse, which the ombashi ... unceremoniously took from the Tatar, who had just brought his camels from the steppe» (Дюбуа де Монпере, Ф. 2009, с. 72).

Even P. Sumarokov, who can hardly be called an unengaged traveller with an objective view of the actions of the Russian Empire, while describing Kaffa, reported that the main mosque with one minaret, which was larger than the Dormition Cathedral in Moscow, was turned into a warehouse where regimental things, as well as firewood from palm trees, were stored; another mosque was converted into an Orthodox church, the third mosque and a public bath were con-

verted into a shop and warehouse (Сумароков, П. И. 1800, с. 62–63). We find the same evidence in texts by F. DuBois de Montperreux (Дюбуа де Монпере, Ф. 2009, с. 81–82).

In addition, travellers of the end of the 18th century often recorded the transformation of the Crimean Peninsula into an imperial military base. It was overcrowded with regiments, guns and warships. The diaries of F. de Miranda are filled with descriptions of regiments and parades. In particular, he noted: «Having overcome another 18 versts, they arrived at Bakhchysarai at half past two. The Phana-goria Grenadier Regiment made a very positive impression» (Миранда, Ф. 2001, с. 57); «We were present during the examination of two regiments — Kyiv and Tavia — which was undoubtedly very well done, including a wonderful orchestra» (Миранда, Ф. 2001, с. 71); «at seven o'clock we arrived in Karasubazar... Cannon shots announced our arrival, and we were met by the officers of two grenadier regiments and two bombardier companies stationed here» (Миранда, Ф. 2001, с. 64). Elizabeth Craven, while in Bakhchysarai, asked if there were Russian troops in the city, and received the answer that a thousand soldiers were based above the city (in turn, there were about 5 thousand Tatars here) (Крейвен, Э. 1795, с. 286).

In the records of travellers, there are often descriptions of the port of Sevastopol with the military power of the Russian Black Sea Fleet. In the diaries of F. de Miranda, we find the following information: «The number of ships in Sevastopol: 14 frigates, three 66-gun ships and one bombard. In this port, a squadron that will number more than a hundred battleships can quite reliably hide, at the same time, in case of any damage, the repair will last no more than a week, because the shipyard is well equipped...» (Миранда, Ф. 2001, с. 61). In turn, Elizabeth Craven drew attention to this. In her correspondence, she noted: «The wharf for warships is hidden behind two high rocks, so that even the largest ship of the Russian fleet, «The Glory of Catherine», which is anchored here, cannot be seen... Two batteries are enough to protect the entrance to the harbour and flood ships of the enemy if they had the courage to enter here» (Крейвен, Э. 1795, с. 301–302).

However, DuBois de Montperreux was the one who described the military power of Sevastopol in the most detail. He claimed that during the journey of P.-S. Pallas, the city had already had five cannon batteries named after Tsars Alexander and Constantine: two controlled the entrance to the Great Harbour, the third on the northern side, and two more facing each other between the Southern and Artillery bays. The harbour was protected by two forts that had 320 cannons. DuBois also mentioned the construction of the third one, Mykolaiv Fort, which was supposed to have three bastions and 260 cannons (Дюбуа де Монпере, Ф. 2009, с. 226–228).

A. Maikov was delighted with what he saw. He recalled: «The fortifications of Sevastopol gape at us with countless embrasures. We pass between two horrifying batteries, which are located on both sides of the narrow passage to the bay; somewhat distantly, two more just like those ones look menacingly, ready

to instantly burn to ashes those daring and lucky ones who survived the first; ... 120 gunships stand in a crowd, touching the shore, protected from everything and from any side» (Майков, А. Н. 1848, с. 11–12).

Travellers drew attention to the sometimes-miserable situation of individual peoples of the former Crimean Khanate and the fear of the local population before the military and local administration. Francisco de Miranda wrote that he hardly saw women on the streets of the cities. Those whom he met on the road tried to escape quickly. He described one such case that happened in Sevastopol in his diary: «We climbed the minaret of the main mosque, where we were noticed by a Tatar woman who was shocked by the appearance of the «kafirs» and immediately disappeared» (Миранда, Ф. 2001, с. 61).

