

CHAPTER 4

ALEXANDER I AND MOSCOW UNIVERSITY, PART II

The War of 1812 was a great divide in Alexander's reign. After the war, the tsar pursued religious, mystical, and, at times, reactionary policies. This change in attitude was disastrous for his newly-created educational system and proved how fragile "autonomy" could be.

Alexander I after 1812

The tsar considered a turn to religion one possible solution to the educational problems plaguing his country. In 1814 Prince Kochubei urged him to combine the Ministry of Education with the Holy Synod, arguing that "religion must be the primary guide in the education of youth."¹ Eventually Alexander followed that advice. In 1816 he appointed Prince Aleksandr Golitsyn, the head of the Russian Bible Society, as the minister of education, and one year later, he created the dual Ministerstvo dukhovnykh del i narodnago prosveshcheniia (Ministry of Religious Affairs and National Enlightenment).²

¹Nikolai P. Eroshkin, Ministerstva Rossii pervoi poloviny XIX veka (Moscow, 1980), 75; Flynn, University Reform of Tsar Alexander I, 71-72, 74.

²"Uchrezhdenie Ministerstva dukhovnykh del i narodnago prosveshcheniia," Sbornik postanovlenii, 1: 971-1011; Rozhdestvenskii, Istoricheskii obzor, 106-09; Flynn, University Reform of Tsar Alexander I, 80; and Eroshkin, Krepostnicheskoe

Reactionaries like Aleksandr Sturdza, Dmitrii Runich, and Mikhail Magnitskii soon gathered around Golitsyn.³ Although none of these men had any prior experience in educational affairs, they all wanted greater government control of education and hoped to isolate Russia from the West since they claimed that:

The whole mischief which has been observed in our universities has been caused by the education, the books, and the men we have imported from the German universities.⁴

When Prince Metternich orchestrated the Karlsbad Decrees in 1819, similar measures ensued in Russia.⁵

Magnitskii's assault on Kazan University was the most infamous of these measures. In 1819 he went there to investigate if the school should "continue in existence," and he recommended that it be closed.⁶ Magnitskii believed

samoderzhavie, 51-52.

³Aleksandr Sturdza had been a diplomat, and Dmitrii Runich was a writer and translator. Mikhail Magnitskii had studied at Moscow University and then worked with Speranskii, with whom he was exiled, during which time he developed reactionary views.

⁴Johnson, Russia's Educational Tradition, 79; Steinger, "Government Policy," 37-39.

⁵Steinger, "Government Policy," 40; Whittaker, Origins of Modern Russian Education, 75. The Karlsbad decrees established government censorship, installed an inspector at each university, and banned certain patriotic student organizations in the German Confederation.

⁶James Flynn, "Magnitskii's Purge of Kazan University: A Case Study in the Uses of Reaction in Nineteenth-Century Russia," Journal of Modern History, 43 (December 1971): 598-614, 604-05;

that:

The aim of the government in the education of students is the bringing up of true sons of the Orthodox Church, loyal subjects of the State, and good and useful citizens of the Fatherland.⁷

The tsar, however, opposed the school's closure and, instead, named Magnitskii the curator, providing him with the opportunity to institute a number of obscurantist measures, such as ordering that classes in the sciences and history conform to biblical teaching and purging the library of "useless" books.⁸

Similar measures followed elsewhere. The minister of education dismissed professors from St. Petersburg, Vilna, and Kharkov universities and declared that Russian professors who had studied abroad could no longer teach. It was also forbidden for students to study at certain "dangerous" German universities: Heidelberg, Jena, Giessen, and Würzburg.⁹

Flynn, University Reform of Tsar Alexander I, 84-99; and E. Feoktistov, Materialy dlia istorii prosveshcheniia v Rossii (St. Petersburg, 1865), 2-7.

⁷"Instruktsii direktoru Kazanskago universiteta," Sbornik postanovlenii, 1: 1199-220, 1203.

⁸Alexander Kornilov, Kurs istorii Rossii XIX veka, 3 vols. (Moscow, 1918), 1: 231-32; Flynn, "Magnitskii's Purge," 609.

