

Imperial landscapes in late nineteenth – early twentieth century Eurasia: Kazan on the Volga

Paper presented at:
CESS 20th Annual Conference
Gulchachak Nugmanova, Washington, USA
11 October 2019

Gulchachak Nugmanova
Leading researcher
Research Institute of Theory and History of Architecture and Urban Planning
9 Dushinskaya Street
Moscow, 111024, Russia
Tel. +7 903 3132239
Email: gulchachak.n@gmail.com

WORKING PAPER: Not for citation or distribution without permission of the author.

Abstract

This paper explores the creation of an imperial image of Kazan, the former capital of the Kazan khanate separated from the Golden Horde. Conquered by Tsar Ivan IV the Terrible in 1552, it symbolized Russian empire's beginning. I argue that region's distant past played a great role in representation of empire in the emerging urban landscape of the 19th – early 20th century imperial city of Kazan. The imperial idea of state greatness inspired the government of Catherine the Great to start an ambitious project of transformation of the medieval structures of all Russian cities. The architectural model of an imperial city was first materialized in absolute terms during the construction of the new capital of St.-Petersburg. Since the second half of the 18th century, it was implemented by the government on the vast expanse of the rest of Russia through strict regulation of building including the artistic styles of the edifices. I consider how the state vision of an imperial city was realized, paying particular attention to the city center and Tatar quarters. Tatars-Muslims with their own architectural and planning traditions, and their own points of historical memory formed a significant part of the population of the city. I wonder how these traditions interacted with state norms and legislation; what tools and approaches the authorities on the one hand, and local population on the other, used for the success of the imperial project of modern city and resolution of the cultural conflicts. Local historical and architectural monuments are also the focus of my attention, with the kremlin viewed by the official St.-Petersburg as a

captured Tatar fortress at the center. Russian power appropriated the Kazan past physically embodying the city's history and using it in representative purposes. I show that the process of urban transformation in 19th century Kazan fully reflected the essence of the empire itself. This paper, which is an attempt to comprehend the urban process in late imperial Kazan, is based on archival materials from the National Archive of the Republic of Tatarstan and authors published materials concerning the construction history of some city buildings and ensembles.

Introduction

The imperial idea of a great state was a main idea of Russian history beginning at least from Peter I. It was this idea that turned Muscovy into Russian Empire, and the same idea encouraged the empress Catherine II and her government to start a grandiose reconstructive activity on replanning and rebuilding of all provincial cities. The architectural and urban model of Russian province was implemented during the largest part of the long 19th century filling with new content and demonstrating various forms of visible expression of the imperial project on the empire's periphery. This article aims to show the ways in which the experiences of empire and urbanism intersected in provincial Kazan, annexed by the Russian state in 1552. City's status of a former capital of the Tatar Khanate determined its identity and marked its place and meaning in history and structure of Russian Empire. The paper examines how this agenda was realized through the physical landscape of Kazan focusing particularly on the late imperial period of the last third of the 19th and early 20th century. It argues that constructing of city's imperial image was a constant concern of tsarist officials and monarchy itself. Though much has been written about Kazan buildings and its ensembles, this key aspect of local architectural studies has been set aside.

1. Regular city as an imperial precedent

Regularity was the brightest architectural expression of the imperial idea of state greatness in New time Russia. Since the reign of Catherin II, a regular net of cities, many of which having been appointed from the villages by power's volitional decision, covered evenly all the imperial space. A regular planned city built uniformly with European-style buildings became a visible expression of the state consistent policy to turn the country into "Russian Europe". Regular plan and model project approved by the emperor were given the force of law, and it is they that served as a main tool for transformation of the medieval face of the Russian province. Every private building, or even the gate and fence had to be built following one of the state model projects, and painted one of the sample colors.¹

Plan of 1768 changed cardinally the urban space of Kazan, covering not only the Russian-Orthodox city inside the walls, but also its periphery with ethno-confessional "others" as Old believers and Muslim Tatars. The regularized Tatar quarters were incorporated into one city space and into a single system of straight and wide streets and squares, one of them having been arranged directly on the place where the Muslim cemetery was. This practice of compulsory architectural unification came into conflict with local urban characteristics as, for example, small plots compared to the capital ones, and with local traditions of housebuilding. This conflict had been resolved through adapting of the state norms to the local conditions, or by means of alternative architectural and planning solutions, such as free interpretation of the model façades, or using of their

fragments. As a result of this strict regulation, the Government's aim was achieved, and Kazan quarters including the Tatar ones acquired a unified appearance.

In the second half of the nineteenth century, empire cities economic well-being largely determined their architectural appearance, depending on the degree of trade development and inclusion into the all-Russian transport infrastructure. Kazan was connected to the Russian railway network in 1893 only. Formation of a new square and construction of a grand railway station building marked that occasion. The design of its facade with a dome and tall turrets, which provoked direct associations with mosque minarets, was to visualize the Tatar-Muslim origin of Kazan.² This image reproduced the "European" orientalism of the Russian Empire of the epoch of Great reforms with its "own East". But since the accession of Middle Asia, now it played the role of Russian "East", while Kazan became the "inner" city that needed different architectural expression for this highly significant public building.

