

DOI: doi.org/10.51209/platform.2.6.2022.150-167

УДК 725.96:2-523(477.43)

**Natalia Oleksiivna URSU,**

DSc in Arts, Professor,

Kamianets-Podilskyi National Ivan Ohienko University,

Kamianets-Podilskyi, Ukraine

e-mail: ursu@kpnu.edu.ua,

ORCID: 0000-0002-2660-2144

**Ivan Andriyovych HUTSUL,**

PhD in Arts, Associate Professor,

Kamianets-Podilskyi National Ivan Ohienko University,

Kamianets-Podilskyi, Ukraine,

e-mail: hutsul@kpnu.edu.ua,

ORCID: 0000 0001 7945 3587

**Ivan Stanislavovych PIDGURNY,**

PhD in Arts, Associate Professor,

Kamianets-Podilskyi National Ivan Ohienko University,

Kamianets-Podilskyi, Ukraine,

e-mail: pidhurnyy@kpnu.edu.ua,

ORCID: 0000 0003 0981 2964

## **FORTIFICATION SACRED BUILDINGS ON THE LANDS OF KHMELNYTSKYI: CHANGES OR RUINS?**

**Abstract.** The article is dedicated to the study of the fate of defensive sacred architecture, fortress temples, chapels, fortified monasteries of monastic orders located on the lands of Khmelnytskyi. It is noted that fortress temples have become symbols of the preservation and protection of statehood, bearers of spiritual

and cultural value, characteristic features of the outlook, mental and material foundations of the Ukrainian people. In the period of growth of the national self-identity of Ukrainians, against the background of open Russian aggression, the appeal to the consideration of the domestic improvement, which serves to protect the inhabitants of Ukrainian lands, becomes the subject of research in the article. There was an awareness of the cultural and artistic value of defensive temple architecture, which undoubtedly caused considerable interest in the problem of preserving the national multicultural heritage for future generations, a desire for changes in the attitude towards the pearls of architecture of various denominations in Ukraine.

The authors consider specific temples-fortresses located within the territory of Khmelnytskyi region, state the characteristic features of the buildings, analyze the architecture and signs of belonging to these lands. The article provides information on the state of preservation of some monuments and states insufficient attention of state structures responsible for the state of existence of the architectural heritage of Ukraine. Attention is drawn to the fact that in most cases there are claims to the preservation of the historical appearance of buildings, to the introduction of adapted building materials into the process of revitalization. These problems require immediate changes. Society also needs changes, first, in the minds of citizens, in particular officials, on whom the respectful attitude towards authentic architectural works in the territory of Khmelnytskyi depends. Otherwise, we will get not changes, but ruins. The next steps in the research will be the expansion of the area of the analyzed fortress temples and the introduction of this information into scientific circulation.

**Key words:** defensive sacral architecture, architecture, fortifications, temple-fortress, monastery, ruins.

**Introduction.** Defensive sacred building or temple-fortress – a church, built for the purpose of short-term or long-term defense by equipping the sacred building with a number of fortification elements: flanking towers, loopholes, machicolations along the perimeter of the building, gates with cherts, etc. In times of threat, when there was an urgent need to protect the native land from a foreign invasion, the protective power of buildings, the height and thickness of fortress walls, and defensive towers were erected. The oldest defensive structures of sacred purpose were built of wood. In the XIII century with the appearance of wall-piercing tools, they began to build much higher stone fences, defensive towers with loopholes, etc. From the 13<sup>th</sup> century, as well as in the 14<sup>th</sup> – the first half of 16<sup>th</sup> century in terms of scale of construction and number of types, fortified temples occupy a prominent place in Khmelnytskyi. Their characteristic features are clear functionality, strict silhouette, conciseness of architectural volumes, restraint of plastic forms, sparing use of decor.

