

АРХИТЕКТУРА И ГРАДОСТРОИТЕЛЬСТВО. РЕКОНСТРУКЦИЯ И РЕСТАВРАЦИЯ

УДК 72.03

DOI: 10.22227/1997-0935.2018.8.912-923

The history of the construction and reconstruction of the Yaroslavsky station

Yulia V. Posvyatenko

*Moscow State University of Civil Engineering (National Research University) (MGSU),
26 Yaroslavskoe shosse, Moscow, 129337, Russian Federation*

ABSTRACT: Subject: the subject of this research is the extension of the history of the Yaroslavsky Station building and its interiors' reconstruction and restoration caused by changes in the cultural and historical development of Russia.

Objective: to generalize the scattered data related to the Yaroslavsky station building construction and reconstruction; to find out what the impact of external conditions related to the various periods of development of Russian history and culture on the appearance of the station was; to find actual materials about restorers' actions in the last decades; to trace the change in the functional peculiarities of the station.

Methods: the methodology of the article is based on the principles of objectivity, consistency and historicism. With the help of historical and genetic method, the conditions that gave birth to the need to create the station, the reasons that contributed to the constant changes in the design of the building, its interiors and their content were examined. The functioning of the station building in a capital city was described by systematization of separate materials, generalization and analysis of data from various sources.

Results: the main result was the statement that the Yaroslavsky station, being an important public building, retains significant changes in the development of Russian society in its history and appearance and reflects new ideas implemented in construction practice. Significant changes in the appearance and scale of the station building were noted; they occurred after the revolutionary events of 1917, the victory in the Great Patriotic War, the increase in passenger flow in the 1960s and attempts to restore the elements of historical interiors and exteriors of the station of the Shekhtel's reconstruction time since the 1990s. The actual materials for the reconstruction and restoration of the station building in last decades, the expansion of the functions of the station premises, as well as the prospects for the development of work in this direction were elicited from various sources.

Conclusion: the interesting experience of construction and reconstruction of the Yaroslavsky station allows saving and positioning of the most valuable elements of the building, designed by outstanding architects, tracing the nature of the semantic and engineering changes. The materials complement our ideas about the mutual influence of the transport system development and public consciousness on the architecture of the railway stations. The prospects for the preservation of the cultural heritage and the expansion of its functions are shown.

KEY WORDS: the object of cultural heritage, the Yaroslavsky Railway Station, Art Nouveau, national style, restoration, reconstruction, urban planning, F.O. Shekhtel, L.N. Kekushev, passenger flow, railway

FOR CITATION: Yulia V. Posvyatenko. The history of the construction and reconstruction of the Yaroslavsky station in Moscow. Vestnik MGSU [Proceedings of Moscow State University of Civil Engineering]. 2018, vol. 13, issue 8 (119), pp. 912–923. DOI: 10.22227/1997-0935.2018.8.912-923

История строительства и реконструкции Ярославского вокзала в Москве

Ю.В. Посвятенко

*Национальный исследовательский Московский государственный строительный университет
(НИУ МГСУ), 129337, г. Москва, Ярославское шоссе, д. 26*

АННОТАЦИЯ: Предмет исследования: расширение представлений об истории реконструкции и реставрации здания Ярославского вокзала и его интерьеров, вызванных изменениями в культурном и историческом развитии России.

Цели: обобщить разрозненные сведения об истории строительства и реконструкции здания Ярославского вокзала, выявить какое влияние на здание, архитектурный облик вокзала и его конструктивные особенности оказали события и явления российской истории и культуры, выявить фактический материал о действиях реставраторов в последние десятилетия, проследить изменение функциональных особенностей вокзала.

Методы: в основу методологии положены принципы объективности, системности и историзма. С помощью историко-генетического метода были рассмотрены условия, породившие необходимость создания вокзала, причины, способствовавшие постоянным изменениям конструкции здания, его интерьеров и их содержания. Путем систематизации разрозненных материалов, обобщения и анализа данных различных источников описан процесс бытования здания вокзала в пространстве столичного города.

Результаты: основным результатом стало положение о том, что Ярославский вокзал, являясь важным общественным сооружением, сохраняет в своей истории и облике существенные изменения в развитии российского общества, отражает новые идеи, реализуемые в строительной практике. Отмечены значительные изменения в облике и масштабах здания вокзала после революционных событий 1917 г., победы в Великой Отечественной войне, расширении

пассажиropотока в 1960-е гг. и попытки с 1990-х гг. восстановления элементов исторических интерьеров и экстерьеров вокзала времен шехтелевской реконструкции. Из различных источников выявлены фактические материалы по реконструкции и реставрации здания вокзала в последние десятилетия, расширению функций вокзального помещения, а также перспективы развития работ в этом направлении.

Выводы: интересный опыт строительства и реконструкции Ярославского вокзала позволяет сохранить и позиционировать наиболее ценные элементы здания, выполненные по проектам выдающихся архитекторов, проследить характер вносимых смысловых и инженерно-технических изменений. Материалы дополняют наши представления о взаимном влиянии развития транспортной системы и общественного сознания на архитектуру вокзалов. Показаны перспективы развития сохранения объекта культурного наследия и расширения его функций.

КЛЮЧЕВЫЕ СЛОВА: объект культурного наследия, Ярославский вокзал, модерн, национальный стиль, реставрация, реконструкция, градостроительство, Ф.О. Шехтель, Л.Н. Кекушев, пассажиропоток, железная дорога

ДЛЯ ЦИТИРОВАНИЯ: Посвятенко Ю.В. The history of the construction and reconstruction of the Yaroslavsky station in Moscow // Вестник МГСУ. 2018. Т. 13. Вып. 8 (119). С. 912–923. DOI: 10.22227/1997-0935.2018.8.912-923

INTRODUCTION

The railway stations' appearance is connected to the start of railway construction in Russia in 1837. Each of the stations has a specific history. At first, the buildings emerged in towns' outskirts at the expense of unoccupied or bought out land and continued historical directions of transport and people flows along already existing roads [1]. Later, surrounded by town buildings, railway stations became important transport junctions of the towns and required constant expansion and concordance with aesthetic tastes of the period due to the increasing demand for transportation.

In 1850–1860s under the conditions of industrial revolution the question of how to develop the vast country's resources became relevant. Railways and roads' suggested projects were being discussed widely on both state and local levels [2]. In 1860s there was a "railway rush" in the country, especially in the Central industrial region. Its first display was the organization of Yaroslavl and Ryazan directions. In relation to this, at the same time with Nikovaevsky railway station, new deadend stations were built at the Kalanchevskaya Square — Troitsky (later — since 1870 — Yaroslavsky, since 1922 — Northern, since 1955 — Yaroslavsky again) and Ryzansky (later — Kazansky). As a result, Moscow Kalanchevskoe Field turned into a station square — a unique "square of the three stations". Despite separate moments of the stations' history being described in researchers works, it requires not only extension and elaboration caused by new facts about the station's immediate past being revealed, but also a development prospects' analysis, positioning of this object of cultural heritage as an important mark in national architecture evolution and an evaluation of its semantic value for Moscow urban space development.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The history of the Yaroslavsky Station building is not sufficiently represented in scientific literature.

