

CHAPTER 12

MOSCOW UNIVERSITY AND SOCIETY, 1835-1847

In the 1840s Moscow University greatly expanded its ties to society. The school had long possessed various means of exerting influence on society and, in turn, being influenced by society, and during the reign of Nicholas, these means became very important, because the tsar tried to suppress any independent social activity. As a result, individuals were forced to turn to theoretical pursuits, and the University, under Stroganov's direction, proved to be a haven for those individuals by providing a less-constricting environment for their activities. Boris Chicherin considered it to be "the center of all intellectual movement in Russia."¹

The University not only was at the center of progressive society, but it also played diverse roles to maintain that position. For instance, in addition to being at the forefront of advances in many scholarly fields, the school was an extensive publishing center, and it provided a medical center for treating patients and experimenting with new techniques. Further, the University was a big business

¹Chicherin, Vospominania, 33-35.

for local contractors and merchants who profited from their transactions with the school. All these means aided the transmission of knowledge from the University to society.

Print media

A traditional "transmission belt" employed by the University was its press. By 1840 publishing activity had become well established in a number of forms, and the power of print in Russia at that time was inestimable. For example, by the time the future historians Konstantin Bestuzhev-Riumin and Stepan Eshevskii entered Moscow University in 1847, they were already familiar with Granovskii's master's dissertation, Solov'ev's master's and doctoral dissertations, and Shevyrev's and Buslaev's scholarly writings; all of which had been disseminated by the school's press. Furthermore, they had almost memorized Kavelin's path-breaking article on the juridical customs of ancient Russia.²

Under Stroganov, the press substantially upgraded its operations, adding its first rapid-printing machines and new type-face capabilities in the late 1830s. This further improved its ability to communicate with society. By the end of Stroganov's curatorship, the press's annual output of works had increased by

²Bestuzhev-Riumin, "Eshevskii," xiii.

more than fifty percent.³ (Table 74)

TABLE 74
Number of Works Published by the Press

<u>Year</u>	<u>at University Expense</u>	<u>Private Expense</u>	<u>Total</u>	
1835	2		57	59
1836	12		78	90
1837	10		68	78
1839	14		69	83
1841	10		36	46
1843	?		44	80
1845	15		99	114
1847	?		48	89

Source: University annual reports except for 1843, 1847, and 1848 from Rechi.

³"Obshchii otchet 1835," Zhurnal, 10 (1836): xl; "Obshchii otchet 1838," Zhurnal, 22 (1839): 25-32; "Obshchii otchet 1836,"; and Trifonov, 225 let, 70. By contrast, St. Petersburg University did not have its own press.

The University used the profits from the press to renovate the Pashkov building and to construct the astronomical observatory, new press building, and chemistry laboratory. The school also gave money to the Rumiantsev Museum, the city gymnasia, the Nobles' Institute, and the Ministry of Education. Thus, the press also affected society by providing financial support for important public institutions.⁴

The major press operation of the time was the publication of the newspaper, Moskovskiiia vedomosti, which came out twice a week (on Saturdays and Wednesdays) and usually averaged about fifty-three pages. It contained news from around the world and the country, official and academic announcements, and advertisements.⁵

The press also printed a number of periodicals, including the school's annual Otchet and Rechi and the short-lived Uchenyia zapiski (1833-36), which Uvarov had intended to use "to inspire young people to study more closely national history." The press also printed the various publications of the scholarly societies.⁶

Some University professors edited their own journals, which carried their influence beyond the lecture halls. In 1838 Pavlov began Russkii zemledelets (The Russian Landowner), while Pogodin, who had earlier published Moskovskii vestnik (The Moscow Herald), edited Moskvitianin (The Muscovite). In 1843

⁴Trifonov, 225 let, 69.

⁵Ibid., 72.

⁶Zhdanov, "Moskovskii universitet v 1825-1855 gody," 49.