Historical circumstances led to the fact that the most ancient period of construction of defense structures in Ukraine was focused on the fullest possible use of the protective capabilities of the surrounding natural environment. In this respect, protective architecture corresponded to the general nature of urbanism, which in the Khmelnytskyi region was originally integrated with nature and formed a single entity with it. Since the surrounding landscape was diverse, the defense doctrine was not to surround a certain territory with a standardized belt of fortifications, but to provide reliable protection using various means, primarily natural.

**Problem statement.** The so-called fortifications, which the Podil region is rich in, include the so-called fortress temples and fortified monastic complexes of monastic orders, which make up a separate group, and deserve close attention, because they integrated

the idea of protecting not only the material, but also the spiritual world of the inhabitants of these lands.

The appearance of a specific type of building, which combined cultic and defensive purposes – a fortified temple – was caused by inter-feudal wars and Tatar raids. Even with the lack of elements of active protection, massive monolithic walls with a minimum number of small, high windows, a single entrance and the absence of external decoration clearly testified to the defensive nature of the building [2, p. 248]. As examples of architecture, fortress temples have become symbols of the preservation and protection of statehood, bearers of spiritual and cultural value, characteristics of the outlook, mental and material foundations of the Ukrainian people. In the period of elevation of the national self-identity of Ukrainians, against the background of open Russian aggression, it becomes relevant to consider the domestic development, which serves to protect the inhabitants of Ukrainian lands, which became the subject of the study. In these difficult times came the realization of the cultural and artistic value of defensive temple architecture, which undoubtedly caused considerable interest in the problem of preserving the national multicultural heritage for future generations, and the desire for changes in the attitude to the pearls of architecture of various denominations in Ukraine.

**Analysis of recent research and publications.** The circle of scientists who considered the fortification architecture of Khmelnytskyi region includes Y. Sitsynskyi [10], O. Lesyk [5], O. Plamenitska [9], V. Vecherskyi, I. Danilova [3], O. Godovanyuk, I. Berezina [1], E. Vodzinsky [2], I. Pidgurny [11], N. Ursu [12, 13] and others. Some separate materials can be found in the Monuments of Urban Planning and Architecture of the Ukrainian USSR [8], in archival historical descriptions [7], History of Ukrainian Architecture [4], Dictionary-reference on architecture [6], etc.

However, sacral fortifications on the territory of Khmelnytskyi region were practically ignored. Some of them were considered individually and were not included in the complete compendium of defensive buildings of architectural complexes. In the studies of scientists, there is almost no information about the state of preservation and problems related to the revitalization of architectural landmarks. Fortified architecture was not yet a separate object of study by scientists, unfortunately, the current state of these architectural monuments remained unexplored. Therefore, the **purpose** of this article is to review the state of defensive sacred buildings on the lands of Khmelnytskyi.

**Presentation of the main research material.** Presenting main material. An example of a combination of religious and defensive functions is the Church of the Intercession in Sutkivtsi in the Zazbruchansky Podil, built in the second half of the 15<sup>th</sup> century (1476). The church is a classic example of an ecclesiastical combination of cult requirements and incastellation; its ideal centrality is consistently carried out both in the ground plan and in the elevation. Four semicircular towers are concentrated around its central square nave, three of which are finished with a wide crenellated cornice and a stitched ceiling with a lantern and a crown above. The western – front – tower once had a beautiful wooden superstructure (from the 18<sup>th</sup> century), typical for Ukrainian wooden belfries, but it was destroyed by inept restoration in 1903. The central nave is covered with a gable roof with stepped gables characteristic of Gothic construction. The internal structure of the Sutkovets church is two-story. The ground floor with round fortress windows and embrasures is covered by a complex system of gutter and pointed vaults with Gothic ribs that "shoot" from a massive pylon in the middle of the nave. The top floor of the church-fortress, intended for the accommodation of the defenders, has a whole system of embrasures. The walls of the church are made of broken

limestone filled with a kind of cement; the vault is made of brick. "The general concept of the entire building, the spatial distribution of masses, structures and vaults, ceilings, individual architectural forms and some details clearly indicate that we are dealing with Gothic here" (V. Sochinskyi). Only the ground plan and design of windows and embrasures remain here from Byzantine-Romanesque [1, p. 145]. This is one of the few fortress churches that are in satisfactory condition, are constantly under supervision and are being restored in a timely manner.

