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The Edge of Empire: Rudbeck and Lomonosov and the Historiography of the North

Introduction
From the Mediterranean south, ever since the earliest ages, the North was seen as darkness associated with strange languages, distance, alien cultural behavior, and just plain bad weather. This darkness – or the fog and mist if we use the early description of Marco Polo – was not ignored but itself became a screen upon which the south could project an ever-growing list of fantasies. By the early eighteenth-century, northern historiography – both Russian and Swedish – became increasingly self-conscious about the way they were portrayed and sought to develop histories that were more independent. For Sweden, the writing of a northern history became a self-conscious effort to graft Sweden into the histories of Europe. For Russia, historical writing in the seventeenth

---

1 "Still further north, and a long way beyond that kingdom of which I have spoken, there is a region which bears the name of DARKNESS, because neither sun nor moon nor stars appear, but it is always as dark as with us in the twilight. The people have no king of their own, nor are they subject to any foreigner, and live like beasts (p. 484)." Another version reads: "Because for the most part of the winter months the sun appears not, and the air is dusky, as it is just before the dawn when you see and yet do not see (p. 485 note)." The quotations are from The Travels of Marco Polo. New York 1993 [1871, 1875, 1903]; see also Larner, John, Marco Polo and the Discovery of the World. New Haven 1999. A substantial effort to counter misconceptions of Sweden appears in Oluf Magnus, A Compendious History of the Goths, Swedes, and Vandals and Other Northern Nations. London 1658. The work first appeared in Latin in 1555 and should be read together with the Carta marina, his famous map of Scandinavia prepared in Danzig and published in Venice in 1539.

and eighteenth centuries became an effort to defend itself not only from European distortions but also from genealogies that would associate it too closely with Sweden. While I initially thought that a comparison of Olof Rudbeck and Mikhail Lomonosov would be a useful way of approaching northern historiography during the early decades of the eighteenth century, I have become convinced that such a comparison is not only convenient but essential. Each offers not only a point of entry into the writing and use of history in Sweden and Russia but also provides illuminating vantage points on their different objectives.

Several features must be identified from the outset. While the famous statues of Charles and Peter have come to symbolize the power of Sweden and Russia, they can also remind us of the conscious efforts on the part of Swedes and Russians to write ancient histories that would ground recent accomplishments. The statues might be compared to Voltaire's own monumental volumes on Charles XII (1731) and Peter the Great (1759). But for Sweden and Russia alike, Voltaire's writing also carried an inevitable reminder that these histories, although spectacular, carried a glamour that we might compare to a Spielberg Hollywood production of great northern panoramas. If we wish, we might even detect in Voltaire's ability to throw his voice into the north - his intellectual ventriloquism if you will - a reminder that for Swedes and Russians especially in the seventeenth century there was a kind of historiographic crisis from the vantage point of ancient sources that could be shaped into histories shared with other European nations. Given Sweden's success in the Thirty Years War and the monumental accomplishments of Peter (the civil and human engineering required to construct St. Petersburg provides one example among many), the paucity of historical sources might even appear somewhat paradoxical. This, however, is the case. If we used a somewhat contemporary analogy, we may say that while there were a plethora of news stories, there was little historical understanding. It is at least in part the absence of a shared historical record that permits Voltaire to shape the heroic stories of Charles and Peter. Using historical terminology closer to the seventeenth century, we might say that the tempus mythologicum, the time of the most ancient history, works as a blank page that must be filled. For Swedes, the absence of ancient written material might be attributed to the early destruction of northern books written in the Runic alphabet by Olof Skötkonung as early as 1001. For Russians, it is

the problem first of knowing what sources there are and then of learning how to deal with the discovery of vast amounts of material. For Sweden this involves Icelandic sagas; for Russia it involves historical chronicles that include not only the canonical Nestor's Chronicle but a rapidly accumulating mass of information from Siberia. For scholars in both countries, textual evidence is simply insufficient and they are required to turn to ethnographic and archeological evidence. More than anything else, the following pages show, albeit in an abbreviated manner, how in both Swedish and Russian settings, one finds an elaborate process of collecting voices and even Gogol-like ghosts that contribute to the creation of new national histories. As we will see, for each nation, the new material asks what it means to discover another "history" or other "histories" within yourself? In both cases the assimilation of the archival material provokes not only internal debates but influences the elaboration of a northern identity and finally a recalibration of the idea of Europe itself. What is also interesting is that they are compared and provoke historical debates that have continued to our own day.