Redkin and one of his friends started Biblioteka dlia vospitanii (A Library for Education), which lasted for four years, at which time Redkin began publish Novaia biblioteka dlia vospitanii (New Library for Education, 1847-49). Issues included both explanatory articles, such as Aleksandr Drashusov's "O lune" (The Moon), and more specialized ones, such as Sergei Solov'ev's "Russkaia letopis' dlia pervonachal'nago chteniia" (Russian Manuscripts for Elementary Reading).⁷

In the 1840s the press also published a diverse range of scholarly works. Textbooks ranged in size and complexity from Perevoshchikov's fourteen volume mathematics encyclopedia, Ruchnaia matimaticheskaiia entsiklopediia (Hand Mathematical Encyclopedia, 1826-36, 14 vols.) to Filomafitskii's Kurs fiziologii (Physiology Course, 1836-40, 3 vols.) to Pogodin's Russkaia istoriia dlia gimnazii (Russian History for Gymnasia, 1837). Specialized works included all dissertations defended at Moscow University, such as Grigorii Sokol'skii's Uchenie o grudnykh bolezniakh (Study of Chest Illnesses, 1838). Occasionally, even student works were printed, for example, Fet's Liricheskii panteon (Lyrical Pantheon).⁸

Professors also contributed to the publications of other presses.

Konstantin Kavelin's article, "Vzgliad na iuridicheskii byt' drevnei Rossii" (The Juridical Way of Life of Ancient Russia, Sovremennik, no. 1 [1847]), was an

⁷Aleksandr Drashusov, "O lune," Novaia biblioteka dlia vospitanii, no. 1 (1847): 1-63; Sergei Solov'ev, "Russkaia letopis' dlia pervonachal'nago chteniia," Novaia biblioteka dlia vospitanii, no. 2 (1847): 1-33.

⁸Polonskii, "Moi studencheskiia vospominaniia," 668; Fet, "Rannie gody," (February): 468; and Trifonov, 225 let, 70.

important example of how a professor could use print to influence the context and content of intellectual debate in the country.⁹ Kavelin's article contained the first popular statement of the "clan" theory of Russian history and an explanation of the country's historical development.¹⁰

One of the best "transmission belts" that the University possessed was a graduate who became involved in journalism, like Aleksandr Herzen. His two series of articles, "Diletantizm v nauke" (Dilettantism in Science, 1842-43) and "Pis'ma ob izuchenii prirody" (Letters on the Study of Nature, 1845-46) were enthusiastically received by educated society because of his critique of the prevailing intellectual current of idealism and his explanation of Hegel's dialectic in light of a recognition that change was inherent in Hegel.¹¹

Though print was an important channel of influence, it was not always a simple matter to publish an article because of the rigors of the censorship. Restrictions in Moscow tended to be more severe than in St. Petersburg, and it was doubtful that Kavelin's article would ever have passed the Moscow censors. Dmitrii Golokhvastov, the chairman of the censorship committee in Moscow, was very "aggressive" as compared to his counterpart in St. Petersburg. For

⁹"Vzgliad na iuridicheskii byt' drevnei Rossii," in Kavelin, Sobranie sochinenii, 3 vols. (St. Petersburg, 1897), 1, pp. 5-66.

¹⁰D. A. Korsakov, "Zhizn' i deiatel'nosti K. D. Kavelina," in Kavelin, Sobranie sochinenii, 1: ix-x; Galanza, "Razvitie istoriko-iuridicheskoi nauki," 205; and Offord, Portraits of Early Russian Liberals, 181-82.

¹¹Polonskii, "Moi studencheskii vospominaniia," 649, 653; Fedosov, Revoliutsionnoe dvizhenie v Rossii, 159; Malia, Alexander Herzen, 236, 245; Herzen, My Past and Thoughts, 2:

example, in 1835 Pogodin went to St. Petersburg to complain to Uvarov that he could not publish anything in Moscow. Kachenovskii had rejected two books written by Pogodin, including the simplified Nachertanie russkoi istorii (Outline of Russian History), but both of the manuscripts were accepted for publication in St. Petersburg.¹²

At times, Stroganov provided some protection from the arbitrariness of the censorship. In 1844 an uproar occurred over a book in which the author claimed that the administration in the Caucasus region promoted officials on the basis of personal connections and not merit. Professor Krylov had cleared the book, but Nicholas ordered the book recalled and summoned Krylov to St. Petersburg for an explanation. Stroganov went with Krylov and defended him as not having time to read all the material, so the tsar gave him only a simple reprimand.¹³

Stroganov eventually complained to Uvarov about the censorship and its harmful effect on Russian scholarship. Because of the intricacies of the regulations, Stroganov wrote, "our scholars are very much hindered in the publication of their works, and often the most well-intentioned and useful articles remain unpublished or are published inappropriately." Unfortunately, he was not able to change Uvarov's mind.¹⁴

580-81; and Tikhomirov, Istoriia, 228.

