



ARTICLE

Tyumen Embankment: Urban Hubris as a Trigger for the Transformation of Urban Identity

Vladimir G. Bogomyakov

Marina G. Chistyakova

University of Tyumen, Tyumen, Russia

ABSTRACT

The article discusses the problem of place affecting urban identity formation. The granite-lined embankment of the Tura River becomes a factor in reassembling urban identity and forming new urban sensuousness for the residents of Tyumen. The identity of Tyumen has long oscillated between the provinciality of the “village capital” and the nomadism of the “hub city”, serving as a transit point to service the oil and gas industry. Nowadays, city residents perceive the embankment not only as a sign of Tyumen’s integration into a modern urban context, but also as a metaphor for the escape from the boggy swamp of uncertainty to the *terra firma* of solid granite. The technological characteristics of the four-tier embankment (its height and length) mark it as an outstanding engineering structure. The visual excessiveness of the embankment, framing the banks of a small river, makes it a source of pride for the citizens. To clarify the process of urban identity formation, the authors introduce the term “urban hubris”. There are multiple connotations of the hubris concept, ranging from “pride” to “transgression of one’s own destiny”. In this article, urban hubris refers not only to specific traits of people initiating megaprojects but to transgressive change in urban identity. This change can be triggered by fundamentally new strategies in city design or, as in this case, by a large-scale urban development project, conveying new city images, creating new public spaces, changing citizens’ daily practices, and, ultimately, transforming their urban identity.

Received 27 December 2021

Accepted 20 May 2022

Published online 11 July 2022

© 2022 Vladimir G. Bogomyakov,

Marina G. Chistyakova

v.g.bogomyakov@utmn.ru

m.g.chistyakova@utmn.ru

KEYWORDS

urban identity, place identity, embankment, public space, urban hubris

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was supported by the RFBR and Tyumen Region under Grant №20–411–720007. The authors express their appreciation to the anonymous reviewers for their valuable comments.

Over the last few decades, the problem of urban identity has drawn considerable attention due to increased interest of researchers to urbanism. A multitude of factors, such as social, cultural, historical, territorial, and others, affect citizens' identity formation. One of them is "place", a part of the city space which carries specific meanings. A place's identity establishes the link between its connotations, its significance for citizens, and their self-concept. The concept of place can be addressed not only as individual but also as collective identity, because this identity inspires the formation of urban communities. Normally, this role is attributed to some public space, equally available for all. When a "place" grows emblematic for citizens, it is perceived as a landmark, the symbol of the city where it is located, and it becomes associated with it. In some cases, such places are not just aesthetically attractive. Citizens look at them with pride.

The article discusses the Tyumen embankment's function as a local landmark and how it affects the urban identity of its citizens. For a long time, Tyumen developed apart from modern urban trends. Its embankment can be regarded, on the one hand, as an attempt to measure up, by means of creating an up-to-date public space. On the other hand, it is a megaproject, which is unique and so disproportionate both in size, human scale, and in regard to the small river it frames, that it is associated with hubris. By developing the idea of hubris in connection with urban megaprojects, the authors introduce the term "urban hubris", which is later utilised to examine the transformation of urban identity. Hubris, in this respect, is seen not so much as arrogance and conceit, but as creative boldness, enabling authors to design and complete megaprojects in the urban environment. The conceptual framework of the study is supported by the theories of place identity, social identity, and new urbanism in public space design. The results of an opinion poll on the citizens' attitude to the embankment, conducted in social media, were used as empirical material.

Embankment: The Ambiguous Landmark of Tyumen

Historically, building cities on riverbanks offered a number of decisive advantages, mainly practical ones. Grigory Revzin (2021) identifies the following ones: firstly, fortification, which complicated any attempt to conquer the city. Secondly, logistics, as the river provided the cheapest way to transport freight. And finally, "hygiene": the river was often used as a reservoir for waste dumping (p. 112). Tyumen is no exception in this regard: since the time of its founding, the Tura River has served similar functions. The city was founded on the high river bank for safety reasons. In the second half of

the 19th century, the river became a crucial component of the city economy. All goods exchange between the European part of the country and Siberia was affected by means of the Tura transport hub with harbour facilities linked to the railway station. The first embankment was constructed there in 1893. It was narrow, made of wood but equipped with electric street lights. In time, this part of the city fell into disrepair and its revitalisation was linked to a major large-scale city project, embankment construction.

The construction of embankments as complex architectural infrastructure dates back to the XVIII–XIX centuries, at a point when the aesthetic function of the river joined the utilitarian one. Water became an object of contemplation. A stroll along the waterfront was one of the favourite pastimes at the time, especially in metropolises. The granite-clad embankment in St. Petersburg is viewed as one of the symbols of the capital and the empire. Moreover, it became one of the first European embankments. Thereafter, city planners start viewing the waterfront as public space.

The omnipresent integration of water into the city environment is a crucial element of contemporary urban planning. Without the benefit of this opportunity, a city can create an impression of “urban understatement”, failing to fulfil its potential. Until recently, Tyumen was a city of this kind. Despite the fact that the Tura River, flowing through the entire city, divides it into two parts—its right and left banks—post-revolutionary Tyumen lacked an embankment.

