The Restoration of Moscow after 1812

Author(s): Albert J. Schmidt

Source: *Slavic Review*, Spring, 1981, Vol. 40, No. 1 (Spring, 1981), pp. 37-48

Published by: Cambridge University Press

Stable URL: http://www.jstor.com/stable/2496426

ALBERT J. SCHMIDT

The Restoration of Moscow After 1812

The calamitous fire which destroyed Moscow in 1812 precipitated a momentous urban renewal, which took on special architectural significance because it made Moscow one of Europe's foremost classical cities. To a greater degree than London, Edinburgh, Berlin, or Vienna, Russia's old capital acquired a "neoclassical" look despite the reappearance in it of much that was traditional and wooden. The purpose of this article is to stress the significance of the fire as a watershed in the city's history, noting those planning and building antecedents that gave rise to the new city after 1812.

Russian classicism as an eighteenth- and nineteenth-century architectural mode did not draw upon a Renaissance-baroque continuum from Europe. Although both the Renaissance and baroque styles had been used by Peter and Elizabeth's Petersburg architects, they appear not to have been precursors of that classicism, or romantic classicism, which dominated Russian building during the reigns of Catherine II and Alexander I.[1] Classicism in this sense probably originated with the English garden early in the eighteenth century. Subsequently it acquired authenticity, "a noble simplicity and quiet grandeur" from the archeological remains in Herculaeum and Pompeii, and marvelous advertisement from the Hellenist Winckelmann and the etcher Piranesi.[2] The work of architects Louis-Étienne Boullée, Claude Nicholas Ledoux, and Jean-Jacques Lequeu completed the break with the Louis XV style. Their language of classicism was of a different sort from that of their predecessors. Boullée spoke for all three when he expressed his captivation by "simplicity, regularity, and reiteration."[3] Avoiding the fanciful and the imitative, they (Ledoux, especially) adopted a severe style in a stark world of spheres, cubes, and pyramids. If these works did not have clear prototypes in antiquity, their unembellished quality won them immediate acceptanee as symbols for perfecting the world of the late eighteenth century. Such was the unsettled state of European architectural style which Catherinian Russia encountered.

Russia entered the mainstream of classicism by adopting a variation of the Palladian style. This was accomplished principally through an emancipated nobility's extensive construction of estate houses in town and country after mid-century. These houses, which mirrored a new Russian elegance, symbolized the "golden age

1. The term romantic classicism was first used by Sigfried Geidion in *Spätbarocker und romantischer Klassizismus* (Munich, 1922). Fiske Kimball introduced it in English in "Romantic Classicism in Architecture," *Gazette des Beaux-Arts,* 25 (1944): 95–112. Henry-Russell Hitchcock has explored its meaning and development in *Architecture: Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries* (Baltimore, 1967), pp. xxi–xxix and 1–19. I am also very much indebted to S. Frederick Starr for his perceptions of romantic classicism and its Russian linkage.

2. Kimball emphasizes the English garden origins ("Romantic Classicism," p. 99); the quotation is from Fritz Baumgart, *A History of Architectural Styles* (New York, 1970), p. 259.

3. Quoted from Emil Kaufman, *Three Revolutionary Architects: Boulée, Ledoux, and Lequeu. Transactions of the American Philosophical Society,* n.s., vol. 42, no. 3 (Philadelphia, 1952), p. 471.

of the nobility" in Catherine's Russia. Under both Catherine II and Alexander I, classical building accompanied diverse, town planning enterprises, not just in St. Petersburg and Moscow, but throughout the empire. The rebuilding of St. Petersburg with its grandiose ensembles became the best known of these undertakings. Moscow, on the other hand, until 1812 possessed a traditional and picturesque look: its classical edifices, softened by light pastels and delicate baroque ornament, radiated warmth, charm, and even intimacy, despite their size. By contrast, the buildings and squares of St. Petersburg reflected imperial grandeur and monumentality. In 1812 Alexander I was well along in his task of transforming the new capital on the Neva, little thinking that his energies would have to be diverted to rebuilding Moscow. The great fire changed all this. Many of the plans on the drawingboards of Moscow architects for the previous half-century would now have to be realized.

Three stages of development describe the restoration of Moscow after 1812. One, the "Project Plan" of 1775, occurred nearly a half-century before the conflagration. Also important were the plans developed between 1813 and 1817 by the Scottish architect and planner William Hastie and by the Moscow Building Commission (*Komissiia dlia stroeniia v Moskve*). The final event was the actual creation of Moscow's center, especially as expressed in the work of the architect Osip Bove. The romantically classic Moscow that emerged after 1812 survived intact until the 1930s, when various Soviet projects altered the city center.

