The Historical Journal, 48, 3 (2005), pp. 623–640 © 2005 Cambridge University Press
doi:10.1017/S0018246X05004590 Printed in the United Kingdom

A RUSSIAN BOURGEOIS'S ARCTIC ENLIGHTENMENT*

ADRIAN JONES
La Trobe University

ABSTRACT. *Studies of Europe's Enlightenment have been enriched by attending to its real and imagined impacts on indigenous peoples and of indigenous peoples on Europeans. Applying these methods to new-settled eighteenth-century societies offers another standpoint on the Enlightenment. This study is a sample: a civic history of a relatively new – in European terms – place suggests the possibilities. In 1792, a bourgeois, Vasilii Krestinin, from Russia's White Sea shore, published a history of Archangel, founded in 1584. Krestinin's view from a new Arctic society is as far from Europe's elegant metropoles and eloquent* lumières *as the ship captains, Pacific Islanders, and cat killers in influential recent studies of the Enlightenment. Just as these studies – and others on readers and reading – transformed studies of the Enlightenment, historians can use sources from new societies to observe answers and actions of people casting themselves as Enlighteners. This study of enlightened sensibility in an Arctic society suggests how the Enlightenment – viewed from settler societies – became anxious, how it fanned nationalisms, and how it was ensnared by naïve presuppositions that progress was a prerequisite of power.*

This is a study of the Enlightenment as espoused by an odd person, Vasilii Krestinin, in an odd place, Archangel, on Russia's Arctic Circle, in the eighteenth century. This article offers another reference point on the Enlightenment: a settler-society perspective.[1] Some post-colonial agendas are here applied to Enlightenment-era settler societies.[2]

School of Historical and European Studies, La Trobe University, Victoria 3086, Australia adrian.jones@latrobe.edu.au

* This article was first a paper to the XIth David Nicol Smith conference, Humanities Research Centre, Australian National University and the Australian National Library. I thank colleagues Lotte Mulligan, Bill Murray, Peter McPhee, and Alan Frost for their advice.

[1] Donald Denoon's fine study of the interplay of 'isolation, a reluctant labour force and extreme dependence on Europe' (p. 28) in other 'New Lands' (in great South ones, in his case studies) and his analysis of their distinctive educated and capitalized settler civil societies of free (specialized) trade has influenced my approach in this article to 'old' Europe and its Enlightenment: *Settler capitalism: the dynamics of dependent development in the southern hemisphere* (Oxford, 1983), chs. 1–2. Greg Dening's *Mr Bligh's bad language: passion, power and theatre on the Bounty* (Cambridge, 1992) is an outstanding example of work on the Enlightenment in interplay.

[2] Franz Fanon's *Les damnes de la terre* (Paris, 1961), along with Jean-Paul Sartre's Preface, is a key text. It was translated by Constance Farrington in *The wretched of the earth* (New York, 1968). Another is Edward Said's *Orientalism* (New York, 1978). Dipesh Chakrabarty's *Provincializing Europe: postcolonial thought and historical difference* (Princeton, 2000) develops the traditions Fanon and Said started. Sir Vidia Naipaul is sceptical: 'Our universal civilization', address to Manhattan Institute (1991), reprinted in

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X05004590 Published online by Cambridge University Press

As well as the indigenous peoples whose worlds were turned upside down in the era of the Enlightenment, settlers are another 'other', another exotic. And settlers have the advantage, for historians, of being more in tune than indigenous peoples with the things to which they were responding. Studies of settlers – a different kind of people in-between – widen the scope of studies of the Enlightenment.[3] This is a field of study that has had to endure post-colonial pejoratives of postmodernism as much as it once encouraged Eurocentric eulogies of modernism.[4]

In this case I analyse here – the outlook of a Russian merchant living in an exotic Arctic location – the settlers are distinguished by the fact that they wrote, spoke, and acted in what they took to be the language of the Enlightenment.[5] Claiming to be Enlighteners, fine fellows (we have no female voices) on the periphery claimed they saw at least a part of what their would-be Enlighteners of the metropoles had in mind. From their realizations, from their agency – in play-back, so to speak – we can show facets of the Enlightenment: how it went over with people who could heed well.[6] This framing complements other ways in which studies of the Enlightenment were renewed by looking at the reception of ideas rather than their inspiration.[7] Studies of

New York Review of Books (31 Jan. 1991), pp. 22–5, and reprinted in his *The writer and the world: essays*, ed. Pankaj Mishra (New York, 2002), pp. 503–17.

[3] Consider 'Subaltern studies': Ranajit Guha, 'Prose of counter-insurgency', in Ranajit Guha, ed., *Subaltern studies II: Writings on South Asian history and society* (Delhi, 1983); Ranajit Guha, *Elementary aspects of peasant insurgency in colonial India* (Delhi, 1983); Simon During, 'Post-colonialism', and Dipesh Chakrabarty, 'Trafficking in history and theory', in Ken Ruthven, ed., *Beyond the disciplines: the new humanities* (Canberra, 1992).

[4] Richard Rorty, 'The continuity between the Enlightenment and postmodernism', in Keith Baker and Hans Reill, eds., *What's left of Enlightenment?* (Stanford, 2001), pp. 19, 36. Linda Hutcheon's *The politics of postmodernism* (London, 1989), pp. 1–5, 11–15, offers a guide to modernism's framing of the Enlightenment. The many editions of two great works – Kingsley Martin's *French liberal thought in the eighteenth century* (London, 1929) and Peter Gay's *The Enlightenment: an interpretation* (London, 1970) and anthologies that accompanied them – exemplify the modernist approach. Settler and indigenous societies are missing in these works. Peter Sloterdijk's *Kritik der zynischen Vernunft* (Frankfurt, 1983), trans. M. Eldred as *Critique of cynical reason* (Minneapolis, 1987), is a postmodern tilt at the Enlightenment – esp. ch. 4. Kindred works, from an Eastern European perspective, are Larry Wolff's *Inventing Eastern Europe: the map of civilization on the mind of the Enlightenment* (Stanford, 1994), and Maria Todorova's *Imagining the Balkans* (New York, 1997).

[5] Naming and classifying was another aspect of the mindset: Donald Denoon, Philippa Mein-Smith, and Marivić Wyndham, *A history of Australia, New Zealand and the Pacific* (Oxford, 2000), ch. 1.

[6] John Gascoigne, *The Enlightenment and the origins of European Australia* (Cambridge, 2002), pp. ix–xii, 6–9, and Part 2.

[7] Linda Kirk, 'The matter of Enlightenment', *Historical Journal*, 43 (2000), pp. 1129–43. I refer to cultures of telling, reading, writing, and publishing, key innovations in Enlightenment Studies: Robert Darnton's *Business of Enlightenment: a publishing history of the* Encyclopédie, *1775–1800* (Cambridge, MA, 1979), *Literary underground of the old regime* (Cambridge, MA, 1982), *The great cat massacre and other episodes in French cultural history* (London, 1984), *The Kiss of Lamourette: reflections in cultural history* (New York, 1990), and *The forbidden best-sellers of pre-revolutionary France* (New York, 1995), and Roger Chartier's *L'éducation en France du XVI^e au XVIII^e siècle* (Paris, 1976), *Les usages de l'imprîme, XV^e–XIX^e siècle* (Paris, 1987), *Cultural history: between practices & representations* (Cambridge, 1988), *Cultural origins of the French Revolution* (Durham, NC, 1991), *The order of books: readers, authors and libraries in Europe* (Cambridge, 1994).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X05004590 Published online by Cambridge University Press

new-settler and colonial societies show playgrounds of Enlightenment discourses in action.[8]

I offer two tentative theses. In the remote Europe of the Arctic – and, I venture, in settler societies generally – collusion with Enlightenment values was neither vacuous nor in vain, but anxious and vulnerable all the same. As ardent and sincere as educated people in new societies might have been, their isolation as Enlighteners in remote, café-less places like settler societies made them easier to suborn. This study of sensibility in a cold and odd place concludes by showing some ironic consequences of their collusion with the values of the Enlightenment. In the eighteenth-century new societies of Europe's peripheries – in Russia's Arctic, as in this study, in Southern Africa, in the Atlantic Americas, and in Australasia and the Pacific – the Enlightenment fanned new-society nationalisms, rather than the cosmopolitanism and tolerance lauded in the Enlightenment's metropoles.[9] A recent study also suggests a similar trajectory for Prussia.[10]