The idea to build an embankment was first discussed back in the 1980s, but for various reasons (mostly financial ones) the execution of the project was constantly postponed. Construction work on the riverfront started in 2008. Several contractors have worked on the project over the years. LLC *IST Architecture and Engineering Group* (LLC IST) accomplished a major part of the project (Naberezhnaia reki Tury, n.d.). The Tura embankment is a remarkable hydraulic engineering structure not only because of its length but more so due to its height. Challenging terrain is its distinctive feature: the elevation difference between the apex point of the right bank and the water level reaches 22 metres. The right bank, where construction began, is steep and rugged at some stretches and had been eroded by the river, especially in spring flood. High flood marks were an additional hindrance to choosing easy solutions. Water rises by 4 or 5 metres on average, reaching over 9 metres at peak levels. The right bank was embedded in concrete and secured with reinforced concrete piles to prevent further erosion.

The embankment in Tyumen, unique in Russia, comprises 4 tiers. The two lower levels are covered by water until June, when the river’s flow subsides. This was a decisive factor in choosing cladding material. Granite was selected to cover the embankment for its entire length. On the one hand, it is a practical decision; on the other, it evokes pleasant associations with metropolitan waterfronts. The completed embankment has a stretch of 3.1 km but it has been decided to extend it along the entire riverfront.

Even though the current length of the embankment is quite modest, it appears massive and seems obviously exaggerated for such a small river. In recent years the Tura has grown shallow, while in some places water has receded from the bank by several metres. A tall and imposing construction clad in granite does nothing but exacerbate this imbalance. The situation is similar in terms of the human scale. The

embankment does look excessive in this respect. The monotonous, granite-clad embankment stretching for several kilometres appears almost gargantuan.

According to the architect and urbanist Jan Gehl (2012), city design should consider the human scale and use it as its core concept. Urban planning should be done in the following order: life, space, buildings (p. 198). In the case of the Tyumen embankment, it happens to be exactly the opposite. The buildings became established priorities, and technical problems were solved first, leaving other objectives behind. This error is quite frequent in modernist urban planning, where buildings are prioritized. However, it appears out-of-date by the logic of modern urban development.

The paradox of the Tyumen embankment is that on the one hand, it is much liked by city dwellers and is perceived as a landmark and the heart of the city (Naberezhnaia reki Tura, Tyumen', n.d.), one of the key sights and an essential feature of the city brand. On the other hand, even its proponents agree that the riverfront has a long way to go before contextually and functionally it meets our expectations for a modern recreational space (Oldenburg, 1989). This turns the embankment into an object of criticism, no less than an object of admiration. That said, most people are of the same mind that presently this imposing and ambitious construction is an important symbol of Tyumen.

The embankment's construction has taken over a decade but it has failed to feature a variety of leisure opportunities or comfortable recreational zones. There are no cosy benches or playgrounds on the waterfront, yet there is an abundance of bronze images in bas-relief, and sculptures representing Tyumen's milestones and its heroes. In its central part historical context prevails over the contemporary reality. Available activities lack variety. These are jogging, Nordic walking, roller skating, cycling, strolling, or sitting on the benches.

The part of the waterfront adjoining Maslovsky Vzvoz is more up-to-date. It is a historic road which in the 19th century connected the railway station and the wharves, integrating it into a transport hub. The renovated building of the Steam Navigation Office hosts a multifunctional centre bearing the same name, which is aimed at a host of creative initiatives. It offers more opportunities to spend leisure time by holding street festivals, flash mobs, organising dancing parties, or gymnastics classes; there is an outdoor cinema. The building features exhibition rooms, a coffeeshop, and a lecture hall.

A serious drawback in landscaping on the riverfront is the disregard for climatic conditions in Tyumen. The designers seem to have made allowances only for the spring flood. It is very windy by the river in winter but no windshield or sunshade has been implemented. There is no shade for the whole stretch of the riverfront, which means that most benches on a hot summer day are in full sun. The only artificial source of refreshing coolness is a fountain. Further, there is little chance of spontaneous communication here due to the lack of infrastructure, mainly street furniture. Originally benches without backrest were sited here, making it difficult to sit on them for long. They were later replaced with more comfortable ones, equipped with backrests. Even so, they are stationary, equidistant, and fixed in their places. Greenery is restricted to lawns, where no walking on the grass is allowed.

The borderline zone of the riverfront is a bit of an eyesore, at least at its very beginning, next to the Bridge of Lovers. It neighbours a parking lot, a pavilion with

a *Police* sign and several kiosks with loud generators. Points of descent to the water are located far away from each other and are equipped with “inhospitably” long stairs (142 steps) and ramps. A panoramic lift planned here has not been constructed so far. There are no cycling lanes and no zoning available. The main drawback is that there is no access to the water’s edge along the entire waterfront. The city dwellers are sympathetic and even explain the reasons for this, with river pollution being the first, and safety (so that no one falls into the water) coming second. A prospective city beach is yet to be designed, while at present the water is simply out of reach.