In a whole row of researches the Yaroslavsky Railway Station is mentioned only as an example of neo-Russian or national Art Nouveau in the work of Russian architects [2, 4, 11, 18, 32]. The style peculiarities of F.O. Schechtel's project are examined in monographs written by Kirichenko E.I. and Pechenkin I.E. [18, 24]. Data of a little-known reconstruction of the building is introduced in one of E.I. Kirichenko's articles [20]. The most substantial studies devoted to the station's history are the articles by Vaskina A.A. [3, 11, 19, 23], where the author has introduced very interesting actual materials emphasizing the station's construction history and Schechtel's reconstruction. At the same time, in a whole range of works scattered individual [5, 9, 30] and general [2, 32, 40] information related to the capital's railway stations development supplementing the concepts of the Yaroslavsky Railway Station's history and the reflections of the new societal development tendencies in its outward can be encountered. No studies devoted to the station's architectural form shaping were found among foreign works. Nevertheless, the general issues of Art Nouveau, railway infrastructure development, construction experience and railway stations' adaptation prospects are addressed in a variety of works and are of significant interest [7, 26, 28, 41, 43].

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Insignificant historiography of the Yaroslavsky Railway Station's history was complemented with materials found in different scientific and periodical literature devoted not only to the building's stylistics but also to the results of the restorative works, railway infrastructure development issues, culturological analysis of railway stations spaces. Informational editions containing relevant data about plans of railway stations' development have an important role in understanding its contemporary tendencies.

The methodology of the article is based on the principles of objectivity, consistency and historicism. With the help of historical and genetic method, the con-

ditions that gave birth to the need to create the station, the reasons that contributed to the constant changes in the design of the building, its interiors and their content were examined. Periodization method allowed identifying the features characterizing the main periods of the station's existence in the cultural space of Russian reality, their succession and novelty. Comparative method allowed us to correlate changes in station's interiors to socio-political and economic events and to show that railway station buildings' of 19–21 centuries development tendencies have common features in many countries around the world.

RESULTS

The appearance of the Yaroslavsky Railway station dates back to 1862, to the establishment of regular railway traffic between Moscow and Sergiev Posad organized along the route of pilgrimage to holy places — Trinity Lavra of St. Sergius. According to the majority of researches, the idea of building an arterial road belonged to A.I. Delvig, an engineer at the Ministry of Railways. V. Chizhov — a scientist, an entrepreneur, a public figure with slavophilic views, executed it [3]. Being the editor of an entrepreneur's magazine ("Industry bulletin" 1856–1861), he tried to engage major entrepreneurs in the development of the road and to make it the first Russian railway with a station built without attracting foreign funds (to taunt the French and those Russians who didn't believe we could do it ourselves) [4]. I.F. Mamontov, the father of S.I. Mamontov, future arts' patron, played the main role in its construction. He became the main shareholder in 1859 and they founded one of the first joint-stock companies in Russia — "Moscow-Yaroslavl railway company" headed by F.V. Chizhov (since 1861). Having conducted a two-month study of potential demand for the new line's services, F.V. Chizhov persuaded investors and government officials in the enterprise's profitability and got the permission for construction [5]. Trinity road paid off quickly, and, according to the contemporaries, turned out to be exemplary in terms of the structure, costs economy and strict accountability of the management.

Contractors M.U. Levestam and I.H. Bremme constructed the first station building and its project was designed by R.I. Kuzmin and S. Shustov (1859–1862). It didn't claim to have a major town-planning role. We can appraise its outlook by looking at the remaining photos. It was white-stone and had two storeys. The first storey was decorated with big arched windows, and the window line of the second storey was garnished with finely profiled rods. An attic storey with a flagstaff where the flag of the Ministry of Railways fluttered crowned the building. The building was constructed with side wings that edged deadend tracks of the station. The Board of the Railway was located in one of those wings [6].

However, due to fast development of the road and the growth in transportations, the building required re-

construction [7]. In 1868 I.V. Shtromm, an architect, extended the side corpses of the station; by 1870 the railway tracks were outstretched to Yaroslavl [8]. In 1880s the reconstruction of the right ("departure") wing was conducted by an unknown architect [9].

After I.V. Mamontov's death in 1869 his youngest son Savva became the major shareholder of the Moscow-Yaroslavl railroad and in 1872 he became the chairman of the company board. He used his substantial inherited capital for railroads' construction as well as for national culture development. His estate Abramtsevo was the center of artistic life in 1870–1890. I.E. Repin, V.A. Serov, K.N. Korovin and other artists used to stay and work there.

The joint-stock company's business was going well. The need to reclaim new sources for raw materials and market led to prolonging the road further to North to Arkhangelsk in 1890s (also integration with the Great Siberian way), which again required extension of the Yaroslavl Railway Station [10].

L.N. Kekushev, a famous architect, was invited to do a substantial renewal of the station. In 1890s he rebuilt the Eastern wing of the station and the platform. The reason for this reconstruction was an accident that occurred in August of 1897. A passenger rolling stock crashed into a timber fender at full speed and continued motion deforming the station's wall. On August the 30th, passenger train No. 9-bis, arriving from Sergiev at 10 a.m., crashed at the Moscow station of the Yaroslavl railway. <...> The accident occurred because the train was approaching the station at a speed as high as is permitted only during the route. There were 13 carriages equipped with Westinghouse autobrakes in the train, but for unknown reasons the brakes didn't function at the time. Then the operator started making alarming whistles to the train staff in order to activate hand brakes, which they did immediately. But it was too late, the train was already at the end of the platform and there was no possibility to stop it. It hit an empty luggage carriage located at the end of the track near the timber fender. The locomotive waded the carriage halfway and destroyed attached pretty well to a bunch of rails. Then this entire array advanced towards the passengers' station building through a wooden passage and hit a window sash. The luggage carriage broke a station's wall from the ground up to the bureau ceiling, where, thankfully, no one was at the time. The carriages following the locomotive started to press and the luggage carriage got on the tender that hit the wall of the "Railway board" [11] — was written in newspapers. As a result a new platform with a massive colonnade was built. Above it the new 2nd floor premises were constructed.

At the frontier between 19th and 20th centuries another stage of the country's railway net development begins. During it a lot of railroads become state. Profitable joint-stock company "Moscow-Yaroslavl railroad" was signed away to treasury because of S. Mamon-

tov's financial problems. In 1900 the Yaroslavsky railway station became state.

The state policy, pursued by S.U. Vitte, was directed towards the expansion of the railway system and making it state, which promoted architectural creativity. This led to growth of urban-planning and presentative role of stations as buildings representing not only the railroad, but also Moscow as the second capital of Russia and the regions connected to it. Monumentalization features prevailed in stations' images those years [12]. The old station buildings didn't meet these advanced requirements, which was the reason for their fundamental reconstruction and the wide spread of contests during their design [13]. This combined with the growth of stations' role as architectural dominants of urban space led to the transition to individual projects and their renewal in accordance with the architectural fashion of the time.

