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1. IDENTIFICATIONS

a) country
   Russian Federation

b) Republic
   Dagestan, Eastern Caucasus, Western Seaboard of Caspian Sea

c) Name of property
   Derbent citadel, ancient city and fortress fortifications in ensemble

d) Exact location
   Long. 48° 20’ 55” E  
   Lat. 42° 02’30” N

e) Maps or schemes, showing limits of territory presented to nomination
   See supplement 1

f) Area of territory and proposed buffer zone of property submitted to nomination
   9.72 – medieval city and citadel
   2.0 – city bordered by walls

2. JUSTIFICATION FOR INSCRIPTION ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

a) Statement of significance
   Derbent is the most ancient city on Easter Caucasus and possibly even on the whole territory of Russia. Its records of history are going back (on the basis of archeological studies) to five thousand years. Founded in deep antiquity it changed from a small settlement of Early Bronze to one of the biggest medieval cities of the Eastern Europe and the Front Asia.

   The city has a unique urban structure. It is situated across a narrow seaside strip of plains with width of 3 km cutting it crosswise by double row defensive walls that are extended to 40 km to Caucasus mountains. Walls also are extended to 500 m seawise to screen the harbor. Up today Derbent has preserved its historic topography intact since 6th century. City borders include:
   - ancient roads and town-planning of historic urban area;
   - ancient system of water supply of 6th – 7th centuries; with fountains and springs;
   - ancient defensive walls crowned with citadel.

   Architecture of Derbent is complex phenomenon. The city has been a cultural center that dominated interaction of cultures representing different peoples and regions.

   During many centuries Derbent has been a thoroughfare of new information about types of buildings and constructions
(fortresses, mosques, mausoleums, minarets etc.) design forms, planning methods for villages of southern Dagestan. The city’s urban construction was closely connected with certain periods of architectural history of countries of the Front Asia and the Eastern Caucasus.

First of all it is related to a defensive system of Derbent – a structure of the world significance. It strikes one’s mind both by its design (a link in the chain of “Long walls” separating nomadic peoples of the North from land tillers of the South), and by its tremendous scope, unique layout of a city fortress (extended between citadel and artificial harbor), and workmanship of construction.

Derbent system of defense occupies an honorable place in the history of the world architecture along with such structures as Great Chinese Wall or “Long walls” of Pyreus. Among similar fortifications typologically it gives a unique example of integral combination of “Long wall”, a powerful fortress, city and port.

Cult construction of Derbent is of great interest for one who studies history of architecture of the Front East. Djuma-masjid of Derbent is one of the most significant early mosques constructed beyond borders of the Arabic caliphate. On one hand, it is an important link of evolution of Islamic cult building, and on the other hand, it’s one of prototypes of local mosques on the Eastern Caucasus.

In 14th – 15th centuries when Derbent was a part of possessions of Shirwanshahs its architecture was developing in close interaction with architecture of Shirwan. Derbent buildings of this time help better to understand general state of architecture of the Eastern Caucasus.

b) Possible comparative analysis

There is a rare property on the territory of the Russian Federation that can compete with Derbent in antiquity of its foundation and nature of cultural heritage that in its most ancient and valuable part can be traced back to eastern Muslim traditions.

Perhaps, it is possible to make some comparisons with Kazan. The architectural ensemble of Kazan Kremlin was included into the World Heritage List in 2000. This complex like a similar one in Derbent is closely connected with the Muslim period of development of the city as a capital of khans state. It also has as its basis fortress structures and connected with them historic buildings of different styles and period of construction. In certain time of their lives both Derbent and Kazan were included into the Russian Empire. It influenced considerably multinational cultural heritage of these cities.

However, Derbent is much older than Kazan that is only going to commemorate soon its first 1000-year anniversary.

Topography, of Derbent, its location of fortifications, total layout of structures, degree of conservation of old buildings - all these elements of urban heritage are much different from
those of Kazan, in other words beyond citadel borders they are older, better conserved, more developed spacewise. Perhaps, it is also possible to compare the property submitted to nomination with other properties on the territories formerly included in the USSR. Nowadays these cities are situated on the territories of independent states of the Transcaucasia and the Central Asia to wit Azerbaijan, Georgia, Uzbekistan. Their development went on in the framework of Muslim architectural traditions or under their considerable influence that resulted in local “east color” of urban environment.

Number of properties have already been inscribed in the World Heritage List or nominated for inscription. They are Icha-Kala of Khiva (1990), historical center of Bukhara (1993), similar center of Shakhripsiabs (2000) in Uzbekistan; Icheri-Shekher (city within the fortress borders) of Baku (2000) in Azerbaidjan; historical part of Tbilisi (2001) in Georgia. In all of these cities unique heritage has been formed as a continuation of Arabic urban traditions when cities were consolidated under the aegis of the ruler’s citadel or a provincial citadel. It was surrounded by fortress walls (called shahristan, and in Mediterranean tradition-medina), and afterwards spatial suburban quarters were built around such nucleus along roads coming out of the city center. Later they were surrounded in their turn by walls (called rabad).

Derbent as a true eastern Muslim city with domination of Arabic cultural traditions during several centuries couldn’t but follow this tradition. However, its unique strategic position on the Caspian passage, and parallel “Long walls” constructed already by Persians in pre-arabic period, and later reinforced by Arabs, determined consolidation of an absolutely unique version of town-planning structure of an eastern city.

One can see here the whole set of necessary elements of town-planning of such city: citadel, shahristan and rabad form a linear structure developing itself from mountains to seaside between two walls without trespassing these limits up to mid of the 19th century. Separate parts of old city town-forming structure were divided by transverse walls—“partitions” from which only archeological remnants are left nowadays. Besides, not one of well known cities of the East has around it such large-scale system of defensive structures going up to mountains (almost to 40 km), and down to seaside extending to open sea. They defended city port and prevented it from circumvention by enemies.

There is a well known example of “Long walls” of Pyreus in Greece. But they didn’t embrace city’s historical center with full complex of residential and public buildings-monuments as it is in case of Derbent but only connected two cities – Pyreus and Athens.
c) Authenticity/Integrity

1. The city has preserved its historical topography since the 5th century b.c.
2. Fortress structures have kept its historical look unchanged since the second half of the 19th century when the last construction was done in the citadel. Towers and walls have not been rebuilt since middle of the 19th century. They came down to ruins only in some parts.
3. Monuments of medieval architecture have kept their historical look and their planning without changes.
4. Fortress Narin-Kala or the citadel as a whole has preserved its main buildings constructed in the 14th – 15th centuries. Earlier constructions, for example its underground Christian cathedral were also partly conserved.

Fortress structures – Northern walls of the city have been preserved in all their stretch, and Southern ones have been ruined in half.

The mountain wall is still exists partly in ruins and as separate archaeological monuments.

Restoration works of the second half of the 20th century conserved partly medieval buildings, rehabilitated historical look of the citadel’s tower and some part of buildings in the citadel but actually left untouched authenticity of structures of the 6th – 18th centuries.

d) Criteria under which inscription is proposed

1. The citadel, fortress structures and the ancient part of Derbent are an ensemble of structures of different designations integrated by a common historical and artistic background of the past culture of population that lived within city borders. The urban ensemble was united under architectural and urban traditions during a number of centuries. The a.m. city’s integral parts and the city as a whole represent outstanding value of culture, history and artistic life that enriched European and Eastern civilizations.

2. The citadel, fortress structures and ancient Derbent altogether represent the following:
   - a unique work of art, a masterpiece of creative genius of native population of this region (i);
   - big influence of Derbent architecture on development of art of monumental architecture and typological images in the art of construction culture of peoples of Eastern Caucasus in medieval times (ii);
   - a thought that city stays an exclusively valuable witness of disappeared civilization (iii);
   - monuments of medieval Derbent are outstanding structures of 14th – 15th centuries, typical specimens of muslim culture of the Caucasus (iv);
   - city of Derbent is a unique example of a traditional dwelling of a human being. It is a hub of defensive system on Eastern
Derbent architecture existing during 14 centuries is a material evidence of long history of this area, a witness of penetration of Islamic ideas to territories of the Caucasus. (v).

3. Description

a) Description of property

1. Derbent fortress as an architectural structure consists of the citadel (Narin-Kala), fortress city structures and defensive fortifications going to mountain up to 40 km (mountain wall). The fortress walls closing approach to the sea are conserved and exist as architectural monuments. Fortress is positioned from a strategic point of view in the most narrow and vulnerable place of the Caspian Passage. The path along seashore was blocked by two parallel fortress walls concluded by the citadel. The citadel is situated on closest to the sea high spur of Jangar mountain ridge. It was founded in the 5th century. It existed as a defense construction up to the 19th century. Northern and Western sides of citadel are defended by steep declensions. Easter side facing the city has also a steep-declension. Therefore citadel walls on considerable length are actually propping counter force walls. Their upper part is at the ground level inside the citadel. Western gate closing from North and South side projection of wall together with towers is well protected. Beginning from this gate up to the south wall the citadel is well fortified by powerful towers sitting on the wall at the distance of 20-30m one from the other. During historical period of city development all these towers were repeatedly repaired and rebuilt. The corner square tower is the most interesting one among other ancient towers of the citadel that is situated at the junction of the citadel with the mountain wall. It is the only one from the most ancient towers that has inside space with several tiers.

At the beginning of 17th century Derbent citadel was converted into an independent fortress that was not only a part of Derbent fortress. It also defended a Persian garrison from hostile local population. Constructing a new tower in close proximity to the south-west corner of the citadel can be understood only in the light of this circumstance. After demolishing the part of the mountain wall adjoining to Derbent this total citadel corner became the weakest spot of the city defense. All these towers were erected by means of special laying work that can be dated to the period of Shah
Abbas construction endeavors to strengthen this city-fortress.

Primary, most ancient stone-laying is easily traced at all expanse of preserved parts of fortress structures both in city walls of Derbent and the citadel, and Mountain wall. Outside look of ancient walls creates an impression that they were made of large stones well adjusted together. However, actually it is only their facing. Walls of Derbent consist as if of two exterior face walls layed with large stones dry and of back filling (crude stones of different size) with lime mortar. Average size of face stones is 100 x 65 x 25 cm. They were layed face and header side alternately to get better cohesion with back filling. External surface of stones was well finished, and inner one was left rough to strengthen cohesion of facing and back filling.

Ancient laying-work of walls (to be exact facing) consists of even though one type but not standard irregular stones of different forms and sizes. Apparently separate stones of facing were fit (cut) one to another in the process of laying the wall. Later, in time of rebuilding and repairing walls attempts were made to imitate an initial laying-work. Studies of half-ruined parts of ancient sections of Derbent walls showed that they were erected the following way: first stones of facing were laid out dry up to one layer height. Then filling was laid, and afterwards lime mortar was poured in. After that the following layer was set, and everything was repeated again. Layers of back filling with thickness respective to the height of separate rows of facing are well discernible, for example, at the fracture of the south wall nearby the tower.

Thickness of walls varies from 2,3m to 3,8m. Their height runs up to 12m at some sections left intact. At present it’s difficult to say definitely how ancient completions of Derbent walls looked like. Any way, in Mountain wall which was not renewed after Arabs completions of those types that left intact and in all probability emerged later, were not revealed. Mountain wall has three-step completions. It shows that they are completions of sessanide walls. Apparently such step dentels also completed city walls of Derbent. Any way, sizes of machicolations left on the north wall and the rhythm of their twin placing coincide with the width of step dentels (as a rule without machicolations) is generally characteristic for ancient architecture of Front Asia, and that it was widespread as early as in the first millennium bc.

Constructions of the defensive system were made of local shell rock. At the same time one can easily see that primary ancient laying is the same for all constructions of the defensive system of Derbent. It shows that the whole complex of still existing defensive constructions (city
walls, citadel, Mountain wall) was built during the one historic period. Although in the time of this construction separate stages could reasonably exist.

The citadel has plan looking like lentil kernel. The least defended gate is on the west side. It was called Mountain gate. The gate flanked from outside by two rectangular buttresses projected up to 8m. It was strengthened in 19th century by counterforces forming a narrow up to 3m passage to the gate. This passage is exposed to fire from a.m. buttresses.

One more gate – Narin-kala-kapi leads to the city from the east side. This gateway is made through a supporting wall because ground overfall inside and outside is 5m. A sloping pass-pandus – is excavated in the ground. The inscription left over aperture bears the name of the Shah Abbas. Gateway is covered by an arch, and gatepass – by a dome. Later two-storey building was erected above the gate. Its walls were supported by two heavy-duty pointed arcs overlapping the passage. Well preserved gate is dated to not later than the beginning of the 18th century.

The gate and building have a common facade. They don’t have storey differentiation. Both gates of citadel have inside well preserved stone profiled brackets with circular holes for hinges.

Khan’s palace inside citadel is the most interesting civil building of Derbent. It was probably constructed in the middle of the 18th century because citadel plans of the beginning of the century show another building on this site. Two-storey building of the palace made of crude stones was erected on the highest point of mountain spur. Chambers where the khan and his sister lived were positioned inside a square building with swimming pool in the center of it. Gallery was made on the upper storey of the building facing the city. According to descriptions of the end of 18th century palace complex consisted of two parts – new buildings adjoining to eastern part of citadel wall, and old buildings – service quarter in north-west corner of citadel at site of former palace of the ruler. According to archeological date there are 5 layers of medieval palaces of the 12th – second part of 17th century.

Khan’s palace complex is built on steep mountain slope that is why all four of its palaces are positioned on different artificially leveled terraces. Such grounds resulted in the situation that all buildings around main courtyard with basin have on one side two-storey, and on another side-one-storey facades. The group of buildings consolidated by big yard (24,7 x 28,4m) is the most interesting part of all palace ensemble. Courtyard with basin was a front part of it. Palace front yard had a planned flower bed, big basin in the center. Galleries with carved poles, and niches in wall
internal side. Service yard circled by warehouses, kitchens etc. was situated towards west from palaces. To the left from entrance to the citadel was the last yard with building for soldiers of citadel permanent garrison.