A view from the odd and remote Arctic also helps show two aspects of the Enlightenment. The first is its ability to instil visions of progress, inspiring emulation, empowering self-assertion. The second is its embryonic nationalism, owing as much to the Enlightenment as to Romantic reactions to the French Revolution.[11]

I rely on two works published by the Imperial Academy of Sciences, Peter the Great's harbinger of Enlightenment in Russia. One work is extraordinary, the other ordinary; together, they show an eighteenth-century bourgeois's Enlightened sensibility in an exotic and quasi-colonized part of Russia. The extraordinary work glimpsing bourgeois sensibilities in remote provincial Russia was by a merchant, Vasilii Vasil'evich Krestinin (1729–95).[12] A corresponding member of the Academy of Sciences, protégé of Count A. R. Vorontsov, Krestinin published a *Short history of the town of Archangel* in 1792.[13] To A. A. Kizevetter, a Russian liberal historian charting – from tax records – Russia's by-passed civil society and missing bourgeoisie, Krestinin seemed just 'an accurate

[8] Gascoigne, *The Enlightenment and the origins of European Australia*, Part 2.

[9] Hans Rogger, *National consciousness in eighteenth-century Russia* (Cambridge, MA, 1960); Denoon, Mein-Smith, and Wyndham, *A history of Australia, New Zealand and the Pacific*, Part 3; Gascoigne, *The Enlightenment and the origins of European Australia*, chs. 3, 8.

[10] Matthew Levinger, *Enlightened nationalism: the transformation of Prussian political culture, 1806–1848* (New York, 2000).

[11] Consider Roy Porter's eulogy, *Enlightenment: Britain and the creation of the modern world* (London, 2000), and Linda Colley's *Britons: forging the nation, 1707–1837* (New Haven, 1992).

[12] А. А. Севастьянова, 'Василий Васильевич Крестинин : Архангелогородский пролог историографий' (Vasilii Vasil'evich Krestinin – prolegomenon to history writing in Archangel city), in Юрий Николаевич Беспятых, ed., *Архангельск в XVIII веке* (Archangel in the Eighteenth Century) (St Petersberg and Groningen, 1997) (hereafter cited as Sevast'ianova, in Bespiatykh, ed., *Arkhangel'sk v XVIII veke*), pp. 259–71, offers the best introduction to Krestinin.

[13] В. В. Крестинин, *Краткая история о городе Архангельском* (Short History of the town of Archangel) (St Petersberg, 1792) (hereafter cited as Krestinin). On Vorontsov: Sevast'ianova, in Bespiatykh, ed., *Arkhangel'sk v XVIII veke*, pp. 259, 265.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X05004590 Published online by Cambridge University Press

chronicler of the affairs of local merchantry of the time', half-way between a hack (Tatishchev?) with chronicles and an historian (Karamzin?) of state policy.[14]

Krestinin offers more. His elevated discourses of civic reform and pride enable us to trace how educated people settled in an exotic edge of Europe made sense of key Enlightenment discourses of civil society.[15] In him, we can study the Enlightenment in parley, assessing how it was received and what was parroted back.

We also have another source to put Krestinin in context. This is a more humdrum work. But it traverses the same terrain of Russia's European Arctic: S. Kozma Molchanov's *Description of Archangel Province* (1813).[16] Molchanov's tableau of seals, rivers, fish, and cloisters grounds Krestinin's self-image as an Enlightener. I read these texts to retrieve discourses from their word-ly world-views, troubling to privilege reports of actions.[17] I will not view Krestinin – as in Soviet historiography – as just articulating middling-class struggle and self-assertion.[18] Where Soviet-era intellectuals once had to think that bourgeois-dom in Russia was just a matter of levels of economic development and administrative clout, post-Soviet scholars are now free to emphasize *mentalités*.[19]

[14] А. А. Кизеветтер, *Посадская община в России XVIII столетия* (Town councils in the eighteenth century) (1st edn, 1903; Newtonville, MA, 1978), quoting p. 689: 'точный бытописатель ему событый из местного посада' (hereafter cited as Kizevetter, *Posad*); Sevast'ianova, in Bespiatykh, ed., *Arkhangel'sk v XVIII veke*, p. 260, citing А. А. Кизеветтер, 'Школьные вопросы нашего времени в документах', in *Исторические очерки* (Moscow, 1912), p. 115.

[15] Studies of the Enlightenment in Eastern Europe thus complement Darnton's and Chartier's line of research on reading and telling in the West. Both explore the reception of ideas.

[16] С. Козма Молчанов, *Описание Архангельской губерний, ея городов и достопримечательных мест со многими древними историческими и замечаниями, к дополнению Российской Историй слуушими, из разрых рукописных книг монастырских церковных архив, из достоверных словесных преданий и других песомнительных источников, с риобшением Архангельской Губерний карты, плапа и вида города Архапгельск, собранное в Архангельске* (Description of Archangel Province, its cities and chief places, with many ancient historical features and distinctions, supplemented by a Russian history derived from manuscripts and printed books in monastery and church archives, made up from true philological discoveries and other indubitable sources, plus appendices with a Archangel province map, and a plan and a view of the town of Archangel, all assembled in Archangel) (St Petersberg, 1813) (hereafter cited as Molchanov).

[17] I use methods of Michel Foucault, *L'archéologie du savoir* (Paris, 1969), as critiqued by Michel de Certeau, 'L'opération historique', in J. le Goff and P. Nora, eds., *Faire l'histoire* (3 vols., Paris, 1974), I, pp. 3–41, and his *L'Invention du quotidien: arts de faire* (1980; 2nd edn, Paris, 1990). My method is explained in my 'Word *and* deed: why a *post*-poststructural historiography is needed and how it might look', *Historical Journal*, 43 (2000), pp. 517–41.

[18] У. М. Коляков, in *Совецкая историческая энциклоредия* (Soviet historical encyclopaedia) (Moscow, 1966), VII, p. 75, and his 'Василий Васильевич Крестипп и его общественно-политическая деятельность (из общественной жизнь Архангельск 60–90 гг. XVIII вв.)' (Vasilii Vasilevich Krestinin and his social and political activities – a glimpse at social life in Archangel from the 1760s to the 1790s) (Candidate Dissertation in History, Leningrad State University, 1962); Sevast'ianova, in Bespiatykh, ed., *Arkhangel'sk v XVIII veke*, p. 260, citing С. Л. Лештич, *Русская историография XVIII века* (Russian historiography of the eighteenth century) (Leningrad, 1965), II, pp. 296, 300, 327.

[19] А. А. Кизеветтер, *Местное самоуправление в Россий IX – XIX ст.: исторический очерк* (Local self-government in Russia from the ninth to the nineteenth centuries: an historical outline) (2nd edn, 1917; The Hague and Paris, 1970) (hereafter cited as Kizevetter, *Samoupravlenie*), exemplifies the old

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X05004590 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The exotic Arctic shores of the White Sea in Russia are not often associated with studies of the impact of the Enlightenment.[20] Since Diderot, sun-kissed, sexualized shores of the Pacific have seemed to scholars a rather better site in and from which to query assumptions of Europe's Enlighteners. In recent decades, scholars have dwelt on the Enlightenment's Pacific exotic: products of journeys and imagining, where European Enlightened sensibilities collided with, but seldom colluded with, Islander others.[21] Historians then tried to retrieve the lost perspectives of the Islanders, but the evidence was muted in the sources left by Europeans, the historians having 'to look through the eyes of men who could not see what they were looking at'.[22] The quest has proved challenging.[23]

Among one of Europe's-own exotics, among merchants of the tundra, however, we find settlers affecting to speak with the sensibilities of their Enlighteners.[24] Krestinin the settler's fancy public talk and fine reports of civic deeds aped European metropoles. Settler admirations and imitations betray meanings received from discourses of Enlightenment. Moroever, these merchants of the Arctic had more agency, unlike native peoples of the Pacific,[25] but like other

---

approach. Л. Ф. Лисарькова, 'Развитие местного самоуправление в России до великих реформ: обычай, повинность, право' (Development of local administration in Russia till the Great Reforms: custom, obligation, law), *Отечественная История* (Fatherland history), 2 (2001), pp. 3–27, and the essays in А. В. Семенова, А. В. Демкин и В. Б. Лерхавко, eds., *Купечество в Россий XV – первая половина XIX века: Сборник статьей во честь профессора А.А. Преобрауенского* (Entrepreneurs in Russia, fifteenth to the first half of the nineteeenth centuries: Prof. A. A. Preobrazhenskii *Festschrift*) (Moscow, 1997), exemplify the new interest in *mentalités* (менталитеты). See also Б. Н. Миропов, *Историк и Социология* (The historian and sociology) (Leningrad, 1984).

