INTRODUCTION

The first university in Russia ‘based on the example of the European universities’ was opened in 1755 in Moscow. Between 1802 and 1804, a system of universities covered the entire country and six imperial universities became the centres of educational districts.

The emergence of the universities in Russia is related to the country’s cultural orientation on the values of European civilisation. Established by the supreme power, the university concept was first seen as an instrument for the Europeanisation of the population. It was an educational project supported entirely by the state and aimed at the upbringing of a new type of imperial subject who would think in the European way. In the 19th century, German universities served as the model for Russian schools of higher education after the reform of the University of Göttingen, and thereafter based on the development of the so-called classic university modelled on Humboldt’s concept.1 Russian universities should ‘do their best to make sure Russian science is on a par with the science in other

1 Trude Maurer, ‘Universitet i (ego) gorod: novaya perspectiva dlya issledovaniya istorii rossiiskikh universitetov’, Universitet i gorod v Rossii (nachalo XX veka), ed. by Trude Maurer, Alexander Dmitriev (Moscow: NLR, 2009), 10.
European countries and to attract all the new findings approved by the scientific community to the teaching programme\textsuperscript{2}.

The large-scale urban transformations that were underway in Russia during the last third of the 18\textsuperscript{th} and first half of the 19\textsuperscript{th} century were also aimed at the total Europeanisation of the country. The Western European idea of a typical city, embodied by Peter the Great in the new capital of St Petersburg, and which had been implemented throughout the vast space of Russia since the reign of Catherine the Great, visualised the changes. However, these often outpaced the real social reforms that required more time. Urban transformations, which were based on standardised plans and had been approved by the Emperor, had the force of law. Most of the provincial towns had been re-planned by the early 19\textsuperscript{th} century as the authorities focused on their architecture. It was thought that cities should be constructed with monumental buildings in the neoclassic style, which was just beginning to flourish. In the university cities, the university complexes were assigned the central role in the city centres.

Kazan University opened in 1804 and became the centre of a huge educational district extending from the Volga River to the Far East. Kazan, a city in the Middle Volga region of Russia, was the former capital of the Khanate of Kazan\textsuperscript{3}. Conquered in 1552 by the troops of Tsar Ivan the Terrible, by the 19\textsuperscript{th} century it was being perceived as a symbol of the Russian Empire’s creation. This article aims to show the role that Kazan University played in the university landscape and in the urban space, along with the role it played in the evolution of university architecture in the country, and specifically, as an educational institution that reflects the role of Kazan in the history of Russia.

KAZAN UNIVERSITY: THE HISTORY OF BUILDING AND THE DESIGN OF THE ENSEMBLE

The stone kremlin built in place of the Tatar fortress at the confluence of the Bulak and Kazanka Rivers during the 16\textsuperscript{th} and 17\textsuperscript{th} centuries

\textsuperscript{2} Andrej Iu. Andreev, ‘Idea universiteta v Rossii (XVIII – nachalo XX v.)’, Byt’ russkim po dukhu i evropeitsem po obrasovaniyu. Universitety Rossiskoy Imperii v obrazovatel’nom prostranstve Tsentral’noi i Vostochnoi Evropy XVIII – nachala XX v., ed. by Andrej Iu. Andreev, Andrej V. Doronin (Moscow: Rossiiskaya politicheskaya entsiklopediya, 2009), 19.

\textsuperscript{3} Kazan Khanate – a feudal Muslim state in Middle Volga region (1438–1552) established on the territory of Kazan ulus as a result of the decline of the Holden Horde; after the conquest of Kazan in 1552 by Tsar Ivan IV, it was annexed by Russia.
comprised the planning core of the medieval city. A posad with wooden walls surrounding it was adjacent to the city. The market square with a gostiny dvor adjoined the kremlin’s Spasskaya Tower on the south. Voskresenskaya Street stretch down the hill from here. In the lowland, the posad extended along the banks of the Kazanka River to the north, and Bulak River to the west. The slobodas were outside the posad walls and the Tatar settlement was located at a distance from the city on the other side of the Bulak. The Tatars, who were loyal to the Russian state, were allowed to settle on the left bank of Lake Kaban.

