



Enlightenment or Counter-Enlightenment in Russia? Freemasons Writing History in the Late Eighteenth Century

Natalie Bayer

HCM 7: 1089–1120

DOI: 10.18352/hcm.599

Abstract

The article explores the themes of Enlightenment and Counter-Enlightenment through the lens of Freemasonry, and, more specifically, Freemasons in Russia who wrote history. It tests the approaches of Masonic history writers against Berlin's definitions of the Enlightenment and Counter-Enlightenment. Whilst a definitive break between the Enlightenment and Counter-Enlightenment seems attractive, the article advances a more nuanced picture of the plurality of religious and secular discourse in Russia. Instead of opposing the Enlightenment, many late eighteenth-century Masonic writers of history provided their own, alternative interpretative models of history as a way out of the perceived crisis between the mind and the soul.

Keywords: counter-enlightenment, eighteenth century, enlightenment, freemasonry, Russia

Introduction

In 1786, Ivan Elagin, the Russian Provincial Grand Master, who had been patented by the Grand Lodge of England in 1772, began working on a book devoted to the history of Freemasonry and mystical doctrines from ancient times up to the end of the eighteenth century. According to his plans, the book was designed to be as all-encompassing as its

title: *Doctrine of ancient philosophy and divine knowledge, or knowledge of Free Masons and diverse makers, profane, ecclesiastic, and mystic, collected and presented in five parts by I. E., the Grand Master of the Russian provincial lodge.*¹ As a retired Privy Councillor and Senator, Elagin was able to devote a lot of his time to this project, but by 1788 he had only finished a part of what he had envisaged. To this day the work has never been published,² and it was probably only meant to be read by the members of the secret governing body of the so-called Second Elagin Union that merged lodges loyal to Elagin with those of the Swedish Rite that espoused a decidedly mystical outlook.³ Elagin's history of Freemasonry not only includes the description of the degrees, but also his ideas on faith, religion, God, Creation, the end of history and discussions related to Orthodox Christian tradition.⁴

This puzzling eschatological understanding of history permeates his work and is seen through the lens of the kabbalistic and mystical sources as well as Christian interpretations of the Old and New Testaments and of Russian history. As I establish, this approach is characteristic of the way many Freemasons in Russia constructed their histories by the end of the eighteenth century. In the eyes of their contemporary critics and in many later analyses, this approach consistently placed Freemasons on the fringes of the mainstream Enlightenment movement. Elagin, for instance, started writing another large work called *An Essay on the Tale about Russia*,⁵ which was extensively criticized in Russia at the time for its antiquated literary style and fantastical interpretation of facts.⁶ Catherine II, a fellow amateur historian and an enthusiastic supporter of 'Voltairianism',⁷ perceptively connected these shortcomings in Elagin's Masonic interests in a letter to F. M. Grimm from 12 January 1794: 'As for Elagin, he has died, and his history will probably remain unfinished; he left an incredible colossus of a work related to Freemasonry which proves that he had gone mad'.⁸

It is well established that, on an intellectual level, the rationalistically-minded monarch, who prided herself in carrying out personal correspondence with the leading figures of the European Enlightenment, considered Masonic rituals and ceremonies to be absurd and contrary to reason. In her private correspondence Catherine consistently treated Freemasonry as a disguised form of social climbing, aristocratic-corporatist politics and pseudo-religious ritualism that had lost touch with reality.⁹ She brought her private criticisms of the Masonic 'stupidities

and absurdities' to the public level by publishing a series of plays in which she targeted fashionable interest in Western esotericism.¹⁰

While the Empress placed Freemasonry against the grain of the 'rational' Enlightenment movement, many Freemasons in Russia identified with the general confusion and perpetual search as indicative of the intellectual and emotional turmoil experienced by the educated Russian public in the second half of the eighteenth century. By the 1770s, the power of reason that Voltaire proposed, and, in a way, that served Russian Freemasonry in its early stages, became synonymous with moral nihilism and depravity. The majority of Russian Freemasons found the fraternity to be a crucible in which to resolve internal conflicts between their spiritual needs and the allure of 'Voltairianism'. Furthermore, by the late eighteenth century Freemasons created a number of rites, with varying ceremonies and degrees, which led to a confusion about the uniformity of Masonic principles and rituals and conflicts among a myriad Masonic affiliations. The differences between the rites, which were often identified with the national allegiances of their propagators, became increasingly muddled throughout the century. As a result, by the end of the century Russian Freemasons had a vast and nuanced variety of models on offer: from the three-degree English version of Freemasonry, with its support of the established political and religious order of constitutional monarchy and tendency towards practicality and rationalism, to the various high-degree rites that espoused elements of so-called Western esotericism.

Given this variety, confusion about 'national' origins, and the personal intellectual predispositions, it is difficult, if not impossible, to generalize about a group identity of the intellectuals involved. However, I would argue that the growing fear throughout the eighteenth century vis-à-vis the likelihood that rational philosophy would undermine moral values and lead Russian society to total depravity became one of the *leitmotifs* in the writings of Freemasons in Russia, and this is reflected prominently in their writings in history.

As I explore the themes of Enlightenment and Counter-Enlightenment through the lens of Freemasonry, and, more specifically, Freemasons in Russia who wrote history, I shall test the approaches of Masonic history writers against Berlin's definition of the Enlightenment as a tradition and a movement with the central doctrine rooted in the belief 'that human nature was fundamentally the same in all times and places' and 'that a

logically connected structure of laws and generalizations susceptible of demonstration and verification could be constructed' on the basis of methods similar to that of Newtonian physics.¹¹ Whilst the definitive break between the Enlightenment and Counter-Enlightenment seems attractive in its diametrical stance,¹² I would like to advance a more nuanced picture of the plurality of religious and secular discourse in Russia by interpreting a 'dialectical, not antithetical'¹³ conception of the Enlightenment and of its critics. As I argue, instead of opposing the Enlightenment, the late eighteenth-century Masonic writers of history whom I consider here provided their own, alternative interpretative models of history as a way out of the perceived crisis between the mind and the soul.

Berlin's Counter-Enlightenment Through the Lens of History of Freemasonry

Leo Tolstoy's epic *War and Peace* (1865–1869) contains one of the best known intellectual and spiritual journeys towards initiation into Freemasonry in nineteenth-century literature.¹⁴ A Russian nobleman, Pierre Bezukhov, is going through a deep crisis when he meets a charismatic Mason, Bazdeev, who invites Pierre to join the society of Freemasons. Feeling frustrated by his current spiritual and emotional life, Pierre hopes that the brotherhood will provide him with answers to the quintessential questions about the meaning of life. On a practical level, he sees Freemasonry as a means of devoting his life to serving humanity. These hopes do not come to fruition for Pierre. Instead of charting a path to enlightenment, early nineteenth-century Russian Freemasonry, as portrayed by Tolstoy, is an elitist organization that encourages its members to participate in bizarre rituals shrouded in mysticism. The latter is a point of poignant criticism for Tolstoy. Far from embracing a Masonic worldview and rituals, the writer uses Bezukhov's journey within Freemasonry to demonstrate a false way out of a crisis of discord between reason and spirituality.

Tolstoy's depiction of Freemasonry in *War and Peace* can be seen as one particular instance of his interest in the interplay between subjectivity and objectivity and between human agency and laws in history. According to Morton White, throughout the work Tolstoy 'asks what

he calls two fundamental questions: What is historical force or power? and What force or power produces the movements of nations?' The first is addressed through a definition of force modelled on Newtonian physics: 'power is the relation of a given person to other individuals, in which the more this person expresses opinions, predictions, and justifications of the collective action that is performed, the less is his participation in that action'. Relating force and movement in answering the second question, he postulates, 'the movement of nations is caused ... by the activity of all the people who participate in the events, and who always combine in such a way that those taking the largest direct share in the event take on themselves the least responsibility and vice versa'. It is this individual action, multiplied, that causes breaks in the fabric of history, revolutions and wars. Just as laws in physics are able to chart the connection between a cause and an effect in a deterministic way, so too can one trace the laws of history. A non-deterministic approach is 'unthinkable' for Tolstoy in history.¹⁵ As White indicates, in the concluding sections of the Epilogue and also in 'Some Words About War and Peace', published in 1868, Tolstoy 'explicitly defends determinism as "inevitable necessity"'.¹⁶ When Isaiah Berlin considers Tolstoy's early vision of history, he points out in a similar way:

History alone – the sum of empirically discoverable data – held the key to the mystery of why what happened as it did and not otherwise; and only history, consequently, could throw light on the fundamental ethical problems which obsessed him as it did every Russian thinker in the nineteenth century. What is to be done? How should one live? Why are we here? What must we be and do? the study of historical connections and the demand for empirical answers to these *proklyatye voprosy* became infused into one in Tolstoy's mind, as his early diaries and letters show very vividly.¹⁷

Berlin claims, however, that Tolstoy's 'sense of reality'¹⁸ would eventually translate into a large-picture view of causal determinism: 'Tolstoy's central thesis ... is that there is a natural law whereby the lives of human beings no less than those of nature are determined; but that men, unable to face this inexorable process, seek to represent it as a succession of free choices'.¹⁹