[20] An exception is the chip-on-the-shoulder genius of Mikhail Vasil'evich Lomonosov (1711–65), who left his village on the Dvina in 1730. A *lumière* like his fellow northerner, Krestinin, Lomonosov also put Russians before foreigners: 'Panegyric to the Sovereign Emperor Peter the Great', in Marc Raeff, ed., *Russian intellectual history: an anthology* (New Jersey, 1978), pp. 32–48; Boris Menshutkin, *Russia's Lomonosov, chemist, courtier, physicist, poet* (Princeton, 1952).

[21] Bernard Smith's *European vision and the South Pacific, 1768–1850* (Oxford, 1960) spawned a field he elaborated in *Imagining the Pacific: in the wake of the Cook voyages* (Melbourne, 1992). Greg Dening's *Islands and beaches: discourse on a silent land, Marquesas, 1774–1880* (Melbourne, 1980) and Anthony Pagden's *European encounters with the new world: from Renaissance to Romanticism* (New Haven, 1993) are outstanding examples.

[22] Greg Dening, 'Writing what the eye sees', in *Readings/writings* (Melbourne, 1998), 41.

[23] My enthusiasm for research in Pacific dimensions of Enlightenment history is not universally shared: Gananath Obeyesekere, *Apotheosis of Captain Cook: European mythmaking in the Pacific* (Honolulu and Princeton, 1992). Marshall Sahlins defends the approach in *How 'natives' think about Captain Cook, for example* (Chicago, 1995).

[24] Given my antipodean frame of reference, other cases might focus on enlightening objectives of settlers of colonial societies like New South Wales. Consider how W. C. Wentworth's *Statistical, historical and political description of the colony of New South Wales …* (London, 1819; repr. Adelaide, 1978) and James Macarthur's *New South Wales: its present state and future prospects* (London, 1837) parallel the Archangel materials. (I thank Alan Frost for alerting me to these works.)

[25] An exception is interest in a Tahitian, Omai, brought to Britain by Captain Cook: *Cook and Omai: the cult of the South Seas*, Australian National Library, Canberra, 2001.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X05004590 Published online by Cambridge University Press

settler societies such as Sydney.[26] When Krestinin troubled to publish a history of his town in 1792, he colluded with Catherine the Great's enlightening (просвечующий) state. As Krestinin saw it, he too was an Enlightener.[27] Few other students of Enlightenment discourses of and on indigenous exotics can discern such answers back.[28]

To put things into perspective, we need to smell our subject. Archangel reeked. If you ignore the tundra and ice, Vasilii Krestinin's proud town was really a smelly hell, a wen of seal-blubber distillers, beef- and seal-tallow scour-works, shipwrights, salt-works, and vodka soaks.[29] It was like many a European outpost in the Caribbean and the Pacific! Only the smells may have differed. Peter the Great never cared to stay in the town on each of his three visits to superintend the building of ships in July–September 1693, May–August 1694 and 1702. He camped on off-shore islands, drank gallons, swam, frolicked with his rough mates, sailed frenetically, coming to town only for church – a tedious service ended with his curses, cannon fire, and a blast from his pistol. Surviving a trying storm at sea prompted him to plant a cross, labelled inimitably, 'kruvs maken kaptein Piter'.[30]

Archangel was always a tough frontier town. As early as 1729, two-thirds of local revenues were collected from taverns.[31] It worsened when the state promoted vodka in 1761. In the first week of the fiery quaff, profits soared and '10 people … fell down dead'.[32] By 1770, tavern profits could even still exceed civic leaders' best expectations by 6,000 rubles.[33] On the Tsar's day, town worthies feasted, toasting Catherine and Russia: 'undertaking the perilous task of draining the entire brace of beverages', wrote Krestinin. Celebrations often ended in brawling.[34]

Archangel was new and raw. It had no ancient or medieval history.[35] The great historian, Kliuchevskii, once remarked that Russia was the only European state to colonize itself.[36] Archangel is an example. Tsar Ivan the Terrible founded the town as a disembarkation point for foreigners in 1584. Monks held off coming till

[26] Alan Frost's *Arthur Philip: his voyaging, 1783–1814* (Oxford, 1987), and *Botany Bay Mirages* (Melbourne, 1994), and essays in his *Terra Australis to Australia* (Oxford, 1988), and *Pacific Empires* (Melbourne, 1999); Gascoigne, *The Enlightenment and the origins of European Australia*.

[27] Krestinin, p. 51.

[28] Dening's 'Between land and sea', in *Mr Bligh's bad language*, pp. 189–213, is an exception, tracing interactions – with undercurrents of collusion – between Polynesians and inter alia, Wallis, Cook, and mutineers; David Turnbull, 'Cook & Tupaia, a tale of cartographic *méconnaissance*?', in M. Lincoln, ed., *Science and Exploration in the Pacific: European voyages in the southern oceans in the eighteenth century* (Auckland, 1998), pp. 117–31.

[29] Molchanov, pp. 100–1.

[30] Krestinin, pp. 8, 96ff; Molchanov, pp. 82–9, 93–4, 146–7; Ю. Н. Беспятых (Iu.N. Bespiatykh), 'Третье ≪путешествие≫Летра I на Белом Море' (Peter's third 'journey' to the White Sea), in Bespiatykh, ed., *Arkhangel'sk v XVIII veke*, pp. 31–62. Molchanov (pp. 88–9) recounts the gunfire in church, 29 June 1702 and the cross (p. 86) in mock-Dutch, on 5 June 1694.

[31] Kizevetter, *Posad*, p. 465. [32] Krestinin, pp. 21–2. [33] Ibid., p. 47. [34] Ibid., p. 135.

[35] G. G. Frumenkov and A. S. Pushkina, eds., *Архангельск, 1584–1984: Фрагменты истории* (Archangel: fragments of history) (Archangel, 1984).

[36] V. O. Kliuchevsky, *A course in Russian history: the seventeenth century* (Moscow, 1907), trans. Natalie Duddington, ed. Alfred Rieber (Armonk, New England, 1994), pp. xxx–xxxi, 3–6.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X05004590 Published online by Cambridge University Press

1637, though they had long lived upstream nearby at Kholmogory.[37] Local archpriests had a home in Archangel in the 1680s, but would not live there till 1744 or perhaps 1762.[38] The place was too foreign for most devout Orthodox, who were xenophobes.[39] Moreover, Archangel's ten Orthodox churches – however often they burned down,[40] and even when re-built in stone – never adopted the steeple style promoted in St Petersburg's Peter and Paul.[41] Archangel the city without much history had straight streets; the quarter which Peter built to house garrison troops after 1703 was even in the Dutch-style of single- and two-storey terrace houses.[42] Catherinian Enlightenment stone façades, classical porticoes, and an enhanced grid layout for the town awaited the 1780s and 1790s.[43] Governors (воевода, губернатор, наместник) only came there to live in 1702, then left when boundaries changed, returning in 1786.[44]

Manufactured like many a colonial outpost in the antipodes and tropics, Archangel was built to service English, Flemish, and Dutch merchant seamen who began arriving in 1533.[45] Tsar Ivan IV Vasil'evich did not want foreigners staying anywhere, trading with whom they pleased. Ivan conjured burghers for Archangel from state peasants; promised six to ten years' tax exemption, 130 families moved from lands along the Northern Dvina River near Kholmogory monastery.[46] Others followed, down the years.[47]

Ivan IV built at Archangel a wooden fort of 6 bastions, 3 courts, a lock-up and 60 merchant dépôts, 45 km from the mouth of the Dvina at the White Sea.[48] The Northern Dvina offered the best route, once the ice heaved, to the river routes of the Russian plain; there was only one portage at Vologda. But it still took a week to get a message to Moscow. At Archangel, where taiga meets tundra, Ivan IV settled 200 fusiliers.[49] At least a thousand were based there during a seventeenth-century Baltic war.[50] Along came customs officials, too, on the take, receiving

[37] Krestinin, pp. 2–3; Molchanov, p. 70.

