Religion, State & Society, Vol. 28, No. 4, 2000

'Renegade' Monks and Cultural Conflict in Early Nineteenth-Century Russia: The Cases of I. A. Fessler and J. B. Schad

FRANKLIN A. WALKER

The dismissal in 1810 of the Mason I. A. Fessler from the St Petersburg Theological Academy and in 1816 of the philosopher J. B. Schad from Khar'kov University anticipated the notorious persecution of harmless scholars at Kazan' and St Petersburg Universities in 1820–21.[1] The story, however, is more than that of early efforts of obscurantists to suppress modern thought. An examination of the writings of the two ex-monks shows why educational authorities scented subversion from professors who had transformed their seminary religiosity into world-transforming moral regeneration. The Fessler-Schad careers illustrate the cultural crisis that Kantianism and its aftermath caused in Russia. Could an autocratic government and a serf-owning society tolerate that emphasis in contemporary philosophy on the autonomy of the individual? Did the rejection of traditional religion threaten Russian Orthodoxy, which like Roman Catholicism was dogmatic, with sacraments, hierarchy and monasteries?

That Russian officials first welcomed but then rejected the notorious anti-Catholic polemicists illustrates the change in the reform plans of Tsar Alexander I (1801–25). Invitations to former priests early in the reign were unexceptional means to promote the expansion of higher education. Hostility to Rome had long been endemic in educational circles; anticlericalism, when not directed against the Orthodox Church, hardly raised eyebrows. The wars with Napoleon, however, intensified reaction against 'godless revolutionaries'. The treatment meted out to Fessler and Schad was the initial stage of a reaction that distorted the government's original cultural goals and destroyed the emperor's 'progressive' image.[2]

Ignaz Aurelius Fessler (1756–1839)

Fessler came to Russia in 1810, while Schad had arrived in 1804, but Fessler's almost immediate removal from the St Petersburg Theological Academy anticipated Schad's troubles at Khar'kov University six years later. The two do not appear to have been influenced by one another's writings, although they had common acquaintances in the German literary and philosophical world. Fessler's autobiography is the basic source of information about his early life. A smug defensiveness is as remarkable here as in any set of memoirs.[3] Born of humble German parents in Zurndorf, Burgenland, in the frontier between Hungary and Austria, he first studied with the

ISSN 0963-7494 print; 1465-3974 online/00/040347-12

Jesuits and hoped to enter the Society, but at its cassation he entered the Capuchin order at Moor, Stuhlweissenburg. The cloister does not seem to have been mentally or socially restrictive. His novice master presented him with Seneca's essays to wean him from the exclusive reading of religious books. The Roman stoic, Fessler recounted, taught him a morality closer to the 'heart' than the 'eructations of Jewish hatred' in the psalms. Seneca kept him pure when the sight of pretty girls in church aroused hitherto unexpected sexual desires. A Protestant landlord, a patron of the monastery, loaned him books from the Catholic scholars Claude Fleury (1640–1723) and L. A. Muratori (1672–1750) whose independence from neoscholasticism and papal authority were among the influences on the coming state–church struggles in Austria. From the same library erotic poetry suggested an alternative to celibacy.

Clergymen acquainted the young monk with modern views of ethics that were a departure from the teachings of Catholic Christianity. His intellectual journey was not unusual. Among other authors, he read Machiavelli, Bacon, Hobbes and the English deist Matthew Tindal (1653?–1733). He also read Voltaire, Hume and Rousseau. Under the influence of the Enlighteners and disappointed with the loss of those religious consolations which he had experienced as a boy, Fessler claimed that he had altogether lost his religious faith. This did not prevent him from presenting himself for ordination to the priesthood, nor from accepting the social prestige and scholarly opportunities that this offered. While he deplored the hateful 'chains' of monasticism, he depicted a comfortable priestly life, where he enjoyed aristocratic society and delighted in the company of attractive women. He continued his studies, having been sent from his monastery to the University of Vienna, where he lived at a nearby Capuchin monastery. He fulfilled his priestly obligations even if he no longer believed in the sacramental system.

An interest in that broad category of what was then termed 'Jansenist' literature renewed some interest in Christianity, at least in its antipapal versions. A priest-scholar of this sort Joseph II admired. In 1784 the priest became a professor of Oriental languages at Lemberg University. He received permission from the government in 1787 (but without a papal dispensation) to leave the Capuchins, but he remained in the priesthood.[4]

Fessler's 1782 pamphlet *Was ist der Kaiser*? had established his wish to be included among the many publicists who supported secular control over the church. He offered a blunt defence of authoritarianism in the state. Scripture and the Fathers, in holding that a Christian must be holy and humble, commanded obedience to the ruler. The power of the prince came directly from God and therefore the ruler had the right to correct abuses in the church. The author asserted the decline of religion in the high Middle Ages and abused especially popes such as Gregory VII and Boniface VIII for 'breathing the spirit not of Christianity but of disunity and division'.[5]

The author's alienation from Catholic theology may be seen in his 1788 *Sydney*, an anti-Catholic portrayal of the late Stuart monarchy. While academic society in Lemberg applauded the work, an ex-Jesuit insinuated that the author intended to slander Joseph II under the guise of King James II. Fessler feared that legal steps might be taken and departed for Prussia.[6] It does not seem that he had become a convinced Protestant but in 1791 he asked a prominent Lutheran preacher to accept him into the Lutheran Church. What moved Fessler's religiosity now were the 'holy' Kantian concepts of 'law', 'obligation' and 'reason'. He made no detailed confession of faith in Lutheran precepts.[7]

In Protestant Germany Fessler obtained an income by tutoring and writing, and prior to Napoleon's 1806 Prussian campaign the former monk for a short time had a

minor Prussian bureaucratic post as the representative of the state to the Catholic Church in the southern and eastern parts of the country. In 1796 he had opened a school for sons of the nobility from the Baltic part of the Russian Empire, but that ended when in 1797 the new emperor Paul I recalled his subjects from foreign schools.[8] Fessler's wide reading in ancient and medieval narrative histories, as well as in philosophy and theology, allowed him to popularise historical themes and intellectual sagas. In one of his many commonplaces he argued that literature should lead to the 'moral and aesthetic formation' of a nation.[9]