It was characteristic for the architecture of the 19–20 centuries' frontier to transition from eclecticism to Art Nouveau and to the search for a "national style" [14]. These seekings got a visual embodiment in the outlook of the two new station buildings at the Kalanchevskaya Square — Yaroslavsky and Kazansky railway stations (architect A.V. Shchusev, 1914–1926) [15].

In 1901 a new project for the Moscow-Yaroslavl railroad station building by L.N. Kekushev was ratified. The cause for the construction works was the attachment of Shuisko-Ivanovskaya, Yaroslavl-Kostrmskaya, Yaroslavl-Rybinsk and Aleksandrov-Ivanovskaya lines, which increased the passenger flow substantially. "The Russian North renewal idea and its connections to the Russian historical center predetermined the facade's style" — the contemporaries wrote [16]. Also in 1901 an International exhibition took place in Glasgow, Scotland where the Russian wooden pavilions were designed by F.O. Schechtel and made to resemble the traditional Northern Russian architecture. Participation in this exhibition's preparation helped F.O. Schechtel to get a well-earned title of Academician of Architecture.

The choice of F.O. Schechtel as an architect for the Yaroslavsky railway station reconstruction was caused not only by the change of ownership but also by his triumph in Glasgow, because the national architecture ideas became important for the employer. The project approved by Tsar Nicholas II reflected the aspiration to strengthen the national identity under the conditions of industrial society formation in Russia and success in economic development pace [17]. It wasn't accidental that this was expressed above all in Moscow architecture since the influence of the Abramtsevo circle, which was actively developing Russian cultural traditions, was strong here [18].

F.O. Schechtel was invited to improve L.N. Kekushev's project, which resulted in the building including a part of the old station and some elements from the previous project. Finally, in 1900–1902 he created a new project changing the building's facades substantially

and enlarging usable spaces by adding storeys [19]. In 1904 the renewed and more spacious building welcomed passengers again.

The construction was done in two turns until 1907: at first, the central part of the arrival building and symmetrical side parts of the station were reconstructed, later the vestibule of the station, which became artistic composition dominant, was reorganized. The architect used new construction materials — metal structures, reinforced concrete and tiles, which allowed reducing the construction costs substantially [19]. Volumes of different size were connected and it became possible to go freely from the main entrance to the platform unlike in the original building. Techniques of Art Nouveau, trending at the time, interlocked marvelously with stylized form of Kievan Rus architecture presented extensively at the Scotland exhibition by F.O. Schechtel. In 1903 F.O. Schtechtel wrote about the connection between new station's project and the pavilions in Glasgow, that he had been trying to impart severity and harmony of northern buildings to Russian style [20]. As a result, the Yaroslavsky railway station became the biggest and the most significant project among the civilian buildings made by F.O. Schechtel in the national and romantic branch of Art Nouveau. The railway station, being a three-level building with two mezzanine storeys, was 87 meters in breadth and 104 in length; it belonged to station buildings of the dead-end type.

The outlook of the Schechtel's building was made in neo-Russian style. In addition, characteristic for the architect's work solutions, tested earlier in mansions, exude brightly. The building's composition is symbolic and narrative. Besides the emphasis on the northern region as a national identity symbol, the station building refers us to the brightest and the most distinctive period of 17th century in Russian architecture, characterized by asymmetric volumes, abundance of architectural garnish details, rich scale of polychrome tiles. The fact of establishing regular connections between the center of Russia and its rural regions and the idea of a railway station as a main gate to a town, traditional in the beginning of 20th century, were also reflected in the composition [21]. It was expressed in an enormous entrance arch, leading to the station vestibule, and through it — to railway tracks and the platform.

Tower theme dominates in the building's composition, subjecting all the other volumes. The balance of the asymmetrical composition deprives the building of freezing while imparting liveliness to it. This peculiarity stresses close connection between Schechtel's idea for the station vestibule and his novations in Art Nouveau. At the same time the entrance tower creates a static center, composition core, in regard to which all the other volumes are perceived [22]. Large forms and volumes of the building are treated generally; they transition into one another unnoticed. Each of the corner towers is equally important part of the angular and facial facades' composition.

Looking like a giant entry tower, the central avant-corps with the station entrance in it is crowned with a keeled top. It reminds of wooden watchtowers of the Russian North, a nomadic yurt and the kokoshniks girls from the northern provinces wore with festive clothes at the same time. Astride the central tower two other ones aspire subjected to it. Each of them associates with towers of kremlins in ancient cities, which were connected and drawn closer by the railroad. The huge entry arch was crowned with a characteristic comb with a two-headed eagle, which is visible on some photos. There were reliefs with Moscow, Yaroslavl and Arkhangelsk coats of arms inside its fronton. Towers crowning the pylons were decorated with coats of arms' low reliefs at the top and with bear images below [23].

At the same time, despite characteristic for Art Nouveau asymmetry, the station building is a whole unity. One gets this impression with the first look at the building. It is not accidental that many note the tense influence of the station on a spectator. This effect was achieved by intentional enlargement of some building elements. Due to this F.O. Schechtel was not putting his building into the urban environment but opposing it. These features of Schechtel's Art Nouveau are not random. It is known that at the beginning of his career he used to make theatre decorations, decorate performances and different public events. That is why Old Russian chambers' gable roofs of the main tower combined with large details of the garnish draw paramount attention emphasizing northern motifs and national character of the building.

Unlike the representatives of preceding eclecticism (so called Russian style) the author didn't aspire to copy famous elements from Old Russian architecture exemplars, but tried to use images of the past in their emotional interpretation [10]. Thus, the building's decorative elements act as a peculiar cultural code, which contains special significance of the Yaroslavsky railway station in the urban space structure.

Metal laces of the roof were also made in accordance with the traditions of the Russian North. Rich scale of decoration materials (facing bricks, stone, plaster) texture and color juxtapositions are complemented with reliefs, metal grids patterns, majolica mural of Old Russian towns, flora and fauna, and a turquoise-green frieze, made in a ceramic studio in Abramtsevo.

Northern motives also sound in the majolica canvases. They were based on F.O. Schechtel's and K.A. Korovin's drawings and made in Abramtsevo studio using special technology developed by artist M.A. Vrubel and artist-ceramist P.K. Vaulin. I.E. Pechenkin thinks the idea to "play" with proportions, which allowed creating a spectacular and recognized image without direct citation, was picked up by F.O. Schechtel at Paris exhibition in 1900 in the pavilions of the Great Duchy of Finland (architects E. Saarinen, G. Gezellius, A. Lindgren) [24].

Unlike the facade, the station's interior was decorated in the spirit of international European Art Nou-

veau and had a quite severe guise. The waiting room was lit by lamps, similar to those on the Moscow Art Theatre's facade, in the shape of strict rectangles bordered with bronze, the lower part of the walls was decorated with wooden panels forming a unified entire with the benches for waiting passengers. Benches, lamps and telephone booths and colorful majolica were based on drawings and projects of F.O. Schechtel.