Moscow originated in the twelfth century as a *kreml'* at the confluence of the Moscow and Neglinnaia rivers. From this stockade, essentially triangular in shape, the city emanated, within a series of concentric walls. Adjacent to the walled Kremlin, evolved the walled, commercial Kitai gorod, with its Red Square separating the two. Both of these resided within the confines of Belyi gorod, and all were contained within Zemlianoi gorod. These walls, in turn, were breached at their various gates by radial thoroughfares. Moscow followed the classic medieval fortress pattern of the cross within the circle, the radials intersecting with the fortress wall.[4]

By the time of the accession of Catherine II in 1762, both Moscow's medieval walls and the city itself were in decay. Catherine despised the place and loathed going there for her coronation.[5] Although she intended to renovate the city, she procrastinated. For a time she was persuaded by the architect Vasilii Bazhenov to raze most of the medieval Kremlin and replace it with an enormous classical one.[6] This enterprise, partially begun at the end of the 1760s, did not proceed because Catherine lost interest or felt financially pressed, or both. Although she allowed the Kremlin project to falter, she was not relieved of the burden of Moscow. Fires and the plague in the early 1770s necessitated action. When her Commission for the

4. For Moscow's early development see P. V. Sytin, *Istoriia planirovki i zastroiki Moskvy,* 2 vols. (Moscow, 1950–54) and L. M. Tverskoi, *Russkoe gradostroitel'stvo do kontsa XVII veka* (Moscow, 1953), pp. 39–43.

5. John T. Alexander admirably shows Catherine's distate for the city (see "Catherine II, Bubonic Plague, and the Problem of Industry in Moscow," *American Historical Review,* 79 [1974]: 637–71).

6. The main corpus of the palace covered 11.12 acres, or an area of one and a half million cubic meters. This was twice the area covered by Zakharov's Admiralty in St. Petersburg and four times its cubic capacity. A wooden model of this classical Kremlin may be seen in the architectural museum in the Donskoi Monastery (Moscow). Arthur Voyce, *The Moscow Kremlin: Its History, Architecture, and Art Treasures* (Berkeley, Calif., 1954), pp. 59–63 provides a survey of this topic.

Building of St. Petersburg and Moscow (*Komissiia dlia stroeniia stolichnykh gorodov Sankt-Peterburga i Moskvy*) submitted a plan for Moscow, she took heed. The Moscow office of this body, the so-called Separate department (*Otdelennyi*), actually developed the Project Plan of 1775, a document which would influence planning and building in Moscow for the next half-century and serve as a model for its restoration after 1812.

The plan of 1775,[7] the most important of the numerous plans of Moscow developed during Catherine's reign, divided Moscow into the Belyi gorod "city," the Zemlianoi gorod "suburbs," and the "outlying lands" within the Kamer-Kollezhskii Rampart. It left intact the historic, radial ring pattern and city limits. Intended to revamp the "city," particularly with squares and public buildings, the 1775 plan was not associated with construction then occurring within the Kremlin. In Kitai gorod, where the plan called for three squares, no fundamental alteration of Red Square was planned. Nearby Il'inskaia Square was to have been widened; and alongside St. Basil's Cathedral a projected plaza meant razing the shops between St. Basil's and the Kremlin wall as well as removing commercial stalls and other buildings between the cathedral and the *lobnoe mesto.*

For Belyi gorod the plan was more ambitious. A semicircular chain of squares embracing the Kremlin and Kitai gorod was projected for space cleared of ancient defenses and congested wooden buildings. For the Neglinnaia River area the proposed Okhotnyi Riad, Moiseevskaia, and Mokhovaia squares were expected to reduce the hazard of fire and accent new architecture in their midst. The planners sought to upgrade the Neglinnaia, which served as a dump. They recommended pumping more water into it and improving its appearance so that it would enhance the squares and their buildings. The plan incorporated a regulated canal from the Samoteka Creek (where the Neglinnaia entered Zemlianoi gorod in the north), a widened and deepened bed, straightened banks, and tree-lined quays.

In addition to these well-ordered squares adjoining a scrubbed Neglinnaia, the plan called for another ring of squares at the various Belyi gorod gates. These squares were to be linked by a tree-lined, concentric Boulevard Ring (*Bul'varnoe kol'tso*), arrayed with classical edifices. The distinctively administrative squares would be supplemented by two commercial squares for the city's grain market in Zamoskvorech'e on the Moscow River. The latter would contain the necessary commercial rows, granaries, plantings, and easy access to a good port and harbor.

Frequent flooding of the Moscow River also concerned the planners of 1775. To facilitate drainage of the river's right bank, opposite the Kremlin and the sprawling foundling home, they proposed a system of drainage canals from the Great Stone Bridge to the Krymskii Ford. The planners also urged leveling the banks, reinforcing the embankments with stone, and laying out tree-lined thoroughfares on them. The right bank, once drained, was to have been divided into regular city blocks, embellished with new buildings.

