The young editors of *Moskvitianin*

The appearance of intelligentsia conservatism in Russia is usually associated with the rise of intelligentsia radicalism. Conservative thought among the *intelligentsia* is said to have been provoked by the materialism, scientism, and utilitarianism of the radical nihilists in the early 1860s. This view is by no means entirely inaccurate. Conservative formulations in the post-Emancipation period bore the impress of just such a reaction. Nevertheless, major changes in ideology rarely occur overnight but generally require a lengthy period of intellectual gestation. The philosophical, historical, and national principles on which the new conservatism in Russia was based did not spring up full-blown from the clash with the nihilists. Instead, its fundamental tenets were worked out in a relatively complete form in the years before and during the Crimean War (1853-5) and simply applied by conservative *intelligentsia* as a counter-weight to nihilism in the changed intellectual and social atmosphere of the Emancipation era. The new conservatism first manifested itself as a theory of literature and literary criticism, but, as was often the case in Russia, literature and criticism opened broad avenues into philosophy and social thought.

In 1850 a group of young Moscow writers and poets, literary critics, and dilettante philosophers gathered in the editorial office of the patriotic journal *Moskvitianin*. Contemporaries dubbed the little band of literary bohemians the 'young editors' of *Moskvitianin*. While the founding, or 'old,' editor, M.P. Pogodin, retained control of the political or historical sections of the journal, his junior associates, from 1850 to 1856, assumed responsibility for its *belles-lettres* and literary criticism. For a short while at the beginning of the decade, the impact of this brilliant, if erratic, youthful coterie made *Moskvitianin* one of the most vital and widely read
It is true that Pogodi'n's preoccupation with his journals in Russia. The group, which had come together by chance and never formed more than a loose association, gradually disintegrated as disagreements among them multiplied. In 1856 it dispersed completely when Moskvitianin ceased publication. Before they went their separate ways, however, the young editors established sufficient agreement on fundamentals to create the ideological basis of intelligentsia conservatism in the Emancipation period.

Moskvitianin, which had been established in 1841, had assiduously cultivated a reputation for heavy-handed pedantry, punctuated only occasionally by flashes of determination and insight. Its editor, Pogodin, and his colleague S.P. Shevyrev, respectively professors of history and literature at the University of Moscow, had chosen the motto 'Orthodoxy, Autocracy, and Nationality' as the basis of their program. S.S. Uvarov, Nicholas I's minister of enlightenment, had, of course, originally authored the slogan as an antidote to the formula 'Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity' of revolutionary Europe, and such blatant association with government-sanctioned ideology had done little to improve the reputation of the professors or their journal. Moskvitianin had become equated in the public mind (not entirely fairly) with the obscurantist proponents of 'official nationality' in bureaucratic and journalistic circles. The prospects of Moskvitianin were further jeopardized by the tortured prose of the two academics, which thoroughly disenchanted both new readers and old subscribers. The result was that by 1850 Moskvitianin was insolvent, and Pogodin was in desperate need of fresh talent.1

Opportunity presented itself late in 1849. Impressed by the manuscript of Bankrot (The Bankrupt), a play about merchant life in Moscow by the still novice writer A.N. Ostrovsky, Pogodin hastened to meet the author. Early in December he arranged a literary evening at which Ostrovsky read his play to a large company. Among the distinguished guests were N.V. Gogol' and A.S. Khomiakov. The performance was repeated a few days later at the home of the Countess E.P. Rostopchina, who was soon to become the young editors' patroness.2

Ostrovsky had already established friendly relations with a junior associate of Moskvitianin. In 1847 he had by chance met T.I. Filippov, an aspiring philosopher and a protégé of Pogodin, in one of Moscow's student taverns. Filippov introduced Ostrovsky to the budding critic E.N. Edel'son. Shortly afterwards two poets, B.N. Almazov and L.A. Mei, were drawn into the circle. The nucleus of the young editors' set was completed in 1850 when A.A. Grigor'ev begged, on his knees the story went, to be admitted to the group. The novelist A.F. Pisemsky was also involved with the circle until 1852. It was these young men who were directly concerned with the day-by-day editing of the literary section of Moskvitianin. Many others hovered on the fringes. The ready access the young editors enjoyed to the pages of a journal at a time of severe censorship restrictions inevitably attracted many ambitious authors to them at one time or another.3