The standardised plan designed by Vasiliy Kaftyrev, and approved in 1768, was a synthesis of rectangular and fan-shaped systems, with the kremlin playing a dominant role and streets radiating out from its towers. The posad and sloboda were combined into one composition. The main town centre developed along Voskresenskaya Street. The classical buildings with flat facades in the early version of the plan determined the face of the city in the early 19th century. The governor’s house, which appeared in 1798, and new Gostiny Dvor in 1801, marked the beginning of neoclassicism in Kazan and stood out from the other buildings with their plastic forms (dome and columned porticos).

The Governor’s house was being completing when, in 1798 during his visit to Kazan, Emperor Paul I ordered that the building be made into a secondary school. And that’s where the University was first located after its establishment in 1804. Thereafter, the Tenishev, Kastelli and Spizharnaya estates were purchased for the university complex as was the empty land on the opposite side of the street. The houses were reconstructed. A botanic garden appeared on the site, and an observatory in the former garden-house.

In 1820, after Michael Magnitsky’s appointment as the trustee of the Kazan Educational District, the construction of the university complex began. He was the one who inspected the university in 1819 as a member of the main department of schools and concluded it should be shut down. But after the Emperor’s resolution saying ‘why destroy, better to fix’, he was also the one who was mandated with making the corrections. Magnitsky’s reforms of the university as an educational institution were unsuccessful. However, he was successful

---

4 National Archive of the Republic of Tatarstan [Natsional’nyi arkhiv Respubliki Tatarstan, NART], 87-1-10090a, 1.

5 Nikolai P. Zagoskin, Istoriya Imperatorskogo Kazanskogo universiteta za pervye sto let ego sushestvovaniya. 1804–1814 (Kazan’: [s.n.], 1902), 73.
in building the university. And the choice of Peter Pyatnitsky as the university’s architect was a major factor. Pyatnitsky was a pupil of Andrey Voronikhin, the famous master of neoclassicism at the Academy of Arts, and worked for him in St Petersburg.

The purpose of reproducing a classic university in Russia was make it into something more than just a governmental institution with an educational function – to make it into a scientific centre. Therefore, the universities in Russia were initially designed as large complexes with various premises intended not only for classes, but also for scientific and public purposes. Cabinets and laboratories were needed, as were grand halls for public lectures and debates. The facilities included clinics, anatomical theatres, physics and chemistry labs, libraries, observatories, professor’s apartments, dormitories and other premises, some of which required isolation.

Between 1820 and 1825, Peter Pyatnitsky designed the master plan for the university ensemble. And he also designed, and even built, its main building. By that time, the universities in Tartu (1803–1810), Kharkov (1803–1823) and Moscow (1817–1820) had already been built. The same building practices were used in Kazan6.

Pyatnitsky recommended a three-part composition for the university’s yard. The secondary school and Tenishev’s house comprised one large main building, with a two-storied main volume and one-storied wings on the sides. The utility buildings were parallel to it forming a small courtyard. The semi-circular residence, together with two adjoining structures (apartments) located on the axis of the main building, were the other elements of the composition. The architect placed the rotunda (chemistry laboratory and astronomical observatory) at the centre of the square. The rest of the area was occupied by the botanic garden. Pyatnitsky used the same methods of construction that were used for other large city ensembles. He wanted to create a complex with buildings that were not just subordinated to the main building, but also had their own meaning. However, Pyatnitsky only managed to build the main building, and after its completion, he went to St Peters burg. He would later return to Kazan as the city architect. The other university buildings were completed in the 1830s.

6 Natalja A. Evsina, Progressivnye traditsii v arkhitekture russkikh uchebnykh zavedenii epokhi klassitsizma. Dissertation (Moscow: Gosudarstvennyj institut iskusstvoznaniya, 1967).
In 1826, Emperor Nicholas I removed Magnitsky from his post and appointed Michael Musin-Pushkin to replace him. Nikolai Lobachevsky became the new university rector and headed up the building committee. In 1832, he invited Michael Korinfsky, who was working in Simbirsk at the time, to be the university architect. Korinfsky had also been Voronikhin’s pupil at the Academy of Arts and he became known for his buildings in the Middle Volga region, such as Voskresensky Cathedral in Arzamas, a secondary school, Troitsky Cathedral in Simbirsk, and others.