7. For the best and most detailed acount of Moscow planning see P. V. Sytin, *Istoriia planirovki.* For Moscow planning in the context of Russian planning see V. Shkvarikov, *Ocherk istorii planirovki i zastroiki russkikh gorodov* (Moscow, 1954). For the plan of 1775 specifically see M. Budylina, "Planirovka i zastroika Moskvy posle pozhara 1812 goda (1813–1818 gg.)," *Arkhitekturnoe nasledstvo,* 1 (1950): 135–74 and S. A. Zombe, "Proekt plana Moskvy 1775 goda i ego gradostroitel'noe znachenie," *Ezhegodnik instituta istorii iskusstva* (Moscow, 1961), p. 55.

Whatever its aesthetic and practical merit, the project exhibited obvious shortcomings. It placed excessive emphasis on the administrative center and highways and too little on the suburbs and outskirts. The governmental and economic activity planned for the "city" squares would have been remote from the populace. Proponents of the plan, who claimed that it would reduce the danger of fire, were forced to recognize that the masonry "city" contained only 13 percent of Moscow's dwellings. Moscow, unlike St. Petersburg, had to contend with its past.

Although the project remained a model for subsequent planning, it underwent frequent modification. Most important, the Masonry Bureau (*Kamennyi prikaz*), charged to implement the plan, was not allowed to succeed.[8] A shortage of funds and bureaucratic infighting undermined the agency from the beginning, and it was dissolved only eight years after its establishment. Moreover, the plan was disturbed by alterations of Red Square undertaken in 1786, and by a new Moskvoretskaia Street, linking the Moscow River quay to Red Square, begun in the 1790s.

Despite these setbacks, the plan was in part implemented. In Belyi gorod, the central squares inched toward reality by the close of the century. The same may be said of the ordering of the Neglinnaia. In 1786 a canal and pools with parallel boulevards were proposed, and the canal was completed in 1791. Due to a failure of the aqueduct, however, the remaining construction was shelved until after 1812. The origins of the great Theater Square may be traced to the 1770s and the city blocks north and east of the Kremlin and Kitai gorod walls to the 1780s. In Zemlianoi gorod, especially in Zamoskvorech'e, notable changes occurred. Besides the Bolotnaia and Polianskaia commercial squares, Serpukhovskaia and Kaluzhskaia squares appeared after 1798. The Vodootvodnyi Canal was built during the years 1784–86 to reduce flooding in the area. It followed the arc of the old Moscow River bed and was roughly parallel to and south of it. This Moscow River sector indeed changed considerably. In the late 1780s, construction of the quays from the Great Stone Bridge to the mouth of the Iauza began. The Kremlin embankment, completed by 1791 or earlier, became a favorite place for the aristocracy to stroll before the warmer and drier Tverskoi Boulevard opened in 1796. Other embankments were completed by 1812, and the planting of trees along them began as early as the 1790s.

What conclusions can one draw about Moscow planning efforts at the end of the eighteenth century? The achievements were notable, yet two Soviet authorities on the subject disagree as to their extent. P. V. Sytin regarded those years as especially significant because of the "origin, creation, and completion of the Project Plan of Moscow"; however, he insisted that the plan in itself constituted no guarantee of a planned city. Instead it and its innumerable variants "led to a planless, mainly spontaneous building of the city."[9] Sytin was critical of Catherine's planners for exaggerating the diversity of Moscow's parts and for proposing distinctive architecture for each part. After all, wealthy nobles as well as impoverished artisans lived beyond and in the western sector of Zemlianoi gorod. In fact, nobles there often lived more splendidly than some inhabitants in the eastern portion of Catherine's masonry "city." In restoring the city to a tripartite division, Catherine, he believed, took no account of the scarcity of building materials. While she forbade

8. The *Kamennyi prikaz* is discussed in Sytin, Budylina, and Zombe; its role in architectural education is the subject of M. V. Budylina, "Arkhitekturnoe obrazovanie v kamennom prikaze (1775–1782)," in *Arkhitekturnoe nasledstvo,* 15 (1963).