Khan's palace was the most significant civil building of Derbent. However externally it was not discernible from the city on its background. One could see only butt facades of its two buildings and an octagonal pavilion on top of one of its towers.

Considerable attention of Derbent architectures was devoted to the portal - main entrance that had art finishing. Walls flanking portal had similar arc niches as in external parts of walls. The palace part adjacent to portal also had art finish. A system of tanks for water collection and storage was important part of citadel architecture. Tanks were dated to 17th century. Historians say about earlier construction of these structures.

There are several tanks in citadel. One of them with cross-shaped plan was put near the palace. Cross ends are covered by cupola with diameter of 5m and thickness of 40cm. Total height is above 10m. There was a hole with dimensions 60x60 cm in cupola. The tank had waterroof coating. There as a descending stare 10m of center leading to side wall where was an arc aperture with shaped cantilever stones in arc's slab (apertures dimensions: width - 1,5m, height - 1,8m). Cross-shaped tank watered the basin in the center of front court-yard.

The second tank was close to service yard - a structure situated at the west side of citadel. It is an arc-type structure. One end of is in the ground. Open end but also had a arced pass with stare leading to tank's bottom. Dimensions of stare: span - 8m, length - about 20m, height - 6,5m. The aperture was supported by two arches. It was 3,5 m wide.

One more tank was in south part of palace complex. Water from this storage was used for ruler's meeds. Cellers for khan's prisoners were made near citadel walls.

One of sights of Derbent are its arched baths. They are dated to the 17th century, still are in a good shape, and functioned up to recent time.

This type of structures is quite traditional for the east. Baths played a big role in muslim cities being an integral part of social life.

Baths of Derbent, particularly baths of the citadel are close by their planning and space composition to the most sophisticated baths of Azerbaijan (Gadjhi-hamam in Baku). Baths are arc and cupola-type structures digged in the ground illuminated by natural light through special holes in cupolas and apertures. All constructions are made of shell stone.
Well thought system of coverings has to be noted. It took into account complexity of structures' plans and basic demands of static work of arches and cupolas. Architects who were well aware of work of arc system used also system of side trust for covering bath structures. Floors were covered by stone slabs pavement, walls and cupolas were plastered and white washed. Perfect system of communication between cold and warm rooms, and underground position of baths promoted rather economic use of hot air. Facades of baths are primitive. Interiors produce strong art impression by organization of space. Complicated internal space formed by combination of arches, apertures, niches illuminated by upper natural light leaves an impression of some complex and irreal world.

One more monument that was situated on palace complex needs to be mentioned. It is a mosque building which had the tallest minaret. Unfortunately it is not existing any more but was shown on all medieval city images. The mosque was a round building with square foundation. The a.m. minaret that was close to the building simultaneously served as guard tower. The mosque minaret and a Christian cathedral survived and are monuments of archeology. The cathedral situated in the north-west corner of citadel was covered by earth to its total height (about 12m), and after cleaning internal space was used as water storage for a long time. The building can be seen through a ground hole at the place of former dome-drum.

2. Fortress structures
One of the first mentions about adobe walls of Derbent is an information from Al-Istarhi (the 10th century). It indicated that besides stone walls Derbent had also adobe ones. The adobe wall in its main part was disrupted during last twenty five – thirty years. At present it is preserved partly at south section of the wall. Base foundation of the adobe wall is one meter lower than stone wall foundation. Height of a survived part of adobe wall is 4-7m, width – up to 8m. These remnants and drawings of beginning of the 18th century (cross sections of some parts of north city wall) allow to say that the adobe wall partitioned Derbent Passage from citadel to the sea. By its construction, characteristics of laying-work, and bricks size this wall is similar to Gilginghais defensive line. Stone fortress walls of Derbent are well preserved, and even now they basically determine look of Derbent from art point of view. The first thing that strikes a new comer to Derbent is its fortress structures. At present the following elements of mighty Derbent fortress system are preserved: the north wall – on almost full of its length, the southern wall – only in some of
its parts, and citadel and Mountain wall – in separate fragments of them.

Long fortress walls deprived of any decorative elements give to the city as a whole apparently a severe unforgettable ancient look.

A dramatic long history of the city could not but reflected itself on city’s walls. Today it’s possible to count up to ten types of stone laying related to different periods of history. Thickness of city walls varies from 2-3m up to 4m, height in some places is 10-12m. Machicoations can be seen on separate parts of the wall. They are stone consoles with projection of 30 cm. Laying between each couple of consoles has a bevel.

According to studies made by historians walls had ancient completions in the form of step dentels which practically cannot be met within city limits but they can be found on Mountain wall that was not rebuilt by Arabs. Dentels have 4 steps. Their shape and size are non-standard (dentels are even not symmetrical).

Part of alterations and rebuilding of walls that attempted to imitate ancient laying-work can be associated with the second-arabic-period. The facts that traditions of the 6th century in one or another degree were preserved in the 7th - the 10th centuries can be substantiated by similarity of Derbent ancient wall laying and that of the mausoleum in Karchage (Kasumkent region) that was built after appearance of Arabs in Dagestan anyway. Lower parts of Djuma mesjid of Derbent have similar laying (the 8th century).

It is possible to assert that those fragments of Derbent walls showing stones of more regular shapes, and those of them that besides alternating laying of face and side of bricks have rows of stones that were laid flat can be dated to arabic period.

The third big construction period in the history of Derbent walls is connected with the 14th - the 15th centuries when Derbent was in the possession of sirwanshahs. Laying with considerably small (average size of 20 x 30 or 30 x 40cm) stones well adjusted to each other can be associated with this period. A picture (alternating of long and short sides of stones) and picturesque, not strictly horizontal and vertical seams of ancient laying an image of mighty and long fortress walls. Stones in laying of the 14th - the 15th centuries form an even surface, often with almost indiscernible seams. Separate stones does not mean much in exterior look of walls. As against of ancient laying where separate stones form a sort of cyclope graphic composition laying of the 14th - the 15th centuries may serve as a background for architectural details, inlaid pieces of sorts etc. It is not accidental that this very laying was so
characteristic for the architecture of Azerbaijan of the 15th century with its masterfully done stone carved details.

Stone wall of Derbent had a number of gates. The first gate exists since the 6th – the 7th centuries (for example in citadel). Some gates were punctured at new sites in muslim period. Let’s familiarize ourselves separately with each gate. We start from the north city wall. The first one is Djarchi-kapi (messenger’s gate). Khan’s messenger broadcasted orders near it. Arabs called it Bab-al-Mukhadjir (runaway’s gate), and Russian named it Water gate (citadel defenders could reach a water spring beyond city wall easiest way). According to the project of 1811 this gate was rebuilt. At that time its aperture apparently got a half-circular shape. However on drawings of 1720 it was shown as a pointed one.

The second (to count from the citadel) gate in the northern wall – Kirkhlar-kapi – was obliged to nearby Kirkhlar cemetery.

Arabs called it Bab-al-Djikhad (gate of holy war). Russians named it Kizlarski. Kirkhlar-kapi is one of the most ancient gates in Derbent preserving in its lower part primary laying-work. It was the main front city gate from the north side. It had the richest architectural and art decoration. The aperture of Kirkhlar-kapi (3.4m width) is covered by a straight flat, wedge type lintel made of seven big stones with height up to 90cm. A passage covered by pointed arch leads to the aperture from the city.

The fortress wall on both sides of the gate has small recesses in laying to mark out the gate. Sculptured figures of lions and a capital projecting like a console adjoin to the edge of this niche that emphasizes borders of the gate facade.

Two slabs are put in outside laying above the aperture. Inscriptions on them in Persian tell about repair works in 842 (1438-1439) that were performed by the master Khadjii-Akhmat. Eight stone supports of complicated shape are preserved in laying above a.m. inscriptions. Supports can be dated to the 14th – the 15th centuries. Probably they were a part of some defensive mechanism similar to completions (machicolation type) of the northern gate of Baku fortress 91608) that is also fixed by eight stone supports with size, and shapes analogous to supports of Kirkhlar-kapi.

The upper part of this gate with laying made of small rough stones has loop-hole embrasures and machicolarions restored in sixties of the last century.

Kala-kapi-gate next to the citadel in the south wall was built only in the end of the 18th century. In twenties of the last century it went down leaving a hole in the wall that existed for a long time. In sixties the gate was rebuilt.
The external facade of Kala-kapi is extremely simple. It has a rectangular aperture (with wedge type lintel). This way it looks on one drawing of the 19th century. The internal facade is more interesting. At restoration its arc cover was converted to a pointed one similar to the cover of the earlier gate.

The second gate of the south wall - Bajat-kapi - that Arabs called Bab-al-Maktub, had a pointed aperture. As against to other Derbent gates there were two arc apertures, external and internal, between which in the wall thickness a passage was made covered by a pointed arch. In the beginning of the 19th century Bajat-kapi was radically rebuilt according to a project of military engineer Karpov. In those works the old scheme of the plan was preserved. However, apertures cot half circular shape, and the passage between them was covered by a wooden dead floor.

The gate was preserved comparatively well (restored in sixties). Externally flanked by two semicircular towers laying of which consists of strictly regular stones (stretchers and bounders) and has layers of stones put in flat. It shows that this laying is made later than the primary one. Similar framing of both arc apertures (with spans of 3,36m) is laid with cut stones and consists of semicircular archivolts (with detached lock stone) and pilasters with capitals in the form of cove with flange. An inscription in Russian is carved above the lock stone: “Time ruined me, obedience restored. 1811”.

Except laying picture of lower parts of flanking projections all the rest elements of Bajat-kapi (aperture shape, details of projections framing) are related to one period – beginning of the 19th century. Simplified forms of Russian Empire were used in shaping portals.

Decorativeness is a characteristic of Derbent medieval architecture. The decorative wall in front of the gate - Orta-kapi – can be an example of it. One can see here stalactite capitals and niches, and a profiled pointed arch that in their style characteristic are close to the decoration of Divan-khane from Baku palace complex of shirvanshahs (first half of the 15th century).

City towers of Derbent didn’t play an independent role in defense. They have shapes of bends curved inwards. Wall bends form powerful projections from which clank shooting was made. The straight section of the north wall has 25 well preserved towers and one dead-end protection built later. Towers mainly have semicircular shape (width – 13m, projection – 7m). Besides there are several rectangular and trapezium towers there (width – 20m, projection up to 12m). The straight section is closed by the largest tower that can be named as Round Bastion.
In the beginning of the 19th century it was adapted by the Russian garrison for artillery. Instead of usual parapet wide embrasures were constructed on it for guns. This tower is shaped in its plan as almost three quarters of a circle with diameter of 24m.

The north city wall near Round bastion first turns southward under direct angle, and then goes along a steep ravin bank (bed of mountain river) following its turns. Wall bends can explain absence of towers with big projections at this wall section because conditions for flank shooting are created there anyway. Most of towers are blind, small sized, with average distance between them much shorter than on the straight section of the wall (about 25m).

Twelve towers out of total number positioned on the section of the north wall from Round bastion to the gate Djarchi-kapi are blind, rectangular in plan (two of them were built later).

Three towers are open inward, they also are rectangular in plan. One tower actually is a bend of fortress wall. The north city wall from the gate Djarchi-kapi goes sharply up the mountain and joins the citadel wall projection overhanging above it. The last tower of the worth wall being a small blind wall projection is situated here.

As against to the north wall the south city wall is built rectilinearly on its total stretch from the sea to the citadel. It was not important in the defense of the Derbent Passage as the northern one. That is why it had much smaller number of towers. All ancient towers were rectangular here.

Summary:
The stretch of city walls is: 3,65km (north one), 3,5km (south one). Walls stretch from the citadel to the sea parallel to each other. Archeological studies showed that walls entered the sea to 500m. They were built in the 5th–6th centuries. Walls were strengthened by towers to make them more lasting. Total number of them is up to 73. The north wall as a main one has 46 towers positioned at the distance between them of 70m (aim distance of bow shot). In four cases the distance was reduced to 35m. This wall predominantly has semicircular towers (22) with outside radius of about 6,5m. Rectangular towers have dimensions of 12x20m (big) and 7,5x13m (small). Trapezium shaped towers have width of 15-18m with projection of 10-11m.

The south wall has only rectangular towers. As an exception there are two circular towers built in another construction manner in later times. Distance between towers is 170-200m, their width – 13-16m, and projection – 6-7m.

There are small, rectangular, blind towers in the citadel. It’s more correct to call them tower projections. The only
empty one is the south-west corner tower which had an exit to the Mountain wall.

At present 9 gates still exist: two – in the citadel, four – in the south wall, three – in the north one.

Earlier, prior to destruction, there were 14 gates in Derbent. Gates were not only an important place of fortifications but also they were architecture sights.

Let us enumerate them:

1. "Narin-Kala-kapi" in the east part of citadel. Its aperture was done in the 6th century, the last rebuilding in the 7th – the 8th centuries.

2. West ("Mountain") gate of the citadel appeared in the 10th and rebuilt in the 7th – the 8th centuries.

3. "Kali-kapi" ("Citadel gate"). The upper one in the south wall. The 5th, the 10th – the 11th centuries – time of construction and rebuilding.

4. "Bajat-kapi" ("Gate in front of waste ground" or "Gate of song masters"). It was built in the 6th – the 7th centuries). Its upper part was rebuilt in 1812.

5. "Orta-kapi" ("Middle gate") in the south wall was constructed in the 6th- the 7th centuries. External decoration is related to the 11th or the 14th century.

6. "Dubari-kapi" ("Double wall gate") supposedly was built in the 10th – 11th centuries in the south wall.

7. "Dzharchi-kapi" ("Messenger gate") was arranged in a place of fracture of the north wall in the 11th – 13th centuries. It was fundamentally rebuilt in 1811.