¹²Solov'ev, Moi zapiski, 41; Nikitenko, Dnevnik, 1: 171, 493-94.

¹³Nikitenko, Dnevnik, 1: 277, 232-33; Polonskii, "Moi studencheskiiia vospominaniia," 676.

¹⁴"Stroganov," 527; Whittaker, Origins of Modern Russian

Scholarly societies

Another traditional mechanism used by the University to influence society was the activity of the four scholarly societies: the Historical, the Natural Scientists, the Physico-Medical, and the Agricultural. These groups not only published travels and transactions, but their meetings, exhibitions, and collections also served to disperse scientific information to the public.

Stroganov, while curator, was also chairman of the Historical Society, and he succeeded in getting for the Society the title of "Imperial" and an annual subsidy of five thousand rubles for its publications.¹⁵ Thanks to the hard work of Stroganov and Osip Bodianskii, the secretary, the Society succeeded in putting its publications on a more stable basis than in previous years. Trudy i letopisi (Works and Chronicles, 1815-37) became Russkii istoricheskii sbornik (Russian Historical Collection, 1837-44), which was issued along with the irregular Russkie dostopamiatnosti (Russian Memorabilia, 1815, 1843, 1844). In 1843 the Society decided to end the Sbornik and begin a new, more ambitious series, which it achieved with the issuance of Chteniia (Readings) under the editorial direction of Bodianskii. In a little over two and a half years, thirty-two books were published.¹⁶

The Historical Society's growth under Stroganov's direction found reflection in the steady stream of donations that it received. For example, in 1835 a merchant gave books and materials worth an estimated four thousand rubles. That growth also manifested itself in contacts with foreign scholars and societies, such as the Washington National Institute.¹⁷ By 1847 the Historical

¹⁵Sbornik postanovlenii, 2: pt. 1, 988; Moskovskiiia vedomosti, 23 June 1837.

¹⁶"Pis'ma P. A. Kulisha k O. P. Bodianskomu," RA, 30, bk. 3 (1892): 297; Georgievskii, "Moi vospominaniia," (September 1915): 424-25; and Zabelin, "Deiatel'nosti Obshchestva istorii," xxvi-vii.

¹⁷"Obshchii otchet 1835," xlix; Moskovskiiia vedomosti, 7 April 1837; and Zabelin, "Deiatel'nosti Obshchestva istorii," xxvi.

Society had a total of 167 members (a slight increase from the total of 134 in 1839). It held more than twice as many sessions in 1847 as in 1839 and published four times as many issues of its transactions.¹⁸

Stroganov also presided over the Society of Natural Scientists, which published a quarterly Biulletin (Bulletin, 1829-86) and a bi-annual Nouveaux mémoires de la Société imperiale des naturalistes de Moscou (New Works of the Imperial Society of Moscow Naturalists, 1829-51). It also printed individual works, for example the study of Carl Eichwald, Fauna Caspio-Caucasia (1841), and funded expeditions like Rul'e's investigation of the Moscow basin. All materials donated to or found by the Society were given to the University. By 1845 the Society claimed to have over one thousand members, including almost five hundred abroad (twenty in America), and at the eight public sessions, scholars gave at least thirty talks.¹⁹

Two other societies were also active in the 1840s. The Physico-Medical Society, which aimed to disseminate useful medical information to the general public, held monthly public meetings at which doctors read scientific papers, which the Society published. For example, at the ten gatherings in 1839, forty-one papers were read. The other society, the Agricultural Society, published a Zemledel'cheskii zhurnal, later renamed as the Zhurnal sel'skago khoziaistva

¹⁸"O zaniatiiakh Imperatorskago Obshchestva istorii i drevnostei rossiiskikh v 1847 godu," Zhurnal, 58 (1848): 28-31; Rechi 1839, 83-84.

¹⁹Rechi 1841, 79; Otchet 1844/45, appendix; Kursanov and Deinga, "Moskovskoe Obshchestvo ispytatelei prirody," 353-62; and Istoriia Moskvyy, 506-07.