⁹"O rasprostraneniia na vse voobshche gubernii zapreshcheniia otpravliat' iunoshestvo dlia obucheniia v universitety Geidel'bergskii, Ienskii, Gissenskii i Virtsburgskii, Sbornik postanovlenii, 1: 1541-47; Regina Eimontova, "Prosveshchenie v Rossii pervoi poloviny XIX veka," Voprosy istorii, no. 10

Reaction took a new turn in 1824 when Golitsyn resigned as minister under pressure from the Orthodox church and the minister of war, and the tsar broke up the dual Ministry into its component parts. The new minister of education became the seventy-year old Admiral Aleksandr Shishkov, a conservative who proposed to curtail university autonomy by allowing the curators to appoint professors and who believed that education should be tied to both religion and class.¹⁰

He asserted that:

To teach the whole people, or a disproportionate number of them, to read and write would do more harm than good. To instruct a farmer's son in rhetoric would be to make of him a bad and worthless, if not positively dangerous, citizen.¹¹

Moscow University after 1812

The biggest disaster for Moscow University under Alexander I was the War of 1812 itself. During the campaign, many students left school and volunteered for military service. Medical students and professors were especially important to the army and suffered significant losses. Then on the night of 4-5 September, after the

(October 1986): 84; and Rozhdestvenskii, Istoricheskii obzor, 128.

¹⁰Rozhdestvenskii, Istoricheskii obzor, 162-64; Flynn, University Reform of Tsar Alexander I, 158-61; Galskoy, Galskoy, "Ministry of Education, 26-27, 109-16; and Steinger, "Government Policy," 101, 100-07.

¹¹Darlington, Education in Russia, 63.

French had occupied the city, a fire broke out that resulted in the complete destruction of the University and the loss of the valuable library, museum, laboratories, and professors' private collections. Only the hospital, rector's house, and walls of the main building were left standing.¹² Confusion reigned throughout that summer, and the entire chain of events illustrated both the regime's mixed attitude to the University and the school's unreliable leadership.

Neither the Moscow General-Governor Fedor Rastopchin, nor the Curator Pavel Golenishchev-Kutuzov, nor the Rector Ivan Heim, took responsibility for ensuring the school's safety during the 1812 campaign. On 23 August Rastopchin did order the curator to evacuate the University either to Vladimir or Nizhnii Novgorod, but Golenishchev refused to take orders from Rastopchin and delayed moving. On 28 August, two days after the battle of Borodino, Rastopchin again ordered Golenishchev to evacuate the University, and Golenishchev eventually left for Kostroma late on the night of 30 August, along with his family and two thousand rubles from the school's treasury. Finally, before dawn on 1 September, the rector, Professors Petr Strakhov and Andrei Briantsev, and some students departed for Nizhnii Novgorod.

Before leaving, they put the archive, library, museum, and

¹²I. A. Fedosov, "Moskovskii universitet v 1812 godu," Voprosii istorii, no. 6 (1954): 111, 113; Kizevetter, "Moskovskii universitet," 83.

scientific collections in the basement of the main building for safe-keeping, but all perished in the fire.¹³

After the remnants of the University arrived in Nizhnii Novgorod, there began a long discussion about where to lodge the school's professors and material. The governor of Nizhnii Novgorod proposed to send the University to Kazan, while Razumovskii, the minister of education, after Napoleon left Moscow in October, ordered it to move to Simbirsk, but Heim delayed any further move. When Golenishchev returned to Moscow in late November, the Ministry now favored setting up the school in Iaroslavl'.¹⁴ Rastopchin had strong doubts about its return to Moscow. He felt that:

There [should] be no University in Moscow for the University and its administration are filled with a spirit of Jacobinism..., and it is harmful that a university should exist in the capital.¹⁵

A contemporary wrote that the "fate of the University is very pitiable, and God only knows what will come of it."¹⁶

Finally, in December the Ministry agreed to let the

¹³N. Likin, "Moskovskii universitet v Nizhnem Novgorode v 1812 godu," Zhurnal, 57 (June 1915): 206; Tret'iakov, "Imperatorskii Moskovskii universitet," 313-14; and Fedosov, "Moskovskii universitet v 1812," 112.

¹⁴Likin, "Moskovskii universitet v Nizhnem Novgorode," 207-12; Nil' Popov, "Moskovskii universitet posle 1812," RA, no. 1 (1881): 390-91.