After an expedition to Arkhangelsk, Murmansk, Northern Norway, organized by S.I. Mamontov for K.A. Korovin and V.A. Serov, their works adorned the pavilion of Nizhegorodskaya commercial and industrial exhibition of 1896 for a short time and turned out not to be in-demand. But the influence of such exhibitions on national culture development was strong and it is not surprising that the Yaroslavsky railway station was decorated with a series of these expressive works [25]. K.A. Korovin's mural was located at the central hall interior frieze. "Walrus hunting", "Polar bears", "Fishing at the Murmansk Sea" and other canvases complemented the laconic interiors of the station.

The station's decoration is perceived as a cultural text, which embodies the purposes detected by the researchers in Art Nouveau [26]. Firstly, it is the contrast between increasing industrial domination and the diversity in handmade craft decorations of the building; secondly, it is the motive of running away from civilization combined with bright individuality of the building's outlook and its interiors; thirdly, it is the contraposition of the idea to seek better and more rational world order combined with paintings of acts of nature and elements. The researchers note that for a long time there was an underestimation of semantic contents of the decorative Art Nouveau elements [27]. These features are less expressed in public buildings than in mansions typical for the style, however, the Yaroslavsky railway station definitely can be classified as a part of Art Nouveau culture containing hidden meanings in its decorative elements. At the same time the building's outlook was supposed to be looked at both from close and distant viewpoints. The building's image in the spectator's perception changes every time depending on the angle chosen.

Schechtel's reconstruction insignificantly enlarged the station's usable spaces and focused on the vestibule part of the building. Unfortunately, the historical events following year 1917 seriously damaged the interiors and the building itself. Initially, all the symbols of the previous regime were destroyed and the Soviet symbol, hammer and sickle, was put above the main tower's roof. In 1933–1937 a substantial loss of the Art Nouveau station interiors, as not corresponding with the new era's tastes, occurred. The remaining elements of already severe interior were supplemented with tragic fates of those masses of people that were sent to labor camps to northern and eastern regions from the Yaroslavsky station in 1930–1950 in the public mind. The discovery, for example, of the Vorkuta coal deposits and

their mining alone combined with the construction of Northern-Pechorskaya railway seriously increased the passenger flow at Yaroslavl direction. As a result, the building was expanded in those years on account of the railway bed being moved further and construction of a new passenger hall in the freed space between the two side wings. L.N. Kekushev's colonnade ended up being inside the new volumes of the building. This way the station's updating was happening.

Under the conditions of wide after-war restoration of railway infrastructure objects, in 1946–1947 architect A.N. Dushkin and sculptor I.S. Efimov notably "livened up" the severe station interiors with low reliefs on northern topics in the style of socialistic realism. However, by doing this they brought discord into earlier hurt Art Nouveau interiors. The wall surface in between the pilasters of the rectangular vestibule pillars was divided into stamps by horizontal notches; four symmetrical vertical compositions emerged in the center of the room. In the openings between the pillars just under the ceiling I.S. Efimov put arched through reliefs portraying fishing and bear and elk hunting.

The constant growth of traffic on Yaroslavl direction reflected a new stage in industrial development of northern and eastern regions. It was no coincidence that in 1963–1966 architects A.V. Kulagin and G.S. Makhotin changed the station building substantially. It was mentioned in the project description of Yaroslavsky railway station reconstruction that the building "... doesn't have a unified composition conception. Station building wings done in Art Nouveau style with their ornate heavy cornice and randomly positioned openings are tasteless". Such evaluation isn't surprising for 1950–1960, when excesses in architecture were fought against, which led to simplifying of the outlook of many buildings currently under construction and constructed already. The Yaroslavsky railway station with its aesthetic solutions became a focal point of those decorative elements that were primarily criticized by party ideologists of new industrial typical construction [28]. The intentions to complement the building with architectural novations were also not accidental and connected to their popularization in foreign countries [29]. A decision was made: "to design a building corresponding with the spirit of times and new progressive structures" (the correspondence was conveyed in a big stained-glass window opening new suburban ticket office halls towards the station). In order to connect new facade with the old one it was suggested "to knock the cornices and rustics down and to revet the facades with ceramic tiles of fair shades" [30]. The main results of the works were the following: deconstruction of the waiting room built in between the wings and building a two-storey space in its place. It was covered with three sections of reinforced concrete vaulted shells of positive curvature with 20-meter spans and a two-storey extension at the platform side with a solid glass wall. The two-storey extension is based on a reinforced con-

crete skeleton with a net of columns 6×6 meters and 6×18 meters. The load-carrying framework of these buildings was composed of underframes consisting of precast and monolithic columns and beams. The ceiling was made of precast prestressed concrete. Total structural volume increased from 85 to 137 thousands of square meters. A primary internal resiting was done for the three floors' spaces and a technical floor with flat roof was constructed above the side wings of the original building. The engineering systems were renewed substantially in the whole building. Tunnels connecting the station building to "Komsomolskaya" underground station vestibule were organized in order to make passengers' passage more rational. They made it possible to divide passenger flows of different directions. Unfortunately, serious losses of the details of original décor and interiors occurred during the reconstruction. The coats of arms of the three cities were replaced with the one of the Soviet Union; the pattern of the metal figured grill above the main entrance's tented roof was also changed [20]. Only 8 of 12 L.N. Kekushev's platform columns were left. All arched openings in the wall along the colonnade were walled up. All F.O. Schechtel lamps disappeared. The counter ceiling spoiled the arcs. Not a lot was left from the interiors of the beginning of the century. On the other hand, the usable area for passengers was enlarged from 3160 m² to 5460 m²; the basement part of the building was equipped with a baggage room of 1812 m² in size. Thus, the station building underwent the second substantial reconstruction perceived differently among the society. Many people see the professional architectural and engineering solutions only as rational with inexpressive features of the new aesthetics [31].

In 1978–1979 new works were conducted in order to check the technical condition of the roof. As a result of its examination and measurements, it was found out that its construction above the main part of the building facing the Komsomolskaya Square together with the towers stayed the same since 1904. It was discovered that the main tented roof is a wedge-shaped volume with a hipped roof formed by a system of rafters and bracings leaning on plates. The rafters were made of bars with 170×216 and 190×216 mm cross sections and connected by tiers of horizontal bonds in the shape of crossed bracings; moreover, the top tier consisted of one row of bars, and the other two tiers — of three. Except for the horizontal bonds there are vertical transverse ones also made in the shape of crossed bracings. In the section from the plates to the top tier the rafters are double, above it — single. The main coupling points were enforced by brackets or bolts and also by zip ties. The tented roof boarding was made of sheet zinc. The minor tented roof had similar construction to that of the major one, but its rafters were made of single bars. Specialists noted that despite the long service period, the load-carrying constructions are in satisfactory condition (based on wood samples study). No obvious de-

fects or mechanical injuries were found in the majority of the samples. The compressive strength along the fibers was 411...531 kgf/cm² which is close or above the pine wood ultimate strength. The relative humidity was in the interval of 8.4...9.7 %. At the same time, in the major tented roof the researchers found one rafter coupling point, which was completely rotted; lathing decay cases were exposed in a range of places. Together with separate negative changes in the tented roof's condition, there were longitudinal cracks in constructive elements, which it was advisable to mend in order to prevent decay [20]. In general, specialists from Central Research Institute for Transport Construction reached a conclusion that it was necessary to take measures to preserve the wooden constructions of the building and to take fire safety measures. There is no information about significant work on preserving the roof in open sources.