It is not surprising then that when Berlin relates his vision of Tolstoy's theory of history to how Freemasonry is presented in *War and Peace*,

he confidently concludes, ‘Tolstoy stood at the opposite pole to all this ... he was against unintelligible mysteries, against mists of antiquity, against any kind of recourse to mumbo-jumbo: his hostile picture of the Freemasons in *War and Peace* remained symptomatic of his attitude to the end’.²⁰ In the same way as Berlin swiftly connects the ‘innate conservatism of [Tolstoy’s] outlook’ with ‘natural anti-intellectualism and anti-liberalism’,²¹ he also relates an emphasis on cultural differences and ‘protest against the authority of timeless general laws and rulers’.²² If Tolstoy’s perceived conservatism goes hand-in-hand with a mistrust of homogenous cosmopolitanism, this then provides another reason for Tolstoy’s charge against an institution that claims to unite men into a universal brotherhood. When this attitude towards Freemasonry is put against the historical context of the Great Patriotic War of 1812, it is the early Russian conservatives who make heightened accusations against Russian Freemasons as foreign agents, who were corrupting fellow Russians with irreligious ideas and subverting the war efforts of true Russian patriots.²³

Tolstoy places the story of a Russian nobleman’s embrace of Freemasonry at the beginning of the nineteenth century, yet, in reality the protagonist’s spiritual journey towards Freemasonry is more redolent of earlier generations of Russian intellectuals, who tried to reconcile traditional Russian values with the confusing stream of ideas coming from the West in the second half of the eighteenth century.²⁴ In eighteenth-century Russia, Freemasonry was intertwined with the country’s Westernization and effectively became one of its active agents. In the exaggerated rhetoric of a later commentator, if Peter the Great ‘hewed a window into Europe’, Freemasons ‘built the foundations of this window and the supporting pillars, bringing the whole building of the empire to the future’.²⁵ After Freemasonry was introduced into Russia in the first half of the century, it became an important channel for the transmission of ideas from Europe to Russia and a means for the construction of a public sphere.²⁶ By the last quarter of the century, however, while being closely allied with the intellectual and educational strivings of the Enlightenment and of the Russian State, Freemasons began producing their own reactions to cosmopolitanism and rationalism. Many increasingly concentrated on the uniqueness of Russian customs, traditions and history, and became involved in the construction of a public sphere in their motherland by choosing different Masonic systems and relating their own principles to the perceived needs of their country.

Enlightenment in Russia? Russian Enlightenment? Russian Counter-Enlightenment?

Freemasonry was a heterogeneous, multifaceted and ever-evolving phenomenon in the eighteenth century and its role at the time was hotly debated by contemporaries and subsequently by commentators and researchers. Interpretations of eighteenth-century Russian Freemasonry depend on conceptualizations of the Enlightenment and ideological attitudes towards the influence of Western ideas and values, due to its interconnections with both the Enlightenment movement in the context of European history and with Westernization in the Russian context. If we identify the Enlightenment as a general trend towards literacy, social and cultural mobilization, and national assertion, then Freemasonry can fit into the general movement towards ‘national awakening’.²⁷ If we equate the Enlightenment with ‘rationalism, instrumentalism, scientism, universalism, abstract rights, eurocentrism [and] individualism’, then many Masonic variations laden with elements of Western esotericism can be seen as expressions of the Counter-Enlightenment.²⁸ While some argue that Masonic modes of thought and practice were central to the Enlightenment, with Masonic organizations as a tool promoting Enlightenment ideas, others see Freemasonry as an inversion of Enlightenment views of human nature, social institutions and social processes and, therefore, essentially a reactive movement against the Enlightenment.²⁹ Building on Jürgen Habermas’ concept of the public sphere, Margaret Jacob, for instance, has persuasively argued that European Freemasonry actively constructed a public sphere by promoting a new form of sociability that affirmed man’s natural inclination toward fellowship and articulated a discourse of politeness.³⁰ Other historians, notably Reinhart Koselleck, attribute the beginnings of revolutionary and democratic activism to Freemasonry, which led to the French Revolution.³¹

What do these interpretations of the Enlightenment that centre on the rise of the public sphere mean when applied to Russia in the long eighteenth century? According to an established estimate in Russian-language scholarship, only 6.9% of the population of European Russia over the age of nine could read in 1797. While the indicators of literacy are higher for the urban population (21%), the Russian public as a social category was significantly slanted towards the nobility and state

service bureaucracy.³² With this in mind, Douglas Smith considers the composition and role of Masonic lodges and puts forward a powerful argument for Russia developing a public sphere that was more limited than that in Western Europe, but that possessed great potential for social advancement due to its ‘porous’ social structure.³³

Related to the problematic notion of a public sphere, there are continuous debates on the nature of the definition of ‘Enlightenment’ in the national contexts.³⁴ How can we reconcile anti-clericalism, secularism, universalism and cosmopolitanism with the parallel developments of the irrational, the illiberal and elements supportive of autocracy within the same movement? After all, while there is an established tradition of the study of the transmission and reception of Western ideas in the course of the eighteenth century,³⁵ some historians continue to deny that Russia participated in the Enlightenment movement.³⁶ The ideas were available to them, but they postulated the superiority of the traditional and chose to concentrate on other principles, rather than adopt Western values of egalitarianism, democracy, tolerance and individual freedom. These are the grounds for Michael Confino, for instance, to stipulate that there was no Russian Enlightenment, but rather a ‘Counter-Enlightenment’ that reacted to the European Enlightenment.³⁷

Instead of associating the Enlightenment movement with the rise of the public, in his seminal work, *The Enlightenment: An Interpretation*, Peter Gay directly equates the Enlightenment with the westernizing campaign of Peter the Great. He emphasizes a connection between the Enlightenment in Russia and Enlightened absolutism, while reducing Russian intellectual and cultural developments to printing ‘a handful of technical manuals’ on the orders of Peter the Great, while ‘the bulk of Russian books remained religious tracts’.³⁸ As the literary historian Viktor Zhivov postulates, while the Enlightenment in the West marked ‘the emancipation of culture from the state’, in Russia it led to the opposite situation. Far from being a lived reality, according to Zhivov, the Russian Enlightenment was ‘a Petersburg mirage’.³⁹ The state-sponsored Enlightenment ‘firmly tied culture, secular as well as religious, to the state ... Therefore the end of Enlightenment in Russia spelled the emancipation of culture’.⁴⁰

There is also a growing body of literature on the role of religion, and especially Russian Orthodoxy, in shaping the directions of the Enlightenment movement in Russia.⁴¹ Thus, for instance, in her work

on Metropolitan Platon, Elise Kimerling Wirschafter convincingly argues for the need to investigate ‘the interplay between Orthodox enlightenment and Enlightenment ideas’ in order to understand the ways Russians perceived European ideas and culture.⁴² In a similar vein, considering the impact of Westernization and Orthodoxy on writers in the public sphere, Colum Leckey demonstrates an approximation of the notion of ‘enlightenment’ with the values of the Russian Orthodox Church. According to Leckey, in defining enlightenment in the Russian context, Novikov’s *Opyt istoricheskogo slovaria* (1772) juxtaposes ‘the rich Orthodox Christian heritage of the Eastern Slavs’ to ‘the avalanche of secular European civilization triggered by the Petrine reforms’.⁴³ If so, then a combination of the religious and political, the Christian humanism of Ukrainian churchmen and the state-supported westernization, can be taken as a feature of the Enlightenment in Russia.⁴⁴ Rafaella Faggionato reaches a similar conclusion about reactions to perceived manifestations of extreme atheism and materialism in a retreat to religious values in her work on the Masonic and Rosicrucian groups in Russia.⁴⁵

Novikov’s Dilemma

The historiography on the publisher Nikolai Novikov (1744–1818), one of the main public intellectuals in Russia, is especially indicative of the difficulty of one-dimensional interpretation. In the 1770s, Catherine’s Legislative Commission, of which Novikov was a member and which heralded the beginning of his public career, was the most enlightened project undertaken by the autocrat. But then Catherine and Novikov chose different paths.⁴⁶ By the late 1770s, Novikov was already known as an author and the publisher of the popular *Toward a Historical Dictionary of Russian Writers* (1772), as well as the multi-volume *Ancient Russian Library* (1773–75) and several popular magazines. At this time, he also began to play an instrumental role in Freemasonry and, more specifically, in developing its social and spiritual agenda in Russia. In 1779 he leased the printing house of Moscow University for ten years with the help of Mikhail Kheraskov,⁴⁷ the curator of Moscow University and an ardent Mason. As an official correspondent of Catherine involved in esoteric Freemasonry, Novikov suffered persecution as a publisher of

books that fell foul of the Imperial censor. He was eventually arrested and imprisoned in 1792.⁴⁸

Is Novikov a representative of Enlightenment, Counter-Enlightenment or Super-Enlightenment,⁴⁹ given the development of his interests and preoccupations, and the interactions between him as a public intellectual⁵⁰ and the Empress (and the state)? Novikov's arrest is often seen as the climax in the first struggle between the authoritarian state, which was anxious to maintain its critical function, and an increasingly self-conscious public.⁵¹ As Alexander Pushkin famously pointed out, 'Catherine ... admired the Enlightenment, and Novikov who dispersed its first rays went ... to a prison cell where he resided until her death'.⁵² While this version of the events is still persuasive, in addition to using a particular definition of what Enlightenment was, on the factual level, it plays down important particulars, such as accusations of sectarianism and charlatanism, the political ambiguity of communicating with Grand Duke Paul (the heir to the Russian throne), dependence on the guidance of German princes and their ministers, and the state of European politics at the time. With strengthening opposition to everything foreign that developed in reaction to the French Revolution, and Russia's increasing involvement in international affairs, Freemasonry, an essentially foreign import sustained by the efforts of foreigners, was becoming more and more suspect in the eyes of the Russian public and authorities.⁵³ Paradoxically, while the majority of Freemasons in Russia set their lodges against the philosophy of the French, of which Catherine was a great admirer, and which, as Freemasons thought, preached godlessness and immorality, Freemasons' practical activities and their very existence went counter to the idea that Russia's development should be directed from above. Yet, from another perspective, it can also be argued that the dialectic development of Catherine's attitude to Freemasonry through the last thirty years of the eighteenth century is indicative of a general European tendency. Tensions generated by the Revolution in France did contribute to government action against secret societies in Russia. Given the persistent rumours about the involvement of Grand Duke Paul in Freemasonry, and the participation of secret societies (without distinguishing between Freemasons, Martinists or Illuminati) in the French Revolution, the state's measures against the Moscow Masons were dictated by important political and ideological concerns. If we consider the Novikov affair in a European context, it

becomes clear that his arrest and state control over the activities of his group were not simply heavy-handed acts of a Russian autocracy.⁵⁴