¹⁵Fedosov, "Moskovskii universitet v 1812," 114; Beliavskii and Sorokin, Nash pervyi, 19.

¹⁶Fedosov, "Moskovskii universitet v 1812," 113.

University remain in Moscow, and that month a special committee formed to review what had survived the fire. In the spring the Ministry agreed that professors and students could return from Nizhnii Novgorod. In July the University council met for the first time since before the fire and decided to begin lectures in August in the two undamaged buildings, a recently-purchased house, and other rented quarters. Classes resumed on 17 August, but only 129 students attended that year.¹⁷

The question of the restoration of the buildings lingered. Already in March 1813 an architect gave the special committee a provisional plan for restoration, but no government money was forthcoming, despite repeated requests from the University.¹⁸ When the tsar finally visited the University in August 1816, he decided to rebuild it. At a council session that November, the curator reported that it was necessary to decide where to locate the school in the city, and he gave three possibilities: (1) rebuild the former building, (2) resettle in a Kremlin property, or (3) buy the General Apraksin house. The minister wanted an immediate decision, before the money disappeared again. The council voted for the first option because: (1) another

¹⁷Popov, "Moskovskii universitet posle 1812," 391-96; Fedosov, "Moskovskii universitet v 1812," 114-15; Tikhomirov, Istoriia, 92; Fedosov, Letopis', 46; and Shevyrev, Istoriia, 421-24.

¹⁸Fedosov, "Moskovskii universitet v 1812," 114-16.

building would take too long a time to renovate; (2) it had the large area required by the school; (3) it was located in the center of town; (4) the press and boarding-school were nearby; (5) the two buildings saved from the fire and a rebuilt one were there; and (6) donations for this purpose had already been received.¹⁹

The curator and the Moscow governor agreed with the decision, as did the tsar, and in January the government allocated 486,699 rubles for the task.²⁰ Work began under the supervision of the Italian architect Domenico Giliardi and finished in 1819.²¹

During the lengthy rebuilding process, in January 1817, Golitsyn replaced Golenishchev as curator with Prince Andrei Obolenskii, a member of a well-connected family and a charter member of the Bible Society. Obolenskii worked hard, even on Sundays and holidays, and proved to be an able administrator.²²

Despite his association with the Bible Society, Obolenskii was liberally oriented and enjoyed good relations

¹⁹Popov, "Moskovskii universitet posle 1812," 414-17; Fedosov, "Moskovskii universitet v 1812," 116; and Shevyrev, Istoriia, 425, 430.

²⁰"O vozobnovleniia zdaniia Moskovskago universiteta," Sbornik postanovlenii, 1: 879-82; Popov, "Moskovskii universitet posle 1812," 417.

²¹Fedosov, "Moskovskii universitet v 1812," 116.

²²Tret'iakov, "Imperatorskii Moskovskii universitet," 333-35; Kizevetter, "Moskovskii universitet," 84; and Flynn, University Reform of Tsar Alexander I, 126-28, 155.

with the tsar. Thus, Obolenskii helped to spare the University from further reactionary excesses, like those at other universities. For example, when Andrei Briantsev, professor of philosophy, died in 1821, Ivan Davydov,²³ an adjunct professor, should have replaced him, but the minister of education refused to confirm Davydov's election to the vacant chair. Then, in May 1823 Magnitskii attacked Davydov's book, Nachal'nyia osnovaniia logiki (Basics of Logic, 1821), just as he had done elsewhere, but "nothing happened." The government did not dismiss Davydov, and no further persecution took place.²⁴

Restoration of the school's collections after the fire was a drawn-out process that depended largely on donations from private individuals, the scholarly societies, and the Academy of Sciences. In the first year after the fire, the library received over five thousand books, and by 1815 it had more than seven thousand.²⁵ The Demidov family took the lead in restoring the Natural History Museum, when in 1813 N. N. Demidov donated his natural history collection of over twenty-eight hundred items, and the following year the

²³Ivan A. Davydov, 1794-1863, was a protégé of Murav'ev who did his doctoral work on Francis Bacon. He later became professor of Russian Literature.

²⁴Flynn, University Reform of Tsar Alexander I, 155-56.