To help him design the university buildings and confirm the projects, Korinfsky was sent to St Petersburg to study the best public buildings in the capital. Working for a year, he reworked Pyatnitsky’s master plan for the university and also prepared the plans for the observatory, anatomical theatre, chemistry laboratory and physics cabinet, library, auxiliary structures, and bathhouse with laundry. Tsar Nicholas I confirmed all of them, except the observatory, which he felt should follow the style of the one in Tartu.

Although Korinfsky’s idea follows Pyatnitsky’s general plan, several alterations were made. Korinfsky’s plan can be considered more functional and suitable for the university. In it, the university buildings were divided into two groups: the first consisting of services, and the second of the educational and scientific institutions. The anatomical theatre, library, and chemistry and physics laboratories were opposite the long main building. The anatomical theatre was placed on an axis with the entrance. A semi-circular fence with colonnade connected the theatre with its two symmetric constructions parallel to the main building. The bathhouse and two symmetric service buildings on its sides behind the theatre echoed the curve of the colonnade. Thus, the anatomical theatre became the central focal point of the yard.

The Kazan University ensemble created by Korinfsky was an integrated composition. A monument to Derzhavin, a famous figure of the Russian Enlightenment and native of Kazan, became its final element. During his visit to Kazan in 1836, Emperor Nicholas I personally indicated the place for its installation at the centre of the semi-circular square. Although the inspection of the troops was the official aim of the imperial visit, he examined the university complex.

---

7 A building with baths for communal use.
8 NART, 977- Council-2093, 1.
in detail. The magnificence of the university, its adherence to the achievements of modernity was so admired by Nicholas I that he said that ‘the university buildings were the best of the kind he had ever seen’, as Alexander von Benckendorff who accompanied the Emperor on his trip wrote in his memoirs.

**THE KAZAN UNIVERSITY ENSEMBLE: ITS PLACE AND MEANING IN THE EVOLUTION OF THE UNIVERSITY COMPLEXES IN RUSSIA**

To assess the full scope of the Kazan University ensemble, to understand its meaning and place in the evolution of the institutions of high education, the older university building in Russia should be examined. The University ensemble of Tartu was built by Johann Wilhelm Krause after 1803 in the old town and on the top of Toomemägi Hill. The university’s outstanding neoclassical architecture contrasted with the surrounding Gothic churches and densely built one or two-storied houses with peaked roofs and poorly decorated flat facades. Krause was the first to design a university not as a single building – even a grandiose one – but as an ensemble consisting of several elements. This new trend was developed further during the first third of the 19th century in the buildings dedicated to higher education. However, the idea of a complete ensemble was not fully embodied in the Tartu project. The composition/planning was influenced by the principles of residential architecture, with the main house in front, and other more modest buildings randomly located in the yard in the rear.

The project for the Karazin National University of Kharkov, designed in 1803 by architect Evgeny Vasiliev, shows a new approach to the university, as a complex in which not only the main building but also other structures played an important role. Corresponding to the idea of ‘temples of science’ promoted by the 18th century Enlightenment, it was designed as a huge complex. The simultaneous emergence of their projects indicates that Krause and Vasiliev thought alike. But Vasiliev

---

9 Alexander Kh. Benkendorff, ‘Zapiski (1832–1837 гг.)’, Nikolai K. Shilder, *Imperator Nikolai I. Ego zhizn’ i tsarstvovanie*, Tom 2 (St Petersburg: [s.n.], 1903), 733. Alexander von Benckendorff, who headed the 3rd Department of His Imperial Majesty’s Own Chancellery, had Baltic roots (his father was Governor of Riga during the reign of Paul I).

