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AS I COMPLETED THIS BOOK, George Floyd was murdered in Minneapolis. With the impassivity of tying his shoelace, a police officer kneeled on Floyd’s neck, suffocating him for eight excruciating minutes. Such overt brutality, exercised by law enforcement against unarmed African Americans, was nothing new. But this incident in May 2020 was caught on a witness-video whose viral distribution revived Black Lives Matter activism in the United States. Protests rippled outward, far and wide, reaching Paris within a week. In France Floyd’s case resembled that of Adama Traoré, a young Malian who had been arrested in July 2016 for not carrying his national identity papers. A few hours later, he died in police custody under similarly cruel circumstances. After a lengthy investigation, the implicated public officials were exonerated just four days after Floyd’s death. Suddenly the French were gripped by the same issue: a state condoning the use of deadly force against its inhabitants of color (fifteen of them a year on average).

It seemed like an odd time for me to be correcting endnotes. But after two decades of researching and teaching civil society, I recognized the essential components of a social movement supported by voluntary associations and their coordinated activities. The pattern was unmistakable, despite its new guise in an international quest for racial justice sustained by non-profit organizations like SOS Racisme and Les Indivisibles. Online reporting by cable outlets and newspapers contributed to widespread awareness of an issue raised by minority voices. Unlike local expressions of concern years earlier in Ferguson near Saint Louis or in Beaumont-sur-Oise north of Paris, the numerous, large-scale demonstrations on behalf of George Floyd and Adama Traoré realigned, however briefly, the relations between the state, the economy, and the third sector.

My longstanding fascination with the public space of women in freemasonry, albeit in previous centuries, had been transposed to the present. In the midst of a pandemic compounded by political dysfunction and economic failure, I sensed a potential watershed moment. At a minimum, it evoked the civic morality of freemason women on the eve of the French Revolution of 1789 and again before World War I. In their solidarity, these women also realized causes of their own making. They honored obligations to their lodges and more: they proposed to
raise money to outfit a frigate for American independence from Britain; and, most notably, they campaigned for women’s equality during the belle époque. The exemplary freemason Marie Bonnevial, for instance, was not all that different from Adama Traoré’s dynamic sister, Assa. These two women resorted to the same means—organization, publicity, and action—and for the same reasons—to pressure the state and to harness the economy in the name of human rights.

It is hard to fathom the outcome of efforts to eradicate structural racism. As with women’s emancipation, progress will wax and wane episodically for a long time, perhaps never to prevail. But the constituent community of activists will persist, as have others like freemasons for the past three centuries or so of the third sector’s existence in France and the United States. I have experienced a comparable fraternity of fellow historians at scholarly conferences and in university settings, along with capable librarians and archivists, for the twenty years it took to write this book. It elicited the collaboration, cooperation, and assistance on the part of such varied enablers. Their role in a civil society of another sort, one that makes humanistic scholarship possible, feels much like a social movement with its many willing hands, such as those of an artist, the cartographer Rick Britton in Charlottesville, Virginia, who drew the two-page map of France in Chapter 1.

I wish to thank dozens of generous mentors, masons, and colleagues, but my doing so here is neither feasible nor necessary. They already know of my deep gratitude. So I will focus instead on those whom I cannot thank enough. Let me start with Heather Stauffer, who coordinates the production of such handsome books at the University of Nebraska Press. Kudos to her and Ihsan Taylor at Longleaf Services. Although we have never met, my wise editor Matt Bokovoy has made me a better historian as well as a better writer. He called on two specialist readers whose patience exceeded all bounds. They carefully read two unruly drafts of the manuscript. Karen Offen, hearty soul, provided copious comments on her hard copies as well as in her formal critiques. I wish I knew the second reader, but she was equally forbearing and insightful. (Make no mistake: all remaining errors, indiscretions, and misjudgments in A Civil Society are solely my responsibility, as are the translations from other languages unless otherwise specified in the notes.)