Fictionalised history was a vehicle for Enlightenment platitudes, drawn especially from Montesquieu, but including elements of traditional Christian morality along with Kantian precepts of duty. Marcus Aurelius appears as an idealised constitutional monarch, a supporter of 'security of persons, rights and property'. A leader of 'the people' justifies rebellion against the tyrant in the name of 'natural rights'. Fessler praised Alexander the Great as the patron of Aristotle and learning. Only through an expanded knowledge of nature could the 'domain of superstitious thought be lifted'. An historical novel based on the quarrel of Bishop Bossuet with Madame Guyon and Archbishop Fénelon not surprisingly favoured the latter two against Bossuet and other clerical 'persecutors'. The famous conflict allowed the author to press the theme of a 'higher religion' superior to dogma.[10]

How distant Fessler was from traditional religion may be seen in his 1805 *Ansichten von Religion und Kirchenthum* which on its title page cited Lessing's distinction between the 'religion of Christ' and the 'Christian religion'. While Fessler assailed especially the Roman Catholic Church, he objected to all 'sectarianism'. He praised the sixteenth-century reformers, but acknowledged they had not grasped 'inner faith'. Spinoza's ethics had aroused in the author a 'spark of life', while Kant's method opened the way of uniting one's will to the eternal will of God. At the conclusion of a long account of his disillusionment with monasticism and Catholicism, he claimed to have moved to a firm faith in 'Father, Son and Holy Spirit'.[11] What he meant at this time by 'firm faith' is uncertain. Like so many others since the Renaissance he returned to neo-Platonic 'striving to the divine', which corresponded to his version of Masonry.[12] If there was little that was original or profound in Fessler, he was at least an industrious populariser of the neognosticism which Kant's complex rational religiosity had stimulated. An 1810 novel describes religion as revealing itself through 'symbolism'. He likened Christian teachings to ancient myths such as the 'stealing of the heavenly fire' and urged that Christian preachers, following St Paul, must 'bring the Gospel from the Jews to the Greeks', by which he implied that Christianity must absorb more from the ancient Greek philosophers. Theology, he maintained, was 'nothing more than a collection of pictorial indications of ideas which are not reached by reflection'.[13]

The Masonic movement for Fessler was a surrogate church which would, he hoped, lead to the regeneration of humanity. He first joined the Masons in 1784 when in Lemberg. In the 1790s he became active in Berlin's Royal York Lodge, where he delivered addresses before members, associated with leading aristocrats and tried to establish moral reform as the objective of ritual and symbolism. The philosopher Fichte joined him. They agreed that most of the lodge brothers seemed to show little 'spiritual and moral character', but the two mentors did not see eye to eye on how best to convert the majority. Some lodge members thought Fessler was too 'mystical', while others feared Fichte was 'Jacobinical'. Fessler argued that the origins of Masonry could be seen in ancient documents concerning gnosticism and Christianity, while Fichte looked to present-day Masonic ritual as the culmination of

an age-old oral tradition. The point of Masonry for Fichte was to serve as the vehicle for the propagation of philosophical-moral ideals, not in what he thought to be the 'falsification' of history. In any event, both left the lodge when the brothers rejected the reformers' preachings. However, Fessler maintained his interest in other Masonic lodges.[14]

After Napoleon's 1806 campaign Fessler, without an academic or civil service post, was in sorry economic circumstances. 'My present is oppressive, my future dark', he complained to a friend in 1808.[15] He jumped at the opportunity to become a professor of oriental languages at the newly restructured St Petersburg Theological Academy – a prestigious seminary for the Orthodox Church. P. D. Lodi, a former Lemberg student and fellow-Mason, now a professor of philosophy at the St Petersburg Pedagogical Institute, had recommended him to the powerful minister M. M. Speransky.[16]

At first all went well. Fessler opened a Masonic lodge in the Russian capital at which Speransky occasionally appeared.[17] Speransky, like Fessler and many members of the Russian educated public, admired Fénelon and dreamed of a 'truly' Christian renewal, even of an 'inner church'.[18] Fessler's knowledge of Oriental languages filled a gap at the Academy, while soon his passion for Kant allowed him to explain his philosophy to students whose professors could make little sense out of a neo-Kantian book on aesthetics.[19] But here he ran into the opposition of the Academy's professor of literature, Feofilakt (Rusanov), archbishop of Ryazan', who thought of himself as an authority on German philosophy. Feofilakt was an ecclesiastic of considerable culture. His experience as a monk had no more hindered his intellectual or social development than had the Capuchin order prevented Fessler from absorbing the ideas of the Enlightenment. Feofilakt was well read in European literature and resented, Fessler thought, the newcomer's dialectical skill.[20]

The archbishop wrote a sweeping if confused denunciation of Fessler's conspectus of a proposed course in philosophy. Even though Feofilakt had not read Fessler's Masonic writings, he knew enough of Fessler's approach (or at least had read enough of the writings of the Western European reaction) to make a link between Kantian philosophy and neognostic heresies. It must be granted that Fessler indeed had seen the church as having distorted Christ's intention of inaugurating the rule of reason.[21] Feofilakt argued that to base philosophy on reason alone, independent of 'feeling', undermined religion. Such rationalism adopted the subjectivism of the 'ruinous opinions of the Illuminati' – those often demonised followers of the ex-Jesuit and former Ingoldstadt canon law professor Adam Weishaupt (1740–1830) who advocated an 'interior' and 'rational' understanding of Christianity.