10 Evsina, *Progressivnye traditsii v arkhitekture russkich uchebnykh zavedenii epokhi klassitsizma*, 204–214.
developed the idea further. His university was a separate town for 3,000 students and professors, which was located at a distance from the city, and thus represented the next step in the history of university landscapes. The complex had a rectangle plan, with three-storied buildings that surrounded the garden at the centre. The project was approved by Giacomo Quarenghi and Andrey Voronikhin, the best architects of the capital, and described as an ‘ideal fulfilment of the artistic program’. However, the idea of creating a grandiose complex in which the architecture would reveal the important public meaning of the university was not implemented. The university was installed in several buildings in the centre of the city. And their reconstruction added nothing new to the university’s architecture\textsuperscript{11}.

The architecture of public buildings at the turn of the 19\textsuperscript{th} century in Russia was characterised by its dependence on palace architecture. Voronikhin was the first who managed to reject the architecture of the palace. His Mining Institute (1808–1811) opened a new stage in the history of neoclassicism and a new period in the history of public buildings. In the 1780s, he studied the projects submitted to the Grand Prix at the Royal Academy of Architecture in Paris. Inspired by the French architects, he dreamed of majestic public forums. Understanding the important role of the educational building in the ensemble of the city, architect’s high civil pathos helped realise the Russian Enlightenment’s dream of a ‘temple of science’.

Similarly to Kazan, the new architectural trends have had an impact on the reconstruction of Moscow University. Between 1817 and 1819, Domenico Gilyardi and Dormidont Grigoriev created a new volume-spatial composition on a large territory behind the old main block of Moscow University, which had been built in the 18\textsuperscript{th} century with a garden at the centre and new buildings grouped around. Unlike the projects in Kharkov and Tartu, the Moscow architects did not consider the buildings in the yard to be of a secondary importance. For the first time, these structures received equally treatment artistically. However, they focused their efforts on the appearance of the ensemble, i.e. on the external facades on Nikitskaya Street and Dolgorukovskyi Lane\textsuperscript{12}.

\textsuperscript{11} Evsina, \textit{Progressivnye traditsii v arkhitekture russkikh uchebnykh zavedenii epokhi klassitsizma}, 215–233.
\textsuperscript{12} Ibidem, 257–264.
Only in Kazan did the inner space of the university complex became the object of special attention. It is here that a unique ensemble was created, which marked the final stage in the evolution of the university complexes in the Age of Enlightenment. Kazan University was the most complete embodiment of the university concept of Alexander I’s epoch when the elite believed the European myth of a perfect civilisation as an ideal of humanity. The architectural solution for the ensemble of Kazan University materialised this cosmogonic idea of the university.

Kazan University in the urban space

The main university building, which was completed in 1825, became Kazan’s main public building in the first half of the 19th century. Pyatnitsky had originally looked to the best public architecture of St Petersburg for his inspiration, such as the Admiralty, Pavlov’s barracks and the Mining Institute. But by choosing a different path, he managed to organically fit the new building into the ensemble of the provincial city.

On the relatively narrow Voskresenskaya Street, the building was visible at the close range, or from the side along the front. Therefore, Pyatnitsky reduced the centre’s importance by rejecting such traditional features as a dome and order rules, and placed greater emphasis on the sides by adding columned porticos and attics. Thus, the building stretched along the street following its rhythm, and an effective perspective of the university was visible from the kremlin. Flat forms prevailed on Voskresenskaya Street. The university and Gostinyi Dvor, the two buildings on either end of the street, were the major expressively interpreted accents. At the same time, Pyatnitsky managed to emphasise the main role of the university by creating a different artistic image.

He designed an institution of high education. There were Ionic order instead of the Doric one. There was no emphasis of splendour; no contrast between the central and side sections, of the colonnade or the wall (it was decorated with pilasters and bas-reliefs). The first floor did not look like a base and a low, wide staircase led to the central entrance. However, the sense of dignity and officialdom made the main facade of the Kazan University resemble early 19th century government buildings. This slightly different interpretation of an educational building was not accidental on the 1820s. The concept of a ‘temple of sciences’, as
embodied in Vasilyi Bazhenov’s and Andrey Voronokhin’s works, changed completely. This was largely due to the changes in the nature of public buildings. At the same time, the architect managed to emphasise the public and democratic aspect of his work and to maintain a high civil pathos that corresponded to the ideals of Russian Enlightenment. He achieved this by developing an important ideological meaning for the architecture of Russian universities, which was apparent in the projects of the late 18th and early 19th centuries. It is important to note that in Pyatnitsky’s project, the link between a university ensemble and a palace definitively disappeared. At first glance, his university was perceived as a public building.