As Leckey points out, however, Novikov's own definition of the 'enlightenment' that he provided in his celebrated publication, *Toward a Historical Dictionary*, 'presented *prosveshchenie* as the pinnacle of Russian national achievement', in which 'an inner virtue manifested through personal charisma, evangelical zeal, and bookish erudition – all signifiers of the most prominent Russian churchmen of the age and the same qualities which Novikov would later try to cultivate in himself as a Freemason'.⁵⁵ As I argue in the second half of this article, Novikov is one among many late eighteenth-century Masonic writers in Russia who tried to offset the tensions between the old and the new, the traditional and the foreign, by looking at the past through the lens of moralistic humanism. In particular, an interpretation of the Russian past served to counter the thoughtless adoption of foreign customs as well as perceived Western (Enlightenment) godlessness by introducing a Russian version of *prosveshchenie* directly related to morality and religious virtue.

Writing (Masonic) History in Russia as a Case Study

In 1830 a Russian literary critic Ivan Kireevskii remarked on the contemporary obsession with history: 'history in our time is at the center of all intellectual quests and is the most important of all sciences; it is the indispensable condition for all development; historicism embraces everything'.⁵⁶ A 'remarkable decade'⁵⁷ of the 1830s reflected the public preoccupation with history in the context of the rise of Romanticism and the formation of modern national identity after the Napoleonic Wars.⁵⁸ However, it was already in the eighteenth century that the problem of identity was put in the language of historical inquiry.⁵⁹ Hyla Whittaker identifies forty-seven Russian authors who wrote histories of Russia throughout the eighteenth century. Thirty-two of these works were not published.⁶⁰ While they were not professional historians in the modern sense, their writing reflects a historical point of view nonetheless, along with attempts at defining an idea of progress and formulating causal interpretations based on moral judgements. Eighteenth-century Russian historians were 'nearly all amateurs and thus more typical of

the educated public' than their nineteenth-century counterparts or pre-Petrine predecessors.⁶¹ As Uspenskii points out, eighteenth-century writing on history and the emergence of intellectuals who could 'think historically ... was one of the basic innovations of post-Petrine culture' and an example of 'real, not mythological Europeanization'.⁶²

Writing history, especially the history of Russia, as well as the conscious and methodical collection of historical sources and artefacts, meant both participating in the public sphere and being a patriot, as encouraged by popular publications, such as *Rossiiskii magazin*, published in St. Petersburg (1792–1794).⁶³ In a similar vein, Novikov directly connected the widespread research, writing and learning of Russian history to his idea of 'enlightenment': 'What a great honor, and what great use for Russia! The most notable persons take part in the enlightenment of their fellow citizens. It is a sign of strongly rooted scholarship in the boundless Russian Empire when notability of lineage and learnedness do not contradict each other'.⁶⁴ Nikolay Karamzin (1766–1826), in his twelve-volume *History of the Russian State* (1816–1826), proclaimed unequivocally, 'the history of the people belongs to the tsar'.⁶⁵ In this context, the writing of history contributes to the genesis and formulation of conservatism in early nineteenth-century Russia.⁶⁶ As Grudzinska Gross points out, Karamzin's great view of history 'contained the idea of historical progress and of the irreversibility of the movement of history'.⁶⁷ This stands in contrast to seeing history as a 'return to the past',⁶⁸ but utilizes the past to define the future.⁶⁹ In his 1815 foreword Karamzin puts forward a potent mixture of spiritual content and practical form view of history, proclaiming, 'in a certain sense, history is the sacred book of a nation, the main, the indispensable book, the mirror of its existence and activity, the table of revelations and rules, the ancestors' bequest to posterity, the supplement and explanation of the present, and the example for the future'.⁷⁰ In both these directions Karamzin comes from an established eighteenth-century tradition of combining didactic writing with history that includes public intellectuals, such as Novikov, Kheraskov, Boltin and Shcherbatov, many of whom were associated with Freemasonry.⁷¹

When we take stock of the Russian intellectuals who were involved in Freemasonry and the writing of history, it is clear that a popular option was at the juncture of both. In addition to Karamzin and Novikov, there were a number of intellectuals associated with Moscow University,

who were interested in history, languages and antiquity, and also participated in Masonic lodges.⁷² This perception led many of them to undertake a fundamental reinterpretation of the history of Freemasonry within national history. Thus, for instance, the Moscow Masonic group consistently conceived their efforts in Freemasonry as a rediscovery of what they, as Russians, already possessed. In this sense, writing about history and Freemasonry served as a gateway to a spiritual tradition.⁷³ In a way, references to Russian Orthodoxy when considering sources of Freemasonry created a circular logic of mutual validation: Freemasonry was important because it acknowledged Russia's spiritual tradition as authentic, true and unique; while Russian Orthodoxy was important because it was related to the eternal essence of the 'ancient science of Freemasonry'.⁷⁴

The stories about the origins of Freemasonry that eighteenth-century Russian brothers developed helped them reinforce their ties to Europe through shared Masonic memories, traditions, myths, symbols and values.⁷⁵ In many ways they followed a European blueprint when they imagined the past.⁷⁶ At the same time, they used their version of the history of Freemasonry for articulating hopes that Russia's destiny was sanctioned by God, and, in many cases, was determined by the course of history, or for legitimizing their own innovations within Freemasonry. The path of moral rebirth that these Masons pursued was validated by a mythology that glorified Russia's past. This mythological construction of the past reflected the Russian Masons' concern with their Masonic identity as well as with a Russian identity. Historians who were Masons were looking for ways to make their eschatological dream about the coming kingdom of truth a reality. They used history to overcome the feeling of alienation from the past and the desire for continuity in order to pursue the utilitarian purpose of sharing a vision of a glorious self-invented future. They used the same idea of Russia as a paradise, Eden or the Third Rome,⁷⁷ but chose a discernibly different view of history's progression. By the 1780s many arrived at the conviction that Russia was historically different, instead of emphasizing Russia's place in Europe and the similarity of their linear development.⁷⁸

By pulling the past into the present through the use of mimesis, Masons in Russia effectively levelled history and created a sense that Russia not only deserved a space on the world stage but that the (Western) Enlightenment signifiers of civilization might not serve as a

universal measure for every society.⁷⁹ In doing so, they turned to the idea that Russia had a special spiritual mission and consequently a special role in world history.⁸⁰ Russia was now imagined as a country that had developed as a consequence of its stability and spirituality in contrast to the West.⁸¹ In emphasizing the essence of Russia's spiritual tradition and invoking (moral) continuity between the pre-Petrine past and the post-Petrine present, Russian Freemasons revealed their anxiety about history and Russia's rightful place in it, and expressed their hopes for the future. Instead of being a backward late comer in the drama of historical progress and civilization, the country emerged as the site of the future Golden Age.

When we consider Elagin's project of writing a history of Freemasonry, for instance, several important points stand out. First, it assumes that history starts with the creation of the world, while human history begins with Adam and Eve and ends with Judgment Day. Within this scheme, Freemasonry's roots were to be found in 'ancient times' with Adam, Noah and Abraham, and then, via early Jewish mystics, the science of Freemasonry had been passed down in the Middle Ages to knightly Orders and thereafter to the high-degree eighteenth-century rite, which would ultimately culminate in the definitive end of temporal history. As Elagin asserts, 'our science [i.e. Freemasonry] was already discovered in Eden' and the tree of life, which was once planted in paradise, has remained in the center of our temples [i.e. lodges].⁸² He consistently treats Jesus of Nazareth as one of the 'hieroglyphs',⁸³ or 'effective images' of the primordial Jesus and as a Freemason. Moreover, according to Elagin's interpretation, the ancient science of Freemasonry was not a recent transplant onto Russian soil, but formed part of Russia's spiritual tradition since her baptism in 988.⁸⁴ Because of the purity and longevity of 'True Christianity' in Russia, Freemasons there had a higher chance of re-discovering the knowledge lost by Adam.