Such behaviour was caused not only by restrictions related to religious beliefs, as interpreted by P. Sumarokov (Сумароков, П. И. 1800, с. 67). This was also explained by the actions of the Russian authorities in general and the local administration. Certain reasons for fear were described by Gilbert Romme while staying in Sudak. He reported: «Tatar saklis huddled inside the fence of the fortress, but after the capture of the Crimea by the Russians, the unfortunates were forced to move out of the fence, and now they can be seen in the gorge (nearby). They will not stay there for long — 37 families are going to Anatolia. They are not allowed to cut firewood in the forest, their orchards are ravaged, they cannot peacefully use their fruits; it is natural that they go to look for peace and security in another state» (Ромм, Ж. 1941, с. 47). Then the traveller noted: «The entire coast up to Yalta is guarded by Arnauts¹ to prevent the emigration of Tatars... These Arnauts committed atrocities during the turmoil, and are now a threat to poor Muslims. It is not surprising that the latter beg the heavens to save them from the situation in which they live» (Ромм, Ж. 1941). Mentions of the Arnauts and a detailed description of one of the units that guarded the coast can be found in Elizabeth Craven: «The Albanian commander lined up his regiment under a mountain on the seashore next to his own house. Anyone who has ever watched regular army training cannot imagine anything stranger than this Albanian regiment. Soldiers' rifles are made by various manufactures; what are they wearing? Oriental and Italian sabres and strange-looking pistols tucked into their belts. Some soldiers were wearing hats, others were wearing caps, others — helmets... Albanians wear short jackets with two, three or four rows of buttons intertwined with cords» (Крейвен, Э. 1795, с. 310–311).

We also find an explanation of the fear of the Tatars in the letters of the Swiss statesman and diplomat Ch.-R. Pictet de Rochemont. Moving through the steppe from Perekop to Simferopol, he wrote: «There is a reason why this country appears to be wild, which in reality is not so, the reason for this is the fear of

¹ Kaznacheev Olexsandr Ivanovich (1788–1880) was a Russian senator, an active privy counselor. Since 1823, he managed the office of the Novorossiysk and Bessarabia governor M. S. Vorontsov. Since 1927, he had been the mayor of Feodosia. Later, he held the position of Taurida governor

the Tatars who migrate away from the big roads; when a road is made through one of their villages, they are forever transported to a completely different place» (Пикте де Рошмон, Ш.-П. 1810, с. 54–56).

Later, he recorded another incident that happened during the trip. In one of the Tatar villages, the traveller and his companion decided to have lunch, but there was a certain delay with the food. When the guide, who was served by a non-commissioned officer, found out that the local official made them wait, he hit the Tatar and ordered to serve lunch urgently. The traveller wrote: «Since our guide was a non-commissioned officer, he arrogated the right to do this to the Tatar, even though he was at his home; this brutality in military people around is, unfortunately, noticeable» (Пикте де Рошмон, Ш.-П. 1810, 54–56). In turn, М. Murzakievich mentioned the oppression of the Tatars by the local administration. He wrote: «The meeting (of М. Vorontsov) with the Tatars was joyful and relaxed; it is clear that they felt and understood the protection that the count gave them against the Zemstvo and county authorities that were draining their flesh and blood...» (Мурзакевич, Н. Н. 1886, с. 106).

The Tatars themselves outlined their attitude towards the Russian presence quite covertly. In his notes, Mykola Sementovsky recounted an ordinary conversation with his guide. He noted: «Having sat down with the talkative old man, I began to ask him about the names of the nearest villages.

- Here is the lovely village of Konechi, and here, a little further, is the other Koyaosti; my old friend Abul-Adi lives here.
- Tell me, Yuzbashi-Barali, what is special and famous about this place? What was here in ancient times?
- Here, sir, was the abode of holy souls; several hundred years ago, all the Tatars and even their wives came here to pray, and then, when the Russians conquered the Crimea, the holy souls went to no one knows where; we have only the shrine left» (Сементовский, Н. М. 1847, с. 27–28).