Like its models in the capital, Kazan University played a great role in the town. Located atop a hill, it was very visible from afar. By further developing Pyatnitsky’s ideas, Korinfsky strengthened the urban role of Kazan University. His bathhouse, which was located behind the anatomical theatre on the hillside, faced Malaya Prolomnaya Street, which stretched down the hill. The two-storied building, which had a mezzanine and semi-circular windows and facade crowned with a pediment and balustrade, looked like a dwelling rather than a utilitarian building. It blended organically into the surroundings, echoing the architecture of neighbouring dwellings. Thus, the insularity of the university ensemble was overcome, and it became inscribed into the city landscape.

The townspeople treated the university square like a public space, similar to the ancient forum in Athens where Socrates could appear anytime surrounded by pupils. It partly compensated for the absence of a traditional city public square, which Kazan lacked due to its geographical location.

Its majestic architectural ensemble had a strong impact on both the citizens and the self-awareness of the university’s faculty, students and staff giving rise to a feeling of university patriotism. One student who studied at the university in 1840s remembered that in his time the university was the most beautiful building in Kazan, and undoubtedly the most beautiful among the Russian universities. Another contemporary said, ‘In the university buildings and institutions
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13 Nikolai Agafonov, ‘Kazanskyi universitet’, Pervyi shag (Kazan’: Tipo-i lit. K.A. Tili, 1873), 479–480.

14 Elena A. Vishlenkova, Svetlana Iu. Malyshева, Alla A. Sal’nikova, ‘Terra Universitatis’, Dva veka universitetskoi kul’tury v Kazani (Kazan’: Kazan State University, 2005), 29.
arranged by Lobachevsky, one could see the mind, deliberation and even luxury"15.

In 1837, Korinfsky intended to expand the university ensemble on Voskresenskaya Street by designing a new clinic. He placed it against the main building in the depth of the plot thus creating a little square between them. By giving the clinic the shape of the Russian letter of ‘Г’, the architect gave it two main facades. The six-columned portico of the first facade echoed the porticos of the main building. A semi-rotunda surrounded by a colonnade was designed for the centre of the other facade, which was very visible from Rybnoryadskaya Street below it. But Nicholas I rejected both the porticos and the colonnade16. The university ensemble had been conceived when neoclassicism was flourishing, but it was not completed until the style was already in crisis.

In late 19th and early 20th century (1890–1900), the university underwent vast construction due to the increased number of students, changes in the process of learning, and differentiation of the sciences as a function became prioritised. A new building was added to the courtyard and this destroyed the university’s ensemble and the semi-circular forum and which the Derzhavin’s monument was removed in 1870. New buildings, which appeared outside the old complex, expanded the university’s presence in the urban space. The buildings of the bacteriological institute, new clinics, dormitory and psychiatric clinic formed a kind of second university campus on the outskirts17. The new clinics, which were designed by Moscow University’s architect of Konstantin Bykovskiyi,18 left a deep impression on the citizenry. It is interesting that the architectural changes in the university space did not engender any objections at the time. On the contrary, the university’s neoclassic forms were perceived to be archaic, while the modern artistic styles were identified with progress and the development of science in the world19.

15 Vishlenkova, Malysheva, Sal’nikova, ‘Terra Universitatis’, 28.
16 NART, 92-1-4200, 35.
17 Iskander Gilyazov, ‘Gorod Kazan’ i Kazanskii universitet v nachale XX veka’, Universitet i gorod v Rossii (nachalo XX veka), ed. by Trude Maurer, Alexander Dmitriev (Moscow: NLR, 2009), 462–463.
18 NART, 977- Council-9367.
19 Vishlenkova, Malysheva, Sal’nikova, ‘Terra Universitatis’, 36.
The university complex had a strong influence on the architecture of Kazan, especially its central area, where one can follow the neoclassical traditions already from the earlier times. Thus, in 1878, when the new Voskresensky Cathedral was constructed to replace the old one, which located near the university, it was required that the neoclassic style be adhered. This was contrary to the assignment that called for the church to be built in the so-called ‘Russian style’.