As elsewhere, the growth of the urban territory was due to suburban areas, where large industrial clusters emerged. Alongside with the giant enterprises of the Krestovnikovs and I.I. Alafuzov, there appeared large manufactures owned by the Tatars: M.I. Utyamyshev and Co., Azimov brothers, I.A. Arslanov, etc. The industry developed in the lower part of the city, while the outskirts of the upper part accumulated large and modern educational complexes typically in brick and classical styles. They included Commercial, Technical, Women's Diocesan Schools and Higher Women's Courses, as well as new university-owned buildings of hospitals, bacteriological institute, a students' dormitory. Their modern artistic

styles left a deep impression on the citizenry identifying with progress and the development of science in the world.³

Peculiar to Kazan was the state establishment of special educational institutions, which was caused by the new confessional and russification policies in teacher training for local and ministerial schools in foreign, non-native settlements. Kazan teacher (*inorodcheskaya*) seminary and Tatar teacher school corresponded to the state's two different approaches in terms of "connecting non-ethnic communities with the native Russian people". The seminary aimed at cultural assimilation through Christian education. The monumental four-story building, being constructed in 1872 in the Old Tatar sloboda settlement, symbolized a certain consistency of these educational institutions. It was located in the site of the mid-18th century Novokreshchensk office, which was famous for the persecution of non-native population and was further liquidated by Catherine the Great. There, in the sloboda settlement, in the former Apakovs' mansion, the Tatar teacher school appeared in 1876. The futility of the efforts to Christianize Muslim Tatars encouraged the state authorities to focus on their integration through the introduction of the Russian language and secular education.

The fate of Kazan is typical of many Russian cities of the analysed time period, with common architectural and urban-planning. However, the growth of a close Tatar-Muslim community, led by the financially secure and ideologized Tatar bourgeoisie, having their active representatives in local authorities, critically changed the image of the Tatar neighbourhoods, turning them into a "city within a city".

The special role of Sennaya Square in the life of the Tatars is related to the implementation of the regular plan of 1768, which made radical changes to the Old Tatar sloboda settlement of Kazan, which had appeared in the suburbs soon after the Kazan conquest. According to the plan, the square was to be located in the place of the old Muslim cemetery; with a ditch, separating the city from the suburbs was to go straight through the territory of the sloboda, dividing it into two parts. The first one, with the official market area was a part of the city, and was supposed to be developed by Russian residents. Tatars were to move to a new Old-Tatar sloboda located on the outskirts, which was to be built up with new regular quarters. However, from the very beginning, the eastern side of Sennaya Square was formed by the Tatar merchants' shops, because contrary to the plan, the Tatar districts did not disappear from this part of the city. After the old sloboda division, the Tatars who lived there did not move to the designated area in the suburbs, but stayed, forming an independent Muslim congregation. The Tatar estates spread between the regular planned quarters, in one of which in 1798 a stone mosque with facades in the predominant early classicism style, appeared. In 1818, petitioning for the construction of another mosque there, a merchant's widow Gabida Kitaeva called this place "the old Tatar sloboda".⁴ The indication of a materially non-existent settlement in a fully transformed urban space is revealing. This territory remained the Old Tatar sloboda in the minds of the inhabitants, providing an example of the conservative collective consciousness, both in questions of toponymy and perception of living space, in general. The perception of the place that had been passed along through generations and centuries was preserved in the

mindset of the population. In the end of the 19th century, Sh. Marjani highlighted the vitality of the image of the ancient Muslim cemetery in people's memory, when they documented the location of their ancestors' burial sites, matching them to the modern redevelopment.⁵ The consecrated nature of the place caused deliberate displacing of the Russian population and the spread of the Tatar quarters. After the fire of 1859, a great deal of property was bought by the merchant Zigansha Usmanov, who registered another Muslim congregation there. At the beginning of the 20th century, most of the buildings in Sennaya Square belonged to Tatars. They also owned the property in the other parts of the city. But, what is important is that in the area of Sennaya Square the former Old Tatar sloboda was basically recreated. The square itself had an important role in the Tatar social movements of the late 19th – early 20th century, becoming the symbol of national recovery.

The reform of Tatar education initiated by the state and supported by the Tatar community, who foresaw potential prospects in it, resulted in the establishment of educational buildings in Tatar quarters. Maktab and madrasah, which had previously been located in mosques, or in the residential style buildings, started to gain the image of public buildings, with expressive facades in the classicism or brick style. The Russian-Tatar schools and Russian classes at the madrasah became the focus of special patronage of the Tatar bourgeoisie. Some claimed well-equipped facilities in the City Duma, thus, in 1913, the male and female Tatar schools acquired one of the best mansions.⁶ Others built religious schools at the mosques for donations. In 1867, Z. Usmanov created the Usmania madrasah

together with the mosque.⁷ The oldest mosques of Kazan — Apanaevskaya and Yunusovskaya acquired their modern school buildings in 1877 and 1880.

Muhammadiyah madrasah was an elaborate architectural complex, created in 1883-1901, in four stages by different philanthropists.⁸ The provided “European” conditions, such as well-equipped classrooms (with desks, boards, chairs, paintings, visual aids), a wellmaintained dormitory, workshops, a stadium (a skating rink in winter), had the same general atmosphere of freedom in the madrasah, with handwritten newspapers and magazines published and various performances staged. The mullah G. Barudi was convinced that the Muslim world development is impossible without its integration with the achievements of the European and world civilization and ensured the prime of the Tatar confessional school of 1913-1918. In 1916, the women’s school established by Fatiha Aitova at her own expense received the status of a Muslim gymnasium.

