

УДК 711.4 + 72.03 ](571.51)

## **The Role of the Curtain Walls of the Krasnoyarsk Double Enforced Ostrog in the Tradition of the City Building**

**Katerina V. Gevel\***

*Siberian Federal University*

*79 Svobodny, Krasnoyarsk, 660041 Russia<sup>1</sup>*

Received 6.01.2011, received in revised form 15.05.2011, accepted 8.11.2011

---

*The discovery of the Yenisei river in the history of Siberia was a kind of a “threshold” and reaching it in the beginning of the 17th century became an important landmark in the further movement of the Russian pioneers to the north and to the east. The role of the outposts was first mentioned in the research and art work by S.U. Remezov who had drawn the city layout of the Drawings’ Book of Siberia (Remezov, 1882). The city of Krasnoyarsk had quite a vast territory, the lands where the influence of Krasnoyarsk ostrog spread were marked from the “forenoon”, i.e. in the south “unpeaceful volosti (districts)” past the Abakan river and in the north the Kazaks’ zaimki (lodges) past Yukseeva...*

*Keywords: the Krasnoyarsk urochishche (natural landmark); the Strelka; the historical skeleton; the curtain walls.*

---

Studying the historical environment of the city Krasnoyarsk basing on ***the town planning analysis of the historical succession of the building compositional structure formation*** offers a new understanding in the natural environment of the town, the Krasnoyarsk urochishche (natural landmark). This research is the result of a long-term preliminary project work of the author in cooperation with the researchers of the Krasnoyarsk Local Lore Museum, archivists and local historians. Preserving the historically formed environment is the result of the twenty year research of the city’s space in the Krasnoyarsk urochishche which spreads from Atamanovo village in the east to the Birusa river in the west in the bend of the Yenisei river, between the northern steppes and bald peaks to

the southern ridge of the Sayan offshoots. It is necessary to study various historical places of the residents attraction for the development of the complex programme of the environmental zones reconstruction, restoration of the heritage objects and the revaluation of the environment of the Krasnoyarsk city historical centre (Panov, 2010).

The problem of the effect of the curtain walls on the further space-and-planning development of the city in the Krasnoyarsk urochishche.

The prerequisites for the research were the processes of intensification of historical territories and real estate objects usage and, as a consequence, sharpening of the problem of ***preserving the original historical substance and civil engineering protection of the heritage, claiming the priority conservation of***

---

\* Corresponding author E-mail address: k.gevel@mail.ru

<sup>1</sup> © Siberian Federal University. All rights reserved



Fig. 1. City layout by S.U. Remezov “The Drawing of the territory of the Krasnoyarsk city”

*the heritage objects, especially preserving the restrictions on the conditions of perception.* The increase of the importance of the architectural heritage protection in the central zones due to the growth of reconstruction in the historical districts of the city has played an important role as well.

#### **Materials and methods of the research**

This work is based on the author’s in-situ investigations of the city centre in 1983-1990s and in 2005-2007 in comparison of the city development layouts of the previous centuries, archive documents of the State archive of the Krasnoyarsk Territory (hereinafter referred to as GAKK) and the materials of the Krasnoyarsk Territory Local Lore Museum (hereinafter referred to as KKKM).

Archive materials, graphical and photographic data have been systematised and generalised, *the stages of the city layout development* have been observed in order to determine *typical composition methods* and

peculiarities of space decisions in city complexes which *contribute to the inclusion of the “historical skeleton” of the memorial places* of Krasnoyarsk into the modern environment taking into consideration the requirements of the town planning protection of the historical and cultural heritage.

During the studies of the city building significant attention was paid to the people’s wooden zodchestvo (Russian architectural style) preserved in the Krasnoyarsk urochishche. Far away from the Western centres with the active influence of the official architectural styles, here we find a lot of original carpenter’s methods and all-Russian traditions already vanished in the European part of Russia of that time.