Kazan University: ‘between West and East’

For the central government in St Petersburg Kazan was the historical centre of the Tatar Khanate, and also Russia’s ‘window’ on the East. Alexander Herzen said: ‘If Russia is appointed, as Peter the Great has foreseen, to bring the West to Asia, no doubt, Kazan will be the main stop on the caravan route for European ideas travelling to Asia, and introducing Asian spirit to Europe’. This geopolitical position of Kazan as a ‘meeting point of two worlds’ determined the Eastern specialisation of the Kazan University in the second half of the 19th century.

Initially, all Russian universities were faced with the common challenge of ‘enlightening’ the local environment. Kazan University played the role of an outpost for advancing ‘West civilisation’ to the ‘unenlightened East’. In this regard, even if Kazan University was located between West and East, it was clearly facing Europe as the centre of the Enlightenment.

After the Ministry made its revisions in 1819, the mission of Europeanisation was given new content. Now, Russian universities had to produce a new knowledge that would increase the country’s prestige. As relations with the West had frozen, the Russian Empire’s interactions with the East became more active. In response to St Petersburg’s request for more translators, diplomats and experts on the East, the Eastern

20 Robert Jerasi, Okno na Vostok: imperia, orientalism, natsia i religia v Rossii (Moscow: NPR, 2013).
21 Alexander Herzen, ‘Pis’ma iz provintsii’, Znamenitye lyudi o Kazanskom krae (Kazan: Tatar Book Publishing House, 1987), 63.
22 Elena A. Vishlenkova, ‘Between “West” and “East”: Cultural and Spatial Orientations of Russian University’, Byt’ russkim po dukhu i evropeitsem po obrasovaniyu. Universitety Rossiskoy Imperii v obrazovatel’nom prostranstve Tsentral’noi i Vostochnoi Evropy XVIII – nachala XX v., ed. by Andrej lu. Andreev, Andrej V. Doronin (Moscow: NLR, 2009), 83–99.
Department was opened in 1835. Although it did not become a centre of academic Orientalism in the West European sense of the term, the orientalists in Kazan made significant contributions to formulating a Russian concept of the East, as a subject of their research and as a political object.\(^23\)

In the 19th century, a new concept of historical monuments appeared that was related to the idea of nationalism in the history of world culture. And this created a new field of architectural activity – the restoration of national architectural monuments. At Kazan University, the foreign professors were the first to express their interest in the local history and monuments. In 1817, a book called *The History of Kazan* was published. Its author, Karl Foux, a German-born professor of medicine, who had settled very close to the city’s Tatar neighbourhood, became a founder of Tatar ethnography.

The systematic study of the antiquities in Russia commenced with Nicholas I’s decree of 1826. The Government focused on ancient Orthodox churches from the Early Middle Ages, which did not exist in the Kazan region. The historical meaning of the region was related to the Kazan conquest, which, in fact, had given the Empire its start. Therefore, it was the churches built immediately after this event and the kremlin that became the local historical monuments, together with the Tatar antiquities. First, the Emperor’s decrees were enforced by the local administration. The documents indicate that officials knew nothing about Foux’s book, or the ruins of the ancient city of Bolgar – the capital of the Bolgar state in Middle Volga that dated back to the 13th to 16th centuries and was preserved in Kazan Province’s Spassky County.\(^24\)

In the 1830s, Kazan University started gathering information that succeeded in drawing the attention of the entire Russian academic community to the local monuments. The first All-Russian Archaeological Congress was held in 1869 in Moscow, and it was declared that, ‘Italy is justifiably proud of its classic Pompeian ruins. Russia also has its Pompey, which is Bolgar on the Volga’. The congress expressed its regret that the Russian Pompey had been being forgotten and was unknown.