Part 1: Rudbeck (1630–1702)

For a generation of Swedes who had learned to maneuver in Latin and Greek commentaries in order to study at German or Dutch universities the Swedish poems of Georg Stiernheim (1598–1672) marked not only the strength of the Swedish language but a growing nationalism that also sought recognition in a unique history of the north. Even a glimpse at the extraordinary work being undertaken by seventeenth-century Swedish scholars such as Johannes Schefferus (Svecia literata [1698]), reminds us that by the 1670s and 1680s there was a Swedish industry not simply engaged in antiquarian studies but in a search for epic material. These antiquarian pursuits were supported in

---

substantial ways by noblemen such as Magnus Gabriel de la Gardie (1622–1686) who was astutely aware of the ways that publication of ancient documents could draw attention on a scale much larger than church reliquaries in the catholic past. The publication of Hervarars Saga in 1672 offers an example not only of antiquarian research and the definition of a Swedish epic but shows us the context in which Atlantica was born.10 The importance of the work appears not only in the copious commentary which includes notes by Stierheim and Rudbeck but in the allegorical dedication that draws an extended comparison between Sweden’s rich iron resources and the new resource that is now being provided through the publication of the saga.

In our fatherland we have iron mines of such richness that they have always been regarded as one of the nation’s unique treasures. As a result, our land’s nobles and kings must with particular care and supervision do nothing but see to their significance and value for everyone.11

The mining metaphor used by Verelius works well for just as the country must look toward its hidden natural resources, it should also explore its hidden historical resources. In reading the saga, one has the impression that it functions as a Nordic Odyssey if not in a literal sense as poetic text that merits commentary worthy of the Greek epic poem. As the portrayal of Homer in the frontispiece to Atlantica hints several years later, northern epics could also be thought of as school texts for Homer. Just as the Homeric scholia participated in the conceptual foundation of Greece, the extended commentary on the saga becomes involved in the definition of Sweden. While the actual text of first chapter of the saga is only three pages long and comprised of both the text in Old Norse and a Swedish translation, the commentary takes up thirty-three additional pages! When approached from the scholarly apparatus used by


Verelius, Rudbeck’s Atlantica appears less strange.12 If Hervarar Saga suggests a potential for a foundational epic, Rudbeck’s work might be thought of as a scholarly commentary on a lost civilization that might best be described as a cross between Servius and Schlickeim. Rudbeck’s undertaking amounts to the imaginary recreation of a lost Swedish epic based on a massive collection of fragments. Although the undertaking has seemed farfetched and has often been ridiculed, Rudbeck’s work may also be viewed as a new universal history that sought to integrate northern histories into an historiography that had been unquestioningly directed toward the south and the Mediterranea. In effect, Rudbeck seeks to show that what has been ignored may have undreamed of consequences not only for the Swedish nation but for the very understanding of world history.

Atlantica, published in four volumes (vol. 1 and a folio of illustrations [1679], vol. 2 [1689]; vol. 3 [1698], vol. 4 [1702]), might best be described as a continually evolving book that sought to establish support for the thesis that the postdiluvial source for humankind could be traced to Sweden and the burial mounds in Old Uppsala.13 While Rudbeck’s hermeneutical method at first appears disorganized, the disparition of textual scholarship which constructed arguments through the copious citation of textual sources.14 Such practice was expected and is found commonly throughout the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. Rudbeck’s arguments are informed by the seventeenth-century recognition that language could be studied as an abstract system that carried, through its words and structure, the history of people. With linguistic theory and the practice of seeking synchronisms in history, Rudbeck proceeded to amass what he viewed as significant connections between ancient history associated with the Hebrews, Greeks, and Romans and the history of the north. One of the arguments implicit in Rudbeck’s work is that universal history in the seventeenth century had become too ethnocentric or dominated by what we might think of as Mediterranean assumptions. While Rudbeck certainly can be accused of presumptuous ethnocentrism himself, his research also provides a rich laboratory for the study of history. Three related theses or assumptions emerge from Atlantica: (1) that natural history (geography and especially a description of nature and natural resources) provides an alternative schema for reading political and cultural history; (2) that natural history

12 For example, references to "Manhem" (identified in the Swedish translation as Sweden) and "Jutahem" (Gran-horne) in the saga provide departure points for extended commentary and eventually evidence for Rudbeck in Atlantica. See especially the first chapter of the saga.
provides a foundation for the growth of a nation; (3) that there is a Mediterranean thesis that may be challenged and augmented.