Typical for Podillia are three-conch temples (basically shaped like a shamrock), almost all of which had a defensive function. Cult buildings of this type are among the oldest and date back to the 13th century.

The three-conch defensive churches are represented in Kamianets-Podilskyi by four churches, two of which have survived to our time (Mikolayivska and St. Apostles Peter and Paul), and two – John the Baptist and Holy Trinity (according to other sources, Troitska) could also have survived to the present day, if they had not been dismantled in the 30s of the 20<sup>th</sup> century by Soviet regime.

Mikolayivska Church (13<sup>th</sup> century) is one of the oldest Armenian buildings in the city. It was built on the site of the earlier 11-12 centuries. Until 1811, it was called Blagovishchenskaya. It was destroyed in 1672; at the beginning of the 18<sup>th</sup> century – restored. At the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> – beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> centuries the church is fortified with flying buttress. Stone, one nave, one apse. The walls are 1.5 m thick. The inner volume is covered by box vaults with four shutters and a shell with one shutter in the apse. In the north-western corner, an internal staircase leads to the choir. It is covered with a gable roof with faces above the apse. In front of the central part of the western facade is a low wooden vestibule. On the side facades, according to the walls in the interior between the formwork – one buttress. A khachkar with the date "1554" and the

name “Akop” is inserted on the southern facade. On the continuation of the wall of the western facade, 4.4 m long flying buttress with a wide arched opening each go to both sides. The window openings have arched lintels and inner quarters made of profiled white stone blocks. Door openings with semi-circular lintels; the southern opening is paved, and the painting was made with oil paints (20<sup>th</sup> century) based on the paving [2, p. 250]. The white stone framing of the niches on the western facade and the arched portal on the southern are characteristic of Armenian architecture: a complex combination of deep curves, slanted shelves and a three-quarter shaft, the bottom of which is ornamented with twisted braids in the late Romanesque style. The simplicity of the three-dimensional planning solution of the monument in combination with the decor put it in several valuable buildings of the late Romanesque style, which reflected one of the early schools of Armenian masters. The good state of the church is supported by the community of believers, as the fortress church is still active.

Peter and Paul Church was built in 1580. At the end of the 18th century the walls are reinforced with buttresses, and in 1834 a belfry in the style of classicism was added to the western facade. Stone, triconch; had a tower above the part of church that was for woman. The nave is rectangular in plan with two semicircular conchs and is completed by a semicircular apse in the east. Overlapping the nave and vestibule are semi-circular vaults with formwork, the tops of which converge in rows. The monument belongs to a small group of three-conch temples that reflect an important period in the development of Ukrainian architecture and creative ties with Moldova [11, p. 142]. The temple-fortress in question is also in good condition thanks to the Orthodox community of the city. However, not always the faithful, who maintain the church in proper condition, adhere to the historical and

cultural features, the authenticity of the appearance and materials in the restoration process.

A fortress-type temple – the Church of the Holy Trinity, one of the oldest temples in Kamianets, dating from approximately the 13<sup>th</sup> century, restored by the Koriatovych family in the 14<sup>th</sup> century. Unfortunately, in Soviet times, in 1930, this stronghold, as well as Church of St. John the Baptist, was dismantled. The Church of St. John the Baptist was used as a defensive structure – no decoration, strong buttresses, small window openings located high from the ground. It belongs to the thriconch temples with a defensive tower along the axis of the western facade. Nowadays, it is completely restored, well-maintained and serves for the believers of the Greek-Catholic community. The construction of the monastery of the Basilian Order is being completed.