The education reforms, the appearance of a generation of national intelligentsia, thinking afresh, contributed to the development of Tatar secular culture. Among the numerous printing houses with melodious names, some of which were located in rented buildings (“*Bayan el'-Hak*”), others — in houses built on purpose (“*Millyat*”), a modern publishing and trade complex belonging to the Karimov brothers, stood out. It included a printing house, a bookshop and the “*Kitaphana Islamiya*” library with a reading room for 150 people.⁹ The Oriental Club established in 1907, was located in the rooms of “*Bulgar*”, in the Sabitovs’ house on the Kaban Lake, and only in 1910 moved to its own threestory building. In the rebuilt house of the merchant Karim Apanaev, which was equipped with a

dressing room, an auditorium for 150 people, a Russian-Muslim library, leisure rooms, they played games, had lectures and debates, organized staged performances (in both languages) and holidays, and planned to create a national museum.¹⁰ New public buildings demonstrated the reforming of the nation's traditional patriarchal way of life, its integration with the spiritual advantages of the world civilization.

The program on the development of Russian urban environment, adopted by the government of Catherine the Great constituted a part of the “internal colonization” project of the empire, which aimed at integrating and creating a single social space that would function according to the general “European” rules.¹¹ The implementation of this program in Kazan demonstrated the Tatar homeowners' positive reaction, as they did not object the regular, linear urban-planning of the city districts, and adopted the internal layout of the classic noble residence. However, they firmly indicated their commitment of the traditional organization of the estate space, adjusted the housing layout to the division into male and female areas, and upheld the borders of the Tatar sloboda. It could be said that the “European ideology” was adapted to express their own traditional content, and was endowed with their own, unique meanings.

The success of the imperial integration of the second half of the 18th – the first half of the 19th century led to the increasing need to emphasize the Tatar peculiarity by external means, because due to national self-consciousness growth, it had lost its remarkable character. The understanding that the national community is not a fact of life, and requires conscious political and cultural efforts, was

becoming widespread at the end of the 19th~early 20th century, when the ideas of national revival possessed the minds of the Tatar bourgeoisie and the emerging intelligentsia. Conscious attitude to the “Tatar” concept manifested itself in architecture through national motifs, previously non-characteristic of the Tatar houses facades, reproducing the model projects of the capital. Among the fresh design details were Arabic script inscriptions on the gables, bay windows, multi-layered stalactite-like consoles, colour glass, and keel-shaped embrasures. It was the artistic language of European Orientalism, adapted by the Tatar community to express its own “oriental” particularity.

The so-called “house of Shamil”, built in 1903 by Maryam Shamil-Apakova, the wife of the fourth son of the revered Imam Shamil, the Major General Muhammad-Shagi Shamil, is considered to be a classic example of Tatar romanticism architecture. Maryam Shamil-Apakova graduated from the women's gymnasium in Kazan. She spoke Russian to her husband, as he could not speak Tatar properly, and maintained the home lifestyle of cosmopolitan European elite. In winter, in the courtyard of their mansion in Tatar sloboda, the Shamils installed two fur-trees. The first one was chosen by Shamil himself and was to be taller than the governor's was, while the second was set “for the people”. At that time, the decorated fur-tree was exclusively a symbol of the Christian Christmas, but even if the Shamils did not introduce any religious meaning to this holiday (for example, timed it for the New Year), it was an extremely “unconventional” gesture from the heiress of the Tatar murza and the son of the leader of the Sharia movement in the North Caucasus.

Thus, the Tatar peculiarity of Maryam Shamil-Apakova was no longer determined by maintaining customs, but by informed choice. This choice was manifested in the desire to build a house in the old Tatar sloboda, but not in the noble “Russian” quarters of the city (where the number of Tatar homeowners was increasing). It was also their choice that the building designed in the European modern style was overburdened with the demonstratively orientalist motifs. Functionally, it was the very “Orientalism”, which Edward Said later described as a fantastic idea of the essence of the “Oriental” as Europeans’ object of imagination. Nevertheless, in fact, the ordering customers of the building consciously belonged to the “oriental” background: they were the famous Tatar philanthropist and a devoted son of Imam Shamil. Perceiving European culture as a universal and possessed by no one in particular, capable of “creating, uniting and preserving the whole world,” Maryam Shamil-Apakov used it to express her national identity.

Probably, with time, the Tatar national trend in architecture could have been formed, but the social revolution of 1917 changed the direction of its development. By this time, even in the minds of the Tatar intelligentsia there was no clear understanding of the modern national style in architecture. Thus, the famous writer Fatih Amirkhan, who published a series of fantastic stories about the future of the Tatar people (1909-1910), described the design of the buildings in very general terms: “like European style, but decorated with the best, what oriental art could give”.¹² This phrase perfectly suits to describe “the house of Shamil” as an architectural expression of a certain period of mutual reflections of the imperial

cultural metropolis and the province: when they started to describe the local identity through the language of the universalist culture, but had not yet developed their own original language to express this identity.

The regular space with a European image, which was originally interpreted, adjusted to the traditions and formed in the course of mutual compromises, marked the beginning of the new Tatar-Muslim architectural and urban-planning culture. The favourable position of the Tatar elite in the Age of Enlightenment promoted the perception of the European culture through Russian culture and developing the new tradition on its basis.