9. Sytin, *Istoriia planirovki,* 2:481.

the construction of wooden building in Kitai gorod and Belyi gorod, she did not preclude masonry in either Zemlianoi gorod or beyond. She consequently spread her materials too thinly and encouraged a lax policy of enforcing building codes within the "city." In the face of shortages in funds and building materials and opposition from vested interests, Moscow's building continued uncontrolled despite the proclaimed aura of planning that characterized the period.[10]

S. A. Zombe, differing sharply with Sytin, construed the plan of 1775 as "one of the most interesting examples of such planning composition." Even into the nineteenth century this project remained a "basis on which were conducted city planning operations. It introduced a disciplinary principle into the planning and building of the city." Zombe took Sytin to task for diminishing the practical significance of the 1775 project and for saying that the principles embodied in the plan were merely whims of Catherine II. More than Sytin, Zombe emphasized that this period in the history of town planning was significant because of the "movement to regulate the planning and construction of the city . . . and to bring its network of streets to a determined, rationally built system." The project of 1775, he concluded, was outstanding "for its great comprehension of realistic ideas over abstractions. . . . Its brilliant continuation of a historically composed city determined its role in the ensuing formulation of the planning and architectural-artistic appearance of Moscow."[11]

During the half-century before 1812 some notable architects contributed to the aesthetic of Moscow's center.[12] Matvei Kazakov, Vasilii Bazhenov, Karl Blank, and Nikolai LeGrand, respectively, built the university, Pashkov House, the foundling home, and the military commissariat—which together formed an impressive classical ring around the old fortress. Kazakov, who was easily the most productive member of this group, also contributed the Senate, the Golitsyn Hospital, and the governor's house on Tverskaia Street to the Moscow scene. These ensembles (each with its broad, city planning implications) and Kazakov's innumerable drafts show the extent of his thinking about a classical city during the half-century before 1812. It is not surprising that these years in Moscow's history have been identified specifically with him.[13]

Classicism won especial acceptance in the radial thoroughfares—the Prechistenka, Great Nikitskaia, and Tverskaia—where the wealth of the aristocracy was mirrored in their edifices. The Iauza River, continuing as the palatial setting it had been since the turn of the eighteenth century, accommodated the new classicism as it had the baroque and rococo. Either in accord with the plan of 1775 or with its general intent, an ordered and classical central Moscow emerged in the midst of the old city during the decades before 1812.

The fiery destruction of Moscow in that year was nearly complete. The Kremlin at the city's core escaped, but its walls suffered serious damage from explosions which occurred at the time of French withdrawal. Beyond the Kremlin walls lay a

10. Ibid., pp. 481–82.

11. Zombe, "Proekt plana Moskvy," pp. 53–54, 96.

12. The architectural works mentioned below as well as other notable works are described in N. I. Brunov et al., *Istoriia russkoi arkhitektury* (Moscow, 1956); I. E. Grabar' et al., *Istoriia russkogo iskusstva,* 12 vols. (Moscow, 1953–61), vol. 8, *Iskusstvo vtoroi poloviny XVIII veka* (1961); and, most recently, Kathleen Berton, *Moscow: An Architectural History* (New York, 1978).

13. The best accounts of Kazakov and his ideas are E. A. Beletskaia, *Arkhitekturnye al'bomy M. F. Kazakova* (Moscow, 1956) and A. I. Vlasiuk et al., *M. F. Kazakov* (Moscow, 1957).

smoldering, ruined Kitai gorod. The portion of Belyi gorod west of the Kremlin from the Neglinnaia River to the Boulevard Ring was thoroughly demolished. Only parts of the far northern and northeastern sections remained intact. In Zemlianoi gorod Zamoskvorech'e especially lay ravaged. Even substantial parts of the city beyond Zemlianoi gorod burned.

Contemporaries verified the extent of Moscow's ruin. John Thomas James, visiting Moscow after the fire, wrote that "street after street greeted the eye with perpetual ruin. Disjointed columns, mutilated porticoes, broken cupolas, walls of rugged stucco, black—discolored with the stains of fire and open on every side to the sky—formed a hideous contrast with the glowing pictures which travellers had drawn of the grand and sumptuous palaces of Moscow."[14]

Statistics corroborated the eye-witness accounts. Three-quarters of the city lay in ruin. The fire consumed 71 percent of the 9,151 houses existing in the city before the disaster. Nearly 80 percent of the city's masonry dwellings were destroyed or gutted; and 67 percent of the wooden buildings in the city were lost.[15]

The magnitude of Moscow's destruction naturally evoked a response from St. Petersburg officialdom, which conceived of restoration in three aspects: (1) providing immediately for housing and shops; (2) creating a long-range plan for a new city; and (3) embellishing the city with imposing architectural monuments and ensembles. The instrument devised to achieve these utilitarian and aesthetic objectives was the Moscow Building Commission established on May 5, 1813.

The fire offered planning opportunities unimagined by Moscow's architects during the previous half-century.[16] Alexander I named a Scotsman, William Hastie, to assume responsibility for drafting a plan for Moscow.[17] Hastie, who built the first cast-iron bridges across the Moika River (1805–17) in St. Petersburg and who became city architect in Tsarskoe Selo in 1808, undertook supervision of all Russian town planning from 1811 to 1830. Although Hastie's plan for Moscow retained features of the 1775 plan, its departures from the earlier project and the cost of realizing the new plan led to its defeat.