The bulk of the research occurred in Paris with the help of good friends. For some fifteen years, Roger and Danielle Bensky shared their apartment just two strolls and a city bus from either the old or the new Bibliothèque Nationale de France. How fondly I recall our long meals together. Yes, the spirited repartee of French conversation is an art form, every bit as sophisticated as Roger’s passion for the theater and Dany’s well-wrought sculptures and paintings. The late
Daphné Doublet-Vaudoyer is also worth remembering here. For years, while she guided my work on her grandmother’s diary, Daphné told me about the other members of her accomplished family, including an uncle, the historian Daniel Halévy. Her keen insights into his mercurial character, as his sensibilities about women shifted over the course of his long life, informed my thinking about the contradictions of gender relations and public space. He typified the community of Parisian elites contemporary with Charles de Gaulle.

Oddly enough, I began this book while my wife was in residence at the Freie Universität Berlin. References and bibliographies in the libraries there were more than adequate for my purposes then. We later moved operations to Freiburg-im-Breisgau where we had already established contacts. It did not take long for me to discover the intriguing collection of the Institut für Grenzgebiete der Psychologie und Psychohygiene. Less unforeseen but still more welcome was the amiable spirit embodied by Martina Backes and Michael Hardung-Backes, our hosts on countless occasions. The libraries and archives in Colmar, Strasbourg, Nancy, Dijon, and Lyon were not far from the Alsatian crémants we drank together on the German side of the Rhine. Also in Freiburg, Ingrid and Werner Höfel provided us another second home. Their sweetness to us has been immeasurable, as have been their commitments to associations like Caritas (where Ingrid worked until retirement) and a tennis club in Sankt Georgen (where Werner was an active member). I have long admired their civic-mindedness.

Of course, the closest of kindred spirits is my dear spouse, Anne Winston-Allen. For the past three years, as I drafted this study, she painstakingly traced the many textual variants of the Saint Alexius legend. Much have I heard about the legend’s two versions, the papal and the bridal, the latter of which Anne firmly believes was redacted for a female religious audience in the wake of the Hirsau conventual reforms. This work’s connection to French freemason women is surely the sumptuous Saint Alban’s Psalter (c. 1123), which contains an incipient bridal version in Norman French. The book’s architectural features, detailed in its exquisite illuminations, would have pleased the medieval stonemasons who inspired the symbolic craft many centuries later. Like Alexius and his bride—“now he has her with him, their souls are together: I cannot tell you how great is their joy”—Anne and I have made our scholarly endeavors for the better, collectively, collaboratively, for more than thirty-five years of felicitous partnership. This book is happily dedicated to her because she, too, understands how profoundly our work matters.

August 2020
Union Hill, Makanda Township, IL
A CIVIL SOCIETY
Introduction

French Women in Public Space

IN BRIEF: A CIVIL SOCIETY studies how women in French freemasonry realized a civic morality, one marked by the ideals of brotherly love, generosity, and tolerance. This book argues that freemason women, who embraced these aspirations and worked hard to achieve them, ultimately contributed to a more liberal republic, a more open society, and a more engaged public culture in France. Their communal agency evolved over a two-hundred period, from the first initiation of women in the 1740s to the revival of masonic life after the war in the 1940s. Active in one or more of French masonry’s organizational federations in this period, the affiliated women had much to do with the transition to modernity. They networked with others who also subscribed to masonry’s cardinal virtues and drew inspiration from its revolutionary slogan: Liberty, Equality, Fraternity. They thereby expanded the reach and the impact of this exemplary association. As such, freemasonry was and has remained surprisingly influential at home and abroad.¹