Of the inner circle in 1850, Almazov, at twenty-three, was the youngest, and Grigor'ev, at twenty-eight, the oldest. The young editors were, therefore, roughly a generation younger than the early Slavophiles with whom they have most often been associated by historians. Almazov, who was the product of high Moscow society, boasted by far the best pedigree. The others, for the most part, were the sons of bureaucratic officials on the lower and middle levels of the Table of Ranks.4 The offspring of lesser bureaucrats, they had not followed in their fathers' footsteps but had instead chosen literary careers. At least two of the young editors, Ostrovsky and Grigor'ev, were intimately acquainted with the life-style of the Russian merchants among whom they had spent their childhoods. Their understanding of merchant life was no doubt enhanced by the friendship of I.I. Shanin, a young merchant who was an intimate of the young editors' circle.

The collaboration of the old and young editors of Moskvitianin was not as unlikely as it at first appeared. Certainly, it was not as incongruous as some 'progressive' historians at the turn of the last century supposed.5 It is true that Pogodin's preoccupation with his distinctive version of 'Orthodoxy, Autocracy, and Nationality' seemed remote from the primarily aesthetic interests of the young editors. Money was rarely far from Pogodin's thoughts, and he was undoubtedly, at least in part, motivated by nothing more than purely financial considerations in his efforts to attract youthful contributors to his journal. His pecuniary expectations were not disappointed. In 1851, on the strength of Ostrovsky's plays and Pisemsky's stories, subscriptions to Moskvitianin more than doubled, to 1,100.6

In fairness, however, it should be said that the sources reflect a genuine sense of gratitude towards Pogodin on the part of a number of young intellectuals, a gratitude that was based on a natural affinity. Pogodin, who had risen from humble origins, had already developed some of the ideas associated with the conservative wing of the intelligentsia. He was not only a teacher, but in his modest way also a patron, and one more influential in Russian intellectual life of the mid-century than has commonly been granted. Almazov and Grigor'ev

---
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Like their olde editors, Dostoevsky, Grigor'ev, and Native Soil conservatism repeatedly proclaimed Pogodin as their spiritual and intellectual mentor; Ostrovsky lived amicably in the irascible professor's home for some time in the early 1850s and continuously demonstrated his loyalty by publishing most of his new plays in Moskvitianin until 1855, in spite of receiving only fifteen rubles per folio page from Pogodin at a time when Sovremennik and Otechestvennye zapiski were offering fifty rubles. Not all the young editors were so idealistically motivated. Pisemsky, for one, abandoned Moskvitianin as soon as he got a better offer. But for most there were more cogent reasons for alloying with Pogodin than blatant careerism.

Pogodin was one of the pioneers in the exploration of Russian nationality. In company with Viazemsky, Chaadaev, and Odoevsky, he expanded on the idea of Russian universality earlier raised by Karamzin. In his patriotic writings, Pogodin offered a formula that combined the Slavophiles' preference for Russia before Peter with the westernizers' admiration for the changes Peter had brought about in the life and orientation of Muscovy. Pogodin's conclusions were grounded in his studies of Russian history. He began with the popular, and remarkably durable, theory that the Russian state had not been founded on foreign conquest as had the states of western Europe. Consequently, Russia had been spared the feudal tyranny and class strife that had ravaged and divided the nations of the West. Instead, Pogodin asserted, during the Russian middle ages, forms of self-administration, communal tenure, and patriarchal freedom had evolved that guaranteed social harmony. Pogodin accepted that such an idyll was not destined to last in a world of competitive nation states. Geopolitics had required Peter the Great to interrupt Russia's national (narodnoe) development. In order to safeguard their independence Russians had been compelled to crush their northern enemies and arm themselves with the weapons and tools of western Europe. Pogodin believed that in the century following Peter's reign the goal of external security had been attained. With the establishment of an autonomous Russian presence among the nations of Europe, the Petrine age had completed its mission, and the stage was set for a new era in Russian historical development. Pogodin was an admirer of Schelling and was deeply influenced by his vision of a universal culture in which the cultural and moral principles governing East and West were commingled in a new and higher civilization. He was convinced that Peter's reforms, by bringing the West to the East, had made such a synthesis possible in Russia.