Confronted by a stream of ideas emanating from Europe, many educated Russians could not help but feel 'the difficulty of their cultural situation' by the middle of the eighteenth century.⁸⁵ After the forceful introduction of Western science, technology and values to Russia the traditional way of living and thinking that had been familiar to the members of the Russian educated elite seemed old and irrational to many. They regarded this new situation as pointing the way to the

imminent arrival in Russia of a new Golden Age. At the same time, those who opposed Westernization, often connected it to the proliferation of moral depravity and nihilism and viewed it as a sign of the approaching Apocalypse. In reaction to this they embraced the branches of high-degree Freemasonry that emphasised the role of religion and faith. Characteristically, Elagin reworked the principle, found in the Charges of Freemasons, according to which a Mason 'will never be a stupid Atheist, nor an irreligious Libertine'. Instead, Elagin's version asserts, 'he who blasphemes will be abhorred as an ignominious stain to nature'.⁸⁶

Late-eighteenth-century Russian Masonic ideologists insisted on Freemasonry and Christianity having a common goal, explicitly stating that the whole purpose of the fraternity was to 'obtain the knowledge lost by Adam'.⁸⁷ The Masonic goal of returning man to the image and likeness of God was deemed to be integrally connected with the resurrection of Adam's lost paradisaic knowledge. According to a legend used in a Russian high-degree lodge, after the expiration of Adam's period of punishment, God sent a ray of light that enlightened the mind with knowledge not otherwise available to postlapsarian man. After being passed on to the biblical patriarchs, Noah, Moses and Jesse, and then preserved in the temples of ancient Egypt, this ray was ultimately transferred to Palestine by Hiram Abif. Through him this knowledge was transmitted to the Masons.⁸⁸ Other high-degree Freemasons portrayed Jesus as the head of the first Masonic order and called him 'the Alchemist who is rich with love'.⁸⁹ In the opinion of J.-G. Schwarz, a leader of the Moscow Masonic circle, Freemasonry was a secret science, whose first adepts were Jewish sectarians, Essenes and Therapeutae 'who had existed in the days of Christ and were renowned for their virtuousness'. They were the ones who received a 'spark of light', which was then transferred from one wise man to another through a 'chain of Tradition'.⁹⁰

If the essence of Freemasonry was Christianity, then the conversion of Kievan Rus' in 988 becomes the single-most important event for Russians writing about the history of Freemasonry. In his epic *Vladimir Reborn*, Mikhail Kheraskov turned to the events surrounding the decision to convert to Christianity made by Prince Vladimir I.⁹¹ While Kheraskov's story follows the basic plot of the Russian Primary Chronicle, which was originally compiled in Kiev about 1113, his Prince-Christianizer is presented as 'a spiritual knight (a Mason)', who

set the country on the path to 'True Christianity'. What is noticeable is that the phrase 'True Christianity' hints at Arndt's mystical work of the same name, which was translated by a member of the Moscow circle and published in 1784 by the printing company of the Masonic circle.⁹² Moreover, Schwarz consistently used the phrase 'True Christianity' to denote Freemasonry in his university and lodge lectures in Moscow.⁹³

According to Kheraskov, *Vladimir Reborn* is a story of the 'wanderings of an insightful man along the Path of Truth, on which he meets worldly temptations, is tested by many enticements, falls into the darkness of doubt, struggles with his innate passions, finally overcomes himself, finds the path of Truth, and, after having attained enlightenment, is reborn'.⁹⁴ After meeting 'the ancient philosopher Cyrus',⁹⁵ Vladimir realizes that the true spirit resides within him, and thus turns to the 'True Faith' and enters a prototype Masonic 'temple', where he 'will learn the truth and will come to know himself'.⁹⁶ He hoped that after baptism Russia 'will develop under the influence of the True Faith'.⁹⁷

Besides the strong Masonic undertones and the attempts to fuse Christianity with Freemasonry, change was achieved in both Elagin's and Kheraskov's visions of Russia's baptism through the actions of a powerful prince endowed with a sacred mission.⁹⁸ In his unfinished history of Russia,⁹⁹ Elagin goes as far as to claim that Christianity is directly associated with monarchy.¹⁰⁰ The history of the Russian state starts only with the baptism of Russia.¹⁰¹ It was this powerful mixture of 'True Faith', Orthodoxy and enlightened monarchy that was supposed to ensure Russia's special position among Christian countries.

Kheraskov presents an allegorical depiction of these themes through a Masonic lens in his novel *Cadmus and Harmonia*.¹⁰² Cadmus, whose story derives from Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, is the builder of the city of Thebes. Searching for his sister Europa, who had been abducted by Zeus, the main character goes on a typical Masonic journey, following the path of enlightenment to rebirth. This was a path that Kheraskov hoped to replicate in his Moscow lodge, which was aptly named 'Cadmus and Harmonia'. In the process Cadmus finds not only a wife for himself – named Harmonia – but also an inner harmony within himself. At the end of his journey he also finds the 'promised land' inhabited by a group of people called 'Slavs'. His search for Europa is abandoned; he is now not just Cadmus, he is Adam Kadmon,¹⁰³ the God-like man, reborn in the promised land of Russia.¹⁰⁴

Conclusion

When the notions used in writing the history of Freemasonry are matched, the following common features become apparent in the constructs of Russian Freemasons: history is seen as organic, directional, unfolding toward a definitive goal which found expression in the moral sphere (and in this sense history was deterministic), didactic and divinely guided. Rather than investigating the particulars of events surrounding the introduction of the formal aspects of Freemasonry to Russia, these intellectuals chose to concentrate on what they called the ‘development of the human spirit’¹⁰⁵ over time, the search for a direction of historical change, the role of God in the causal nexus, and the interconnections between Orthodoxy and Freemasonry. Far from being a mere compilation of information from various sources, history was thus not just about the past. Masonic ideologists altered the narratives of the past to present interpretations reflecting their fears about perceived dangers to modern society.

In this dualistic approach to continuity and disruption, there was a point of departure for the history of Russia (as well as the history of Freemasonry or the history of Christianity), which symbolized a sharp break with the past and the beginning of the new period. While this point was generally associated with a change in the political structure or a dynasty for the writers of non-Masonic official history, Masonic ideologues viewed the change as being directly connected to the alterations in the moral fibre of society. In this sense, the vital force of historical causality was in the sphere of ideas, in the juncture of ‘the idea, morality, and the national spirit’.¹⁰⁶ Progress was thus seen by these Freemasons as not any form of material or intellectual improvement, but rather an idea that human beings can alter their world for the better in a fundamental way – the creation of heaven on earth.¹⁰⁷ This heaven was supposed to have a space and a place in Russia. As Stephen L. Baehr puts it, ‘Russia’s emergence as the country most favored by God, the seat of a religious empire, was seen as the ultimate end (in both senses of the word) of history’.¹⁰⁸

A juncture between faith and reason, rationalism and romanticism, a nascent public sphere and proto-nationalism, Enlightenment and Counter-Enlightenment as seen in the historical writing of Freemasons in Russia raises questions about the problematic use of generalizations

and concepts. In application to Freemasonry in Russia, for instance, it can be argued that as a movement, organization and concept, it was far from being uniform. In the course of the long eighteenth century Freemasons borrowed and adapted intellectual currents that were new to them, including neo-stoicism, various strands of Christian thought, Renaissance ideas, Hermeticism, Cabbalistic thought and Pythagorean and Newtonian science, when seeking to come to terms with the range of ideas that the Enlightenment produced.¹⁰⁹ Many Russian Freemasons tried to assess the spiritual legacy of the Orthodox Church and its overlaps with both ancient and modern Western philosophical traditions. They tried to fit their own hotchpotch of ideas with those of the High Enlightenment, which resulted in the creation of a body of thought plagued with contradictions.

Notes

- 1 I. P. Elagin, *Uchenie drevnego lubomudriia i bogomudriia, ili nauka svobodnykh kamen'schikov i raznykh tvortsov svetskikh, dukhovnykh i misticheskikh, sobrannaia v piati chastiakh predlozhennaia I. E., Velikim ross. provintsial'noy lozhi masterom*, in Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv drevnikh aktov (RGADA), Fond 216, n 8, pt. 3, 26–9. It is a copy written by Elagin himself.
- 2 The introduction to the work has been published twice. See Elagin, 'Doctrine of ancient philosophy and divine knowledge', in V. I. Novikov, *Masonstvo i russkaia kul'tura* (Moscow, 1998), 223–35.
- 3 As Smith notes in Douglas Smith, *Working the Rough Stone: Freemasonry and Society in Eighteenth-Century Russia* (DeKalb, 1999), 215.
- 4 RGADA, Fond 16, n 8, pt. 3, f. 2. Also cited in P. P. Pekarskii, *Dopolneniia k istorii masonstva v Rossii XVIII stoletii* (St. Petersburg, 1869), 96–7; G. Verdnadskii, *Russkoe masonstvo v tsarstvovanie Ekateriny II* (Petrograd, 1917), 186.
- 5 Ivan Elagin, *Opyt povestvovaniia o Rossii* (Moscow, 1803).
- 6 T. V. Artemyeva and M. I. Mikeshin (eds), *Ideya istorii v Rossii XVIII veka, Filosofskiy vek 4* (Saint Petersburg, 1998), 113–6.
- 7 'Voltairianism' was used as a term to denote various intellectual, cultural, social and religious orientations to the West, including a wide spectrum that encompassed religious freethinking and the imitation of French fashion.

A Freemason, deist, atheist, freethinker or anyone else whose views and attitudes were presumed to be influenced by Western ideas was often called a *vol'terian*, meaning an advocate of Voltairianism. For Catherine's attitude towards the fashion of Voltairianism, see Catherine II, 'Zapiski kasatel' no rossiiskoi istorii', *Sobesednik liubitelei rossiiskago slova* 1–11 (1783) and 12–5 (1784). For more on Catherine's historical writing, see A. N. Pypin, 'Istoricheskie trudy Ekateriny II', *Vestnik Evropy* 5 (September 1901), 170–202 and 6 (December 1901), 760–803.