²⁵Fedosov, "Moskovskii universitet v 1812," 117; Fedosov, Letopis', 47-48; and Shevyrev, Istoriia, 439-40.

museum reopened.²⁶

The University also restored its laboratories and other facilities. Professor Reuss rebuilt the chemistry laboratory, and Ivan Dvigubskii, the first professor of technology in Russia, supervised the restoration of the physics laboratory. The botanical garden took a long time to revive under Professor Fischer, and the University sold off part of it for more money for the school's general budget.²⁷

The rebuilt University significantly improved its medical facilities. Matvei Mudrov, who taught anatomy, used his own means to reopen the Medical Department in 1813, but there were few students.²⁸ Then in 1818 the school acquired the anatomical collection of Justus Loder, the tsar's personal physician, for the substantial sum of 125,000 rubles.²⁹

Because of the shortage of physicians in Russia, especially for the army, the minister of war asked Prince Obolenskii to suggest measures to increase the enrollment of

²⁶Biograficheskii slovar', 2: 282-85; Fedosov, Letopis', 47-48; Turov and Dement'ev, "Ocherk istorii zoologicheskogo muzeia," 178; and "Letopis' mineral'nogo kabineta," 79.

²⁷Zelinskii, "Khimia v Moskovskom universitete," 6; Meier, "Botanicheskii sad," 333-34.

²⁸Fedosov, "Moskovskii universitet v 1812," 115; Kovnator, Moskovskii universitet v vospominaniakh sovremennikov, 448.

²⁹"O priobretenii anatomicheskago kabineta dlia Moskovskago universiteta," Sbornik Postanovlenii, 1: 1049-50; Rossiiskii, 200 let Meditsinskogo fakul'teta, 61.

medical students. This eventually led to an unfortunate rivalry between Professors Efrem Mukhin, who taught physiology, and Mudrov. While Mukhin proposed to build a separate medical school, under his direction, Mudrov proposed that a medical institute, directed by himself, be established at the University. The tsar opted for the latter and in April 1819 organized a medical institute for one hundred students.³⁰ At the same time, he allocated 401,288 rubles for the expansion of the school's clinical facilities. By 1820 the school had erected a new building to house a clinic with three divisions: internal illness (thirty-two beds), surgical (twelve beds), and obstetrical (six beds).³¹

While the University's facilities recovered only very slowly in the aftermath of 1812, the number of students who entered the University grew steadily each year. (Table 1) By the mid-1820s the number was rising quite fast, while the admissions rate remained stable or changed very little. The figures also showed that many students were not able to finish the full course of University studies in the three years allotted them, but they were not dropping out as readily as in past decades.

³⁰"Ob uchrezhdenii pri Moskovskom universitete Meditsinskogo instituta," Sbornik postanovlenii, 1: 1166-68; Tret'iakov, "Imperatorskii Moskovskii universitet," 340-42; Rossiiskii, 200 let Meditsinskogo fakul'teta, 61-62; and Vasilii Chervakov, 150 let kafedra Sudebnoi meditsiny (Moscow, 1955), 14-18.

³¹"O postroiike novykh zdaniia dlia Moskovskago universiteta," Sbornik postanovlenii, 1: 1448-50; Rossiiskii, 200 let Meditsinskogo fakul'teta, 61-62; and Fedosov, Letopis', 54.

TABLE 1
Students Entering Moscow University,
1813-1825

<u>Year</u>	<u>Admissions</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Admissions</u>	<u>Total at school</u>
1813-14	129	1820-21	140	494
1814-15	160	1821-22	141	605
1815-16	?	1822-23	147	695
1816-17	58	1823-24	161	768
1817-18	?	1824-25	157	800
1818-19	?	1825-26	205	876
1819-20	92			

Source: Shevyrev, Istoriia, 459.

This was due to standardization, and resulting increased difficulty, of university degrees that took place in 1819. The 1804 statute had only mentioned the degrees of kandidat (candidate), magister (master), and doktor (doctor), but most students left school without those degrees, instead obtaining a "student" certificate, which said that they had been a "student." After a series of fraud cases, Alexander decided to issue new regulations that provided for four degrees: deistvitel'nyi (real) student--rank 14 on the Table of Ranks, candidate--12, master's--9, and Ph.D.--8. A "real" student completed a full course of studies and passed his final exams to receive the degree. A student who passed his exams with outstanding success and presented a written essay obtained the degree of candidate.