Not only the Tatars were afraid of the government's actions. The need to build military facilities in a short period of time forced the imperial authorities to transfer criminal prisoners who served as free labour to the Crimea. In particular, according to

F. DuBois de Montperreux, in the 1830s, pontoons (old decommissioned ships) were placed in the Sevastopol harbour on which thousands of convicts who worked at shipyards were kept, which quite frightened the city's residents (Дюбуа де Монпере, Ф. 1843, с. 228).

Subjugation of the peoples of the region was carried out not only by force. There were attempts to influence, in a certain way, by bribery, as well as by giving preferences. The Russian administration repeatedly sent local religious leaders and public figures money and gifts and also arranged for their children to attend military educational institutions (this was also an attempt to educate the younger generation in the imperial spirit). Such cases were recorded by Francisco de Miranda.

In his diaries, he noted: «We slept very soundly, and in the morning, I met several interesting people... We talked with the mullahs (Tatar clergymen) standing near the window, and they were outside. Each of them was given an item of clothing. In the evening, we returned home, and after dinner, in connection with the fact that it was necessary to send a gift to the mufti, the prince showed us various watches that were expertly made by local craftsmen, several rings ... and the Order of the Golden Fleece with aquamarine of unusual sizes and purity... The prince gave a watch and a ring to the mufti, it seems, and money to other clergymen. Among the local Tatar youth there are two young men aged 14–16 who are direct descendants of Genghis Khan, and the prince, honouring them, ordered them to be enrolled as junior officers in the guard regiment» (Миранда, Ф. 2001, с. 66).

The result of the Russian conquest can be traced in Gilbert Romme's conversation with one of the muftis: «This mufti-effendi told us that before Crimea was densely populated, there were one hundred and fifty thousand houses in it, 3–4 families lived in each house; it was necessary to add more Nogais who lived in carts, to this number, and there were more than 200 thousand of them... They became lazier only in the last 40 years, and the lands turned out to be abandoned. When I asked about the reasons for such changes in the customs of the people, he only answered that it is a long story and he limited himself to that» (Помм, Ж. 1941, с. 41).

Another result was recorded by F. DuBois de Montperreux: «The Russian government introduced a system of converting the extraordinary mosques of the conquered cities into Greek ones, especially after the Mohammedan population left them». Speaking about Biok-Dzam — the main mosque of Feodosia, he noted: «first they started to remove the lead covering of the roof, which was sold for a profit, it is not known to whom». Then the state allocated huge amounts of money for reconstruction, which quickly ran out, and for several years the building which was no longer a mosque but not yet a church resembled ruins. Governor Kaznacheev¹ ordered to transport the magnificent columns intended for the church to his country house. There were already lions there, which he had taken out of Phanagoria. Although he was forced to return the stolen property by a court decision, nothing actually changed (Дюбуа де Монпере, Ф. 2009, с. 83); that is, the mosque did not exist, and the church, as of 1832, was never built. Another decoration of Feodosia, the Turkish baths (they were located in the centre of the city and prevented parades), was destroyed by the governor.

Conclusions

Most of the information in diaries, letters and travelogues of travellers is devoted to the history of the Crimean Peninsula, descriptions of nature, topography, and architectural monuments. However, to a large extent, these texts pay

¹ Kaznacheev Olexsandr Ivanovich (1788–1880) was a Russian senator, an active privy counselor. Since 1823, he managed the office of the Novorossiysk and Bessarabia governor M. S. Vorontsov. Since 1927, he had been the mayor of Feodosia. Later, he held the position of Taurida governor.

attention to the ethnic composition of the population and the situation of the peoples who became part of the Russian space. Travellers recorded the decline of the «old» (Tatar) Crimea, and the development of the new, Russian one, which consisted in the development of strategic cities (in particular, Sevastopol) and roads, the construction of forts and bastions, the ostentatiousness and luxury of the country residences of local officials and the palaces of the tsars' inner circle. Along with complementary and exciting stories about nature, antiquities, entertainment and the extraordinary courtesy and kindness of Russian military and officials to them, travellers recorded: the devastation of lands, religious and social oppression of the local population, the destruction of architectural monuments, the creation of an atmosphere of fear.