[38] Molchanov, pp. 73–4; [А. Л. Мельгунов], 'Магистратское описание города Архангельска 1779 года' (A. P. Mel'gunov, town chief's description of Archangel in 1779), in Bespiatykh, ed., *Arkhangel'sk v XVII veke*, pp. 285–302, at p. 291.

[39] Xenophobia in medieval Russian Orthodox culture is analysed in Fr Georges Florovsky, 'The problem of Old Russian culture', *Slavic Review*, 21 (1962), pp. 1–15; Edward Keenan, 'Trouble with Muscovy: some observations upon problems of the comparative study of form & genre in historical writing', *Medievalia et Humanistica*, 5 (1974), pp. 103–26; Alexander Pereswetoff-Morath, *A grin without a cat* (2 vols., Lund, 2002).

[40] Krestinin, p. 6; Molchanov, pp. 68–70, 97–8.

[41] Mel'gunov (1779), in Bespiatykh, ed., *Arkhangel'sk v XVII veke*, p. 291, reporting all Orthodox churches построенных в нынейшем веке собразец старинныя Российская архитектура. On churches in general, see Molchanov, pp. 68–73; Л. Д. Лопова (L. D. Popova), 'О градостройтельной истории Архангельска в XVIII веке (On the history of city layout of Archangel in the eighteenth century), in Bespiatykh, ed., *Arkhangel'sk v XVII veke*, pp. 7, 11–16.

[42] Popova, in Bespiatykh, ed., *Arkhangel'sk v XVII veke*, p. 9.

[43] Ibid., pp. 19–25.

[44] Molchanov, pp. 67, 80.

[45] Ibid., pp. 52–56; Popova, in Bespiatykh, ed., *Arkhangel'sk v XVII veke*, p. 7.

[46] Krestinin, p. 4; Molchanov, p. 79.

[47] Molchanov, pp. 76, 79; Krestinin, pp. 184–98; Bespiatykh, in Bespiatykh, ed., *Arkhangel'sk v XVII veke*, pp. 34–5, 45–7.

[48] Molchanov, pp. 75–6.

[49] Krestinin, p. 3.

[50] The entry for 1638 in Krestinin's chronology (pp. 96ff) which mentions 1,800 стрельцы.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X05004590 Published online by Cambridge University Press

'gifts' from merchants. As the locals maintained, 'Customs – that's a gold-mine!'[51]

Archangel was a tipsy, anxious, anything-goes, exotic, and frigid colonial place. As Ivan IV's pious successor, Fëdor I Ivanovich, put it in a charter of 1596 to Russian merchants new settled in Archangel: they could keep their beets and their whores (блядни) scot-free, but they could not shelter usurers, thieves or serf runaways, and: 'With the foreigners coming you must not live together; you must not buy their products from beyond the seas when you meet them in your city; always look sharp to their cunning foreign ways.'[52] In the eye of any beholder, Archangel was (and is) no Venice.

Now hear the proud voice of Vasilii Krestinin, published in 1792 on his 'glorious city of trade', Catherine the Great's 'well-spring and store-house' of northern prosperity. In his enlightened times and by his enlightened work in writing history, Vasilii Vasil'evich Krestinin, trading man (купец) of Archangel, living in and belonging to his community of townsmen (посад), was going to write about his town's traders and his town's stature. He said he wanted to fulfil his Empress Catherine's wish that everyone should know history, not just gentry (дворяне). This barb pointed at the nobility. Krestinin knew of no one of his estate writing history before.[53] Diaries are rare enough.[54] Krestinin still set out to enlighten, to dedicate a 'living monument' to the legacy of Peter the Great.[55]

This was unusual for provincial Russia. Russian regional towns were service centres.[56] They often had little more than a market, a brothel, taverns, barracks and state offices fronting a parade-ground, dusty-muddy-snowy square. Save for Ukrainian borderlands, Central Asia, and Siberia, gentry predominated in the officers' messes in their barracks and in the upper echelons of offices of state in these towns. Although Archangel seemed as under-developed as many a Russian provincial town, it differed. Few provincial places in eighteenth-century Russia had a local historian. Krestinin the merchant and corresponding member of the Academy of Sciences was pointedly writing as a public-minded historian in a largely gentry-less place – odd for Russia. In his Archangel, gentry were only garrison commanders and top-level state administrators. His Archangel was one of merchants – most wealthier than he – who dominated town affairs, and who received or solicited preferment from state officials.[57] His Far North was a place where rural people, fisher-folk, foresters, and hunters were almost all state peasants, not serfs.[58] As he saw it, the happy conjuncture since the 1760s of a reforming empress and the commercial consolidation of a relatively new and open settler society was enabling an era of Enlightenment.

[51] Krestinin, p. 137. [52] Ibid., pp. 165–6. [53] Ibid., pp. i–ii.

[54] David Ransel, 'The diary of a merchant: insights into eighteenth-century plebeian life', *Russian Review*, 63 (2004), pp. 594–608. [55] Krestinin, p. 51.

[56] J. Michael Hittle, *The service city: state and townsmen in Russia, 1600–1800* (Cambridge, MA, 1979).

[57] Krestinin's study at times becomes prosopography: pp. 52–3, 130–52.

[58] For the data on soul revisions of the 1850s, see Adrian Jones, *Late-imperial Russia: an interpretation* (Berne, 1997), tables 8.3 and 9.10.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X05004590 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Krestinin's *Short history* presents a community of proud – though not particularly pious – traders. In his Archangel in 1764, the proportion of state-registered town-dwellers, as distinct from gentry and peasants, whether state peasants or serfs, amounted to 3 per cent of the provincial taxpaying population, three times the imperial average. Of these town folk, roughly one in four in the middle of the century was a trader (купец), and one in eight an artisan or shopkeeper (мещанин). The rest – five of the eight – laboured, lingered, or begged.

As volumes of trade rose in Archangel during much of the eighteenth century, income disparities among merchants in the town seemed to be widening. Of the купцы, the trading one in four of the people living in the town mid-century, only one in ten qualified financially for the exalted First Guild when it was established in 1764–5, five of the other ten falling within the stout Second, the four remaining in the humble Third.[59] By 1779, however, no merchant in Archangel qualified for the First Guild, only two in ten qualified for the Second, leaving the remaining eight in ten in the Third.[60] Furthermore, the proportions in the status groupings of the town folk had changed since the mid-century: by 1779 artisans and shopkeepers (мещане) amounted to around one town-dweller in three, while traders (купцы) became just one in every ten; unregistered state peasants living, working, and idling in town made up the bulk of the population.[61]

One reason for the change was the rise of St Petersburg as Russia's key port for foreign trade. After the close of the Northern War, Peter the Great was keen to develop his new capital; tariffs there were reduced and directives were issued to trade all but local goods through St Petersburg. Twenty-five merchant and twenty-five artisan families were moved by fiat from Archangel to Petersburg in 1717.[62] Imperial orders, access rules, and differential tariffs like these hindered Archangel's trade. Tariffs and access restrictions on Archangel were only removed in 1762.[63]

But in spite of St Petersburg, Archangel's economy grew. In Archangel, a vast stone fort of 1668–84 replaced the charred wooden one; the new fort had 108

[59] Kizevetter, *Posad*, pp. 47, 119, 158ff.