2. Constructing of imperial identity in the urban space

The imperial image of a Russian city was represented primarily in its main centre. In Kazan, the ensembles of Bogoroditsky (the Mother of God) Monastery and Voskresenskaya Street with the buildings of the City Duma, *Gostiny Dvor* and Kazan University contributed to the city's classical image formed by the first half of the 19th century. Classical styles were the architectural medium through which Europeans always apprehended empire, classical forms evoked a connection with the Roman Empire. The images of classical Rome were created in the key places of the city.

The semantic role of Bogoroditsky Monastery was associated with the acquisition of the icon of the Mother-of-God of Kazan, which became the protectrix of the Romanov dynasty. After Catherine II visited the monastery in 1768, her court architect of Ivan Starov designed a new grandiose cathedral. It was

laid in the presence of Paul I and Grand Prince of Alexander. Alexander since becoming the Emperor provided the annual funding until the church was completed in 1808. The monumental cathedral with columned porticos, pediments and massive dome gave the urban setting a truly imperial scale. Conceived in 1809, the ensemble with the oval square surrounded by a colonnade was a direct reference to the most famous monument of the Christian world — St. Peter's Square in Rome, was implemented only to some extent.¹³ Its architect Yakov Shelkovnikov helped in construction of the Kazan Cathedral in Petersburg created in the image of St. Peter's Cathedral by the order of Paul I. As a pupil of famous Andrei Voronikhin in Academy of Arts, Shelkovnikov developed his ideas on empire's periphery. His other pupil Michael Korinfskyi appealed to the same images when creating a symmetrical composition in Kazan kremlin with a bishop's house on the axis and the old and the new Annunciation cathedrals on the sides of a semicircle square.¹⁴

In the second half of the 19th century, the relevance of the aesthetics of regular urban-planning in Russia was mainly expressed through the conservation and maintenance of the existing planning structures. In Kazan, however, the *concept of regularity gained a new impetus* in completing the already initiated and creating new ensembles in the conditions of sustainable classicism traditions.

In 1862, the abbess of Bogoroditsky Monastery expressed the desire to complete the ensemble according to the project of 1810. The new project had reference to the copy of the original general arrangement; that testified the firm determination to follow it. The desire was so strong that it could not follow the

direct instructions of the capital's officials. They encouraged implementing the project "taking into account the present needs of the monastery and the terrain conditions, with no confusion of the facade of 1810, approved by the highest authorities", as the facade no longer produced the same effect as 50 years ago, in the times of its approval. The design delayed because of a lack of funds rediscovered its relevance in 1879 on the 300th anniversary of the acquisition of the icon of the Mother-of-God of Kazan. The Krestovozdvizhenskiy building with new Holy gate, symmetrical to the existing Nikolsky Cathedral of 1810-1815 and completely similar to it, was constructed in 1883-1887. However, the old church, which had been preserved due to the 1869 decree that extended the law on Russian ancient antiquities on the monuments of the Peter's era, broke this symmetry giving picturesque to the strict image of the monastery complex. In 1910-s a cave church was arranged in the basement of the cathedral at the place of direct acquisition of the icon of the Mother-of-God of Kazan initiated by Grand Duchess Elizabeth Feodorovna who had attracted her architect of Aleksey Schusev. Inclusion of the monastery that received royal patronage from its very foundation into the program of celebration of the 300th anniversary of the Romanov dynasty demonstrated for the last time its significance for the imperial family and for the empire as a whole.

The ensemble of the Kazan University that appeared in the gymnasium quarter in 1830-s was one of the best masterpieces of Russian classicism, which embodied the imperial meaning of the educational institution of the epoch of Enlightenment in its architecture. It was of a particular importance taking into account the university's educational mission on the East. The complex was a

completed composition, and famous Russian enlightener, a native of Kazan, Derzhavin's monument became its final element. Emperor Nicholas I personally showed the place for its installation at the center of a semicircular square during his stay in Kazan in 1836.¹⁵ The magnificence of the University, its answering to the achievements of the modernity admired Nicholas I so much that he said that “the university buildings were the best he had ever seen before of the kind”, as Benckendorff wrote in his memories.¹⁶ – продолжить про университет здесь?

Visits to province by monarchs served as a tool for disseminating their reign's scenarios and contributing to the formation of the imperial ideology and inner policy.¹⁷ They were a kind of power's symbolic establishment over a certain territory, which in the case of Kazan had acquired the meaning of a second conquest, no longer military, but the cultural one¹⁸ embedding the urban process into the concept of cultural development of the province. In this regard, the person of Nicholas I, well known not only for his authoritarianism but also for his passion to architecture, is of particular interest.

Nicholas I's arrival to Kazan realized two important imperial ideas. The first was to unit all sections of the people including that of the winner and the won. It was embodied in emperor's meeting with Tatars held in the mosque where he honored the obedience and impeccable loyalty of these his subjects,¹⁹ and mufti met him with a speech that expressed devotion and gratitude of his people, and said a special thanksgiving prayer (first translated and shown to the governor).²⁰

Visiting the church built by will of Tsar Ivan the Terrible in memory to the fallen orthodox warrior of the Kazan conquest, symbolized another imperial idea

related to the image of a victorious country. In 1811, the Zilant monastery's Archimandrite decided to replace the wooden pillar on the grave with the stone one. This private initiative was intercepted by the State, which announced a design competition for a temple monument.²¹ Constructed in 1813,²² it was renovated by the Government in 1832 on the 20th anniversary of the war of 1812.²³ It embodied the glorious conquest of Kazan becoming since the Nicholas I a mandatory place for the members of the Imperial family to commemorate the event. In 1871, when a private person wished to build a belfry he was refused by central authorities that declared it a "state heritage".²⁴ The relevance of the topic of conquest that was the essence of Russian imperial power's representation, increased after the victory in the war of 1812, and the places of old military winnings acquired a new sound.

