

---

---

## БИБЛИОГРАФИЯ

---

---

**Alexander M. Martin.**  
**Enlightened Metropolis: Constructing Imperial Moscow, 1762–1855.**  
**(Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013. 344 pp.)**

### **I. Vladimirsky**

This book is a part of a project on Russian political and intellectual history during the long 18<sup>th</sup> century. Western researches mostly turn their attention to the history of St. Petersburg as a symbol of westernization of Russia, so called "window into Europe" and a pipe which connected Russia with the civilized world. The history of Moscow deserves less attention and usually was concentrated on the period of Ivan the 4<sup>th</sup> (the Terrible) and time of Troubles' aftermath (1598–1613). The book of Alexander Martin is one of the first examples to fill this intellectual gap.

The book is rich of historical sources and materials from TsIAM (Central Historical Archive of Moscow)' journals and newspapers concerning that period such as *Moskovskie Vedomosti* (The Moscow Herald), *Russkii Arkhiv* (The Russian Archive), *Russkii Vestnik* (The Russian Messenger), *Russkaya Starina* (Old Times in Russia), *Izvestiia Moskovskoi Gorodskoi Dumy* (Reports of the Moscow City Duma) and others.

The beginning of Moscow as an enlightened Metropolis can be found during the extended visit to Moscow by the Empress Elizabeth in December 1752. For that time it was hardly possible to think about Moscow as a proper place to reside the Russian government and the court. Only one building in Moscow, the Golovin palace, could suit this demand (p. 1). As a result of this long visit, which lasted about half a year, it was decided to turn Moscow into a refined European city (pp. 2–6). The book is organized in thematically rather in chronological order around central processes or events that turned Moscow into *stolitsa* (metropolis).

The first chapter "The Enlightened Metropolis and the Imperial Social Project" deals with the philosophical conception of the enlightenment. Denis Diderot in his visit to St. Petersburg in 1773-4 insistently recommended to Catherine the 2<sup>nd</sup> to move the capital back to Moscow, the real crossroad of the Russian

commercial life that located close to the estates of the Russian nobility and far from foreign threats (pp. 11–13). Catherine repeatedly criticized Moscow for poor city infrastructure, total ignorance of the city dwellers and their barbaric behavior (pp. 17–18). She decided to transform the city, according to Enlightenment rationalism. The general plan of Moscow reconstruction was ready in 1775, three brilliant architects – Ivan Blank, Matvei Kazakov and Vasilii Bazhenov were responsible for its implementation. Another important component in Moscow reconstruction was the people. Moscow was desperately needed the urban "third estate". This problem could be solved by educating a new race of men and remaking the system of social estates (pp. 24–35).

The second chapter "Space and Time in the Enlightened Metropolis" describes Moscow's urban space under Catherine and her successors. Moscow traditionally was associated with a Russian village with its wooden buildings and low-density sprawl. On the reconstruction attempts was to break this Orientalist stigma (pp. 37–43). Not only the city buildings and the lack of planning were strongly criticized, but as well it's disgusting smell, lack of elementary hygiene and poor quality of water. The other problem which seems unimportant to modern person is the feeling of discomfort caused by the daily cycle of light and dark (pp. 51–56). In Moscow in mid-18<sup>th</sup> century there was no street lighting and clouds frequently covered the moon and the stars. To light the houses, dwellers usually used *luchina* (rush-light) or candles. Artificial light at home and outside usually was associated with the order. The additional element of night life was the presence of military patrols to keep the city dwellers safe. The new city police was established in 1782, one of the policeman's tasks was to light the streets at night (p. 58).

Chapters three and four deals with importance of visual and literary representation of Moscow in Russia and abroad. Important task in visual representation was played by cartographers, graphic artists, statisticians and historians such as Gerhard Friedrich Muller, Vasilii Ruban and Fedor Alexeev (pp. 67–68). City maps should be prepared by professional geodesists according the Western examples. Very often new maps showed the reality, existed on the ground with projected developments. Visual images of Moscow mostly pictured genre scenes, examples of Moscow architecture and symbols of monarchy and religion (court ceremonies, triumphal arches, fireworks, churches and monasteries) (pp. 88–91). Nikolai Karamzin, Sergei Glinka, Alexei Malinovskii and Konstantin Batiushkov worked a lot for textual representation of Moscow as a European and at the same time a Russian city (pp. 116–126).