The present book surveys women’s masonic involvement and its special ties to French civil society. Each century, from the eighteenth onward, witnessed manifestations of these developments: the gendered forms of masonic adoption before and after the Revolution of 1789–94; the instrumental sociability of freemason women’s effective marginalization during the nineteenth century; and co-masonry’s support for a feminist agenda in the five decades before World War II. The stories of individuals and their relationships in and beyond their lodges, eventually in an international context, illustrate the possibilities and limitations of this association over two centuries of rapid historical change. Underlying these accounts are the arresting images of women masons, including archetypal figures in travelogues, novels, plays, and operas, which convey the social imaginaries that the philosopher Charles Taylor has identified as sources of the modern self.² Along the way, this study threads three other themes—gender relations, personal networks, and social capital—in its history of women in public space and the role they played in the third sector of a major European country.
As historian Luis Martin has written of masonry generally, but also as it pertains to the present work, recent scholarship seeks “to clarify [longstanding debates] and show in what, by what, and for what a handful of men and women . . . , in seeing the world around them, engaged themselves deliberately to reflect and act in order to change and improve it.” This view is as true of France as it is of other countries, subject to the cautions of a fragile and at times conflicted civil society. The French themselves felt torn about its potentialities, as reflected in the changing collective emotions that both supported and challenged the masonic community. For that reason, among others, this history is a reminder that many positive features of the present are the result of vigilance on the part of activists who were imbued with a certain faith, against all odds, in liberalism at its inclusive best. Such a trust, like the empowering engagement of women in France, merits a new perspective on its rich and consequential past.

This monograph thus explores the evolution of public space in France from the Old Regime to World War II, tracing women’s participation in freemasonry as one of innumerable ways they shared in the making of civil society. Arguably the most controversial voluntary association in France, masonry provided women, often the wives, sisters and daughters of brethren, a visible place outside the home that was long believed to be reserved exclusively for men. This book contends that the country’s best-known fraternity was far from a secret, male domain. Secrets there were but they pertained primarily to initiation rituals, not to members’ activities outside the lodge. Masonry actually offered women opportunities in the civic life represented by an enterprising sociabilité, especially before the French Revolution of 1789 and again a full century later as gender relations in France shifted under pressure from the first women’s movement. Like marketplaces, salons, charities, religious orders, and the stage, freemasonry enabled women’s public presence and more; in the twentieth century it made possible concerted feminist advocacy on behalf of female suffrage, contraception, education, and employment, among other related concerns. Nearly 20 percent of all 150,000 French masons today are sisters. Despite serious reservations on the part of most male adherents, whose resistance to these trends is considered here in due course, freemason women clearly mattered—and still matter—to the institutions that helped to make one important feature of liberalism a reality in France.

**Freemasonry Writ Large**

Every history of masonry depends upon access to its ample documentation. It was not always secure. As the German Wehrmacht approached Paris in June
1940, for example, many freemasons prepared for the worst. They knew that
the fall of the capital would lead to the wholesale seizure of records by German
forces to identify their enemies in hiding. “Throughout the city and its fringes,
men and women armed themselves,” the journalist Éliane Brault wrote in her
gripping memoir of the Occupation. “Organized volunteers, dreaded by the
Germans, turned to warfare of their own. Civic-minded individuals took the
place of missing authorities.” Among these resisters were brothers and sisters in
an association long suspected of harboring Jews (and feminists) everywhere in
Europe but especially in France. So Brault and other masons like Odette Boyau
in Gironde assumed the heavy burden of destroying their lodges’ official files.
In so doing they expanded (ironically) upon the masonic meaning of illumina-
tion as the papers burned brightly in courtyards, fireplaces, and furnaces across
the country.

Despite these valiant efforts to dispose of meeting logs and membership rolls,
documents remained aplenty. The Germans’ arrival in Paris and elsewhere in
France prompted a coordinated confiscation. More than three thousand boxes
of materials, mainly in the provinces, were captured. Rather than turn the trove
over to Vichy authorities—who gathered up still more from lodges to examine
in the Bibliothèque Nationale de France (BNF)—the Germans shipped their
lot to Berlin for similar ideological and investigative purposes. The spoils were
kept in Germany’s capital until the unexpected entry of Soviet forces some five
years later. After June 1945 the Russians also found the French masonic folders
of interest and carted them off to Moscow where they were classified, albeit in
peculiar ways reflective of a nearly monolingual archival staff. They were safe-
guarded until the collapse of the Soviet Union and the ensuing economic hard-
ship precipitated their repatriation, subsidized generously by the French state,
in December 2000.