The embankment is conceived, among other things, as a place to contemplate the opposite river bank. By and large, that left bank does not look so presentable in Tyumen, which prompted the city authorities to start its redevelopment by means of gentrification and new housing styled on the merchant mansions of the early 20th century. In 2019, efforts to landscape the left bank of the Tura were initiated. The bank was also stabilised, and provided with a skating park, cafeteria, playground, several hardscape elements of unknown function, and a promenade. It was open to public in the spring of 2021 and immediately attracted much criticism. The designers tried to squeeze a host of amenities into a relatively small area, as if making up for their lack of them on the right bank. This resulted in congested space. What is more, a tall solid railing blocks the river view and people are unable to see the water, basically what they come to the waterfront for. Sitting next to the railing, all one can see is grey concrete, and only by coming close to it is the water visible.

The authors of the project seem to have ignored all the principles of embankment renovation (or construction, in our case) listed by Soviet architect Grigory Golts (1936) in his article referring to Moscow embankments *The architecture of embankments*:

- (a) The overall architectural image of Moscow is conceived as a city complex constructed according to the picturesque principle, based on active articulation and elements’ lightness;
- (b) The second principle is respecting the scale of the Moskva River and its embankments;
- (c) The third principle is specific thematic differentiation of embankments on the basis of district division. (Golts, 1936; our translation—V. B., & M. Ch.)

In Tyumen’s embankment there are neither light details nor zoning, and the river is disproportionately small in comparison to the grand embankment. The authors of the project focused not so much on the variety of opportunities to utilise public space, but on its design, markedly grandiose and imposing. This decision was supposed to give the city a new status, having instantly upgraded it on the urban design scale.

As any urban space much exceeding the human scale, the embankment aims to create an image that would impress viewers not by its attractiveness, but rather by its imposing size. It comes as no surprise that the public has come up with the initiative to give the embankment a name. The most frequent proposal is to name it after the Romanov dynasty, who stayed in Tyumen in 1917 on the way to Tobolsk as they had to change from a train to a ship. The imperial theme arises in the media

with predictable regularity. Such allusions derive not only from historical context, but from the archaic, imperial, and imposing image that the embankment creates, and its disproportionate size compared to the river and an individual. What is the reason for this inordinate image? Perhaps such a design solution should symbolize the new status of the city, which, thanks to the embankment, suddenly moved several steps at once on the “scale of urbanism” (Petrova, 2021; our translation—V. B., & M. Ch.). We believe the reason lies in hubris.

Urban Hubris

The Tyumen embankment has managed to revolutionise its urban identity. It has now become part of the city sightseeing list, a “must-visit”. This is the main tourist attraction which is proudly presented by residents to city guests. The very fact of the embankment’s appearance enhances the city’s “urban status”, its standard of life, and ultimately, citizens’ self-esteem. While the embankment is among the most complex, unrivalled and visually inordinate projects of its kind (at least among those constructed in Russia), Tyumen’s urban identity gains new growth potential, namely pride. The notion of “hubris” is here utilised in order to conceptualise urban identity transformation in the context of megaprojects.

The term “hubris” (origin: ancient Greek ὑβρις—audaciousness) had a multitude of connotations in Ancient Greece. It was consonant with the name of Hybris, the goddess personifying excessive, reckless pride and associated with such human features as pride, haughtiness, insolence, arrogance, overconfidence, and inflated ego. Aristotle (trans. 1998) links hubris primarily to verbal insult. A person inflicting it on the other shows disrespect and asserts their own superiority. However, even in ancient tradition, hubris is not only interpreted as a morally reprehensible trait of character. It has a much broader meaning, for instance, referring to a human striving to transgress the boundaries of his destiny, as a challenge to the gods. Homer and Hesiod define hubris as the insolent behaviour of humans willing to surpass themselves. Pindar regards hubris as a desire to push the boundaries of the human lot, to confront mortality (Shevtsov, 2014, p. 412). Gods do not leave the arrogant thoughts of men without notice. It is not surprising that hubris can be defined as one of the central components of ancient tragedy. The action of a character provoked by hubris resulted in folly (Até), inevitably followed by divine retribution (nemesis). At all events, by its extreme nature, hubris challenged conventional assumptions of norms in several contexts: religious, ethical, and legal.

Even if Aristotle first regarded hubris as arrogance, cheek, insolence, and rudeness, he considerably broadened the word’s definition over time. Hence, hubris refers not only to human traits, but actions often linked to pride and superciliousness, illogical by nature, unpredictable, aimed at transgression. Arnold Toynbee wrote about the hubris of civilisations, whose golden age is followed by reckoning and collapse (nemesis), linking this circumstance to the fate of dominant military powers. Michel Foucault examines the unbridled sexuality of man, reflecting his nature, through the prism of hubris, which can be restrained by means of various practices in self-

discipline (Mamonova, 2020, pp. 13–16). In modern philosophy hubris is perceived primarily as a refusal of extrinsic determination in favour of a spontaneous intrinsic impulse. Hubris implies an alteration of the normal state of consciousness, a loss of stability and control. It is associated with intemperance and transgression. Hubris does not match the virtues of social frugality. Consequently, we are unable to predict all the implications of a performed action characterised by immanent creativity.