My reference to a Mediterranean thesis should not be surprising. It can be discerned in Olaus Magnus (and even in the assimilation of Magnus’s work in England in the seventeenth century) and in propaganda from the Thirty Years War. I am not suggesting that antiquity is being called into question in itself but that its presence as an unquestioned assumption begins to be balanced by the possibility that European history might also be approached from a different and perhaps even complementary geographical perspective. In the simplest sense, a northern thesis emerges when the numerous unquestioned universal histories that give unquestioned priority to the Mediterranean become formulated in ways in which they are qualified or formulated through self-conscious reflection. Another way of saying this is to emphasize the ways in which universal histories become vehicles for viewing and even shaping broad historical narratives. Isaac Newton’s own work on universal history certainly carries an interest in English and even personal history. European intellectual traditions often assumed Mediterranean origins in the seventeenth century to the degree that they almost go unquestioned. While Goethecism may bring such Mediterranean history into relief, it does so by using the scholarly methods that were part of European academic traditions.

The cornucopia of observations provided by Rudbeck’s *Atlantica* challenges the reader to expand the ways he or she has thought about history. In contrast to universal histories that only seek to integrate multiple written records, Rudbeck’s work gives repeated attention to natural history that may be used for information. Besides written records, the reader is shown how jewelry, coins, building techniques, clothing, dialectical variations in language, geographical detail, evidence of climatic change all may provide information useful in building up an interpretive stance. It is precisely this hotchpotch of information together with a continuous mixing of genres that has contributed to the eccentric reputation of *Atlantica*. Yet it may not at all be misleading to look again at the apparent eccentricity and see that it really uses the form of a scholarly genre to assemble a massive amount of ethnographic and anthropological detail in the form of collected anecdotes. Rudbeck’s style is associated with his propensity to cluster anecdotal evidence on the same level of evidence drawn from written sources. For example, in a chapter devoted to the idea that there were giant humans living in the north, Rudbeck includes his own experience with persons who were of unusual height.

In regard to the relevance of upbringing, it is important for children to be nursed for a sufficiently long period of time, sleep a great deal and that they don’t receive a lot of air, live in the thick forest, and aren’t put to work too soon. I’m going to give two examples. In the year 1658, I was responsible for a sick person, about 30 years old, who was bedridden because he appeared as if he were dead, but not quite as much as others, because he still could move both his hands and feet. Still, he didn’t have enough strength to work. He had been in bed for 6 years, had a strong appetite and slept most of the time. He had grown three kvarter or 1 1/2 feet during his illness with the consequence that they needed to make him a longer bed. Such an example reminds me of the time I was in Leidens Nosocomio if I remember correctly.

15 European intellectual traditions often assumed Mediterranean origins in the seventeenth century to the degree that they almost go unquestioned. While Goethecism may bring such Mediterranean history into relief, it does so by using the scholarly methods that were part of European academic traditions.

Rudbeck’s repeated use of his own eyewitness accounts – his field studies – amounts to an enlargement of historical research. Two entwined forces drive his work: the formulation of a mythos about the origins of Sweden and the collection of information about the north. What is infrequently noticed is that the exotic arguments regarding the antiquity of Sweden permit a great amount of northern daily-life to be registered as well. It is quite likely that it is the wealth of Rudbeck’s observations that stand behind Leibniz’s comment on Rudbeck’s extravagance:

> I do not know what to think about those who urged on by the love of country mix fantasy with their solid work; it seems that they are productive since through their imagination they actually do good work.

Leibniz urges us to think of the work less as a moment of a great failure and more as a work that admonishes ongoing investigation of history as it is integrated into the daily life of the past.

16 "Vad uppfostringen anklagar står det mycket uppåt att barnen få riklig och länge di, mycket sova och låta vara i tufonen och bo in ut sjöka skogar och sent komma att brukas i arbete. Jag skall indraga tvenne exempel. Anno 1658 hade jag en syrsk hund under mina händer, som var mot sina 30 år och låg stadigt till sängs, emedan han var som en kortitgen, doch icke alldeles som andra, ty han kunde roa både händer och fötter. Men ingen så stor styrka att han kunde gå eller arbeta. Han hade nu i 6 år legat till sängs och åt starkt och hvort mest. Han hade växt tre kvarter eller 1 1/2 fot längre under sin sjukdom, så att de måste göra honom en längre säng. Sådana example påminner jag mig i Leidens Nosocomio om jag rätt minns." The quotation is from Gunnar Eriksson’s splendid anthology of Rudbeck’s *Atlantica* that particularly includes material pertaining to natural history. See Eriksson, Gunnar, *Atlanticae Naturalistica*. Stockholm 1998, p. 219.

17 Leibniz as cited in *Atlantica* (vol. 3 p. 754).
Gothicism as an ideological motif that can be manipulated to characterize Sweden's unique identity within Europe. There are complex shades of meaning which move between the Gothicism of Swedish romantic poetry on the one hand and its use within German propaganda of the Second World War. Within the seventeenth-century, it contributes to process of realignment in which Sweden becomes assimilated into an established idea of European civilization and shows how the discoveries of northern antiquity also influence an evolving idea of Europe.

