



*The Princess*   
THE PATRIOT<sup>★</sup>

**Ekaterina Dashkova,  
Benjamin Franklin, and the  
Age of Enlightenment**

**Sue Ann Prince, Editor**

AMERICAN PHILOSOPHICAL SOCIETY  
*Philadelphia, 2006*

**Arduous and Delicate Task:**

*Princess Dashkova, the Academy of Sciences,  
and the Taming of Natural Philosophy*

MICHAEL D. GORDIN

*P*rincess Ekaterina Romanovna Dashkova has been a woman more often recalled than remembered. Born in St. Petersburg in the uncertain years that followed in the wake of the tumultuous reign of Peter the Great, Dashkova proved in the second half of the century to be an exceptional personage in an age when Russia was truly a boundary to Europe: a bastion of the Enlightenment with the most extensive slavery system in the world; a center of opulence amid a massive impoverished peasantry; and the stage for many of the century's most impressive women in a land of pious Orthodoxy and conservatism. Dashkova's own role in this period was visible and well documented, but historians, chroniclers, and the



popular imagination—in Russia, where she is relatively well known, as opposed to the West, where she is almost unheard of—focus on two aspects of her career: the extent of her involvement in the coup that brought Catherine II (the Great) to the throne of Russia in June 1762; and her position as the head of both the Imperial Academy of Sciences and Arts in St. Petersburg and the Imperial Academy of the Russian Language, posts she held for over a decade.<sup>1</sup> She was the first female public appointee in Russia, and the first woman to head any learned society in the world. If this were not enough, she also penned (in French) autobiographical memoirs that stand as one of the great Russian literary achievements in the genre, notwithstanding the language of their composition and the fact that Dashkova spends most of the memoirs “hiding” her innermost thoughts from the reader.<sup>2</sup>

Dashkova stands out to observers today as a grand exception in the eighteenth century, and to a certain extent she appeared that way to her contemporaries as well. An Irish friend and companion of her later years, Catherine Wilmot, wrote a letter from Moscow to her sister Alicia on December 8, 1805, that set much of the tone for writing about Dashkova since:

I have since I came here often thought what a task it would be to attempt to draw the Character of the Princess Dashkaw! I for my part think it would be absolutely impossible. Such are her peculiarities & inextricable varieties that the result would only appear like a Wisp of Human Contradictions. 'Tis the stuff we are all made of to be sure, but nevertheless nothing is more foreign from the thing itself than the raw materials of which it is made! And woe betide individuality the moment one begins to generalize. You will always conceive her a piece of perfection when you take my experience of her, just as you would suppose Europe a Paradise if you never lived out of Italy & judged of the rest accordingly. But she has as many Climates to her mind, as many Splinters of insulation, as many Oceans of agitated uncertainty, as many Etnas of destructive fire and as many Wild Wastes of blighted Cultivation as exists in any quarter of the Globe! For my part I think she would be most in her element at the *Helm of the State*, or Generalissimo of the Army, or Farmer General of the Empire. In fact she was born for business on a large scale which is not irreconcilable with the Life of a Woman who at 18 headed a Revolution & who for 12 years afterwards govern'd an Academy of Arts & Sciences.<sup>3</sup>

Already the deck has been stacked against remembering Dashkova in her full context, for she is painted primarily as a *woman*. No one could sanely deny that she was indeed a woman, but there are limitations that come with such a narrow scope. In the

nineteenth century, for example, Dashkova was primarily analyzed with an emphasis on her involvement in the Catherinian coup, because politics was a sphere in which women had virtually no presence, and therefore Dashkova was an anomaly to be treated as such.<sup>4</sup> For instance, Aleksandr I. Gertsen (Herzen), Russia's great liberal socialist thinker, chided the Princess's erstwhile companion and chronicler for not focusing on this fact enough: “All of this is true, but Miss Wilmot forgets that, above all, Dashkova was born a *woman* and remained a *woman* her entire life.”<sup>5</sup> The key to presenting her as a political actor for Romanov thinkers was to focus on her essential femininity and deduce her political activities from there.

In the twentieth century, on the other hand, when women's participation in politics (although not, perhaps, in military coups) had become more common, the historiography took a more determined focus on her involvement in the academies. To Dashkova's contemporaries as well, her natural philosophical engagement sparked wonderment in contrast to her political engagement (the latter being not nearly as remarkable for taking place under the most powerful female ruler in modern European history). A 1785 article in the *Edinburgh Magazine* praised “[t]he great mental powers of this extraordinary lady, her thorough knowledge of various sciences, and the vast acquisition she has made of every species of useful information, from the most eminent philosophers and learned men of this age, during her travels through the most polished and civilized nations of Europe, attracted the attention of her Imperial Majesty the Empress of Russia.” To the Scottish author, Dashkova demonstrated “how much better suited the fair sex is often, not only for the highest employments of governing vast and extensive nations, of which Herself [Catherine] is the most illustrious example; but of directing the arduous and delicate task of the various speculative sciences and nobler arts.”<sup>6</sup> Given the tremendous scientific advances made by women in the twentieth century, Dashkova has served for many as a reminder that women have long contributed to science, or rather, one should say, to natural philosophy and natural history—the Enlightenment terms for what would later emerge as the physical sciences and the life sciences, respectively.<sup>7</sup>

But what is wrong with that, we might ask, given that it was indeed extraordinary for a woman to be so engaged with the sciences? Primarily, it prevents us from considering Dashkova's academic service in her own terms—she quickly overcame any scruples that being a woman marked her as unfit or special in this sphere—and it leads to an overweening stress on who Dashkova *was* biologically rather than what she *did* historically. This essay is an effort in the latter. Two salient features mark her administration of the Academy of Sciences (as distinguished from her work at the Academy of the Russian Language, which concerned the codification of the Russian language): first, she was highly competent, coaxing the Academy from the brink of ruin into one of the most flourishing learned societies of the late Enlightenment; second, she almost never engaged with the actual content of the natural philosophy and natural history produced at the Academy, preferring to administer from a position of



intellectual distance (the few cases when she did actually debate academicians on their studies are made much of by historians, precisely because they were so exceptional).<sup>8</sup>

These two features are quite noteworthy for an academy of sciences in the late eighteenth century; they make Dashkova a useful figure with which to trace a major conceptual and institutional transformation. In general, academies were run, often poorly, by one of their members, who was more or less engaged in some kind of active research at the time. Most academy directors burst their budgets, disintegrated into vituperative internecine disputes, offended the courts that supported them, and so on. Dashkova's tenure at the Academy of Sciences was a break in all of that. She stood at the very dawn of the metamorphosis of "natural philosophy" into "science," and one of the major hallmarks of that shift was the transformation of "science" into an affair conducted by professionals; that is, people whose task was to explore the natural world. These emerging professionals controlled a form of specialized knowledge, policed themselves, and fulfilled a social function responsibly. Their administration could be devolved outside of their ranks, to a bookkeeper or a government functionary. That is to say, by exploring the state of the Academy of Sciences in St. Petersburg when Dashkova entered it, and then how she managed it during her lengthy tenure as director, one can observe irreversible changes wrought onto the fabric of how natural inquiry was conducted—a separation of the conduct of investigations (the knowledge) from the "trappings" of administration (the enabling powers that are not knowledge of the natural world). This is the crucial transition from the Enlightenment picture of knowledge to the workaday life of modern science, and Dashkova presided over it.