(Journal of Agriculture).²⁰

Oral media

Yet another means for professors to reach a broader audience were the special public courses that the University sometimes offered, and these lecture series further thrust the University into public prominence. (Table 75) Notable lectures included those by Rodion Heiman, Mikhail Spasskii, and Timofei Granovskii. Heiman taught a yearly course on technical chemistry for Moscow factory owners, while in the winter of 1841-42, Spasskii gave thirty-five lectures on physics, accompanied by experiments. His one-hour lectures began on Tuesday evenings in November; the price of tickets for the full course was set at fifty rubles.²¹

²⁰Rechi 1839, 83-84; Rechi 1840, 83-84; and Istoriia Moskvvy, 508-09.

²¹"O dozvolenii ordinarnomu professora Moskovskago universiteta Filomafitskago chitat' publichnyia lektsii,"

Zhurnal, 35 (1842): 116; Kononkov, Istoriia fiziki v Moskovskom universitete, 199; Orlov, Studencheskoe dvizhenie, 57; and Shevyrev, Istoriia, 569.

TABLE 75
Public Courses at Moscow University

<u>Academic Year</u>	<u>Speakers</u>
1835/36	Heiman, Pavlov
1836/37	Heiman, Pavlov
1838/39	Heiman, Pavlov
1839/40	Heiman
1840/41	Heiman
1841/42	Heiman, Spasskii
1842/43	Heiman, Filomafitskii, Spasskii
1843/44	Heiman, Granovskii
1844/45	Heiman, Linovskii, Shevyrev
1845/46	Heiman, Linovskii, Granovskii, Rul'e
1846/47	Heiman, Linovskii, Shevyrev
1847/48	Heiman, Liaskovskii

Sources: University annual reports, Rechi, and ministerial annual reports.

By far the most important public course was Timofei Granovskii's in the winter of 1843-44. Granovskii had studied law at St. Petersburg University before Stroganov discovered him; and after Stroganov sent him to Berlin to study, Granovskii returned to Moscow in 1839 and began to teach universal history.²²

It is hard to overestimate Granovskii's importance. According to Herzen, "Granovsky's influence on the University, and on the whole of the younger generation, was enormous, and it outlived him; he left a long ray of light behind

²²Granovskii, Granovskii i ego perepiska, 2: 87; Offord, Portraits of Early Russian Liberals, 47-49, 53.

him."²³ For learned society, Granovskii was important because though he "taught the science of the past, listeners took from his lectures a belief in their future," and because of "his public lectures, [the University] became the focal point of the best aspirations and designs for Russian educated society...His name became a slogan, a symbol of social rebirth."²⁴ Granovskii used the University as a podium to propagate his views, and as a result, he brought a large number of people into contact with the school environment and the Westerner point of view.

Granovskii's first lecture of the series took place on 23 November 1843 in the largest University auditorium amidst growing expectation in society. After several lectures on historiography, Granovskii delivered a straight-forward survey of European history from the fall of the Roman Empire to the Reformation. After the third lecture, Chaadaev told Herzen that he thought the lectures were of "historical significance," and a huge ovation greeted Granovskii after the last lecture in April.²⁵ When controversy arose over the nature of the lectures, Granovskii responded:

I am accused of using history merely as a means of expressing my own views. That is partly true; I have convictions and I bring them forward in

²³Herzen, My Past and Thoughts, 2: 500.

²⁴Vasilii Kliuchevskii, "Pamiati T. N. Granovskogo," in Kliuchevskii, Sochineniia, 3: 390-91.

²⁵Herzen, My Past and Thoughts, 2: 504; Nicholas Racheotes, "T. N. Granovskii's Public Lectures of 1843-44 and Their Significance," East/West Education, no. 2 (Fall 1986): 1; and Roosevelt, Timofei Granovskii, 78, 84.

my lectures. If I had none, I should not appear before you.²⁶

The lectures were important for a number of reasons. For one, their message was clear to all present. Granovskii showed that there was no such thing as a chosen people, as the Slavophiles claimed, but that all nations were subject to the same historical laws:

Humanity is subject to the very same laws that nature is subject to, but the laws are not identical in the two areas [because] natural phenomena occur more consistently and purely than historical phenomena.²⁷

For example, when Granovskii criticized the feudal order in Europe, he intimated a direct analogy to the existence of serfdom in Russia with the implication that it, too, would pass away.