Even with the preservation of the masonic collection (FM) at the BNF and
the retrieval of the so-called Russian archives, there is far more to explore. Much
has been published over 275 years, by brethren and nonbrethren alike, about
freemasonry—or the craft, as it is also known (see the glossary in app. 1). Their
publications, often with an Hp call number, have been fully accessible to the
inquisitive reader at the national library, but also at comparable depositories in
London, Berlin, and The Hague. The Russian files thus complemented these
and other caches, like the ones maintained by the Grand Orient de France
(GODF), the Grande Loge de France (GLDF), and other national obediences.
Moreover, the Roman Catholic Church, long troubled by the undue influence
of a clandestine sect, compiled the results of its own investigations; the Jesuits’
Wellsprings Collection in the Municipal Library of Lyon contains nearly all of them. So despite the close call during the war, the problem is not so much of destruction, however regrettable, as it is of surfeit.

Still more remarkable is the documentation on one feature of French freemasonry, its female adepts. The craft’s women represent aberrant curiosities in the flood of images, mostly created by men, about them for the same 275 years. In popular novels, journalistic exposés, and graphic depictions from the fin du siècle, for instance, the sisters actually appear devious and sinister; the infamous devil worshipper of the Palladium, Diana Vaughan, is hardly the sole caricature of this type. But archives and libraries do host other, more reliable accounts of freemasonry for and by women. While hardly as numerous as those pertaining to men, these materials form a portion of the enormous stock left by everyone in the masonic community, which shared disproportionately in urban society (3 to 5 percent of male adults in 1789, 2 to 3 percent of a much larger population at the end of the Third Republic) and in representative bodies (a third of the Estates General in 1789 and a half of the Chamber of Deputies in 1889).

The endnotes and bibliography appended to the present monograph suggest the scope and scale of what is available for consultation. To scholars of this sizeable civic organization, for both men and women, its secrets turn out to be a very large, open book.

Sad to say, the primary sources are imperfect evidence of everything but freemasonry’s internal affairs. Since the craft’s origins in France by 1725, the historiography has been shaded by the motives—and deliberate distortions—of polemical authors, depending upon which feature of masonry is under discussion, such as the Strict Observance, the Egyptian Rites, the Antients and the Moderns (in Britain anyway), the Grande Loge and the Grand Orient, and, of course, the women initiated into the mysteries. The history of masonry is largely driven by disagreement over ritual and who regulates it, which has led to a diversity of masonic practices and governing bodies, including those for the sisters (see the list of French masonic orders/obediences/rites in the front matter). Archival and published narratives tend to the antiquarian or the mythological; analysis of masonry’s significance to its political, social, and cultural moment is left to professional historians. Meanwhile, the conspiracy addicts, the sentimental apologists, and the mystagogues of all stripes, while well informed after their own fashion, can easily mislead the earnest researcher eager to decipher inscrutable references in the documents. Even in the lodge, the brethren and the sisters were notoriously discreet; all too often, they obscured their motives by officious circumlocution.
Cryptic sources aside, another conundrum in writing about the craft remains its extensive web of functional relationships and their broader implications. Such ties cannot be traced by existing records for the purposes they were originally kept. Recent historians now borrow new methodologies, like social network analysis, to plumb the available evidence—membership lists, official correspondence, formal rites, and chronicles of lodge activities—to test the empirical validity of systematic observation. So it is for the study of women in civil society, the main focus of the present work. Beyond freemasonry, there has been much thought about approaches to understanding voluntary associations in general. The scholarly literature on this historical phenomenon is also vast and growing from questions raised by the dysfunctions of the west European welfare state and the struggle of constitutional, democratic regimes to develop in eastern Europe after the Cold War. As political scientists all know, related debates over neoliberalism, like the larger issues of women and gender relations, can benefit from a comparative perspective. In this spirit, the well-known observers Baron de Montesquieu and Alexis de Tocqueville first considered “the social state” standing apart from the private sector (a capitalist economy) as well as the public sector (governmental authority). These thinkers worried that France’s centralization from the absolute monarchy onward had reduced this third sector to inconsequence. Others like Karl Marx and Émile Durkheim analyzed how industrialization ensured its putative marginality. More recently, however, Jürgen Habermas posited a “bourgeois public sphere”—his term for the world of provincial academies, literary salons, coffee houses, and masonic lodges—that supposedly impelled a new political culture on the eve of the French Revolution of 1789. Scholars have since found that these gatherings did not need to be bourgeois, male, rational, unitary, stable, or even rebellious, much less “the public” in its entirety, to serve as intermediaries between the individual and larger historical forces in Old Regime France—and since. The present book draws upon these on-going conversations in the work of historians like Margaret Jacob, Michelle Perrot, and Karen Offen, and of historically inclined theorists like Jean Cohen, Geneviève Fraisse, and Carole Pateman, concerned as they all have been, in one way or another, with women’s collective agency in phallocentric regimes.