For the master's, a candidate had to wait one year, pass both oral and written exams, write a dissertation, and defend it publicly. The doctoral degree required another three year wait and was reserved for those who showed "a

fundamental and deep knowledge of the subject." An applicant had to pass oral and written exams in all the subjects of the relevant department and defend a dissertation.³²

Student life provided mixed rewards during this period of turmoil. Dmitrii Sverbeev, for example, remembered it as a confused time:

The entire four-year university stay remains in my memory as something confused, unaccountable, and this stemmed from the fact that I was too young and...too little prepared for serious study at the University.³³

He divided the student body into two groups: gymnasium graduates--especially clergy--who were already shaving, and "aristocrats, who did not even have down on [their] upper lips." The first group really studied, while "we played and fooled around."³⁴

The clerical students had an advantage over others because of their knowledge of Latin. Most of the one hundred state-supported students were from the clergy, and they formed a special clique that lived on the top floor of the main building.³⁵ Nikolai Pirogov, later a famous

³²"O proizvodstve v uchenyia stepeni na osnovanii polozheniia o sem," Sbornik postanovlenii, 1: 1134-45; Flynn, University Reform of Tsar Alexander I, 128-29; and Shevyrev, Istoriia, 427.

³³Sverbeev, "Iz vospominanii," 79.

³⁴Ibid., 64, 65, 69.

³⁵Ibid., 78.

surgeon and liberal spokesman, had a friend who lived with five other state students in "Number 10." Pirogov often visited him there, in the "large room, filled to the walls with empty beds and small tables, each piled with layers of green, yellow, red, and blue books and notebooks." Usually they sat around talking in the evenings, but once a month they celebrated. On the first of each month, students received their stipends, and everyone dispersed to buy vodka, delicacies, kielbasa, and caviar. They would return, "booze it up" and feast while others kept running in and out with more food.³⁶

While the student body grew in size after 1812, the faculty, in general, declined in quality as many professors did not keep up with new developments in their teaching fields. The University lost six important professors around 1812, including Il'ia Gruzinov, who died while serving as a doctor with the army, and Strakhov, the physicist. A few professors, such as Andrei Briantsev, who had started teaching before Murav'ev still were at the school.³⁷

There were, however, some important professors. Nikolai Sandunov taught Russian civil and criminal

³⁶Nikolai Pirogov, "Iz zhizni Moskovskogo universiteta 20-kh godov XIX veka," in Isaev, Moskovskii universitet v vospominaniakh sovremennikov, 80-81, 82-83.

³⁷Sverbeev, "Iz vospominanii," 65, 68; Kizevetter, "Moskovskii universitet," 86; Popov, "Moskovskii universitet posle 1812," 387-90; and Rossiiskii, 200 let Meditsinskogo fakul'teta, 58-59.

procedure, for which he relied on his practical experience.

He was quick, sharp and energetic:

Denying any kind of theory, not recognizing even Roman law as a theory. He wanted to replace science with Russian common sense and demanded from the jurist only a clear and correct interpretation of the law.³⁸

He used Senate judicial cases as case studies and often staged mock trials. Lev Tsvetaev, who had studied at Paris and Göttingen, taught Roman law and was the complete opposite of Sandunov in both style and interpretation. Tsvetaev, slow and calm and "following foreign scholars, recognized the possibility of a theory [of law] and found its embodiment in Roman law." If nothing else, these two professors gave students two contrasting interpretations.³⁹

In the Medical Department, Professor Loder taught anatomy, and Pirogov remembered an amusing incident about how Loder once dealt with the Moscow city Oberpolicemeister:

[Loder] was on parade in his carriage and the oberpolicemeister galloped up and shouted to the coachman at the top of his lungs: "Go back, back!" Loder, leaned out of the carriage to swipe at the coachman, "Go forward, forward!" The oberpolicemeister

³⁸Sverbeev, "Iz vospominanii," 73-75; N. N. Polianskii, "Predstaviteli nauki ugolovnogo protsessa na iuridicheskom fakul'tete Moskovskogo universiteta," Uchenye zapiski, no. 180 (1956): 169.

