DOI 10.15407/mics2020.10.052

УДК 94(477.75)

Dmytro Moisieiev,

*Archaeological protection Service of Ukraine, junior researcher
ohota_d@ukr.net*

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2434-4409>

MEHMED-GERAI'S HAMAM: THE DISAPPEARED PART OF THE BAKHCHYSARAI PALACE

This article is about the problem of the historical topography of the downtown of Bakhchisarai -Hansaray. It was the centre of formation of the medieval city and the capital of the Crimean Khanate. A popular belief is that Hansaray is, in one sense, a copy and development of the idea of a medieval Eastern Palace (videlicet, the Top Cap in Istanbul) and dominates in historiography.

The study of krimli cultural and historical heritage remains at a very low level as a result of permanent genocide by Russia empire in the XIX-XX centuries. This led to the development of a distorted picture of the historical and scientific understanding of cultural heritage. Great and significant monuments, even scientific memory about them, have disappeared from the cultural and historical landscape. Mehmed IV Geray baths is an example of this. The actual location of the monument with the help of archaeological geolocation method has been determined in this article. This discovery and interpretation, as an important part of the palatial part of the city development, gives a different look at the whole complex of Hansaray. The Khan's Palace is the centre of the city in contradistinction from the Oriental palaces. Quarters of socially important structures formed around it (one of them was Mohammed IV Giray's baths). After that city development transforms into civic blocks with town mansions, mosques and other public buildings.

Keywords: *Hansaray, baths, geolocation, historical topography, historical source.*

Fig. 1. The plan by J. Trombaro, 1797 (by Ibragimova A.M.). 1. Baths Mehmed IV Giray. 2. Embassy courtyard. 3. "Embassy" gate. 4. "Embassy" bridge. 5. "Embassy" street. 6. Central bridge. 7. Main palace building. 8. Gareme / Gareme courtyard. 9. Persian courtyard. 10. Falcon tower. 11. Winter palace. 12. Bakery. 13. Biyuk-Khan-Jami. 14. Khan's madrasa. 15. Stabling. 16. Khan-chair. 17. Central, or Main, or Palace courtyard. 18. Churuk-Su river. 19. Turbe Dilyara-Bikech

Introduction

The tragic history of Crimean Tatars in the 19th-20th centuries and its final Genocide-Deportation in 1944 left its mark on the study of their cultural heritage. The Khan's Palace (Hansaray) in Bakhchisarai (Fig. 1) as the central monument of history, culture, ethnography and archaeology of Qırım is the most precise representation of that fact. Our knowledge about it as a monument of urban planning and archaeology is based on extremely narrow historiography. Only the works by A.L. Jacobson¹, A.M. Ibragimova², O. Gaivoronsky³ and the Code of monuments of history, architecture and culture of the Crimean Tatars⁴ are more or less academic. Special studies of the problem alongside with source criticism studies, as a result, are rare and an exception.

Today Hansaray is one and the only monument of Crimean urban planning tradition with a complex and long history of formation. Nevertheless, in the scientific literature, the theory of the Turkish origin of

planning of the Palace is dominating⁵. The Hansaray complex includes not only Palace's buildings, but also public spaces that have been closely intertwined with it several centuries⁶. In this context, Khan's Palace becomes a valuable source for urban studies of the unique and distinctive Crimean urban planning tradition by itself. Therefore, the study of the historical topography of urban nucleus of Bakhchisarai is relevant. Part of it was lost under private residential development. This is particularly important because of the active development of Bakhchisarai, as a resort center, and Hansaray, as its heart. Lack of research leads to the loss of the Palace due to poor development of cultural protection which example we saw on the catastrophic Hansaray's "repairs" and "landscaping" of the surrounding territory in 2016-2017.

¹ Яковсон, А. Л. (1964). *Средневековый Крым: очерки истории и истории материальной культуры*. Москва; Ленинград, 142–146.

² Ибрагимова, А. М. (2015). *Бахчисарайский Ханский дворец XVI–XVIII*. Киев, 19–217, 251–283.