Because the Kremlin escaped severe fire damage Hastie concentrated on the areas outside it.[18] In Kitai gorod, he planned an enlarged Red Square by annexing the first line of *torgovye riady* (trading stalls) opposite the Kremlin, eliminating the shops and moat along the Kremlin wall, and creating a square around St. Basil's at the other end. From St. Basil's to the river, he advocated open space characteristic

14. John Thomas James, *Journal of a tour in Germany, Sweden, Russia, Poland, during the years 1813 and 1814,* 2 vols. (London, 1817), 1:404.

15. Budylina, "Planirovka i zastroika," p. 156.

16. The best accounts on the rebuilding of Moscow after the fire are ibid.; A. A. Fedorov-Davydov, *Arkhitektura Moskvy posle otechestvennoi voiny 1812 goda* (Moscow, 1953); I. E. Grabar', S. A. Zombe, T. P. Kazhda, "Arkhitektura Moskvy," in Grabar' et al., *Istoriia russkogo iskusstva,* 8:142–60; and L. Chernozubova, "Iz istorii zastroiki Moskvy v pervoi polovine XIX veka," in *Arkhitekturnoe nasledstvo,* 9 (1959): 15–26; and P. E. Gol'denberg, *Staraia Moskva* (Moscow, 1947).

17. For background on Hastie see Miliza Korshunova, "William Hastie in Russia," *Architectural History,* 17 (1974); V. I. Piliavskii, "Gradostroitel'nye meropriiatiia i obraztsovye proekty v Rossii v nachale XIX veka," in *Arkhitekturnaia praktika i istoriia arkhitektury,* 21 (1958): 75–108 and passim; and Albert J. Schmidt, "William Hastie, Scottish Planner of Russian Cities," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society,* 114, no. 3 (1970): 226–43.

18. See in particular Budylina, "Planirovka i zastroika," p. 145.

of the area today. Achieving these objectives required the demolition of many existing shops, removal of the earthen bastions enveloping the Kremlin and Kitai gorod, and filling the Kremlin moat. Hastie also suggested widening Il'inskaia Square in Kitai gorod to reduce congestion there.

In planning Belyi gorod, Hastie turned first to the 1775 plan, although he made some notable departures from it. He adopted the idea of a chain of squares around both the Kremlin and Kitai gorod and an unfolding square before Petrovskii Theater. His proposal for a new, radial Tverskaia Street was, however, a startling innovation, which took little account of the natural or man-made environment.

The complete devastation of Zemlianoi gorod made the planning task there crucial. Besides proposing elimination of crooked alleys and straightening of streets, Hastie projected eleven squares, mainly at the intersection of the radial highways with the old Zemlianoi gorod rampart. Seven were to be essentially or entirely new.

Hastie's plan of 1813 differed significantly from its predecessors, especially that of 1775, in that it stressed the area beyond Zemlianoi gorod. There, as elsewhere, the architect designated regular streets and squares. His conception of an additional fourteen squares where the main arterial highways intersected with the Kamer-Kollezhskii Rampart at the Moscow city limits was his most original idea. All were to have united the radial streets inside the city with roads leading to provincial cities.

The plan, although approved by the emperor, met with strong objections from the building commission, especially from its drafting office directed by S. S. Kesarino, who deplored Hastie's scheme as impractical, expensive, and time-consuming. Objections pertained specifically to the squares and streets. Some squares were needlessly large; others, proposed for sparsely populated sections of the city, appeared likely to serve no useful purpose. Regulated streets, intended to replace old and crooked ones, would both have infringed on private property and violated the topography. The commission appears to have ignored Hastie's plan and worked through its own architects. It was at this time, for example, that Osip Bove was charged to plan the area around St. Basil's, an endeavor that finally resulted in his design for the so-called *verkhnie torgovye riady*. Essentially, commission members wished to treat Moscow as it was and not as a reduction of an abstract model conceived in St. Petersburg.

The commission's critique of Hastie's project constituted, in effect, its own planning guideline. It rejected many of the squares at the Zemlianoi gorod and Kamer-Kollezhskii Rampart. In fact, the commission regarded all fourteen at the latter location as excessively costly; moreover, their remoteness suggested a decorative rather than utilitarian purpose.[19] In all, the commission recommended the elimination of twenty-six of the forty-seven squares projected by Hastie. Conversely, it proposed twenty-eight squares of its own, most of which already existed and required only alteration. These changes, the commission expected, would save almost fifteen of the nineteen and a half million rubles which Hastie had planned to spend.

19. The spokesman for the commission estimated that realization of Hastie's plan would cost the treasury nearly nineteen and a half million rubles; these fourteen squares alone were estimated at 4,021,772 rubles (see Budylina, "Planirovka i zastroika," p. 146).