We studied the chronicles from 1628 to 1699: “replies”, petitions, records and other documents about the Krasnoyarsk ostrog establishment. The “Description list of the Krasnoyarsk ostrog” of 1699 is especially interesting while it contains the information about its serfs, defense buildings and where the newly built fortifications are indicated in sazhen (the old Russian measure equal to 2.13

meters). It is said in the famous petition of 1690 by Lev Poskochin to the tsars Ioann Alekseevich and Petr Alekseevich about renewal, rebuilding and enforcement of the Krasnoyarsk ostrog: "... in the steppe side ... is added to the ostrog and ... is enforced by various fortresses and from the Yenisei river to the Kacha river one hundred twelve sazhen of the new ostrog were added...". Further, all the parameters and sizes of the newly built walls of the big city with two western towers, angle north-west interim enforcement and five-angle range of the Kacha river are given (Bezyazykov, 1978, 2004).

Toponymy allows to confirm the true facts when no official data in the form of layouts and schemes have been preserved. The originator of the graphic reconstruction of the Krasnoyarsk ostrog and its towers in 1970s was the architect E.M. Panov who called toponyms "the cultural heritage ... spatial, materializing the historical time in itself" (Panov, 2010). Studying Krasnoyarsk toponyms allows to specify the borders of the Big city and its suburbs and gives an opportunity to prove that Parizhskoi kommuny street appeared where the western ditch under the fortress wall used to be located:

a) the 18<sup>th</sup> century – the street Razdelnaya popereshnaya was frontier to the ostrog and separated the Strelka area from the new part of the city – after the fire in 1773 it went along the ditch under the fortress wall, and now it is Parizhskoi kommuny street.

b) the 19<sup>th</sup> century – Dubensky street was named in the honour of Andrey Anufrievich, the genius founder of the new ostrog during Siberia exploration in 1624 (Kartsev, 1929).

c) the 20<sup>th</sup> century – Parizhskoi kommuny street and along with this name the enforced bastions are recalled, which the old-residents associated with the wall curtains of the Big city-fortress of the 17<sup>th</sup> century and the walls which appear in the modern yards- to the east from this

street (Parizhskoi kommuny), the western border of the ostrog determined in our argument.

In the reconstruction design it was important to study *the nature of the city's environment formation*, its historical development *according to the natural landscape*.

The metaphor "environment" serves as the expression of capturing the entire content of the architectural activity, *its wholeness* and gives *the understanding of the approach to the analysis of town planning events...* Such an approach will be referred as "*environmental*" in the architectural design. Here we mention the environmental approach as of the objective which should and could be solved during *the design in the historical centre of the city*. The formation of the environmental approach in the modern projects happens along with *the preliminary project studies* providing maintenance and harmonization of the architectural environment in the Krasnoyarsk urochishche (Eremin, 1987).

Thus, in case of the Krasnoyarsk city in the 17<sup>th</sup>-18<sup>th</sup> centuries the Yenisei Cossacks were sometimes reckoned among the city parish, but lived in the vast urochishche – in the country lodges (Yesaulovo, Zykovo, Zlobino, Laletino, Lodeiki, etc). The Krasnoyarsk historian G.F. Bykonya named this settling in his study of 1980s "a distributed town" where the peasants were transferring gradually in to the city class: in fact, at that time there wasn't such a significant contrast between the city's and the country's way of life. The nature of the city development in our urochishche started to change from the middle of the 19<sup>th</sup> century when Krasnoyarsk got the status of the capital of the province (Yamshchikova, 1986, 1989).

The studies lead to the understanding of a sensible town planning as one of the significant elements of the ecological framework of the city environment.

During this work I have been studying systems (images, types, styles) and interweaving of connections – something common which gives the grounds to review at the historical part of Yeniseisk city and Krasnoyarsk city in comparison, with the immersion into ***the contexts of architecture and history of town planning***.

The idea of the architectural heritage (***cultural heritage***) itself and especially the interaction of the old and the new in city development has overtaken a long-term evolution: from the importance of the heritage first recognized in the Russian Renaissance. The protective measures in relation to the specific outstanding buildings taken out of the context (but looking out of place and run down in the new environment) – to the modern broad understanding of the ***environmental design*** but yet without any legal support. ***Modern ideas along with the masterpieces of Zodchestvo include necessary ordinary buildings and their environment which characterise the epoch – the organic historical environment so that the monuments don't get into the awkward framing. This decreases their own value and discredits the very idea of protection*** (Regame, 1987).