The essential elements of Pogodin's vision were his sensitivity to the organicism or continuity of Russian history and his relativist conviction that each separate phase of Russia's historical development was valuable in and for itself. Every part of the nation's history, including the Petrine era, was held to be an independent and unique expression of a greater, still unconscious whole. Pogodin recognized the necessity of the past—all of it—in the preparation of Russia's great future. If the Slavophiles denounced the entire Petrine period as a hideous error (though one with which Russians now had to cope), Pogodin welcomed it as a necessary and natural step towards the fulfillment of Russia's purpose. The prosaic and stifling reality of Nicholas I's Russia might not have been adequate in Pogodin's eyes, but he was supremely confident that something entirely satisfactory was destined to emerge from it. The relativism and immanentism that were intrinsic to his interpretation of Russian history were Pogodin's most important bequest to the young editors and to the subsequent development of Russian conservatism.

There were other affinities between the old and young editors of Moskvitianin. The young editors had originally been attracted to one another by their passion for the Russian folk-song. Like their older Slavophile contemporary P. V. Kireevsky, they collected the traditional songs of the people and sang them with all the enthusiasm of the newly converted. The young editors revered Russia's national songs as spontaneous expressions of the national soul and offered them as evidence of the artistic and historical sensibilities of Russians in past ages. The folk-song, they were fond of repeating, put to the lie the facile assertion of some westernizers that Russia had produced nothing of cultural value before the time of Peter the Great. With their enthusiasm for the nation's traditional songs, the young editors were more amenable to collaboration with a journal that had for several years proclaimed the glories of the Russian middle ages than with those which denounced or altogether ignored them.

Finally, there was the crucial question of literary criticism, which was and remained the primary concern of the young editors. Almost all historians of the period agree that the quality of criticism in the progressive St Petersburg journals declined sharply after the death of Belinsky in 1848. It was, however, more the tendency of St Petersburg literary criticism than its quality that offended the young editors.

The period 1848 to 1855 saw the predominance in Russian literature and literary criticism of the natural school. On the dubious authority of Gogol's Dead Souls, natural school writers assumed a critical and negative attitude towards almost all aspects of Russian reality. Natural school literary critics, such as Sovremennik's I.I. Panaev, valued literature merely as a weapon for the realization of proscribed social aims.
Panaev and even his less abrasive counterparts on the more conservative Otechestvennye zapiski denied the very existence of a native Russian literature and scoffed at Russian folk poetry as inartistic. The natural school of literary criticism represented the antithesis of everything the young editors stood for in art. Since Shevyrev, with some assistance from M.A. Dmitriev, had for several years been combating the natural school tendency in Russian literature on the pages of Moskvitianin, the young editors understandably deemed it to be an appropriate organ for their own ideas about literature.

Unfortunately for those who wished to study them, the young editors were more remarkable for the enthusiasm than for the symmetry of their thought. They were representative of a youthfully exuberant creativity, uninhibited by tiresome thoughts of consistency or polish. They lived intensely and wrote feverishly. Much of their thought was still vague and a great deal was left altogether unsaid. In later years Grigor'ev liked wistfully to refer to this chaotic period as the 'antediluvian' stage of the movement that was to possess him until his death. It was only after 1856, when the young editors had gone their separate ways, that he was able to impose a semblance of order on the thoughts that germinated among his youthful associates.

Looking back in 1857 to the heyday of the young editors, Grigor'ev identified the three principal components of their movement: art (Iskusstvo), democratism (Demokratizm), and immediacy (Neposredstvennost'). In these three elements were contained the ingredients of a profoundly conservative outlook that was to have far-reaching consequences for the later history of Russian conservatism. In a slightly altered order they still provide the most satisfactory basis for an examination of the young editors' movement.