#### **Unworthy: Dashkova Comes to the Academy**

Dashkova was born on March 17, 1743, to Marfa I. and Count Roman I. Vorontsov, a scion of a highly distinguished noble St. Petersburg family. Her childhood, as she recalled it, did not presage that of a gregarious and active woman of high society, politics, and public administration: "From my infancy I wanted to be loved, I wanted to interest everyone that I loved, and when, at the age of thirteen, I grew to perceive that I was not producing this effect, I became an isolated being . . . My eyes, attacked mostly by illness, did not allow me to read, for which I was, I could say, passionate. A profound melancholy, of reflections on myself and above all that to which I belong, changed my lively, cheerful, even malicious character: I became serious, studious, I spoke little and only with knowledge of the matter."<sup>9</sup> She had books read to her, and was particularly drawn to major Enlightenment thinkers like Voltaire and Montesquieu, the former of which she would eventually meet. This childhood—Europeanized, educated, and caught up in the trappings of the intellectual Enlightenment—was privileged and sheltered, but was not atypical for a member of her class and sex. She was raised, as were most such girls of this period, to be married to an appropriate spouse, and this happened in February 1759, when she wed Prince Mikhail I. Dashkov, from another ancient Russian princely

line hailing from the Monomakh clan of Smolensk. This union endowed her with her honorific "princess," which she bore proudly until her death.

Her more or less happy marriage to Dashkov had two significant consequences for her. Since she had been raised in the rarified circles of St. Petersburg, young Ekaterina had never learned to speak Russian properly, using French almost exclusively. The Dashkovs, however, were a Moscow family who (although still highly Europeanized in fashion and conduct) held tightly to the Russian language and could not converse in French. Dashkova learned Russian to communicate with her in-laws, and through the rest of her life, her French memoirs notwithstanding, held to the primacy of the Russian language with the zeal of the convert.<sup>10</sup> The second important consequence of the marriage was the particular way her husband, who was a vice-colonel in the leib-guards, introduced her into specific higher circles of Russian political life associated with the military.<sup>11</sup> It would be these associations that would put her in closer contact with the prospective tsarina, and enable her to assist in the coup that brought Catherine to power.

Dashkova's public life can be fairly cleanly divided into four major periods. The first was from 1759 to May 1763; that is, from the moment Dashkova met the Grand Duchess Ekaterina Alekseevna to the cooling of relations after the latter became Empress Catherine II. Dashkova's main activity during this time was assisting in Catherine's ascension to the throne. The second period, from the summer of 1763 until the end of 1782, saw Dashkova without much influence in the court at St. Petersburg; she devoted the time to her children's education and to traveling around Western Europe as a means to that end (there were two trips, 1770–71 and 1775–82, both studded with luminaries of the French and Scottish Enlightenments). The third period, from 1783 until the fall of 1794, marks her tenures as head of the two academies and occupies the central focus of the present essay. During the final period, from the fall of 1794 until her death in January 1810, Dashkova was informally and then formally removed from all her public posts and intervened in public life only episodically.<sup>12</sup> It is from this last period that we have her memoirs and the Wilmot sisters' recollections of her. Hence all of it is retrospective and is of limited assistance in gleaning what Dashkova thought or felt while in the midst of her activities. To examine her role at the Academy of Sciences as it happened, we have to turn to contemporary documents, many of which have recently been plumbed from the depths of the Russian archives.

Perhaps the most astonishing aspect of Dashkova's directorship of the Academy of Sciences was that she managed to be named to this post in the first place. As she recalled it in her memoirs, the whole affair started as a whim of the empress at a gala ball. Catherine drew her aside for a private audience and put forth her proposition. Dashkova wrote decades later:

I was flabbergasted when Her Majesty told me that she wanted to offer me the place of the director of the Academy of Sciences.



My astonishment deprived me of speech, and the Empress had time to tell me several very flattering things and that she believed would encourage me. "No, Madame," I said, "I cannot accept a post above my capacity. If Your Majesty is not making fun of me, I would tell her that from attachment to her, amid many other reasons, I cannot rush to render myself ridiculous and even culpable, of having made such a choice!"<sup>13</sup>

Dashkova further recalled:

This conversation gave me a fever, and I believed that my entire physiognomy was disorganized; for I perceived on the faces of some of my companions (near to those I returned to sit by), the satisfaction that they had, believing that it was a disagreeable scene for me that had taken place. . . . I wrote immediately upon my return home a letter which might have annoyed a different sovereign; because I allowed myself to tell her that sometimes the private life of a monarch narrowly escapes the pen of history, but never the bad or harmful choices she makes; that God himself, in making me a woman, had excused me from the post of the director of the Academy of Sciences; that I knew myself for an ignoramus and that I had never angled for being incorporated into a learned society, even in that of Arcadia, where for a few ducats, in Rome, I could have achieved the honor of joining it.<sup>14</sup>

Dashkova's letter, whose exact date is uncertain but was penned no later than January 24, 1783, confirms her retrospective recollections of an initial refusal that was grounded in a sense of her own "unworthiness" as a woman, a fiercely gendered response: "But, sovereign, my capacities are weaker than my zeal, and if your highness has finally decided upon what I heard from you, then I beg you to edify and direct me, to indulge me and not to offend me with the assumption as if I deserved this distinguished post, which, in my opinion, does not belong with my sex."<sup>15</sup> Obviously, despite her early protestations, she relented, largely because of a conversation she had with Catherine's long-term favorite, Grigorii A. Potiomkin (Potemkin), who convinced her that Catherine was serious and should not be disobeyed on this matter.

It seems that to all concerned (especially Dashkova), the appointment of a woman to direct the Academy of Sciences, which had been founded by Peter the Great as part of his reform project to modernize Muscovite Russia, was unthinkable.<sup>16</sup> This raises the very legitimate question as to why Catherine would do something that was so plainly beyond the pale of both custom and common sense. The surface reason was

that Dashkova was a woman, the two of them were friendly and respected each other intellectually, and Catherine wanted to demonstrate that she thought there was no reason why women could not serve in any public post in Russia. This proto-feminist interpretation is mostly superficial, however. The reasons to appoint Dashkova were not philosophical but political, both foreign and domestic. In terms of Catherine's "foreign policy" of Enlightenment, her willingness to appoint a woman director of the Academy was a bold statement of her position as a leading advocate of the Enlightenment, daring to call the bluff posed by the rhetoric of sexual equality of many contemporary thinkers. (The French Academy of Sciences, by contrast, would not admit women as members until after the Second World War.) The domestic policy reasons, however, were probably more salient to Catherine's reasoning. Dashkova was an intelligent and capable woman, skilled in political intrigue, and she was back in St. Petersburg; better to appoint her to the political backwater of the Academy, where she would be isolated from court machinations, and to hold her close but neutralized.<sup>17</sup>