[60] Mel'gunov (1779), in Bespiatykh, ed., *Arkhangel'sk v XVIII veke*, p. 295.

[61] Ibid., pp. 293, 298, assuming average households of eight persons, based on 146 registered купцы and 340 registered мещане households in a population of 10,823 in 1778. Registered and resident foreign traders in Archangel would not have affected these calculations because they were mostly single men, and were only numbered between a low of 47 in 1724 to 97 in 1710 and 83 in 1719 and 106 in 1779: Б. Н. Захаров (B. N. Zakharov), 'Иностранные купцы в Архангельске при Летра I' (Foreign merchants in Archangel in the time of Peter I), and Mel'gunov (1779), in Bespiatykh, ed., *Arkhangel'sk v XVIII veke*, respectively pp. 181–209 at pp. 195–8, 201, and 292. Idlers (гулаки) and beggars (нищие) were registered as 33 of 340 artisans or shopkeepers (мещане) in 1779, and 20 others were мещане registered elsewhere.

[62] Hittle, *The service city*, p. 91; Kizevetter, *Posad*, pp. 51–2.

[63] Н. Н. Репин (N. N. Repin), 'От дискриминации к фритредерству: Лравительственная регламентация торговли через Архангельска в 20–60 годы XVIII в. и её результат' (From discrimination to free trade: government regulation of trade through Archangel, 1720s to 1760s, and its results), in Bespiatykh, ed., *Arkhangel'sk v XVIII veke*, pp. 228–49. See also in the note above the decline in foreign merchants, 1719 compared to 1724, and the revival by 1779.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X05004590 Published online by Cambridge University Press

bond stores, 202 defence slits, a rampart, and palisade.[64] Peter built other forts downstream to guard each arm of the delta of the Dvina.[65] More officials collected revenues, even though the population remained stable.[66] Five wooden churches had sprung up in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. By 1803, the town boasted ten stone churches, the original five having been burnt and upgraded.[67] In 1655, 67 foreign vessels are recorded in Archangel, only 40 on average in 1693–97, but c. 160 annually in 1709–13, and 200 yearly in 1803–7.[68] Molchanov reports the trade coming from the Russian end of the Northern Dvina amounting to 120 big barges, 40 half ones, 1,200 rafts, and 255 river craft a year early in the nineteenth century. During Krestinin's 1780s there were 6.5 km of wharves in Archangel. Molchanov counted 900 wood houses quayside, 26 wooden shops, 9 public buildings of stone, another 26 wooden, including barracks. He counted town-side another 1,000 wood houses, plus 17 stone ones for big merchants, 219 shops (6 to 1 wooden), plus 4 public buildings of stone, and 12 wooden.[69]

Krestinin had no doubt that Archangel's mid-to-late eighteenth-century prosperity derived from Catherine the Great's decision to let local merchants manage the seal, tallow, and oil trades. She was moving away from Colbertist, Petrine, and Prussian models of using state monopolies, predatory pricing, and concessions for foreign entrepreneurs to develop commerce.[70] In Archangel, Catherine ended long periods when trades had been monopolized by magnates, like the Shuvalovs and Naryshkins, who had the inside running at Court.[71]

But this study is mainly of perceptions, not economic actualities. And Krestinin was seldom interested in the quantum of trade. Writing his civic history in the 1780s, he was interested in Russian hopes and values. Krestinin set out a sunny view from his new-settled society in which there were foreigners all about; in which the trading economy, once curbed, had still grown and even revived; and in which traders' income disparities were widening. Krestinin painted a civic vision of autocratic Russia; his people were secure under his sovereign. Many Prussians of the era would have agreed with his sentiments.[72] In Krestinin's mind, his civic

[64] Molchanov, pp. 76–7; 'Географическое описание города Архангельска и уезда 1768 г.' (Geographic description of the town and region of Archangel, 1768), in Bespiatykh, ed., *Arkhangel'sk v XVIII veke*, pp. 276–84 at pp. 276–7.

[65] Bespiatykh, in Bespiatykh ed., *Arkhangel'sk v XVIII veke*, pp. 31–62 passim.

[66] Officials (1730s–1770s): Mel'gunov (1779), in Bespiatykh, ed., *Arkhangel'sk v XVIII veke*, p. 300; Kizevetter, *Posad*, pp. 254, 263. People (1720s–1760s): Kizevetter, *Posad*, pp. 83–9, 106–16, 417.

[67] Molchanov, pp. 68–71.

[68] Krestinin, pp. 96ff, chronology entry for 1655; geographic description (1768) in Bespiatykh, ed., *Arkhangel'sk v XVIII veke*, p. 278; Molchanov, p. 102.

[69] Molchanov, p. 103.

[70] C. B. A. Behrens, *Society, government and the Enlightenment: the experience of eighteenth-century France and Prussia* (London, 1985), pp. 117–27; Isabel de Madariaga, *Russia in the age of Catherine the Great* (New Haven and London, 1981), ch. 30.

[71] Krestinin, pp. 11, 23, 25, 27–9, 36–42, 58, 63–6; Molchanov, pp. 94–9, 100. See also: Hittle, *The service city*, p. 107; Anthony Cross, *By the banks of the Neva: chapters from the lives and careers of the British in eighteenth-century Russia* (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 75–9; Kizevetter, *Samoupravlenie*, p. 92.

[72] Levinger, *Enlightened nationalism*, pp. viii, 5–7, 14 and ch. 3.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X05004590 Published online by Cambridge University Press

vision of a monarchical society was estate-less, Enlightening, corporative, potentially free from abuses of power, and indifferent to the landed gentry. Krestinin was proud, for example, sketching his gentry-free blubber community occasioning the birth of a future Tsar, Alexander I Pavlovich, in 1777: 'At the end of the divine service all undertook to assemble at the State Prefect's (Магистрат), in whose building were gathered in peace the whole trading community (посад) … Where once only the best people assembled at the Prefect's … the elder (старшин) of the petty townsmen (мещане) now read, for the general edification', what rich and poor traders alike had agreed on in supporting orphans and poor children.[73] Echoing his Empress Catherine the Great's moves to regularize poor relief and to espouse Enlightenment norms of alms for improvement, Krestinin wrote paternalistically of his fellow townsmen's 'guardianship (попечительство)' for the poor and infirm.[74] Krestinin's was a language of civil society, of a 'common rank of gentlemen (единаго чин граждане)'. All Archangel's trading folk were 'my co-citizens (мои сограждани)'.[75] This view differs from the mirthful, jaundiced sketches of nineteenth-century civic life in satires of Nikolai Gogol and Mikhail Saltykov-Shchedrin; satires of supine slavery.[76] Krestinin artfully reflected instead what he took to be Catherine the Great's hope, enunciated in her Charter to the Towns (Лородовое Лоложение or Жалованная Грамота Городам) of 1785, for 'a civil society of all free folk'.[77] Krestinin was speaking and writing the language of citizenship in Arctic eighteenth-century Russia.

We need to attune to the sources and echoes of this monarchist discourse of citizenship coming from a place new in the European imagination. Krestinin's idea of 'citizenship (гражданство)' mirrors another kind of talk in pre-revolutionary France. This was the startling language of *concitoyens* that Colin Jones found in the 'great chain of buying' that cut across bodies-corporate (*corps*) of *ancien régime* France, subtly undermining them, even as it upheld monarchy itself.[78] Krestinin's Russian discourse of an enlightened citizenry of trade (граж данство) also resembles Guy Chaussinand-Nogaret's, Colin Lucas's, and Sarah Maza's French studies of bourgeois anti-capitalist sensibilities.[79] Their research

[73] Krestinin, p. 60.

[74] Janet Hartley's fine study, 'Philanthropy in the age of Catherine the Great', in Roger Bartlett and Janet Hartley, eds., *Russia in the age of Enlightenment: essays for Isabelle de Madariaga* (London, 1990), pp. 167–202, traces the shift from Peter's pragmatism, putting loafers to work, to Catherine's humanitarianism; Krestinin, pp. 31, 51, 71–4, 135, 145, quoting 33: люди скудные.