Бойко, А. В. 2000. Південна Україна останньої чверті XVIII століття: аналіз джерел. Київ. 308 с.

Всеволожский, Н. С. 1839. Путешествие чрез Южную Россию, Крым и Одессу, в Константинополь, Малую Азию, Северную Африку, Мальту, Сицилию, Италию, Южную Францию и Париж, в 1836 и 1837 годах. Т. 1. Москва.

Деремедведь, Е. Н. 2002. Крым глазами английского путешественника Р. Лайелла. *Культура народов Причерноморья*. № 43. С. 163–169.

Дюбуа де Монпере, Ф. 2009. Путешествие по Кавказу, к черкесам и абхазам, в Грузию, Армению и в Крым. Т. 5, 6 Париж, 1843 / Пер. с фр., предисл. и примеч. Т. М. Фадеевой. Симферополь.

Громенко, С. В. 2011. Stepy, morze i góry: Польские путешественники конца XVIII — начала XX века о Крыме. Симферополь: Антиква. 304 с.

Коляструк, О. А. 2008. Документи особового походження як джерела з історії повсякденності. *Український історичний журнал*. № 2. С. 145–153.

Костомаров, Н. И. 1990. Исторические произведения. Автобиография / Сост. и ист.-биогр. очерк В. А. Замлинского; Примеч. И. Л. Бутича. 2-е изд.

Крейвен, Э. 1795. Путешествие в Крым и Константинополь в 1786 году Миллади Кравен / Пер. с фр. [Д. Рунича]. Москва.

Майков А. Н. Десятидневная поездка на Южный берег Крыма. Одесса, 1848. Миранда, Ф. де. 2001. Путешествие по Российской Империи / Пер. с исп. Москва. Муравьев-Апостол, И. М. 1823. Путешествие по Тавриде в 1820 году. Санкт-Петербург. 337 с.

Мурзакевич, Н. Н. 1886. Николай Никифорович Мурзакевич: автобиография. Санкт-Петербург, 1886.

Мурзакевич, Н. Н. 1837. Поездка в Крым в 1836 г. *Журнал министерства народного просвещения*. № 3. С. 625–691.

Наливайко, Д. 1998. Очима Заходу. Рецепція України в Західній Європі XI–XVIII ст. Київ: Основи. 578 с.

Непомнящий, А. А. 1999. Записки путешественников и путеводители в развитии исторического краеведения Крыма: 3 тр. 18 — нач. 20 вв. Киев. 211 с.

Пикте де Рошмон, Ш.-Р. 1810. Письма о Крыме, об Одессе и Азовском море. Москва: тип. Н. С. Всевожского. 289 с.

Прохорова, Т. А. 2013. Античные и средневековые памятники Крыма глазами Карла Коха на примере восточных и центральных областей. *Український історичний збірник*. Вип. 16. Р. 296–303.