Catherine knew that Dashkova would be quite busy at the Academy if she were to take her post at all seriously, as she anticipated she would. The Academy of Sciences, so optimistically staffed with European scholars and savants at the end of Peter's reign, had somewhat stagnated in its influence domestically, although the return in 1766 of Leonhard Euler, the most prominent mathematician of the century, from his hiatus at the Berlin Academy of Sciences ensured that its influence abroad was still strong. Technically, the president of the Academy from 1746 until 1798, encompassing within its copious span the entire reign of Catherine, was Kirill G. Razumovskii, but he paid absolutely no attention to the day-to-day affairs, and Catherine decided to create a post of director to manage the unraveling Olympus of the Russian Enlightenment. The first director she appointed (on October 25, 1773) was Vasilii G. Orlov, brother of Catherine's sometime lover and Dashkova's antagonist Grigorii G. Orlov, who masterminded the coup against Catherine's husband, Peter III (Dashkova's assistance in that event merely worsened their already-fraught relations). Orlov did not take to the labor of the Academy and retired on December 15, 1774.<sup>18</sup> In his absence the acting director was the writer Aleksei A. Rzhevskii, who had been former vice-director, but he was unable to serve during the crisis of the Emel'ian I. Pugachev serf uprising and was soon replaced by Sergei G. Domashnev, who was appointed on July 22, 1775. Domashnev gave his opening speech on December 11, and held the post until late 1782.<sup>19</sup>

Domashnev was an unmitigated, colossal catastrophe. He ruled with arbitrary, highly centralized, almost despotic personal power, asserting authority over almost every decision that had been customarily left to the academicians, including the approval of appointments.<sup>20</sup> On January 10, 1780, for example, he declared that academicians should publicly explain why so many of them had failed to conduct less research than previously proposed. The academicians felt insulted, claiming that they could not all be as productive as the preternaturally gifted Euler.<sup>21</sup> Active scholarly work almost



completely collapsed. Domashnev prevented the publication of many works, almost never attended the regular meetings of the body, failed to fill (or even attempt to fill) many vacated posts, embezzled funds from the Academy's treasury, withheld incoming books from the library for his own personal collection, and allowed the Academy's *gymnasium* for educating young Russians to fall into disrepair.<sup>22</sup> Needless to say, Domashnev was not very popular and, in an unprecedented move, the academicians openly called for his removal. The conflict came to a head with Domashnev's dismissal of academician Semion K. Kotel'nikov, in April 1782, and his subsequent attempt to transfer the latter's cabinet of natural history to another academician, Peter Simon Pallas. The academicians claimed that "Such an authoritative act would overturn the entire system of academic obligations, and each academician in the future would begin to fear a similar unkindness, if his duty depended only on the director." Insisting that the dismissal violated the Academy's 1747 charter, they asked Domashnev to retract his decision. He ignored their protest—including their public statement of no confidence on August 22—and the affair ended with Domashnev being shown the door by Catherine.<sup>23</sup>

The Kotel'nikov affair gave the St. Petersburg court some pause. These academicians were traditionally expected to be pliant servitors of the government, answering technical queries and raising the state's prestige, not fomenting rebellion. The responsiveness by the government to the scholars' complaints has been taken by at least one historian as evidence that the government learned that it could not impose its will arbitrarily on the academicians.<sup>24</sup> Not quite. True, academic reform had been vigorously pursued as a topic of discussion during Domashnev's rampage through the system, even by the eminent mathematician Euler himself. Ever loyal to his administrative obligations on the Academy's governing council even while he was overhauling the foundations of physics and mathematics, Euler worried extensively over how Domashnev's arbitrariness was bankrupting the Academy. He proposed that the membership of the Academy be sharply curtailed, and that sales of newspapers, books, and calendars be expanded (the Academy controlled the printing industry in eighteenth-century Russia). He also thought the administration should be undertaken by someone of high status who could grease the wheels of power with the tsar (or tsarina) in case of difficulty. An academic commission of February 19, 1767, further expanded on these thoughts, angling for an expansion of academic privileges, such as an elimination of censorship on imported books and a raise in salary.<sup>25</sup> This commission's charter was not approved by the empress, however, and its failure replayed a familiar pattern of Catherine's reign; that of toying with liberalizing reforms and then flinching at the last moment.

But Catherine and her courtiers did learn something from the Domashnev years and especially from the circumstances of his removal. If the Academy were not properly governed, it could turn into a seed of instability that could disgrace the state and alienate the elite. In other words, the institution needed to be administered competently

or the scholars would get uppity. Dashkova's appointment was not an answer to the call for reform; rather, she was a spoiler sent in to prevent the academicians' calls for deeper, more far-reaching reform to bolster their autonomy.

### Episodes from the End of the Enlightenment: Dashkova's Tenure

Dashkova's career very much partook of the Enlightenment. She was deeply engaged with the ideas of her time, but paradoxically her legacy became one of the signal moments of the end of the Enlightenment in its Russian incarnation. By the "end of the Enlightenment" here, I mean those aspects of Dashkova's administration of the Academy of Sciences that contributed to the decline of a particular eighteenth-century vision of the pursuit of knowledge and the birth of professionalized science in the nineteenth century. These transformations were unplanned, and they stemmed from expressing rather straightforwardly some of the most basic features that characterized Enlightenment learned institutions. By institutionalizing them effectively in the late Catherinian context, Dashkova began to purge the pursuit of natural knowledge—including its research, publication, and distribution—in Russia of some of its more distinctive Enlightenment characteristics.

#### *Episode 1. Euler and Inauguration: Enlightenment Knowledge and the Court*

One of the most salient characteristics of natural philosophy and natural history practiced in scientific academies in the eighteenth century, as opposed to those activities in the universities or in private salons, was the close connection among those institutions, the knowledge they produced, and the court.<sup>26</sup> Dashkova's first instinct when she received her appointment was to perpetuate this close relationship; unintentionally, however, she ended up generating more distance, leading to the ostensible separation of science and politics that characterizes the modern period.

Dashkova knew that her appointment to the Academy would be controversial among the academicians—who were still energized by the drubbing they had given Domashnev—and she sought to extinguish any rancor by acting according to the refined etiquette protocols she knew best. As she narrated in her memoirs, her first action at the Academy before assuming her appointment was to approach Euler, the most distinguished scholarly (although not by rank) member of the Academy, and ask him to repay the kindness of her visit with his approval. She took the completely blind old man to her inaugural assembly in her coach: "Then I entered into the hall of sciences, I said to the professors and adjuncts that were assembled there that as testimony to the respect which I had to the sciences and enlightenment, however unfortunately ignorant I was myself, I was unable to find a more solemn way of proving this than by having myself introduced by Monsieur Euler."<sup>27</sup> (Within that very year, Euler was to pass away, and Dashkova respected the service his silent protection had rendered her by memorializing him in at least two special assemblies on September 11



and October 23.)<sup>28</sup> Her speech to the Academy on her inauguration, on January 30, 1783, was recorded in the Academy's minutes as follows:

I dare to assure you, sirs, that the choice that her Imperial Highness made of my person, having laid upon me the presidency of this assembly, is for me an infinite honor, and I beg you to believe that these are by no means empty words, but a feeling by which I am deeply touched. I am ready to agree with the fact that I am inferior in enlightenment and capacities to my predecessors in this post, but I am not inferior to anyone of them in the directness of my own advantages, which will always instill in me an obligation to defer what is due to your talents, sirs. Far from ascribing to myself your merits, I regard it as my obligation to inform her Highness about the merits of each of you in particular with respect to the utility which the entire staff of the Academy brings to the good of her empire. This is the single advantage which I can promise you from my appointment; but since this will be exclusively in the care of your interests, then I hope that I, that my activity, based on this principle, will be able to evoke among you, sirs, a competition, in which each of you, working for the sake of your own fame, will not spare either energy or labor and that, in the end, thanks to our united efforts, the sciences will not from now on exist fruitlessly on our soil here; but, having settled here, they will leave deep roots and will blossom, finding themselves under the protection of a great monarchy which values learning.<sup>29</sup>

Through her instincts of flattery and ceremony, therefore, Dashkova situated herself as the conduit between Academy and court, and, more personally, between individual scholar and empress. But this inadvertently changed the function of the Academy of Sciences, subtly but decisively: now the Academy was understood as a place where learning was shielded from turmoil and friendly competition was provoked for the sake of learning. It was *not* a collection of hired factotums to amuse the empress. Dashkova had managed to use the tropes of courtly etiquette to move the Academy from an adornment of the court to a servitor of Russia.

Immediately upon assuming office, she instituted a series of reforms meant to regularize the Academy's position in the civil service, but also to render it distinct. On February 3, 1783, she proposed that all academic employees wear a newly commissioned uniform made of purple drape, with light yellow piping, and a cravat of light green, to be designed by Peter Pallas and approved by Dashkova herself.<sup>30</sup> This suggestion had the twin effect of making the academicians feel integrated into the state civil apparatus, as opposed to the court, but also to be distinct to the eye from other servitors. Science was, in other words, becoming a profession.

#### *Episode 2. Financial Reform: The Bureaucratization of Knowledge*

Notwithstanding repeated invocations of the otherworldly disinterestedness of science and natural philosophy, remarkably little knowledge of nature can be produced without substantial (or at least stable) finances. Dashkova's success in this realm was striking. When she arrived at the Academy of Sciences, it was in complete disarray. When she left her active administration of the institution in late 1794, the Academy had 100,000 rubles in the bank and 46,592 in cash; the bookstore and library were 390,000 rubles in the black, and the value of the assets at the printing press was 23,000 rubles—all of this after taking into account 100,000 rubles sunk into a new building. In sum, this was over half a million rubles of earned money.<sup>31</sup> The obvious way for an Enlightenment academic administrator to solve the financial arrears of his (or, in this case, her) institution was to ask the monarch for funds. Despite pledges of aid from Catherine, this was not what Dashkova chose to do. Instead, she reformed the Academy's internal finances with the zest of the most fastidious merchant. She ran the Academy like a business, and ran it well—another feature of her tenure that marked a shift away from Enlightenment practices and foreshadowed the rise of a more “bureaucratic” conception of administration, one that was more routine, impersonal, and efficacious.

This process of restructuring the Academy of Sciences so that it ran more like an efficient boarding house or press than like a cantankerous collection of savants and courtiers began as soon as the ceremonies of Dashkova's inauguration were concluded. She immediately had the papers of the administrative chancellery sent to her. “It was in reading these,” she recalled, “that I was able to grasp, at least in part, the understanding of the task which I had to fulfill.” The gravest problem was economic: the Academy was in debt to bookstores in Russia, Paris, and Holland. To compensate for the shortfall, instead of asking Catherine for succor, she raised the prices of Academy publications thirty percent, a shrewd business move that soon made substantial inroads in the Academy's debts.<sup>32</sup> She also reinvigorated the *gymnasium* from the brink of ruin. Although the Charter of 1747 demanded that there be fifty students enrolled, there were only twenty-seven in attendance at her inauguration, nine of whom could not attend classes due to complete ignorance of the sciences. Within three years, through a series of important pedagogical reforms, Dashkova managed to preside over eighty-nine competent students.<sup>33</sup>

In 1786, Dashkova wrote (in French) a lengthy report to Catherine detailing the transformations she had wrought on the Academy, all in the view of making it a more efficient bureaucratic institution. This document consists of a series of forty-five numbered problem areas, with an indented comment under each in smaller print explaining the reforms she had undertaken to remedy them. The very first point concerned finances: “1. Monetary affairs were extremely muddled as a consequence of the negligence with which so-called permanent sums were delimited from economic (special) sums; permanent [sums] included money allotted annually by the treasury for



the maintenance of the Academy; special sums were comprised of money obtained from the sale of books and other economies. These sums turned out to be conflated with each other."<sup>34</sup> She alerted Catherine to the fact that she had begun reprinting the transactions (*Commentarii Academiae*) of the Academy (no. 8), which had been left unpublished since 1779—this lapse in publication had seriously cut into the Academy's revenues from their sale abroad—and adds as an aside (no. 9) that she had done something for scholarship as well:

[Before] The professors, burdened with matters foreign to their sciences, did not have time to study their specialties, which hurt the successes of science.

[Now] Each of them can study their science completely freely, not meeting any obstacles from my side; with all affairs they turn directly to me and receive a speedy resolution, not submitting to chancellery rigmarole, which frightens some of them.<sup>35</sup>

It almost seems that Dashkova had no interest as to what "their science" actually consisted in, as long as they could do it in the most efficient manner possible. (Of course, it was not all smooth sailing, as when she butted heads with the academicians in September 1788 by micromanaging their expenses for learned correspondence; she eventually retracted her interference.)<sup>36</sup>

Dashkova also actively tried to raise the prominence of the Academy. She knew that by appointing more honorary and foreign members, she could increase the prestige of the Academy at essentially no cost, and she appointed forty-seven honorary and foreign members (including Benjamin Franklin), a total amassed in barely over a decade that comprised a full twenty-five percent of all honorary academicians appointed during the entire eighteenth century.<sup>37</sup> She also instituted a number of moneymaking enterprises that would transform the finances of the Academy of Sciences, beginning with restructuring the book trade in Russia by organizing the Academy's press under more efficient principles.<sup>38</sup> The resulting funds were then channeled into material improvements in the laboratories and botanical gardens of the Academy, and then finally into the long-discussed construction of new quarters—a neoclassical façade that still houses Academy facilities today.<sup>39</sup> Interestingly, in the fall of 1783 the reason she gave Catherine for actually undertaking the building was that the Academy needed better space for selling books, for hosting (profit-making) public lectures, and then finally for housing the Academy's servants.<sup>40</sup> All in all, Dashkova's Academy ceased to be merely an appendage of the court designed mostly for show; it was a functioning business enterprise. It would be decades before other European academies took the same approach to their administration.

### *Episode 3. The Republic of Letters: Knowledge and Fatherland*

In the nineteenth century, science would be marked by sporadic but fiery debates over the role of nationality in the production of knowledge. Science became an issue of national prestige: some nations were deemed (by their patriots) to be "more scientific" than others. In this area, too, Dashkova's tenure was a harbinger of a future era. A hallmark of her reforms was the promotion of nationality and language in the institution's affairs—a move towards the more nationalistic, nineteenth-century *modus operandi*.