8. "Kirkhlar-kapi" ("Gate of forty"). It is a main military city gate in the north wall. Built in the 5th – the 7th centuries, and rebuilt in the 17th century.

9. "Dash-kapi" ("Stone gate") was built in the 10th – the 12th centuries in the north wall.

3. Cult constructions.

The cross-shaped cathedral in the citadel was built in the 5th century B.C. in traditions characteristic to similarly shaped early Christian churches of Georgia and Armenia, and Italian ones of the 5th – the 7th centuries a.C. (Rovenia).

The cathedral was abandoned, and then covered with earth entirely because of predominant non-Christian local populations worshiped zoroastrism (Iranians) and later – Islam (Arabs and Jews). In late times it was cleared away inside and used as an underground water storage. Djuma-masjid (Friday mosque) is a unique monument of cult architecture and the most ancient monument of Islam in the East Caucasus. Research workers suppose that it was built on an early christian church and partly used the walls of the latter. The mosque is a construction rectangular in plan with a projection in the central part of the south facade.
The mosque’s interior consists of three-nine hall stretched from east to west, and beneath cupola space covered by a pointed dome (9,3m diameter) resting on 8 wall arches crowned by a stalactite frieze. Dimensions of the building are the following: width – 67x17m, middle nave width – 6,3m, side nave width – 4m, distance between square plan (97x97cm) columns with carved capitals – 2,4m, central spacing – 3,8m, side spacing – 2,54m. Sections of side naves are covered by original semicircular coves with projections in upper and lower parts. Sections of the middle nave are covered by mirror vaults, and the central section- by a faceted pendentive pointed dome with 4m diameter.

The space beneath the dome is opened to double-tier galleries connected with the rectangular hall of the mosque by stairs. The south wall of this hall has a niche for mihrab. Square and rectangular halls are connected by arch apertures. The former one is lighted by three windows in the south wall. Besides there are 4 openings in the big dome.

Four entrances are leading to the rectangular hall. A main one (on domes’ axle) is decorated by a portal with a pointed arc niche. The portal is ornamented by oil paints from outside. Laying stones inside the arc niche of the main portal have stones with carved inscriptions cut above door aperture. One of inscriptions (arabic) has the date of construction in muslim chronology – 115 (in European one – 733-734 a.c.) Another one informs that the mosque fell down and was rebuilt in (770) 1368-1369 a.c. One shows the architect’s name – Tadj-ad-Din from Baku. Lower parts of the walls were laid with big stones, and upper ones – with bricks. Walls from inside were plastered, arch bricks on the contrary were marked out against white background of seams that forms a geometrical picture and ornaments.

“Djuma-mesjid” is one of the earliest mosques on territory of the former USSR. it began functioning in the 7th century. It was constructed by Maslama ben-Abu-Melik in 733, and was reconstructed by Shah Abbas in the 10th century. Two gates lead into its courtyard – eastern and northern ones. The east gate was constructed in the 8th century. It was not renewed in 14th and the 17th centuries. Because of absence of a minaret it is used as a muedzin place.

The north gate was built later (the 15th century) and is not used at present.

The Medrese building is situated in front of the mosque. It was constructed in the 15th century. Together with the mosque and an administrative building they forms a closed courtyard. Very old platanes crow in it. Supposedly they are not less than one thousand years old.
The "Minaret-mosque" is situated in one of city magals (a magal corresponds to a European quarter). It is the only city mosque with a minaret that was constructed in the 13th - 14th centuries. The very mosque was rebuilt in the 19th century.

"Kilsa-masjid" is in the old city. It was built in the 12th - 13th centuries. "Bala-masjid" is a late cult building. It was constructed inside the old city in the 19th century.

"Kirkhar-masjid" is the only one of dome-type mosques situated in magals. It was built in the 17th century. The Armenian church of the 19th century is a typical one for cult buildings of Armenia. It is interesting as one built in the medieval muslim city.

Two Russian orthodox cathedrals that were constructed in the 19th century are rebuilt considerably and hardly preserved their decorations.

4. Public buildings
The only karavan-sarai of Derbent is hardly conserved. The only portal is left intact from a construction of the 17th century.

Baths as public constructions were very wide spread in Derbent. The biggest one was built in a magal near to the Kilsa masjid in the 16th - 17th centuries. Thirty years ago at the time of restoration the mosque's dome was simplified.

One more bath is situated next to Djuma-mesjid. It is a monument of the 17th century. It is the best preserved one from all medieval baths of Derbent.

One more bath was constructed near the gate Kirkular-kapi. It also belongs to the 17th century. It is a big bath of the city that was restored in the seventies of the 20th century.

"Maidens bath" nearby Tali-mesjid is of the late 19th century.

There are oldest water reservoirs of Derbent in vicinities of the track of Rostov-Baku highway. They are dated to the 10th - 11th and 17th centuries. One of them is a rectangular tank with pointed arches resting on pilasters. Another one is a square in plan with an arch vault.

One more reservoir of the 17th -18th centuries is in the magal of the Minaret mosque, and it is used according to an original assignment.

It's necessary to mention some still working water springs - one near Orta-kapi, another near Kirkhlar-kapi, and one more in magals.

5. Medieval city
Residential quarters are closing on the citadel. The ancient city planning stays unchanged during many centuries as a result of peculiarities of historic and urban characteristics of this old settlement.
The territory of ancient and as well later Derbent stayed practically unchanged to the contrary of majority of cities where citadels were circled by residential quarters. Since the 5th and up to 19th centuries the city positioned itself only between two parallel walls exclusively on spurs of the Dalgan ridge leaving a seaside plain almost untouched. The picture of streets’ network fixed by the position of gates in the fortress walls and the permanent landscape is preserved up the present time.

Absence of tall houses in the city’s medieval quarters, stability of urban life traditions determined a lock of the city.

During many centuries life of the city-fortress, city-trader and city-craftsman was locked on the territory with the length of 2.7 km and the width of 200-400m.

For a long time public life in the north part was clustered around the citadel and an ancient trading path alongside mountain ridges. As early as in the 8th century the arabic commander Msslama-Ben-Abdul Malik divided the city into seven magals (quarter) and built a mosque in every one of them. He constructed a biggest mosque – Djuma-mesjid – in the center of this city.

In the 17th century at the picture made by A. Olearius one can see it divided to big functionally deferent parts: the citadel with a very dense building that can be seen even at present, an upper part of the city with Djuma-mesjid and Caravan sarai, and a poorly built plain and seaside areas inside the walls.

Planning and building of the old city was stopped by the end of the 18th century.

With arrival of Russian inhabitants to Derbent the city was as if divided in two parts – an upper one that still stayed Islamic in its construction traditions, and a lower one that was planned built anew and according to European style.

Preservation of building traditions in the upper city was greatly influenced by the population decent from one ethnic group emigrated to Derbent from Persia long ago. Emigrants settled in one common quarter (magal) and preserved their kindred and ethnic ties. That in its turn promoted greatly keeping real estates and a character of planning construction untouched.

Separate quarters (magals) consisted and still consist of formed self-centered architectural elements because of climatic conditions, way of life and religious demands. Interior space organization is more important for them than exterior look of facade.

These elements are not expected to be observed from city streets or courtyards. Purely private, internal life has not to be disposed to foreign glances. The fact that the medieval city preserved this agelong peculiarity shows stability of
b) History of property

During long ages Derbent transformed itself from small settling of Early Bronze into one of the biggest cities of the Front Asia and Eastern Europe. It survived during stormy events of history. It was claimed by Rome and Parthia, Iran and Byzantinum, Arabic caliphate and Khazarous kaganate, Seldjucks State and Golden Orda, sefevids shahs and Turkish sultans.

The city’s name ascending to the 6th century a.c. has a Persian origin and literally means “Knot of gates”, “Bond, lock of gates” (“Dar” – gate, “band” – tie, knot, bolt). Besides a Persian name the city had more twenty names reflecting geographic and strategic peculiarities of its position. Historians of Rome and Greece of antiquity called it Caspian or Albanian gate. Caucasian medieval authors named it Chor gate of Chola (even today Dagestanians call Derbent “Churul or Chully”). It was called by Byzantinians – a fortress of Tzor, Tzup, Tcur, Arabs – Bab-al-Abvab (Gate of gates) or Bab-al-Hadid (Iron gate), Mongolians – Kahulga (Gate), Turks – Temirkapi (Iron gate), Russians – Derbent or Iron gate. During many ages Derbent played a separate role in historic fates of different peoples. It was an important border fortress of states of the Near and Middle East in cultural, architectural work out of planning and space organization of residential houses.

The citadel or courtyard adjacent to its gates never were a public center of the medieval city. Access to the citadel was so difficult that living quarters could not be easily developed around it. Street adjacent to it had such complicated turns that the main road to the citadel east gate bypassed the city and went along a path outside city walls. Djuma-mesjid always was a true center of public life. A trading center changed its place up to the 18th century when it was finally settled in an area of Caravan sarai.

These two centers gravitated towards principal transit roads. One went from the gate Kickhlar-kapi to the south gate almost at the same level as the seaside terrace. Another one passed the gate Bayt-kapi and climbing towards mountains reached the north gate Djarchi-kapi. Such direction of roads caused by gates position preserved planning structure of this medieval city.

Public buildings – mosques, the Caravan sarai, baths, water springs and reservoirs whose position did not change for ages and their look from architecture point of view as well – give a full idea about stability of urban construction culture, planning laws of medieval Derbent, residential habits of its population that long ago was buried in cemeteries situated near its walls.
their struggle with nomads of the South-East Europe. Already since the epoch of the Early Bronze steppe bellicose tribes rushed through the Caspian Passage to blessed farming lands in the South. Later many other inhabitants of steppes situated to the North of Caspian sea, Caucasus, Black Sea and areas of Urals and South Siberia repeatedly passed this way. They were skiffs, sarmats, alans, hunnes, savirs, avars, khazars etc.

The most effective way to close this main road of expanse of steppe peoples to the ancient East – the Caspian Passage – was to start constructing fortifications on a large scale.

So, in the 5th century a.c. construction of Derbent defensive complex began. It had to be a solid continuous line of powerful fortifications with towers and forts.

A special role of Derbent as a guardian of the main Caucasus passage exerted a decisive influence on events of Derbent history.

Archeological excavations in Derbent begun by the Institute of languages and literature of the Dagestan affiliate of the USSR Academy of Sciences allowed to date an emergency of ancient settlement to the 4th – 3rd millennia b.c. i.e. five thousand years ago.

The territory of Derbent hill was lived on in later time – about the last third of the second – beginning of the first millennia b.c. Dwellings found in ancient cultural strata of Derbent made of stones and turluk (wooden sticks plastered with clay) may be referred to this time.

Excavations showed that at the boundary of the 7th – 8th centuries b.c. a powerful fortress-refuge appeared at Derbent hill that with rebuilding and repairing existed till Sasanides arriving there in the 6th century a.c. They built a new citadel named Narin-kala. Its walls are entirely congruent with those of the ancient fortress-refuge.

In the 3rd – 1st centuries b.c. a new state – Caucasus Albania – emerged at the territory of modern Azerbaijan and southern Dagestan. In the 1st century b.c. Derbent entered into this state. Treasures with antique coins and different articles of crafts from the Near East found in vicinities of Derbent may confirm that already in the early antiquity Derbent controlled not only a military strategic way but a well known trading path as well.

In the middle of the 3rd century a.c. an Albanian successful development period of Derbent was interdicted by the campaign of the Persian czar Shahpur I that was provoked by a new activity of nomads in steppes of the north Caucasus and Caspian regions.

An inscription on one antique temple of Iran of Sasanides era said that after conquering Transcaucasia and other lands “horses and people of Shahpur” reacted “Albanien gate
(one of Derbent names) where Shahpur himself... effected devastations and fires..."

However, despite the success of this campaign Iranians could not secure their position in Derbent and expand their power over it. Local rulers continued to control gates of Derbent. Only in the end of the 4th century after long wars with Rome for the possession of the Caucasus ended by the partition of the latter into spheres of influence Iran of Sassanides got control over the West Caucasus and seized Derbent.

In the first half of the 5th century under the czar Ezdigerd II (439-457) Persians built defensive constructions in Derbent. In the 6th century under the czar Kawade I (488-531) and his famous son Hosrow I Anushirvan (539-579) the second period of Sassanide construction began - building of a huge defensive complex to replace fortifications made of adobe bricks.

Construction of Derbent complex was divided ... to several stages: first the citadel and the North city wall, then the South wall, and later Mountain wall. In the 6th century the first transverse wall was built. It partitioned an inhabited part of Derbent near the citadel from an area adjacent to the seaside that was not occupied (other two transverse walls appeared in the 10th - 18th centuries).

In the 6th - 7th century Derbent became not only the most important military stronghold in fighting with nomads but a thriving economic, and cultural center of the entire Caucasus. It was transformed to a big early medieval city with the territory of about 27ha on which the citadel and the city proper with developed crafts and commerce were distinctly marked out.

The second fourth of the 7th century brought a new stage of Derbent history. In the first fourth of the 8th century the city was finally integrated into the Arabic caliphate. Under the rule of Maslam ben Abd-al-Malik, a famous arabic commandcr, the son and brother of arabic califs whom for his large scale construction activity in the city historic sources called “the Second Father” of Derbent (the first was Hosrow Anushirwan) Derbent stood out as largest military and political center of the Caucasus. It housed a big garrison and the seat of the governor of the halif: Taxes and provisions from all the North-East Caucasus were channeled here and Islam was spread in the region.

In the end of the 9th - beginning of the 10th centuries dependence of Derbent from Bagdad went down considerably. In 869 a local dynasty of Khashimides from a famous arabic tribe of sulamy came to power. Simultaneously very important events took place in the South-East Europe where the ancient Russian state crushed Khazar kaganate. The lasting thread of many ages went
down. The struggle for domination between Derbent and Shirvan, two powerful feudal states of the East Caucasus moved forward.