- Ромм, Ж. 1941. Путешествие в Крым в 1786 г. Ленинград.
- Сементовский, Н. М. 1847. Путешественник: (Южный берег Крыма). Санкт-Петербург, 1847.
- Сумароков, П. И. 1800. Путешествие по всему Крыму и Бессарабии в 1799 г. с историческим и топографическим описанием всех тех мест. Москва. 238 с.
- Храпунов, Н. И. 2009. Путешествие по Крыму Стивена Греллета. *Материалы по археологии, истории и этнографии Таврии: Зб. наук. пр.* Вип. XV. С. 656–681.
- Clarke, E.-D. 1898. *Travels in Russia, Tartary, and Turkey*. Aberdeen: Published by George Clark and Son, 1898.
- Dickinson, S. 2002. «Russia's First «Orient»: Characterizing the Crimea in 1787». *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History*. № 3.1. P. 3–25.
- Haxthausen, A. 1856. *The Russian Empire, Its People, Institution, and Resources*. V. II. London, 1856.
- Holderness, M. 1823. *New Russia. Journey from Riga to the Crimea, by Way of Kiev with Some Account of the Colonization, and the Manners and Customs of the Colonists of New Russia. To which are Added, Notes Relating to the Crim Tatars*, London.
- Marshall, J. 1772. *Travels through Holland, Flanders, Germany, Denmark, Sweden, Lapland, Russia, The Ukraine, and Poland, in the Years 1768, 1769 and 1770: In which is Particularly Minuted, the Present State of Those Countries, Respecting Their Agriculture, Population, Manufactures, Commerce, the Arts, and Useful Undertakings*. Vol. 3. London.
- Vsevolozhskii, N. S. 1839. *Puteshestvie chrez Yuzhnyu Rossiyu, Krym i Odessu, v Konstantinopol', Maluyu Aziyu, Severnyu Afriku, Mal'tu, Sitsiliyu, Italiyu, Yuzhnyu Frantsiyu i Parizh, v 1836 i 1837 godakh* [Journey through Southern Russia, Crimea and Odessa, to Constantinople, Asia Minor, North Africa, Malta, Sicily, Italy, Southern France and Paris, in 1836 and 1837]. T. 1. Moskva. [In Russian].
- Boiko, A. V. 2000. *Pivdenna Ukraina ostannoï chverti XVIII stolittia: analiz dzhel' [Southern Ukraine of the Last Quarter of the 18th Century: Analysis of Sources]*. Kyiv. [In Ukrainian]. Deremedved, E. N. 2002. *Krym glazami angliyskogo puteshestvennika R. Layella [Crimea through the Eyes of the English Traveler R. Lyell]*. *Kul'tura narodov Prichernomor'я*. № 43. P. 163–169. [In Russian].
- Dyubua de Monpere, F. 2009. *Puteshestvie po Kavkazu, k cherkesam i abkhazam, v Gruziyu, Armeniyu i v Krym* [Journey through the Caucasus, to the Circassians and Abkhazians, to Georgia, Armenia and the Crimea]. T. 5. 6. Paris, 1843 / Trans. from French, foreword and notes by T. M. Fadeeva. Simferopol. [In Russian].
- Gromenko, S. V. 2011. *Stepy, morze i góry: Polskie puteshestvenniki konca XVIII — nachala XX veka o Kryme* [Stepy, morze i góry: Polish Travelers of the Late 18th — Early 20th Century in the Crimea], Simferopol. [In Ukrainian].
- Koliastruk, O. A. 2008. *Dokumenty osobovoho pokhodzhennia yak dzherela z istorii povsiakdennosti* [Documents of Personal Origin as Sources from the History of Everyday Life]. *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal [Ukrainian Historical Journal]*. № 2. S. 145–153. [In Ukrainian].
- Kostomarov, N. I. 1990. *Istoricheskie proizvedeniya. Avtobiografiya* [Historical Works. Autobiography] / Comp. and hist.-biogr. essay by V. A. Zamlinskii; Notes by I. L. Butich. 2nd ed. [In Russian]. Kreiven, E. 1795. *Puteshestvie v Krym i Konstantinopol' v 1786 godu Miladi Kraven* [Journey to the Crimea and Constantinople in 1786 by Lady Craven] / Trans. from French [by D. Runich]. Moskva. [In Russian].
- Maikov A. N. 1848. *Desyatidnevnyaya poezdka na Yuzhnyi bereg Kryma* [Ten-Day Trip to the Southern Coast of Crimea]. Odessa. [In Russian].

Miranda, F. de. 2001. Puteshestvie po Rossiiskoi Imperii [Journey through the Russian Empire] / Trans. from Spanish. Moskva. [In Russian].

Murav'ev-Apostol, I. M. 1823. Puteshestvie po Tavride v 1820 godu [Journey through Tauris in 1820]. Sankt-Peterburg. 337 s. [In Russian].