- 8 Cit. in N. V. Drizen, 'Ivan Perfil'evich Elagin', *Russkaia starina* vol. 80 (1893), 118.
- 9 See, for instance, Catherine the Great, 'Pis'ma Ekateriny Vtoroi k baronu Grimmu, January 11, 1780, in *Russkii arkhiv* 3 (Moscow, 1878), 62.
- 10 In the beginning of the 1780s, Catherine composed her first play against Freemasonry, *Société Antiabsurde (Taina protivonelepogo obschestva, otkrytaia ne prichastnym onomu* (St. Petersburg, 1759 [1780])), followed by a trilogy of comedies mocking Masonic ritual and exposing the order as an international conspiracy: *Obmanschik (The Deceiver, 1785)*; *Obol'shchennyi (The Deceived, 1785)* and *Shaman sibirskii (The Siberian Shaman, 1786)*. On the success of Catherine's plays in Russia, see Smith, *Working the Rough Stone*, 149–50. On the anti-esoteric direction of the plays, see Ruth P. Dawson, 'Catherine the Great: Playwright of the Anti-Occult', *Thalia's Daughters: German Women Dramatists from the Eighteenth-Century to the Present*, Susan, L. Cocalis and Ferrel Rose (eds) (Tubingen, Basel, 1996), 17–34; Lurana D. O'Malley, 'The Monarch and the Mystic: Catherine the Great's Strategy of Audience Enlightenment in "The Siberian Shaman"', *The Slavic and East European Journal* 41:2 (1997), 224–42; O.L. Roganova, 'Komedii Ekateriny Velikoi "Obmanschik", "Obol'shchennyi", "Shaman Sibirskii" v kontekste istorii russkogo masonstva', *Ekaterina Velikaia: epokha rossiiskoi istorii*, T. V. Artem'eva and M. I. Mikeshin (eds) (St. Petersburg, 1996), 157–60.
- 11 Isaiah Berlin, *Against the Current* (Princeton NJ, 2013), 1–2.
- 12 Robert E. Norton defines this break as 'a Procrustean bed of Provincial and reactionary figures', in 'The Myth of the Counter-Enlightenment', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 68:4 (2007), 635–58. Norton argues that Berlin and his followers 'have unwittingly continued the work of early twentieth-century conservative German intellectuals who were bent on eradicating the legacy of the French Enlightenment, with its emphasis on the power of individual reason to advance liberty and equality from German cultural and political life', 657–8. For a more recent exploration of the political aspects

- of the debates on the meaning and significance of the Enlightenment movement, see Annelien de Dijn, 'The Politics of Enlightenment: From Peter Gay to Jonathan Israel', *The Historical Journal* 55:3 (2012), 785–805.
- 13 Joseph Mali, 'Berlin, Vico, and the Principles of Humanity', in *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, New Series, 93:5 (2003) ('Isaiah Berlin's Counter-Enlightenment'), 51–71, at 65. In a similar vein, as Darrin McMahon stresses, there was a continuous and fundamental 'dialectic of Enlightenment and Counter-Enlightenment'. Darrin M. McMahon, *Enemies of the Enlightenment; The French Counter-Enlightenment and the Making of Modernity* (New York, 2001), 201. As Jonathan Israel argues, 'the central thread throughout ... is that Christendom is being destroyed by an insidious philosophical conspiracy, and that at the heart of the conspiracy is a new conception of philosophy – *l'esprit philosophique*, a universal threat, undermining the pillars of authority and tradition, that is Christian, royal, and aristocratic society'. In Jonathan I. Israel, *Enlightenment Contested: Philosophy, Modernity, and the Emancipation of Man 1670–1752* (New York, 2006), 38–9.
- 14 For more on Freemasonry in *War and Peace*, see Rafaella Faggionato, *L'alambicco di Lev Tolstoj: Guerre e pace e la massoneria russa* (Rome, 2015).
- 15 Morton White, *From a Philosophical Point of View: Selected Studies* (Princeton, 2005), 60.
- 16 White, *From a Philosophical Point*, 62.
- 17 Isaiah Berlin, *The Hedgehog and the Fox: An Essay on Tolstoy's view of History* (New York, 1953), 12.
- 18 Berlin, *The Hedgehog*, 69.
- 19 *Ibid*, 27.
- 20 *Ibid*, 45–6.
- 21 *Ibid*, 44.
- 22 Isaiah Berlin, *Vico and Herder: Two Studies in the History of Ideas* (New York, 1976), 149.
- 23 This attitude is fully reflected in F.V. Rostopchin, 'Zapiska o martinistakh, predstavleniia v 1811 godu velikoi kniagine Ekaterine Pavlovne', *Russkii arkhiv* 3 (1875), 75–81. For more on the context of this document, see Alexander M. Martin, *Romantics, Reformers, Reactionaries: Russian Conservative Thought and Politics in the Reign of Alexander I* (DeKalb, 1997), 59–73, 92–3, 100–7, 125–34.

- 24 Especially part V, chapters 3 and 4 in *War and Peace*.
- 25 Vsevolod Sakharov, *Ieroglify vol'nykh kamenshchikov. Masonstvo i russkaia literatura XVIII-nachala XIX vv.* (Moscow, 2000), 15.
- 26 According to Serkov's estimations, there were more than 3000 active foreign and Russian Freemasons in the country in the eighteenth century. This number grew to 5690 during the period between 1800 and 1861. A. I. Serkov, *Istoriia russkogo masonstva* (St. Petersburg, 2000); Serkov, *Rossiiskoe masonstvo: Slovar'-spravochnik* (Moscow, 2001).
- 27 This assumption is made, for instance, in Georgii Vernadskii, *Russkoe masonstvo v tsarstvovanie Ekateriny II*. 2nd ed. Materialy i issledovaniia, vypusk 1 (St. Petersburg, 1999).
- 28 In Soviet historiography, this tradition is rooted in Lenin's article 'What is the Heritage That We Disavow?' in which he claimed that Russian enlighteners were direct intellectual forebears of the Decembrists, and, in Western Europe, the critics of the old order; V. I. Lenin, 'Ot kakogo nasledstva my otkazyvaemsia?' *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, vol. 2 (Moscow, 1958), 507–50. Since Freemasons did not fit into the model of revolutionary intellectuals, their existence and heritage were either downplayed or turned into 'anti-Enlightenment' propaganda and, ultimately, 'disavowed'.
- 29 On the correspondence between Freemasonry and the Enlightenment, see, for instance, Heinz Ischreyt et al, *Beforderer der Aufklarung in Mittel- und Osteuropa. Freimaurer, Gesellschaften, Clubs* (Berlin, 1979); Anthony J. La Vopa, 'Conceiving a Public: Ideas and Society in Eighteenth-Century Europe', *The Journal of Modern History* 64:1 (1992), 79–116; Smith, *Working the Rough Stone*. For works insisting on the existence of a radical break between the Enlightenment tradition and Freemasonry, see Isaiah Berlin, *Against the Current, Essays in the History of Ideas* (New York, 1979); Gilbert McArthur, 'Catherine II and the Masonic Circle of N. I. Novikov', *Canadian Slavonic Studies* IV:3 (1970), 529–46; Lurana D. O'Malley, 'The Monarch and the Mystic: Catherine the Great's Strategy of Audience Enlightenment in *The Siberian Shaman*', *The Slavic and East European Journal* 41:2 (1997), 224–42; Marsha Keith Manatt Schuchard, *Freemasonry, Secret Societies, and the Continuity of the Occult Traditions in English Literature*, unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, University of Texas Austin, 1975.
- 30 Jürgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere* (Cambridge, 1989); Margaret Jacob, *Living the Enlightenment: Freemasonry and Politics in Eighteenth-Century Europe* (New York, 1991) and *The Radical Enlightenment: Pantheists, Freemasons and Republicans* (Boston, 1981).

- 31 Reinhart Koselleck, *Critique and Crisis: The Enlightenment and the Pathogenesis of Modern Society* (Cambridge MA, 1988).
- 32 B. N. Mironov, 'Gramotnost' v Rossii 1797–1917 godov: poluchenie novoi istoricheskoi informatsii s pomosh'iu metodov retrospektivnogo prognozirovaniia', *Istoriia SSSR*, no. 4 (1985), 137–53.
- 33 Smith, *Working the Rough Stone*, especially Chapter 2.
- 34 As Gary M. Hamburg points out in *Russia's Path Toward Enlightenment: Faith, Politics, and Reason, 1500–1801* (New Haven, 2016), 19, there can be at least three notions of enlightenment: an original religious and moral conception connected with the Christian faith meaning 'spiritual illumination'; the nineteenth-century conception mixing science, reason and ethical duty; and a twentieth-century conception connected with the process of education meaning 'rational instruction', 'progressive political education', or simply 'the condition of rationality'.
- 35 See, for instance, Martin Malia, *Russia Under Western Eyes: From the Bronze Horseman to the Lenin Mausoleum* (Cambridge MA, 1999), esp. Chapter 1; Thomas Barran, *Russia Reads Rousseau, 1762–1825* (Evanston IL, 2002). For a comprehensive study of publishing in Russia in the eighteenth century, see Gary Marker, *Publishing, Printing, and the Origins of the Intellectual Life in Russia, 1700–1800* (Princeton NJ, 1985).
- 36 See, for instance, V. M. Zhivov, 'Gosudarstvennyi mif v epokhu prosveshcheniia i ego razrushenie v Rossii kontsa XVIII veka', in *Iz istorii russkoi kul'tury*, vol. 4, XVIII – nachallo XIX veka (Moscow, 1996), 657–83.
- 37 Michael Confino, 'Herzen, and Russia's Elusive Counter-Enlightenment', in *Isaiah Berlin's Counter-Enlightenment. Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, New Series 93:5 (2003), 177–92.
- 38 Peter Gay, *The Enlightenment: An Interpretation*, vol. 2, *The Science of Freedom* (New York, 1969), 61–2. Quoted and acutely criticized for its selective and cursory treatment of the Russian Enlightenment in Jonathan Israel, 'Enlightenment! Which Enlightenment?' *Journal of the History of Ideas* 67:3 (2006), 523–45, at 539–40.
- 39 Zhivov, 'Gosudarstvennyi mif', 670.
- 40 Viktor Zhivov, *Language and Culture in Eighteenth-Century Russia*, trans. Marcus Levitt (Boston, 2009), 349.
- 41 In addition to the works discussed in this section, see Hans Rothe, *Religion und Kultur in den Regionen des russischen Reiches im 18. Jahrhundert: ester Versuch einer Grundlegung* (Opladen, 1984); Gregory Freeze, 'Handmaidens of the State? The Church in Imperial Russia Reconsidered', *Journal of*