In the beginning of the 8th century some events took place in steppes of the Central Asia. Mongolians were united under Chingizkhan power. It had catastrophic consequences for peoples of the medieval East and Europe. An epoch of envasions of unprecedented terror began.

The grandeur and power of Derbent fortifications exerted very strong impression on Subudai and Djebe. Mongolians decided to outflank Derbent without an attempt to storm it using internal communication routes of Dagestan.

In 1239 Mongolians nevertheless took possession of Derbent. However it was not ruined. The reason of it was not a humane treatment of the city inhabitants by Mongolians. It was forced by necessity to preserve the rule of invaders.

In the second part of the 14th century a new thread in person of Timur appeared in the Central Asia. He consolidated a strong state on the basis of weakened Mongolian uluses. In 1385 Tokhtamis marched through Derbent with 90 thousand strong army into the Transcaucasia. In 1395 Timur replying to this march invaded Shirvan and Dagestan, passed Derbent, and crushed Tokhtamish on Terek.

Thirties of the 16th century brought sharpening the struggle between Turkey and the state of Sefevides that appeared in the Transcaucasia in the 15th century and included Azerbaijan, Iran and Iraq. For a long period Derbent again began a ground of fierce fighting that had pernicious influence on its development.

In the beginning of the 17th century the shah Abbas – one of powerful Sefevide rulers managed to inflict heavy defeats to Turks in the Caucasus. He did big efforts to restore Derbent fortifications and the port, and converted the city to a stronghold of Sefevides on the East and North Caucasus. Derbent became a large center of commerce between Iranian Transcaucasia and Russia.

On May 27 of 1722 Peter 1st with his troops landed on the North sea shores of Dagestan and advanced to Derbent which was entered without fighting on August 23. “Naibe of this city, - reported Peter to the Senate, - assented the key of the city gate...”

Growing tensions between Russia and Turkey, and worsening of internal and international state of the former after Peter’s death resulted to concluding a number of Russian-Iranian treaties directed against the latter. One of main conditions of a.m. treaties was a cession of Derbent and lands adjacent to the Caspian sea to Iran.
The recognition by Russia the sovereignty of the shah Nadir over Derbent and Dagestan brought new burdens to the local population. It was not an occasional event that simultaneously with retreating Russian troops in 1735 inhabitants of two villages of Dagestan fled to mountains. That was a result of rumors about cruelty of the shah. However, in 1741 Nadir shah "Thunderstorm of the Universe" – suffered a crushing defeat in the mountains of Dagestan, and in 1743 was forced to leave Derbent that was his seat, and where he constructed a palace for himself on seaside lands.

In the second part of the 18th century Fatali-khan, a ruler of Kuba, a neighboring feudal possession, with support of dissatisfied population and feudal masters of Dagestan managed to seize the city and overthrow a weak-willed Mahommad-Hussain-khan that was installed by the shah of Iran earlier. Fatali-khan distributed part of lands of Dagestan between its local feudal rulers to strengthen his position. He married the sister of Kaitaga ruler Tuti-Bike to enhance his political status.

Fatali-khan addressed to the Empress of Russia Katherine II with a request about Derbent joining the Russian Empire and sent keys of Derbent to Saint-Petersburg. However, Russia not wanting to add tensions to its relations with Iran temporarily decided not to accept Derbent under its power. In 1806 Derbent was finally attached to Russia, and in 1813 according to the Gulistan Treaty Iran legally acknowledged the incorporation of Dagestan to the Russian state. In February of 1812 provinces of Derbent and Kuba were formed to be headed by military areal chiefs who had highest administrative functions.

The city court – Divan – was established for managing internal affairs. In 1840 provinces were transformed to districts that were ruled similarly to the same divisions of internal gubernias of proper Russia i.e. without taking into consideration of local and national conditions.

After 1820 according to the order of the general Ermolov a part of the south wall was demolished, and an active building was started in the lower seaside part of the city. The upper part (magals) where 11-12 thousand people lived was left basically untouched, the lower one got a European planning with straight broad streets and regular quarter building.

Social and cultural conditions of the city dwellers developed slowly. In 1838 the first Russian district school was opened. From 2 to 5 pupils were graduated from it annually. In 1841 the first medical school – hospital for 60 beds appeared, and the first pharmacy on the basis of private sponsorship was opened in 1860.
In 1846 a post of military governor of Dagestan was introduced with the seat in Derbent that existed till 1860 when in the connection with establishing Dagestan oblast a civil administration was introduced in the city.

In the second part of the 19th century the city economy was in the state of decay. More than one century Derbent was a center of growing and selling marena that was a raw material for making red colour - fast paint for textile industry. After inventing cheap aniline dies the demand for marena dropped sharply. The loss of revenues resulted to the economic emergency in the city.

The construction in the end of the 19th century of Vladicaucausus railway line that connected Baku with Russia (officially the traffic through Dagestan to Baku was opened on April 01, 1900) was a special event in the development of Derbent. It connected the city with more advanced regions of Russia, and with the largest Caucasus center – Baku as well. Derbent became an important railway junction that positively resulted to its economic conditions and growth.

At present when the work of the railway line between Russia and Baku is temporarily suspended the city is looking for new ways for its economic prosperity. One of them is tourism. Ancient monuments, a nice climate conditions, marvelous vineyards could contribute to developing tourism business. The city administration considers ways and means of financing construction of hotel complexes and separate small private hotels.

4. Management

a) Ownership

In accordance with the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Decree No3020-1 of 27.12.91 all monuments of history and culture the list of which is confirmed by the Decree of B. Eltsin, the President of the Russian Federation, No176 of 20.02.95 and that are named below, belong to the federal ownership. The land on which the monuments are situated is in the federal ownership in accordance with the Land Code of the RF. Lands and monuments are turned over to the Reserve of history and art of Derbent in the excise of its right for operative management.

b) Legal status

All monuments situated on the territory of the museum - reserve are ascribed to monuments of the Federal (All Russia) status (Decree of the President of the RF No176 of 20.02.95).

In accordance with the RSFSR Council of Ministers Decree about the establishment of Reserve of history and art of
Derbent as a territory with properties under the state protection the museum reserve is a state organization.

The Charter of the state organization - the Reserve of history and art of Derbent - confirms its main task - preserving and restoring properties of history and art and the territory around them (buffer zone).

The museum - reserve employs professional historians and architects who study monuments, fix their state condition, compile acts of their technical state, exercise repair and restoration works.

All construction activity on the city territory are effected under control of the staff members of the museum-reserve and in coordination with them.

To exercise protective measures on properties of the museum-reserve experts from Moscow institutes “Specrestavratsia”, “Rosrestavratsia” and professional restorers from Derbent workshop are attracted.

The reserve of history, architecture and art of Derbent has authority for operative management of properties and their territory within framework of their competence. (see Annex 1).

Actual carrying out all preservation measures to conserve architectural monuments, territory, natural wealth - together with Derbent administration.

Control for realization of republican programs on preservation of property and work of the museum-reserve is exercised by the Ministry of culture of the Republic of Dagestan together with Committees on land and natural resources of the Republic of Dagestan.

Address of the Ministry of culture of the Republic of Dagestan: 367012, Makhachkala, 2 Lenin Square
Fax: 872 2 68 0868
Mrs. Abdulgamidova Naida Abdurahmanovna
Minister.

Incorporation of republican programs on preservation properties and their territories to Federal specialized programs on preservation of cultural heritage of the peoples of the Russian Federation is exercised by the Ministry of culture of the Russian Federation.

Address of the Ministry of culture of the Russian Federation: Russia, 103074, Moscow, 7 Kitaigorodky proezd
Fax: 095 928 17 91
Minister.
f) Agreed plans

In plans of measures of the Federal special program “Culture of Russia” (2001 – 2005) for 2001 and following years one million rubles is earmarked for restoration of the gate “Dubari-kapi” and constructions of the citadel “Narinkale” (about 350 thousand US Dollars) (see Annex 2). The program of the Ministry of culture of the Republic of Dagestan stipulates funds from the republican budget for conservation of properties of Derbent (see Annex 2).

g) Sources of finance

Funds Reserve

Funds for upkeep of Reserve of history, architecture and art are available in the amount of 7783 (seven thousand seven hundred eighty three) roubles from the republican budget. The government of the Republic of Dagestan marks out 100 thousand roubles a year for upkeep of monuments of history and culture. Annually funds in the amount of about 1mlo roubles for restoration of properties are directed to Derbent from the federal budget.

h) sources of expertise and training in conservation

and management techniques

Once a year the Ministry of culture of the Russian Federation organizes seminars for training chiefs of organizations and institutions in legislative and legal acts in the sphere of heritage conservation. Last year such seminar was held in Tomsk. Academy of restoration (chief – O.I. Prucin) trains members of staff of different museum-reserves in new methods of restoration. At the end restorers get diplomas. In accordance with methodics “Management of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List” experts in architecture and management come from Moscow to Derbent for training and conducting seminars on preservation of heritage.

i) Visitor facilities and statistics.

Daily the citadel Narin-kale is visited by not less than 100 people. Annually the city of Derbent is visited, especially in summer season, by more than 10 thousand people. There are two hotels in the city for 700 people each. After perestroika in the nineties tourists may use the hotel of former military enterprise.
j) Property management plan and statement objectives

Objectives of preservation and conservation of natural heritage of Derbent are stipulated in the Charter of the museum-reserve (see Annex 2, paper 3). Management plan is aimed to development of the city infrastructure to be included into world tourist routes, organizing a systematic popularization of historic and cultural values of Derbent (see Annex 2, paper 4).

k) Staffing levels

Staffing levels (see Annex 2, paper 5)

5. Factors affecting the property

a) Development pressures

At present some activity are made on the territory of the museum-reserve that could have a negative effect on the property and landscape around it because this territory is also the city territory. Industrial development is not allowed according to legislative acts of the Russian Federation and Republic of Dagestan prohibiting any activity detrimental to properties and nature on reserved territory.

b) Environmental pressures

Nowadays ecological conditions of this area can be acknowledged as almost good.

c) Natural disasters and preparedness

Sometimes region of Dagestan have earthquakes that were not big so far. The management of the museum-reserve is informed about approaching disaster by seismologic service. Restorers in advance try to straighten the most ruinized properties before alarm announcement about earthquake.

d) Visitor/tourism pressures

Annually the city is visited by about 10 thousand tourists. They come from nearby health resorts and from the capital of the Republic of Dagestan. Inhabitants of Dagestan visit the museum-reserve on their own. On Sundays more than 10 cars arrive here. At present visitor pressure doesn’t have adverse effect on the territory of 72 ha.

e) Number of inhabitants within the property.

Today the territory of Derbent is inhabited by 140740 people. They represent traditional craft industries – potter, glass-blowing, metal-working, leather processing etc. Especially carpet weaving is highly developed here.
6. Monitoring

a) Key indicators for measuring state of conservation

Key indicators for measuring state of conservation of property are taken from acts of technical state of every construction. Technical state is judged upon tables that are duly affirmed documents (see Annex 3, paper 4). Carrying out inventories of properties and their passportization promote finding out constructions that need earliest repair. Photographic pictures and measuring are also the documents that fix state of conservation of constructions and of landscape.

b) Administrative arrangements for monitoring property

Administrative duties of staff members of the museum-reserve determined by list of staff and confirmed by the Ministry of Culture the Republic of Dagestan represent administrative arrangements for measuring state of conservation of property because list of staff includes experts that are necessary for conducting conservation measures.

c) Results of previous exercises

See Annex 3, paper 5.

7. Documentation

a) Photographs

Format for the nomination of the ensemble of constructions of medieval Derbent includes photographs and videofilm. The videofilm gives a notion about landscape around the city. Annex 4 includes photos that are submitted to Committee for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage for use and publication.

b) Copies of property management plans and extracts of other plans relevant to the property

Format includes copies of city plans used by specialists of City Department of Architecture and projecting institute “Giprogor”.

d) Bibliography
Passports of properties of the Republic of Dagestan are held in archives of the Ministry of Culture of the Russian Federation (103074, 7 Kitaigorodski proezd, Moscow, and also in archive of Museum-reserve of history, architecture and art of Derbent).

Reports on studies of properties and acts of technical state are held in the Ministry of culture of the Republic of Dagestan and in archive of the museum-reserve. Reports for last 46 years since the date of first restoration and conservation works are kept.
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APPENDIX 1

Plans and maps, facades and cross sections of medieval monuments of Derbent, plans of Derbent city.
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4. The citadel. Topographic plan. 2001 Scale 1:1250


13. Plan of Derbent. 1824. GVIA, Fund 349, op.1, No 1376, s.3.


15. Plan of Derbent. 1856. GVIA, Fund 349, op.12, No 2132.


17. Central part of khan’s palace. Plan.


ДЕРБЕНТ • ГЕНЕРАЛЬНЫЙ ПЛАН
СОВРЕМЕННОЕ ИСПОЛЬЗОВАНИЕ
И КОМПЛЕКСНАЯ ОЦЕНКА
ТЕРРИТОРИИ

МАШТАБ 1:5000
Дербентская стена - Прасло № 65-70
Схема технического состояния

Закладка в земле 1.5-3.5
шт. 500

Линейная масштаб: 1:500

Схема технического состояния
Чертёж стены Дербента
Масштаб 1:500

Дербентская стена-памятник 1849-90
Схема технического состояния
План
Украинского Города Дербента взятого Российскими войсками в 1722 и в 1796 годах.
План Дербента:

План центральной части ханского дворца в цитадели. Вторая половина XVIII в.
73. Ханский дворец в цитадели.
Реконструкция автора
Цистерны в цитадели. Планы и разрезы.
Обмерный чертеж автора
Джума-мечеть. VIII—XIV вв. Фасад и план.
Обмерный чертеж автора
Кырхляр-мечеть. XVII в.
Продольный разрез и план.
Обмерный чертеж автора
Баня у ворот Кырхляр-капы. XVII в.
Разрез и план. Обмерный чертеж автора
Форты, башни и бастионы Горной стены
Реконструкция автора
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Explanatory notes to Annex 1:

2 “A” – Drawings 2 and 3
2 “B” – Drawings 5,6,7 and 8
2 “C” – Capital Investments
2 “D” – List of Staff
EXPLANATORY NOTE

on project for territories to be protected
“Conservation and use of heritage.
Basic regulations for zones of protection
of monuments of history and culture”

Derbent is one of the most ancient and unique cities of Dagestan, Russia has conserved important national relics and values. Ancient Derbent is first of all representing heritage. Monuments of Derbent are considered in General plan as foundation and effective basis for development of the city and the whole region as well.