[75] Krestinin, pp. v, 20, 23, 51.

[76] Nikolai Gogol, *The government inspector* (1834–6); Mikhail Saltykov-Shchedrin, *History of a town* (1869–70).

[77] Quoted in Kizevetter, *Samoupravlenie*, 97: все-сословное общество градское.

[78] Colin Jones, 'The great chain of buying: medical advertisement, the bourgeois public sphere and the origins of the French Revolution', *American Historical Review*, 101 (1996), pp. 13–40. A classic of monarchist *concitoyen* talk is [Nicolas Edme Restif de la Bretonne], *Les plus forts des pamphlets: l'ordre des paysans aux Etats-Généraux* (1788–9) (Paris, 1967).

[79] Sarah Maza, 'Luxury, morality and social change: why was there no middle-class consciousness in pre-revolutionary France?', *Journal of Modern History*, 69 (1997), pp. 199–229; Colin Lucas, 'Nobles, bourgeois and the origins of the French Revolution', *Past and Present*, 60 (1973), pp. 84–126; Guy

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X05004590 Published online by Cambridge University Press

shows how French bourgeois really wanted to retire and live like nobles (*vivre noblement*). As the Enlightenment of Voltaire and Montesquieu gave way to the aristocratic and paternal ideals of sensibility of Turgot, Rousseau, and Mably, this *corps* and family feeling changed into a new educated *esprit sociale* of civic fraternity and of mediation-cum-representation for the good of an increasingly abstracted *Patrie*.[80] These bourgeois of most stamps – commercial, professional, *gens de letters* – found nobles' unearned privilege, luxury (*luxe*), and laxity (*mollesse*) inimical to service and a common good. They also disdained class-and-capital mindedness. Self-interest was decried.[81]

Merchant though he was, Krestinin's Arctic-settler ideal was also the common good, and never the bottom line.[82] Like many Prussian bourgeois of the eighteenth century, Krestinin loathed merchants who put profit before everything.[83] His merchant-*concitoyen* enlightened sensibility loathed 'capitalists (капиталисти)', bemoaning the 'strength and malice of the wealthy'. Like the *lumières*, Krestinin abhorred illiteracy.[84] To Krestinin, капиталисти were self-made people on the take who put self-interest and profit before the interests of their city.[85] They flouted measures to control prices of staple commodities.[86] They went to 'out-of-town middlemen', by-passing their community.[87]

Krestinin also prized an abstracted rule of law. He recalled with pride the civic elections of 'judges and civic officials (всех новых судей гражданскаго чина)' over four 'holidays (праздники)' in July 1780: the voting, the church services, the cannon salutes, the Procurator presenting first the candidates and then the elected to the Governor, the subsequent dinner of barbecued deer, finches, tundra mushrooms, and breads for the elected and the illustrious, and the closing, when gifts were distributed to humbler folk, who had already been fed on benches outside. Krestinin pointedly concluded: 'Never before in the history of Archangel has there been such a spectacle of fun, issuing not from any fear of the people by those of power and authority (власти и начальства) as from love of mankind and wisdom.'[88] For Krestinin, the core Enlightenment value was a firm, consultative, freedom-giving imperial rule of law.[89] Offering autonomy amid order,

---

Chaussinand-Nogaret, *The French nobility in the eighteenth century: from feudalism to Enlightenment* (Cambridge, 1985).

[80] Lynn Hunt, *The family romance of the French Revolution* (Berkeley, 1992); Carol Blum, *Rousseau and the Republic of Virtue* (Ithaca, 1986).

[81] Albert Hirschmann, *The passions and the interests: political arguments for capitalism before its triumph* (Princeton, 1977).

[82] Krestinin, pp. 11, 134–7.

[83] Ibid., pp. 11–13, 17–19, 23, 26–7, 56–8, 134–7. On Prussia: Behrens, *Society, Government and the Enlightenment*, p. 200.

[84] Krestinin, p. 12.

[85] Ibid., pp. 11, 16–19, 55, 133–7, 144–5.

[86] Ibid., pp. 23, 28–9, 33.

[87] Ibid., pp. 13, 16, 47–8, 175–84, quoting 37–8: посторонные руки перепродажи.

[88] Ibid., pp. 83–7, quoting from 83, 85, 87.

[89] On these values in general in Russia, see: Il'ia Serman, 'Russian national consciousness and its development in the eighteenth century', in Bartlett and Hartley, eds., *Russia in the age of Enlightenment*, pp. 40–56.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X05004590 Published online by Cambridge University Press

fraternity, and peace, this Catherinian civil dignity, maintained Krestinin, 'happily restores citizen-like freedom, upheld by law, to the whole merchantry'.[90] German-style 'associations of civilized men' were in prospect.[91] Krestinin's view parallels the *Wohlfahrtsstaat* of Christian Wolff's influential *Politik* (1736) in Prussia: dependency makes for security when it is orderly, ordered, natural, and reasoned – as only an enlightened monarch can be.[92] Like Montesquieu, Krestinin thought the progress of the entire посад community of traders, and hence Russia, slowed when state governors behaved arbitrarily.[93]

Yet Russia had never experienced the rule of law. Krestinin had to know that. This must be why he emphasized the Enlightenment. Upright civic values or *mœurs* were as vital to Krestinin as to Montesquieu.[94] As Krestinin explained, people who were tyrannized were trapped 'in an unhappy condition' of 'servility (раболепное)', a 'state of hapless infancy'; Krestinin even observed, disingenuously, that people were knouted in Russia sometimes.[95] Krestinin's comment about this 'unhappy condition' supports Kizevetter's judgement, a century later, that urban officials in Russia were hostage to the state for the tax arrears of their trading brethren.[96] Even though his *Short history* only discussed abuses of power of local merchants and local officials, this was Krestinin's settler-society way of showing Catherine and the gentry what more needed to be done in Russia as a whole. Krestinin's purpose was 'to praise and lament the behaviour of civic fathers of yore (ово хвалы, ово хулы достоиние)'.[97] His civic agendas resemble Denis Fonvizin's alternately caustic and optimistic view of gentry sensibilities; everyone was able to be educated. In Fonvizin's 1782 play, *The infant* (Недоросль), ignorance is blamed for the barbarism of Russia.[98] Enlightenment will remedy everything. There are odd affinities here with Arlette Farge's study of political talk in urban *ancien régime* France: the sudden, seemingly unilateral, self-assertion of a right to be informed, and the novel idea of government as an open partnership of

[90] Krestinin, pp. 11, 17, quoting 27: щастливое возстановление гражданская всего посада вольности, защищаемыя законами. On Catherine's 'republicanism': David Griffiths, 'Catherine II: "the republican empress"', *Jahrbucher für Geschichte Osteuropas*, 21 (1973).

[91] Richard van Dülmen, *The society of the Enlightenment: the rise of the middle class and Enlightenment culture in Germany*, trans. Anthony Williams (Cambridge, 1992), ch. 4.

[92] Behrens, *Society, government and the Enlightenment*, pp. 178–9, 203–4.

[93] Charles-Louis Secondat de Montesquieu, *De l'Esprit des Lois ou du rapport que les lois doivent avoir avec la constitution de chaque gouvernement, les mœurs, le climat, la religion, le commerce etc.*, in his *Œuvres complètes*, ed. Roger Caillois (Paris, 1951), II, bk 1 ch. 5, bk 3 ch. 5, bk 5.

[94] Sevast'ianova, in Bespiatykh, ed., *Arkhangel'sk v XVIII veke*, pp. 263, 265. David Ransel's study of another merchant, Ivan Tolchenov of Dmitrov, 'An eighteenth-century Moscow merchant family in prosperity and decline', in Jane Burbank and David Ransel, eds., *Imperial Russia: new histories for the empire* (Bloomington, 1998), and 'The diary of a merchant', *Russian Review*, parallels my conclusions about Krestinin.