'Spinozism' was but another version of the same harmful tendency. The Russian cleric's outline of the history of philosophy was, to say the least, jumbled. Feofilakt warned the commission in charge of ecclesiastical schools that Fessler intended to reintroduce Platonic philosophy, especially as found in Plotinus, which had produced as many heresies as had French freethinkers who, under Voltaire's guidance, had substituted the metaphysics of Locke for the philosophy of Descartes. In addition to Descartes, the Russian (like many Enlighteners) looked to Francis Bacon and back to Aristotle. That the archbishop picked what he wanted from his authorities is apparent from his appeal to Descartes while protesting that Fessler encouraged 'the method of doubt' and had utilised the Platonic method to produce 'German scepticism'.[22] Feofilakt would have had much more ammunition if he had read Fessler's writings, but he found alarming enough a review in a German periodical of *Theresia* which remarked that the author had passed through all stages

of faith, doubt and knowledge, had lost the first, rejected the second and ended as an idealist.[23]

Feofilakt persuaded the ecclesiastical school commission to remove Fessler from his post. He was allowed to remain in Russia, first as a member of the commission reviewing the laws, but he soon left the capital for Saratov province. For two years he was a tutor at the home of a Masonic friend in Vol'sk, then went to the town of Saratov in 1813, and then to Sarepta in 1815. After the death of a favourite daughter in 1816 he turned to the Bible and to traditional Lutheranism. His conversion led to a new career when in 1820 he became the superintendent of the Lutheran Church in Saratov.[24] Besides personal tragedy his later path was not always smooth. He entered into a pamphlet war with a Lutheran pastor whom some Lutherans regarded as too much of a rationalist, while the pastor, who blamed Fessler for the loss of his parish, accused the superintendent of participating in a 'dark conspiracy' of Jesuits and Protestant pietists to restore the power of the Roman hierarchy.[25] In 1824 the new minister of education, the conservative Aleksandr S. Shishkov, grumbled to the council of ministers about the imprudence of allowing Fessler 'to spread among simple people every heresy and disturbance'.[26] The complaint appears to have been without result; in 1833 Fessler returned to St Petersburg as the general superintendent of the Lutheran Church.[27]

Johann Baptist Schad (1758–1834)

Fessler was fortunate that his conflict with Feofilakt occurred prior to the post-Napoleonic reaction. Much less happy was the fate of Schad, whom the police bundled out of the country in 1816, thereby concluding a comfortable 12-year post at Khar'kov University. Not through Masonry, but by philosophy would Schad transform society and to this goal he gave his own theosophical interpretation first to Kant, then to Fichte and finally to Schelling. While Fessler used literary devices to exhort, Schad wrote books of philosophy, but their views were close and their careers in part were similar. Both began as followers of baroque Catholic mysticism, became disillusioned with monastic spirituality, fled to Protestant Germany, married and then looked to Russia for advancement.

The son of poor Catholic parents in Mürsbach, between Coburg and Bamberg in the grand duchy of Würzburg, Schad at the age of nine entered the Benedictine monastery at Banz as a choirboy. At the age of 14 he studied under the Jesuits at Bamberg, where in addition to neoscholastic philosophy he perfected the knowledge of Latin that later would give him such distinction. When he was 20 he returned to the Banz monastery. According to his account for seven years he was a zealous monk, despite torments of sexual temptation. Frustrated, however, in efforts to achieve the glories of sanctity and suffering from doubts, he began to regard monastic prayers and readings with disgust. He found consolation in Kant's philosophy, which seemed to combine the spirit of freedom, rationality and common sense with a moral purpose. By 1788, although still a monk, he had mentally 'broken the chains of monasticism', signalled in his ridicule of monks in *Über Leben und Schicksal des ehrwürdigen Vaters Sincerus.* Although it was an anonymous publication, the nervous author left the monastery at night, sought refuge in Protestant Jena, and found a wife. In Jena he attached himself to Fichte, whose philosophy he substituted for that of Kant. When Fichte, after facing charges of 'atheism', left Jena in 1799, Schad lectured in his place.[28]

His successor, Fichte remarked, was 'very diligent', and 'understood better than

many others' the nature of 'transcendental idealism'. Schad became friends with Friedrich Schlegel and Schelling, whose views Schad began to prefer to those of Fichte.[29] On the eve of his turning to Schelling's philosophy, Schad published a three-volume study that stressed the profundity of religion in Fichte. In absolving the idealist from charges of atheism, Schad also told the story of his own journey from the darkness of monkery – 'a true hell' – to the light of philosophical religion. The anger in Schad's attack on Catholic dogmatism, which included ridicule of 'that old chatterer Augustine' (for over-emphasising the role of divine grace), may have appealed to some ardent sectarians in Germany, but there were fearsome implications for any traditional Christian. He objected to Luther and Calvin. Protestantism was not a true religion, any more than Kantianism was the final goal of philosophy. Both were necessary to destroy an evil past, but they only pointed to the future.

The merit of Fichte's philosophy was in showing the path to God. Schad scorned theologians who lightly tossed out the accusation of 'atheism', but he himself resorted to that device. Fichte, according to Schad, demonstrated that man, who represented a combination of the sensible with the supersensual, necessarily strove to the divine, while the teachings of Spinoza, Leibnitz and even some interpreters of Kant led to atheism. Only true philosophy could show religion in its purity.[30] His 1801 *Logik* followed Fichte in seeing the self strive to the absolute of an ennobled life and to God himself, while Schad repeated observations on the 'atheism' of Spinoza and the incompleteness plus contradictions in Kant and his followers.[31]

Despite his objections to monastic life, Schad kept enough of his youthful piety to interpret Fichte's moralism as signifying more religious striving then perhaps the philosopher had in mind. Schad may have realised this as he turned from Fichte to Schelling. Already in 1802 Schad credited Schelling with having Fichte's goal, but was afraid that the philosopher of 'nature' might lead into materialism those who were not philosophers.[32] By 1803 the ex-priest no longer had reservations about Schelling, whom he saw as pursuing the same objective as himself in 'filling the gaps' in Fichte's system. Schad described the capacity to reason as divine, looked to Christ as a divine teacher, rejoiced in 'complete spiritual harmony' and argued that the human inclination to religion called forth 'revelation'.[33]