Another reconstruction of the station's internal space was completed in 1995. Its aim was to expand the space for the waiting rooms and for passenger service in relation to another increase in passenger flows. The transformation resulted in transfer of the ticket office area and clearing of about 1500 m² for waiting rooms and passenger service area organisation.

In the post-Soviet time, under the conditions of national self-identification processes [26], the interest in architectural achievements of the beginning of 20th century grew; names of the architects whose contribution to the development of architecture was underrated became well known. It wasn't accidental that another alteration in the Yaroslavsky railway station interiors started in 2002 and coincided with a 150 jubilee of F.O. Schechtel (1859–1926) birthday. The reconstruction idea was based on positioning the remaining historical elements of the building combined with the expansion of the passenger premises and making them more comfortable. Waiting rooms were consolidated into a united space with new escalators [33]. As a result of the natural and artificial light combination the interiors' perception changed; the former station's courtyard with L.N. Kekushev's (1862–1917) colonnade restored became more favorably noticeable [34]. It is interesting that the architects restored the columns' guise using architectural archaeology's methods, and as a result, it became clear that the columns' bases were hidden in the additional flooring. A decision was made to lower the floor on 0.15 m in order to reveal the columns with the same look and proportions as they were designed by L.N. Kekushev. The preserved 4 columns, original facade elements, window frames' elements found as a result of probing, coffered ceiling recovered in the course of work and moulding combined with other restored details of the old station external walls decorum of Schechtel's interior have a big artistic and historical value and are exhibited while continuing to carry out, among others, their aesthetic functions given by L.N. Kekushev and F.O. Schechtel. Therefore, the conducted work was based on the method of discrete res-

toration combining techniques from analytical "clean" restoration of individual well-preserved elements to synthesis of preserved elements of the building into the new internal station space depending on the condition of an object. As a result of the restoration conducted the facilities for passengers were improved: L.N. Kekushev's colonnade with the historic side wall of the building elements was restored on the first floor, the lamps of F.O. Schechtel's design were restored and hung in their places, some of the art work also took its place. On the second floor soaring shells of the coating's vault made in 1960s against the neutral lining background began to stand out favorably; now fragments of opened historical facades are present [33]. Except for visual images that appeared during the reconstruction, the tradition of live piano concerts, first established in 1904 [35], was revived as the station manager V. Ostryakov suggested. Soft live music filling the changed station spaces contributes to it being more comfortable and reminds of the etymology of the term "station" itself [36].

In 2012–2014 another restoration, designed by N.V. Schemschurina, was enacted. The work was conducted as an anti-damage one. Numerous cracks and chips of ceramic tiles, leaking roof and the need to renew windows and doors threatened the building's preservation. The restoration was done in two stages: at first the central volume was restored, and then — the side wings of the building. After the scaffolding installation clearing of the facades and pointing of the cracks were done; the missing details were put in place. The facade's colorizing was made in refined in on location experiments colors. In order to select each color a trial coloring was done. As a result, decorative elements of the facades were restored basing on the preserved details. The entrance doors from the Komsomolskaya Square side were restored; the lost drips were installed on the windows. As a result of roof works the western part of the building got a new roof steel coating; chimney caps appeared on pipes; dormer windows were repaired [9]. So the restoration works aiming at the outlook of the cultural heritage object preservation were conducted using analytical methods.

The preservation of such cultural object as a railway station could be influenced by such changes as reducing the passenger flow; it is no secret that the Yaroslavl direction is the leader by this index and according to the official data of Russian Railways, it transmits about 7 million people in a month and more than 220 thousand passengers daily. Attempts to reduce the intensity for passengers are being made based on the global experience both with the construction of new tracks and suburban high-speed trains and with the help of Moscow Circle Railway [37]. It is necessary to point out that the Mayor of Moscow Yu.M. Luzhkov proposed the idea of necessity to move the main railway stations to the line of the Third Transport Circle and to transform the buildings into shopping centers in 2000. In spite of this solution not getting support, some changes are still being

discussed in the Moscow Architecture Committee [38]. For example, a plan to move arrivals of long distance trains away from Moscow railway stations, including the Yaroslavsky, to platforms situated further from the city center in order to reduce the passenger flow on Koltsevaya line underground stations [39]. So it is possible to assume that if these ideas were executed, the building would lose its semantic role as the “northern gate” of Moscow [40]. This, in order, may help develop new educative functions of the station building [41] connected to the history of architecture if, for example, an exhibition space was to be organized there. Despite the idea not being executed, a lot of Moscow railway stations started to adapt to such projects. Potential possibilities of the building and its location suggest, first of all, making cultural and business centers here [42]. There are a lot of cases in the history of architecture of former railway stations being transformed into such centers and residential or hotel buildings (the Varshavsky railway station in Saint-Petersburg). That’s why the decision to restore the historical guise of the former platform gallery allows talking about the beginning of realization of the idea of a museum actively functioning in the station changing its original appearance dynamically.

However, statistics tells us of a different tendency. The suburban passenger flow reduced from 6916 thousand people to 6056 in 2014–2017, while the passenger flow in long distance trains increased from 516 thousand people to 563. Therefore, the overall reduction in passenger flow of nearly 900 thousand people happened on account of suburban traffic and this means that the long distance passenger flow increases and the station’s role as the “northern gate” to the capital remains intact.

Modernization in relation to passenger flow increase is a necessary condition for railway stations’ existence [43]. The popularization of tourist railway

routes, happening all over the world since the end of the 20th century, draws substantial attention to infrastructure and facilities for passengers [26, 28, 29]. The Yaroslavsky railway station wasn’t an exception: passenger halls and ticket offices changed their locations plenty of times; and different cultural events were held in its walls repeatedly. For example, the exhibition coinciding with 180-year anniversary of railroads in Russia, organized by Russian Railways together with the State Historical Museum, was held in its waiting rooms [44].

CONCLUSION

To sum up, one should point out that all the information about construction and reconstruction history of Yaroslavsky railway station compiled together allows better understanding of the reasons for and the essence of the changes: the reconstruction stages became a reflection of the need to accommodate constantly growing passenger flow of Yaroslavl direction, the growth of the northern and the eastern regions’ significance in economic and political life of the country and the capital. Changes in the building’s outlook and its interiors, in their turn, starting with F.O. Schechtel’s reconstruction became an expressive reflection of aesthetic values’ changes in imperial, soviet and modern Russia, dominance of different ideologies in social and political life of the country. Currently the Yaroslavsky railway station’s history can be used a visual example of how a building meets requirements of a modern transportation hub and remains a cultural heritage object with expansion of practical functions by adaptation and actualization of the internal space by reconstructions and restorations. Specialists’ opinions on further operation of the building will decide the perspectives of its reconstruction and restoration within the capital’s transport system reformation.