The most grandiose monument to the Kazan conquest was the renewed kremlin, viewed by the official Petersburg as a captured Tatar fortress. After Nicholas I's arrival to Kazan, the restoration works that began as recovery after the fire of 1815 turned into a full-scale reconstruction with the idea of creating an emperor's residence there. The kremlin, though built in 16-17-th centuries by Russians, was perceived as the participant of the Kazan conquest, and therefore was of great interest for emperor. This was evidenced by Alexander von Benckendorff, who accompanied the tsar in his walk "along the walls of ancient kremlin, once long resisted the Moscow power". That was when the idea came to Nicholas I to resume the ancient khan's palace by the type of the epoch and in place near the survived Suyumbeki tower.²⁵ A nearby church was thought to be rebuilt from the palace mosque, and Suyumbeki tower its minaret.²⁶ This last

actually was a watchtower of the turn of the 17-18 centuries. However, the myth of its Tatar origin firmly established in the 19-th century mind. The university professor of Karl Fuchs in his “History of Kazan” dated it to the middle of the 17th century referring to tower’s architecture to prove this point, and, in particular, its niche for the icon and pilaster, which, in his view, was unknown for the Tatars.²⁷ A complex supposed to appear on the ruins of the khan’s palace (placed “into a whole one with the remains of the ancient building”²⁸), would include the Governor-General’s house with emperor’s apartments in case of his arrival to Kazan, the restored church (which emperor wished to be connected with his rooms²⁹), and the Suyumbeki tower. The project designed by the Kazan architect Foma Petondy³⁰ launched a long-term search, in which the architects and officials, both local and capital, were involved, including “the main empire’s architect” Konstantin Thon and even emperor’s court gardener. Nicholas I monitored the design process attentively going into the details of the decisions. The ancient buildings were carefully measured.³¹ The project designed in the capital and confirmed in 1838³² lost its relevance immediately with the emergence of Thon’s Moscow kremlin project. In 1843, Thon recreated its reduced replica in Kazan with the similar set of forms-signs of Russian-Byzantine style.³³ Restoration of the church was a matter of principle. Despite the bad physical condition, that made it difficult to restore the building, the Emperor strictly rejected the Governor’s proposal for erecting of a new temple instead of the old one.³⁴

The Governor-General's house was stated to face the Annunciation Cathedral built in 1561-1562.³⁵ Emperor's forthcoming arrival inspired the citizens to lay a new cathedral in his presence,³⁶ and the project was designed.³⁷ But, Nicholas I ordered to extend the existing cathedral without building of a new one,³⁸ and he even personally measured the space for this extension.³⁹ A series of projects was designed during next 4 years.⁴⁰ The new extension contrasted with the ancient temple whose recognizable decoration reminded of its mid-16th century origin.

The fortress itself was a matter of similar associations. The emperor refused categorically the governor's proposal to demolish the Tainitskaya Tower ordering to reinforce it with buttresses.⁴¹ Built in the 16th century on the place of the Tatar Nur-Ali tower and exploded during the Kazan siege, it had a key place in Kazan history. Right here Ivan the Terrible rode into the ruined khan's fortress on October 4, in 1552 two days after the Kazan conquest. Spasskaya Tower was another symbolic place in the kremlin. Here was the tsar's flag during the fight, and, here the tsar hoisted an orthodox cross after winning, and a camp tent church was erected by Ivan the Terrible's order. Nicholas I ordered to resume the tower church of the Savior Nerukotvorny.⁴²

The ensemble of the Governor-General's palace expressed the state idea of the union of Self-rule, Orthodoxy and People in its architecture, where the "Tatar" tower of Suyumbeki represented an indigenous component of the empire's people. It also symbolized the restoration of power and urban structures. The Kazan kremlin emperor's residence became a place of stay and official functions for the whole royal family. During the period of the second half of the 19th – beginning of

the 20th century 14 its members lived there including emperors, both current and future.⁴³ The myth of Suyumbeki tower's Tatar origin had rooted in the public mind. Thus, in 1907, when a deviation from tower's vertical axis was revealed, Kazan Muslims expressed their readiness to take fully the repair costs, and established a special Committee from trustworthy merchants headed by respected Akhmet Saidashev.⁴⁴

At the second half of the 19th – early 20th century, the concept of the State was still manifested through creating of an expressive public space, indicating the genetic and substantial kinship with the ideas of regular town planning of the previous epoch.⁴⁵ Development and designing of significant city spaces continued this time.