An efficient general legal regulation on the protection of the historical building is needed, such as the model Law which was adopted in 1974 and continues to work successfully nowadays in the land of Bavaria, the extract, which impresses with its up-to-datedness: ***“The architectural ensemble consists of a bigger or smaller number of buildings and constructions interconnected with each other, which together form an image of settlements, streets and squares worthy of preserving... While the Law about the protection of the monuments includes preserving the architectural wholeness of the villages and cities including the parts of the old city, then the ensemble also includes the buildings which are not the heritage themselves and preserving which as the separate object is***

no interest for the society. Nevertheless, ***being connected with*** other buildings of cultural and architectural heritage, ***these buildings become the integrated part of the ensemble, i.e. the part of the complete monument***” (Prutsin, 1990).

In the research topic the ***methods of multifactors of the historical analysis of the building wholeness*** have been implemented. The methods are based on the in-situ and the comparative graphical analysis of the landscape, environmental building, during the study of the heritage objects by photo documents and ***determination of their town planning meaning***, as well as on the comparative analysis of project and standard materials, the expert evaluation in the field of town planning protection of cultural heritage. *In 1990-1993 the inventory of the Historical centre building was done in order to highlight historical complexes and types of environment due to the project of the protected zones in the composition of the team of Institute Lengiprogor (now Saint Petersburg Institute of Urbanistics – the project of the general layout of Krasnoyarsk city).*

The methods of the in-situ investigation for determination of the local zones of the memorial complexes combined with mapping of historical materials (historically significant house and land ownership, residences and lodges) of the territories of the Krasnoyarsk urochishche were used during the study (Gevel, 2002, 2006).

These methods allowed to trace the changes which had happened within 14 years (after the protected zones project) and to classify ***the architectural heritage according to the town planning scheme*** of the objects in the spatial organisation of ***the twelve curtain walls of the historical layout of Krasnoyarsk city*** in the modern situation. For the suburbs with valuable history in the core of the city the main objective was to determine the boundaries of the Double enforced ostrog basing on the standard



Fig. 2. The fragment of the map of 1953 with the old church taken as the basis for precise drawing of the ostrog and its suburbs relative to the lines of the coastal borders' terrain. In the work the materials of the towers' graphic reconstruction in 1978-1980 by the honorary architect E.M. Panov were used



Fig. 3 Strelka district, the photo from the KKKM funds

documents, research developments and own project proposals for the Krasnoyarsk Territory taking into consideration city development building around Strelka (the area where the was originally founded) at different time periods.

Due to the town planning research of the Krasnoyarsk fortress and the enforced posad (suburbs) of the building of 1628-1691 *the establishment of the Double city-ostrog and posad* has been specified. The author has studied graphic materials, schemes and texts of archeological reports of 1959-1990s. During the construction of the building KatekNIIugol in 1980 the archeologists found at the eastern side of the foundation pit the northern fortress tower of

the Krasny Yar town. The architect N.I. Grekov developed the project of the "Museum over the pit" in 1987 while the archeologists found below the blockhouse of the fortress the layers of the Late Stone Age and the Paleolithic Age at Strelka.

As the result, during the period from 1983 till 1993 almost the whole image of the Double enforced city was reconstructed in the modern topographic layout, specified in 2001-2005 in the parts of the southern and the western curtain walls (fortress walls) of the Big city by the architects A.U. Tarasov and B.G. Butorin, after the excavations of the wooden suburb church which they called "Pokrovsky necropolis". It is the coastal fortress line along the upper border



Fig. 4. On this layout of 1991 the Double enforced city is drawn without additions made in 1690

of the Yenisei river and the 9<sup>th</sup> of January street – the former first border of the enforcements in the middle of the 17<sup>th</sup> century. The place of excavations in the modern layout: near the 9<sup>th</sup> of January street/Karla Marksa and Uritskogo streets (*Note: "Report about excavations of the Pokrovsky necropolis of the Krasnoyarsk ostrog (Uritskogo str. 18) in Krasnoyarsk", Volume 1, 2000-2001, the archeologist A.U. Tarasov (Tarasov, 2000; Fokin, 2005).*

**Research discoveries and conclusions**

made as the result of the investigation in the area of Strelka are as follows:

1) the fortress extended to the north-west along the outline of the upper terrace (previous research indicated it as a straight line...);

2) the location of the towers has been specified according to the archeological pits, precisely we are able to determine the location of the northern tower taking into account the excavations of 1980s during the construction of KATEKNIUgol by the V.V. Orekhov project;