Although I have no room here to review the assimilation of Gothicism in Sweden or in Europe in general, I would like to conclude my comments by looking briefly at two emblematic representations of Rudbeck's Atlantica published by his son in Nora Samolad sive Laponia illustrata (Uppsala 1701).

Following the example of his father, Rudbeck the younger undertook an expedition to Lapland in 1696 in which he sought to gather material that would be useful in demonstrating the great antiquity of Sweden. The expedition which was the first ever sponsored by the royal crown marked an imitation of northern explorations in Sweden which would be followed by Linneus and others. The detailed frontispiece to the book portrays a northern landscape with reindeer, a Lapp settlement, and a burial mound suggestive of those found in Gamla Uppsala. In the middle ground, we see a young nobleman who could either be Rudbeck the Younger or the patron of the expedition, Charles XI, in discussion with a Lapp guide. In the foreground we see putti deciphering the arcane hieroglyph-like symbols from a lapp drum. The scene on the left side of the central landscape shows a speaker or prophet who points out the relation between the lamb he holds before a congregation in prayer and resurrected Christ in the heavens. The scene on the far right depicts a waterfall. Given Baroque practice, it is appropriate to consider the relationship between each of the three scenes. By moving from left to right, we notice that each portrays a truth that may be superimposed on the other: just as God revealed his covenant between the heaven and earth through Jesus, so God may be revealed in the study of the north. Furthermore, God may be revealed in natural wonders like waterfalls that may be used for the benefit of mankind. The four emblematic seals in the foreground each carry an inscription in Swedish and Hebrew which further indicates that deciphering or reading the northern landscape is part of a revelatory process that will take one closer to the origins of all wisdom.

---

18 For a discussion of royal directives in Sweden that required parish priests and other officials to ask the population for assistance in identifying antiquities see Larsson, Mats G., Sveahovdingens budskap. Stockholm 2000, pp. 42–43.


20 Rudbeck d.y., Oluf, Nora Samolad sive Laponia illustrata. Uppsala 1701.

Achilles heel if we are anatomically and historically precise, we notice Nöteborg, at the time a small Swedish fishing village located at the point where the River Neva moves into the Gulf of Finland. Besides marking Sweden's own sense of its eastern frontier, Nöteborg very soon not only challenges our Baltic figure to reaffirm his attention but becomes the site of an ongoing discussion of Atlantis and its meaning not for Sweden but for Russia. It is this discussion, which accompanies the transformation of Nöteborg to St. Petersburg, one year after Rubeck's publication, that I turn to next.

Part 2: Lomonosov (1711–1765)

Unlike Olof Rudbeck, who becomes recognized for heroic efforts in demonstrating not only Sweden's distant past but its links to Europe, Mikhail Vasilyevich Lomonosov's historiographic work seeks to establish a framework in which the question of origins plays a different role.23 For Lomonosov the question of ancient origins, particular within a tradition of Greek or Roman antiquity, is far more distant because he quite literally participates in framing an origin that is more immediate. When Rudbeck dies in 1702, Nöteborg, the Swedish fishing village located on what is now Vasilievskiy Island and still identified on the Baltic map considered above, is a recognized name even though the work on clearing and dredging for the new St. Petersburg would soon be underway. St. Petersburg – quite literally its construction – has enormous significance for Lomonosov for it becomes the stage for his very career.24 When he arrives in the city on New Year's Day in 1736, his thoughts are hardly directed toward antiquity but to participating in building a new civilization.25 Given his own childhood and youth on the White Sea, St. Petersburg would have seemed far closer to home than Moscow in numerous respects. I have no time here to consider Lomonosov's work in natural philosophy other than to emphasize how it exemplifies not only his own accomplishment but his participation in creating a communication network that could forward and defend early Russian work in natural philosophy. Just as Lomonosov learned the importance of asking who it was that drew maps of Russia and Sweden in the early decades of the eighteenth-century because of their capacity to suggest control and ideological resolve, he shrewdly

23 For a helpful overview of Lomonosov together with collected translations from his work see Langewiesche, Lomonosov: 1711–1765; or vis, over o ware. Paris 1967; for a detailed overview of Russian historiography dealing with the north see Slavne i Rus: kontseptii, rozhdenye trekhvekovoy pokolenii, v krestinamnoz tseli. Moskva 1999.


26 Bagrow, Leo, A History of the Cartography of Russia up to 1800. Ed. by Henry W. Castner. Wolfe Island, Ontario 1975; and Bagrow, Leo, A History of the Cartography of Russia up to 1800. Ed. by Henry W. Castner. Wolfe Island, Ontario 1975; my research on Russian and Swedish cartography in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries has been helped greatly by the Johannes Sack collection at the Newberry Library.