Hastie's proposals for the center were subjected to a similar scrutiny. First, the commission discarded Hastie's costly and environmentally destructive new Tverskaia arterial thoroughfare. It accepted the squares belting the Kremlin and Kitai gorod and even proposed covering the Neglinnaia River. In the Boulevard Ring area, it both confirmed and rejected Hastie's proposals. The commission urged extending Arbat Square, left unaltered by Hastie, to accommodate crowds and accentuate its architecture and advised slight changes in Zemlianoi gorod and beyond. For some squares the commission prescribed regulated siting, nothing more. Like Hastie, the commission proposed changes in Red Square, including razing the shops and filling the moat along the Kremlin wall, but recommended retaining, at the north end of the square, wooden buildings which defined the limits of the plaza at the Resurrection Gates.

The commission proposal was carried to St. Petersburg by Osip Bove early in 1814. Matters did not proceed rapidly because Alexander I was en route to Paris; even after his return there were revisions. In November 1815, the new Moscow governor, Tormasov, requested of the commission additional information. By January 14, 1816, the commission had developed a general plan, which after numerous modifications was approved on December 19, 1817, as the "Project Plan of the Capital City of Moscow of 1817."[20] It was this plan which served as the basis for restoring and renovating the city. The commission solutions, reduced to deleted squares and thoroughfares, clearly focused on Moscow's natural and historic contours as well as immediate needs. Its prescription for restoration was intended to limit costs to essentials, which could, it was believed, conform to the classic aesthetic of the age.

Besides this planning dimension, architects had to recognize the critical need for housing. Although wooden dwellings quickly reappeared, special care was given to masonry ones, which, like squares, thoroughfares, and the larger ensembles, had their antecedents in Kazakov's Moscow. These relatively modest homes were intended to embellish the city by providing it with a classical "program." To achieve this aesthetic goal, the city's architects employed the "model facade."

Used as early as in the founding of St. Petersburg, the model facade became by the second decade of the nineteenth century an integral part of planning and building enterprise throughout the empire.[21] Models prepared by Petersburg experts and enforced by law were expected to guide inexperienced local builders in achieving the desired classical look. This design standardization also promised to speed up production, reduce costs, and maintain high quality in building. When model facades combined with similarly standardized town, city, block, and plaza design, classical regularity for a town was assured.

Russian facade design was defined in three albums published between 1809 and 1812. The first two, in 1809, were edited by Hastie and Luigi Rusca; the third, three years later, was prepared by Vasilii Stasov. These earlier albums depicted masonry and wood houses of varying heights—one, two, and three stories—with and without mezzanines. Some facades displayed porticoes, and all were in varying degrees

20. See footnote 7.

21. See E. Beletskaia, N. Krasheninnikova, L. Chernozubova, and I. Ern, *"Obraztsovye" proekty v zhiloi zastroike russkikh gorodov XVIII–XIX vv.* (Moscow, 1961); Piliavskii, "Gradostroitel'nye meropriiatiia"; and Chernozubova, "Iz istorii zastroiki Moskvy."

finished with rusticated or smooth stucco surfaces. Each frame design was derived from the proportional relationships of its columns, pilasters, archivolts, keystones, and cornices, and the number of windows and stories. Stasov, whose designs were judged superior to those of Hastie and Rusca, spoke to the need for utility buildings, greenhouses, craft shops, factories, commercial buildings, fences, and single-story modest dwellings for the less affluent. The success and comparative speed in restoring Moscow after 1812 was traceable to such standardization.

The reconstruction of central Moscow was on a scale quite beyond model designs. Removal of shops, the Neglinnaia River, and the defense bastions built by Peter I around the Kremlin and Kitai gorod made possible an uncluttered Red Square, the Alexander Gardens (*Aleksandrovskii sad*), and vast Theater Square. The chain of squares proposed in 1775 also achieved a measure of reality. Spacious squares appeared at intersections of the boulevards and radial streets after both the Boulevard and Garden (*sadovoe*) rings were completed during the 1820s and 1830s. Masonry and wooden houses conforming to the classical idiom and splendid architectural ensembles surpassed the number standing before 1812. The English traveller, William Rae Wilson, in observing that the city was less bizarre than formerly, admitted that "there is something captivating in this display of Grecian and Palladian architecture intermingled among the old national structures."[22]

The rebuilding of Moscow brought forth a new generation of architects, the most prominent of whom were Osip Ivanovich Bove, Dementii Ivanovich Giliardi, and Afanasii Grigor'evich Grigor'ev.[23] Their work consisted of both broad, city planning enterprises and design of specific buildings. Bove, a prominent member of the commission, was involved especially in remaking central Moscow. His work on the Red and Theater squares, the Bol'shoi Theater, and the Manezh determined the character of the city center from that day until our own.