[95] Krestinin, pp. 23, 27, quoting 25 and 11: состояния безсильных младенцов. On corporal punishment: ibid., pp. 16, 55, 134.

[96] Kizevetter, *Samoupravlenie*, pp. 87–8.

[97] Sevast'ianova, in Bespiatykh, ed., *Arkhangel'sk v XVIII veke*, p. 263.

[98] Joshua Cooper, ed. and trans., *Four Russian plays* (Harmondsworth, 1972); Serman, 'National consciousness', p. 47.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X05004590 Published online by Cambridge University Press

governors and governed.[99] Krestinin's question-and-answer *Short history* was an act of information and partnership.

We do not expect to find these Enlightenment values of civic self-assertion and partnership in provincial Russia. Where did they come from? Consider three contrasts: French, Balkan, and Prussian.

An analogy with the Enlightenment in France, of the kind advanced by Arlette Farge, would emphasize religious influences (Jansenism) and the discursive effect of new café, salon, and newspaper *sociabilités*. None apply to the settler-society Russia of Krestinin's Archangel. Another study of the Enlightenment *sociabilités* in settler societies in the Australian colonies also emphasizes religious pluralism, 'free' lands, 'free-born' rights, and ease of access to education.[100] None is apparent in Russia. Krestinin, indeed, overlooked education altogether.[101]

Comparisons with the Balkans in the eighteenth century will not assist either. Balkan Orthodox clergy were vital in encouraging (among Greeks in Odessa, around the islands, in the Morea; among Serbs around Belgrade, and in the Vojvodina) or discouraging (among the Phanariots in the Danubian Principalities, and in the Ecumenical Patriarchate) an emerging national *sociabilité* in Serbia, Greece, and among Romanians. Russian clergy seem to have disliked Archangel, however. They do not figure in Krestinin's *Short history* nor in his civic vision for Russia. Krestinin's only religious concern was a settler's archetypical fear of civic impermanence; he (and Molchanov) wanted all local churches to be stone, not wooden.[102] Clergy bemoaning ignorance and tyranny seem as rare in Russia as they were influential in Serbia or Greece.[103] In the development of civic vision of an enlightened society, it seems to have mattered – church-wise – whether the tyranny you were resisting was 'yours' or not. This seems a legacy of Peter the Great and Feofan Prokopovich's unequivocal linking of Orthodoxy with the Imperial Russian state.[104]

Contrasts with Prussia, after the shocks of 1806–7, do resonate however. Prussia's reformers around Hardenberg and Stein – mostly bourgeois and

[99] Arlette Farge, *Dire et mal dire: l'opinion publique au XVIII^e siècle* (Paris, 1992).

[100] Gascoigne, *The Enlightenment and the origins of European Australia*, chs. 2–6.

[101] Molchanov, p. 73, mentions 200 children of clergy studying in the seminary in 1810s, but offers no details (pp. 98–9) of the numbers of pupils, respectively, in a war-orphans' school, a secondary school (гимназий), and a primary school (главное народное училище) in Archangel that he also mentions. Mel'gunov (1779), in Bespiatykh, ed., *Arkhangel'sk v XVIII veke*, p. 314, also lists the seminary, a garrison school that corresponds to the war-orphans and a 'Russian school' where children of 'various' classes obtain instruction in reading and writing in the rear of the Troitsk cathedral. There is no mention of a secondary school in Mel'gunov's report of 1779.

[102] Krestinin, pp. 6–7; Molchanov, p. 70.

[103] Paschalis Kitromilides, *The Enlightenment as social criticism: Iosipos Moisodax and Greek culture in the 18th century* (Princeton, 1992); an autobiographical memoir (1829) of Adamantios Korais of Chios (1748–1833) in Richard Clogg, ed. and trans., *The movement for Greek independence, 1770–1821: a collection of documents* (London, 1976), pp. 119–31; Lovett Edwards, ed. and trans., *Memoirs of* Prota *Matija Nenadović* (written c. 1830, pub. 1856) (Oxford, 1969); George Noyes, ed. and trans., *The life and adventures of Dimitrie Obradović* (Berkeley, 1953).

[104] James Cracraft, *The church reform of Peter the Great* (London, 1971).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X05004590 Published online by Cambridge University Press

professionals of Krestinin's kind – also tried to forge 'a rational and harmonious civil society'. According to a major recent study, they conceived that society as 'a hybrid' of 'a sovereign king and a politically mobilized nation', a hybrid that 'would enhance rather than diminish the power of the Prussian monarchy'.[105] In the era between the 1760s and 1790s, German merchants were likely to join civic patriotic societies championing a very Krestinin-like agenda of state interests, civic pride, useful trades and poor relief; officials and professionals preferred to join civic reading societies.[106]

To be sure, Russia was not Germany. Russia lacked northern Germany's Protestant traditions, its influx of Huguenots, its merchants with some appreciation of free trade, and indeed its exposure to Scots liberal ideas.[107] The conjuncture – odd for Russia – of free settlement and associated new kinds of freer economics seems rather to account for the occurrence of Krestinin's enlightening mindset in an odd place like Archangel. It is striking how a recent study of settler historians in great South lands has reached similar conclusions: 'Settler historiography was not only Eurocentric, but also forward looking. A golden age lay not in the past but in the future. Humble origins could be conceded and the arduous life of pioneers could be relished in retrospect, because there could be no going back to such primitive conditions.'[108] As in France, an emerging autonomous urban trading environment, freed from state monopolies, encouraged a new mindset.[109] To adapt Colin Jones's work on France, Krestinin's Arctic example is a variant of the 'great chain of buying': a Russian chain of buying, boasting, and belonging.[110] It was the more ardent in its enlightening mission for being expounded on the gentry-less periphery of European settlement as a civic vision supporting what Krestinin took to be his empress's mission.[111] Krestinin had seen Archangel prosper, especially once it could trade unimpeded, in spite of income disparities widening.

Krestinin's sensibility in his Arctic narrative of Enlightenment had revealing limits, however. Unlike Empress Catherine and mainstream western-European enlightened sensibilities, Krestinin's historical narrative lacked a cosmopolitan dimension.[112] In his semi-sovereign, provincial town-world, foreigners were

[105] Levinger, *Enlightened nationalism*, quoting from pp. viii, 14.

[106] Van Dülmen, *The society of the Enlightenment*: on civic reading circles, see pp. 88–9, 134–5; on civic patriotic societies, see pp. 67–78.

[107] Behrens, *Society, government and the Enlightenment*, pp. 123, 126; Fania Oz-Salzberger, *Translating the Enlightenment: Scottish civic discourse in eighteenth-century Germany* (Oxford, 1995).

[108] Denoon, *Settler capitalism*, p. 207.

[109] Kizevetter, *Samoupravelenie*, p. 92.

[110] Jones, 'The great chain of buying'.

[111] Contrast Gascoigne, *The Enlightenment and the origins of European Australia*, chs. 4–7, on the colonial ethos of 'improvement' in Australia.

[112] Karen O'Brien, *Narratives of Enlightenment: cosmopolitan history from Voltaire to Gibbon* (Cambridge, 1997). For Empress Catherine: W. F. Reddaway, ed., *Documents of Catherine the Great: the correspondence with Voltaire and the instruction of 1767, in the English text of 1768* (Cambridge, 1931); A. Lentin, ed. and trans., *Voltaire and Catherine the Great: selected correspondence* (Cambridge, 1974); Denis Diderot, *Mémoires pour Cathérine II* (Paris, 1966).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X05004590 Published online by Cambridge University Press

always 'Other', to one side, not with 'Us' – never the rollicking companions or snide simperers common to the courts of the time of 'the Greats': Peter and Catherine.