- Ecclesiastical History* 36 (1985), 82–102; Olga Tsapina, ‘Secularization and Opposition in Times of Catherine the Great’, James E. Bradley and Dale K. Van Kley (eds), *Religion and Politics in Enlightenment Europe*, (Notre Dame IN, 2001): 355–92; and ‘Pravoslavnoe Prosveshchenie – oksiumoron ili istoricheskaia real’nost’?’, S. Ia. Karp and S. A. Mezin (eds), *Evropeiskoe prosveshchenie i tsivilizatsia Rossii*, (Moscow, 2004), 301–13; Andrei Zorin, *Kormia dvuglavogo orla: Literatura i gosudarstvennaia ideologiia v Rossii v poslednei treti XVIII – pervoi treti XIX veka* (Moscow, 2001), esp. Chapter 1.
- 42 Elise Kimerling Wirtschafter, ‘Religion and Enlightenment in Eighteenth-Century Russia: Father Platon at the Court of Catherine II’, *The Slavonic and East European Review*, 88:1/2 (2010) (*Personality and Place in Russian Culture*), 180–203, at 199; also Idem., *Russia’s Age of Serfdom, 1649–1861* (Malden MA, 2008), especially Chapter 6.
- 43 Colum Leckey, ‘What is “Prosveshchenie?” Nikolai Novikov’s “Historical Dictionary of Russian Writers” Revisited’, *Russian History* 37 (2010), 360–77, at 366.
- 44 For the corresponding eighteenth-century linguistic debates on ‘Slaveno-rossiiskii’, a new discourse unifying Church Slavonic and vernacular elements to reflect the synthesis, see Marcus Levitt, ‘The Rapprochement between “Secular” and “Religious” in Mid to Late Eighteenth-Century Russian Culture’, *Early Modern Russian Letters: Texts and Contexts* (Boston, 2009), 274.
- 45 Faggionato, *Rosicrucian Utopia*; Idem, ‘From a Society of the Enlightened to the Enlightenment of Society: The Russian Bible Society and Rosicrucianism in the Age of Alexander I’, *The Slavonic and East European Review* 79:3 (2001), 459–87.
- 46 For the European context of ‘exits from the Enlightenment’ between 1780–1820, see Margaret Jacob, ‘Exits from the Enlightenment: Masonic Routs’, *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 33:2 (2000) 251–4.
- 47 For more on Kheraskov, see Natalie Bayer, ‘Khéraskov, M. M.’, Charles Porset and Cécile Révauger (eds), *Le Monde Maçonnique des Lumières*, vol. II (Paris, 2013), 1602–05.
- 48 Historians place special emphasis on Novikov’s relations with Catherine II and the seeming contradiction between Novikov’s interest in mysticism (manifested through high-degree Freemasonry) and his overall Enlightenment posture. See Isabel de Madariaga, *Russia in the Age of Catherine the Great* (New Haven, 1981), 522–31; W. Gareth

Jones, *Nikolay Novikov, Enlightener of Russia* (Cambridge, 1984); P.N. Berkov (ed.), *Satiricheskie zhurnaly N. I. Novikova: Truten', 1769–1770; Pustomelia, 1770; Zhivopisets, 1772–1773; Koshelek, 1774*, ed. (Moscow, 1951); J. G. Garrard (ed.), *The Eighteenth Century in Russia* (Oxford, 1973); V. P. Semennikov, *Knigoisdatel'skaia deiatel'nos't' Nikolaiia Ivanovicha Novikova* (Petrograd, 1921); M. N. Longinov, *Novikov i moskovskie martinisty* (Moscow, 1867); G. Vernadskii, *Russkoe masonstvo* (Petrograd, 1918); William Gleason, *Moral Idealists, Bureaucracy, and Catherine the Great* (New Brunswick, 1981); G. P. Makogonenko, *Nikolai Novikov i russkoe prosveshchenie XVIII veka* (Moscow, Leningrad, 1951).

- 49 For more on this category, see Dan Edelstein (ed.), *The Super-Enlightenment: Daring to Know Too Much* (Oxford, 2010).
- 50 It has often been pointed out that the notion of the intelligentsia as a socially active educated elite was added to the Russian lexicon by Novikov's masonic comrade, Johann Georg Schwarz (1751–1784), in a series of lectures he delivered in Moscow Friendly Society at Moscow University in 1782. See, for instance, V. Tukalevskii, *Iskaniia russkikh masonov* (St. Petersburg, 1911).
- 51 This position is prominently reflected in Bogolubov, *Novikov i ego vremia*, 454, 457–9; Pypin, *Russkoe masonstvo*; Makogonenko, *Nikolai Novikov i russkoe prosveshchenie XVIII veka*.
- 52 A. S. Pushkin, *Polnoe sobranie sochiennii*, vol. 8 (Leningrad, 1978), 92.
- 53 In the beginning of the twentieth century, Russian historians tended to emphasize the political aspect of the Moscow Masonic circle, including their involvement with foreign lodges and Grand Duke Paul (for instance, the interpretations by Barskov, Pypin and Vernadskii). Soviet-era historians preferred to interpret the events as Catherine's personal attack on Novikov-the-Enlightener in view of the revolutionary events (Makogonenko, *Novikov i russkoe prosveshchenie*). Most recently, Raffaella Faggionato concentrated on the esoteric components of the Moscow circle, which was considered by the monarch as being harmful to society and the state, in *A Rosicrucian Utopia*, especially Chapter IV. For a bibliography of Novikov and Catherine's relationship, see Madariaga, *Russia in the Age of Catherine the Great*, 522–31; Jones, *Nikolay Novikov*; Gilbert McArthur, 'Catherine II and the Masonic Circle of N. I. Novikov', *Canadian Slavonic Studies* 4:3 (1970), 529–46; Berkov (ed.), *Satiricheskie zhurnaly N. I. Novikova*; Garrard (ed.), *Eighteenth Century in Russia*; Semennikov, *Knigoisdatel'skaia*

deiatel'nost' Novikova; Longinov, *Novikov i moskovskie martinisty*; Smith, *Working the Rough Stone*; Vernadskii, *Russkoe masonstvo*.

- 54 After 1784, authorities in many European countries exercised similar caution towards Masonic lodges. In 1784, for instance, Masonic lodges were banned in Bavaria. In 1787, Joseph II closed down all but a few Masonic lodges in the Habsburg Empire. In Prussia, numerous controversies concerning secret societies complicated the work of German Freemasons. In France, after 1789, members of masonic lodges were suspected of political plotting by all sides, and the lodges were virtually extinguished by 1794. Lodges came under intense scrutiny in Britain, culminating in the Unlawful Societies Act of 1799.
- 55 Leckey, 'What is "Prosveshchenie?"', 363.
- 56 Cited in Svetlana Evdokimova, *Pushkin's Historical Imagination* (New Haven, 1999), 31. This does not imply that history was not done in the Russian Empire before the 1830s. For more on V. N. Tatishchev (1686–1750), often considered the author of the first comprehensive history of Russia and his historical methods, see Edward C. Thaden, 'V. N. Tatishchev, German Historians, and the St. Petersburg Academy of Sciences', in *Russian History* 12:4 (1986), 367–98; 'V. N. Tatishchev and the Development of the Concept of State Service in Petrine and Post-petrine Russia, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, New York University (1971). As Cynthia Hyla Whittaker notes, in his writings on history Tatishchev connected his method to the scientific methods of Bacon, Descartes, Newton, Locke, Grotius, Fontenelle and Pufendorf (in a footnote in 'The Idea of Autocracy among Eighteenth-Century Russian Historians', *The Russian Review* 55:2 (1996), 149–71, at 159).
- 57 *Zamechatel'noe desiatiletie* is a phrase coming from the title of Pavel Annenkov's personal reminiscence, 'A Remarkable Decade (1838–1948)'. Isaiah Berlin used it for a series of his four essays on early Russian intelligentsia, 1955–1956. The essays were included in Berlin's *Russian Thinkers*, Henry Hardy and Aileen Kelly (eds) (New York, 1978).
- 58 In the words of J. G. A. Pocock, 'the Napoleonic episode obliged the dialectic between revolutionary empire and romantic nationalism to become the definition of European history', in 'Enlightenment and Counter-Enlightenment, Revolution and Counter-Revolution: A Eurosceptical Enquiry', *History of Political Thought* 20:1 (1999), 125–39, at 134. There, Pocock utilizes Berlin's terms 'Enlightenment' and 'Counter-Enlightenment' to differentiate between the formative powers of history