In Red Square, Bove supervised the razing of the shops along the Kremlin wall and around St. Basil's and imposed a classic facade on the first *verkhnii torgovyi riad* block on the east side of the square. He embellished this facade with twin columns, which appeared to support the arcade's archivolt and elevated the building's center. Both portico and cupola, which served no functional purpose, formed a diametrical axis with the cupola of Kazakov's Senate building within the Kremlin across the square. In accenting the length of the building by introducing an architrave across the arcade and dividing it into three harmonious divisions, Bove remained faithful to the current architectural tenet that elegant commercial buildings should receive prominent display. Work on this classical arcade was completed in

22. Indeed, he added that "it would not be amiss if a few of our architects were to pay a visit to the two capitals of Russia which certainly contain structures that deserve to be more generally known at present" (William Rae Wilson, *Travels in Russia,* 2 vols. [London, 1828], 1:52–53).

23. Cf. Z. K. Pokrovskaia, *Arkhitektor O. I. Bove* (Moscow, 1964). No satisfactory biography of Giliardi exists. For a brief summary of his work, see Grabar' et al., *Istoriia russkogo iskusstva,* 8:207–36. See also E. Beletskaia, "Vosstanovlenie zdanii Moskovskogo universiteta posle pozhara 1812 goda," *Arkhitekturnoe nasledstvo,* 1 (1950): 175–90. For Grigor'ev see A. G. Vvedenskaia, "Arkhitektor A. G. Grigor'ev i ego graficheskoe nasledie," *Arkhitekturnoe nasledstvo,* 9 (1957): 106–16 and E. A. Beletskaia, *Arkhitektor Afanasii Grigor'evich Grigor'ev, 1782–1868* (Moscow, 1976). V. I. Piliavskii has written *Stasov Arkhitektor* (Leningrad, 1963); however, Stasov's role in Moscow was a lesser one than that of Bove, Giliardi, and Grigor'ev. E. V. Nikolaev, *Klassicheskaia Moskva* (Moscow, 1975) also discusses these architects.

1815, and so it remained until replaced by A. N. Pomerantsev's Slavic Revival edifice which we know today as Gosudarstvennyi universal'nyi magazin, or GUM. Bove's design acquired importance beyond its architectural merit because it served as a precedent for the trade row ensemble, a distinctively Russian design.

Moscow's second great square, Theater Square, finally became a reality after 1812. Although long envisioned, the actual molding of this expanse had been delayed by the meandering Neglinnaia. After the fire the commission decided that insufficient water flow and pollution warranted enclosing the stream in an underground pipe. This was done between 1817 and 1819, whereupon work on the Theater Square commenced.

Theater Square surpassed even St. Peter's and the Place de la Concorde in size. On its two long sides the square was encased by four low buildings, similar in appearance. The dissecting streets created a diametrical axis for the square, just as the Bol'shoi Theater, built between 1821 and 1825, formed the longitudinal one. These peripheral buildings, now destroyed except for the Malyi Theater on the northeast side of the plaza, enhanced the appearance of the Bol'shoi Theater. Their corners, where the streets pierced the square, were cubes, higher than and projecting beyond the rest of the building. Their middle floors held shallow loggias with half-columns and the lower story, a small arcade.

In designing Theater Square, Moscow architects had an unusual opportunity; they dealt with vast and hitherto unused space, thereby avoiding the need to reconcile their creations with existing ones. Bove and Andrei Alekseevich Mikhailov conceived of a monumental theater edifice, dominating the square.[24] Reaching a height of 98 feet, the projected theater corresponded to a 1 : 6 ratio with the square's length. By lowering all lateral wings and buildings to uniform height, the architects balanced the horizontality of the square against the verticality of the theater.

Osip Bove was also involved in changing the environment along the Kremlin's west wall. On what had been the banks of the Neglinnaia, he set out the Alexander Gardens, called by Robert Lyall "a magnificent ornament and an elegant promenade."[25] These grounds, nearly twenty-two acres in all, took their name from the tsar, who after visiting Moscow determined that a garden be laid out in this area. By the early 1820s three appeared there. An iron gate and fence bordered the garden in Resurrection Square, where a decorative paving of the walks and cobblestone streets also enhanced the entrance. Beneath the Arsenal Tower, Bove constructed a small Doric grotto which became an integral part of classical central Moscow.