Scholarship in fact must continue assessing the gendered options for liberalism’s many subalterns. In one instance at least, associational life in France has been more substantial and more open to women than theorists, historians, or liberals have assumed since Tocqueville. The foundational work by Pierre Rosanvallon, for example, has shown how such opportunities arose well before the
Waldeck-Rousseau law of 1901 promulgated the right to associate (twenty years after the National Assembly had affirmed the rights to peaceful assembly and a free press); notwithstanding its repression by the state, France’s civic impulse, he argues, survived; actually it “is fully implicated in the antinomies that define the structure of modernity” typical of other Western states. The question is, how did French sociabilité—in Maurice Agulhon’s sense—apply to married women as legal wards of their spouses under the debilitating terms of the Napoleonic Code? After all, “the wife [owed] obedience to her husband” (art. 213) first and foremost. The answer lies in the archives and publications on freemasonry, an organization that was under close surveillance during the Old Regime and plainly illegal under the terms of the Penal Code of 1810 (art. 291) but tolerated by public authorities for much of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, particularly after the Third Republic was firmly established. It is clear that women’s participation in masonry was tolerated, too (along with no fewer than eighteen women’s rights organizations in operation before 1901), providing another valuable source, one maintained by the police.

This history of civil society, including freemasons in the public space that it created, is integral to comprehending the associations, networks, and civisme of French women. Moreover, social scientific concepts can clarify its past, to the extent that the copious but problematic records allow. But such an account elicits a question for which there is no obvious answer: Who qualifies as a freemason? Specialists often turn abstract to cover every variation on the proper noun. In light of the enormous range of masonry’s manifestations—from the lodges recognized by the Grand Orient de France (GODF) to those of self-proclaimed paramasonry disdained by the GODF—the temptation is simply to speak of freemasonry in the plural or, better yet, with a lower case “f” to cover everyone who felt she was sharing in masonic secrets, whether or not the leading obediences acknowledged them. Although this inclusiveness rankles the craft’s purists, it has the decided advantage of delineating a larger realm for women who were, until 2010, not officially permitted in regular French masonic lodges. By widening the lens on masonry, this book follows the commitments of no fewer than fifteen orders, fifty lodges, and eighty-five women (twenty-six of whom appear in the exceptionally useful BNF’s FM Bossu file cards for identifying masons and their fellow travelers, c. 1780–1850).