22 "The people who have walked in darkness have seen a great light" (Isa. 9); "Let my soul rest in the Northern lands" (Zach. 6); "And the Lord smelled a sweetness" (Gen. 8); "This is the sign of my covenant" (Gen. 9).
understood that the matter of origins must be closely linked to who it is that writes history.\textsuperscript{26}

By the time Lomonosov writes about Russian origins the question had become a muddy ditch. These debates could easily be simplified by the very site of St. Petersberg which continued to be regarded as Swedish and European territory into the 18th century. When Peter travels to Holland and indeed by the time he is in correspondence with Leibniz, Rudbeck's work was already well advertised.\textsuperscript{27} Although it might seem that the Battle of Poltava (1709) would have made the question of origins less important, this is not the case. Rather than being a moment of division, the decisive battle at Poltava created an opportunity for more expanded work into Russian geography and history. The relationship between Philipp Johann von Strahlenberg (1677–1747) and Vasili Nikitich Tatishchev (1686–1750) marks a good example of the research which followed Poltava.\textsuperscript{28} Well beyond their participation in the battle itself, the subsequent capture of Strahlenberg led to his supervision of mining operations in Siberia where he met Tatishchev. Tatishchev's career provides a detailed look into Peter's institutional reform and his interest in making connections with the west. In 1717 Tatishchev is involved in negotiations to purchase an icon of the Last Judgment from Danzig because it was believed to have been carved by St. Methodius. In 1718 he is one of the chief negotiators at the congress called to end the Great Northern War between Sweden and Russia. In the same year, he is directed to plan the administration for the College of Mines and Factories and by 1719 he presents Peter with a plan for a land survey of Russia. It is his early work on mapping and his curiosity about place names that provokes Tatishchev's interest in early Russian history. Peter himself directs Tatishchev to the Nestor Chronicle in the Imperial Library, When Tatishchev comes to Sweden in 1724–26, he visits Strahlenberg in Stockholm and reviews his book manuscript on Siberia. Tatishchev's trip to Uppsala was specifically arranged by Peter I in order to determine whether Russia might send students to Sweden to study mining technology. Tatishchev left St. Petersberg at the end of October 1724 and by the winter of 1725 had visited Swedish mines and factories in Salberg, Avestar, Stalheim, and Bervors in addition to receiving diagrams of the machines in use at the great mine in Falun. In his early letters to Peter, he reports that Strahlenberg had written a history of Siberia and that he had


\textsuperscript{28} “Did Scandinavians found, or dominate, or merely visit and serve, the early Russian state?"
Russian First Chronicle but in a setting that had been ideologized by Rudbeck’s *Atlantica* and Swedish Gothicism in general. Given his research in Sweden it is not surprising that Tatishchev should display his awareness of Olof Rudbeck and Olof Rudbeck, the Younger, as he does in his history. Finally, however, one must conclude that Tatishchev demonstrates an interest in Swedish scholarship in general rather than any attraction to a particular Gothic argument.

If Tatishchev and Strahlenberg represent early eighteenth-century lay-research on Russian history and geography, Gerhard Friderich Müller marks professional research in the same area one generation later. Müller first arrived in St. Petersburg in late 1725 among the first group of European scholars recruited to teach in the newly established Russian Academy. Rather than professors like Bernoulli and Euler, however, Müller was recruited in the capacity of graduate student who was expected to teach at the gymnasium. Soon he had added an assistantship in the new Academy Library to his teaching responsibility and other quickly followed. In 1728 he became the archivist responsible for German dispatches on current affairs and was asked to edit the new *St. Petersburg Gazette*. A short time later he was also asked to organize a supplement concerned with history, genealogy, and geography and then to edit Russia’s first scholarly publication, *Commentarii Academiae Scientiarum Imperialis Petropolitanae*. Joseph Black writes that “Müller quickly became a central figure in the project to propagate knowledge among Russians.” (p. 19) In 1730 he was authorized to represent the Academy of Sciences on a trip to England, Holland, and Germany. In England he attended a meeting of the Royal Society and was asked to stand for membership for which he was elected on 10 December, 1730. Little of his experience as an academic envoy prepared him for what was to become the major influence on the remainder of his career in Russia. Beginning in 1733, Müller participates in the first Russian expedition to Siberia during which he becomes an authority on the material collected. Beginning in the late 1740s, surely influenced by his time in Siberia, Müller undertakes his own study of the origins of Russia. However, when *De

After a quarter millennium debate, there is still no consensus, partly due to the politically charged nature of the debate itself. The Slavs had been “lifying savage beasts and birds” before the advent of the civilizing Norsemens, according to the German-born Moscovian academian Schlüter in 1802, a view adopted by several subsequent scholars and nonscholars alike, including Adolf Hitler, who saw in Russia “a wonderful instance of the state-organizing capability of the Germans among an inferior race.” Thoroughly provoked, many Russian and Soviet historians have countered by downplaying, questioning, or even denying any Scandinavian influence on the rise of early Russia. In short, noise emanating from more modern racist assumptions have often “jammed” signals from a distant past.” Stang, Haakon, Norse in Russia, *Medieval Scandinavia: An Encyclopedia*, Phillip Pulsiano (ed), New York 1993, pp. 556-558; 556.