Nowadays the term “hubris” is used in a variety of fields: from business to politics, and from ecology to information technology. Hubris can be used in both negative and positive meanings. For instance, the term “Hubris Syndrome” (Sadler-Smith et al., 2018) was coined to refer to the negative implications of professional deformation for political leaders, and leaders in general. This syndrome may manifest itself in people holding leading positions in any sphere: military, economic, academic, etc. (Owen, 2008). Hubris is present in research on geoengineering (Meyer & Uhle, 2015), as well as on the anthropogenic impact on the environment and ways to combat it, including by way of architecture (Nugent, 2020).

Currently the term “hubris” is seen more and more frequently in the context of architecture and urbanism. Hubris can be traced to both individual architectural works and urban development projects alike, completed in different cultures at different points in history. One common criterion uniting them all is a defiant transgression of the human scale. It is the case of global projects and of excessive buildings, primarily in terms of dimensions. As a rule, they are of gigantic size, surpassing the boundaries of all common sense. The basis of urban hubris is, in our view, not pride as such but the audaciousness of the author, transgressing banality.

Architect Rem Koolhaas (1995) links the problem of gigantism to American architecture of the previous century. According to R. Koolhaas, gigantism was inspired by an avalanche of technical innovations (the elevator, electricity, steel, etc.). It needs no manifestos—the size of the building can play the role of an ideological programme *per se*, irrespective of the architect’s intentions (p. 4). The above-mentioned statement appears quite convincing in terms of contemporary large-scale buildings. They are obviously self-sufficient and rarely carry symbolic meaning. They are what they are: gigantic structures, badly fitted into the urban space, while each of them is a kind of a city within the city (Koolhaas, 1978).

Nevertheless, historically, a predominant majority of mega-buildings were erected not so much for people in order to meet their daily needs, but with the intent to manifest a certain idea, either a religious or a political one. This undoubtedly indicates an intent to demonstrate superiority, either in terms of a religious confession or a corporate identity. The idea to embody the sublime in quantitative form is far from being novel—it has been long used to establish power. Most megaprojects of the past, such as the Wonders of the World and the Colosseum in antiquity, medieval temple architecture, and the Eiffel Tower—all fall into the same category. The work of their creators is quite logically associated with hubris. The term is also used to analyse the architecture of totalitarian Germany (Tewari, 2021) and the concrete architecture of Boston (Pasnik et al., 2015), along with politicians of resurgent cities (Cheshire, 2006, p. 1231). Every kind of megalomania is linked to hubris, as it always confronts existing aesthetic,

ethical, technological and other norms. Even though only a handful out of a plethora of similar projects have been completed, their ambition still impresses us today. It is sufficient to address the projects of the French megalomaniacs of Enlightenment, for instance, Isaac Newton's cenotaph (by Etienne-Louis Boullée), or post-revolutionary constructivist and post-constructivist projects, conceived for completion in our country: the Monument to the Third International (by Vladimir Tatlin), the People's Commissariat of Heavy Industry (by Ivan Leonidov), and many others.

Hubris may inspire grand projects of urban development linked both to the founding of new cities and their redevelopment, bringing radical change for their residents (for instance, Haussmann's Paris renovation in 1853–1870). The results of such activity often arouse controversy. Indeed, Baron Haussmann is criticised to this day for the drastic measures he employed by destroying entire districts as part of his renovation process. Yet, the intensity of criticism gradually diminished as Parisians got accustomed to the new image of the capital; and today it is impossible to imagine the city without the parks and gardens, boulevards and avenues laid out by Haussmann.

Contemporary megaprojects can be exemplified by "smart cities". Take Songdo, the first smart city in South Korea, designated for research and business, or the "green" Masdar City in Abu Dhabi designed by Foster and Partners. Contemporary megaprojects comprise skyscrapers, bridges, tunnels, airports, artificial rivers, etc. Even though their cost reaches dozens of billions of dollars, contenders for the tallest, the longest, the most expensive, the most spacious projects continue to come and go. That said, architectural megalomania does not mean that the affected place instantly becomes a source of pride for the citizens. More often than not, it is the citizens who criticise the authors of the projects for huge budgets, aesthetic inconsistency and mindless gigantism.

The governments supporting such projects have passed into history, while their architects, ever since the construction of the Tower of Babel, have made a name for themselves. The architect and urbanist Dhiru A. Thadani (2021) developed a formula for the author's renown based on hubris. It can be presented as a sum of Hubris and Form minus Common Sense. In terms of architecture and urbanism, hubris identifies primarily the creative ambition of the project's author and their team, comprising engineers, contractors, politicians and others. It is hubris that characterises John Rockefeller's engagement in New York development (Bleecker, 1981). The buildings constructed in the city due to the ideas and investment of this renowned philanthropist and patron are "hubristic", that is, they are associated with hubris as a bold impetus to find new urbanist solutions. "Hubricity" is the hallmark of the author's hubris in its creation, a feature which makes the author's hubris evident for all.

A project's hubristic nature is bound to provoke recipients' response. A grand edifice to be erected elicits intense emotions, and as mentioned earlier, these emotions are often far from positive. The project may be shocking or irritating, but it cannot go unnoticed. As the scope of work to construct such an object is quite impressive, its hubristic nature is undeniable even for its detractors. In this case, if the construction is positively evaluated, the author's hubris in the minds of recipients receives a positive connotation—it becomes pride, not conceit. While conceit implies

excessive and overblown arrogance connected to recklessness and haughtiness, pride can be perceived in a positive way as it is associated with the sense of self-worth and self-respect.