³⁹Shevyrev, Istoriia, 451-52.

then shouted straight at Loder, "I forbid you. I am the oberpolicemeister." "But," replied Loder, "I am Justus Christian Loder. Only Moscow knows you, but all of Europe knows me."⁴⁰

Another bright spot at the University was Mikhail Kachenovskii who taught a variety of subjects from 1805 until his death in 1842. Born in 1775 in Kharkov, he was the son of an "unknown and insignificant" Greek father. He initially studied at the Kharkov gymnasium before entering military service where he remained until 1801, when he retired from the post of quartermaster of the Iaroslavl' Infantry Regiment. He then became the director of the chancellery of Count Razumovskii, later the Moscow curator.⁴¹

In 1805 he received his master's, and the following year he obtained his doctorate and became an instructor of Russian in the gymnasium. In 1808 he became an adjunct at the University and, two years later, an assistant professor.

Finally, in 1811 he received the chair of Fine Arts and Archaeology. In later years he taught Russian history,

⁴⁰Pirogov, "Iz zhizni Moskovskogo universiteta," 84; Tret'iakov, "Imperatorskii Moskovskii universitet," 344-45.

⁴¹Biographical information is in Biograficheskii slovar', 1: 383-403; "Nekrolog Mikhaila Kachenovskago," Zhurnal, supplement (1842): 40-49; Nikolai Barsukov, "Mikhail Trofimovich Kachenovskii," RS, 67 (October 1889): 199-202; and Istoriia Moskvyy, 494-95.

universal history, and finally Slavic dialects.⁴²

Kachenovskii was an important editor, publisher, and critic. In 1804 he began to collaborate with Karamzin in publishing the journal, Vestnik Evropy, which he later edited alone. He used that journal and the Trudy of the Society of the Lovers of Russian Literature as a forum to develop his critical views on Russian literature and history. In 1817 he published five volumes of the Biblioteka povestei i anekdotov (Library of Stories and Anecdotes).⁴³

As the founder of the "skeptical school" of Russian history, Kachenovskii denied the veracity of such ancient manuscripts as the Ruskaia pravda (Russian Truth)--the law code of the eleventh century--and the Russian Primary Chronicle. He also considered the Kievan period to be the low point in Russian history and tried to refute the Varangian theory of the origin of the Russian state by attributing that foundation to southern Slavic tribes rather than marauding Scandinavians. Because of these, and other, views, Kachenovskii came into direct conflict with the historian Nikolai Karamzin and his Istoriia gosudarstva rossiiskago (History of the Russian State), which began to appear in February 1818. Karamzin's was the first truly popular account of Russian history, and it glorified the

⁴²Biograficheskii slovar', 1: 383-403.

⁴³Ibid.

role of the state in history, relying on just those sources that Kachenovskii disputed. In 1819 Kachenovskii examined the work in a series of reviews in Vestnik Evropy, and though he praised Karamzin's beautiful style, he denied the veracity of Karamzin's manuscript sources. He did not like Karamzin's "excellent fairy tales" for he believed that "truth is the main source of satisfaction for readers." He also disliked Karamzin's nationalist point of view and the moralizing tone of the work. Even though later historians proved the validity of the sources and Kachenovskii's mistaken judgements, he was successful in attracting students to the study of Russian history.⁴⁴

Despite Kachenovskii's controversial prominence, the University faced many problems in rebuilding its ties to society after the Napoleonic War. The press quickly resumed its work after the fire; the first issues of Moskovskiiia vedomosti rolled off the presses in November 1812. Retooling began in 1816, and by the next year, it had probably the best printing machinery in the country. The newspaper eventually reached a circulation of nearly eight thousand, and the profits helped to construct a new building. The press was vital in re-establishing the University's contact with society.⁴⁵

⁴⁴Joseph Black, Nicholas Karamzin and Russian Society in the Nineteenth-Century (Toronto, 1975), 129; Istoriia Moskvyy, 494-95.