None of this meant that Schad's philosophy was incompatible with the rational 'moral religion' of early German idealism. In 1804 he charged that monks, in wishing to deprive man of his freedom, dedicated themselves to the service of Satan. He blamed their love of 'darkness' for contributing to the despotism that caused the French Revolution. Monks and priests had replaced 'rational Christianity' with the 'crudest superstitions'. 'Holy religion' was not the slavery of the monkish spirit, but rather was the 'daughter of reason'.[34]

Officials of the Russian education ministry probably knew no more of Schad's writings than the ecclesiastical authorities would later know about Fessler. It was enough that Schad was a respected instructor, whom Goethe had recommended. The ex-seminary students at Khar'kov who could follow Schad's Latin were as enthused about his explanations of idealism as Fessler's students would be later. The students enjoyed Schad as a host in evenings of Latin conversation, interspersed with the master's playing of the violin and his droll stories about his monastic brethren. The professor's colleagues, some jealous of his scholarship, looked askance at his convivial habits.[35]

Into this remote academic world entered a smooth French royalist refugee, Anton Antonovich Degurov (1766–1849) (A. Jeudy Dugour). Prior to the revolution he had taught rhetoric and history in France and had written a detailed defence of Louis XVI

against the charge of treason.[36] Degurov had looked into his colleague's writings and found them to be subversive and his conduct to be unprofessional. In reports to the university's academic council and to the education ministry Degurov charged that two of Schad's doctoral students had copied their dissertations from their mentor's lectures, that in publishing an edition of classical Latin writings for students he had included unseemly expressions and that in a book on the natural law – *Institutiones juris naturae* (1814) – he had propagated the corrosive political views of the natural rights school and moreover had questioned the institution of marriage.[37]

Although Schad insisted that the doctoral candidates were unusually well qualified, he acknowledged that students at the university had no other sources than his manuscripts and books. While Schad's work on the natural law was filled with professions of loyalty and respect for religion, there was also a good deal on 'freedom', 'dignity', the rejection of 'slavery' and 'oppression', and even a mention of the 'right of resistance'. A section on marriage implied that in case of the cessation of love, there was a remedy in divorce.[38]

As the emperor's support of liberalism gradually gave way to fears of revolution and educational authorities were turning against Kant, Fichte and Schelling, Schad's calls for 'freedom' sounded louder than his patriotic effusions. In 1816 the new education minister, the pietist A. N. Golitsyn, gave the educational system a more pronounced religious direction than had his predecessor, A. K. Razumovsky, although Razumovsky himself had come under the influence of the reactionary Count Joseph de Maistre. Golitsyn obtained the approval of the council of ministers for the professor's dismissal and immediate despatch from Russia.[39]

Given no time to get his affairs in order, Schad left for Germany under police escort to spend the rest of his life in poverty as he protested his innocence and demanded justice. Since he had been a well-known lecturer in Jena his letters of complaint to German journals created so much stir that a Russian diplomatic official hoped that the grant of some money might 'shut him up'. When the conservative religious writer Aleksandr S. Sturdza, on his way from the diplomatic service to membership in the chief directorate of schools, reported to Golitsyn on the sad financial condition of Schad and his Russian wife, the tsar authorised the payment of 300 ducats to the wife, but nothing for the husband 'who had abused the confidence of the government'. Schad continued to bombard St Petersburg with long letters and as late as 1828 in his memoirs retold his injuries. In addition to recounting enormous financial losses, the breakup of his family and the destruction of his career, he explained his situation as the result of an intrigue on the part of the then curator of Khar'kov University, Count S. O. Pototsky, and of Degurov, who resented Schad's anti-Napoleonic rhetoric. He attached no blame to the tsar or to Golitsyn. Although Pototsky had nothing to do with his dismissal, Schad knew that many Polish aristocrats had supported Napoleon. While Degurov was a genuine enemy Schad attacked him not for obscurantism but as an adherent of Napoleon and of French Enlightenment ideology, neither of which accusation was true. These anti-Russian conspirators, Schad charged, had deceived the high-minded Golitsyn.[40]

How much any of this the officials bothered to read cannot be determined. The education ministry continued to suppress what it believed to be philosophical radicalism and would soon remove from their posts Russians who had been infected with 'poison' from studies in Germany. The disgust which liberal academics would feel for the anti-intellectualism and slander of career-seeking obscurantists has meant that Fessler and Schad, as early victims of the reaction, have been treated with generosity.[41] If they had misrepresented intellectual life in the German monasteries,

and in Russia were not quite the unique representatives of modern culture in a barbarous land (as they tended to see themselves), they were learned and productive. Fessler fell because a theologian with such heterodox views could not but have provided invidious material for Russian theologians apprehensive about new trends in philosophy that they did not understand nor trust. Schad suffered when in Russia idealism had become politically and religiously suspect.

If the narrowness of the education ministry resulted in injury to scholars, it must be remembered that in turbulent Europe ideologues participated in attempts to overthrow absolute monarchies. In December 1825 the Russian government crushed a rebellion from among well-educated army officers. Fessler and Schad were victims of illiberalism but with all their distaste for narrowness they were not altogether free from that limitation. The modern reader is inclined to find uncongenial the rehashing of unfair anti-Catholic abuse on the part of former priests who proclaimed pious objectives. Did they really see themselves as freed from Satan's grasp, or were they anxious to establish their credentials in the non-Catholic world, or at least to confound those who might accuse them of being 'disguised Jesuits?' Their diabolisation of monasticism had a wide audience in the Germanies, where many, instead of recalling the charitable and educational activity of the monks, saw the monasteries as places of misery.[42] The removal of the two Germans set an unfortunate precedent for later purges in Russian higher education, but Fessler and Schad showed at the very least a brashness in promoting views which, however fashionable in Germany, allowed their opponents in Russia to warn of danger to traditional loyalties. In the end sympathies for the persecuted discredited the upholders of the old order. Able Russians would later fill university posts, but the high-handed actions of officials in Aleksandr's reign did much to persuade the intelligentsia that there was a divorce between their ideals and the intentions of a government that too readily, but not unreasonably, identified contemporary philosophy with subversion.