³ Гайворонский, О. (2016). *Страна Крым. Очерки о памятнике истории Крымского ханства*. Симферополь.

⁴ Хакимов, Р. С. (Ред.). (2016). *Свод памятников истории, архитектуры и культуры крымских татар* (Том I. Бахчисарай). Симферополь, 76–99.

⁵ Ибрагимова, А. М. Бахчисарайский Ханский дворец, 180–187; Яковсон, А. Л. Средневековый Крым, 146.

⁶ The palace buildings and spaces include the Main building, the Embassy courtyard, the Kitchen courtyard, Harem, the Pool courtyard, the Persian courtyard and the Falcon tower, the palace of the successor, the Winter palace, the Baker house and the stabling. The public buildings and spaces, that exist in the context of the Palace, are: the Biyuk-Khan-Jami and Khan's madrasah, Khan's cemetery with two Turbes, the Dilyara-Bikech Turbe, the Sary-Guzel baths, the Khan-Chair and the riverwalk with bridges.

Fig. 2. The inscription from baths of Mohammed IV Giray (by Abibulaeva E.E, Seitumerov Sh. S., 2017)

⁷ Челеби, Э. (2008). *Книга путешествия: Крым и сопредельные области*. Симферополь: Доля, 107–109.

⁸ Ибрагимова, А. М. Бахчисарайский Ханский дворец, 27 (рис. 9).

⁹ Хакимов, Р. С. (Ред.). Свод памятников, 99.

¹⁰ There is the only localization of Mehmed IV Geray baths made by O. Hayvoronsky. He places them on the site of the abandoned industrial area “Remstroyuchastok” (from Russian “Repair and building site”), but doesn’t provide argumentation. Гайворонский, О. Страна Крым, 110.

¹¹ Челеби, Э. Книга путешествия, 107–109.

We can regard the problem of study of baths of Mohammed IV Giray in this case. Turkish traveler E. Celebi⁷, who visited Crimea in 1666, described them in his travels. The plan and approximate location of baths are known according to J. Trombaro’s Hansaray plan⁸. The inscription from this building is stored in the funds of the Bakhchisarai Museum-Reserve⁹ (Fig. 2).

The geolocation of the Mehmed IV Giray bath

Mehmed IV Geray baths haven’t become the subject of a special study, neither historical, nor source criticism or archaeological yet.

The problem of the exact location of the object¹⁰ and the absence of incumbrance of cultural protec-

tion on the land plots on the proposed location of the monument cause the necessity and timeliness of such works. Thus, there is real threat of losing a significant part of the archaeological complex of the Khan’s Palace without studying and testing its results in the scientific literature.

The sources for studying the Bath of Mehmed IV Giray consist of the description of Bakhchisaray in 1666 by E. Celebi¹¹, the plan by J. Trombaro, 1797 (Fig. 1), lithographs by Tenilov 1803 (Fig. 3), K.G.G. Graceler, 1800s (Fig. 4) and K. von Kugelgen, first half of the XIX century (Fig. 5).

Fig. 3. The lithography by Tenilov, 1803 (by Ibragimova A.M.)

Fig. 4. The lithography by K.G.G. Graceler, 1800s
(by Ibragimova A.M.)

The description of baths by E. Celebi and J. Trombaro's plan locate them on the right bank of the river Churuk-Su. Small garden with two pools, according to J. Trombaro's plan belonged to baths and were placed in front

the main entrance of the building. The street with bridge over the river Churuk-Su leading to Embassy gate and Embassy courtyard led alongside the baths. They were of considerable size and consisted of two halves. Each half had six domes and a room with a fountain inside placed before the entrance to the main space of the baths (changing room?). Halves were divided by the boiler room with two furnaces - one for each half

("corte" by J. Trombaro). Possible "changing rooms" with fountains were covered with a pitched tiled roof. Domes were tiled too. But by E. Celebi's description one of the domes in each half was made from glass¹². No doubt that the size of the Bath and their location in the immediate vicinity of the "Embassy" street, the "Embassy" bridge and Embassy courtyard bespeak about exceptional importance of Mehmed IV Geray baths.

