Rapid #: -16479692

CROSS REF ID: **216619**

LENDER: **GZQ :: Raynor Library**

BORROWER: **LOY :: Loyola Notre Dame Library**

TYPE:	Article CC:CCL
JOURNAL TITLE:	Year book - American Philosophical Society
USER JOURNAL TITLE:	Year book - The American Philosophical Society.
ARTICLE TITLE:	Russian Architecture and Town Planning
ARTICLE AUTHOR:	Albert J. Schmidt
VOLUME:	n/a
ISSUE:	n/a
MONTH:	n/a
YEAR:	1966
PAGES:	n/a
ISSN:	0065-9762
OCLC #:	1480559

Processed by RapidX: 8/17/2020 9:40:03 AM

ALBERT J. SCHMIDT, University of Bridgeport

Grant No. 589 — Johnson Fund (1964), $700. Russian architecture (classical) and town planning, 1750–1850.

The award, which defrayed both clerical and translating costs, permitted the grantee throughout the summer of 1965 and into the following year to proceed with his project on Russian architecture and town planning, 1750–1850. Besides exploring facets of the subject not previously touched upon, he also synthesized many fragments of earlier research. At the first meeting of the Southern New England Historical Association the grantee spoke on "Planning and Building in Russia at the End of the Eighteenth Century" and expects to finish in the near future an article on "Planning in Moscow 1762–1812."

The focus of the grantee's concern about Moscow before the fire of 1812 was the Project Plan of 1775, which represented a concerted effort to give order to a planless city. The instruments of planning in Moscow during these years were the Commission for Planning and Building in St. Petersburg and Moscow and its creatures, the Separate Commission (*Otdelennyi*) and the Ministry for Stone Building (*Kamennyi Prikaz*). The grantee concentrated especially on the latter, which had the responsibility of supervising building, procuring materials, and training architects. Another theme of considerable interest was the rivalry between the *Kamennyi Prikaz* and the city officials. Questions of budget, vested interests, personal rivalries, and uncertainties about the planning and building schemes, help to explain why some authorities regard the planning in Moscow at the end of the eighteenth century as culminating only in a planless city. Much time has been devoted to the streets within the old Earthen City (*Zemlianoi Gorod*) and the White City (*Belyi Gorod*), which originally encompassed the Moscow Kremlin, in order to compare what was built with what was planned during these years. While the results in building often appear disappointing, unquestionably the planning ideas and accomplishments before 1812 made possible the striking successes in dealing with the great problems arising from the fire.

One of the important building schemes in late eighteenth-century Moscow that came to naught but which greatly influenced the planning of the city was Bazhenov's grandiose Kremlin scheme. Conceived to stamp Moscow with a classical Kremlin, it combined the rational and orderly classical concepts of planning and building with the historic layout of the city. The ancient Kremlin continued to serve as the focus for the radial streets, but on the site of the dismantled *Belyi Gorod* and *Zemlianoi Gorod* walls, wide tree-lined boulevards were planned.

Another concern has been the water problem in Moscow. Planning in late eighteenth-century Russia inevitably emphasized the river basins. Central Moscow benefited in both a utilitarian and aesthetic manner from its straightened river banks and its newly constructed stone quays and flood-control canals. It was along the Neglinnaia River that the most important new central architectural ensembles were projected. Facing the Kremlin these administrative and public buildings became an integral

part of the center without diminishing the architectural dominance of the Kremlin itself. Cleansing of the Neglinnaia and the Iauza River received a high priority in the planning. Manufacturers, slaughterhouses, and cemeteries—which located in the city and along its edges in the *Zamoskvorech'e*, the area immediately south of the Moscow River within the old *Zemlianoi Gorod*, and on the Iauza—were largely responsible for polluting both these waterways and the air of the city.

The authors of the plan of 1775 also proposed canals on the Moscow River in order to reduce the hazards of flooding and enhance the prospects of commerce. Just as fires gave an impetus to new housing schemes so floods resulted in the planning and construction of waterways. The flooding which washed away the shores of the Neglinnaia and Moscow Rivers in 1786 necessitated the completion of the Vodootvodynyi Canal, begun for flood control three years earlier, and the Neglinnyi Canal and the Kremlevskaia and Zamoskvoretskaia quays in 1788–1791. Although the river schemes caused many frustrations, the progress made before 1812 foretold the eventual piping afterward of the Neglinnaia beneath the street surface. This act alone accounts in large part for the lovely streets and squares encompassing the Kremlin today.