The young editors were cultural nationalists in the tradition of Herder and the German romantics. Like Herder and his romantic followers they regarded the nation as a cultural entity and vigorously defended the value of belonging to a particular national culture against the universalizing claims of humanity. Again like Herder and a number of the German romantic conservatives, they believed that each nation was the possessor of an ideal which it developed during the course of its history and which, in time, contributed to the fullness of the universe. In their view of 'art,' the young editors were the Russian heirs of Herder's expressionism. By art Grigor'ev not only meant the primacy of artistic creativity over all the other activities of mind, but also intended to convey the notion that art, and especially literature, were a complete and independent expression of the national ideal. At the root of the young editors' aesthetic theory, therefore, was the assumption that art and nationality were inseparable. In an article in Moskvitianin in 1850, Ostrovsky argued that the literature of all advanced peoples grew in parallel with their social progress. Or, as Grigor'ev put it in 1853, a given work of art was linked organically to the 'state, moral and social concepts' of a particular people at a particular time. The life of a society, Ostrovsky continued, casts up certain character types for artistic depiction. The artist tested these national types against the universal moral ideal, which in Carlyle's phrase -and Carlyle was known to the young editors -'lay in the hearts of all men' but to which the artist was particularly sensitive. If a type lived up to the ideal the artist legitimized it; but if it fell short it became the object of satire. Literature was not simply a mirror of national life but a prism by which the national experience was reflected through universal moral and aesthetic laws. Since every artist was organically bound to his own time and place, there could be no literature without nationality.

Ostrovsky's theory of types was not unique to the young editors but proved to be of great significance to them and later to the pochvenniki. Its importance lay in the fact that it established a reciprocal relationship between the development of narodnost' in life and in literature. Through the artistic depiction of types, nationality, which resided only unconsciously in the life of society, achieved conscious expression in literature and so returned consciously to life. The artist, by virtue of the superior force of his intuition, his gift, mediated between the real life of the people and its ideal essence. Consequently, the history of a nation's literature was the history of the organic progress of nationality towards self-consciousness.

If a work of literature was an intuitive and imaginative re-creation of the internal life of the nation, then, the young editors believed, it was the function of literary criticism to relate any given literary production to the whole body of national literature. They were particularly anxious that the criteria by which the place of a literary work in the whole canon of the nation's literature was determined not be too narrowly or mechanically conceived. Works of literature should be related not merely to other works of literature but to the life of the nation itself. The task of criticism, Grigor'ev insisted, was 'to show the relative significance of all works of literature in a mass, [and] to assign to each its appropriate place as an organic, living product of life.' Good literary criticism, for the young editors, was relativist. They held that an old work of art was not superseded by its successor. Instead, it represented an independent and
uniquely valuable artistic expression to be judged on its individual merits in terms of its own time and place and not solely on its position in a literary hierarchy.

From the great critic Belinsky the young editors had learned that every literary era was dominated by a personality who most fully expressed the contemporary level of national development in his art. For Belinsky, Gogol' had been the leading figure; for the young editors, the age of Gogol' had been succeeded by the age of Ostrovsky. Ostrovsky's plays about the life of the merchant class provided the focus of the young editor's thoughts about Russian nationality. The instincts of a great writer, they were sure, invariably prompted him to depict in literary types the fullest and most contemporary representatives of the national ideal. Ostrovsky had said a 'new word' (novoye slovo), and that word was nationality (narodnost').

With the use of the term neposredstvennost' ('immediacy' or 'spontaneity'), Grigor'ev was consciously aligning the young editors with the so-called reversal of values in European thought that marked the transition from the Enlightenment to the romantic age. This reversal involved a shift of intellectual focus from the abstract and general to the concrete and particular and from the universal truths of reason to the relative truths of historical experience. Grigor'ev reaffirmed the romantic conviction that immediately felt experience was superior to abstract reasoning as the basis of thought and action. The idea of immediacy, like almost every facet of the young editors' thought, grew out of their aesthetic theory. Immediacy, in fact, was the source of their quarrel with the natural school of literary criticism.

Legitimate knowledge of the nation, the young editors argued, arose entirely from the immediate perception of the historical experience of a people. Only in art was such immediacy attained. According to the young editors, therefore, art did not serve the narrow, abstract, and transitory social aims of ideologists as their rivals, the natural school writers, claimed. Instead, art was the agent of the concrete and living moral and spiritual forces that were immanent in a society and that constituted its nationality. In an interesting anticipation of Dostoevsky's aesthetic theories in his famous reply to Dobroliubov in 1861, Edelson expanded in 1854 on the function of art: while it transcended utilitarian social aims, art, nevertheless, was useful to the human soul because moral, intellectual, and aesthetic enjoyment was necessary to 'every man and every society'.