An express analysis of graphic sources confirms the localization of baths that was proposed by O. Gaivoronsky¹³. Indeed all four authors of the plan and lithographs have

Fig. 5. The lithography by K. von Kugelgen,
first half of the XIX century

placed the building with dome system in the so-called quarter "Remstroyuchastok". Now let us analyze the localization of the Bath by each of the authors (E. Celebi's description will not be considered, because he didn't give an exact topographic reference). In other words we will provide source criticism studies.

J. Trombaro's plan 1797 (Fig. 1) gives a fairly accurate scheme of the baths. With regard that the plan of the other undestroyed part of the Palace is authentic we should say that it is trustworthy. Under these

¹² Ibid., 108.

circumstances we can reconstruct the size of Mehmed IV Geray baths as a building about 66,0 m length and 39,0 m width. Each half without a “changing room” with a fountain has square shape with size 26,0x26,0 m. Boiler room has the same length but 12 m width. The size of domes at the base were approximately equal to 8,0-8,5 m.

The geolocation method was used for the accurate localization of the monument. The methodology of this method requires the usage of several images of the object from different positions, that are defined, and several reference points of terrain.

Three lithographs with baths are made from two different places. Tenilov's lithography and Graceler's lithograph were captured from the mountain Suvlu-Kaya or Top-Kaya. Kugelgen's lithography was captured from Harem in the Harem courtyard. Thus, the angle between these two exposures is almost 90°, which is most optimal for successful geolocation.

Tenilov's lithography (Fig. 3) and **Graceler's lithography**, early XIX century (Fig. 4). We can see on them large square building with three or four domes near the Hansaray (to the West, North-West from it). It is situated on the right bank of the river the Churuk-Su. First of all it is needed to determine the location where the lithographs were captured. We can set the criteria for this search, which are based on analyzing of the lithographs. Obviously, they are made almost from the same place. Thus, this place should be quite convenient and attractive for an artist by itself. It should also be on dominating height above Bakhchisaray (the northern slope of the valley or the crag north of it). Further, we can see rock wall in the far left corner of the Tenilov's lithography and it indicates that artist was under a crag. Next he and K.G.G. Graceler had depicted a cape-rock which is sharply rising in the right corner of the lithography. Tenilov shows the drovers of the oxen – consequently there must be a road nearby. However, lithographs have inaccuracies. Both artists somewhat distorted the perspective in order to create a panoramic image.

There are two mountains to the North above Bakhchisaray and the Khan's Palace: the Suvlu-Kaya and Top-Kaya. Exploration of the area had allowed discovering an approximate location of artists (Fig. 6). It is located under a rocky crag of the southern flank of the Suvlu-Kaya. On right sides of images, lithographs depicted crag. Reference points of the terrain in baths geoloca-

Fig. 6. The place where Tenilov and K.G.G. Graceler made their lithographs. I. The photo of the exposition of Tenilov's and Graceler's lithographs. II. The place where Tenilov's and Graceler's lithographs had made.

Geolocation points: a – Turbe Dilyara-Bikech; b – Biyuk-Khan-Jami; c – North Gate; d – Falcon tower; e – end of the road on the slope from the Khan-Chair plateau to the Krasnoflotskaya street. Green area – localization of the Mehmed IV Giray baths by Tenilov's and Graceler's lithographs

¹³ Гайворонский, О. Страна Крым, 110.

¹⁴ Market Street.

tion by Tenilov's and Graceler's lithographs are the spire of the Dilyara-Bikech Turbe or the Biyuk-Khan-Jami (the Big Khan's mosque), Falcon tower, North gate and the end of the road on the slope from the Khan-Chair plateau to the Krasnoflotskaya street. First three points are required for the verification of the correct location of artists, which was obviously accurately defined (Fig. 3, a-e; 4, a-d; 6, a-e). The reference point on the end of the road on the slope from the Khan-Chair plateau to the Krasnoflotskaya str. gives the possibility to determine the axis that limits the location of baths to the Southeast side (side of the Khan's Palace). Turning to the North-West side (side of the Top-Kaya) there is no need for an axis because the location of the Bath is limited by medieval Bazarnaya str.¹⁴ (Fig. 3; 4).