The university complex had a strong influence on the architecture of Kazan, especially its central area, where one can follow the neo-classical traditions already from the earlier times. Thus, in 1878, while constructing the new Voskresensky (Resurrection) Cathedral near the university on the self-titled square, in the place of the old one, the focus on classical forms was clearly observed in the design specifications,⁴⁶ though it contradicted the general direction of the Russian style in church construction. The square itself became part of the university space when in 1893 the Physics and Mathematics Society of the Kazan University initiated celebration of hundredth anniversary of the birth of its professor and former rector famous mathematician Nickolay Lobachevsky. A garden named after him was arranged in part of the square in front of the university and shortly renewed façade

of the Xenin Gymnasium, with the support of the Kazan Duma. A bust of the scientist made by Petersburg sculptor of Maria Dillon was installed in its centre.⁴⁷

The need for the public spaces increased in the era of the declared inclusion of the people in public administration. In the second half of the nineteenth century Russia, City Duma buildings of Russian folk forms symbolized the time of Great Reforms. Unlike the other cities, the building of Kazan Public Self-Government, rebuilt in 1830-1840s, retained its appearance of the classic image of Voskresenskaya Street. In Kazan, the involvement in democratic change found its architectural and planning embodiment in first appeared administrative square. The Kazan City Duma enthusiastically joined the widely spread movement, aimed at memorialization of emperor Alexander II and in 1881, immediately after his death initiated the construction of a monument to the author of Great Reforms in front of the Duma building.

In this respect, in 1885, the abbot of St. John the Baptist Monastery inspired the activity on demolition and rebuilding the 17th century cathedral opposite the Duma, which turned out to be surprisingly timely. Uncommon to Russian architecture, the three-temple cathedral was dismantled despite the strong objection from Moscow Archaeological Society, recognizing it as “a remarkable monument of Russian architecture”.⁴⁸ The local authorities had outstarted the scientific community, having obtained the imperial permission for demolition of the cathedral in the Governing Synod. The new cathedral, founded in 1887 and constructed in 1899, “preserving the old architecture, to the extent possible”, was

greatly brought forward and placed in parallel with the City Duma building, thus, architecturally shaping the southern side of the space.⁴⁹

In 1895, a monument to the Tsar Liberator was erected in its centre on the winning project of academician Vladimir Sherwood. He had submitted two his works for competition entitled “*Slava*” and “*Velikomu*” (“Glory” and “To the Great”). They were both given absolute priority by anonymous vote from citizens, local architects (experts) and the special Committee consisted of the members of the Kazan City Duma and Zemstvo. Thus, the selection procedure was in line with the democratic content of the monument. An exhibition was arranged for the townspeople in the City Duma building where they could cast their votes for the design they liked.⁵⁰

Sherwood’s both projects were intended to convey the idea of royalty and greatness of the state power through the “dear image of the Great Monarch” and his “glorious deeds”, first representing the bust of the Tsar, and the second being his full-length figure. Kazan contest in which the best sculptures of the country participated,⁵¹ showed the same approaches and artistic methods emerged from designing the imperial monument for the capitals.⁵² Of 13 participants Sherwood was the only who saw fit to reflect the Kazan specificity in the monument, which was city’s special civilizational mission. “As key characteristic of Kazan is its educational meaning for the countries of the East, citizens cannot fail to have sympathy for the educational activity of the Great sovereign and wish to capture it on their monument”, – wrote the author in general explanatory note to his designs.⁵³ He embodied this his idea in the image of a sitting wise man in classic

attire with left hand hugging a boy, and the right one pointing to the open book. The pyramidal pedestal was decorated with figures of winged snakes, or *Zilants*, borrowed from the coat of arms of Kazan. Stairs leading up were to remind the educational influence of Kazan at the surrounding tribes, still uncultured.⁵⁴ The author clearly preferred his first project, however, the second one was chosen for realization, with statue of the emperor and “Kazan griffins” holding wreaths of glory.⁵⁵ Emperor Alexander III, who took a vital part in creation of the imperial monuments to his father in the country, made changes in Kazan statue, ordering to abandon the scroll, scarf and exeldants.⁵⁶ Monument’s unveiling dates were very indicative. Initially, the ceremony was scheduled for October 2, which was the memorial day of the Kazan conquest,⁵⁷ then moved to October 22, the day of miraculous finding of the icon of Kazan Mother of God.⁵⁸ Because of the death of the emperor, the opening was postponed again and took place only next year in 1895, August 30 on Alexander III’s Day.⁵⁹ In the same year, in the eastern part of Gostiny Dvor, facing the square, there appeared a city museum, which was marked by a corner turret.⁶⁰ At the beginning of the 20th century, the monument was surrounded by a luxurious cast iron fence and illuminated.⁶¹ The square renamed to “Alexandrovskaya” became an important part of the city centre. It embodied a new vision of the empire expressed through such a key notion of the "European" of the time as “self-governing” in its architecture. For the first time since realization of the regular plan of 1768, the city public space similar to the European Town Hall Squares appeared in Kazan by the end of the 19th century, with its own “town

hall”, i.e. City Duma building. The ensemble of the main city centre got its completion.

Conclusion

At all times, architecture was the quickest and the most accessible tool for illustrating the imperial idea in terms of both realization and perception.