There are many barrows, ruins of fortifications, ancient tracts of roads and settlements in environs of Derbent. About 30 monuments are under protection of the state including 10 under protection of local authorities. Around 120 objects of history and culture are registered and offered to be included into the list of protected ones first as monuments of local significance.

Traditional local crafts and industries such as pottery, glass blowing, metal working, leather processing are also considered as belonging to town sharing potential of heritage. Weathing and carpet making were highly developed some decisions are offered to rehabilitate all these crafts and trades.

The project of general plan of development of Derbent includes a proposition to declare historic part of the city a State reserve of history and architecture, a city-museum, a complex monument of urban development and architecture.

Heritage of history and culture.

Buffer zones of monuments of history and culture – historic nucleus as a whole, its separate monuments and historic landscape were considered as effective, optimal means of their preservation, conservation and utilization determining direction and character of development of the city as a whole, and areas adjoining to the historic nucleus in particular. Such zones were discerned as ways of maintaining of city historic environment along with development of distinguished features and individual look of the city, providing optimal chances for organized showing historic and archeological values of the city, and effective perception of these values by onlookers.

All works on preservation, conservation, restoration of objects of protection and their historic environment in buffer zones are allowed only after coordination with bodies intrusted with protection of monuments of history and culture.

In accordance with the instruction on organization of buffer zones of immovable monuments of history and culture “buffer zone is a territory directly surrounding a monument designated for providing security of the monument and environment nearest to it, its expedient use, and favorable visual perception” (p. 2.3) “Connected with the monument plots of building of historic and artistic value, surroundings, open spaces are included into borders of buffer zone” (p. 4.1.2)

In order to provide harmonious protection and conservation of monuments of architecture and historic environment with new construction the project proposes to create zones of regulation of building around buffer zones.
New construction regulated by functional designation, height and character of building is envisaged in zones of regulated buildings. Valuable planning, best elements of landscape are preserved in these zones. Besides favorable conditions for visual perception of monument in their historic surrounding are provided as well.

A zone of protected landscape is established on a territory not included into protected zones, and zones of regulated construction, in order to conserve a valuable landscape that influences on integrity of historic look of populated area or monument situated in the populated area or outside of it.

The concentration of monuments and building surrounding them may be integrated into reserve territories. In accordance with The Land Code of the RSFSR “in zones of protection of monuments of history and culture, and of museum – reserves the law of the RSFSR and that of Republics included into the RSFSR, a separate regime of use of mentioned categories of land may be established upon coordination with a respective Soviet of people deputees” (part 1, chapter 1, article 4). “Lands on which monuments of history and culture, sights are situated including lands declared reserves, national parks, historic and cultural reserves (museum-reserves) are declared lands of natural and cultural designation. Lands of natural and cultural designation are used in a separate regime established in accordance with the law of the RSFSR and that of republics included into the RSFSR.

Withdrawal of lands of natural and cultural designation for needs contradicting their special designation, and any activity not complying with the established regime are not allowed. In accordance with the law of the RSFSR separate lands of historic and cultural designation may be completely withdrawn from economic use/including lands on which (and in which) historic and cultural objects subject to study and conservation are situated” (part VI, article 93).
IT IS PROPOSED TO CREATE THE FOLLOWING ZONES
OF PROTECTION OF MONUMENTS OF
HISTORY AND CULTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Territory (ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The citadel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Historical nucleus of Derbent city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submarine part of the ancient harbor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone of historical cemeteries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone of protected natural landscape of museum-reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Museum-reserve “Ancient Derbent”, including lands used by museum-reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>buffer zone of museum-reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zone of protected natural landscape of museum-reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Buffer zone of historic nucleus and separate monument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffer zone of cultural stratum and archeological objects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Zone of reserved characteristic city and natural landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone of protected natural landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2500,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Zone of regulation of building by city construction regimentation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 2 "B"

RESEARCH, EXAMINATION AND RESTORATION
OF SEPARATE OBJECTS. STATE OF CONSERVATIONS

a) Diagnosis

In General the state of the architectural complex of Derbent is satisfactory. The following destructions and problems of monuments are fixed:
- landsliding in ground slopes and deflection of city and citadel walls from vertical position;
- seismicity;
- surface and deep erosion;
- development of grass and bush vegetation on surface of walls and seams of laying;
- economic activity of population -- getting stones from counterforces for personal needs.

1. Permanent saggings and landsliding of foundations and slopes, and temperature deformations of long, massive walls caused appearance of deep vertical cracks (in upper laying and filling). In some cases clefts are 40-50 mm, and sometimes even 80-100mm deep. In such spots laying destruction is going into the depth of massif of wall very intensively.

2. Under the influence of soil erosion and wind erosion of unprotected ground slopes, and under the influence of enormous weight of fortress and city walls slow scattering and sliding of soil mass down the slopes takes place that results to lessening stability of walls and their declension from initial vertical position.

3. Long impact of atmospheric precipitation and destruction factors, and also growth of grass vegetation on wall surface penetrating with its roots into laying seams little by little result to opening "dry" seams of laying and violating hardness of laying. Bulging and swelling separate stone blocks and their falling out from the massive of wall take place.

4. South and West facades of citadel walls were exposed to destructive effect of artillery shelling, machine gun and rifle firing during combat operations near fortress walls in different epochs.

5. Surfaces of laying of the citadel North wall in considerable extent (more than on the south side) are exposed to influence of lichens.

6. Surface and deep erosion of stone and laying mortar of fortress walls reached dangerous magnitude in some places. Separate stones of laying -- are almost entirely lost. It caused falling out of neighboring blocks. Widely opened "dry" seams of laying are exposed to deep erosion of filling mortar and its intensive pouring out from massif' of walls.

7. From time to time destructive impact of a.m. factors to weakened parts of fortress was increased by seismicity that resulted to further intensive deformations of laying.

8. During recent years further physical destruction of laying of fortress and city walls took place as a result of economic activity of owners of private houses situated on canyon slopes. Impact of a.m. destructive factors on fortress and city walls caused considerable damage to them. As a result of studies the urgent need of organizing conservation and antiemergency measures was revealed in order to stop further development of deformations and destructions of walls, counter forces, and towers of city and fortress walls.
b) Historic aspects of research, conservation and restoration works.

In the 19th – beginning of the 20th centuries fundamental studies and research of antiquities of Derbent were exercised by well-known scientists N.V. Trever, I.I. Lavrov, A.A. Beresin. In Soviet time this work was continued by V.F. Minorski, S.O. Khan-Magomadov, V.V. Kudriavtsev and others. The big contribution to research of history and material culture were made by archeological studies and excavations in the fortress Narin-kala, and also by submarine archeological works in aquatory of the ancient harbor of Derbent. During many years a.m. works were exercised by the Institute of history, language and literature of Dagestan, the affiliate of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR (At present Dagestan Scientific Center of Academy of Sciences of the RF).

c) Plans and directions of work

The scheme of development and the project of protection zones of the State museum-reserve of history, architecture and art “Ancient Derbent” was elaborated by the projecting institute for restoration monuments of history and culture “Spetsprojectrestavratsia” of the Ministry of culture of the RF in accordance with the resolution of the Council of Ministers of the RF No110 of March 31 of 1988 and Council of Ministers of Dagestan Republic No 86 of May 11, 1988 “On creation of the State museum-reserve of history, architecture and art “Ancient Derbent” of the Ministry of culture of Dagestan Republic, and also in accordance with the resolution of the Council of Ministers of the RF on urban construction and the Board of the Ministry of culture of the RF No 36 of June 31, 1971 about inscription of Derbent city on the list of 115 historic cities of the Russian Federation. These both papers were confirmed by the instruction of the Council of Ministers – the Government of Dagestan Republic No 540-p of December 3, 1993.

The general plan of development of Derbent city was elaborated by Moscow Institute on urban projecting “Giprogor” in 1971. It was corrected in 1994.

These documents determine the order of maintaining and use of preserved monuments of history and culture, and natural landscapes of this ancient city, formulate principles of restoration historic and cultural complex (integrity, restoration of architecture in aesthetic expressive forms, adaptation with consideration of historic heritage), keep programs of conservation and development of historic and cultural heritage of the city.

The longstanding work of studying monuments and practical restoration was carried on by Moscow All-Union integrated plant for scientific and restoration. During last decades a leading institute on urban projecting modern Derbent is Moscow Institute of urban projecting “Giprogor”. The workshop No3 of the Institute “Spetsprojectrestavratsia” exercises study and elaboration of projects on separate monuments of architecture more than 30 years. Practical restoration works in Derbent began in 1956. They were carried on by experts of the All-Union integrated plant for scientific and industrial restoration guided by the architect A.V. Vorobiev. As a result of these works the following architectural monuments of the city were restored:

1. In the fortress Narin-kala – square building, cross shaped water storage, khan’s bath, guardhouse and separate sections of defensive walls as well.
2. Gates of the North and South city walls: Dzarchi-kapi, Khrkhlar-kapi, Kala-kapi, Bayat-kapi and a section of the North city wall next to Tschurinski gate.
3. Kilja-mesjid and Minaret mosque in magal part of the city.
4. Mausoleum of Tuti-Bike on Khrkhlar cemetery. Since 1973 restoration works are carried on by specialists of the association “Rosrestravratsia” under leadership of the architect V.N. Krmarenko.

By this time restoration has been completed on mosques of Kirchlar and Bala, Khrkhlar and Maiden baths, house of Bestuzhev-Marinski, Armenian Gregorian cathedral and five sections of the North city wall.
Annex 2 “C”

CAPITAL INVESTMENTS TO DEVELOPMENT OF DERBENT
State museum-reserve of history, architecture and art
“Ancient Derbent”

The volume of capital investments to development of Derbent museum-reserve is calculated on the basis of needs to realize necessary measures directed to restoration of cultural heritage.

Total amount of capital investments includes the following expenses:
- for restoration and rehabilitation of historic objects;
- for adaptation and museum works;
- for emergency works and current repairs;
- for archeological works and conservation;
- for compensation for resettlement and demolition on territories withdrawn for needs of reserve;
- for new construction;
- for improvement
- for other and limited needs.

To determine the volume of capital investment required for restoration and rehabilitation works, and adaptation of historic objects prices were taken according to norms existing in the RF. Calculations were made on the basis of opinion of experts. Special coefficients were used ($k_1 = 100$ and territorial one for Dagestan to offset increasing prices of construction and assembly works $k_2 = 1.16$).

Investments for archeological works and conservation were estimated by prices existing in this sphere at present. Volume of investments for compensation for resettlement and demolition, and for new construction was estimated on the basis of prices existing now. However, capital investments for all kinds of expenses may actually be much higher because of inflation processes.

Other and limited expenses were estimated as 20% of total amount of capital investments. Total expenses for development of Dagestan museum-reserve amounted to about 1.5 million roubles for the first stage.
**ESTIMATE OF EXPENDITURES**

for work out and realization of the project

Customer – Ministry of culture of the RF  
Executor – Ministry of culture of Dagestan Republic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of expenses</th>
<th>Annual amount according to plan thousand roubles</th>
<th>Percent of total amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Wages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Extra fees for wages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Production costs altogether including:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) materials</td>
<td>84,3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) services by other organizations</td>
<td>353,9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) travelling allowances</td>
<td>1230,1</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) other expenses</td>
<td>16,9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>1685,0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From total amount of expenses

| a) republican budget                                  | 370,7                                           | 22                       |
| b) Ministry of culture of the RF                      | 1280,6                                          | 76                       |
| c) executor’s own funds                               | 33,7                                            | 2                        |
| d) funds attracted by executor                        |                                                 |                          |
| e) other sources                                      |                                                 |                          |
| **Total:**                                            | **1685,0**                                      | **100**                 |

Chief of the project

Chief accountant
CONSOLIDATED TABLE OF APPROXIMATE CALCULATION of capital investments to development of Derbent museum-reserve (million of roubles)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of expenses</th>
<th>1st stage</th>
<th>Perspective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Restoration</td>
<td>281,6</td>
<td>60,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Restoration with adaptation</td>
<td>48,1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Restoration of facades</td>
<td>4,7</td>
<td>10,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Repeated restoration</td>
<td>5,3</td>
<td>7,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Rebuilding</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Archeological works</td>
<td>712,2</td>
<td>20256,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Conservation</td>
<td>152,0</td>
<td>23600,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Emergency works</td>
<td>1,4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Current repairs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Museum works</td>
<td>6,0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. New construction</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Demolition</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Improvement</td>
<td>0,7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Compensation for resettling (p. No 35)</td>
<td>15,0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td>1287,0</td>
<td>44005,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Other and limited expenses (20% of total investments)</td>
<td>257,0</td>
<td>8801,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand total</strong></td>
<td>1544,0</td>
<td>52806,0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

including other and limited expenses
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>№</th>
<th>Наименование должностей</th>
<th>Разряд</th>
<th>К-во ед.</th>
<th>Оклад в м-ц</th>
<th>Надбавки</th>
<th>Фонд з/п в м-ц</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Директор</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1197</td>
<td>1197</td>
<td>2394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Зам. директора по науке</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>1944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Зам. директора по АХЧ</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>1944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Зам дир. по научно-просветит.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>1944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Гл. хранитель фондов</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>1944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Гл. архитектор</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>1944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Гл. бухгалтер</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>1944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Научный консультант</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>1718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Бухгалтер-кассир</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Кассир - билетный</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Зав. отделом</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>10308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Зав. сектором</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>1054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Ст. научный сотрудник</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>2692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Научный сотрудник</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>8076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>2108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>2380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Экскурсовод</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>3162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>2472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Музейный смотритель</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>6048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Таксодермист</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>1346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Художник-реставратор</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>1346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Библиотекарь</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>1054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Ст. инспектор по кадрам</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Машиналиста</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Агент по снабжению</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Водитель</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>2108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Начальник службы безопасности</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>1718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Сотрудник СБ</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>13980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Рабочий</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Дворник</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Реставратор по камню</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>2692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Садовник</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Уборщица</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,5</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>3150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Истопник</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Юрист</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>1346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Инспектор по арх.рест.надзору</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>1346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Инспектор по технадзору</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>1346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Художник-оформитель</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>1346</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Итого: 92,5

Фонд з/плата в год: 93274х12=1119288

Директор
Бухгалтер

Н.К. Касумов
М.М. Султанова
Derbent (Russian Federation)
No 1070

1. BASIC DATA
State Party: Russian Federation
Name of property: Ancient City and Fortress Buildings of Derbent
Location: Dagestan, Eastern Caucasus, Western Seaboard of Caspian Sea
Date received: 28 June 2001
Category of property: In terms of the categories of cultural property set out in Article 1 of the 1972 World Heritage Convention, this is a: group of buildings. In terms of Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention, this is a section of an inhabited historic town.
Brief description:
The Citadel, Ancient City and Fortress buildings of Derbent were part of the northern limes of the Sasanian Persian Empire, which extended to east and west of the Caspian Sea. The fortification was built in stone, and it consisted of two parallel walls that formed a barrier from the seaside up to the mountain. The town of Derbent was built between these two walls, and has still retained part of its medieval fabric. The site continued having great strategic importance until the 19th century.