Such ambitious planning and building schemes demanded a team of qualified engineers, planners, architects, foremen, and skilled laborers. Because of the scarcity of such personnel many of the principal figures in the city building programs in Russia came from abroad. Attempts were made, however, to train a force of Russian experts. Despite Peter's interest in building, he had done nothing to further architectural education. During the 1740's an architectural school affiliated with the Chancery of Buildings was founded in St. Petersburg. This school, apparently an outgrowth of the ideas of the architects Eropkin, Korobov, and Zemtsov, was followed by one in Moscow organized by D. V. Ukhtomskii. The latter institution, which remained open until 1764, educated such famous architects as M. F. Kazakov and A. F. Kokorinov, and stressed the theoretical as well as practical aspects of architecture. During the 1770's and 1780's the *Kamemnyi Prikaz*, besides supervising construction, trained a number of architects who subsequently left their mark on the buildings of Russia.

Building in Moscow before 1812 was also considered. A detailed study was made of such structures as Bazhenov's Pashkov house opposite the Kremlin, his Iushkov house on Miasnitskaia Street (now Kirov Street), the various architectural monuments of M. F. Kazakov such as the Senate building within the Kremlin walls, the Church of Philip the Metropolitan in Moscow (1777–1788), the University of Moscow building in Mokhovaia Street (1782–1793), and lastly, his Golitsyn Hospital (1796–1801), one of the great public buildings of that day. Aside from these monumental works renowned for their classical exteriors, Kazakov created some remarkable and monumental interiors characterized by great halls and grandiose cupolas. In these interiors this architect utilized such typically classical devices as columns, pilasters, cornices, bas-relief sculpture, and painting. Kazakov interiors which have been preserved include the Gold Room of the Demidov House, the Senate, the Golitsyn Hospital and, most

importantly, the Columned Hall (*Kolonnyi Zal*) of the Nobles' Meeting House (now the *Dom Soiuz*).

Kazakov like Bazhenov has been passed over in favor of the St. Petersburg school by western scholars. Besides the buildings he designed before the Great Fire, Kazakov played a prominent role in planning his city; and as successor to Bazhenov as head of the "Kremlin Expedition," he became the founder of a school for training architects. He helped develop such outstanding Russian architects as Bove, Egotov, Rodion Kazakov, Nazarov, Karin, Legran, Menelas, Blank, and Bakarev.

The materials utilized for this extensive building program were, of course, an important consideration. Since Peter's day there had been an official insistence on stone buildings in St. Petersburg. Although edicts to this effect were often ignored, the fires in Moscow at the end of the century provided convincing arguments for the use of brick and stone. Construction of and repairs to some of the buildings in the late 1700's were accomplished with the materials from the razed *Belyi Gorod* wall. The Foundling Hospital (*Vospitatel'nyi Dom*) was a case in point.

The grant from the American Philosophical Society aided in the exploration of numerous themes of Russian architecture and town planning beyond Moscow. Metallurgical production in the Ural and Altai Mountain regions during the eighteenth century resulted in the founding of numerous towns. In the course of the eighteenth century these towns changed from fortresses to well-planned geometrical cities. One such Altai town was Barnaul, which received its classical stamp during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries by the work of the architects Andrei Ivanovich Molchanov and Ia. N. Popov and the chief of Altai plants P. Frolov. Similar building and planning developments occurred in Ural mining towns such as Yekaterinburg, Izhevsk, Ocher, and Nizhnyi Tagil.

Other themes investigated were the architecture and planning in Tver, Kolomna, classical wooden houses in Moscow at the beginning of the nineteenth century, the planning in St. Petersburg 1737–1740 and 1764–1773, and the planning of the square before the Petersburg Aleksandriinskii Theater at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Classical Tver, planned and built anew after its destruction by fire in 1763, proved as much a model for Russian classicism as did St. Petersburg. The grantee also traced the erection and demolition of old buildings on the main Moscow streets of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Research on residential architecture, just begun, will be carried on in greater detail in the immediate future. Lastly, this grant has permitted integration of material from Russian and Soviet sources with Western travel accounts which provide a colorful and highly accurate portrait of Russian towns of the period considered.

CHARLES B. SCHMITT, Fordham University

Grant No. 3809 — Penrose Fund (1965), $1,200. Changing conceptions of vacuum, 1500–1650.