3) the scale of combination of the old layouts, the location of the wooden Pokroskaya church and the square in front of it, the place of

the famous Krasnoyarsk rebellion, is the square on the opposite side of Kuznetsovsky metochion in the first curtain wall;

4) Voskresensky cathedral has been mapped out precisely as it had been located in the fortress built with the hipped bell tower in 1760s near Preobrazhensky wooden church before the fire of 1773 (the location of the preserved basements of the church was proved by geophysicists in 1990s using the devices and by archeological excavations in 2008-2009);

The masons from Yeniseisk located the church at the upper border along the southern wall notwithstanding the north-eastern orientation of the sanctuary. The location of the cathedral's "nave" was according to the shape of the free square and building in the fortress for the new stone church. It was built at the edge of the steep cape, at the bank;

5) the ditch formed in the place of the ostrog wall of the Big city after the fire in 1773 was located along Parizhskoi kommuny street and the walls in the places of the burnt northern wall of the posad – they can be traced in the yards – and in the eastern part from modern buildings along



Fig. 5 The view to the east



Fig. 6 The view to the south-east

In Parizhskoi kommuny street near Markoskogo street at the high site over the Kacha river bed the interim support of the western ostrog wall of the Double city-fortress was located (photo of E. Gevel 2008 – discovery of the remains of the enforcements and walls at specification of the Krasny Yar ostrog mapping at the modern layout).



Fig. 7. The Double enforced city in the modern layout with the border of the Big ostrog to the modern Parizhskoi kommuny street extended in 1690.

Parizhskoi kommuny street and from the north from Lenin's street. Thus, we note that the street Razdelnaya popereshnaya –now Parizhskoi kommuny street – coincides with the ditch from the western side of the ostrog wall and the posad walls burnt in the fire of 1773 formed the wall which even after built-up of the two-centuries cultural layer can be “read” in the yard spaces to the east from Parizhskoi kommuny street. And according to verification of the ostrog enforcements sizes on the modern layouts of the Strelka area, the western wall extended to the Parizhskoi kommuny street.

6) the interim support and the five-cornered range in the upper border of the Kacha's water bed have been drawn, while they fit precisely in the sizes of the Big city from the “Petition to the Tsar” of 1690, as well as the location of the passable tower of the ostrog;

7) The location of the five-corner range is a significant interest in terms of town planning, namely its five corners. Later on, in this part of the layout, between the first and the second curtain walls, the pentamerous entrance square was organised with five openings: the first was in the direction of the Tatyshv island, the second was to the fortress with the Preobrazhenskaya church (led by Kachinskaya street). The north-western axis was directed to the watch tower at the Kum-Tigei hill, the forth axis was to the west, to the city entrance and the gate behind the fifth curtain wall and the fifth axis faced the Southern mountains.

***We are sure to suppose that the five-cornered range of the Big city (the posad with the wall) was in the range of the modern street of the 9<sup>th</sup> of January and later, the pentamerous entrance square in front of the Blagoveshchenskaya church appeared.***

8) The western curtain wall of the fortress gave birth to the new layout of the city produced by the sergeant-geodesist P. Moiseev from Tobolsk,

from 1775 precisely dividing the layout into the groups of districts – curtain walls between the transverse broad streets from the Strelka district to the foot of Afontova mountain in the west.

During the studies we determine ***the Strelka district (area)*** – from the mouth of the Kacha river at the Yenisei river to Parizhskoi kommuny street, previously known as Dubenskogo street, and earlier as the street Razdelnaya popereshnaya, as ***the fundamental for the city from the town planning point of view***, with a dense “historical skeleton” of traditional building principles development, ***with the view openings on the natural landmarks in the urochishche*** (in the neighborhood of the city). This district is examined more thoroughly in the Historical centre of Krasnoyarsk.

### Discussions

Tracing the stages of the Krasnoyarsk regular structure layouts from the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century: the first regular layout of 1775; the new layout of the province town of 1828; the layout of 1855; and the layouts of 1894 and 1906 and the layout of the city with suburbs of 1924-1929 (KKM No. 154), we outline the convenient designation in the documents of GAKK by the curtain walls 1, 2, 3 and so on to the vast Novosobornaya square (in the place and around the building of the Krasnoyarsk Territory Government) typical only for Krasnoyarsk layout of the outpost. The curtain walls started to form in the posad in the 18<sup>th</sup> century as the large areas of city development past the western wall of the Ostrog.