Another attractive quality of Granovskii's historical vision was his emphasis on the role of the individual in history. He felt that the "great man" certainly affected the course of history for he personified an era. Granovskii felt that though it was true that "the people is a collective, its collective idea or will must, to reveal itself, turn into the ideas and will of one person."²⁸

A further appeal of Granovskii was his scientific air. At that time, scientific, or materialistic, views were increasingly well received by Russian society, as evidenced by Herzen's articles on "Dilettantism in Science." A Soviet scholar noted that "Granovskii was the first professor of history who put on his banner the

²⁶Herzen, My Past and Thoughts, 2: 545.

²⁷Shchipanov, Moskovskii universitet i razvitie, 183.

²⁸Ibid., 183.

idea of science and used that science...in relationship to other branches of human knowledge."²⁹

A fourth reason for Granovskii's success was his optimism. He once told a class of students that "they belonged to a new generation that held in its hands the future of the country." There would come a time to act, and they must be ready for that moment. His lectures on the historical process reassured his listeners of that future opportunity.³⁰

While the public lectures brought a large number of people into contact with the University, another way that the school influenced society involved the dissertation defenses for the master's and Ph.D. degrees. These were also always open to the public and announced in the newspaper. Both of Granovskii's defenses were major public events, especially that of his master's dissertation, "Volin, Iomsburg i Vineta," in February 1845. The work proved that the mythical Northern Venice, "Vineta," never existed but was a confusion of the Pomeranian townships of Jomsburg and Wollin. Aleksandr Afanas'ev, later a collector of folk songs, attended the spectacle and reported that the room was "filled to the brim"; and he had to stand on a table at the back of the hall to see, but from there it was difficult to hear because applause erupted whenever Granovskii spoke. The public came to see a showdown between a Westerner and the defenders of

²⁹Ibid., 179-85.

³⁰Kliuchevskii, "Pamiati Granovskogo," 391-92, 393.

Official Nationality, as Shevyrev and Pogodin opposed the work. The defense turned into a noisy demonstration of support for Granovskii, and later, Uvarov, after learning of the spectacle, threatened to dismiss all those who had been present, but Stroganov told him, "I myself was at the dispute. There is nothing to be concerned about."³¹

The annual school ceremonies provided another occasion for school and society to interact. These occurred twice a year: on 12 January, the anniversary of the founding of the University, and in June for graduation. At the June ceremony, professors delivered orations, in Latin or Russian, in which they described some aspect of their scholarly discipline. The University later printed the speeches, which gave their contents an even wider circulation.³²

Aleksandr Chivilev delivered an interesting oration in 1848 on "Nauka narodnago khoziaistva i eia poritsateli" (Economics and Its Opponents). It was

³¹Afanas'ev, "Iz studencheskikh vospominanii," 186-88; Otchet 1844/45, 62; and Whittaker, Origins of Modern Russian Education, 176.

³²See Appendix 8 for a list of these orations.

significant for the fact that despite the dangerous climate of that year, Chivilev dared to speak at some length about socialist views, including those of St. Simon and Fourier.

It was certainly true that Chivilev showed little sympathy for any of the socialist doctrines. For example, he said that the "phalange" was the idea that "poor Fourier dreamed about all his life," an idea descended "from the world of magical tales."³³ How will you ever get people to work?

The idea that everyone will work from an inner compulsion, from a recognition of the necessity of doing so, or in gratitude to society for supplying other means is only amusing.³⁴

He reassured his audience of the utopian nature of socialism:

Civil institutions change, the external forms of society change, and state decrees take a new form over the course of time, but there is one thing that never changes, the human heart....[That is] the safeguard against the transformation the socialists want.³⁵

Chivilev's tirade though was important for educated society because, despite his attack on socialist ideas, he did at least describe the ideas publicly. He also hinted at the similarity between the concept of a phalange and the

³³Aleksandr Chivilev, "Nauka narodnago khoziaistva i eia poritsateli," Rechi 1848, 26.

³⁴Ibid., 31-32, 33.