Often, the attic of the church was adapted for defense, and a deaf parapet, parapet, or attic with shooting holes was arranged above the building or part of it for shelling the surroundings. Such buildings include the bell tower of the Armenian church, which rises in the middle of the Old Town in Kamianets-Podilskyi. Almost every image of the panorama of the city includes an image of this stronghold.

The tower of the Armenian Church in Kamianets-Podilskyi, late 15<sup>th</sup> – early 16<sup>th</sup> centuries, built as a bell tower of the Armenian Mykolaiv Church of the 14<sup>th</sup>-15<sup>th</sup> centuries (the western gallery has been preserved). Since 1633, the church of Stepanos was in the first tier of the tower. At the same time, its walls and vaults were painted. Five-tiered, it is a square building with sides of 11 m; the height of the stone walls is 22.7 m, the total height is 38 m. The overlap on the 1st tier is cylindrical. The doorway on the first floor is framed by a white stone Renaissance portal. The entrance to the second tier is via external wooden and stone stairs, inside via wall stairs. The connection with the rest of the tiers is via wooden ladders. In the

third and fifth tiers there are loopholes on four sides with cheeks expanding in both directions; in each corner tower there are three keyholes. A window opening in the apse of the first tier with an arrow lintel and a white stone platband, the profile of which is characteristic of Armenian architecture. A fresco painting of the 17<sup>th</sup>-18<sup>th</sup> centuries has been preserved in the interior of the church. The facades are divided by white stone cornices. The walls are plastered (except for the white stone decor). The roof is finished with a truncated octahedron tent, which turns into a drum with a dome. Corner turrets are covered with domes, on small drums of which there is a tent finish. The monument is a building of the early Renaissance period [3, p. 54]. Unfortunately, this tower needs immediate intervention to restore it and bring it up to the existing norms of preservation of sacred buildings.

Separately, you can single out temples in which often separately located belfries-towers were adapted for defense, or simply towers that together with the temple made up the complex. Such is the Intercession Church-castle in the village of Sharivka (14<sup>th</sup>-16<sup>th</sup>, 18<sup>th</sup> centuries). The ancient part of the building – the bell tower – was completed in the 14<sup>th</sup> century like a defensive tower. In the 30s of the 15<sup>th</sup> century the three-conch volume of the church is attached to the eastern facade of the tower. The defense tower became a belfry, its first tier was turned into a vestibule, the second was converted into choirs. Restored in 1773, after destruction at the beginning of the 18th century. A new vault was made in the central part, the walls were hewn, and window openings were laid in the upper parts, new entrances were punched in the side volumes, and the roof was replaced. In 1890-1892, the building was rebuilt: the walls of the side volumes were raised, Gothic openings were laid, a new roof with a wooden drum and a low tent was erected. The tower has two tiers with a tented roof. According to the spatial and planning decision, the building belongs to the triconch type. The

ceiling is a system of semicircular conch vaults with shuttering above the windows. The central part is opened to the apse and side branches with three wide openings with pointed arches [1, p. 144]. The bell tower is almost square in plan, with internal side dimensions of 6 m × 5.4 m. The thickness of the stone walls is 1.7 m. the upper two tiers are made of brick. The ceilings above the first tier are semi-circular, above the others – beam. The stairs to the second floor are built inside the stone wall and pass through the southern wall. Door and window openings on the outside – with architraved brick lintels, ancient doorways – with stone lintels of a three-center contour. Ancient window openings – with stone, arrow contour and inner quarters made of profiled white stone blocks. The monument belongs to a rare type of buildings that have survived in Ukraine and synthesize cultic and defensive functions and needs to be restored to its authentic appearance.