By contrast, one of the most characteristic features of Enlightenment knowledge production was the so-called Republic of Letters, the continental and even intercontinental exchange of correspondence for collaborative resolution of heated disputes in philosophy, politics, and belles lettres. This exchange was not so much "international," since there were few well-defined nation-states for most of the eighteenth century, but rather "non-national"; and since almost everyone corresponded in French, it was functionally universal. One of the reasons Dashkova was appointed to direct the Academy was because she was already familiar with many of the major foreign denizens of the Republic of Letters.

During her travels in Europe, which were strongly motivated by her desire to inspect the Enlightenment bastion of Edinburgh University as a place for educating her son, Dashkova met with such luminaries of the epoch as Voltaire and Denis Diderot, meetings she dwelt on in her memoirs.<sup>41</sup> Although she and Catherine were both in some sense products of the Western European Enlightenment, that Enlightenment in fact came in many varieties. Catherine was a resolute Francophile, as can be seen in her correspondence with Voltaire, her copious quotations from Montesquieu in her *Instruction de Catherine II* (the *Nakaz*),<sup>42</sup> and her soliciting of Diderot to come to St. Petersburg. Dashkova, on the other hand, was partial to the Scottish and English Enlightenments, which tended to be gradualist and conservative in the sense championed by Edmund Burke: small changes grounded in tradition, all within the context of a protective monarchy. John Parkinson, a British visitor to St. Petersburg, recalled a conversation with Dashkova from November 1792: "We did not get away till near two after holding a long conversation with the Princess Dashkoff who was excessively civil. Though she blames us for some things, upon the whole she is a great admirer of the English Nation, envies us our constitution and regards a well-educated English Gentleman as the glory and perfection of his species."<sup>43</sup> Dashkova's attitude toward England provides a clue for how she acted at the Academy: she wished to run it like an English (or Scottish) university, not like a French debating society.

It may seem counterintuitive, but Dashkova's 1789 nomination of Benjamin Franklin as a foreign member of the Academy of Sciences, and his nomination of her as the first female member of the American Philosophical Society (APS), was in many ways tinged by this Anglophilia. (Dashkova would also propose APS member John Churchman as a foreign member



in 1792.) The APS was modeled in part on the Royal Society of London, and Dashkova apparently perceived the American colonies as still very much of the English cultural sphere, and thus not tainted by French extremism (the American Revolution notwithstanding).<sup>44</sup> Dashkova herself was quite taken with Franklin when she met him during her second set of travels around Europe. At the time Franklin was serving diplomatically in France for the cause of American independence. On January 26, 1781, Franklin traveled from his home in Passy through Paris to the Hôtel de la Chine specifically to meet Dashkova, but she was not in and he had to return a week later. On Saturday, February 3, the two finally met.<sup>45</sup> Dashkova, in her memoirs, reveals Franklin only in a footnote:

He had also such affection and esteem for me that he proposed me as a member of that respected and even celebrated Philosophical Society of Philadelphia; I was admitted there unanimously; I even received a diploma; after a certain period the Society did not miss a single occasion to send me the works which it had published. This packet contained a few [of them], as well as a letter of the secretary. That of Franklin flattered me more than that of the Duke [of Sudermanie], because I regarded him as a superior man and who combined with profound enlightenment a simplicity in his entire appearance and manners, and who with an unaffected modesty had a great deal of indulgence for others. I wrote to Franklin and to the secretary of the Philosophical Society, and thanked them sincerely for the works which they had sent me.<sup>46</sup>

Her reciprocal nomination of him was similarly good-natured. Franklin was an uncontroversial choice for the Academy, as he had been well known in Russia for years before his nomination for his seminal experiments and theories on electricity. His name was first mentioned in the Russian press in 1752, citing his work on atmospheric electricity, and he was clearly aware of the similar work of the Russian academician Franz Aepinus (and also, apparently, marginally aware of the work of the native Russian natural philosopher and academician, Mikhail V. Lomonosov).<sup>47</sup> Franklin was accepted unanimously on November 2, 1789.<sup>48</sup>

Dashkova's contacts with foreign natural philosophers and *philosophes* are strong markers of her active participation in the Republic of Letters. In her administration of the Academy of Sciences, however, one finds equal indications of a rising nationalism in her attitude toward scholarship that counteracted this earlier ecumenism. In her lengthy 1786 report to Catherine about her reforms at the Academy, she remarked:

41. Observations and discoveries conducted inside the country, were communicated abroad before their publication in Russia and, to the Academy's shame, were used by them before they were here.

I had the journal improved, so that the academicians do not have from now on to communicate such discoveries abroad until the Academy has gleaned from them fame for itself by means of print and until the government has used them.<sup>49</sup>

On 16 October 1786 she officially proclaimed that all Academy work would be published in Russia first, even though most of the academicians were still of Western or Central European origin and the language used in the *Commentarii Academiae* was still Latin. This stricture was quite a striking change in attitude toward the Academy, although it seemed to pass without a murmur from the academicians. From even before the age of Peter the Great, in early academies the scholars were not perceived as being part of and thus beholden to the national body; rather, their prestige abroad was intended to reflect on the glory of the monarch who was their patron. In that way of thinking, publishing abroad was essential, and whether or not one published at home was a matter of preference. Under Dashkova, the Academy began to be about serving the nation first in a notional, non-consultative way, and about becoming a crown jewel of the Romanov absolutist state as it evolved towards a nation-state. Dashkova's proposal for and administration of the Academy of the Russian Language—the new literary academy which was created to purify the Russian language, codify usage, and compile a dictionary—served the same function of early nation-building, although it cannot be discussed in detail here.<sup>50</sup>

Dashkova would often, in fact, claim that the sciences were native to Russia, and that the insistence on publishing in Russia first was merely a return to a time when Russia preserved knowledge for Europe during the imagined Dark Ages—a Slavic variant of how the Irish saved civilization. Dashkova wrote in her memoirs: "The sciences had been transported from Greece to Kiev long before they went to several European countries, who accord so freely to Russians the name of barbarians. The philosophy of Newton was taught in these schools when the Catholic priesthood did not permit that it be brought into France."<sup>51</sup> Dashkova thus worked to build an image of the Russian nation as a scientific state. She took the initiative in 1784–1787, for instance, to publish the works of Mikhail V. Lomonosov—the first Russian national to be appointed academician and often touted by contemporaries and historians since as the founder of science in Russia—a symbol of Russian ingenuity and parity with other nations then congealing in the West.<sup>52</sup>

#### Exits, Graceful and Not: Dashkova's Retirement and Legacy

Dashkova managed in just over a decade to set in motion a series of reforms that would not just tame natural philosophy and the practices of Enlightenment in Russia, but would resonate with measures taken across Europe to move towards pan-continental regimes of professionalized, bureaucratized, and nationalized science in the century



to come. Dashkova's tenure at the Academy was so amicable that the radical nature of these transformations was not remarked upon explicitly at the time. It is therefore surprising to find that her manner of leaving was colored by revolution, rupture, and rancor, although it provides a historically satisfying closure to the transformative nature of her efforts at the Academy.