With reference to hubristic projects, it is the sense of pride that becomes a basis for the sense of community shared by people living in the same city. By transforming identity, pride forms a new attitude both to the particular place, and to the city itself.

Hubris and Pride in the Context of Place Identity

One of the sources of urban identity formation is place. Elizabeth Halpenny (2010), a researcher in environmental psychology, defines “place” as a spatial location that appropriates meanings and values held by society and individuals. “Place identity”, “place attachment” and “sense of place” are all terms describing the impact of environment on identity and self-concept, regarding relations between an individual and a place as primarily affective. However, they do not only comprise emotions and affects. Leila Scannell and Robert Gifford (2010) also include cognitive (knowledge, meaning, memory, schemas) and behavioural factors (proximity-maintaining, reconstruction of place).

There are no strict definitions of these terms and their meaning is often vague. Having analysed three identity theories (place identity theory, social identity theory, and identity process theory) Åshild Hauge (2007) concludes that the term “place identity” may be seen as a part of other identity categories. Identity manifests itself on many levels, one of which is place.

Bruce Hull et al. (1994) regard place identity as the contribution of place to one’s identity through the meanings and values symbolised by place features. The term is linked to a particular place and refers to it as a distinct space fragment. The uniqueness of a place is a result of the interaction between its physical features and its users (Kaymaz, 2013). Place identity refers to an essential component of both personal and urban identity. Living in the same space creates a communal feeling of belonging (Blackshaw, 2010).

“Place attachment” is often viewed as part of “place identity”. Place attachment stems from the positive experience a person acquires in the process of interacting with a particular place. Place identity, for its part, is derived from the assumptions, meanings, emotions, ideas and attitudes attributed to a place (Hauge, 2007). It can be formed both on the individual and group level. A sense of place and place attachment can strengthen not only personal identity but also the bonds within a community (Anguelovski, 2014). In this regard, sense of place and place identity form an important social phenomenon that structures and develops social space and forms communities (Kyle & Chick, 2007). We consider the identity of a place in the context of the interaction of its personal, social and physical components (Raymond et al., 2010, p. 434).

A distinctive feature of hubris-inspired places is their scale. This property, firstly, does not let places stay unnoticed, and secondly, is a factor enabling residents to express their attitude towards megaprojects. For a variety of reasons, these projects do not earn unanimous approval. More often than not, they are criticised

because they do not fit in the urban fabric. For instance, they can drastically change the familiar cityscape, affecting the entire city or one of its districts. However, in spite of a broad range of opinions, the problem of a negative attitude to a controversial construction is easily resolved. If the place is frequently visited, despite the controversy, it becomes a landmark, and joins the list of key local sights. As a result, not only do city dwellers still take pride in this particular place, but it also spills over into their attitude to the city itself.

The reasons for feeling affection towards a place are as diverse as those triggering criticism of it. It is essential that people feel the desire to linger, and later keep returning to this place. In time, citizens develop the sense of place attachment. The longer a large number of people spend their time there, the more successful the place is in terms of public space. In this respect, public spaces have much better chances of turning into a landmark in comparison with constructed objects with limited access (hotel, business centre, residential high-rises).

Therefore, when creating a “place” conceived as public space, it is crucial to do research and conduct public polls. If the project initiators are planning to create a popular, much-frequented place, they need to collaborate with local communities and discuss the project together. This form of planning has been termed “placemaking”. The concept of placemaking as a vehicle to improve urban environment refers to the idea of turning city spaces into places. The process of placemaking implies advisory planning, where not only professionals but ordinary city dwellers participate. Thus, placemaking aims to create a popular place, which would not only evoke positive emotions but also create the sense of attachment. It starts to be associated with this specific city, thus becoming a landmark.

The very fact of introducing the principle of urban space transformation, where professionals collaborate with local residents, brings to the foreground the concept of place not only for the urban environment but also for city dwellers. According to Jan Gehl (2010), first we create cities, then they create us (p. 13). While designing the embankment in Tyumen, attempts to use placemaking were made, but obviously they were insufficient. A competition to design the embankment was held and the winning project was selected with regard to citizens’ preferences. In addition, designers held multiple meetings with the public. But judging by the results, the preliminary work required by placemaking was not consistent. In any case, even now the public continues to negotiate over the faults of the riverfront with designers and officials, suggesting ways to further improve the amenities. On the other hand, the construction is ongoing and there is a chance that citizens’ requirements will be taken into consideration. Meanwhile, contrary to one of the key principles of placemaking which reads: “a place should be created, not designed”, the imposing image of the embankment dominates the interests of city dwellers.

Nevertheless, despite all its shortcomings, the citizens of Tyumen perceive the embankment as an iconic place, their pride and joy. It has boosted the self-esteem of a considerable number of residents, thus affecting new urban identity formation. How exactly can the sense of pride trigger identity transformation, both on the personal and urban levels?