- in the creation of the British Empire vis-à-vis a ‘Franco-German-Russian “Europe”’ (138).
- 59 S. L. Peshtich, *Russkaia istoriografiia XVIII veka* (Leningrad, 1971).
- 60 Whittaker, ‘Idea of Autocracy’, 151.
- 61 As Whittaker points out, with the exception of the three imported German-language historians, Gottlieb Baier, Gerhard Müller and August-Ludwig Schlözer; ‘Idea of Autocracy’, 150.
- 62 Iu.M. Lotman and B. A. Uspenskii, ‘The Role of Dual Models in the Dynamics of Russian Culture’, A. Shukman (ed.) *The Semiotics of Russian Culture* (Ann Arbor, 1984), 35.
- 63 *Rossiiskii magazin*, 1792, part 1, 545–6; cited in Makogonenko, *Novikov i russkoe prosveshchenie*, 9–10.
- 64 As Leckey points out, this is a quote from Müller that Novikov uses in his entry on Shcherbatov; N. I. Novikov, *Opyt istoricheskogo slovaria o rossiiskikh pisatelei. Iz raznykh pechatnykh i rukopisnykh knig, soobshchennykh izvestii, i slovestnykh predanii* (St. Petersburg, 1772), 250–51. Quoted and translated in Leckey, ‘What is “Prosveshchenie?”’, 373.
- 65 N. M. Karamzin, ‘Predislovie’, *Istoriia gosudarstva rossiiskogo* vol. 1 (St Petersburg, 1818), xvi.
- 66 For more on the connection between Karamzin’s writing and the formation of nineteenth-century Russian conservatism, see J. L. Black, *Nicholas Karamzin and Russian Society in the Nineteenth Century: A Study in Russian Political and Historical Thought* (Toronto, 1975); J. L. Black (ed.) *Essays on Karamzin: Russian Man-of-Letters, Political Thinker, Historian, 1766–1826* (The Hague, 1975); A. G. Cross, *N. M. Karamzin: A Study of His Literary Career, 1783–1803* (Carbondale IL, 1971); Irena Grudzinska Gross, ‘The Tangled Tradition: Custine, Herberstein, Karamzin, and the Critique of Russia’, *Slavic Review* 50:4 (1991), 989–98; Henry M. Nebel, Jr., *N. M. Karamzin: A Russian Sentimentalist* (The Hague, 1967); Iurii Lotman, *Sotvorenii Karamzina* (Moscow, 1987), esp. 280–320.
- 67 Grudzinska Gross, ‘Tangled Tradition’, 994–5.
- 68 Iurii M. Lotman, ‘Binary Models in the Dynamics of Russian Culture’, in Iurii Lotman, Lidiia Ginsburg and Boris Uspenskii (eds), *The Semiotics of Russian Cultural History* (Ithaca, 1985): 30–66, at 64.
- 69 As Edward Thaden indicates, Karamzin’s work lacked ‘a vision of history as natural, organic growth’ despite the repeated use of the concept of ‘development’, in ‘The Vocabulary of Russian Historicism’, *Russian History* 17:3 (1990), 297–303, 300.

- 70 Marc Raeff (ed.), *Russian Intellectual History. An Anthology* (New York, 1966), 117.
- 71 On Karamzin's problematic relationship with Freemasonry, M. P. Pogodin, *N. M. Karamzin, po ego sochineniiam, pis'mam i otzyvam sovremennikov. Materialy dlia biografii* (Moscow, 1866); N. D. Kochetkova, 'Ideino-literaturnye positsii masonov 80–90–x godov XVIII veka i N. M. Karamzin', *XVIII vek, sbornik VI* (Moscow, Leningrad, 1964), 176–96; Ia. L. Barskov, *Perepiska moskovskikh masonov XVIII v., 1780–1792* (Petrograd, 1915); Alexei A. Kara-Murza, 'Traveler or Fugitive? A New Reading of Nikolai Karamzin's *Letters of a Russian Traveler*', *Russian Studies in Philosophy* 55:6 (2017), 410–21; Andrew Kahn, 'Nikolai Karamzin's Discourses of Enlightenment', Karamzin, *Letters of a Russian Traveller*, Andrew Kahn (ed.) (Oxford, 2003), 459–551. Iu. M. Lotman in his 'Ideia istoricheskogo razvitiia v russkoi literature kontsa XVIII- nachala XIX v.', *XVIII vek* 13 (Leningrad, 1981), 88, pointed out that Karamzin 'owed' many of his conceptions, and especially the one on *historiosophy*, to the Moscow Masonic circle.
- 72 To name a few, M. G. Gavrilov (1759–1828), Iohann Christian Geim (1758–1821), Christian Friedrich Mattei (Matthaei) (1744–1811), Jacob (Johann) Sneider (1747–1848) and Khariton Tchebotarev (1746–1815). For more on their Masonic careers, see A. Serkov, *Rossiiskoe masonstvo: entsiklopedicheskii slovar'* (Moscow, 2000).
- 73 For instance, Ivan Lopukhin's theories blended the ideas of Boehme and Voltaire; while Kutuzov did not see much contradiction between the concepts of Paracelsus and Condillac.
- 74 For more on the Russian high-degree Masonic/Rosicrucian identification of 'True Faith', lost knowledge and Orthodoxy, see Faggionato, *Rosicrucian Utopia*, esp. Chapter 3. Wirschafter's important work on the Russian Orthodox Church in the eighteenth century establishes how a juncture between Enlightenment moral philosophy and Russian Orthodox belief provided for a powerful combination of the modern and traditional. Wirschafter, 'Religion and Enlightenment', 180–203.
- 75 By referring to these ideas as Masonic I do not imply that they belonged to a single uniform vision, but address the views on history that originated in Masonic circles.
- 76 Masonic manuscripts in Russian libraries are peppered with citations from and references to Hermes Trismegistus, Pythagoras, Marsilio Ficino, Paracelsus, Fludd, Roger Bacon, van Helmont, Madame Guyon and the whole pantheon of mystical literature. Among the modern eighteenth-

century authors were F. G. Gellert, A. Haller, E. Young, F. G. Klopstock, Fr. K. Möser, Ch. Fr. Gernershausen and J. Bunyan. At the same time, systematic translations of the European sentimental works of writers like Gellert, Gessner, Rousseau, S. Richardson and Goethe with the efforts of Masons, paved the way for new ideas and new tastes in Russia.

- 77 On the importance of the idea of Russia as the Third Rome as a foundation of a cultural myth in the nascent structures of nationalism, see Stephen L. Baehr, 'From History to National Myth: Translatio Imperii in Eighteenth-Century Russia', *The Russian Review* 37:1 (1978), 1–13; Dimitri Stremookhoff, 'Moscow the Third Rome: Sources of the Doctrine', *Speculum* 28 (1953), 84–101.
- 78 Whittaker places Shcherbatov within a group of intellectuals who tried to provide a comparative framework for the causal connections in Russian history vis-à-vis Europe. 'The Idea of Autocracy among Eighteenth-Century Russian Historians', *The Russian Review* 55:2 (1996), 149–71, at 163–4. For more on Shcherbatov, see Anthony Lentin, 'Introduction', *Prince M. M. Shcherbatov: On the Corruption of Morals in Russia* (New York, 1969), 1–102.
- 79 This use of mimesis comes from Cathy Gutierrez, *The Occult in Nineteenth-Century America* (Denver, 2005), 237.
- 80 For more on the variety of Russian 'historiosophical' archetypes, see T. V. Artemyeva and M. I. Mikeshin, 'Istoriosofskie arkhetyipy v russkoi kul'ture', T.V. Artemyeva and M. I. Mikeshin (eds), *Filosofskii vek. Almanach. Vyp. 5: Ideii istorii v rossiiskom prosveshenii* (St. Petersburg, 1998), 12. On early attempts at Russian historiosophy, T.V. Chumakova, 'Zametki o drevnerusskoi istoriosofskii', *Filosofskii vek*, 79–80.
- 81 For an example of this viewpoint, see the works of Johannes M. Schaden (1731–1797), a German follower of Wollfian philosophy, who taught philosophy, languages, rhetoric, poetry and mythology at Moscow University and was a rector of its academic gymnasiums. A Soviet researcher, N.A. Penchko, presented Schaden as 'one of the most reactionary conservatives' at Moscow University, at the same time associating him with a group of the 'materialistic orientation' that included young Karamzin. See N.A. Penchko (ed.), *Dokumenty i materialy po istorii Moskovskogo Universiteta vtoroi poloviny XVIII veka*, vol. 1 (Moscow, 1960), 383. Karamzin remembers his study at Schaden's private pension during 1778–1782 as an introduction to Gellert. On this connection, see A.A. Kara-Murza, 'Karamzin, Schaden i Gellert. K istokam liberal'no-konservativnogo diskursa N. M. Karamzina', *Filologiya: nauchnye issledovaniia* a (2016), 101–06.