'Immediacy' had, however, implications wider than aesthetics. It also linked the young editors to the antirationalist tendencies of European conservatism. Like conservative nationalists in other parts of Europe, the young editors maintained that the imposition of rationally conceived ideals on the life of a nation served only as obstacles to its organic and natural development. In a study of Nikolai Stankevich's story 'The Idealist' in 1851, Grigor'ev wrote: 'Idealism is one of the sicknesses of our age. To demand from reality not what it gives of itself but what we determine [for it] in advance; to approach any living phenomenon with an abstract and, consequently, lifeless preconception; to recoil from reality the moment it rebuffs the demands of our ego, and to shrink proudly into ourselves: such are the most common symptoms of this disease, its inevitable course.' Since the young editors themselves were unquestionably idealists, Grigor'ev's outburst appears odd at first sight. It is significant, however, that the author of the story in question, Stankevich, had been one of Russia's leading Hegelians before his premature death in 1846. Grigor'ev's critique, therefore, may reasonably be taken in general as a foray against Hegelian idealism and in particular against Hegel's historicism. The whole question of Hegelianism and Russian conservatism can best be dealt with in the following chapter. It is enough to point out here that the young editors vehemently opposed all attempts --either idealist or positivist -to discover the 'laws' of history and to deduce from them a universal theory of historical development. They regarded such universal laws as abstractions, detached from the concrete reality of the unique historical experience of individual nations and useless as guides to action.

It is evident from what has been said that the young editors were philosophical nominalists. Universals or abstract concepts were, to them, merely names with no corresponding realities in the world of experience. They were theories, the products of ratiocination and apriorism. The young editors opposed to such abstractions the concreteness of living experience in all its variety. Life was too rich and complex, too arbitrary, to be embraced by an a priori ideal. Rather, life had to be apprehended immediately through the kaleidoscope of individual and national experience.

In light of the remarkable degree of interpenetration that the young editors believed to exist between art and life and their hostility to Hegelian historicism, it is not surprising that the relativism contained in their literary criticism extended also to their view of history. Just as every work of art was valuable for itself and not as a mere harbinger of its successors, so, they asserted, each stage in the life of a nation was to be
judged according to its intrinsic merit and not on the extent of its contribution to some rationally conceived future end.

In 'democratism,' the remaining element of Grigor'ev's triad, was contained the foundations of the later conservative doctrine of social and ideological reconciliation. Grigor'ev intended by the term to underscore the essentially classless or integral character of Russian nationality. In an article of 1855, he insisted that there was 'no essential separation in the living, fresh and organic body of the nation.' All social strata, despite superficial appearances to the contrary, were fundamentally joined in the unity of the national ideal.

If for the Slavophiles Russian nationality had been 'preserved' in the peasantry, for the young editors it was 'evolving' in the merchant class. The middle position that the merchant class occupied in society and its traditional contacts with all social levels made it, in the eyes of the young editors, the repository of all the forms and customs present in Russian life. The merchants combined 'both the ancient Russian life which whole centuries experienced and which had not been destroyed by alien influences ...and the full passion [among Russians] for the European comforts of life.' It is understandable, Edel'son continued in an article of 1854, 'that with such variety all the fundamental national features, whether they are subjected to the influences of multi-faceted civilization or are preserved in their pristine simplicity, are...revealed in [the merchant class].'

The emphasis the young editors placed on the merchant class as the bearers of Russian nationality has, understandably, induced some Soviet commentators to represent them as apologists for the emerging bourgeoisie in Russia. Such a view, superficially at least, appears to be well-founded. It is important to remember, however, that the young editors believed, with pogodin, that Russian nationality was in a process of becoming. In their opinion an 'independent Russian ideal has not yet finally been worked out up to our own day.' Their affinity for the merchants arose less because they identified their own interests with a rising middle class -they were equally capable of an impassioned defence of peasant culture -than because they saw in the merchant estate a convenient composite of all the significant elements of Russian nationality. As far as they were concerned the merchant class represented no more than the partial embodiment of a much greater, future national ideal that would ultimately embrace Russians of all classes.