To answer this question, let us address David Hume's *A Treatise of Human Nature* (Hume, 1998). One part of the book is devoted to pride, which Hume analyses in regard to identity. Pride for him is a passion whose object is the self. "In order to excite pride, there are always two objects we must contemplate, viz. the cause or that object which produces pleasure; and self, which is the real object of the passion" (Hume, p. 344). He distinguishes between pride stemming from extrinsic factors, and pride as a sense of self, a source of affirming oneself as a worthy subject. According to Olga Zubets (2012), who researches pride in Hume's interpretation, the philosopher's reasoning "starts with the analysis of pride as an extrinsic object but later comes to relevance of the self as a condition and requisite of the former" (p. 186 ; our translation—V. B., & M. Ch.). Being a passion, pride in something is evoked by an agreeable object by means of associations between ideas and impressions. This statement needs to be clarified. Hume formulates several limitations in its connection. Not every agreeable object results in the sense of pride. Firstly, it has to be associated with us, be close to us—in other words, not be casual. Secondly, it has to be peculiar and unique; and if it is shared with somebody else, it has to belong to just a few people. Thirdly, the object has to be discernible and obvious but not just to ourselves, but to others too. Fourthly, as the cause of these passions is casual, inconstant, and brief, they give us little pride, which means the cause of pride should be durable. Finally, one has to consider the influence of general rules upon pride.

Hume's key point is that a genuine source of pride is not so much an external source, but it is within the individual. Even if pride has an external cause, it should be relevant to self. By the same token, an extrinsic evaluation, how we are judged by other people, is determined by the significance of these people for the self and how relevant their evaluation is to my own. Pride then is determined by the immediacy of self over the world's impact on the individual, and it is pride that represents a form of self-discovery and self-constitution (Zubets, 2012, p. 187). In this regard, pride becomes a source of identity for an individual. If the same object or the same place is a source of pride for many people, it refers to collective identity.

The embankment in Tyumen, viewed in this context, presents an object agreeable for many people since it provides new sensuous experiences. In this respect, the riverfront evokes pleasant associations for the majority. At the same time, it is a unique construction. It is one of a kind—not only because it is part of the cityscape of this specific city, but also due to its technical features. It cannot go unnoticed either on the part of citizens or visitors, as evidenced by broad coverage of the topic on Tyumen local sites and social media. Thus, pride becomes a source of place identity, resulting in urban identity.

How Exactly Does the Embankment Affect Urban Identity?

Urbanists who have visited Tyumen have been ambivalent in their evaluation of its urban identity. For instance, Svyat Murunov, founder of the Centre for Applied Urbanism, remarks that "in terms of macro processes, such as population growth, ambition, numerous focal projects and densely scheduled city events, Tyumen is perceived as a capital, but regarding its residents' self-concept, it is still a provincial town" (Neradovskaia, 2017).

The background of Tyumen's contradictory identity comprises real cultural and historical events, as well as urban myths and legends, some of which are derogatory. According to one of them, the thriving merchant town was so muddy that, quoting the *Siberian Merchant Newspaper*, on April 14, 1826 a horse drowned in its central street. In the Soviet era the town was pejoratively nicknamed the *village capital Tyumen*. The annexation of some areas from Omsk district to Tyumen municipality in 1944 can probably account for the name. Another likely reason is the incorporation of nearby villages. On similar grounds, even London could not escape the *Big Village* sobriquet in its day.

The discovery of rich oil and gas deposits in Tyumen district earned it another nickname—*Tyuxas* (prompted by Texas). Tyumen, previously a provincial city-garden, was transformed into a city-hub, a transfer junction and a transport centre to cater for the oil and gas sector, which resulted in “nomadic” identity development in some citizens. All this time, urban environment demonstrated no concern for its residents but rather reflected a set of statist attitudes. Hence, a convenient city with all the desirable urban features was a long-held dream for Tyumen residents. The situation has changed now and the public, supported by the authorities, not only actively discusses urban problems with experts from Moscow, Yekaterinburg, Kazan, and other cities, but plays an active part in public space planning. That said, Tyumen still remains a city prioritizing automobiles, not pedestrians. The city has high-quality roads and interchanges, but it obviously lacks public spaces.

The riverfront development has become a major project capable of making a breakthrough in this field. According to urbanist and blogger Ilya Varlamov (2018), a co-founder of *Urban Projects* fund,

the only human place in Tyumen now is its new embankment, but it was made in a way that's “costly and inexpert”. Currently, there is no strategy to exploit either the river (which is the greatest natural asset), or the embankment. They seem like a burden, and the authors of the project are trying to distance themselves as much as they can. When you walk along the bank, you don't even realise there's water somewhere. Overall, the embankment resembles a gigantic memorial complex. (Varlamov, 2018; our translation—V. B., & M. Ch.)

The riverfront is also criticised by Svyat Murunov:

When they were making the embankment, most likely it was the city authorities who commissioned work. There was a large budget and they wanted to do everything in a massively expensive way. But it is much more complicated to do it in relation to people because that would require formulating an idea of what kind of people live in their city—with their emotions, social connections, dreams and objectives [...] You have to understand this person, but our cities certainly cannot do it yet. They are trying to produce wealth instead—see, we have a luxurious embankment! Good for you, but the embankment could be more functional. (Gut & Gaisina, 2016; our translation—V. B., & M. Ch.)