REFERENCES

1. Ban D. The railway station in the social sciences. *The Journal of Transport History*. 2007, vol. 28, issue 2, pp. 289–293. DOI: 10.7227/tjth.28.2.9.
2. Gudkova O.V. *Stroitel'stvo Severnoy zheleznoy dorogi i ee rol' v razvitiy severnogo regiona (1858–1917 gg.)* [Construction of the Northern railway and its role in the development of the Northern region (1858–1917)]. Vologda, Antiquities of the North, 2002, pp. 12–13. (In Russian)
3. Vas'kin A.A. Istoriya i arkhitektura moskovskikh zheleznodorozhnykh vokzalov. Yaroslavskiy vokzal [History and architecture of Moscow railway stations. Yaroslavl station]. *Voprosy gumanitarnykh nauk* [Questions of humanitarian Sciences]. 2008, no. 1, pp. 12–16. (In Russian)
4. Surnina I.A. *F.V. Chizhov — zhurnalist : zhurnal “Vestnik promyshlennosti”, gazeta “Aksioner” : avtoref. dis. ... kand. filol. nauk* [F.V. Chizhov — journalist : journal “Bulletin of industry”, newspaper “Shareholder” : extended abstract of dissertation ... candidate of philology sciences]. Moscow, 2010. 30 p. (In Russian)
5. Murashev A.A. *Dvoryane vse rodnya drug drugu* [Nobles all related to each other]. St Petersburg, 2005, pp. 76, 93–98. (In Russian)
6. Posvyatenko Yu.V. Etapy rekonstruktsii Yaroslavskogo vokzala v Moskve [Stages of reconstruction of Yaroslavsky railway station in Moscow]. *Razvitie fundamental'nykh osnov nauki i obrazovaniya v stroitel'stve : sb. tez. XIV Mezhd. nauch-prakt. konf.* [Development of the fundamental foundations of sci-

ence and education in construction : collection of abstracts XIV International Scientific-Practical Conference]. Moscow. 2017, pp. 124–125. URL: <http://mgsu.ru/resources/izdatelskaya-deyatelnost/izdaniya/izdaniya-otkrdostupa/>. (In Russian)

7. Enflo K., Palau E.A., Henneberg J.M. Transportation and regional inequality: the impact of railways in the Nordic countries, 1860–1960. *Journal of Historical Geography*. 2018, vol. 62, pp. 51–70. DOI: 10.1016/j.jhg.2018.05.001.

8. *Pravitel'stvennyy Vestnik* [Official Gazette]. St. Petersburg, 1888, No. 6, pp. 3. (In Russian)

9. *Moskva, kotoraya est'*. *Luchshie primery restavratsii XXI v.* [Moscow which is. Best examples of restoration of XXI century]. 2014, pp. 172–176. (In Russian)

10. Ikonnikov A.V. *Arkhitektura Moskvy. XX vek* [Moscow architecture. of the twentieth century]. Moscow, 1984, pp. 27. (In Russian)

11. Vas'kin A.A. Fenomen russkogo moderna [The Phenomenon of Russian art Nouveau]. *Moskovskiy zhurnal* [Moscow journal]. 2012, no. 12 (264). (In Russian)

12. Petukhova N.M. Evolyutsiya gradostroitel'noy roli zheleznodorozhnykh vokzalov Rossii v 1830-kh – 1910-kh godov [The evolution of the urban the role of railway stations in Russia in the 1830s–1910s]. *Vestnik Moskovskogo gosudarstvennogo oblastnogo universiteta. Ser.: Lingvistika* [Vestnik of the Moscow State regional University. Ser.: Linguistics]. 2010, no. 3, pp. 215. (In Russian)

13. Shvidkovskii D. *Russian architecture and the west*. London, 2007, pp. 340–356.

14. Brumfield W.C. The origins of modernism in Russian architecture. Berkeley, University of California Press, 1991, pp. 343.

15. Molokova T.A., Frolov V.P. *Pamyatniki kul'tury Moskvy: iz proshlogo v budushchee* [Cultural Monuments of Moscow: from the past to the future]. 2nd ed. Moscow : Izd-vo ASV, 2010, pp. 112. (In Russian)

16. *Arkhitekturnyy i khudozhestvenno-tekhnicheskii zhurnal «Zodchiy»* [Architectural and art-technical magazine “Architect”]. Saint-Petersburg, 1905, no. 1, pp. 13. (In Russian)

17. Clowes E.W., Kassow S.D., West J.L. Between tsar and people : Educated society and the quest for public identity in late imperial Russia. Princeton. *Princeton University Press*, 1991. 383 p. DOI: 10.2307/2499641.

18. Kirichenko E.I. *Russkaya arkhitektura 1830–1910-kh godov* [The Russian architecture 1830–1910s years]. Moscow, Art Publ., 1978, pp. 12. (In Russian)

19. Vas'kin A.A. Yaroslavskiy vokzal v Moskve. Istoriya stroitel'stva (1902–1904 gg.) [Yaroslavsky station in Moscow. History of construction (1902–1904)]. *Sovremennye gumanitarnye issledovaniya* [Modern Humanities research]. 2008, no. 1 (20), pp. 11–15. (In Russian)

20. Kirichenko E.I., Makeev A.M. Yaroslavskiy vokzal — pamyatnik russkoy arkhitektury [Yaroslavsky railway station — a monument of Russian architecture]. *Transportnoe stroitel'stvo* [Transport Construction]. 1980, no. 2, pp. 59. (In Russian)

21. Posvyatenko Yu.V. Kharakternye cherty moderna v tvorchestve F.O. Shekhtelya (na primere Yaroslavskogo vokzala) [Characteristic features of art Nouveau in the works of F.O. Shekhtel (by the example of the Yaroslavl station)]. *Sovremennaya stroitel'naya nauka i obrazovanie : sb. dokl. i tez. XIII Vseros. nauch.-prakt. konf., posvyashchenoy 95-letnemu yubileyu* [Modern construction science and education. Collection of reports and abstracts of the XIII all-Russian scientific and practical conference dedicated to the 95th anniversary of the IAS-ISI]. Moscow, 2016, pp. 103–105. (In Russian)

22. *Arkhitekturnaya skazka Fedora Shekhtelya* [Architectural fairy tale of Fyodor Shekhtel]. Moscow, 2015, pp. 162. (In Russian)

23. Vas'kin A.A. Istoriya i arkhitektura moskovskikh zheleznodorozhnykh vokzalov. Yaroslavskiy vokzal [History and architecture of Moscow railway stations. Yaroslavl station]. *Voprosy gumanitarnykh nauk* [Questions of humanitarian Sciences]. 2008, no. 1 (34), pp. 16. (In Russian)

24. Pechenkin I.E. Shekhtel' [Shekhtel]. Moscow, Direct Media, 2014, pp. 58. (In Russian)

25. Frolov V.P. Pavil'ony Rossii na vseмирnykh vystavkakh: stroitel'stvo i arkhitektura [Russian Pavilions at Universal Expositions: Construction and Architecture]. *Vestnik MGSU* [Proceedings of Moscow State University of Civil Engineering]. 2013, no. 6, pp. 44. DOI: 10.22227/1997-0935.2013.6.42-49. (In Russian)

26. Kido E.M. Station for People — Important Factors in Station Design. *IABSE Symposium Report*. 2014, vol. 102, issue 4, pp. 3158–3165. (In Russian)

27. Okuneva T.I. *Semantika arkhitekturnogo dekoratsionnogo russkogo moderna : dis. ... kand. isk.* [Semantics of architectural decor of Russian art Nouveau : the dissertation ... the candidate of art criticism]. Moscow, 2010. 200 p. (In Russian)

28. Aurei P.V. *Less is Enough: on Architecture and Asceticism*. Moscow, Strelka Press, 2017. 64 p.

29. Kido E.M., Cywiński Zb. Aesthetic perception of steel-glass architecture in Japan. *Stahlbau*. 2017, vol. 86, issue 6, pp. 515–526. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/stab.201710495>.