Opposite the Alexander Gardens rose the expansive Manezh, central to a new square, and the restored Moscow University. Intended by Alexander I to house and drill an infantry regiment and provide ample space for cavalry to exercise their mounts, the Manezh was perceived by the rest of Europe as a kind of secret Russian weapon. Meanwhile, Kazakov's university was rebuilt largely in the empire idiom in 1817 to 1819 by the architect Dementii Giliardi.[26]

24. See D. Khripunov, *Arkhitektura Bol'shogo Teatra* (Moscow, 1955).

25. Robert Lyall, *The Character of the Russians and a detailed history of Moscow* (Moscow, 1823), p. 525.

26. See Beletskaia, "Vosstanovlenie zdanii Moskovskogo universiteta."

Central Moscow's radial thoroughfares, long coveted by the nobility and the wealthy, changed variously after 1812.[27] Burned palatial mansions were replaced or reappeared in much altered form. On the elegant Prechistenka they differed from those designed by Bazhenov and Kazakov a generation earlier. The Seleznev house, probably designed by Grigor'ev, was perhaps the most splendid of the empire mansions. Tverskaia Street, by contrast, took on a greater commercial look after 1812. At the opposite end of the radial network, on the Solianka, rose one of the city's most important empire edifices, the Office of the Foundling Home Trustees (*Opekunskii sovet*), built between 1823 and 1826 by Dementii Giliardi and, probably, Grigor'ev.

Besides its architecture, two of central Moscow's most successful projects after 1812 were the Boulevard and Garden rings, derived from Moscow's historic ramparts encompassing, respectively, Belyi gorod and Zemlianoi gorod. Although the Belyi gorod walls had disappeared shortly after 1750, it required the fire to clear remaining obstacles to a boulevard ring. Within two decades the ring and its accompanying squares became a reality. New or restored masonry houses also lined the boulevards to make them an ever popular place for strolling. The Garden Ring rose on the ramparts of Zemlianoi gorod. Although the authorities gave no serious thought to repairing these decayed fortifications after 1812, translating them into boulevards and squares proved to be a major financial commitment, even before the Boulevard Ring was completed. Projected for 197 feet in width, the Garden Ring required paving, lighting, cleaning, and maintenance. The economic question was finally resolved by laying streets and sidewalks that were only sixty-nine to eighty-two feet wide. The remaining footage was left for residents to use for flower gardens.

The Garden Ring was perhaps the most extensive and visionary undertaking by Moscow planners and architects after 1812. When completed, it became a delightful garden area with both modest and elegant dwellings. The squares and boulevards, more grandiose than on the Boulevard Ring, were less conducive to aristocratic promenades. The great breadth of the Garden Ring with its traffic-bearing potential, looked to the future, and, like the boulevards of Paris, imposed a measure of control on the populace. It also enveloped what we have chosen to call central Moscow, where the most dramatic building after 1812 occurred.

The conflagration which swept Moscow had contradictory results. If it presented that city's architects with an unusual opportunity for fulfilling the essence of late eighteenth-century plans and creating a city in the image of European classicism, it also proved a costly enterprise to those immediately concerned. The nobility, whose arrival in Moscow after their emancipation from state service had precipitated classical building in the first place, lost much both psychologically and materially from the fire. Those unable to afford the city simply retired to their country estates or sought preferment in official St. Petersburg, which they had once avoided. Others may have found the new, booming city of investment capital and

27. Descriptions of important architectural monuments may be found in Brunov, *Istoriia russkoi arkhitektury*; Grabar' et al., *Istoriia russkogo iskusstva*, vol. 8; and N. F. Gulianitskii, "O kompozitsii zdanii v ansamblevoi zastroike Moskvy perioda klassitsizma," *Arkhitekturnoe nasledstvo*, 24 (1976): 20–40.

industry to their liking. Yet most contemporaries lamented the decline of aristocratic Moscow and the physical decay of the lovely old houses. In this climate of waning classicism, architectural eclecticism prevailed despite fitful starts in the direction of Byzantine and Slavic Revival (seventeenth-century) styles. When Osip Bove built his City Hospital beyond the Garden Ring between 1828 and 1833, it proved to be one of the last important classical buildings erected in Moscow. The 1830s and the 1840s, especially, witnessed a hurried decline of the style.[28]

Classicism, as it turned out, had not really expired. At the beginning of the present century a new aristocracy—not one of birth but of commerce and finance—joined architects and planners to resurrect the style. They not only built mansions in the old style but sought to restrain industrial expansion by employing planning schemes reminiscent of those devised a century earlier. Although this resurgent classicism abated during and immediately after the Revolution, it surfaced again in the 1930s when, among other things, Gor'kii Street (the old Tverskaia) was recast in a pseudoclassical mold. Paradoxically, the imposition of the Stalin classic resulted in the leveling of much that dated from the aftermath of 1812. Similarly, in the 1960s Kalinin Prospekt's path through the heart of the old Arbat took a considerable toll. Despite classicism's fading image, it has had for Moscow an enduring significance. Moscow's classical facade of just less than two centuries ago established the city's relationship with Europe, a notable dimension in its diverse history and in Russia's encounter with the West.

28. See E. I. Kirichenko, "Arkhitekturnye ansambli Moskvy 1830–1860-kh," *Arkhitekturnoe nasledstvo,* 24 (1976): 3–19.