Kugelgen's lithography (Fig. 5), first half of the 19th century. We see ruins of a monumental building with three domes (one large - on the left side and two small - on the right side), the gap in the wall with well-crafted blocks. It opens partially ruined arch of some premise.

The viewpoint of the lithography is determined by the location of the following points: Yeshil-Jami (the Green mosque), Yany-Jami (the New mosque) and the Armenian Church of Blessed Virgin Mary. They are lined up (the Armenian Church is some upper under this line). Yeshil-Jami's minaret and its base, located on the eastern side of the building, are visible. The view on Yany-Jami is from the Southeast (the East-Southeast?). By keeping the approximate azimuthal proportions between these three landmarks it is possible to define the location of the artist in one of the buildings of the Harem (Fig. 6).

The south-western corner and south-western dome (?) of Mehmed IV Giray baths are situated on the line from the viewpoint of the lithography to Yany-Jami. The southeast dome is on the line to the church of Blessed Virgin Mary and the ruined arch – on the line to Yeshil-Jami minaret.

Thus, the geolocation of baths allows to make some conclusions. Tenilov's and Graceler's lithographs locate baths between the right bank of Churuk-Su river and Bazarnaya str. Kugelgen's lithography locate them in the modern residential area of the "Remstroyuchastok" quarter. Therefore, we can confirm the correct location of Mohammed IV Geray baths in the plan by J. Trombaro. Apparently, O. Gaivoronsky's location of baths on "Remstroyuchastok" isn't accurate as there were pools and a garden. To verify the geolocation results a visual reconnaissance was made on the site. It was assumed that Mohammed IV Giray baths were a monumental structure and they should be some ruins remained. The site for reconnaissance is currently a residential quarter with five yards and one abandoned industrial zone "Remstroyuchastok". Two of the houses are two-store buildings with apartments and land plots. They form two structures: first (Western) is oriented to medieval street with modern name "Shkolnaya"¹⁵ (Fig. 6, k; 10, g). Second (Eastern) is oriented along the ramp to Remstroyuchastok". Eastern part of the quarter, including access to the "Embassy" bridge that leads to the Embassy courtyard, is occupied by "Remstroyuchastok".

The verification of the results of Mehmed IV Geray baths locating

Fig. 7. The map of the Old town of Bakchisarai (by GoogleMaps, 2020): a - Turbe Dilyara-Bikech; b – Biyuk-Khan-Jami; c – North Gate; d – Falcon tower; e – end of the road on the slope from the Khan-Chair plateau to the Krasnoflotskaya street; f – Yany-Jami; g – Armenian Church of Blessed Virgin Mary; h – Yeshil-Jami. Yellow row – the place where Tenilov's and Graceler's lithographs had made. Yellow octagon – the place where Kugelgen's lithographs had made

¹⁵ School Street.

¹⁶ ХАКИМОВ, Р. С. (Ред). Свод памятников, 96.

later than the XVII century¹⁶. Retaining wall ends near the eastern edge of the house on 77 Lenin street.

There were found two constructions: retaining wall of Churuk-Su riverbed (Fig. 8, a) and medieval wall in the building on Lenin street, 77 (Fig. 8, b; 9).

Retaining wall of Churuk-Su riverbed is made of well-crafted limestone blocs with a parapet on them. An identical masonry technique is used between the bridges near the North Gate of Hansaray and the “Embassy” gate. This suggests that the strengthening of the embankment of the Churuk-Su was carried out during a synchronous building activity no

Fig. 8. The Churuk-Su river to the West from Embassy courtyard: a – the retaining wall of Churuk-Su riverbed; b - medieval wall in the building on Lenin street, 77

Medieval wall in the building on 77 Lenin street, has two-celled three-layer masonry type with filling laid on a mortar and horizontal leveling and anti-seismic wooden beams. The preserved height of the wall is 4.5 m, thickness – 0.7 m, length – 23.0 m. It was partially demolished at the entrance to the garage of a private residential building. Its monumental character is clearly visible in this place. It extends eastward. The wall turns to the North at the southern abandoned warehouse of “Remstroyuchastok” (Fig. 10, c). There