³⁵Ibid., 27.

Russian village commune.³⁶

In a less formal manner, evidence of the close ties between Moscow University and educated society was apparent in the active participation of many professors in the city's literary salons. This participation provided them with yet another forum for disseminating their views and interesting the public in intellectual pursuits.³⁷

Nikolai Pavlov, a close friend of Boris Chicherin's father, maintained a famous, rather opulent salon that was open on Thursdays to both Slavophiles and Westerners. Redkin, Shevyrev, Kavelin, Kriukov, and Granovskii were all regular visitors. Chicherin later wrote that "this was the most shining literary time for Moscow. All questions of philosophy, history, and politics, everything that occupied the best contemporary minds, were discussed at these meetings."³⁸

Other salons also contributed to the enlightened atmosphere of the period. Among those attending the lively Saturday-evening salon of Elizaveta Karl'govna were Bodianskii, Drashusov, Katkov, Pogodin, Shevyrev, and Solov'ev. Granovskii and Kavelin also frequented the salon of Avdot'ia Elagina, the mother of the Kireevskii brothers,³⁹ and Katkov and Pavel Leont'ev, who started to teach

³⁶Ibid., 23.

³⁷Polonskii, "Moi studencheskiiia vospominaniia," 673-74.

³⁸Chicherin, Vospominaniia, 5.

³⁹Georgievskii, "Moi vospominaniia," (September 1915): 418-19, 423; Korsakov, "Zhizn' Kavelina," xvi; Granovskii, Granovskii i ego perepiska, 2: 374, 383; and Polonskii, "Moi studencheskiiia vospominaniia," 645.

at the University in 1847, were often at the homes of the Countess Salias, Dmitrii Sverbeev, or Petr Chaadaev.⁴⁰

Some professors chose to share their knowledge in a more intimate manner and set aside time to meet with students or friends to discuss academic or social topics. Granovskii, Kavelin, Kudriavtsev, and Redkin all held Sunday-morning meetings, and Granovskii also liked to have students over for dinner. The Kavelin meetings tended to focus on Hegel, but the participants could openly discuss both scholarly and current problems. Katkov also set aside time to meet with students and direct their independent studies.⁴¹

Kudriavtsev's Sunday-morning gatherings were well-known, even though his wife did not like the practice and tried, unsuccessfully, to put a stop to it. He was "in the highest degree reliable, honest, unflinchingly faithful, and firm in his obligations,"⁴² and he was extremely warm and polite with students and worked carefully with them. The three future historians, Evgenii Feoktistov, Konstantin Bestuzhev-Riumin, and Stepan Eshevskii were frequent visitors at his house and indebted to him for his guidance. At his home, they would read books and discuss recently-published works--somewhat in the form of a colloquium.⁴³

⁴⁰Solov'ev, Moi zapiski, 109-10; Galakhov, "Sorokovye gody," 412; Granovskii, Granovskii i ego perepiska, 2: 374, 383; and Fet, "Rannie gody," (January): 21-22.

⁴¹Korsakov, "Zhizn' Kavelina," xx; Fet, "Rannie gody," (January): 12; Chicherin, Vospominaniia, 31, 52; and Georgievskii, "Moi vospominaniia," (September 1915): 418-20.

⁴²Georgievskii, "Moi vospominaniia," (April 1916): 89-92.

⁴³Eshevskii, "Kudriavtsev kak prepodavatel'," 372; Galakhov,

Professors performed various other functions which helped to influence society. Some, for example, Granovskii and Hoffmann, gave private lessons.⁴⁴ Additionally, countless students gave lessons, bringing a part of the University into even more homes. Other professors helped to make sure that applicants got properly enrolled in the University. For example, Rul'e helped Nikolai Chaev transfer from the Iaroslav Demidov Lycée to the University.⁴⁵ Finally, professors sometimes used their connections to help students find jobs. For example, when Nikolai Kalachev finished the University in 1840, he obtained a post in the Ministry of Education on Pogodin's recommendation.⁴⁶

Another important role that the University began to play during Stroganov's curatorship, in particular by Rodion Heiman, was as a stimulus of local industry. Heiman had started his career with a dissertation, "O pol'ze khimii v meditsine" (The Use of Chemistry in Medicine), and became the first scientist in Russia to divide the study of chemistry into organic and inorganic parts. After Stroganov made the suggestion that a public course on technical chemistry could benefit local factory owners, Heiman began to offer the course in 1836. Attendance increased from approximately fifty in 1836 to over five hundred by the

"Sorokovye gody," 150.