Most historians date the beginning of the end of Dashkova's directorship of the Academy of Sciences to the November 1793 publication by the Academy's presses of Iakov B. Kniazhin's play *Vadim Novgorodskii* [Vadim of Novgorod], a theatrical piece that made references to the public assembly (*veche*) of the medieval Russian city of Novgorod. According to many historians, Catherine—who was transformed by the French Revolution (and particularly by the execution of Louis XVI) from a polestar of Enlightenment to a *bête noir* of political reaction—took offense to what she interpreted as a play sympathetic to republicanism. And because Dashkova was responsible for its publication as head of the Academy, Catherine assumed she supported such views and punished her.<sup>53</sup> This account correctly reports the events in question but mishandles their interpretation. At no point could Catherine have rationally (or even irrationally) believed that Dashkova was actually a republican. Outside of the very real rise in the empress's paranoia about conspiracies at home and abroad against her reign, perhaps in favor of her son—who would, at her death in 1796, become Tsar Paul I—the political narrative of Dashkova's fall is more subtle than Kniazhin's eminently forgettable play.

The main point to remember about Dashkova's dismissal is that the academicians had nothing to do with it. They were happy with her and seemed genuinely sorry to see her leave. She had, after all, been running the Academy very competently for many years, and people seemed to have forgotten the days when the institution had been run like Domashnev's personal fiefdom and almost closed its doors. This selective amnesia played a role in Dashkova's exit, since the primary reason Catherine was upset with her former favorite for allowing a potentially subversive text to be published was not because she thought Dashkova was seditious, but that she had forgotten her responsibility as the Academy's censor. Dashkova had been so tremendously competent for so long, that this lapse, perhaps forgivable in less politically sensitive times, proved hard to ignore.<sup>54</sup> In addition, her favorite brother, Aleksandr R. Vorontsov, had recently been "retired" from government service after his protégé, Aleksandr N. Radishchev published the sharply critical *Puteshestvie iz Peterburga v Moskvu* [Journey from St. Petersburg to Moscow].<sup>55</sup> Dashkova suffered from the association (however loose) with both these objectionable events.

She was not subjected to the humiliation of a public dismissal, however. In August 1794, whether by hint from Catherine or her minions or, more probably, from an acute sense of which way the wind was blowing, Dashkova asked for a leave of absence from the Academy to tend to her health and domestic affairs. At the same time, she wrote the empress's state-secretary D. P. Troshchinskii that she wished to remain the fully active

president of the Academy of the Russian Language, since she could perform those duties in the countryside away from St. Petersburg. On August 10, 1794, Troshchinskii informed her that she would be released for two years, and he accepted her suggestion of her relation Pavel P. Bakunin as a fill-in for her role at the Academy of Sciences. On August 24, 1796, she asked for an extension of her leave for another year (granted by Catherine on September 11, one of the empress's final acts). Dashkova thus remained the titular director of the Academy until after Catherine's death. On November 18, however, Catherine's son Paul fired her unceremoniously from both academies.<sup>56</sup> She retired to a state of relative poverty and a brief exile (whether voluntary or involuntary) to Korotovo, Novgorod Province, a place to which she never became accustomed and the resentment of which never left her even after her partial rehabilitation by Paul's son, and Catherine's grandson, Alexander I.

Dashkova lived through these final dark years with bitter recollections of the glory days at Catherine's side and then at the head of the Academy. Throughout all her travels of these last years, she continued to think of herself as a herald of the ideas and institutions that Catherine ostensibly stood for, and refrained from criticizing too sharply the monarch who treated her shabbily at the end. The academies she directed so well were remembered fondly, but it was clear that she never did realize quite how transformative her leadership there was. Even while penning her memoirs, which she saw as her central legacy, she did not perceive her tenure at the Academy as the dawn of a modern vision of science, nor did she see it as the end of the Enlightenment, whose creature she most definitely was.

#### Notes:

1. The two academies often cause confusion in terminology. The Imperial Academy of Sciences and Arts in St. Petersburg was established by Peter the Great in 1725 as a typical Western European learned society, complete with salaried academicians who were to pursue their own research and consult with the state on technical matters. The Imperial Academy of the Russian Language was founded under Catherine the Great at Dashkova's behest as a linguistic institution to standardize the Russian language. In the nineteenth century the Russian Academy was folded into the Academy of Sciences to become its second division on Slavic history and philology.

2. Princesse Dashkova [E. R. Dashkova], *Mon histoire: Mémoires d'une femme de lettres russe à l'époque des lumières*, eds. Alexander Woronzoff-Dashkoff, Catherine Le Gouis, and Catherine Woronzoff-Dashkoff (Paris, 1999); translated into English as E. R. Dashkova, *The Memoirs of Princess Dashkova*, tr. and ed. Kyril Fitzlyon (Durham, 1995). All subsequent references to the memoirs are from the French version in my own translation. On the convoluted publication history of the memoirs, see the editor's introduction, in E. R. Dashkova, *Zapiski. Pis'ma sester M. i K. Vil'mot iz Rossii*, ed. S. S. Dmitriev, comp. G. A. Veselaia (Moscow, 1987), p. 29; and the helpful E. L. Rudnitskaia, ed., *Spravochnyi tom k zapiskam E. R. Dashkovoi, Ekateriny II, I. V. Lopukhina* (Moscow, 1992). On memoirs as a genre of women's writing, see A. Woronzoff-Dashkoff, "Disguise and Gender in Princess Dashkova's *Memoirs*," *Canadian Slavonic Papers*, vol. 33 (1991), pp. 62–74; Catriona Kelly, "Sappho, Corinna, and Niobe: Genres and Personae in Russian Women's Writing, 1760–1820," in *A History of Women's Writing in Russia*, eds. Adele Marie Barker and Jehanne M. Gheith (Cambridge, 2002), pp. 37–61; Judith Wovles, "The 'Feminization' of Russian Literature: Women, Language, and Literature in Eighteenth-Century Russia," in *Women Writers in Russian Literature*, eds. Toby W. Clyman and Diana Greene (Westport, Conn., 1994), pp. 35–60, 43; Kelly Herold, "Russian Autobiographical Literature in French: Recovering a Memoiristic Tradition



(1770–1830)" (Ph.D. diss., University of California, Los Angeles, 1998), pp. 119–22, 208; and the seminal study by Barbara Heldt, *Terrible Perfection: Women and Russian Literature* (Bloomington, 1987), p. 71. On disputes about the authenticity of Dashkova's memoirs, see the analysis in M. M. Safonov, "Ekaterina malaia i ee 'Zapiski,'" in *Ekaterina Romanovna Dashkova: issledovaniia i materialy*, eds. A. I. Vorontsov–Dashkov et al. (St. Petersburg, 1996), pp. 13–22. For supplemental material not included in the initial publication, see V. G. Esipov, "K biografii kniagini E. R. Dashkovi," *Istoricheski vestnik*, vol. 9 (1882), pp. 668–75.

3. Martha and Catherine Wilmot, *The Russian Journals of Martha and Catherine Wilmot, 1803–1808*, eds. Marchioness of Londonderry and H. M. Hyde (London, 1934), p. 211.