Notes and References

[1] M. I. Sukhomlinov, *Izsledovaniya i stat'i po russkoi literature i prosveshcheniyu* (2 vols) (A. S. Suvorin, St Petersburg, 1889); S. V. Rozhdestvensky, *Materialy po istorii S. Peterburgskogo Universiteta*, vol. I (Gos. Tip., Petrograd, 1919); Cynthia H. Whittaker, *The Origins of Modern Russian Education: An Intellectual Biography of Count Sergei Uvarov, 1786–1855* (University of Illinois Press, DeKalb, IL, 1984), pp. 72–83; Cynthia H. Whittaker, 'From promise to purge: the first years of St Petersburg University', *Paedogica Historica*, vol. 18, no. 1, 1978, pp. 148–67.

[2] An erudite and balanced account of Russian academic life in this period is James T. Flynn, *The University Reform of Tsar Alexander I 1802–1835* (Catholic University of America Press, Washington D.C., 1988). For a general account of Russian culture see: James H. Billington, *The Icon and the Axe: An Interpretive History of Russian Culture* (Knopf, New York, 1966), esp. pp. 261–97; Alexander Vucinich, *Science in Russian Culture: A History to 1860* (Stanford University Press, Stanford, 1963), esp. pp. 226–32; and Andrzej Walicki, *A History of Russian Thought from the Enlightenment to Marxism* (Stanford University Press, Stanford, 1979). For a discussion of philosophy in Russia in the early modern period see V. V. Zenkovsky, *A History of Russian Philosophy*, translated by George L. Kline, 2 vols (Columbia University Press, New York and London, 1953), vol. I, pp. 46–107. On the 'safe' use of Kant very early at the University of Moscow see I. Ya. Shchipanov (ed.), *Istoriya filosofskoi mysli v Moskovskom universitete* (Moscow University Press, Moscow, 1982), pp. 20–21. The ambassador-publicist Joseph de Maistre went much too far when he remarked in a letter of 7 December 1810 that Russia's only religion was 'hostility to the Roman church'. (*Oeuvres complètes de J. de Maistre*, 14 vols

(Emmanuel Vitte, Lyon, 1884–93), vol. XI (1885), p. 521.) But Catholicism was a favourite target at school celebrations in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. For a few among a great many instances see Franklin A. Walker, 'Enlightenment and religion in Russian education in the reign of Tsar Alexander I', *History of Education Quarterly*, vol. 32, no. 3, Fall 1992, pp. 347–48.

[3] For a monumental study of Fessler's life and writings see Peter F. Barton, *Ignatius Aurelius Fessler: Vom Barockkatholizismus zur Erweckungsbewegung* (Hermann Böhlaus, Vienna, Cologne, Graz, 1969). See also: Peter F. Barton, 'Ignatius Aurelius Fessler: Von ungarischen Kapuziner zum Bischof der Wolgadeutschen', in Robert Stupperich (ed.), *Kirche im Osten*, vol. 7 (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1964), pp. 107–43; and more recently Peter F. Barton, *Jesuiten, Jansenisten, Josephiner: eine Fallstudie zur frühen Tolesranzzeit: der Fall Innocentius Fessler* (Hermann Böhlaus, Vienna, Cologne, Graz, 1978). For brief treatments of Fessler in English see Paul P. Bernard, *Jesuits and Jacobins: Enlightenment and Enlightened Despotism in Austria* (University of Illinois Press, Urbana, 1971), pp. 134–37, and Henri Brunschwig, *Enlightenment and Romanticism in Eighteenth-Century Prussia*, translated by Frank Jellinek (University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1974), pp. 39–40.

[4] [Ignatius Aurelius Fessler], *Dr Fessler's Rückblicke auf seine siebzigjährige Pilgerschaft* (W. G. Korn, Breslau, 1824), pp. 35–36, 43–44, 56–59, 66, 72–78, 157–58, 183, 199, 251–55, 447; Barton, *Ignatius Aurelius Fessler ...*, pp. 62–120.

[5] *Was ist der Kaiser? Verfasst von einem Kapuziner-Mönch. Herausgegeben von Fessler* (Vienna, 1782), pp. 9–17, 20–25, 33, 58, 82.

[6] Barton, 'Ignatius Aurelius Fessler ...', p. 115.

[7] [Fessler], *Dr Fessler's Rückblicke*, pp. 251–53; Barton, *Ignatius Aurelius Fessler ...*, pp. 198–203.

[8] Barton, 'Ignatius Aurelius Fessler ...', p. 114.

[9] Ignatius Aurelius Fessler, 'An die ästhetischen Kunstrichter der Deutschen', in *Berlinisches Archiv der Zeit und ihres Geschmacks* (Berlin), vol. I, 1796, p. 243.

[10] [Ignatius Aurelius Fessler], *Aristides und Themistocles* (2 parts) (Friedrich Maurer, Berlin, 1792), part I, p. 12. [*id.*], *Marc-Aurel* (3 parts) (W. G. Korn, Breslau, 1793), part I, pp. 3–5; part II, pp. 420–21. See discussion in Barton, *Ignatius Aurelius Fessler ...*, pp. 188–89; [*id.*], *Alexander der Eroberer* (Berlin, 1800), preface, pp. 358–60; Dr I. A. Fessler, *Äbalard und Heloisa* (2 parts) (Friedrich Maurer, Berlin, 1806); [*id.*], *Theresia oder Mysterien des Lebens und der Liebe* (3 parts) (W. G. Korn, Breslau, 1807). Fessler's extensive histories lack scholarly apparatus. See among other works his *Die geschichten der Ungarn and ihrer Landsassen* (10 vols) (J. F. Glendisch, Leipzig, 1815–25), *Die alten und die neuen Spanier: Ein Völkerspiegel* (3 parts) (Friedrich Maurer, Berlin, 1810) and *Attila König der Hunnen* (W. G. Korn, Breslau, 1794).