Most city dwellers agree with this criticism but at the same time, it does not negate their attitude to the embankment. They perceive the latter as a project that brings an air of “metropolis” to the city’s identity. In any case, “it used to be worse”. One of the authors come to this conclusion after analyzing the interviews of the townspeople about their attitude to the embankment. In the opinion poll asking respondents “What is your attitude to the embankment?” a more critical attitude was held by the cohort of city dwellers with higher educational qualifications, professionally linked to creative arts, journalism, or education. Nevertheless, the riverfront has become one of the favourite spots for taking selfies; there are groups on different sites where people write enthusiastic reviews, with visitors to the city among them (Naberezhnaya reki Tura, n.d.).

Figuratively speaking, the embankment refers to an escape by city dwellers from the swamp of uncertainty to the *terra firma* of granite. The metaphor of the swamp in culture has many negative connotations: it is something stagnant, unsteady, rigid, boggy, sleepy, like quicksand, etc. (Leontyeva & Mokienko, 2021), while stone is associated with stability, solidness and reliability.

Conclusion

Urban space is made up of specific places. Citizens develop emotional bonds with them, which can be termed place attachment or a sense of place (Low, 2000). Such places become part of a person’s biography and a factor in identity formation—both on individual and collective levels.

The concepts of new urbanism prescribe the creation of public spaces and places based on the principle of human scale. At the same time, a persistent stereotype has it that the extravagance of a project’s in size can secure its role as a local landmark, later to be associated with this specific place and perceived as its emblem or symbol. A mega place, unlike smaller and human-scaled places, affects urban identity in a particular way, hence the term “urban hubris”. Urban hubris refers to various aspects of megaproject creation and perception, linked by transgression of the norm. Both the developers’ boldness and the intensity of citizens’ reaction affect urban identity, leading to its transgressive transformation.

Residents perceive the project authors’ hubris in a milder form and interpret it not as conceit but pride, which is inspired by the mega place and spills over into the city itself. This article has studied the link between pride and identity within the frameworks of David Hume’s theory, who examined this problem in one of the parts of *A Treatise of Human Nature*. Thus, if city dwellers approve of the new place, it is regarded as a source of pride for the city, and a new dimension is added to their identity. If the place is rejected, their identity is also transformed. Residents who harbour doubts and irritation about the project get involved in discussions and public debates; they start reflecting on what an ideal modern city should be like, and what the project should have achieved. Their attitude towards the city also changes: it loses its indifference and passivity. The city dwellers gain agency. Consequently, urban hubris triggers urban identity transformation.

Urban hubris has been explored in the article with the Tyumen embankment presented as a case study. It is a controversial structure, imposing in terms of its technical features, but disproportionate in regard to the river, or to the human scale, and yet popularly accepted as the symbol of the city. Despite its ambivalence, this example has demonstrated the identity transformation of Tyumen residents as a transgressive breakthrough to blend the city with the contemporary urban context. For some city dwellers it is an accomplished fact, while the others regard it rather as a process, not the result.

References

Anguelovski, I. (2014). *Neighborhood as refuge: Community reconstruction, place remaking, and environmental justice in the city*. MIT Press. <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/9780262026925.001.0001>

Blackshaw, T. (2010). *Key concepts in community studies*. SAGE. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446279076>

Bleeker, S. E. (1981). *The politics of architecture: A perspective on Nelson A. Rockefeller*. Routledge.

Cheshire, P. C. (2006). Resurgent cities, urban myths and policy hubris: What we need to know. *Urban Studies*, 43(8), 1231–1246. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00420980600775600>

Gehl, J. (2010). *Cities for people*. Island Press.

Golts, G. (1936, July 9). Arkhitektura naberezhnykh [The Architecture of embankments]. *Arkhitekturnaya Gazeta*. <http://theory.totalarch.com/node/105>

Gut, V., & Gaisina, D. (2016, July–August). Kod Tiumeni [Tyumen Code]. *tmn*, 2(29), 10–12. http://1tmn.ru/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/tmn_29_2016-2_razvorotno.pdf

Halpenny, E. A. (2010). Pro-environmental behaviours and park visitors: The effect of place attachment. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 30(4), 409–421. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2010.04.006>

Hauge, A. L. (2007). Identity and place: A critical comparison of three identity theories. *Architectural Science Review*, 50(1), 44–51. <https://doi.org/10.3763/asre.2007.5007>

Hull, R. B., Lam, M., & Vigo, G. (1994). Place-identity: Symbols of self in the urban fabric. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 28(2–3), 109–120. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0169-2046\(94\)90001-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0169-2046(94)90001-9)

Hume, D. (1998). *Traktat o chelovecheskoi prirode: O poznanii. Ob affektakh. O morali* (S. I. Tsereteli, Trans.). [A treatise of human nature: Being an attempt to introduce the experimental method of reasoning into moral subjects]. Popurri. (Originally published in English 1739–1740)

Kaymaz, I. (2013). Urban landscapes and identity. In M. Özyavuz (Ed.), *Advances in landscape architecture* (pp. 739–760). InTech Open. <https://doi.org/10.5772/55754>

Koolhaas, R. (1978). *Delirious New York: A retroactive manifesto for Manhattan*. Oxford University Press.

Koolhaas, R. (1995). Bigness, or the problem of Large. In S, M, L, XL: *Small, Medium, Large, Extra Large*, Jennifer Sigler (Ed.). The Monacelli Press.