4. Much of the recent scholarship on women and politics in the Russian Enlightenment points to the historical specificity of the debates about female rule, drawing from the path-breaking study by Brenda Meehan-Waters, "Catherine the Great and the Problem of Female Rule," *Russian Review*, vol. 34 (1975), pp. 293–307.

5. A. I. Gertsen [Herzen], "Kniaginia Ekaterina Romanovna Dashkova," in A. I. Gertsen, *Sobranie sochinenii*, vol. 12 (Moscow, 1957), pp. 361–422, 361.

6. "The Russian Academy," *The Edinburgh Magazine* (April 1785), pp. 304–7, 304.

7. D. Mordovtsev, *Russkiiia zhenshchiny novogo vremeni: Biograficheskie ocherki iz russkoi istorii*, vol. 2 (St. Petersburg, 1874), pp. 119–59; O. I. Eliseeva, "Ekaterina II i E. R. Dashkova: Fenomen zhenskoi družby v epokhu prosveshcheniia," in *E. R. Dashkova i A. S. Pushkin v istorii Rossii*, ed. L. V. Tychinina (Moscow, 2000), pp. 19–33; V. V. Ogarkov, *E. R. Dashkova: Eia zhizn' i obshchestvennaia deiatel'nost'* (St. Petersburg, 1893), p. 27; and Carol S. Nash, "Educating New Mothers: Women and the Enlightenment in Russia," *History of Education Quarterly*, vol. 21 (1981), pp. 301–16.

8. For example, in April 1786 she intervened with Academy corresponding member Johann-Michael Renovanz to finish organizing the cabinet of foreign minerals, insisting that he use the Linnaean system of mineralogical classification instead of Bergman's, since she thought the former was superior. L. V. Tychinina, *Velikaia rossiianka: zhizn' i deiatel'nost' kniagini Ekateriny Romanovny Dashkovi* (Moscow, 2002), p. 143. The scholarship on Dashkova at the Academy is extensive but not always terribly illuminating. For some of the more prominent studies, see L. Ia. Lozinskaia, *Vo glave dvukh akademii*, 2d. ed. (Moscow, 1983); B. I. Krasnobaev, "Glava dvukh akademii," *Voprosy istorii*, no. 12 (1971), pp. 84–98; G. I. Smagina, "Akademii nauk i narodnoe prosveshchenie v Rossii vo vtoroi polovine XVIII veka," *Voprosy istorii estestvoznaniia i tekhniki*, no. 1 (1991), pp. 39–46; idem, "E. R. Dashkova—direktor Peterburgskoi akademii nauk," in *E. R. Dashkova i ee vremia: issledovaniia i materialy*, eds. L. V. Tychinina et al. (Moscow, 1999), pp. 35–43, 36; G. A. Tishkin, "A Female Educationalist in the Age of Enlightenment: Princess Dashkova and the University of St. Petersburg," *History of Universities*, vol. 13 (1984), pp. 137–52; idem, "'Ee svetlost' madam direktor' (E. R. Dashkova i Peterburgskii universitet v 1783–1796 gg.)," in *Ekaterina Romanovna Dashkova*, pp. 80–93; M. P. Tolstoi, "E. R. Dashkova—organizator rossiiskoi nauki," *Vestnik Rossiiskoi akademii nauk*, vol. 63, no. 3 (1993), pp. 245–48; E. P. Ozhigova, "E. R. Dashkova—Direktor Peterburgskoi akademii nauk," in *Ekaterina Romanovna Dashkova*, pp. 94–102; Günther Schlegelberger, *Die Fürstin Daschkowa: Eine biographische Studie zur Geschichte Katharinas II.* (Berlin, 1935). H. Montgomery Hyde, *The Empress Catherine and Princess Dashkov* (London, 1935) is unreliable with respect to the facts of her involvement in the Academy.

9. Dashkova, *Mon histoire*, p. 15. Dashkova had a passion for books her entire life. The catalogue of her Moscow library ran fifty pages and contained almost 4,500 books on a huge variety of topics. See Tychinina, *Velikaia rossiianka*, p. 54; and A. Woronzoff-Dashkoff's essay in this volume.

10. M. I. Sukhomlinov, "Kniaginia E. R. Dashkova," in M. I. Sukhomlinov, *Istoriia Rossiiskoi akademii*, vol. 1 (St. Petersburg, 1874), pp. 20–57, 21.

11. Tychinina, *Velikaia rossiianka*, p. 31.

12. Tychinina, *Velikaia rossiianka*, pp. 91–92.

13. Dashkova, *Mon histoire*, p. 156.

14. Dashkova, *Mon histoire*, pp. 157–58.

15. Cited in E. R. Dashkova, *O smysle slova "vospitanie": sochineniia, pis'ma, dokumenty*, ed. G. I. Smagina (St. Petersburg, 2001), p. 272.

16. On the foundation of the Academy of Sciences by Peter the Great, see Michael D. Gordin, "The Importation of Being Earnest: The Early St. Petersburg Academy of Sciences," *Isis*, vol. 91 (2000), pp. 1–31.

17. Tychinina, *Velikaia rossiianka*, p. 130.

18. N. I. Nevskaiia, ed., *Letopis' Rossiiskoi Akademii Nauk*, vol. 1 (St. Petersburg, 2000), pp. 607, 622.

19. Nevskaiia, *Letopis' Rossiiskoi Akademii Nauk*, pp. 627, 629.

20. K. V. Ostrovitianov, ed., *Istoriia Akademii nauk SSSR*, vol. 1, 1724–1803 (Moscow, 1958), p. 320.

21. Nevskaiia, *Letopis' Rossiiskoi Akademii Nauk*, p. 665.

22. Truth be told, the academicians had not been terribly well behaved under Orlov or Domashnev. On January 20, 1774, they had to be publicly reminded that they had to attend meetings regularly and publish, indicating that not all of them were as assiduous as they later claimed. See Nevskaiia, *Letopis' Rossiiskoi Akademii Nauk*, p. 610.

23. Nevskaiia, *Letopis' Rossiiskoi Akademii Nauk*, p. 688 (quotation), p. 693 (dismissal).

24. Ostrovitianov, *Istoriia Akademii nauk SSSR*, p. 321.

25. Ostrovitianov, *Istoriia Akademii nauk SSSR*, pp. 317–18.

26. On this, see Gordin, "The Importation of Being Earnest."

27. Dashkova, *Mon histoire*, p. 161.

28. Nevskaiia, *Letopis' Rossiiskoi Akademii Nauk*, pp. 704–5.

29. Cited in Dashkova, *O smysle slova "vospitanie"*, p. 274. Dashkova came through on this promise. In 1784 the academicians suggested that any proposal by an adjunct had to be approved by a full academician, but Dashkova vetoed this because it diminished the fame that could be obtained by the adjuncts: "Fame is often the only reward for the labors of science: why encroach upon its attainment? Let everyone know about the discovery and judge it fairly; if there is some kind of scientific discovery communicated in the memoir of an adjunct, which has gone through the hands of a professor, then it is very possible to suggest external participation, which lowers the merit of the author, in particular, if it is a young scholar who has managed to incur envious ill-wishers for himself." Quoted in Tychinina, *Velikaia rossiianka*, p. 147.