The Church of the Intercession in the village of Adamivka (in Khmelnytskyi region) was built in 1773. In 1884, a belfry was added to the western facade. Made of stones, belongs to the ancient type of defensive three-conch temples of Ukraine of the 16<sup>th</sup> century. The main volume consists of a part for women, a nave with two small semi-circular conch-apses from the north and south and a semi-circular altar part extended to the east, the area of which is 2 times larger than the dimensions of the branches. Adjacent to the nave is a square, two-story belfry topped by a four-sided tent top. In the northern wall of the bell tower there are stairs leading to the choir. The nave is covered by a wooden closed vault on a wooden octagonal light drum, planted on the walls with the help of sails and folds. The roof is gable, forming semi-conical tents over the apse and conches, covered with sheet iron [4, p. 228]. Ceilings in the belfry and apses are flat, board-beamed, in the nave – with a seam ceiling. In the first tier of the belfry there is a vestibule connected by a central part with a doorway. The austerity of the architectural

appearance of the facades is decorated with a belt of a carved wooden cornice, previously painted, a vertical band of a drum, and rectangular windows of late origin, which have preserved the profile of the arched lintel in the apse. The monument is a rare example of a three-conch temple of the 18<sup>th</sup> century and is in satisfactory condition.

A separate variety can be distinguished castle temples, which were located on the territory of the fortress and in this connection performed, along with religious, also defensive functions (Kamyanets-Podilskyi). A separate group consists of fortress monasteries, the architecture and complex of buildings of which is almost no different from castles.

An example is the Bernardine monastery in the city of Izyaslav, at the beginning of the 17<sup>th</sup> century. The monastery buildings include the Bernardine church, cells and walls with towers and gates. The monastery complex is a typical example of buildings in the Baroque style of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, which embodied a developed version of buildings with a defensive function [4, p. 346]. Walls with gates and towers (beginning of the 17<sup>th</sup> century) surrounded the monastery on four sides, forming a rectangle in plan. The western wall, which includes a three-slot arched belfry, has been preserved. The monastery is maintained in a satisfactory condition.

**Conclusions.** Khmelnytskyi is rightfully considered one of the iconic regions in terms of the concentration here not only of defensive fortresses and castles, but also of temples, which, in addition to their religious purpose, performed the functions of fortifications and could, if necessary, provide shelter to those who needed it. In general, several types of fortress churches can be traced, illustrating the development of cult defense construction:

✓ three-conch temples: one of the first sacred structures, were quite common in the territory of the studied region, often had towers adapted for defense.

- ✓ temples with fortified bell towers.
- ✓ churches located on the territory of fortresses, due to which they had a defensive function.
- ✓ defensive monastic complexes, the architecture and complex of buildings of which is almost no different from castles.

At the same time, it is possible to ascertain insufficient attention in the state of structures responsible for the preservation of the architectural heritage of Ukraine. In most cases, there are claims to preserve the authentic appearance of buildings, to the use of appropriate building materials for revitalization works. These processes require immediate changes. Society also needs changes, first, in the minds of citizens, in particular officials, on whom the respectful attitude to cultural and historical monuments on the territory of Khmelnytskyi depends. Otherwise, we will get not changes, but ruins. The next phase of the research of fortress temples will be the expansion of the area of the analyzed sacral buildings of a defensive nature and the introduction of these materials into scientific circulation.

### References:

1. Berezina, I. (2005). Oboronna arkhitektura Ukrayiny na litohrafiyakh Napoleona Ordy [Defense architecture of Ukraine based on the lithographs of Napoleon Horde]. Bulletin of the Ukrzakhidproekrestavratsiya Institute, 15, 143-147 [in Ukrainian].
2. Vodzynskyi, E. (1995). Pytannya okhorony svoyeridnosti istorichnykh mist Ukrayiny [The issue of protecting the uniqueness of historical cities of Ukraine]. Ukrainian Studies, 2, 242-253. Arkhitekturna spadshchyna Ukrayiny. Ukrayinoznavstvo. 2, 242-253 [in Ukrainian].
3. Danilov, I. Fortyfikatsiya: pohlyad u mynule [Fortification: a look at the past]. Narys z istoriyi oboronnoho mystetstva. 1999 [in Ukrainian].