A treasure of documents helps with study of the craft as an institution, but it does not necessarily address the wide variety of individual experience in masonry. For example, only a small minority of women ever became master masons, much less assumed leadership in one or more lodges for decades, like the
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educator Marie Bonnevial; many more of them, like the writer Félicité-Stéphanie de Genlis, disappeared soon after their initial enthusiasm; others, like the anarchist Louise Michel, were not initiated until their later years. So, are these latter figures still masons, despite a passing presence in their lodge? It is hard to say. Initiation is a sine qua non for membership; it literally makes the mason. But every initiate knows there is more to the craft than its rituals (and membership dues), however central they are to the life of the lodge. As article 3 of the Droit Humain’s constitution proclaims, “the Order’s members work to shape the principles of liberty, equality, and fraternity and to realize for everyone the maximum moral, intellectual and spiritual development, a condition for the happiness that is possible for each individual to attain in a fraternally organized human family.” These widespread masonic sentiments, at least since the Old Regime, represent a civic morality succinctly summarized by Durkheim as “the adherence to something that goes beyond the individual and to the interests of the group one belongs to.” Others besides conscientious lodge members have professed and attempted to sustain these social vocations; for this book’s purposes, they embody civil society itself.

To situate freemasonry in a history of the third sector, it is probably best not to accept the norms for everyone set by an exceptional few. As it is, the largest and oldest order, the GODF, did not officially accept women initiates until very recently. These masons-in-all-but-name mattered, too, as this book promises to show, much as those who never returned or were initiated only late in life were deemed members of the masonic family. As brethren of every sort are wont to say, “maçon un jour, maçon toujours” (once a mason, always a mason). But a more precise operational definition is essential, such as for everyone who fulfilled at least three of four key criteria:

1. initiation by the ritual(s) of any lodge in a mainline or minor masonic order at some point in one’s lifetime;
2. close personal relationships—e.g., a parent, a spouse, a sibling, or a very good friend—with two or more active, initiated masons;
3. exceptional grasp of and respect for the craft and its secrets; and/or
4. advocacy of the most basic of masonic principles—fraternité (brotherhood), charité (philanthropy), and sagesse (philosophical truth).

By this benchmark for identifying sisters in spirit as well as in letter—distinct from the brethren’s wives who were also known as sisters—twelve women like the salonnière Anne-Catherine Helvétius, the author George Sand, the editor Juliette Adam, and the social activist Ghénia Avril de Sainte-Croix merit
consideration, even though there is no firm evidence that they were ever initi-
ated. These masons *sans tablier* (without apron), clearly identified here as such,
tell us much about the character and calling of seventy-five or so other women
whose experiences were deeply imbued by their actual initiation and who are at
the heart of the present work. Together their world was much larger and more
interrelated than any of them (or us) might have imagined.

Approaching masonry in this way—as a community more than an exclusive
brotherhood, as a network more than a sociable pastime, as a habitus more than
an arcane ritual—such a study privileges “social facts.” Sociological phenomena
matter here, not so much anyone’s self-identification as a mason. The historian
Pierre-Yves Beaurepaire has reified the craft accordingly by tracking links be-
tween lodges in other European countries, not just in France, to answer basic
questions: Why does one become a mason? Under what circumstances, collective as well as personal, does this happen? How do relationships lead to such a
decision? “More than an institution,” Beaurepaire states forthrightly, “the lodge
is above all a gathering of equals where the individual enters society.” Masonry
thereby represents a form of social capital affecting identifiable people, certainly,
but also specific events and concomitant trends. As a result, we are in a bet-
ter position to learn about the nature and course of the social movements it
helped to foster. They are almost inconceivable without such networks—think
of well-connected masons Marie Bonnevial, Ghénia Avril de Sainte-Croix, and
Maria Pognon in the *Ligue des Droits de l’Homme*—which in turn helped
shape their changing historical contexts.

Consequently, this history of freemasons, men and women both, may well re-
solve a durable historiographical problem, the craft’s much vaunted secrecy. Ma-
sonry, its adherents today insist, is not a secret organization, an occult force as its
critics contend; it is an association with secrets privy to anyone curious enough
to inquire at a major public library. Despite its circumspect penchant for pri-
vacy, this organization has been a public, constituent element in France’s evolv-
ing civic culture since the eighteenth century; and its past can now be explored
with a greater measure of confidence than some strictly political historians once
thought feasible. Taking a methodological tack akin to social history, a book
about seemingly the most elusive of subjects, the presence of women in this fra-
ternity, makes much more scholarly sense. It pays to look carefully (see ill. 1).