In Krestinin's universe of provincial and commercial values in Russia, there was no love of ways foreign. This was despite Archangel's place, at different times, as Russia's first, second, or third port of call for foreigners. Krestinin wholeheartedly endorsed, for instance, a decree of 1667 obliging 'aliens (иногородцы)' – foreign merchants – to pay Russian dues and to register all their goods in Russian stores.[113] Putting Russians first seemed, to Krestinin, a 'bulwark of the citizens' trading rights'.[114] He loathed fellow 'citizens' making sweetheart deals with foreigners.[115]

The Krestinin example suggests that when Enlightening sensibilities were wrenched from their metropolitan frames of reference, when they had to adapt in particular to outposts of settlement, they took on more xenophobic views of national identity and self-assertion.[116] Some cosmopolitanism was abandoned. Arctic Russia was unlike old-regime France and Italy in this, but perhaps like Greece and Prussia in the era of the French Revolution.[117] Fine and fancy ideas of citizenship seem to have resonated differently among educated elites in the newer, more isolated, more commercial, or more militarized societies in the multinational empires of Eastern Europe, and – in all likelihood – in settler societies elsewhere. The exotic was closer there. 'Fellow citizens (сограждане)' could seem few or many. Far away from the metropoles they honoured, feeling out of place and vulnerable, the opportunities – individual and collective – for defeat or some other demise or humiliation could soon seem as real as the opportunities to

[113] Molchanov too disliked merchants who were too close to foreigners: p. 100.

[114] Krestinin, p. 14; А. А. Преображенкий, 'Русское купечество в XVII века: социальный облик, самосознание' (Russian entrepreneurs in the seventeenth century: social outlook and consciousness), in Семенова, Демкин и Лерхавко, eds., *Купечество в Россий*, pp. 57–94, mentions resentments about foreigners (pp. 72–3, 81–4) and the xenophobic influence of the schism in the Orthodox Church (pp. 78–80) on merchant culture.

[115] Krestinin, pp. 20, 37–42, 65–6, 175–84.

[116] Contrast Gascoigne, *The Enlightenment and the origins of European Australia*, ch. 8, on 'Race and the limits of "improvement"'.

[117] In France, in the age of Voltaire and Montesquieu, and then during the Seven Years War (1756–63), the American War of Independence (1775–83) and Anglo-French commercial treaty of 1786, café and salon public opinion was as confidently French as it was cosmopolitan, explicitly assessing international developments for national implications: Farge, *Dire et mal dire*, and Daniel Roche, *France in the Enlightenment*, trans. Arthur Goldhammer (Cambridge, MA, 1998), ch. 14. Franco Venturi's exhaustive study of eighteenth-century Italian newspapers shows the same talkers and readers obsessed with the implications of international events for their duchy and their neighbours' duchies: *The end of the old regime in Europe* (3 vols., Princeton, 1979–84); Stuart Woolf, *A history of Italy, 1700–1860: social constraints of political change* (London, 1979), chs. 4–8. Greeks seem more self-referential, focusing on re-kindling lost glories of Greece, pagan and Byzantine Orthodox: G. P. Henderson, *The revival of Greek thought, 1620–1830* (Albany, NY, 1970), and documents in Clogg, ed. and trans., *Movement for Greek independence*. Northern European cameralism seems as inward looking. Behrens, *Society, government and the Enlightenment*, p. 182, and Hans Rosenberg's 'The alliance between merit and the spoils system', a chapter in his *Bureaucracy, aristocracy and autocracy: the Prussian experience, 1660–1815* (Boston, MA, 1958), suggests similarities in the Prussian case in the era of the French Revolution.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X05004590 Published online by Cambridge University Press

succeed and to progress. Yet, their sense of themselves as Enlighteners still equipped them to parley a different version of the same language.

From our ways of seeing things, Krestinin's crown was rather hollow. We know that Imperial Russia never came to be renowned for its liberty. Krestinin probably also feared it might be so. But he pressed on. To adapt his phrase, our knowing just how many 'unhappy conditions' of 'servility (раболепное)' persisted, and for how long, in Imperial Russia and in the Soviet era, might encourage a view that Krestinin's Arctic Enlightenment vision of 'fellows and citizens (сограждане)' could never blossom. We should respect his endeavour all the same, and respect it even as we can show how the xenophobia in his new-settlement life and in his *Short history* suborned his Enlightening discourse.

Values were volatile in the era of the Enlightenment. Educated people could hope or profess one thing, and yet live or presume another. Krestinin's discourse of citizenry and community, his anti-capitalism and his eulogies of order and progress through law and by education quickly came to naught, for instance, when Catherine the Great in her administrative reform of 1775 (which she extended in her Charter of 1786) tightened eligibility for the wealthier status group(s) of guilds of merchants (купцы), and correspondingly enabled more shifts down to petty townsmen (мещане) status (and vice versa).[118] In one sphere of life, when he did not fear for his interests, Krestinin could seem Enlightened, calling fellow townsmen 'citizens (сограждане)', constructing and celebrating, when he thought his interests were secure, a civil society of harmony, public spirit, and one-corporate feeling (*corps*): we are one people of the town (посадные люди).

The public good was easy to uphold when you counted yourself as one of the best and first. But when Catherine bade her merchants to form tighter guilds, signifying that they should separate themselves, another sphere of life beckoned: the pecking order, the pull of private interests over a pompous postulate of a public good. Krestinin responded with relish and by habit. Merchants always assess the worth of others' businesses. He knew the 'people with clout (знатные)'.[119] He then wrote easily of 'gradations (звания)', of presence and residence. He had written too of 'old- and new-comers (старожилие и пришлые)' among his citizen-merchants, of 'the clout of some (прикащики)', and of their 'turnover (избощики)'.[120] He could never accept the idea that just anyone could become a trader.[121] In the Enlightenment world – as Adam Smith and Richard Cobden well knew, confronting British Corn Laws across the decades – the public good was easily suborned by forms of life as entrenched as patriarchy and aristocracy, forms of life presuming privilege, forms of life in the living (not in the hoping), forms etched by rank and deference.[122]

[118] De Madariaga, *Russia in the age of Catherine the Great*, pp. 90–1, 281, 300–1.
[119] Krestinin, p. 83. [120] Ibid., pp. 31, 49, 66–7, 96ff. [121] Ibid., p. 67.
[122] Adam Smith, *An inquiry into the nature and causes of the wealth of nations* (1776) (London, 1892), pp. 400–13. France's *ancien régime* was built on Court camarillas and venality of offices. Officer cabals in New South Wales to 1809, and would-be gentry in the Legislative Council of NSW, 1825–42, were likewise driven to take up lands in their own interests.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X05004590 Published online by Cambridge University Press

At another level, however, the same Krestinin responded with dismay to these developments. He was left out. Then again, like Machiavelli, he might not have written his *Short history* in questions and answers had he been in on a ruling cabal, one of the elect select.[123] People prospering in the new pecking order of guilds were people, he wrote, who were wealthier, more ignorant, more corrupt, and more manipulative than enlightened folk like him.[124] Civic electors now signed on in public under the name of a candidate; voting according to one's hopes for a civil society, as Krestinin saw it, became bad for business.[125] Honour seemed to him to have gone awry, replaced by fawning and greed. Krestinin contrasted 'auspicious [times] when civic freedoms of the whole townsfolk were restored, and laws were upheld' with inauspicious times when cabals took over. Krestinin impliedly lamented Russia's fate.[126] His hope was his *History*'s revelation to his empress.[127]

So, with this view from Europe's Arctic periphery, we see limits of the Enlightenment. In some new outpost European lands that were like a colony, where there was an empowered exotic capable of answering back in kind, but differently, the Enlightenment's great cosmopolitan chains of thinking and buying were still too slight. Self-interest in a social and political order inured to distinctions of rank and gender could still corrode all the fine talk, turning it xenophobic, making it more nationalistic, dividing its incipient citizen self. An artful sovereign, like Empress Catherine turning conservative, could still subvert and suborn its enlightening potential by playing up to the older, and as yet still greater, chains of boasting and belonging.

[123] The verb (выбирать/выбрять) is ambiguous in Russian.

[124] Krestinin, pp. 11–13, 17–19, 23, 26–7, 56–8, 134–7.

[125] Kizevetter, *Posad*, pp. 680–1, 689–90.

[126] Krestinin, p. 27: щастливое возстановление гражданская всего посада волъности, защищаемыя эаконами.

[127] Ibid., pp. ii, 34–6.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X05004590 Published online by Cambridge University Press