***The curtain wall in the defense construction was the area of the fortification wall between two towers of the Ostrog at the Strelka area, the city of the 17<sup>th</sup> century.*** And while the most enforced one was the western, “floor-level” curtain wall with the pine forest behind it, the old city development in the western direction at the convenient flat terrace to the foot of Afontova

mountain (the modern district of Nikolayevskaya settlement) *was conveniently divided in the 19<sup>th</sup> century by the curtain walls- the groups of districts between the transverse streets*. In Krasnoyarsk these streets, which during some periods were called lanes in order to distinguish them from the longer longitudinal streets, were nevertheless quite wide and important in the city building, while they served as the coming in-coming out points to the navigation rivers, the Kacha river and the Yenisei river, and as the “view openings” to the natural environment of the city.

Marking along curtain walls used to be a typical method of orientation for a long period of time, which was typical only for Krasnoyarsk and which preserved the memory about the stages of the city-fortress growth from the Strelka district to the west.

## Results

*The main conclusions and results of the research* are as follows: the architectural-layout enlarged module of the Krasnoyarsk historical centre development has been determined – *the curtain wall*, which gathers the districts between the transverse south-western streets – the “*natural view openings*” as the most important link of the town planning structure.

*In the research, the influence and meaning of the Cossack fortress-ostrog with the posad at Strelka brilliantly founded by A.A. Dubensky, the city founder, on the further layout structure of the Krasnoyarsk historical centre. The scale of the curtain walls has been developed which accurately divided the flat terrace at the foot of the Kum-Tigei hill (Karaulnaya hill).*

*The traditional features of the city of Krasnoyarsk development based on the principle of inseparability from the natural environment of the urochishche* in the formed compositional structure, providing connection of

the city landscape with the natural environment have been determined.

*The view openings* for the natural landmarks is a universal compositional technique, which was traditional for ancient Russian cities and was brought by the north Russian pioneers to the Siberian *urochishches*. It was first mentioned in the records of Siberia illustrated by the author – “Siberian history” by S.U. Remezov (Remezov, 1882).

The relationships of the historical matter of the city centre with new architecture present only the verge of a broader objective of the surrounding environment and ecological protection, including the “*cultural ecology*”. The cultural ecology is a kind of a model of interaction of the artificial and natural environments – the environment of the *Krasnoyarsk urochishche* as a whole, while the city is always perceived along with *the suburban landscapes*. In the natural framing *the traditional principles of the formation of the architectural composition of the city on the Yenisei river compose its peculiarity* (Gevel, 2002; 2006).

Obviously, nowadays it is necessary not only to determine the local peculiarity of the territories, but to take into consideration the way of the successive development of the city complexes, *to study the principles of the building formation and peculiarity of the Krasnoyarsk city in various historical periods*, as well as the town planning techniques which can be efficiently implemented in the future development of the city in the marvelous natural layout.

In our work we insist on implementing the necessary methods of city regulation in the design, which contribute to preserving *of architectural heritage at development and regeneration* of the historical territories in the city landscape – *memorial places, where the historical skeleton* is displayed, the hereditary Krasnoyarsk residents are aware of.