30. Gonsales E. *Neposlushnaya arkhitektura. Yaroslavskiy vokzal* [Naughty architecture. Yaroslavl station]. URL: <https://archi.ru>. (In Russian)

31. Bianco L. Architecture, values and perception: Between rhetoric and reality. *Frontiers of Architectural Research*. 2018, vol. 7, issue 1, pp. 92–99. DOI: 10.1016/j.foar.2017.11.003.

32. Chernykh D.G. Fenomen «Russkogo stilya» kak rezul'tat utverzhdeniya etiki narodnosti v Rossii [The Phenomenon of “Russian style” as a result of the approval of ethics of the nation in Russia]. *Vizual'naya*

kul'tura: dizayn, reklama, informatsionnye tekhnologii : sb. tr. XV Mezhd. nauch.-prakt. konf. [Visual culture: design, advertising, information technology : collected works XIV International Scientific-Practical Conference.] Omsk, Izd-vo Omskogo gosudarstvennogo tekhnicheskogo universiteta, 2016, pp. 52–54. (In Russian)

33. Poyasnitel'naya zapiska. Rekonstruktsiya zalov ozhidaniya Yaroslavskogo vokzala Moskovskoy zheleznoy dorogi [Explanatory note. Reconstruction of waiting rooms of the Yaroslavl station of the Moscow railway]. *Arkhitekturnoe byuro Timura Bashkaeva* [Architectural Bureau of Timur Bashkaev]. URL: <https://www.abtb.ru>.34. (In Russian)

34. Mikkel Bille, Tim Flohr Sørensen. An anthropology of luminosity. *Journal of Material Culture*. 2007, vol. 12, issue 3, pp. 263. DOI: 10.1177/1359183507081894.

35. *At the Yaroslavl station there was a staff pianist*. URL: <https://www.rzhd.ru>.

36. Vasil'ev K.B. Vokzal — vokal'nyy zal ozhidaniya imeni Voksa [Vokzal — the vocal waiting hall named after vaux]. *Elektronnyy filosofskiy zhurnal Vox / Golos* [Electronic philosophical journal Vox / Voice]. 2014, issue 17. URL: <http://vox-journal.org>. (In Russian)

37. Jenkin P. Urban railways: system choice. *Urban Railways and the Civil Engineer : conference proceedings*. London, 1987. 288 p.

38. Mironov V. Vokzaly perenesut v otdalennye ot tsentra rayony Moskvy [Stations will transfer to remote from the center of Moscow]. *RBC*. URL:<https://realty.rbc.ru> 6.07.2015. (In Russian)

39. Basharova S., Zmanovskaya A., Korchmarek N. Moskomarkhitektura predlagaet razgruzit' vokzaly stolitsy [The Committee proposes to relieve the stations of the capital]. *Izvestiya* [Newspaper Izvestia]. 6.07.2015. URL: <https://iz.ru/news>. (In Russian)

40. Murunov A.Yu. *Printsipy arkhitekturnoy modernizatsii zheleznodorozhnykh vokzal'nykh kompleksov na sovremennom etape (dlya krupnykh i krupneyshikh gorodov) : autoref. dis. ... kand. archet.* [Principles of architectural modernization of railway station complexes at the present stage (for large and large cities) : extended abstract of dissertation ... candidate of architecture]. N. Novgorod, 2005, pp. 20. (In Russian)

41. Ban D. La gare de l'Est de Budapest. *Ethnologie Francaise*. 2006, vol. 36, issue 2, pp. 299–309. DOI: 10.3917/ethn.062.0299.

42. Abramov S.B. Rekonstruktsiya moskovskikh vokzalov — povyshenie kachestva uslug i effektivnosti raboty [Reconstruction of the Moscow stations — improving the quality of services and effectiveness]. *Ekonomika zheleznykh dorog* [Economy of Railways]. 2012, no. 5, pp. 10. (In Russian)

43. Shcherbanin Yu.A. Some problems of Russia's railway infrastructure. *Studies on Russian Economic Development*. 2012, vol. 23, issue 1, pp. 37–39. DOI: 10.1134/s1075700712010108.

44. *Na Yaroslavskom vokzale Moskvy otkrylas' vystavka «Istoriya zheleznykh dorog»* [At the Yaroslavl station in Moscow opened the exhibition “History of Railways”]. URL: <http://www.rzdtv.ru>.

Received March 31, 2017.

Adopted in final form on May 11, 2018.

Approved for publication on July 31, 2018.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR: **Yulia V. Posvyatenko** — Candidate of Historical Sciences, Associate Professor, senior lecturer of the Department of History and Philosophy, **Moscow State University of Civil Engineering (National Research University) (MGSU)**, 26, Yaroslavskoe shosse, Moscow, 129337, Russian Federation, posviat@mail.ru, ORCID: 0000-0002-1594-6128.

ЛИТЕРАТУРА

1. Ban D. The Railway Station in the Social Sciences // *The Journal of Transport History*. 2007. Vol. 28. Issue 2. Pp. 289–293. DOI: 10.7227/tjth.28.2.9.

2. Гудкова О.В. Строительство Северной железной дороги и ее роль в развитии северного региона (1858–1917 гг.). Вологда : Древности Севера, 2002. С. 12–13.

3. Васькин А.А. История и архитектура московских железнодорожных вокзалов. Ярославский вокзал // *Вопросы гуманитарных наук*. 2008. № 1 (34). С. 12–16.

4. Сурнина И.А. Ф.В. Чижов — журналист: журнал «Вестник промышленности», газета «Акционер»: автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. наук. М., 2010. 30 с.

5. Мурашев А.А. Дворяне все родня друг другу. СПб., 2005. С. 76, 93–98.

6. Посвятенко Ю.В. Этапы реконструкции Ярославского вокзала в Москве // Развитие фундаментальных основ науки и образования в строительстве : сб. тез. XIV Межд. науч.-практ. конф. / под общ. ред. О.А. Ковальчука. М., 2017. С. 124–126.

URL: <http://mgsu.ru/resources/izdatelskaya-deyatelnost/izdaniya/izdaniya-otkrdstupa/>.

7. *Enflo K., Palau E.A., Henneberg J.M.* Transportation and regional inequality : the impact of railways in the Nordic countries, 1860–1960 // *Journal of Historical Geography*. 2018. Vol. 62. Pp. 51–70. DOI: 10.1016/j.jhg.2018.05.001.