4. Istoriya ukrayins'koyi arkhitektury (2003). Za red. V.I. Tymofiyenka [History of Ukrainian architecture Under the editorship]. Kyiv: Technika [in Ukrainian].
5. Lesyk, O. (1993). Zamky ta monastyri Ukrayiny [Castles and monasteries of Ukraine]. Lviv: Svit [in Ukrainian].
6. Marder, A. (1993). Arkhitektura: Slovnyk-dovidnyk [Architecture: Dictionary-reference]. Kyiv: NDITIAM [in Ukrainian].
7. Orlovsky, M. (1864). Istoricheskoye opisanie uyezdnago g. Leticheva Podol'skoy gubernii [Historical description of the district town of Letychev in the Podolsk province]. Podol'skiye yeparkhial'nyye vedomosti. 14, 500-508 [in Russian].
8. Pamyatniki gradostroitel'stva i arkhitektury Ukrainskoy SSR illyustr. spravochnik-katalog (1986). [Monuments of urban planning and architecture of the Ukrainian SSR: illustration. directory-catalogue]. 4. Kyiv: Budivelnyk [in Russian].
9. Plamenyts'ka, O. (2005). Sakral'na arkhitektura Kam"yantsya na Podilli [The sacral architecture of Kamianets in Podillya]. Kam"yanets'-Podil's'kyi: ABETKA [in Ukrainian]. [in Ukrainian].
10. Sytsinsky, Y. (1928). Oboronni zamky zakhidnoho Podillya XIV-XVII st. [Defensive castles of western Podillia of the XIV-XVII centuries]. Kyiv [in Ukrainian].
11. Pidhurnyy, I. (2005). Oboronna arkhitektura Podillya v ikonohrafiyi [Defense architecture of Podillia in iconography]. Visnyk instytutu "Ukrzakhidproektrestavratsiya". 15, 139-147 [in Ukrainian].
12. Ursu, N., Berezina, I. (2011). Khramy-fortetsi na terenakh Khmel'nychchyny [Fortress temples on the territory of Khmelnytskyi region]. Visnyk Kharkivs'koyi derzhavnoyi akademiyi dyzaynu i mystetstv. 4, 151-154 [in Ukrainian].
13. Ursu, N. (2012). Narysy z istoriyi obrazotvorchoho i dekoratyvno-prykladnoho mystetstva Khmel'nychchyny. Navch.

posibnyk [Essays on the history of fine and decorative arts of Khmelnytskyi region. Education manual]. Kamianets-Podilskyi: Axioma, [in Ukrainian].

**Наталія Олексіївна УРСУ,**  
доктор мистецтвознавства, професор,  
Кам'янець-Подільський національний  
університет імені Івана Огієнка,  
Кам'янець-Подільський, Україна,  
e-mail: ursu@kpnu.edu.ua,  
ORCID: 0000-0002-2660-2144

**Іван Андрійович ГУЦУЛ,**  
кандидат мистецтвознавства, доцент,  
Кам'янець-Подільський національний  
університет імені Івана Огієнка,  
Кам'янець-Подільський, Україна,  
e-mail: hutsul@kpnu.edu.ua,  
ORCID: 0000-0001-7945-3587

**Іван Станіславович ПІДГУРНИЙ,**  
кандидат мистецтвознавства, доцент,  
Кам'янець-Подільський національний  
університет імені Івана Огієнка,  
Кам'янець-Подільський, Україна,  
e-mail: pidhurnyy@kpnu.edu.ua,  
ORCID: 0000-0003-0981-2964

## **ФОРТИФІКАЦІЙНІ САКРАЛЬНІ СПОРУДИ НА ЗЕМЛЯХ ХМЕЛЬНИЧЧИНИ: ЗМІНИ ЧИ РУЇНИ?**

**Анотація.** Стаття присвячена дослідженню долі оборонного сакрального зодчества, храмів-фортець, каплиць, укріплених монастирів чернечих орденів, розташованих на землях Хмельниччини. Зазначається, що храми-фортеці стали символами збереження і захисту державності, носіями духовної