Fig. 9. Medieval wall in the building on Lenin street, 77 with its marking by red arrows

is a well-crafted block (0.91x0.24) with a square groove (beam? pipe?) at the base of this wall (0.44 m from the modern-day surface or about 0.75-1.00 m from the ancient «floor») (Fig. 7, IV). It was cracked in two parts in the place of the groove. Its front surface is covered with medieval graffiti. On Trambaro's plan at the blocks' location, there is a window and a podium (bench? Water tank?). On the western edge, the wall turns to the North.

The identified construction remains to confirm conclusions of the geolocation of Mehmed IV Geray baths. The retaining wall of Churuk-Su riverbed, which spreads up to 77 Lenin Street, encloses large area where two pools and a garden in front of

Mehmed IV Giray baths were located. Its location is the same as in Trombaro's plan. It functioned as a public, representative space.

Medieval wall in the building on 77 Lenin Street can be interpreted as the Southern part of the changing room (?) of Mehmed IV Geray baths. Type of the masonry technique confirms this interpretation.

The general plan of "Remstroyuchastok" quarter also shows that there was long and big building stretched along School Street. Its runs parallel to contemplate western facade of the Bath in the distance about 10 m. The view, location and direction of this street have not changed since at least the second half of the 18th century¹⁷ - the time of functioning of the complex. Apparently, it was the Western border of the complex. After its destruction along monumental western Bath's walls, private houses building began. These private courtyards have a unique system of location (Shkolnaya str. 4-12). Usually, two rules were used in the traditional Crimean medieval and late medieval buildings. First, U-shaped houses were built around inside courtyard (for example, town mansions from the Bakhchisarai¹⁸, Chersonesos¹⁹, Eski-Kermen²⁰ and Salachik²¹). Second, houses were located on the plot considering relief features without separating a special zone for the "kitchen garden". This rule in "Remstroyuchastok" quarter isn't observed. We can assume that free space that now is used under the "kitchen gardens", locates on the place of ruins of Mehmed IV Giray baths. Perhaps its foundations could be a factor, that prevented building development of this site in the XIX-XX centuries.

¹⁷ Ibid., 63.

¹⁸ Ibid., 51, 53, 67–68.

¹⁹ Klenina, E. Ju., Moisieiev, D. A., & Biernacki, A. B. (2018). The building ceramics of the Byzantine Chersonesus Taurica: form and chronology. In *Novae. Studies and Materials: Sacrum et Profanum. Haec studia amici et college Andrei B. Biernacki septuagennio dicant* (Vol. VI, p. 174, Fig. 1, c-d). Poznań.

²⁰ Айбабин, А. И., & Хайрединова Э. А. (2011). Позднесредневековая часовня на плато Эски-Кермен. В *Материалы по археологии, истории и этнографии Таврии* (Вып. XVII, с. 433, рис. 1). Симферополь.

²¹ ХАКИМОВ, Р. С. (Ред.). Свод памятников, 36–37.

In addition, the geolocation shows that there are two pools that belong to Mehmed IV Geray baths and are located on “Restroyuchastok”. In this sense, Mehmed IV Geray baths localization made by Gayvoronsky is partially correct: in what refers to the garden with pools in front of the bathhouse entrance (Fig. 10).

Fig. 10. Medieval wall in the building in the Western wall of the southern abandoned warehouse of “Remstroyuchastok”: a – remains of the medieval wall (the West corner of the South changing room?); b – remains of the East corner of the South changing room; c – medieval block with graffiti; d – the retaining wall of Churuk-Su riverbed; e – Embassy bridge; f – abandoned industrial zone “Remstroyuchastok” (red hatchures); g – the Shkolnaya str.; h – medieval Bazarnaya str. Position of Mehmed IV Giray baths by the result of the geolocation has been marked by green lines. The position of the pools of Mehmed IV Giray baths according to the plan by J.Trombaro has been marked by blue polygons

Conclusion

There are many questions in the study of Mehmed IV Geray baths: when and why they were damaged? When exactly were they finally demolished? What existed on the site before their construction? However, the main result of this research is the following. Firstly, we have strong evidence of the location of Mehmed IV Geray baths, and some of its structures still exist. Secondly, the border of the complex of Khan's Palace must be

reviewed and broadened into the “Remstroyuchastok” quarter. Finally, we can say that Hansaray was a more complicated monument than it is considered today. Its philosophy of development and planning is different from, for example, Topkapi Palace in Istanbul, that scientists point as Hansaray's prototype.