8. *Правительственный Вестник*. СПб., 1888. № 6. С. 3.

9. *Москва, которая есть. Лучшие примеры реставрации XXI в. М., 2014. С. 172–176.*

10. *Иконников А.В.* Архитектура Москвы. XX век. М., 1984. С. 27.

11. *Васькин А.А.* Феномен русского модерна // *Московский журнал*. 2012. № 12 (264).

12. *Петухова Н.М.* Эволюция градостроительной роли железнодорожных вокзалов России в 1830-х – 1910-х годов // *Вестник Московского государственного областного университета*. Сер.: Лингвистика. 2010. № 3. С. 215.

13. *Shvidkovskii D.* Russian Architecture and the West. London, 2007. Pp. 340–356.

14. *Brumfield W.C.* The Origins of Modernism in Russian Architecture. Berkeley : University of California Press, 1991. P. 343.

15. *Молокова Т.А., Фролов В.П.* Памятники культуры Москвы: из прошлого в будущее. 2-е изд. М. : Изд-во АСВ, 2010. С. 112.

16. *Архитектурный и художественно-технический журнал «Зодчий»*. СПб., 1905. № 1. С. 13.

17. *Clowes E.W., Kassow S.D., West J.L.* Between tsar and people: educated society and the quest for public identity in late imperial Russia. Princeton : Princeton University Press. 1991. 383 p. DOI: 10.2307/2499641.

18. *Кириченко Е.И.* Русская архитектура 1830–1910-х годов. М. : Искусство, 1978. С. 12.

19. *Васькин А.А.* Ярославский вокзал в Москве. История строительства (1902–1904 гг.) // *Современные гуманитарные исследования*. 2008. № 1 (20). С. 11–15.

20. *Кириченко Е.И., Макеев А.М.* Ярославский вокзал — памятник русской архитектуры // *Транспортное строительство*. 1980. № 2. С. 59.

21. *Посвятенко Ю.В.* Характерные черты модерна в творчестве Ф.О. Шехтеля (на примере Ярославского вокзала) // *Современная строительная наука и образование : сб. докл. и тез. XIII Всерос. науч.-практ. конф., посвященной 95-летию юбилею НИУ МГСУ – МИСИ*. М., 2016. С. 103–105.

22. *Архитектурная сказка Федора Шехтеля*. М. : Русский импульс, 2015. С. 162.

23. *Васькин А.А.* История и архитектура московских железнодорожных вокзалов. Ярославский вокзал // *Вопросы гуманитарных наук*. 2008. № 1 (34). С. 16.

24. *Печенкин И.Е.* Шехтель. М. : Директ-Медиа, 2014. С. 58.

25. *Фролов В.П.* Павильоны России на всемирных выставках: строительство и архитектура // *Вестник МГСУ*. 2013. № 6. С. 44. DOI: 10.22227/1997-0935.2013.6.42-49.

26. *Kido E.M.* Station for People — Important Factors in Station Design // *IABSE Symposium Report*. 2014. Vol. 102. Issue 4. Pp. 3158–3165. DOI: 10.2749/222137814814069949.

27. *Окунева Т.И.* Семантика архитектурного декора русского модерна : дис. ... канд. иск. наук. М., 2010. 200 с.

28. *Aureli P.V.* Less is Enough: On Architecture and Asceticism. М. : Strelka Press, 2017. 64 p.

29. *Kido E.M., Cywiński Zb.* Aesthetic perception of steel-glass architecture in Japan // *Stahlbau*. 2017. Vol 86. Issue 6. Pp. 515–526. DOI: 10.1002/stab.201710495.

30. *Гонсалес Е.* Непослушная архитектура. Ярославский вокзал. URL: <https://archi.ru>.

31. *Bianco L.* Architecture, values and perception: Between rhetoric and reality // *Frontiers of Architectural Research*. 2018. Vol. 7. Issue 1. Pp. 92–99. DOI: 10.1016/j.foar.2017.11.003.

32. *Черных Д.Г.* Феномен «Русского стиля» как результат утверждения этики народности в России // *Визуальная культура: дизайн, реклама, информационные технологии : сб. тр. XV Межд. науч.-практ. конф. Омск : Изд-во Омского государственного технического университета*. 2016. С. 52–54.

33. *Пояснительная записка. Реконструкция залов ожидания Ярославского вокзала Московской железной дороги* // *Архитектурное бюро Тимура Башкаева*. URL: <https://www.abtb.ru>.

34. *Mikkel Bille, Tim Flohr Sørensen.* An Anthropology of Luminosity // *Journal of Material Culture*. 2007. Vol. 12. Issue 3. Pp. 263. DOI: 10.1177/1359183507081894.

35. *На Ярославском вокзале появился штатный пианист*. URL: <https://www.rzhd.ru>.

36. *Васильев К.Б.* Вокзал — вокальный зал ожидания имени Вокса // *Электронный философский журнал Vox / Голос*. 2014. Вып. 17. URL: <http://vox-journal.org>.

37. *Jenkin P.* Urban railways: system choice // *Urban Railways and the Civil Engineer : conference proceedings*. London, 1987. 288 p.

38. *Мионов В.* Вокзалы перенесут в отдаленные от центра районы Москвы // *РБК*. URL: <https://realty.rbc.ru> 6.07.2015.

39. *Башарова С., Змановская А., Корчмарек Н.* Москомархитектура предлагает разгрузить вокзалы столицы // *Известия*. 6.07.2015. URL: <https://iz.ru/news>.

40. *Мурунов А.Ю.* Принципы архитектурной модернизации железнодорожных вокзальных комплексов на современном этапе (для крупных и крупнейших городов) : автореф. дис. ... канд. архит. Н.Новгород, 2005. С. 20.

41. *Ban D.* La gare de l'Est de Budapest // *Ethnologie Française*. 2006. Vol. 36. Issue 2. Pp. 299–309. DOI: 10.3917/ethn.062.0299.

42. *Абрамов С.Б.* Реконструкция московских вокзалов — повышение качества услуг и эффективности работы // *Экономика железных дорог*. 2012. № 5. С. 10.

43. *Shcherbanin Yu.A.* Some problems of Russia's railway infrastructure // *Studies on Russian Economic Development*. 2012. Vol. 23. Issue 1. Pp. 37–39. DOI: 10.1134/s1075700712010108.

44. На Ярославском вокзале Москвы открылась выставка «История железных дорог». URL: <http://www.rzdtv.ru>.

Поступила в редакцию 31 марта 2017 г.

Принята в доработанном виде 11 мая 2018 г.

Одобрена для публикации 31 июля 2018 г.

О Б А В Т О Р Е: **Посвятенко Юлия Викторовна** — кандидат исторических наук, доцент, старший преподаватель кафедры истории и философии, **Национальный исследовательский Московский государственный строительный университет (НИУ МГСУ)**, 129337, г. Москва, Ярославское шоссе, д. 26, posviat@mail.ru, ORCID: 0000-0002-1594-6128.