Murzakevich, N. N. 1886. Nikolai Nikiforovich Murzakevich: avtobiografiya [Nikolai Nikiforovich Murzakevich: Autobiography]. Sankt-Peterburg. [In Russian].

Murzakevich, N. N. 1837. Poezdka v Krym v 1836 g. [Trip to the Crimea in 1836]. *Zhurnal ministerstva narodnogo prosveshcheniya*. № 3. S. 625–691. [In Russian].

Nalivaiko, D. S. 1998. Ochyma Zakhodu: retseptsiiia Ukrainy v zakhidnii Yevropi XI–XVIII st. [Through the Eyes of the West: Reception of Ukraine in Western Europe of the 11th–18th Centuries]. Kyiv. [In Ukrainian].

Nepomnyashchii, A. A. 1999. *Zapiski puteshestvennikov i putevoditeli v razvitiu istoricheskogo krayevedeniya Kryma (poslednyaya tret' XXVIII — nachalo XIX veka)* [Notes of Travelers and Guides in the Development of Historical Local History of the Crimea (the Last Third of the 18th — Early 20th Centuries)]. Kyiv.

Pikte de Roshemon, Sh.-R. 1810. Pis'ma o Kryme, ob Odesse i Azovskom more [Letters about the Crimea, Odessa and the Sea of Azov]. Moskva: typ. N. S. Vsevolzhskogo. 289 s. [In Russian].

Prohorova, T. A. 2013. Antichnye i srednevekoveye pamyatniki Kryma glazami Karla Koha na primere vostochnykh i centralnykh oblastej [Antique and Medieval Monuments of the Crimea Through the Eyes of Karl Koch on the Example of the Eastern and Central Regions]. *Ukrains'kij istorichnij zbirnik*. T. 16. S. 296–303. [In Russian].

Romm, Zh. 1941. Puteshestvie v Krym v 1786 g. [Journey to the Crimea in 1786]. Leningrad. [In Russian].

Sementovskii, N. M. 1847. Puteshestvennik: (Yuzhnyi bereg Kryma) [Traveler: (Southern Coast of Crimea)]. Sankt-Peterburg. [In Russian].

Sumarokov, P. I. 1800. Puteshestvie po vsemu Krymu i Bessarabii v 1799 g. s istoricheskim i topograficheskim opisaniem vsekh tekh mest [Journey through all of Crimea and Bessarabia in 1799 with Historical and Topographical Description of all Those Places]. Moskva. 238 s. [In Russian].

Khrapunov, N. I. 2009. Puteshestvie po Krymu Stivena Grelleta [Journey through the Crimea by Steven Grellet]. *Materialy po arxeologii, istorii i etnografii Tavrii: Zb. nauk. pr.* T. XV. S. 656–681. [In Russian].

Clarke, E.-D. 1898. Travels in Russia, Tartary, and Turkey. Aberdeen: Published by George Clark and Son, 1898. [In English].

Dickinson, S. 2002. «Russia's First «Orient»: Characterizing the Crimea in 1787». *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History*. № 3.1. P. 3–25. [In English].

Haxthausen, A. 1856. *The Russian Empire, Its People, Institution, and Resources*. V. II. London, 1856. [In English].

Holderness, M. 1823. *New Russia. Journey from Riga to the Crimea, by Way of Kiev with Some Account of the Colonization, and the Manners and Customs of the Colonists of New Russia. To which are Added, Notes Relating to the Crim Tatars*. London. [In English].

Marshall, J. 1772. Travels through Holland, Flanders, Germany, Denmark, Sweden, Lapland, Russia, The Ukraine, and Poland, in the Years 1768, 1769 and 1770: In which is Particularly Minuted, the Present State of Those Countries, Respecting Their Agriculture, Population, Manufactures, Commerce, the Arts, and Useful Undertakings. Vol. 3. London. [In English].

The authors express their sincere gratitude to Panayiotis Xenophontos, Lecturer at the Slavonic Sub-Faculty, University of Oxford (MSt., DPhil, Oxon, Oxford, Great Britain), for hi assistance in editing the article and for his constructive advice during its preparation.