30. Nevskaiia, *Letopis' Rossiiskoi Akademii Nauk*, p. 699.

31. E. P. Ozhigova, "E. R. Dashkova—Direktor Peterburgskoi akademii nauk," in *Ekaterina Romanovna Dashkova*, pp. 94–102, 101–2. See also the account of the Academy's finances from Dashkova to Catherine, June 1, 1783; cited in Dashkova, *O smysle slova "vospitanie"*, pp. 282–87.

32. Dashkova, *Mon histoire*, p. 163.

33. G. A. Tishkin, "E. R. Dashkova i uchebnaia deiatel'nost' v Peterburgskoi akademii nauk," *Ocherki po istorii Leningradskogo universiteta*, vol. 6 (1989), pp. 190–207, 196.

34. Cited in Dashkova, *O smysle slova "vospitanie"*, p. 309. For the original French, see *Arkhiv Kniazia Vorontsova* (Moscow, 1881), vol. 21, pp. 389–402.

35. Cited in Dashkova, *O smysle slova "vospitanie"*, p. 311.

36. Nevskaiia, *Letopis' Rossiiskoi Akademii Nauk*, p. 755.

37. G. I. Smagina, "E. R. Dashkova—direktor Peterburgskoi akademii nauk," in *E. R. Dashkova i ee vremia*, pp. 35–43, 39.

38. A. A. Zaitseva, "E. R. Dashkova i knizhnaia trgovlia Akademii nauk," in *Ekaterina Romanovna Dashkova*, pp. 110–27; and G. I. Smagina, "E. R. Dashkova i prosvetitel'skaia deiatel'nost' Akademii nauk," in *Ekaterina Romanovna Dashkova*, pp. 103–9. On publishing in eighteenth-century Russia in general, see Gary Marker, *Publishing, Printing, and the Origins of Intellectual Life in Russia, 1700–1800* (Princeton, 1985).

39. Tychinina, *Velikaia rossiianka*, p. 155.

40. Dashkova, *O smysle slova "vospitanie"*, p. 292.

41. Dashkova, *Mon histoire*, pp. 91–93 (Diderot), p. 99 (Voltaire). On her interactions with French thinkers, and how they perceived her, see A. Niv'er, "E. R. Dashkova i frantsuzskie filosofy prosveshcheniia Vol'ter i Didro," ed. M. I. Mikeshin, in *Ekaterina Romanovna Dashkova*, pp. 41–54; and V. A. Somov, "Prezident trekh akademii: E. R. Dashkova vo frantsuzskoi [sic] 'Rossike' kontsa XVIII veka," in *E. R. Dashkova i A. S. Pushkin v istorii Rossii*, pp. 39–53, 40. Dashkova's reform of the Academy's *gymnasium* was heavily based



on the model of Edinburgh University, as described in G. A. Tishkin, "'Ee svetlost' madam direktor' (E. R. Dashkova i Peterburgskii universitet v 1783–1796 gg.)," in *Ekaterina Romanovna Dashkova*, pp. 80–93, 84.

42. Catherine II's *Instruction* (*Nakaz* in Russian) was written for the Legislative Commission she assembled in 1767 to develop a new legal code for Russia.

43. John Parkinson, *A Tour of Russia, Siberia and the Crimea, 1792–1794*, ed. William Collier (London, 1971), p. 38. Dashkova was fluent in English, and her brothers Aleksandr and Semion actually served in the Russian diplomatic staff in England during Catherine's reign. In her visits to England, she was strongly taken by both Bath and its classic architecture and the climate of Oxford University, which she spoke of in terms that contrast sharply with her suspicion of the salons of Paris. On her Anglophilia and the way the English perceived her, see E. P. Zykova, "Anglofil'stvo E. R. Dashkovoï v kontekste russkoi kul'tury XVIII veka," in *E. R. Dashkova i rossiiskoe obshchestvo XVIII stoletia*, eds. N. P. Karpichenko et al. (Moscow, 2001), pp. 89–106; and Anthony Cross, "Contemporary British Responses (1762–1810) to the Personality and Career of Princess Ekaterina Romanovna Dashkova," *Oxford Slavonic Papers*, n.s., vol. 27 (1994), pp. 41–61.

44. On the Royal Society as model for the American Philosophical Society (APS), see Edward C. Carter II, "One Grand Pursuit": *A Brief History of the American Philosophical Society's First 250 Years, 1743–1993* (Philadelphia, 1993), p. 14. On the early struggles of the APS, see Brooke Hindle, *The Pursuit of Science in Revolutionary America, 1735–1789* (Chapel Hill, 1956), chapter 7.

45. A. Woronzoff-Dashkoff, "Princess E. R. Dashkova: First Woman Member of the American Philosophical Society," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, vol. 140, no. 3 (1996), pp. 406–17.

46. Dashkova, *Mon histoire*, n. 179. See also N. N. Bolkhovitinov, *Rossia otkryvaet Ameriku, 1732–1799* (Moscow, 1991), pp. 148–51.

47. Eufrosina Dvoichenko-Markoff, "Benjamin Franklin, the American Philosophical Society, and the Russian Academy of Science," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, vol. 91, no. 3 (1947), pp. 250–57. On the extent of early contacts between the APS and Russians, see idem, "The American Philosophical Society and Early Russian-American Relations," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, vol. 94, no. 6 (1950), pp. 549–610.

48. Nevskaiia, *Letopis' Rossiiskoi Akademii Nauk*, p. 771.

49. Cited in Dashkova, *O smysle slova "vospitanie"*, p. 319.

50. On the Russian Academy and especially on its dictionary, see Sukhomlinov, "Kniaginia E. R. Dashkova" in *Istoriia Rossiiskoi akademii*; M. Sh. Fainshtein, "E. R. Dashkova i 'Slovar' akademii rossiiskoi' (1783–1794)," in *E. R. Dashkova: Lichnost' i epokha*, eds. L. V. Tychinina and A. V. Semenova (Moscow, 2003), pp. 58–71; Ogarkov, *E. R. Dashkova*, p. 59; E. P. Chelyshev, "Ot Ekateriny Romanovny i Konstantina Romanova do nashikh dnei," *Vestnik Rossiiskoi akademii nauk*, vol. 63, no. 6 (1993), pp. 536–45; Tychinina, *Velikaia rossianka*, p. 145; and Hans Rogger, *National Consciousness in Eighteenth-Century Russia* (Cambridge, Mass., 1960), p. 118.

51. Dashkova, *Mon histoire*, p. 84. Parkinson in December 1792 indicated that this was a longstanding theme of Dashkova's: "The Princess Dashkoff says that during the extinction of the Arts in every part of the world for some time, when nobody could say what was become of them, at that time they took their abode in Russia" (Parkinson, *A Tour of Russia*, p. 50).

52. Ogarkov, *E. R. Dashkova*, p. 57.

53. This is the account offered, for example, in Ch. de Larivière, *Catherine II et la révolution française* (Paris, 1895).

54. Tychinina, *Velikaia rossianka*, pp. 123–24.

55. Woronzoff-Dashkoff, "Princess E. R. Dashkova," p. 412.

56. Tychinina, *Velikaia rossianka*, pp. 133–34.