Mehmed IV Geray baths show that Hansaray was surrounded by socially significant spaces. In the East of it, there is Biyuk-Khan-Jami, the Khan's cemetery and madrasah and Sary-Guzel baths. In the West, there was Mehmed IV Geray baths. Only at a later time the Palace complex has been closed in itself and has included Palace Square, Biyuk-Khan-Jami and Khan's madrasah. This has excluded Mehmed IV Geray baths from Hansaray landscape. Apparently, this process makes the background for the loss of a monumental and magnificent monument in the future.

References

Ajbabin, A. I., & Hajredinova Je. A. (2011). Pozdnesrednevekovaja chasovnja na plato Jeski-Kermen. In *Materialy po arheologii, istorii i jetnografii Tavrii* (Vol. XVII, p. 433). Simferopol'.

- Chelebi, Je. (2008). *Kniga puteshestvija: Krym i sopredel'nye oblasti*. Simferopol': Dolja.
- Gajvoronskij, O. (2016). *Strana Krym. Oчерki o pamjatnike istorii Krymskogo hanstva*. Simferopol'.
- Hakimov, R. S. (Ed.). (2016). *Svod pamjatnikov istorii, arhitektury i kul'tury krymskikh tatar* (Vol. I. Bahchisaraj). Simferopol'.
- Ibragimova, A. M. (2015). *Bahchisarajskij Hanskij dvorec XVI–XVIII*. Kiev.
- Jakobson, A. L. (1964). *Srednevekovyj Krym: oчерki istorii i istorii material'noj kul'tury*. Moskva; Leningrad.
- Klenina, E. Ju., Moisieiev, D. A., & Biernacki, A. B. (2018). The building ceramics of the Byzantine Chersonesus Taurica: form and chronology. In *Novae. Studies and Materials: Sacrum et Profanum. Haec studia amici et college Andrei B. Biernacki septuagennio dicant* (Vol. VI). Poznań.

Моїсєєв Дмитро

БАНІ МУХАМЕДА IV ГІРЕЯ: ЗНИКЛА ЧАСТИНА ХАНСЬКОГО ПАЛАЦУ

Статтю присвячено проблемі історичної топографії ядра міста Бахчисарай, а саме Ханському палацу. Він був центром формування середньовічного міста, столиці Кримського ханства. В історіографії домінує погляд, що він, у певному сенсі, був копією та розвитком ідеї середньовічного Східного палацу. А саме – Топ-Капи у Стамбулі.

Через умови перманентного геноциду кримців Російською імперією у XIX–XX ст. дослідження культурної й історичної спадщини народу залишається на дуже низькому рівні. Це приводило до формування викривленої картини розуміння культурної спадщини. З культурно-історичного ландшафту зникали монументальні нерухомі об'єкти, а пам'ять про них, навіть наукова, втрачалась. Прикладом такого об'єкта є бані Мухамеда IV Гірея. У статті за допомогою методу археологічної геолокації визначено реальне місце розташування пам'ятки. Її відкриття та інтерпретація як важливої частини припалацової частини міста дає змогу по-іншому подивитись на весь комплекс Хансараю як такого. На відміну від Східних палаців, Ханський палац був центром міста. Навколо нього формувалися квартали суспільно важливих споруд (однією з них були бані Мухамеда IV Гірея), які вже потім переходили у громадянську міську квартальну забудову з садибами, мечетями та іншими суспільними спорудами.

Ключові слова: Ханський палац, бані, геолокація, історична топографія, історичне джерело.