[11] Ignatius Aurelius Fessler, *D. Fessler's Ansichten von Religion und Kirchenthum* (3 parts) (Johann David Sander, Berlin, 1805), part I, pp. 23, 51–52, 58–61, 370; part II, p. 50; part III, pp. 179, 470–71. See Gotthold Ephraim Lessing, *Werke* (3 vols) (Winkler, Munich, 1969–72), vol. II (1969), p. 1072. Fessler was fascinated by his own intellectual adventures: see also his *Alonso, oder der Wanderer nach Montserrat* (Karlsruhe, 1810).

[12] [Ignatius Aurelius Fessler], *Bonaventura's mÿstische Nächte* (Friedrich Maurer, Berlin, 1807), pp. 12, 300–1.

[13] [Ignatius Aurelius Fessler], *Der Nachtwächter Benedict* (Karlsruhe, 1810), pp. 16, 192.

[14] Hans Schulz (ed.), *Fichte in vertraulichen Briefen seiner Zeitgenossen* (H. Haesel, Leipzig, 1923), pp. 134–36; Hans Schulz (ed.), *J. G. Fichte: Briefwechsel* (2 vols) (H. Haesel, Leipzig, 1925), vol. II, pp. 226–44; Wilhelm Flitner, *Johann Gottlieb Fichte: Philosophie der Maurerei* (Felix Meiner, Leipzig, 1923), pp. xiv–xix, li, 32, 48, 57; on the importance of political reform in the ideology of Fichte see Frederick C. Beiser, *Enlightenment, Revolution and Romanticism: The Genesis of Modern German Political Thought, 1790–1800* (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA and London, 1992), pp. 57–83; K. A. Varnhagen von Ense, *Denkwürdigkeiten des eignen Lebens*, 2nd edn (9 vols in 8)

(Brockhaus, Leipzig, 1843–49), vol. I, pp. 289–90; vol. II (1843), p. 328; [Ignatius Aurelius Fessler], *Fessler's sämmtliche Schriften über Freymaurerey*, 2nd edn (Gerlach, Freiberg, 1805), pp. 13, 15, 38, 117, 318–27, 375, 377; János Koszó, *Ignac Aurel Fessler: A racionalizmustól a romantikáig* (Budavári Tudományos táraság, Budapest, 1923), pp. 318–27; Barton, *Ignatius Aurelius Fessler ...*, pp. 255–302; Barton, 'Ignatius Aurelius Fessler ...', pp. 122–23; Xavier Léon, *Fichte et son temps* (2 vols in 3) (A. Colin, Paris, 1922–27), vol. II part I (1924), pp. 15, 213–26, 30–37, 42–48, 53; Xavier Léon, 'Fichte, Fessler et la loge Royale York à Berlin', *Revue de métaphysique et de morale* (1908), pp. 813–43; Florian Maurice, *Freimaurerei um 1800: Ignaz Aurelius Fessler und die Reform der Grossloge Royal York in Berlin* (M. Niemeyer, Tübingen, 1997); Paul Vulliaud, *Joseph de Maistre franc-maçon* (É. Nourry, Paris, 1926), pp. 153–55. The philosopher Buhle, who saw Masonry as a moral movement, praised Fessler, but at the same time hinted that he made too many concessions to those who looked to its gnostic origins. Johann Gottlieb Buhle, *Über den Ursprung und die vornehmsten Schicksale des Orden der Rosenkreuzer und Freymaurer* (J. F. Röwer, Göttingen, 1804), pp. 17–18. On Fessler as a reformer of Masonry see A. N. Pypin, *Russkoye masonstvo XVIII i pervaya chetvert' XIX v.* (Ogni, Petrograd, 1916), pp. 13, 105–6, 387, 390, 394, 399. On a short-lived miniscule secret society within the Masons, the 'Euergetes', which Fessler and two others formed in 1793 to further moral and educational reform, see G. P. Gooch, *Germany and the French Revolution* (Longmans, Green & Co., London and New York, 1920), p. 376.

[15] Cited in Koszó, *Ignac Aurel Fessler ...*, p. 337.

[16] 'P.M', 'Iz proshlago', *Russky vestnik*, no. 74, April 1868, p. 505.

[17] Vom Stein, who dismissed Fessler as a 'literary adventurer', accepted doubtful reports that Speransky at Fessler's gatherings had made slurs against the tsar. Erich Botzenhart and Walther Hubutsch (eds), *Freiherr vom Stein: Briefe und Amtliche Schriften* (10 vols in 11), (W. Kohlhammer, Stuttgart, 1957–74), vol. III (1961), pp. 765–66. In 1822, when Masonic lodges were abolished, Speransky claimed that he had visited Fessler's lodge in 1810 and 1811 only twice, and as a member of an official committee investigating Masonic lodges. Speransky to A. N. Olenin, 7 and 11 September 1822, in *V pamyat' grafa Mikhaila Mikhailovicha Speranskago 1772–1872* (Publichnaya Biblioteka, St Petersburg, 1872), pp. 737–38. The memoirs of D. P. Runich, curator of St Petersburg University during the reaction in the final years of Alexander's reign, refer to Speransky's 'ruinous effect' on education as seen in his invitation to Fessler. *Russkoye obozreniye*, no. 5, September 1890, p. 229. For a summary of Fessler's 1810 Masonic activities see T. O. Sokolovskaya, 'Vozhrozhdeniye masonstva pri Aleksandra I', in S. P. Mel'gunov and N. P. Sidorov (eds), *Masonstvo v ego proshlom i nastoyashchem* (2 vols) (Moscow, 1914–15) (reprinted Moscow, 1991), vol. II, pp. 174–76.

[18] See Speransky, 1804 letters in *V pamyat' grafa ... Speranskago*, pp. 374–78.

[19] D. I. Rostislavov (pseudonym R-ov), 'Feofilakt Rusanov: Pervy ekzarkh Gruzii', *Vestnik Yevropy*, no. 6, November 1873, p. 241.