Kyle, G., & Chick, G. (2007). The social construction of a sense of place. *Leisure Sciences*, 29(3), 209–225. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01490400701257922>

Leontyeva, T. V., & Mokienko, V. M. (2021). Metafora bolota v kharakteristikakh sotsiuma [The SWAMP metaphor in characteristics of society]. *Tomsk State University Journal*, 465, 13–21. <https://doi.org/10.17223/15617793/465/2>

Low, S. M. (2000). *On the Plaza: The politics of public space and culture*. University of Texas Press.

Mamonova, V. A. (2020). *Hubris. Smeshchenie po konturu (predvaritel'nyi nabrosok k metamodernistskomu proektu)* [Hubris. Displacement along the contour (preliminary sketch for a metamodern project)]. RuScience.

Meyer, K., & Uhle, C. (2015). *Geoengineering and the accusation of hubris* (THESys Discussion Paper No. 2015–3). Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin. <https://edoc.hu-berlin.de/bitstream/handle/18452/3783/3.pdf?sequence=1>

Naberezhnaia reki Tura, Tiumen' [The embankment of the Tura River, Tyumen]. (n.d.). Tripadvisor. https://www.tripadvisor.ru/Attraction_Review-g662362-d6406767-Reviews-or40Embankment_of_Tura_RiverTyumen_Tyumen_Oblast_Urals_District.html

Naberezhnaia reki Tury [The Tura River embankment]. (n.d.). Arkhitekturno-inzhenernaia gruppa IST. <https://aigist.ru/project/naberezhnaya-reki-tury/>

Neradovskaia, V. (2017, December 14). Urbanisty: V Tiumeni nalitso vse stolichnye protsessy, no gorozhane oshchushchaliut sebia v provintsii [Urbanists: In Tyumen, there are all the processes of the capital, but the townspeople feel like they are in the provinces]. *NewsProm.ru* <http://newsprom.ru/news/Obschestvo/235547.html>

Nugent, C. (2020, October 21). The climate is breaking down. Architect Bjarke Ingels has a masterplan for that. *Time*. <https://time.com/collection/great-reset/5900743/bjarke-ingels-climate-change-architecture/>

Oldenburg, R. (1989). *The great good place: Cafés, coffee shops, community centers, beauty parlors, general stores, bars, hangouts, and how they get you through the day*. Paragon House.

Owen, D. (2008). *In sickness and in power: Illnesses in heads of government during the last 100 years*. Praeger.

Pasnik, M., Grimley, C., & Kubo, M. (2015). *Heroic: Concrete architecture and the New Boston*. Monacelli Press.

Petrova, E. (2021, July 19). “U menia bylo videnie, chto Tiumen’ stanet gorodom budushchego”. Interv’yu s sozdatelem naberezhnoj lllfatom Minulinyim [“I had a vision that Tyumen would become the city of the future”. Interview with the creator of the embankment lllfat Minulin]. *72.ru* <https://72.ru/text/gorod/2021/07/19/69904220/>

Raymond, C.M., Brown, G., & Weber, D. (2010). The measurement of place attachment: Personal, community, and environmental connections. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 30(4), 422–434. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2010.08.002>

Revzin, G. (2021). *Kak ustroen gorod: 36 esse po filosofii urbanistiki* [How a city works: 36 essays on urban philosophy]. Strelka Press.

Sadler-Smith, E., Robinson, G., Akstinaite, V., & Wray, T. (2018). Hubristic leadership: Understanding the hazard and mitigating the risks. *Organizational Dynamics*, 48(2), 8–18. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2018.05.007>

Sampson, K.A., & Goodrich, C.G. (2009). Making place: Identity construction and community formation through sense of place in Westland, New Zealand. *Society and Natural Resources*, 22(10), 901–915. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08941920802178172>

Scannell, L., & Gifford, R. (2010). Defining place attachment: A tripartite organizing framework. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*. 30(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2009.09.006>

Shevtsov, S.P. (2014). K voprosu o znachenii termina *hybris* v arkhaischeskii period. [On the issue of the term *hybris* in Archaic Greece]. *Schole. Ancient Philosophy and the Classical Tradition*, 8(2), 399–417. <https://classics.nsu.ru/schole/assets/files/8-2-shev.pdf>

Tewari, M. (2021, May 9). The architecture of hubris. *Deccan Chronicle*. <https://www.deccanchronicle.com/opinion/columnists/080521/manish-tewari-the-architecture-of-hubris.html>

Thadani, D.A. (2021). Form not content dictates the “smart” city. *Journal of Traditional Building, Architecture and Urbanism*, 2, 231–240. <https://doi.org/10.51303/jtbau.vi2.513>

Varlamov, I. (2018, August 16). Tiumen’—luchshii gorod Zemli? [Is Tyumen the best city on Earth?]. *Varlamov.ru* <https://varlamov.ru/3048792.html>

Zubets, O.P. (2012). Poniatie gordosti u luma: moral’naia sub’ektnost’ kak istochnik identichnosti la [Hume’s notion of pride: The moral agency as the basis for personal identity]. *Eticheskaya Mysl’ | Ethical Thought*, 12, 169–192. <https://et.iphras.ru/article/view/2601>