\(^23\) Vishlenkova, ‘Between “West” and “East”: Cultural and Spatial Orientations of Russian University’, 83–99.

\(^24\) Gulchachak G. Nugmanova, ‘Kazanskie drevnosti. Istoriko-arkhitekturnoe nasledie Kazanskoy gubernii v XIX – nachale XX veka’, *Gradostroitel’noe iskusstvo. Novye otkrytiya*, ed. by I. A. Bondarenko (Moscow: URSS, 2007), 282–294.
to educated Europe, as opposed to the famous Roman Pompey, which was admired by all educated nations. The Middle Volga Region became the main object for study and discussion at the Fourth Archaeological Congress that took place in Kazan in 1877, where the Bolgar civilization was of special interest to the scientists including the foreign ones. The establishment of the Society of Archaeology, History and Ethnography at Kazan University, in order to manage the study, protection and restoration of the local architectural and historical heritage, was the major achievement of the congress. To support its activities, an annual state subsidy was allocated for the excavation of the ruins of Bolgar. The activities were inspired by the theory that the Bolgar civilisation was of Slavic origin, and therefore justified the Russian conquest of the region, rather than by any interest or desire to save the Tatar artefacts.

**CONCLUSION**

The example of the Kazan University, established together with other Russian universities during a short period of harmony between the authorities and the society, demonstrates not only the complexity of transferring and assimilating West European concepts and ideas, but also their adaptation and how one’s own models were created. However, today the role of Russian universities and their operations differ from the autonomous universities of the West. But the interaction of the ideas of Westernisation and their adaptation to local realities continues.

The university building and urban transformations were the most successful Europeanisation projects undertaken by Russian authorities in the 18th and 19th centuries. Kazan University was the last in the series of universities built in Russia during the first half of the 19th century. It also became the last successful work of neoclassicism that embodied the idea of a university of the Enlightenment in its architecture. Taking into account the fact that, unlike German universities, those in Russia

25 K. G. Evlent’ev, ‘Ob uchrezhdenii arkheologicheskogo museuma v Bulgare Kazanskoi gubernii’, *Trudy Pervogo Arkheologicheskogo c’ezda v Moskve*, Tom 1 (Moscow: [s.n.], 1869), 90.

26 *Protokoly IV Arkheologicheskogo c’ezda v Kazani* (Kazan’: [s.n.], 1877).

27 Jerasi, *Okno na Vostok: imperia, orientalism, natsia i religia v Rossii*, 227–242.
were housed in their own buildings right from the start\textsuperscript{28}, the ensemble of Kazan University appears to be a unique masterpiece of the world’s university architecture.

**Gulchachak Nugmanova: Kazan University: Western Concepts, Imperial Power and Urban Transformations in a 19\textsuperscript{th} Century Russian Provincial City**

**Keywords:** University of Kazan; university ensemble; university landscape; urban architecture; 19\textsuperscript{th} century; neoclassicism in Kazan; Peter Pyatnitsky; Michael Korinfsky

Gulchachak Nugmanova is a leading researcher at the Research Institute of the Theory and History of Architecture and Town Planning, Moscow. She received her PhD in 2000 at the State Institute for Art Studies in Moscow. The thesis was titled *The Tatar Estate from the Middle of 19\textsuperscript{th} to the Beginning of 20\textsuperscript{th} century Kazan*. Nugmanova is a specialist in modern Russian Province Architecture focusing on the Middle Volga region whose particular features relate to the existence of a great number of the Tatar-Muslim population. Her studies focus on the problems of urban transformation and interaction between the Russian imperial centre and the Kazan province in the contexts of the imperial ideology. She is also moderator of several conferences on regional architecture in Russia, and of a special architectural panel at the annual conference of the Society of Central Eurasian Studies (2011, Ohio State University, Columbus, USA). Nugmanova has compiled and edited collective monographs and at the moment she is concluding a monograph titled *Power and the Architectural process in a Nineteenth Century Russian Province (Kazan Province)*.

\textsuperscript{28} Trude Maurer, ‘Universitet i (ego) gorod: novaya perspektiva dlya issledovaniya istorii rossiiskikh universitetov’, 48.