33 Black, Joseph L., op. cit., p. 118.


*originibus gentis et nominis Russorum* is presented before the Academy in September 1749, it becomes the focal point of intense argument. The paper which Black has described as “one of the least-studied documents of eighteenth-century Russian historiography and science” (p. 116) contained three positions: 1) dating of the Slav movement to the Dnieper from the Danube; 2) identification of the Varangians with the “Norman-Scandinavians”; 3) equation of the Norman-Scandinavians with the Rus. Müller’s argument so provoked Lomonosov and others that there were twenty-nine special meetings of the Academy between October 1749 and March 1750. Included among Lomonosov’s twelve indictments against Müller are repeated references to his foreign origin and his thin use of Russian sources. When Lomonosov is asked to write up the final verdict on Müller’s treatise his contempt is quite evident:

In a public meeting there should be nothing said that could be an affront to a Russian audience which might produce grievances and hatred against the Academy. But I judge that they, on hearing this dissertation of their new origins, founded on guesses, their naming by the Finns, the contempt for their ancient history, and the new information about the constant defeats, enslavements and conquests by the Swedes over the Russians, they will certainly and rightly be dissatisfied not only with Mr. Müller but with the entire Academy and its directors.

In September 1750 all existing copies of Müller’s dissertation were to be destroyed; he lost his position of rector of the university and was ordered to cease lecturing on Russian history. In October 1750 his salary was cut and his contact with state papers severed. It is within this setting that Lomonosov decides to write his own history of Russia.

In the introduction to Lomonosov’s book, Ludwig Christian Backmeister draws attention to its importance in regard to the idea of origins: “This valuable work embraces the oldest and darkest parts of Russian history and brings clarity to those that are most difficult. There is no doubt that the author would have continued his work if not for his premature death on April 4th 1765. A continuation of the book was not found in his remaining papers.” The sections
Rather than a history of barbarism, Lomonosov would represent Russia’s history as an account of great events. The idea of a *gesta russorum* which can be remembered signals a shift in Lomonosov’s history for as the work evolves it becomes far more a chronicle of indisputable Russian acts which comes as a consequence of great struggle. “(E)very misfortune was followed by a recovery of greater strengths, every decay was followed by a greater growth, and to encourage a fatigued people the Providence erected strong monarchs.” The idea that strength emerges from struggle is turned by Lomonosov into a classical metaphor that can also be supported by his cartographic work:

When I consider the remarkable transformation of the Russian state, the unification of different groups through the sovereignty of the first Varangian princes (followed by) the inner struggle that weakened our fatherland, and finally a new unification under sovereign rule and the inclusion of other strong peoples in the east and the west, so it appears to me that this was like the movement of a great river which grows from its source along wide planes, sometimes breaks up into small streams running among many islands, and thus losing its depth and speed; but later on gathering itself into its bed and with ever greater strength and speed, collecting other great rivers from all around to create an even greater and more abundant flood, which through its movement grows only stronger and stronger.  

The classical metaphor used by Lomonosov indicates that he was well aware of the ways the writing of history could be related to the writing of poetry. Further evidence appears not only in his own poetry but in the assignment he received to gather historical material that could be put to use by Voltaire in his

---

37 “Неправедна рассуждает, кто выражаю именем одного народу. Многие сильные доводы утверждают, что они были разных народов, кого бы ни объясняли своими свойствами, и только лишь говорят, что они были одним народом, но все это вымышлено, ибо поистине, они не были одним народом.” Ломоносов, М. В. "Избранные произведения". Т. 2. Москва, 1986. С. 72.

38 “Только тогда, когда они были единки в своем народе, и только тогда они были не единки в своем народе.” Ломоносов, М. В. "Избранные произведения". Т. 2. Москва, 1986. С. 72.

39 “Немало имели свидетельства, что в России голья великих дел не было, какую представляет многие внешние писатели. Наконец, рассуждаем принудительно будто, смысля сих и тогда пределов и сличия происхождение, поступки, обычаи и склонности народов между собою.” Ломоносов, М. В. "Избранные произведения". Т. 2. Москва, 1986. С. 72.