In the fifth chapter a special attention of the author deserves the city population (aristocracy, lesser nobles, clergy and merchants). Moscow provided a rich variety of cultural opportunities for its dwellers. Aristocracy due to their wealth and social power, allowed to more privileged social groups participation in cultural events by hosting cultural events (pp. 139-150). At the top of the city social hierarchy was a tiny group of the nobility and aristocracy that represented about five percent of the city population. Beneath the, was the middling group represen-

ted by the estates of nobles, clerics, merchants, rich townspeople, guild artisans, government clerks that comprised between five to seven percent of the population. This group later was categorized as *raznochintsy* (people of various ranks). At the bottom as everywhere else were the lower classes, the largest population group.

The 1812 War with Napoleon had a great influence on Moscow and its citizens. Chapter six of the book deals with the Patriotic war of 1812 and responds to the war within the Russian society. Governor-general of Moscow, count Fedor Rostopchin had little respect for liberal western values and thought that the order rested on serfdom and on the bonds of family (pp. 184–187). Unlike Fedor Glinka, who was familiar with Moscow life and dwellers, Rostopchin saw in his position a sign of power and tried to avoid the unpredictability of city crowds. These two people symbolized two different approaches to the war with Napoleon. While Rostopchin thought that the war was a threat to Russia's social harmony, Glinka saw in the war an opportunity to forge a new national solidarity (p. 189). Lack of power and discipline in Moscow influenced the French; Napoleon has nothing to do with an anarchic "carnival" within his troops and on the streets of the city (pp. 198–203).

Chapter seven refers to life of common folk in Moscow during the reign of Nikolai the 1<sup>st</sup>. After the war and the fire of 1812, Moscow become provincial with the city aristocracy had gone into a gradual decline. The city lost its dynamism comparing to other European capitals (pp. 220–221). At the same time the city continued to grow and its population nearly doubled towards 1863. News arrivals from the provinces were the main reason of the city population growth. Cultural and economic dominance slowly was passing from the nobility to the "middle estate" (p. 231). City area was divided into three socially distinct neighborhoods. City center lies inside the Garden Ring (the Kremlin, Kitai-Gorod, White City and Earthen City), here were located the aristocracy, commercial and officialdom. Outside the Garden Ring were socially amorphous suburbs (like Sushchevskaja) and Zamoskvorech'e became a home for the merchantry. Not only place of residence but personal names and the way they were recorded became the marks of identity and changing the social status (pp. 244–249).

The last eight chapter of the book describes the vision of Moscow through the eyes of its dwellers at the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Moscow had become a city of industry, manufacturing and trade (p. 261). City status was considerably improved with the opening of regular traffic between Moscow and St. Petersburg on November, 1<sup>st</sup>, 1851. Two years later, the wires strung along the rails began carrying telegrams. During Nikolai reign Moscow was associated with the regime's official ideology (Official Nationality) and considered as a bastion of tranquility. In the eyes of contemporaries, Moscow was a symbol of the Russian tradition and the progress, city authorities took care about order, security, cleanliness, justice and care for the sick and the disabled (pp.266–269).

The book of Alexander Martin is strongly recommended for students and researches of Russian and Soviet history, urban history and everybody who in-

terests in modern history. It is full by important primary sources, traditional and updated secondary sources, with their deep analysis and proposals that comprise the basis for further academic research.

Our editorial board member Alexander Martin became Co-Winner for UHA Best Book Award (Non-North America). His book was recognized the best book of the year 2013–2014 in the category of "Anthology of Urbanism". The prize was established by the American Association of history of urbanism. The book was received exceptionally well (the theme is virtually unexplored by Western historians as it deals with Moscow, not St. Petersburg as an imperial capital) – the Association quotation.

**Александр М. Мартин.**

**Просвещенная столица: Создание Имперской Москвы, 1762–1855.  
(Оксфорд: Издание Оксфордского университета, 2013, 344 с.)**

**Ирена Владимирски**