The young editors were not deceived in their optimistic assessment of the nationalist potential of the Russian merchantry. The decades from 1840 to 1860 witnessed among the elite of the merchant-industrial class, especially in Moscow, a transition from a narrow group perspective to a wider, Great Russian national consciousness. The transition was at first less political or economic than it was cultural, and the new nationalism of the merchants was most powerfully expressed in their patronage of Russian culture. During these years, several of the great late-nineteenth century merchant collections of Russian art and artefacts had their modest origins. Alfred J. Rieber has pointed out that 'the merchant wing of the Moscow entrepreneurs asserted their fundamental belief in the superiority of the spontaneous, popular, private and national against the bureaucratic, aristocratic and foreign elements in Russian life. They claimed to place industry at the service of culture and, where possible, culture at the service of industry.' Some of the young editors, notably Ostrovsky and Grigor'ev, were finely tuned to these new stirrings and found in the merchants' preference for the spontaneous, popular, and national an almost exact parallel to their own philosophical and aesthetic preconceptions. Far from taking offence at Ostrovsky's often cutting dramas about their way of life, many merchants encouraged him. Pogodin maintained intimate ties with Moscow's merchant elite, and at least one of the young editors benefited directly from merchant largesse with assistance in the publication of his works. Given the passionate sponsorship of Russian culture by the merchants, on the one hand, and the merchants' links with western education and technology, on the other, the young editors were at least in part justified in viewing them as a bridge between the two Russian cultures, the old and the new. It was not a fashionable position to hold. Most of the intelligentsia despised the merchant class for its materialism, its backwardness, and the petty tyranny of its family life which Ostrovsky, himself, did much to expose. But in light of the enormous services that the merchants were soon to render to Russian culture, the young editors proved to be more discerning and sensitive to actual developments in Russian life than most of their fellow intelligentsy.

'Democratism' signalled an important change in thinking about Russian nationality. It marked a turning away from the sharp dichotomy the Slavophiles had drawn between the gentry and the peasants and the rejection of the near monopoly on nationality the Slavophiles had accorded to the peasantry. The nationalist concerns of the Slavophiles, which centred almost exclusively on the cultural and moral relations between aristocrats and peasants, began to give way to a more open conception of nationality. The change represented not only the earliest
signs of a shift in the social background of the leading theorists of intellectual conservatism but also a new urban awareness of the growing complexity of Russian social life. The Slavophiles were for the most part landowners, drawn from the middle ranks of the gentry and actively engaged in the management of their estates. Their ideas were coloured by their rural experience and the patriarchalism of agricultural life in Russia. The young editors had, on the contrary, become detached from any stable class affiliations. They had no resources in the land but lived as best they might by their pens in, what was to them, a highly unpredictable and unstable urban environment. And they did not regularly occupy a position in the official structure of the society.

Whereas the Slavophiles with their roots in the gentry, on the one hand, and with their sophisticated philosophical and religious concerns, on the other, straddled between gentry and intelligentsia conservatism, the young editors were among the first full representatives of the socially unattached conservative intelligentsia. Since both their official status and their social identity were nebulous, the young editors experienced a profound sense of rootlessness that manifested itself in the recurrent theme of 'wandering' in their writings. They attempted to overcome their disorientation and social displacement by embracing a classless and organic conception of nationality in which they, as artists and intellectuals, had a leading role to play.

The young editors were scarcely aware of all the implications of 'democratism.' Further elaboration by Grigor'ev and the publicist's talents of Fedor Dostoevsky were required to disclose its full significance. Nevertheless, its potential was already apparent. If the nation was an organic whole proceeding toward the conscious realization of an as yet unknown national ideal, the whole metaphor of Russia and the West and all it entailed was subject to a thorough re-examination. For it meant that Peter's reforms had not irreparably divided the nation and interrupted the natural direction of national development; it further implied that the westernized gentry and the traditionalist peasantry were equal partners in the creation of a national ideal that was still in the process of becoming; and finally it meant that the two guiding principles, Russia and the West, which peasantry and gentry respectively represented, were far from being mutually exclusive.

The young editors were not destined as a group to draw these conclusions. The early popularity that the novelty of their youthful exuberance had afforded *Moskvitianin* was not sustained. Relations with Pogodin steadily deteriorated. Even Ostrovsky's forbearance gave out at last in 1856. By the beginning of that year the general level of the critical articles and literary offerings of the journal had reached an appalling low. In August, the novelist I.S. Turgenev wrote that 'no one reads *Moskvitianin* and no one publishes in it.' After fifteen years of anxiety and relentless scrimping, Pogodin bowed to what by now was inevitable. *Moskvitianin* fulfilled its subscription pledges for 1856 and then ceased publication forever. The young editors had already dispersed, but their ideals were preserved and extended by their most ardent proponent, Apollon Grigor'ev.