та культурної цінності, характерними ознаками світоглядних ментальних і матеріальних основ українського народу. У період росту національної самоідентичності українців, на тлі відкритої російської агресії, набуває актуальності звернення до розгляду вітчизняного доробку, який слугує захисту мешканців українських земель, що і стало предметом дослідження у статті. Прийшло усвідомлення культурної та мистецької цінності оборонного храмового зодчества, що, безперечно, спричинило неабиякий інтерес до проблеми збереження національної полікультурної спадщини для майбутніх поколінь, бажання змін у ставленні до перлин архітектури різних конфесій в Україні.

Автори розглядають конкретні храми-фортеці, розташовані у межах теренів Хмельниччини, констатують характерні особливості споруд, аналізують архітектоніку та ознаки приналежності даним землям. У статті подані відомості про стан збереження деяких пам'яток і констатована недостатня увага державних структур, що відповідають за стан екзистенції архітектурної спадщини України. Акцентовано увагу, що у більшості випадків є претензії до збереження історичного вигляду споруд, до впровадження у процес ревіталізації адаптованих будівельних матеріалів. Ці проблеми вимагають негайних змін. Суспільство також потребує змін, насамперед, у свідомості громадян, зокрема чиновників, від яких залежить шанобливе ставлення до автентичного архітектурного доробку на теренах Хмельниччині. В іншому випадку отримаємо не зміни, а руїни. Наступними кроками у дослідженнях буде розширення ареалу аналізованих храмів-фортець і впровадження даних відомостей у науковий обіг.

**Ключові слова:** оборонне сакральне зодчество, архітектура, фортифікаційні споруди, храм-фортеця, монастир, руїни.

**Список використаної літератури:**

1. Березіна І. Оборонна архітектура України на літографіях Наполеона Орди. Вісник інституту «Укрзахідпроектреставрація». № 15. Львів: інститут «Укрзахідпроектреставрація», 2005. Сс. 143-147.
2. Водзинський Є. Питання охорони своєрідності історичних міст України. Архітектурна спадщина України. Українознавство. 1995. Вип. 2. Сс. 242-253.
3. Данілов І. Фортифікація: погляд у минуле. Нарис з історії оборонного мистецтва. Кам'янець-Подільський, 1999. 80 с.
4. Історія української архітектури. За ред. В. Тимофієнка. Київ: Техніка, 2003. 472 с.
5. Лесик О. Замки та монастирі України. Львів: Світ, 1993. 176 с.
6. Мардер А. Архітектура: Словник-довідник. Київ: НДІТІАМ, 1993. 334 с.
7. Орловский М. Историческое описание уездного г. Летичева Подольской губернии. Подольские епархиальные ведомости. 1864. № 14. Сс. 500-508.
8. Памятники градостроительства и архитектуры Украинской ССР: иллюстр. справочник-каталог: Т. 4. Київ: Будівельник, 1986. 375 с.
9. Пляменицька О. Сакральна архітектура Кам'янця на Поділлі. Кам'янець-Подільський: АБЕТКА, 2005. 388 с.
10. Сіцинський Ю. Оборонні замки західного Поділля XIV-XVII ст. Київ: Українська академія наук, 1928. 96 с.
11. Підгурний І. Оборонна архітектура Поділля в іконографії. Вісник інституту «Укрзахідпроектреставрація». 2005. № 15. Сс. 139-147.
12. Урсу Н., Березіна І. Храми-фортеці на теренах Хмельниччини. Вісник Харківської державної академії дизайну і мистецтв. 2011. № 4. Сс. 151-154.

13. Урсу Н. Нариси з історії образотворчого і декоративно-прикладного мистецтва Хмельниччини. Навч. посібник. Кам'янець-Подільський: Аксіома, 2012. 224 с.