[20] The Russian churchman objected to Fessler's wish to reduce the hours devoted to aesthetics (Feofilakt's subject). I. A. Chistovich, *Rukovodyashchiye deyateli dukhovnago prosveshcheniya v Rossii v pervoi tekushchago stoletiya* (Komissiya dukhovnykh uchilishch, St Petersburg, 1894), p. 49.

[21] Léon, 'Fichte, Fessler et la loge Royale York ...', p. 822. Other professors objected to Fessler's philosophy. See A. Smirnov, *Peterburgsky period zhizni Mitropolita Filareta* (Tip. A. I. Snegirovoi, Moscow, 1894), pp. 9–10.

[22] 'Zamechaniya chlena komissii dukhnovykh uchilishch, preosvyashchennago Feofilakta, arkhiyepiskopa Ryazanskago, na konspekt filosofskikh nauk, predstavlenny g. Feslerom', *Chteniya v Imperatorskom obshchestve istorii i drevnostei rossiiskikh pri Moskovskom universitete* (1859), part 5, pp. 115–23.

[23] Rostislavov, 'Feofilakt Rusanov ...', p. 242. For details of the conspectus see I. A. Chistovich, *Istoriya S. Peterburgskoi Dukhovnoi Akademii* (Tip. Yakova Treya, St

Petersburg, 1857), pp. 193–98. Joseph de Maistre also attacked Fessler's conspectus: *Oeuvres complètes de J. de Maistre*, vol. VIII (second printing), (Emmanuel Vitte, Lyon, 1893), pp. 233–65.

[24] Barton, *Ignatius Aurelius Fessler ...*, pp. 457–59, 461, 488–92; Erik Amburger, *Geschichte des Protestantismus in Russland* (Evangelisches Verlagswerk, Stuttgart, 1961), p. 72. In 1816 Fessler had been rejected for a post at Dorpat University when the curator, Friedrich Klinger, had the impression from a conversation that the applicant wanted to see all humanity united under some kind of renovated papacy. O. Smolyan, 'Klinger v Rossii', *Leningradsky Gosudarstvenny Pedagogichesky Institut: uchenyye zapiski*, vol. 32, part 2, 1958, pp. 41–42.

[25] Karl Limmer, *Meine Verfolgung in Russland: eine aktenmässige Darstellung der Jesuitischen Umtriebe des D. Fessler und seiner Verbündten in jenen Gegenden* (Karl Heinrich Reklam, Leipzig, 1823), pp. iv, 4–5, 19, 22, 219; *id., Das von Paul Pesovarius gegen die Geschichte meiner Verfolgung in Russland gesprochene Wort der Wahrheit in seiner Unwahrheit dargestellt von K.L.* (Friedrich Schumann, Ronneburg, 1824), pp. 4, 138, 190; *id., Allgemeine Grundsätze für die Beurtheilung und Würdigung der geoffenbarten Religion, mit steten Rücksicht auf die eigenen Aussprüche der Bibel* (Friedrich Schumann, Ronneburg, 1824), pp. 5–6, 21, 55; Ignatius Fessler, *Geschichte der Entlassung gewesen Pastors in Saratow, K. Limmer ...; ein Gegenstück zu Limmer's Libell, beteitelt, Meine Verfolgung in Russland* (G. F. Hartmann, Dorpat and Riga, printed in Leipzig, 1823), pp. 13–14, 27–31, 64, 105.

[26] 'Zapiski Admirala Aleksandra Semenovicha Shishkova', *Chteniya v Imperatorskom obshchestve istorii i drevnostei rossiiskikh pri Moskovskom Universitete*, July–September 1868, book 3, part 2, p. 46. Metternich included Fessler among other former Catholic priests in Russia as 'Jacobins' with a Christian colouring: Ernest Benz, *Die abendländische Sendung der östliche-orthodoxen Kirche* (F. Steiner, Wiesbaden, 1950), p. 684.

[27] *Russky biografichesky slovar'*, vol. 21 (B. Bezobrazov, St Petersburg, 1901), p. 60. For a full discussion of Fessler's later career, see Barton, *Ignatius Aurelius Fessler ...*, pp. 503–51.

[28] *Allgemeine deutsche Biographie*, vol. 30 (Duncker & Humblot, Berlin, 1970 (reprint of 1890 edition)), pp. 493–94; Johann Baptist Schad, *Lebensgeschichte* (3 vols) (Hofbuchdrückerei, Altenburg, 1828), vol. I, pp. 172–87, 268–73; vol. II, pp. 293–95; D. I. Bagalei, *Opyt istorii Khar'kovskago universiteta* (2 vols) (Parovaya tip. M. Zil'berberg, Khar'kov, 1893–1904), vol. I, pp. 494–97. The most recent study is Karl Klaus Walther, 'Johann Baptist Schad in Russland', *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas*, vol. 40, no. 3, 1992, pp. 340–65, who provides an excellent account of Schad's intellectual development at Banz and his later philosophy. Schad is treated also in A. M. Khlopnikov and A. V. Panibranttsev, 'Filosofiya Fikhte v istoriko-filosofskikh trudakh I. G. Bule i I. B. Shada', in Filosofiya Fikhte v Rossii (Izd. Russkogo Khristianskogo gumanitarnogo instituta, St Petersburg, 2000), pp. 47–48.

[29] Schulz (ed.), *J. G. Fichte: Briefwechsel*, vol. II, pp. 250, 327; Horst Fuhrmans (ed.), *F.W.J. Schelling: Briefe und Dokumente* (3 vols), (H. Bouvier, Bonn, 1962–75), vol. I, pp. 228, 238, 269; vol. II (1973), p. 383. On Schad at Jena see Max Wundt, *Die Philosophie an der Universität Jena* (G. Fischer, Jena, 1932), pp. 261–63.