Architecture of Russian cities, which was the mirror and the signboard at the same time, of the imperial idea with its tendency to order and homogeneity most brightly and impressively manifested in the image of their main centres. Early appearance of the regular city plan, approved by Catherine the Great in 1768, contributed to the development of classicism traditions in Kazan, further flourishing in the first half of the 19th century. The stability of these traditions in the subsequent period of the second half of the 19th – early 20th centuries can be explained by the vitality of the “empire” idea in the particularly important conquered region and the ongoing need to visualize it by means of architecture. Interest in antiquities and in local history entailed the acceptance of the imperial order of things, and of its rootedness. The historical episode of the Kazan conquest, important for the region, was interpreted in the frames of this interest as an inclusion into not only the larger, but also more orderly and advanced state structure.

The empire is the field for a single civilization, distributed from its centre. In the spatial dimension, the “imperial” concept brings architecture as its visual image

to the forefront. This indisputability escalated the cultural opposition of the local and the global, if the elements of another culture and civilization were present.

¹ G.G. Nugmanova, «Rossijskaya vlast', evropejskaya model', tatarskaya tradiciya: Transformaciya gorodskogo prostranstva Kazani i svoboda vybora v ramkah gosudarstvennoj reglamentacii» // *Ab Imperio*. № 3. Moskva, 2016. P. 76-117.

² Russian State Historical Archive. F. 350. Op. 27. D. 594.

³ Vishlenkova, E.A. “Terra Universitatis”. Dva veka universitetskoj kul'tury v Kazani / E.A. Vishlenkova, S.YU. Malysheva, A.A. Sal'nikova. – Kazan': Kazanskij universitet, 2005. – 500 s. P. 36.

⁴ State Archive of the Republic of Tatarstan. F. 2. Op. 1. D. 23. P. 653.

⁵ Shihabeddin Marjani. Мустафадель-ахбар фи ахвали Казан ва Болгар). Kazan, 1989. P. 206-207 [in Tatar].

⁶ State Archive of the Republic of Tatarstan. F. 2. Op. 7. D. 2276.

⁷ State Archive of the Republic of Tatarstan. F. 2. Op. 15. D. 312.

⁸ State Archive of the Republic of Tatarstan. F. 98. Op. 4. D. 53.

⁹ Historical and Cultural Monuments of the Tatar People (R. Salikhov, R. Khairutdinov, Pamyatniki istorii i kul'tury tatarskogo naroda). Kazan: Fest, 1995. P. 45-46, 53, 114 [in Russian].

¹⁰ State Archive of the Republic of Tatarstan. F. 2. Op. 7. D. 3207.

¹¹ Russian power, European model, Tatar tradition: Transformation of the Kazan urban space and freedom of choice within state regulations, in *Ab Imperio*, No. 3 (G.G. Nugmanova, Rossiyskaya vlast', yevropeyskaya model', tatarskaya traditsiya: Transformatsiya gorodskogo prostranstva Kazani i svoboda vybora v ramkakh gosudarstvennoy reglamentatsii, *Ab Imperio*, No. 3). Moscow, 2016. P. 76-117 [in Russian].

¹² At the crossroads (Amirkhan F. Na pereput'ye). Kazan, Tatar Publ., 1979 [in Russian].

¹³ The history of planning and construction of the Kazan Mother of God Monastery, in *Monuments of Russian architecture and monumental art* (G.G. Nugmanova, Istoriya planirovki i stroitel'stva Kazanskogo Bogoroditskogo monastyrya, Pamyatniki russkoj arkhitektury i monumental'nogo iskusstva). Moscow: Nauka, 2010. P. 172-216 [in Russian].

¹⁴ KFU, Scientific Library, Department of Manuscripts and Rare Books. Items 3068, 3077.