## References

- G.V. Alferova (1971), "Kormchy Book and the Law Gradsky", Khudozhnik. No. 7. M.
- E.A. Ashchepkov(1953), Russian zodchestvo in the Eastern Siberia. M.
- L.V. Bezyazykov (2004), Krasnoyarsk original. KKI, 1978, Krasnoyarsk.
- B.K. Eremin (1987), Architectural and planning regulations and the problem of succession in the development of the city, Annotation, M.
- R. Gabe (1941), Karelian wooden zodchestvo. M.
- R.M. Garyaev (1986), "From the history of urban redevelopment in the 2nd half of the 18th century.// History of the Soviet Union. – No. 6. Moscow – Leningrad,.
- E.V. Gevel (2002), "Traditions and peculiarity of the city building of Krasnoyarsk and its suburbs in the 19th-beginning of the 20th centuries. Historically formed town planning techniques, peculiarity of the city landscape and art principles of the old city centre formation – "the dialogue of the nature and the city". In Surikov's readings. Collection of abstracts of the Scientific conference 2000, KHM and KKM, Krasnoyarsk.
- E.V. Gevel (2006), "City-crossroad" Krasnoyarsk urochishche in the natural environment". In Cultural, historical and city building heritage of Siberia. Materials of the 1st regional scientific conference, collection of articles, Krasnoyarsk.
- V. G. Kartsev (1929), Materials to archaeology of Krasnoyarsk region, Krasnoyarsk.
- E.I. Kirichenko (1985), Report on the trip to Krasnoyarsk and Yeniseisk,
- M.V. Krasovsky (1916), The course in the history of the Russian architecture. Part 1. "Wooden zodchestvo", St. Petersburg.
- T. N. Kudryavtseva, and M.P. Kudryavtsev (1974), Experience of research of historically valuable cities. TSNIITIA TSNTI (review),, M.
- V.I. Kuzmin (1923 ),The foundation and the past of Krasnoyarsk. Reference materials, Krasnoyarsk.
- N.V. Latkin (1890), Krasnoyarsk District of the Yeniseisk province. St. Petersburg.
- Legislative means of protection and use of immovable monuments of historical and cultural heritage in UNESCO documents, M., 1987.
- E.M. Mikulina (1984), Historical landscapes in town planning. M.
- E.V. Mikhailovsky (1974), Experience and recommendations of preserving the historical complexes in the world city planning. TSTI, M.
- Protection and use of cultural monuments: collection of normative acts and regulations. M., 2004.
- E.M.Panov (2010), "We need to take a closer look into the old urban fabric", Civil Engineering newspaper, No. 4 of 20.04.2010, Krasnoyarsk.
- Problems of protection and development of cultural and historical landscapes of Siberia. Collection of materials, Novosibirsk, 1986.
- T.S. Proskuryakova (1976), "Planning compositions of the fortress-cities of Siberia", Architectural heritage, No. 25, M.
- O.I. Prutsin, B. Rymashevsky, V. Borusevich (1990), Architectural and historical environment. M.
- S.K. Regame et al. (1986-87), Methodological guidelines on the use of historical and cultural monuments in the development of city layouts. M.

S.Yu. Remezov (1882), Drawing's Book of Siberia. St. Petersburg.

“Specificity of planning the cities with valuable historical and architectural heritage”, Architectural monuments in the structure of the Soviet cities. – М., 1978.

A.Yu. Tarasov, S.M. Fokin (2005), “Necropolis of the Pokrovskaya Church of the Krasnoyarsk ostrog”, The heritage of ancient and traditional cultures of the Northern and Central Asia – V. 2. Novosibirsk – 2000. Krasnoyarsk.

A. Yu., Tarasov, S. M. Fokin (2005), “Materials of Early and Developed Middle Ages in historical part of Krasnoyarsk city”, Antiquities of Priyenisey Siberia, Vol. 4. Krasnoyarsk.

The experience of the preliminary project research of historically valuable cities., М., 1974.

Yu.S. Ushakov (1982), The ensemble in the people's zodchestvo of the Russian North. Leningrad.

E.V. Yamshchikova (1986), Materials edited by G.F. Bykonya “the city at the Krasny Yar” (documents and materials on the history of Krasnoyarsk of the first half of the 19th century),, ККИ.

E.V. Yamshchikova (1989), Articles in the collection “Historical and cultural heritage of the Krasnoyarsk Territory”, issue 1, ККИ.

## **Влияние куртин крепости Красноярского двойного острога на традиции формирования застройки города**

**К.В. Гевель**

*Сибирский федеральный университет  
Россия 660041, Красноярск, пр. Свободный, 79*

---

*В истории освоения Сибири Енисей был своеобразным «порогом», а выход к нему в начале XVII века стал важной вехой в дальнейшем продвижении русских первопроходцев на север и восток. Значение сибирского форпоста было отмечено впервые в научно-художественном труде С. У. Ремезова, отобразившего в Чертежной книге Сибири (Ремезов, 1882). Красноярский город с достаточно обширным окружением – земли, на которые простиралось влияние Красноярского острога, обозначены от «полудня» - на юге: «немирные волости» за рекой Абакан, а на севере: заимки казаков - за Юксейвой...*

*Ключевые слова: Красноярское урочище, Стрелка, историческая канва, куртина.*

---