2. THE PROPERTY
Description
The ancient city of Derbent is situated on the western shores of the Caspian Sea, in the narrowest place between the sea and the slopes of the Tabasaran mountains (part of the Bigger Caucasus). The city has an important strategic location as it forms a natural pass (the Caspian Gates) between the Caucasian foothills and the sea. For many centuries, it was thus in the position to control the traffic between Europe and the Middle East. As a result of this geographic particularity the city developed between two parallel defence walls, stretching from the sea up to the mountains. Over the centuries, the city has been given different names, all connected to the word ‘gate’ (‘darband’ in Persian means ‘lock gate’). The fortification was originally built during the Sasanian Empire, and continuously repaired or improved until the 19th century, until its military function lasted. The fortification consists of the defence walls, the citadel (Narin-Kala), and the historic town.

The Defence Walls: The Defence Walls are the most outstanding feature of Derbent. They rise from the Caspian Sea up to the citadel on the mountain, an overall length of ca 3.6 km. There are two walls (north and south) running parallel, ca 300-400 m from each other. The city was built between these walls. The wall then continues over the mountains ca 40 km to the west (mountain wall), as well as extending into the Sea (ca 500 m), in order to protect the harbour. The north wall still exists in its full length, while much of the south wall was demolished in the 19th century. The earliest parts of the walls are in unbaked bricks, but the main part of the structure (6th century CE) is built in solid ashlar stone (in average: 100 x 65 x 25 cm) with lime mortar, and a rubble core. Some of the later construction used smaller stones (ca 30 x 40 cm). The stones are laid face and header side alternately for better binding. The thickness of the walls varies from 230 cm to 380 cm; the height is about 12 m.

A total of 73 defence towers were built at regular intervals. The north wall has 46 towers, ca 70 m from each other. There are several gates, which are of architectural interest in their design. Originally, most gates date from the 6th or 7th centuries, but some have been rebuilt or changed later. There used to be 14 gates, and 9 still remain, 2 in the citadel, 4 in the south wall, and 3 in the north wall: Narin-Kala-kapi (Mountain Gate), Kali-kapi (Citadel Gate), Bajai-kapi (Song Masters Gate), Orto-kapi (Middle Gate, upper part rebuilt in 1812), Dubari-kapi (Double Wall Gate), Dzharchi-kapi (Messenger Gate, rebuilt in 1811), Kirkhlar-kapi (Gate of Forty, rebuilt in 17th century), Dash-kapi (Stone Gate, 10-12th centuries).

The Citadel: The Citadel is situated up on the mountain. It covers an area of ca 180 m x 280 m (4.5 ha), fairly irregular in shape. The walls of the citadel are provided by small defence towers distances 20-30 m from each other. The most interesting of these is in the south-west corner, a square tower that serves as a link to the mountain wall. On three sides, the citadel is defended by steep slopes. Inside the Citadel, there are a number of historic buildings, though most of them in ruins.

Along the southern wall, there is the Khan’s Palace, which was an elaborate building with courtyards, but now partly in ruins. In the Citadel, there are also the remains of a 5th century Christian church, subsequently built over when other religions were introduced (Zoroastrianism, and then Islam). ‘Djuma-mesjid’ is one of the earliest mosques in the former USSR. It probably dates from the 8th century, though renovated or rebuilt in the 14th and 17th centuries. The madrasah building, in front of the mosque, dates from the 15th century. Together with an administrative building, the Mosque and Madrasah form a closed courtyard. The citadel also has bath buildings and several underground water tanks.

The Historic Town: Between the two defence walls, there developed the city of Derbent. The area, ca 300 m wide and over 3 km long, was articulated in two main parts, and there were also some transversal walls (dating from the 10th to 18th centuries). The western part, on the mountain slope just under the Citadel, formed the residential section. The eastern part, close to the sea, was used for merchants, craftsmen, storage buildings, barracks and depots. Close to the seafront, there was another fort built in the 18th century for the Shah’s Palace, which has since been demolished. In the second half the 19th century, Derbent lost its defence function; most of the southern wall was demolished, and the modern town developed in the lower part of the walled area, along the seafront (in north-south direction), as well as on both sides of the ancient walled city. Nevertheless, most of the historic town core has been preserved, though
with some minor alterations, such as a new main street. The old city was divided in separate quarters (magals), and the street pattern referred to the gates. The streets are narrow and tortuous. The town still contains interesting courtyard houses, as well as some public buildings: mosques, baths, madrasahs, and the remains of a caravanserai. The building material is stone, and there are some carved decorations. The two focal points of the old town were the mosque and the caravanserai.

History

The site of Derbent is understood to have been inhabited since some 5,000 years. There was a fortress structure already in the 7th or 8th centuries BCE. In the 1st century BCE, the place was part of a new state formed in the area of Azerbaijan and southern Dagestan.

The subsequent periods related to the nominated property can be summarised as follows:
- Sasanian Empire from 5th to 7th centuries CE;
- Arab Capliphate from 7th to 10th centuries;
- Mongol rule from 13th to 14th centuries;
- Timurid Empire from 14th to 15th centuries;
- Shirvan Khan from 1437;
- Turkish-Persian conflicts during the 16th century;
- Safavid Empire from the 17th to 18th century;
- Derbent Khanate from 1747;
- Russia from 1813.

The Persians (Sasanians) conquered the site at the end of the 4th century CE. The current fortification and the town originate from the 6th century CE, when they were built as an important part of the Sasanian northern limes, the frontier against the nomadic people in the north. From this time and until the 19th century, Derbent remained an important military post. From the 7th century, it was ruled by the Arabs, taken over by the Mongols in the 13th century, and by the Timurids in the 14th century. The Persians took it back in the early 17th century (the Safavid ruler Shah Abbas, whose capital was in Isfahan). In the 18th century, the Persians and Russians fought over Derbent, and finally the Russian sovereignty was recognized by the Persian Shah in the early 19th century.

Over some 15 centuries, the fortification system was in military use. It was regularly maintained and repaired, and additions were built according to needs. In 1820, the south wall was demolished and an active building started in the lower part of the city. The upper part, with its 11-12,000 inhabitants, remained more or less intact. In the second half of the 19th century, the economy was in decline, but the city recovered at the end of the century, when the Vladaicaucasus railway established a connection with Baku (1900). At the moment, the city is again facing some problems, and looks for new resources such as tourism.

Management regime

Legal provision:

The monuments of history and culture are owned and protected by the State according to the prescriptions of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Decree of 27.12.1991. The list of these monuments has been confirmed by the Decree of the President of the Russian Federation of 20.02.1995. The land where the monuments are situated is in federal ownership in accordance with the Land Code of the Russian Federation. Lands and monuments are turned over to the Reserve of History and Art of Derbent who exercise their right for operative management.

Management structure:

The control for the implementation of conservation and restoration programmes is the responsibility of the Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Dagestan, together with Committees on land and natural resources. The republican programmes on preservation are further controlled by the Ministry of Culture of the Russian Federation.

A management plan is in elaboration on the basis of the 1995 legislation, and taking into account all the other relevant guidelines and instructions. This plan has short-term and long-term measures to protect the property, and to guarantee its authenticity and integrity.

Resources:

The special Federal Programme, ‘Culture of Russia (2001-2005)’, has one million rubles earmarked for the restoration of Dubari-kapi in 2001, and some 350,000 $ US for other works in the Citadel. There are further funds available for the maintenance and repair of the ‘Reserve of history, architecture and art’ from the republican budget. The government of Dagestan reserves 100,000 rubles per year for the upkeep of monuments of history and culture.

There are series of training seminars on management issues, organised yearly for the chiefs of organisations and institutions responsible for conservation of cultural heritage.

The Citadel is visited daily by about 100 persons. In the summer season, there are some 10,000 visitors.

Justification by the State Party (summary)

The citadel, fortress structures and the ancient part of Derbent are an ensemble of structures of different designations integrated by a common historical and artistic background of the past culture of population that lived within city borders. The urban ensemble was united under architectural and urban traditions during a number of centuries. The a.m. city’s integral parts and the city as a whole represent outstanding value of culture, history and artistic life that enriched European and Eastern civilizations.

The citadel, fortress structures and ancient Derbent altogether represent the following:

- **Criterion i:** a unique work of art, a masterpiece of creative genius of native population of this region;
- **Criterion ii:** big influence of Derbent architecture on development of art of monumental architecture and typological images in the art of construction culture of peoples of Eastern Caucasus in medieval times;

- **Criterion iii:** a thought that city stays an exclusively valuable witness of disappeared civilization;

- **Criterion iv:** monuments of medieval Derbent are outstanding structures of 14th to 15th centuries, typical specimens of Muslim culture of the Caucasus;

- **Criterion v:** the city of Derbent is a unique example of a traditional dwelling of a human being. It is a hub of defensive system on Eastern Caucasus, a centre of spreading of Islamic culture among peoples of this region; Derbent architecture existing during 14 centuries is a material evidence of long history of this area, a witness of penetration of Islamic ideas to territories of the Caucasus.

### 3. ICOMOS EVALUATION

**Actions by ICOMOS**

Due to administrative problems, an ICOMOS expert mission was only able to visit the nominated property in January-February 2003.

**Conservation**

**Conservation history:**

In the 19th century, a large part of the southern defence wall and the lower part of the town, close to the Caspian Sea, were demolished to give place for new development. There were also some alterations in the north wall made by to accommodate windows and door openings for the buildings.

Research and restoration of the fortress have been going for several decades. Restoration of the monuments started in 1956, under the responsibility of the experts of Soviet Union. These works included the restoration of the fortress Narin-kala, four gates of the north and south walls; Kilsa-mesjid and Minaret mosque; the mausoleum of Tuti-Bike. Restoration has also been completed on some other buildings, as well as five sections of the north wall.

**State of conservation:**

The citadel area, the Narin, is basically an archaeological area, where most structures are in ruins. There have been some repairs and reconstructions using mainly traditional materials.

Regarding the defence walls, there are problems in the stability of the wall structures due to foundation failures and consequent cracks. There is organic growth, and problems caused by rain and thermal movements.

In the residential area of the town, Sharestan and Robat, most of the urban walls that divided the town into different sections have been lost. Only in the mosque area there still remains a dividing wall, which however is covered with cement. The remaining section of the historic town has retained its traditional fabric and the narrow, winding streets. Traffic is not controlled in the historic area. As a result, cars have caused damage to buildings, and the narrow lanes are used for parking. The mosque and several other buildings have been repaired or restored. The baths are now in exhibition and museum use.

**Management:**

The Narin citadel area and its surroundings have been listed as a national monument by the Daghestan Republic, and are protected. The general master plan for the historic area has been approved by the city council, including norms and guidelines for protection and conservation. Any changes to the present situation therefore must be approved by the technical commission of the City Council.

The ICOMOS expert has observed that, while historic area is protected by the government, though there are economic pressures for construction particularly in the surrounding areas. This is particularly relevant to the buffer zone on the southern side of the old town. At the same time, the ICOMOS expert took note of the civic pride of the inhabitants and their wish to preserve the historic town.

**Risk analysis:**

The fortress structure is subject to various environmental problems: such as landslides, thermal movements causing cracking of walls and foundation failures. The impact of rain and sun facilitate the growth of grass and lichens, erosion of surface stones and mortars. The area has moderate earthquake problem. In recent years, the development and construction activities are also causing problems to the historic structures, including some destruction.

The buffer zone is subject to development pressures. Proper building control should be established here, so as to control the height of new buildings and keeping the character of the area homogeneous in relation to the historic district.

**Authenticity and integrity**

**Authenticity:**

Considering the long history of Derbent as a military defence structure, and accepting the loss of a part of the property, it has still preserved a good amount of authentic structures representing the different historic periods. The individual buildings, ie the defence walls, towers, gates, mosques and other public buildings have gone through changes dictated by use, but maintaining essential parts of historic fabric. The restorations in recent decades have been relatively limited, though the current structural conditions require further attention and consolidation.