[30] J. B. Schad, *Gemeinfassliche Darstellung des Fichteschen Systems und der daraus hervorgehenden Religionstheorie* (3 vols) (Erfurt, 1800–2), vol. I, pp. 1–2, 9, 12–16; vol. II (1800), pp. 2–3, 10–11, 70, 72–73, 125–27, 136–37, 306; vol. III (1803), pp. 2, 7, 217, 414–90.

[31] J. B. Schad, *Neuer Grundriss der transcendentalen Logik nach den Principien der Wissenschaftslehre* (Jena and Leipzig, 1801), pp. 89, 110, 223–24, 240, 242–43, 255, 286–87, 346–48.

[32] Schad, *Gemeinfassliche Darstellung ...*, vol. III, pp. 354–56.

[33] J. B. Schad, *System der Natur-und Transscendentalphilosophie in Verbindung* (2 parts) (P. Krüll, Landshut, 1803–4), part I, pp. viii–x, 33, 63, 120, 166, 286–87, 289; part II,

pp. iv–v.

[34] J. B. Schad, *Die Mönche am Ende des achtzehnten Jahrhunderts, oder Gefahren des Staats und der Religion von Secten des Mönchsthums* (Henning, Erfurt, 1804), pp. 2–3, 5–6, 9, 106, 131, 443–45, 461. See also his novel (with poetry) *Das Paradies der Liebe: Ein Kloster-Roman* (2 vols) (Erfurt, 1804), esp. vol. I, pp. 20–47.

[35] Bagalei, *Opyt istorii ...*, vol. I, pp. 506, 609–23, vol. II, pp. 43–44; 'Vospominaniya Professora Rommelya o svoyem vremeni, Khar'kove i Khar'kovskom universitete (1785–1815)', *Yuzhny sbornik* (Odessa), no. 9, 1859, pp. 50–53. In 1816 Karl Morgenstern (1770– 1852), philosophy professor at Dorpat, ridiculed a Schad work on logic as a pretentious imitation of Schelling (his paper was printed in 1821). Karl Morgenstern (ed.), *Dorpatische Beyträge für Freunde der Philosophie, Litteratur und Künste* (3 vols) (M. G. Grenzius, Dorpat and P. G. Kummer, Leipzig, 1813–16), vol. III (1821), pp. 1–6, 12–15, 20–24. A German colleague at Khar'kov, a Kantian, described Schad as a 'drunken lout': Ludwig Heinrich von Jakob, *Denkwürdigkeiten aus meinem Leben*, Halle University mss (microfilm), p. 213. In 1816 the Russian physicist T. F. Osipovsky, another Khar'kov professor, attacked Schad's division of reason between theoretical and practical: I. Ya. Shchipanov (ed.), *Russkiye prosvetiteli (ot Radishcheva do dekabristov)* (2 vols) (Mysl', Moscow, 1986), vol. I, pp. 165–66.

[36] A.J.G.D. [A. J. Dugour], *Mémoire justificatif pour Louis XVI* (F. Dufort, Paris, 1793).

[37] Bagalei, *Opyt istorii ...*, vol. I, pp. 42–44; D. I. Bagalei, 'Udaleniye professora Shada iz Khar'kovskago universiteta', *Zapiski Imperatorskago Khar'kovskago Universiteta*, vol. II, 1899, pp. 5–7; Walther, 'Johann Baptist Schad ...', pp. 355–61.

[38] Bagalei, 'Udaleniye ...', pp. 4–7; [Charles François Lhomond], *De viris illustribus urbis Romae editit Joannes Schad* (Typis academicus, Khar'kov, 1815), p. 44; Bagalei, *Opyt istorii ...*, vol. I, pp. 65–68; vol. II, pp. 42–44; N. Lavrovsky, 'Epizod iz istorii Khar'kovskago universiteta', *Chteniya v Imperatorskom obshchestve istorii i drevnostei rossiiskikh pri Moskovskom universitete*, April–June 1873, part 5, pp. 39–55.

[39] Flynn, *The University Reform ...*, pp. 130–32; Bagalei, 'Udaleniye ...', pp. 12–23; David W. Edwards, 'Count Joseph de Maistre and Russian educational policy, 1803–1828', *Slavic Review*, no. 36, March 1977, pp. 54–75.

[40] Bagalei, 'Udaleniye ...', pp. 30–36, 46–52, 54–58, 106, 124–25. See also A. Lebedev, 'Anton Antonovich Degurov', *Vestnik Yevropy*, March 1876, pp. 142–43, who takes Schad's version too seriously. I am grateful to Alexander Martin who has provided me with copies of letters from A. S. Sturdza to A. N. Golitsyn, Weimar, 8(20) December 1818 (draft) and A. N. Golitsyn to A. S. Sturdza, St Petersburg, 24 February 1819 (Russian Academy of Sciences, Institute of Russian Literature, Pushkinsky Dom, St Petersburg: Sturdza, A. C. and Golitsyn, A. N. correspondence, PD, f.288, op. 1, nos. 58, 10–11, 13, 17–19). The conservative Sturdza may have tried to intervene on Schad's behalf since the well-known Jena medical publicist Professor Christoph Wilhelm Hufeland (1762–1836), a supporter of Schad, was to become Sturdza's father-in-law (Alexander Martin to author, 31 May 1995). On Sturdza see Alexander M. Martin, *Romantics, Reformers, Reactionaries: Conservative Thought and Politics in the Reign of Alexander I* (Northern Illinois University Press, DeKalb, IL, 1997), pp. 169–202.

[41] See Walther, 'Johann Baptist Schad ...', and the Barton works previously cited. F. A. Zelenogorsky in 'Iv. G. Shad' ['J. B. Schad'], *Voprosy filosofii i psikhologii*, vol. 27, no. 159, 1895, p. 590 declared that Schad, who was influenced by his Catholic background as well as by modern philosophy, could not be denied originality or independence.

[42] Heinrich Brück, *Geschichte der katholischen Kirche in Deutschland im neunzehnten Jahrhundert*, 2nd edn (4 vols in 5) (F. Krichheim, Mainz, 1902–8), vol. I, p. 128.