⁴⁴Chicherin, Vospominaniia, 11; Fet, "Rannie gody," (April): 535.

⁴⁵Chaev, "Otryvki iz vospominanii," 956; Buslaev, Moi vospominaniia, 5.

⁴⁶A. V. Smirnov, "Nikolai Vasil'evich Kalachov," RS, 49 (January 1886): 257; Aleksandr Afanas'ev, "Iz vospominanii," RA, 10 (1872): 807; and Georgievskii "Moi vospominaniia," (October,

end of the 1840s.⁴⁷

Heiman accompanied his lectures with practical work in some of the regional factories. He became a member of the Committee of Sugar Producers, a member of the Moscow Division of the Manufacturing Council, and the director of the first Russian stearic acid factory. The only negative effect of his work was that it often distracted him from academic matters.⁴⁸

1915): 253.

⁴⁷"O kurse khimii dlia moskovskikh fabrikantov," Moskovskiiia vedomosti, 14 April 1837; "O prodolzhenii v Moskovskom universitete publichnykh leksii tekhnicheskoi khimii," Zhurnal, 20 (1838): viii-ix; Przheval'skii, "Khimia v Moskovskom universitete," 54-55; and Khimia v Moskovskom universitete, 17-18.

⁴⁸Zelinskii, "Khimia v Moskovskom universitete," 6; Khimia v Moskovskom universitete, 17-18.

Medical facilities

Lastly, the University's medical faculties, which improved greatly in the 1840s, were a further useful means for the school to assist the people of Moscow. From the figures below, it was clear that the new clinical system that began to function in 1846 provided an immediate and enormous benefit to the city's population. The number of patients treated by the University grew by over three hundred percent from 1841 to 1846. (Table 76)

TABLE 76
Patients Treated in University Clinics

In 1841: in the Therapeutic Clinic--94 sick (77 recovered, 12 died), 1,36? came for advice.
in the Surgical Clinic--68 sick (50 recovered, 8 died), 637 came for advice, and 56 operations.
in the Obstetrical Clinic--130 births (5 died).
in the Student Hospital--253 sick (234 recovered, 3 died), 37? came for advice.

In 1846: in the Faculty Therapeutic Clinic--294 sick (223 recovered, 27 died), 1,066 came for advice.
in the Faculty Surgical Clinic--174 sick (138 recovered, 8 died), 2,239 came for advice.
in the Obstetrical Clinic--311 births (8 died).
in the Hospital Therapeutic clinic--752 sick (534 recovered, 129 died).
in the Hospital Surgical Clinic--524 sick (402 recovered, 15 died).
in the Student Hospital--217 sick (205 recovered, 321 came for advice).
Source: Rechi 1842, 87, Rechi 1847, 11-12.

In addition to their work in the official clinic, some medical professors maintained private practices. Professors Aleksandr Glebov, Fedor Inozemtsev,

and Pavel Pikulin were all famous for aspects of their private work. Inozemtsev's morning consultations turned into a huge polyclinic in which he saw up to six thousand patients a year.⁴⁹

In sum, by the 1840s Moscow University, its faculty, and its students had a wide variety of means at their disposal to extend their influence beyond the University. The press, public lectures, medical facilities, and scholarly societies all expanded their operations while Stroganov was curator, and their activities further solidified the University's foremost role in the country's cultural, intellectual, and scholarly development. As a result, society gained much from the University, as the actor Mikhail Shchepkin attested:

True, I did not sit on the student benches, but I will say with pride that I am much indebted to Moscow University in the person of its instructors; some taught me to think, and others to appreciate art.⁵⁰

⁴⁹Aleksandra Shchepkina, Vospominania (Sergiev posad, 1915), 160-61; Smirnov, "Vospominania o Inozemtseve," 732; and Rossiiskii, 200 let Meditsinskogo fakul'teta, 70.

⁵⁰Mikhail Shchepkin, Zapiski aktera Shchepkina (Moscow, 1933), 293.