**Integrity:**

The fortifications of Derbent retained their military function until the beginning of the 19th century. Until that time also the surrounding context remained in its natural condition. Since 1820, a part of the south wall has been demolished, as well as a large part of the medieval urban fabric. The city has developed along the Caspian seaside, in north-south direction, across the fortification walls. This has obviously meant a partial loss of the structural and visual integrity of the place as acquired over several centuries. Nevertheless, the remaining north wall, the citadel and the medieval town fabric with its public buildings have retained a great interest both architecturally.
and historically. This is the case especially in the upper section of the town and the citadel, where the ancient structures dominate the landscape.

The residential area retains its medieval aspect, though it has been subject to continuous transformation over depending on the needs of the inhabitants. The public buildings are mainly religious, and any service structures have been established in new parts of the city. A major interest in this area could be seen in the continuation of the traditional way of living, which obviously is challenged by modernisation.

**Comparative evaluation**

When the Sasanians revived the Persian Empire after the Hellenistic-Parthian period; their main adversary in the west was the Roman Empire, and in the north the Nomadic tribes. The problem of the northern frontier was recognized also by the Romans who even sustained the Persian efforts to resist potential invasion from that direction. This fortified ‘limes’ formed a barrier over the mountains of the present-day Dagestan, where some 40 km still remain. The site of Derbent was critical for the boundary, and the walls actually entered some 500 m into the Caspian Sea to control sea traffic as well. The defence system continued on the eastern side of the Caspian Sea, across the Turkeman steppe. A popular reference of this wall is made to Alexander the Great. In 1937, E.F. Schmidt photographed it from the air noting that there remained some 170 km. There has also been recent archaeological work on this site. In any case, the fortifications of Derbent are the best preserved part of this ‘limes’.

The Sasanian fortification system could be compared to the Roman limes (Hadrian’s Wall, inscribed in 1987, criteria: ii, iii, iv), as well as the Great Wall of China (inscribed in 1987, criteria: i, ii, iii, iv, vi). Even though having a similar function, the Sasanian construction differs in terms of culture and type of construction. In the case of Derbent, furthermore, the question is about a gate structure and related town in a strategic point of north-south communication on the Caspian Sea. In relation to the other sites, it can be seen to have different though complementary qualities.

The Sasanians had strong defences in their towns and villages, and many of these were retained and re-used in the Islamic period. Structurally the walls of Derbent can be compared to other Sasanian constructions, such as those of Takt-e Suleiman in north-western Iran. It is noted that there exists a comprehensive study of the fortifications in Iran (published in 1998), as well as a comparative study by UNESCO of the military architecture in the geo-cultural region of Central and Southern Asia (1997).

While a part of the town of Derbent was rebuilt in the 19th century, there still remains the eastern section under the citadel on the mountain side. This historic centre could be compared with other towns in the region and particularly with the historic centre of Baku already inscribed on the World Heritage List (WH 2000, criterion: iv). This comparison regards particularly the single historic buildings. Considering that the historic development of Derbent was closely related to its defence function, it acquired a rather severe character. In this regard, it is distinguished from the other towns, which were more oriented towards ‘ordinary’ life and activities. In fact, the value of the town should be seen as an element of the fortification system.

**Outstanding universal value**

**General statement:**

The ‘Citadel, Ancient City and Fortress buildings of Derbent’ has been a boundary site at least since the 7th century BCE. Its main significance and outstanding universal value can be seen in its role as part of a defence system, which was created by the Persian Empire retaining its strategic role until the 19th century. This ‘Persian limes’ can be compared with the Roman limes (the Hadrian’s Wall) and the Great Wall of China, which had a similar function. As a place for the control of a boundary, the town should be seen in this relation. The design and construction of these walls was a remarkable achievement, and the walls probably continued much further than the current ca 200 km.

While recognising the strategic role that Derbent continued to have in the Islamic period, its outstanding universal value can hardly be seen in the diffusion of Islam in the Caucasian region. In the 14th and 15th century, in particular, there were other centres which had this function, including Baku, not far from Derbent, as well as the Timurid capitals of Samarkand and Boukhara.

**Evaluation of criteria:**

- **Criterion i:** the nomination dossier refers to Derbent as a masterpiece of the creative genius of native population in this region. While recognising the local contribution in single structures, ICOMOS retains that the historical and strategic significance of Derbent should be seen in a much broader context. It is noted that this criterion was used in relation to the Great Wall of China, considering its size and the quality of construction. While recognising the similarity of these two sites, the Great Wall of China is far larger an undertaking, does not consider this criterion justified.

- **Criterion ii:** while recognising the likely exchange of influences of Derbent in relation to the architecture of the Caucasus region, there is not enough evidence to justify outstanding universal value on this basis.

- **Criterion iii:** the critical location of Derbent has made it a strategic place of control in the region, and the property bears exceptional archaeological and architectural evidence to the cultures that governed and inhabited the region over three millennia.

- **Criterion iv:** while recognising the interest of Derbent in providing evidence to Muslim culture and architecture in the 14th-15th centuries, ICOMOS considers that the outstanding universal value of Derbent should be referred to it as an outstanding example of the defence structure which formed the northern limes to the Sasanian Empire. The military function of the site continued until the 19th century.

- **Criterion v:** the nomination dossier does not provide sufficient information to justify the claim of outstanding universal value in relation to continuous land use. A further study would be required to consider up to what point Derbent would qualify in this regard.
In conclusion, the outstanding universal value of the property is recommended on the basis of criteria iii and iv.

4. ICOMOS RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation for the future

While recognizing the efforts made by the authorities to conserve the nominated property, special attention is drawn to the need to strengthen the implementation of management by providing the necessary financial and professional resources.

ICOMOS also recommends that the norms for new constructions in the areas surrounding the nominated property should be elaborated specifying the height, volume and architectural character in harmony with the historic area.

Furthermore, regarding the citadel area and the ancient defence structures, ICOMOS recommends that any reconstruction be strictly limited, following internationally accepted guidelines.

Recommendation with respect to inscription

That the nominated property be inscribed on the basis of criteria iii and iv:

Criterion iii: The site of the ancient city of Derbent has been crucial for the control of the north-south passage on the west side of the Caspian Sea since the 1st millennium BCE. The defence structures that were built by the Sasanians in the 5th century CE were in continuous use by the succeeding Persian, Arabic, Mongol, and Timurid governments for some 15 centuries.

Criterion iv: The ancient city of Derbent and its defence structures are the most significant section of the strategic defence systems designed and built in the Sasanian empire along their northern limes, and maintained during the successive governments until the Russian occupation in the 19th century.

ICOMOS, March 2003
Derbent (Fédération de Russie)
No 1070

1. IDENTIFICATION

État partie : Fédération de Russie
Bien proposé : Vieille ville et forteresse de Derbent
Lieu : Daghestan, Caucase oriental, côte occidentale de la mer Caspienne
Date de réception : 28 juin 2001
Catégorie de bien :

En termes de catégories de biens culturels telles qu’elles sont définies à l’article premier de la Convention du patrimoine mondial de 1972, le bien est un ensemble. En termes des Orientations devant guider la mise en œuvre de la Convention du patrimoine mondial, il s’agit aussi d’une section d’une ville historique habité.

Brève description
La citadelle, la vieille ville et la forteresse de Derbent faisaient partie du limes nord de l’empire perse sassanide, qui s’étendait à l’est et à l’ouest de la mer Caspienne. Les fortifications en pierre se composaient de deux murailles parallèles formant une barrière du front de mer jusqu’à la montagne. La ville de Derbent s’élevait entre ces deux murailles, et elle a en partie conservé son tissu médiéval. Le site a gardé une grande importance stratégique jusqu’au XIXe siècle.

2. LE BIEN

Description
La vieille ville de Derbent se trouve sur la rive occidentale de la mer Caspienne, au point le plus éloigné entre la mer et les versants des monts Tabasaran (qui font partie du Grand Caucase). La ville se dresse à un endroit stratégique, un passage naturel (les portes caspiennes) entre les monts du Caucase et la mer. Pendant des siècles, elle a donc bénéficié d’une position de contrôle du trafic entre l’Europe et le Moyen-Orient. Du fait de cette particularité géographique, la ville s’est développée entre deux murs de défense parallèles, s’étendant de la mer jusqu’aux montagnes. Au fil des siècles, la ville a reçu des noms différents, tous en rapport avec l’idée de « porte » (dar band en perse signifie « écrous »). À l’origine, les fortifications ont été construites sous l’empire sassanide, et continuellement réparées ou améliorées jusqu’au XIXe siècle, c’est-à-dire tant qu’elles ont gardé une fonction militaire. Les fortifications se composent des remparts de défense, de la citadelle (Narin-Kala) et de la ville historique.

Les murailles
Les murailles sont le trait le plus remarquable de Derbent. Elles s’élèvent de la mer Caspienne jusqu’à la citadelle, sur une longueur totale de 3,6 km environ. Il y a deux murailles parallèles (nord et sud), séparées d’environ 300-400 m l’une de l’autre. La ville a été construite entre ces murailles. La muraille se continue ensuite au-delà des montagnes jusqu’à environ 40 km à l’ouest (muraille de la montagne), tout en s’étendant jusqu’à la mer (sur environ 500 m) pour protéger le port. La muraille du nord subsiste sur toute sa longueur, tandis que celle du sud a été en grande partie démolie au XIXe siècle. Les sections les plus anciennes des murs sont en briques crues, mais la partie principale de la structure (VVe siècle après J.-C.) est en pierres de taille (en moyenne : 100 x 65 x 25 cm), avec du mortier de chaux et un cœur en moellons bruts. Une partie des constructions ultérieures se sont faites avec des pierres plus petites (30 x 40 cm environ). Les pierres sont posées alternativement face et rive, pour une meilleure liaison. L’épaisseur des murs varie de 230 cm à 380 cm, sur une hauteur de 12 m environ.

Au total, 73 tours de défense ont été construites à intervalles réguliers. Le mur du nord comporte 46 tours, à environ 70 m les unes des autres. Il y a plusieurs portes, dont plusieurs présentent une conception d’un certain intérêt architectural. À l’origine, la plupart des portes datent du VVe ou VIIe siècles, mais certaines ont été reconstruites ou modifiées par la suite. Il y avait jadis 14 portes, et il en reste 9 : 2 dans la citadelle, 4 dans le mur du sud et 3 dans le mur du nord : Narin-Kala-kapi (porte de la montagne), Kali-kapi (porte de la citadelle), Bajat-kapi (porte des maîtres de chant), Orta-kapi (porte du milieu), partie supérieure reconstruite en 1812), Dubari-kapi (porte de la double muraille), Dzharchi-kapi (porte du messager, reconstruite en 1811), Kirkhlar-kapi (porte des quarante, reconstruite au XVIIe siècle), Dash-kapi (porte de pierre, X-XIIe siècle).

La citadelle
La citadelle se dresse au sommet de la montagne. Elle couvre 180 m x 280 m environ (4,5 ha), dessinant une zone à la forme plutôt irrégulière. Les murs de la citadelle sont dotés de petites tours défensives à intervalles de 20-30 m. La plus intéressante se trouve dans l’angle sud-ouest, une tour carrée servant de lien avec la muraille de la montagne. La citadelle est défendue sur trois côtés par des versants abrupts, et abrite plusieurs bâtiments historiques, quoique la plupart d’entre eux soient en ruines.

Le long de la muraille du sud se trouve le palais du Khan, un bâtiment élaboré avec des cours, qui est aujourd’hui partiellement en ruines. Dans la citadelle se trouvent aussi les vestiges d’une église chrétienne du Ve siècle, sur laquelle d’autres édifices ont été bâtis au fur et à mesure de l’introduction d’autres religions (zoroastrisme, puis Islam). Djuma-mesjid est l’une des premières mosquées de l’ancienne URSS. Elle date probablement du VIIIe siècle, quoique elle ait été rénovée ou reconstruite au XVIIe et XVe siècles. La méderesa, devant la mosquée, date du XVe siècle. Avec un bâtiment administratif, la mosquée et la méderesa forment une cour fermée. La citadelle possède également des bains publics et plusieurs citernes souterraines.
La ville historique

La ville de Derbent s’est développée entre les deux murs de défense. La zone, d’environ 300 m de large et de plus de 3 km de long, était articulée en deux parties principales, avec quelques murailles transversales (du Xe au XVIIe siècle). La partie occidentale, sur le versant montagneux en contrebas de la citadelle, formait le quartier résidentiel. La partie orientale, à proximité de la mer, accueillait les marchands, les artisans, les entrepôts, les baraques et les dépôts. Près du front de mer se trouvait un autre fort construit au XVIIe siècle pour le palais du Shah, démoli depuis. Dans la seconde moitié du XIXe siècle, Derbent perdit sa fonction de défense ; la majeure partie de la muraille du sud fut démolie et une phase de construction active fut initiée dans la ville basse. La partie supérieure, avec ses 11 à 12 000 habitants, demeura plus ou moins intacte. Dans la seconde moitié du XIXe siècle, l’économie déclina ; la ville regagna sa prospérité à la fin du siècle, quand le chemin de fer du Vladicaucaze établit une connexion avec Bakou (1900). Actuellement, la ville traverse à nouveau quelques problèmes, et cherche de nouvelles ressources, comme le tourisme.

Histoire

On pense le site de Derbent habité depuis 5000 ans environ. Il y avait déjà une forteresse au VIIe ou au VIIIe siècle avant J.-C. Au Ier siècle avant J.-C., le lieu faisait partie d’un nouvel état, formé dans la zone de l’Azerbaïdjan et du sud du Daghestan.

Les périodes ultérieures concernant le bien proposé pour inscription peuvent être résumées ainsi :

- Empire sasanide, du Ve au VIIe siècle après J.-C. ;
- Califat arabe du VIIe au Xe siècle ;
- Jogu mongol du XIIe au XVe siècle ;
- Empire timuride du XIVe au XVe siècle ;
- Khanat de Shirvan à partir de 1437 ;
- Conflits turco-perses au XVIIe siècle ;
- Empire safavide du XVIIe au XVIIIe siècle ;
- Khanat de Derbent à partir de 1747 ;
- Russie à partir de 1813.