40 “Каждому исключению последовало благотворное, более прежнего, каждому шагу высшее восстановление и к обещанию упомянутого народа некоторым божественным проявлением воздвигнуто были бодрые государы.” Ломоносов, М. В. "Избранные произведения". Т. 2. Москва, 1986. С. 72.

41 “Только веним бытия в депах российских; соединение разных народов под самодержавием первых князей выразилось; внутреннее потом незаведомо, оставляя малое отечество, веками, новое соединение неоднократно и приобретение сильных народов на востоке и на западе рассуждал, порядок нынешних народов великого, так как они не одинаково, но восточное торговли и великолепие приобретают; потом проникают в себя иные великие от сторон реки, чем далее проникают, тем добрыми вульгами разумеется и тем большим силах.” Ломоносов, М. В. "Избранные произведения". Т. 2. Москва, 1986. С. 72.

42 "В поэме о поэме",” Ломоносов, М. В. "Избранные произведения". Т. 2. Москва, 1986. С. 72.
own history of Peter the Great recently commissioned by Catherine. The irony of Lomonosov, who had fought at times bitterly to have native Russians write Russian history, must not be lost: Academician Lomonosov playing secretary to Voltaire who ranked among the very foreign scholars who had disseminated misrepresentations of Russia. But it is also probable that Lomonosov saw fully that he had an opportunity to influence the perception of Russia in Europe that far exceeded anything that he could do by himself. A consideration of their correspondence suggests that Lomonosov not only provided information but sought to influence Voltaire. An indication of Lomonosov’s effort appears in the manuscript outline of an epic work concerning the apotheosis of Peter the Great. As described, the epic appears to be an elaboration of the long heroic poem that Lomonosov published in Russian in 1760. The manuscript describes in detail an effort to write a poem that would be entitled “La Zaride” which would be compared with Tasso and Milton. Modeled on great epics of antiquity the poem would describe the exploits of Peter the Great, “le héros du Nord, le modèle des rois, la merveille de son siècle, le restaurateur de sa nation, le législateur, protecteur des arts et des sciences.” The strong desire to shape a Russian epic poem that could be supported by the details of an evolving Russian historiography must be compared with the Swedish efforts to seek such epics either in Icelandic sagas or in a myth of the lost Atlantis. In both cases, the elaborate efforts work to formulate not only national narratives but to create histories that may reshape the Renaissance conception of Europe.

Conclusion

While it is possible to argue that the antiquarian interest towards origins ends with Lomonosov, we must be careful to recognize that the idea of origins for Russia was transformed as a consequence of the extensive exploration that had taken place between Poltava and the death of Lomonosov in 1765. More than anything else, the Siberian expeditions reset the question of a single northern origin by showing that Russian origins were multiple. In effect, rather than seeking to represent Russian origins through a single source or stream, it was possible to turn the ancient story of Atlantis, so idealized by Rudbeck for Sweden, into a Russian fable.

Once the great island Race, who wished to save From gale and storm those drifting on the wave, To give to others comfort, and win praise, A wondrous structure on the shore did raise...

In numerous ways the detailed description of the canal network of Atlantis found in Plato’s Critias (Cf. paragraph 117) suggests multiple ways that it might be applied to the new city of St. Petersburg. For Lomonosov’s occasional poem see Menshutkin, B., op. cit., p. 175.

44 The poem titled “Памят Георгиевской поэмы” is included in Lomonosov, M.V., Ибраным производства, vol. 2, pp. 267–296.
45 Ibid., p. 75.

necessary to find the country’s strength — to use Lomonosov’s own metaphor — in the gathering of many rivers. The deliberations of the Academy of Science in the 1749–1750 might even be thought of as a vehicle for establishing a riverbed. Instead of creating an epic they remind participants of Russia’s multiple origins. Not surprisingly the recognition of such multiple origins allows Russia to be celebrated as the “folk kingdom” for European nations. Multiple publications of the Russian Academy of Science show how quickly Russians and Europeans become aware of the ways in which Russia can serve as a linguistic and ethnographic laboratory for Europe. Unlike medieval French histories, the preparation of Russian chronicles was conducted simultaneously with linguistic research into the development of the Russian language. Such an association is important because the idea of sobornost is as much associated with belonging to a language as it is belonging to a particular locality. The language results in the creation of a Russian phenomenology of language which can at times take the place of an idea of origins. These discussions are important for they mark the end of Renaissance frameworks that would shape everything in the setting of Greek and Latin culture.