- 82 Elagin, *Uchenie drevnego liubomudriia*, cited in Pekarskii, *Dopolneniia*, 98, 110. Also cited and translated in Stephen Lessing Baehr, *The Paradise Myth in Eighteenth-Century Russia: Utopian Patterns in Early Secular Russian Literature and Culture* (Stanford, 1991), 91.
- 83 As shown in Marina Aptekman, *Jacob's Ladder: Kabbalistic Allegory in Russian Literature* (Boston MA, 2011) and Konstantin Burmistrov, 'Kabbalisticheskaia ekzegetika i khristianskaia dogmatika: evreiskaia mistika v uchenii russkikh masonov kontsa XVIII veka', *Solnechnoe spletenie* 18–19 (2002) (<https://www.psyoffice.ru/7944-15-3028.html>, accessed 10 January 2019), the words 'hieroglyphic' [sic] and 'kabbalistic' were used interchangeably by the Russian high-degree Masons and Rosicrucians.
- 84 For more on Elagin's position in regards to the Orthodoxy, see his 'Zapiska o masonstve I. P. Elagina', *Russkii arkhiv*, book 1 (1864; reprinted, 1866), 586–604; *Opyt povestvovaniia o Rossii* (Moscow, 1803).
- 85 V.O. Kluchevskii, 'Vospominania o N. I. Novikove i ego vremeni', *Russkaia mysl'* 1 (1895), 54.
- 86 'The Charges of Freemasons', part 1: 'Concerning God and Religion', in Jacob, *The Radical Enlightenment*, 280; 'Zakony elaginskoi sistemy', *Russkaia starina* 10–12 (1882), 69.
- 87 Rossiiskaia Natsional'naia Biblioteka, o. III, no. 167. Cited in A.V. Semeka, 'Russkie rozenkreitsery i sochineniia imperatritsy Ekateriny II protiv masonstva', *Zhurnal Ministerstva narodnago prosveshcheniia* pt. 39, no. 2 (1902), 351. This version is consonant with the message conveyed by the seventeenth-century Rosicrucian *Fama fraternitas* manifesto. See 'Fama fraternitatis', in F. Yates, *The Rosicrucian Enlightenment* (London, 1972), 249–50.
- 88 Baehr, *Paradise Myth*, 98.
- 89 Quoted in Vernadskii, *Russkoe masonstvo*, 156.
- 90 Semeka, 'Russkie rozenkreitsery', 350, 358.
- 91 M.M. Kheraskov, *Vladimir vozrozhdenyi; Tvoreniia M. Kheraskova, vnov' ispravlennye i dopolnennye*, part 2 (Moscow, 1797).
- 92 J. Arndt, *Ob istinnom khristianstve* (Moscow, 1784).
- 93 This point comes from Baehr, *Paradise Myth*, 242, footnote 74.
- 94 Kheraskov, *Vladimir vozrozhdenyi*, VIII.
- 95 Cyrus, as he was presented in Chevalier Ramsay's and Abbé Therasson's novels that were extremely popular with Russian Freemasons, was deemed among the greatest Masonic teachers. In Russia, there were two translations of Ramsay's *Cyropaedia*, and both were made in Masonic milieu. After Novikov's arrest, in 1792 the book was banned in Russia.

- 96 Baehr, *Paradise Myth*, 105.
- 97 *Ibid.*, 106.
- 98 On the representations of an ideal ruler in eighteenth-century Russian utopias, see Tatiana Artemyeva, *Ot slavnogo proshlogo k svetlomu budushchemu: filosofia istorii i utopii v Rossii epokhi Prosveshcheniia* (St. Petersburg, 2005) and *Ideia Istorii*.
- 99 Elagin, *Opyt povestvovaniia*.
- 100 Artemyeva, *Ideia istorii*, 133. For more on the correlation between history-writing in eighteenth-century Russia with the project of Enlightenment autocracy, see Hyla, 'Idea of Autocracy'.
- 101 This emphasis on monarchy corresponds with the alleged attempts to involve Catherine the Great's heir, Paul, in Freemasonry. According to Serkov, *Rossiiskoe masonstvo*, 993, Paul was 'possibly' initiated on 6 July 1776 in Friedrichsfeld, and visited a lodge in Vienna in the spring of 1782. On Grand Duke Paul's alleged participation in Freemasonry, see for instance Eshevskii, 'Moskovskie masony', 200; E.S. Shumigorskii, *Imperator Pavel I, zhizn' i tsarstvovanie* (St. Petersburg, 1907) and 'Puteshestvie Pavla Petrovicha i Marii Fedorovny za granitsu 1781–1782', *Russkii arkhiv* no. 2 (1890), 17–78; T.O. Sokolovskaia, 'Dva portreta Imperatora Pavla I s masonskimi emblemami', *Russkaia starina* 10 (1908), 81–95.
- 102 M.M. Kheraskov, *Kadm i Garmoniia*, 2 vols. (Moscow, 1789). For similar parallels in German-language literature, see Marianne Thalmann, *Der Trivialroman des 18. Jahrhunderts und der romantische Roman: ein Beitrag zur Entwicklungsgeschichte der Geheimbundmystik*, Germanische Studien, XXIV (Berlin, 1923); Heinrich Schneider, *Quest for Mysteries; the Masonic Background for Literature in 18th-century Germany* (Ithaca, 1947).
- 103 Borrowed from Kabbala, the idea of Adam Kadmon referred to a primordial universal man. See Konstantin Burmistrov and Maria Endel, 'Kabbalah in Russian Masonry: Some Preliminary Observations', *Kabbalah: Journal for the Study of Jewish Mystical Texts* 4 (1999), 9–59; Konstantin Burmistrov and Maria Endel, 'The Place of Kabbalah in the Doctrine of Russian Masons', *Aries: Journal for the Study of Western Esotericism* (2004), 27–68; Aptekman, *Jacob's Ladder*; Yuriy Khalturin, 'Kabbalah, Symbolism and Metaphysics in Russian Freemasonry of the XVIIIth–XIXth centuries', *REHMLAC* 7:1 (2015), 128–40.
- 104 On the (re)invention of a Slavic mythology within the context of the rise of a national consciousness, see Hans Rogger, *National Consciousness in Eighteenth-Century Russia* (Cambridge MA, 1960), 167–71.

- 105 Fond Rukopisei, Rossiiskaia Gosudarstvennaia Biblioteka, Fond 14, ed. kh. 378, 7 (32rev).
- 106 Raymond T. McNally (ed., trans.), *The Major Works of Peter Chaadaev* (Notre Dame IN, 1969), 47. For a similar conclusion about Chaadaev's views on progress, Nicholas S. Racheotes, 'Historicism, Progress, and Personality in the Writings of Peter Chaadaev and Timothy Granovskii', *Studies in Soviet Thought* 32:4 (1986), 341–66, at 350.
- 107 Baehr, 'From History to National Myth', 9, footnote, connects 'this depiction of a mythical paradise' with 'Russia's depiction of nationalistic and millennial goals'.
- 108 *Ibid.*, 10.
- 109 On the exploration of different Western trends and traditions influencing eighteenth-century Masonic thought in Russia, see for instance A.G. Cross, *By the Banks of the Neva. Chapters from the Lives and Careers of the British in Eighteenth-Century Russia* (New York, 1997); 'British Freemasons in Russia during the Reign of Catherine the Great', *Ars Quatuor Coronaturum* 84 (1971), 239–58; R.P. Bartlett, A.G. Cross and K. Rasmussen (eds), *Russia and the World in the Eighteenth Century* (Columbus OH, 1986); Artemyeva, *Ot slavnogo proshlogo*; Faggionato, *Rosicrucian Utopia* (Dordrecht, 2005); Inna Gorbatov, *Catherine the Great and the French Philosophers of the Enlightenment: Montesquieu, Voltaire, Rousseau, Diderot and Grimm* (Palo Alto, 2005); Yuri Khalturin et al (eds.), "*Nebesnaia nauka*": *Evropeiskaia alkhimiia i Rossiiskoe Rozenkreitsersstvo v XVII–XIX vekakh* (St. Petersburg, 2015); Iu.E. Kondakov, *Orden Zolotogo i rozovogo kresta v Rossii. Teoreticheskii gradus Solomonovykh nauk* (St. Petersburg, 2012); Baehr, *Paradise Myth*; Aptekman, *Jacob's Ladder*, especially Chapter 1; Edmund Heier, 'Studies on Johann Caspar Lavater (1741–1801) in Russia', *Slavica Helvetica* Band 37 (Bern, 1991); Roger Bartlett, 'Foreigners, Faith and Freemasonry in the Eastern Baltic: the British Factory and Pastor Georg Ludwig Collins in Riga at the End of the Eighteenth Century', *Russia and the Wider World in Historical Perspective* (London, 2000), 45–66; David Zdenek, 'The Influence of Jacob Boehme on Russian Religious Thought', *Slavic Review* 21:1 (1962), 43–64; Robert Collis and Natalie Bayer, 'Light from the North: Tadeusz Grabianka, the New Israel Society and Millenarian Sentiment Among the Russian Nobility, 1788–1807', Emmanuel Waegemans et al, "*A Century Mad and Wise*": *Russia in the Age of the Enlightenment* (Groningen, 2015), 353–67; R. Collis, 'Illuminism in the

Age of Minerva: Pyotr Ivanovich Melissino (1726–1797) and High-Grade Freemasonry in Catherine the Great’s Russia, c. 1765–1782’, *CollEgium: Studies Across Disciplines in the Humanities and Social Sciences* 15 (2014), 128–68; R. Collis, ‘The Petersburg Crucible: Alchemy and the Russian Nobility in Catherine the Great’s Russia’, *Journal of Religion in Europe* 5:1 (2012), 56–99; R. Collis, ‘Jacobite Networks, Freemasonry and Fraternal Sociability and their Influence in Russia, 1714–1740’, *Politica Hermetica* 24 (2010), 89–99.

About the Author

Dr. Natalie Bayer specializes in European intellectual history. A native of Rostov-on-Don in southern Russia, she graduated from Moscow State University in Russia with a degree in modern European history. She received her Ph.D. in European intellectual history from Rice University (USA) in 2007. Bayer joined the History Department at Drake University (USA) at 2010, where she teaches a variety of courses, including European Enlightenment, history of European nationalism, world history, history of the Russian Empire and history of the USSR, as well as courses on the daily life in the Soviet Union, the Old Regime, the French Revolution and the Russian Revolution of 1917. She publishes on the European Enlightenment as seen through the lens of freemasonry and other secret societies. Together with Robert Collis she authored *Initiating the Millennium: The Avignon Society and Illuminism in Europe* (Oxford University Press, 2019).