Les Perses (Sassanides) conquièrent le site à la fin du IVe siècle après J.-C. Les fortifications et la ville actuelles datent du VVe siècle, époque à laquelle elles furent construites comme une importante partie du limes sassanide du nord, c’est-à-dire la frontière avec les peuples nomades du nord. À partir de là et jusqu’au XIXe siècle, Derbent resta un important poste militaire. À partir du VIIe siècle, elle fut dirigée par les Arabes, conquise par les Mongols au XVe siècle puis par les Timurides au XIVVe siècle. Les Perses la reprirent au début du XVVe siècle (sous l’égide du souverain safavide Shah Abbas dont la capitale se trouvait à Ispahan). Au XVIIe siècle, les Perses et les Russes se disputèrent Derbent ; finalement, le Shah perse reconnaît la souveraineté russe au début du XIXe siècle.

Les fortifications ont rempli des fonctions militaires pendant plus de 15 siècles. Elles étaient entretenues et réparées régulièrement, avec l’ajout de nouvelles constructions selon les besoins. En 1820, le mur du sud fut démoli et une phase de construction active fut initiée dans la ville basse. La partie supérieure, avec ses 11 à 12 000 habitants, demeura plus ou moins intacte. Dans la seconde moitié du XIXe siècle, l’économie déclina ; la ville regagna sa prospérité à la fin du siècle, quand le chemin de fer du Vladicaucaze établit une connexion avec Bakou (1900). Actuellement, la ville traverse à nouveau quelques problèmes, et cherche de nouvelles ressources, comme le tourisme.

Politique de gestion

Dispositions légales :


Structure de la gestion :

Le contrôle de la mise en œuvre de programmes de conservation et restauration est sous la responsabilité du ministère de la Culture de la République du Daghestan, ainsi que des comités des terres et des ressources naturelles. Les programmes de préservation de la République sont en outre contrôlés par le ministère de la Culture de la Fédération de Russie.

Un plan de gestion est en cours d’élaboration sur la base de la législation de 1995, prenant en compte toutes les directives et instructions pertinentes. Ce plan propose des mesures à court et long termes pour protéger le bien et garantir son authenticité et son intégrité.

Ressources :

Il existe des séries de séminaires de formation sur les enjeux de gestion, organisés une fois par an pour les chefs des organisations et des institutions responsables de la conservation du patrimoine culturel.

Chaque jour, une centaine de personnes visitent la citadelle. En été, on compte environ 10 000 visiteurs.

**Justification émanant de l’État partie (résumé)**

La citadelle, la Narin, est fondamentalement une zone archéologique, où la plupart des structures sont en ruines. Il y a eu quelques réparations et reconstructions à l’aide de matériaux traditionnels, essentiellement.

En ce qui concerne les murailles défensives, il y a des problèmes de stabilité, du fait de l’effondrement de fondations et des fissures qui en découlent. On constate une croissance des végétaux et des problèmes causés par la pluie et les fluctuations thermiques.

Dans les quartiers résidentiels de la ville, Sharestan et Robat, la plupart des murailles urbaines qui divisaient la ville en quartiers ont disparu. Il n’en reste qu’une, toutefois recouverte de ciment, dans le secteur de la mosquée. La section subsistante de la ville historique a conservé son tissu traditionnel de rues étroites et sinueuses. La circulation n’est soumise à aucun contrôle dans le quartier historique : les voitures ont endommagé les bâtiments et les ruelles étroites servent de parking. La mosquée et plusieurs autres bâtiments ont été réparés ou restaurés. Les bains sont maintenant utilisés comme musée.

**Gestion**

Le quartier de la citadelle de Narin et ses environs ont été classés monument national par la République du Daghestan et sont protégés. Le plan directeur général pour le quartier historique a été approuvé par le conseil municipal, y compris des normes et des directives pour la protection et la conservation. Tout changement de la situation actuelle doit donc être approuvé par la commission technique du Conseil municipal.

L’expert de l’ICOMOS fait observer que, si le quartier historique est sous protection du gouvernement, il existe des pressions économiques de construction notamment dans la zone avoisinante. Cette remarque vaut tout particulièrement pour la zone tampon du côté sud de la vieille ville. Parallèlement, l’expert de l’ICOMOS a pris note de la fierté que manifestent les habitants à l’égard de la ville historique, et de leur volonté de la préserver.

**Analyse des risques**

Les structures de la forteresse connaissent divers problèmes environnementaux : glissements de terrain, fluctuations thermiques causant des craquelures dans les...
nurs et affaissement des fondations. La pluie et le soleil favorisent l’apparition d’herbe et de lichens, l’érosion des pierres et des mortiers. Les risques de tremblements de terre dans la zone sont modérés. Ces dernières années, des activités de développement et de construction ont également causé des problèmes aux structures historiques, problèmes allant parfois jusqu’à la destruction.

La zone tampon est soumise à des pressions de développement. Il convient d’y établir un contrôle de la construction adéquat, afin de contrôler la hauteur de nouveaux bâtiments et de conserver à la zone son caractère homogène par rapport au quartier historique.

**Authenticité et intégrité**

**Authenticité** :

Considérant la longue histoire de Derbent en tant que structure militaire de défense et compte tenu de la perte d’une partie du bien, ce dernier a cependant conservé une importante quantité de structures authentiques représentant les différentes périodes historiques. Les bâtiments individuels, c’est-à-dire les muraux défensives, les tours, les portes, les mosquées et autres bâtiments publics ont connu une évolution dictée par leur utilisation, mais en conservant les parties essentielles du tissu historique. Ces dernières décennies, les restaurations ont été relativement limitées, quoique l’état structurel actuel exige plus d’attention et de consolidation.

**Intégrité** :

Les fortifications de Derbent ont conservé leurs fonctions militaires jusqu’au début du XIXe siècle. Jusqu’à cette époque, le contexte environnant est lui aussi resté dans son état naturel. Depuis 1820, une partie de la muraille sud a été démolie, de même qu’une grande partie du tissu urbain médiéval. La ville s’est développée le long de la mer Caspienne, suivant l’orientation nord-sud, au-delà des fortifications, d’où une perte partielle de l’intégrité structurelle et visuelle que le lieu a acquise sur plusieurs siècles. Néanmoins, la muraille nord subsistante, la citadelle et le tissu médiéval de la ville, avec ses bâtiments publics, ont conservé un grand intérêt tant architectural qu’historique. C’est particulièrement le cas dans la section supérieure de la ville et la citadelle, où les anciennes structures dominent le paysage.

Le quartier résidentiel conserve son aspect médiéval, quoiqu’il ait fait l’objet de transformations continues en fonction des besoins des habitants. Les bâtiments publics sont essentiellement religieux, et des structures de services ont été établies dans de nouvelles parties de la ville. On peut trouver un intérêt majeur dans cette zone dans la poursuite du mode de vie traditionnel, évidemment mis en péril par la modernisation.

**Évaluation comparative**

Lorsque les Sassanides ressuscitèrent l’Empire perse après la période hellénistique-parthie, leur principal adversaire à l’ouest était l’empire romain, et les tribus nomades au nord. Les Romains reconnaissaient aussi le problème de la frontière du nord, au point même qu’ils appuyèrent les efforts faits par les Perses pour résister à une invasion potentielle venue de là. Ce *limes* fortifié formait une barrière sur les montagnes du Daghestan actuel, et il subsiste aujourd’hui une section d’environ 40 km. Le site de Derbent était essentiel pour la frontière, et les murailles avaient jusqu’à 500 m dans la mer Caspienne pour contrôler également le trafic maritime. Ce système de défense se poursuivait du côté est de la mer Caspienne, de l’autre côté des steppes turkmènes. Une référence populaire associe cette muraille à Alexandre le Grand. En 1937, E.F. Schmidt en prit une photographie aérienne, notant qu’il en restait quelque 170 km. Le site a aussi fait l’objet de récents travaux archéologiques. Dans tous les cas, les fortifications de Derbent sont la partie la mieux conservée du *limes*.

Le système de fortifications sassanide pourrait être comparé au *limes* romain (le mur d’Hadrien, inscrit en 1987, critères ii, iii, iv), ainsi que la Grande Muraille de Chine (inscrite en 1987, critères i, ii, iii, iv, vi). Bien qu’elles aient une fonction similaire, la construction sassanide diffère en termes de culture et de type. Dans le cas de Derbent, en outre, la question porte sur un système défensif et sur la ville associée en un point stratégique de communication nord-sud avec la mer Caspienne. On peut juger qu’il présente des qualités différentes mais complémentaires de celles des autres sites.


Si une partie de la ville de Derbent a été reconstruite au XIXe siècle, il reste toujours la section orientale sous la citadelle, à flanc de montagne. Ce centre historique est comparable à d’autres villes de la région, et particulièrement au centre historique de Bakou, déjà inscrit sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial (PM 2000, critère : iv). Cette comparaison considère tout particulièrement les bâtiments historiques seuls. Considérant que le développement historique de Derbent était étroitement lié à sa fonction défensive, la ville a acquis un caractère assez sévère, et se distingue en cela des autres villes, plus orientées vers des activités « courantes » et quotidiennes. En fait, la valeur de la ville doit être considérée dans l’optique de son appartenance à un système de fortifications.

**Valeur universelle exceptionnelle**

**Déclaration générale** :

La citadelle, la vieille ville et la forteresse de Derbent constituent un site frontière depuis le VIIe siècle avant J.-C., au bas mot. Son importance et sa valeur universelle exceptionnelle résident dans son rôle de composant d’un système défensif créé par l’empire perse et qui conserva son
rôle stratégique jusqu’au XIXe siècle. Ce *limes* perse peut être comparé au *limes* romain (le mur d’Hadrien) et à la grande muraille de Chine, dont la fonction était similaire. En tant que poste frontière, la ville doit être considérée de ce point de vue. La conception et la construction de ces murailles sont une réussite remarquable, et les murs s’étendaient sur une longueur probablement bien supérieure aux 200 km actuel.

Tout en reconnaissant le rôle stratégique que Derbent a conservé durant la période islamique, on peut difficilement lui attribuer une valeur universelle exceptionnelle concernant la diffusion de l’Islam dans le Caucase. Aux XIVe et XVe siècles, en particulier, il existait d’autres centres aux fonctions identiques, notamment Bakou, non loin de Derbent, ainsi que les capitales timurides de Samarkand et Boukharra.

Évaluation des critères :

Critère i : le dossier de proposition d’inscription fait référence à Derbent comme à un chef d’œuvre du génie créateur de la population locale de cette région. Bien que reconnaissant la contribution locale en termes de structures isolées, l’ICOMOS est d’avis que l’importance historique et stratégique de Derbent doit être vue dans un contexte bien plus vaste. On note que ce critère a été utilisé pour la Grande muraille de Chine, compte tenu de sa taille et de la qualité de sa construction. Tout en reconnaissant la similitude de ces deux sites, la grande muraille de Chine est une entreprise bien plus colossale, et l’ICOMOS ne considère pas que ce critère soit justifié.

Critère ii : en dépit de l’influence probable de Derbent sur l’architecture de la région du Caucase, il n’y a pas suffisamment de preuves justifiant une valeur universelle exceptionnelle sur cette base.

Critère iii : l’emplacement critique de Derbent en a fait un lieu de contrôle stratégique dans la région, et le bien apporte un témoignage archéologique et architectural exceptionnel sur les cultures qui ont gouverné et habité la région pendant trois millénaires.

Critère iv : Bien que reconnaissant l’intérêt de Derbent dans son rôle de témoignage de la culture et de l’architecture musulmane aux XIVe – XVe siècles, l’ICOMOS considère que la valeur universelle exceptionnelle de Derbent devrait être attribuée à sa qualité d’exemple remarquable de structure défensive formant le *limes* nord de l’empire sassanide. Le site a conservé sa fonction militaire jusqu’au XIXe siècle.

Critère v : le dossier de proposition d’inscription ne fournit pas d’informations suffisantes pour justifier la valeur universelle exceptionnelle en termes d’occupation continue des sols. Une étude complémentaire serait nécessaire pour décider à quel point Derbent peut être inscrit sur la base de ce critère.

En conclusion, la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien est reconnue sur la base des critères iii et iv.

4. RECOMMANDATIONS DE L’ICOMOS

**Recommandations pour le futur**

Bien que reconnaissant les efforts consentis par les autorités pour la conservation du bien proposé pour inscription, on attire une attention toute particulière sur le besoin de renforcer la mise en œuvre de la gestion en fournissant les ressources financières et professionnelles nécessaires.

L’ICOMOS recommande également que les normes de construction nouvelle dans les quartiers entourant le bien proposé pour inscription soient définies en précisant la hauteur, le volume et le caractère architectural, en harmonie avec le quartier historique.

En outre, en ce qui concerne la citadelle et les anciennes structures défensives, l’ICOMOS recommande que toute reconstruction soit strictement limitée, suivant les principes acceptés à l’échelle internationale.

**Recommandation concernant l’inscription**

Que le bien proposé pour inscription soit inscrit sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial sur la base des *critères iii et iv* :

*Critère iii* : Le site de la vieille ville de Derbent a joué un rôle crucial pour le contrôle du passage nord-sud à l’ouest de la mer Caspienne depuis le premier millénaire avant J.-C. Les structures défensives construites par les Sassanides au Ve siècle après J.-C. ont été continuellement utilisées par les gouvernements perses, arabes, mongols et timurides qui leur ont succédé pendant quelque quinze siècles.

*Critère iv* : La vieille ville de Derbent et ses structures défensives constituent la partie la plus importante des systèmes de défense stratégique conçus et construits sous l’empire sassanide le long de son limes nord, et maintenus jusqu’à l’occupation russe au XIXe siècle.

ICOMOS, mars 2003