Rudbeck’s work as well provokes not only an expectation for a hegemonic epic to celebrate Sweden’s importance but serves as a testament to Sweden’s European identity. Ironically, at the same time that Rudbeck provokes Russian debates about origins, his methods promote research that complements Russian exploration of Siberia. Of course, an even greater irony appears if we consider the ways in which the realpolitik shifts between Rudbeck and Lomonosov. Between 1702 and 1765, the roles of Sweden and Russia change in substantial ways. Nevertheless, even when their roles are exchanged, each continues to explore historiographic narratives in which they may be defined. For Russia, military victory as well as geographic exploration, challenge the creation of a historical vision of such breadth that Russia becomes viewed as a laboratory of the future. For Sweden, military loss challenges the expansion of an intellectual endeavor in which natural philosophy plays a leading role. It is not inaccurate to think of Charles XII’s Greater Sweden transformed from a political to intellectual terrain where research and reconnaissance into natural resources becomes most important. A striking example is found in Emanuel Swedenborg’s Opera philosophica et mineralia (1734) which includes detailed information on Russian

46 See for example Herder’s thinking about the regenerative power of folk poetry. In Über den Ursprung der Sprache (1772), he recommends collecting folk poetry from among the “Scyths and Slaves, Wends and Bohemians, Russians, Swedes, and Poles,” cited in Wellke, René, A History of Modern Criticism, Vol 1 (The Later Eighteenth Century). New Haven 1955, p. 190. Of course, the idea of folk poetry and art is enormously rich in Russian and Swedish history and becomes woven into the multiple strains of Russian and Soviet ethnography.
mining and metallurgy gathered from his conversations with Strahlenberg.⁴⁷ In effect, we may say that the Kingdom of Charles XII becomes replaced by a Kingdom of Linnean Plants.⁴⁸ While the question of origins becomes less important for historiographic research, it remains an important means for registering ideological tests about cultural identity. Especially within German historiography at the end of the 18th century, the comparison of Swedes to “pirates” and Russians to “nomads” takes on a racist tone that can be heard well into the 20th century.⁴⁹

While the monumental statues of Charles XII in Stockholm and Peter I in St. Petersburg remind us of the two contending seventeenth-century empires that engaged each other in the Baltic, another image of their ongoing rivalry is provided by the Gustavianum in Uppsala and the Kunstkamer in St. Petersburg. What should draw our attention in each is not simply the national discussion that each represents or arguments about national origins. Finally, each architectural monument remembers not simply a search for political empire but reminds us that such endeavors inevitably belong to the intellectual terrain as well. The buildings that functioned as stages for Rudbeck and Lomonosov and as libraries for the historical collections of Siberia or Scandinavia that each helped to gather also symbolize our own “search for an order” in the still evolving histories of Sweden and Russia.

---


Hervarar Saga. Courtesy of the Newberry Library, Chicago.
Olaus Rudbeck makes an anatomical demonstration of Sweden's place on the globe for a circle of prehistoric sages. Table 1 to Olaus Rudbeck's *Atlantica*. Courtesy of the Newberry Library, Chicago.

The front page of *Lapponia illustrata*. Courtesy of the Newberry Library, Chicago.
Глава 8.
о Барягах Россий.

Приступают к показанию Барягы Российской, как они и какого народа были, прежде всего высказывай, что они с древних времен известны особым одним концом. Они разъезжались через долину в Крымскую княжескую брандембургскую княжескую о свекровях Прусских, которые еще до наших времён расселялись по некоторым местам в Прусиях, и передавали свои земли, королевские упоминания Липи, Ямуд и Kurkaldu. Ибо в городах возвышались крепости, и море служило преградой Иммера, короля Иммера, в его землях около привилегированного стольника Липи заводили, по неправедному Наполеону благословение.

Западные христианские народы, говорящие на польском языке, неоднократно походили, чтобы обратиться к Матери-родине Иерусалима и прекратить невольные походы на Восток, ку-да собирались множество воинов. По многим несчастливым предприятиям наконец, храбрый курьеский герцог Генрих завоевал Липи, Ямуд и Иерусалим. Не воевали христианские по освобождении земли, где раньше жили междуудобные войны, овладевшего Крымом, вступили в Кипрский заговор: омывая в садовниках вре-мена в-то время Рода, и незримо в Россию, где междуудобные войны, овладевшего Крымом, вступили в Кирееву Казарму. Иные киреевцы к Ни-ве, просили у него за погребённых старых земель в Европе места, для поселения, и в-то время, молча, северные земли в-то время Германии, на которые Иммера покрылись, в-то время_HEADER_END
Cross-section of Gustavianum, the anatomical theater in Uppsala. Table 40, Figure 144 to Rudbeck's *Atlantica*. Courtesy of the Newberry Library, Chicago.

Cross-section of Kunstkammer in St. Petersburg. Courtesy of the Newberry Library, Chicago.