⁴⁵"O postroike dlia tipografii Moskovskago universiteta kamennago korpusa," Sbornik postanovlenii, 1: 1450-52; Trifonov,

The scholarly societies had a more difficult time in renewing their activity after 1812. The Historical Society, in particular, experienced problems. In some years, it did not hold a single session, but it did eventually gather its forces with the help of Professor Roman Timkovskii, who succeeded in editing part of the Laurentian Chronicle, and the historian Konstantin Kalaidovich, who worked on the first issue of Russkie dostopamiatnosti (Russian Memorabilia, 1815). The Society also published Zapiski i trudy (Notes and Works, 1815, 1824). Part of the Society's trouble stemmed from an unfortunate incident in 1812. That year a Kaluga merchant gave the society ten thousand rubles, but during the evacuation of Moscow, Golenishchev absconded with the money, which his family returned only fifty years later.⁴⁶

The other societies were also inactive, although the Society of Natural Scientists continued to publish its Mémoires de la Société des naturalistes de Moscou (Works of the Society of Moscow Naturalists), aided largely by a stipend of 135,000 rubles from the tsar.⁴⁷ The activity of

225 let, 60-61; Fedosov, Letopis', 59; and Flynn, University Reform of Tsar Alexander I, 139-40.

⁴⁶Tret'iakov, "Imperatorskii Moskovskii universitet," 329-30; Zabelin, "Deiatel'nosti Obshchestva istorii," viii-x, xii; Gurevich, Periodicheskie i prodolzhaushchiesia izdaniia, 66; and Fedosov, "Moskovskii universitet v 1812," 108.

⁴⁷"O pribavke summy na sodержanie Moskovskago universiteta v posobie Obshchestva ispytatelei prirody," Sbornik postanovlenii, 1: 1050.

the Physico-Medical Society almost ceased. The monthly Mediko-fizicheskii zhurnal lasted only until 1821, and a mere six volumes of the Commentationes Societatis physico-medicae came out from 1808 to 1825.⁴⁸ One new society, the Moskovskoe obshchestvo sel'skago khoziaistva (Moscow Agricultural Society), formed by Professors Mikhail Pavlov and Fischer von Waldheim in January 1819, began to issue a journal, Zemledel'cheskii zhurnal (Agricultural Journal). By 1828 the society had established a collection of forty-eight agricultural machines.⁴⁹ Although the Moscow societies were in bad shape, those in the provinces fared worse. For example, at Kharkov the Scientific Society held only one meetings in 1818, and none thereafter.⁵⁰

On the other hand, the postwar years were the high point of the activity of the Society of the Lovers of Russian Literature under the chairmanship of Anton Prokopovich-Antonskii, the rector of the University and its Noble Pension. The Society was at that time the center of the emerging trend of literary romanticism and oversaw the publishing of the literary works of Pension students in four volumes of Kalliona (1815-20) and its own works as Trudy,

⁴⁸Gurevich, Periodicheskie i prodolzhaushchiesia izdaniia, 62.

⁴⁹S. S. Dmitr'ev, "Professor Ia. A. Linovskii i sozдание sel'sko-khoziaistvennogo muzeia pri Moskovskom universitete," Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta: seriiia istoriia, no. 2 (1959): 82-84; Fedosov, Letopis', 50.

⁵⁰Flynn, University Reform of Tsar Alexander I, 138.

(Works, 1812-28). It held its enormously popular public sessions in the main hall of the Noble Pension.⁵¹

In summary, during the second half of Alexander's reign, the University confronted the formidable task of rebuilding after the fire of 1812. Though the loss of its buildings, library, and museum was great, and to some extent irreplaceable, the school did restock its collections. The buildings were restored, and the medical facilities expanded. Although the school did have a few outstanding professors, on the whole the faculty did not consistently improve. The school's prominence in cultural life found reflection in the growing enrollment of students and in the fact that the University was at the center of two major intellectual developments of the period: Kachenovskii's skeptical school of history, promulgated both from the podium and in the press, and the battle between the classicists and romanticists in which the Society of the Lovers of Literature played a role. The school provided the institutional platform for both debates.

⁵¹Shevyrev, Istoriia, 458; Trifonov, 225 let, 57-59; Gurevich, Periodicheskie i prodolzhaiushchiesia izdaniia, 40, 71; and Istoriia Moskvvy, 506.