-
- ¹⁵ State Archive of the Republic of Tatarstan. F. 92. Op. 1. D. 4420. L. 65.
- ¹⁶ Alexander Kh. Benkendorf, 'Zapiski (1832–1837 rr.)', Nikolai K. Shil'der, Imperator Nikolai I. Ego zhizn' i tsarstvovanie, Tom 2 (St Petersburg: [s.n.], 1903). P. 733.
- ¹⁷ Richard S. Wortman. Scenarios of Power. Myth and Ceremony in Russian Monarchy. In 2 vol. Scenarii vlasti. Mify i ceremonii russkoj monarhii. V 2-h tomah. Moskva, 2002, 2004.
- ¹⁸ G.F. Ibneeva. Puteshestvie Ekateriny II po Volge v 1767 godu: uznovanie imperii // Ab Imperio. 2000. № 2. P. 87-104.
- ¹⁹ Alexander Kh. Benkendorf, 'Zapiski. P. 734;
- ²⁰ State Archive of the Republic of Tatarstan. F.1. Op. 2. D. 80. L. 179-182.
- ²¹ State Archive of the Republic of Tatarstan. F. 1. Op. 1. D. 9.
- ²² Ibid. State Archive of the Republic of Tatarstan. F. 1. Op. 1. D. 115.
- ²³ State Archive of the Republic of Tatarstan. F. 409. Op. D.
- ²⁴ State Archive of the Republic of Tatarstan. F. 2. Op. 7. D. 2438.
- ²⁵ Alexander Kh. Benkendorf, 'Zapiski (1832–1837 rr.)', Nikolai K. Shil'der, Imperator Nikolai I. Ego zhizn' i tsarstvovanie, Tom 2 (St Petersburg: [s.n.], 1903). P. 733.
- ²⁶ State Archive of the Republic of Tatarstan. F. 1. Op. 1. D. 109.
- ²⁷ State Archive of the Republic of Tatarstan. F. 1. Op. 1. D. 175. L. 1.
- ²⁸ KFU, Scientific Library, Department of Manuscripts and Rare Books. Items 9599, 9601, 9602, 9603, 9604.
- ²⁹ State Archive of the Republic of Tatarstan. F. 409. Op. 8. D. 4. L. 4-5.
- ³⁰ KFU, Scientific Library, Department of Manuscripts and Rare Books. Items 9599, 9601, 9602, 9603, 9604.
- ³¹ KFU, Scientific Library, Department of Manuscripts and Rare Books. Items 9596, 9597, 9598.
- ³² State Archive of the Republic of Tatarstan. F. 409. Op. 8. D. 4. L. 12-13.
- ³³ Russian State Historical Archive. F. 218. Op. 4. D. 7.
- ³⁴ Ibid. L. 221.
- ³⁵ State Archive of the Republic of Tatarstan. F. 409. Op. 8. D. 4. L. 1-2.
- ³⁶ State Archive of the Republic of Tatarstan. F. 1. Op. 2. D. 80.
- ³⁷ KFU, Scientific Library, Department of Manuscripts and Rare Books. Item 9607.
- ³⁸ Yablokov, A. Kafedral'nyj Blagoveshchenskij sobor v Kazani / A. Yablokov. – Kazan', 1901. P. 11.
- ³⁹ Dolgov, E.B. Imperator Nikolaj I v Kazani v 1836 g. / E.B. Dolgov // Ekho vekov. – 2006. – № 1. P.
- ⁴⁰ KFU, Scientific Library, Department of Manuscripts and Rare Books. Items 9611, 9612, 9608, 9609, 9610; Russian State Historical Archive. F. 1488. Op. 1. D. 1238.
- ⁴¹ State Archive of the Republic of Tatarstan. F. 409. Op. 1. D. 515. L. 6.
- ⁴² Sputnik po Kazani. Illyustrirovannyj ukazatel' dostoprimechatel'nostej i spravocnaya knizhka goroda / red. N.P. Zagoskin. Kazan': DOMO, 2005. P. 140-141.
- ⁴³ Ibid. P. 247-262; A. Zeleneckij. Osvyashchenie hrama vo imya Rozhdestva Presvyatoj Bogoricy i chasovni na meste yavleniya Kazanskoj chudotvornoj ikony Bozh'ej Materi v pamyat' trekhstoletiya carstvovaniya Doma Romanovyh // Izvestiya po Kazanskoj Eparhii. Neoficial'naya chast'. Vyp. 11-13. Kazan', 1913.
- ⁴⁴ Russian State Historical Archive. F. 2. Op. 7. D. 1078; F. 2. Op. 7. D. 1590.
- ⁴⁵ Kirichenko, E.I. Gradostroitel'stvo Rossii serediny XIX – nachala XX veka / Pod red. E.I. Kirichenko. T. I. M.: Progress-Tradiciya, 2001. – 340. P. 116.
- ⁴⁶ State Archive of the Republic of Tatarstan. F. 2. Op. 7. D. 692.
- ⁴⁷ Russian State Historical Archive. F. 2. Op. 7. D. 1059; F. 98. Op. 3. D. 1124; F. 98. Op. 3. D. 1743.
- ⁴⁸ Izvestiya Obshchestva Arheologii, Istorii i Etnografii pri Imperatorskom Kazanskom universitete. T. 6. Vyp. 2. Kazan', 1887. A.M. Pavlinov, authoritative restoration architect and architectural historian was convinced of the possibility to preserve "this wonderful monument of Russian architecture".
- ⁴⁹ P. Azletsky, Opisanie Ioanno-Predtechenskogo muzhskogo monastyrya v gorode Kazani). Kazan, 1898.
- ⁵⁰ Russian State Historical Archive. F. 98. Op. 7. D. 182; F. 98. Op. 2. D. 2412; Sooruzhenie i otkrytie pamyatnika imperatoru Aleksandru II v Kazani: Kratkij istoricheskij ocherk. Kazan', 1896.
- ⁵¹ Such as M.A. CHizhov, H.K. Vasil'ev, P.P. Zabello, I.N. SHreder.
- ⁵² YU.R. Savel'ev. Iskusstvo istorizma i gosudarstvennyj zakaz. Vtoraya polovina XIX – nachalo XX veka. M.: Sovpadenie, 2008. P. 185-195.
- ⁵³ Russian State Historical Archive. F. 98. Op. 2. D. 2412. L. 73o6.-74.
- ⁵⁴ Ibid. L. 74o6.
- ⁵⁵ Ibid. L. 75.
- ⁵⁶ Ibid. L. 111.
- ⁵⁷ Russian State Historical Archive. F. 98. Op. 7. D. 182. L. 69.
- ⁵⁸ Sputnik po Kazani. Illyustrirovannyj ukazatel' dostoprimechatel'nostej i spravocnaya knizhka goroda / red. N.P. Zagoskin. Kazan': DOMO, 2005. P. 650.
- ⁵⁹ Sooruzhenie i otkrytie pamyatnika imperatoru Aleksandru II v Kazani: Kratkij istoricheskij ocherk. Kazan', 1896.
- ⁶⁰ Russian State Historical Archive. F. 2. Op. 7. D. 1128.
- ⁶¹ Russian State Historical Archive. F. 98. Op. 4. D. 439.