And so one learns, among many other things along the way, what contempo-
raries found so lacking on the eve of France’s fateful fall to Germany in 1940. A
civil society was there all along, just as the historian Marc Bloch had wished in
the trenchant analysis of his country’s *Étrange défaite* (1946, *Strange Defeat*) and
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as the freemason Éliane Brault described in her less well-known *À l’ombre de la croix gammée* (1943, *In the Shadow of the Swastika*). A Civil Society shows that a civic ethos did indeed exist—for quite some time, however imperfectly—and it underlay the fortunes of a major European state—in peace as well as at war. This characteristic social conscience, as more than freemasons conceived it, left ample traces for historians to follow.

One more aspect of the present monograph begs explanation; it is an account beginning in 1744 and ending in 1944. Why the obscure initial date of 1744? Aside from France joining the War of Austrian Succession, which challenged Maria Theresa’s claim to the Habsburg throne, the first adoption ritual was published in the anonymous pamphlet, *Le Parfait Maçon (The Complete Mason)*, which formalized a version of the craft’s mysteries for female candidates. This publication marked the start of an historical trajectory for freemason women, if not necessarily for French civil society (whose origins are even trickier to pinpoint). There are any number of other possible inception dates, such as evidence of a mixed lodge in Bordeaux in 1734 or Madame de Beaumer’s direction of the *Journal des dames (Ladies’ Journal)*, with the support of masons, beginning in 1761. But none of these moments is as compelling as the regular induction

**ILLUSTRATION 1.** Anonymous, *Initiation d’adoption* (c. 1810), gouache painting, Musée de la Franc-Maçonnerie, Paris, Collection du Grand Orient de France, photo P.M.
of women in an increasingly important voluntary association during the Old
Regime. It was a formative inflection in the history of the third sector on a par
with the state and the economy.

As for 1944, the explanation is tidier. France’s nearly completed liberation
from German occupation saw the impending return of women to masonry after
a four-year hiatus, thanks to the provisional government’s ordinance of August
9 nullifying “all laws pertaining to so-called secret associations” imposed by the
Vichy regime.37 The year 1944 also marks when French women were finally ac-
corded the vote. This civic achievement was the culmination of efforts by the
suffragists, including freemasons Eliska Vincent and Madeleine Pelletier (among
their other feminist commitments), whose organizations helped prepare for this
eventuality. They counted, albeit somewhat longer term, among the factors con-
sidered in the Comité Français de Libération Nationale’s decision on women’s
suffrage, at General Charles de Gaulle’s request, a full year before its implemen-
tation in 1945.38

Thus the chronological sweep from 1744 to 1944 captures a critical phase
in the evolution of civil society. The part that freemason women had in this
process—their ardent engagement, their concerted expression, their persistent
action, their social capital, and, yes, their distinctive sociability—factored as well
in other historical changes. These two hundred years encompassed upheavals in
society, gender, and culture, owing to a modernization that was not restricted to
dramatic events in 1789–94, 1870–71, or 1914–18. Women were more than mere
bystanders to major transitions throughout the period, like the differentiation
of social structures, the reconception of gender relations, and “the disenchant-
ment of the world.” By a slow, incremental unfolding, this French longue durée
(long-term perspective) is as significant as it is timely; it is fully consonant with
the (im)precise dates used here to frame a more specific but no less momentous
transformation in women’s public space.

So why France? It is not the sole site for these developments. Nearly all of
western Europe experienced them in one form or another over the same centu-
ries. But in its civil society, France is exceptional. The French are distinctive in
the long history of their conflicted public sphere, its gendered configuration, and
the persistence of its socially privileged spaces, all of which has captured the at-
tention of writers since the Old Regime. Observers obsessed at length about the
fractious woman question.39 Moreover, as Simone de Beauvoir and others have
suggested, French culture is distinguished by the singular nature of its social and
intellectual life, the special role that independent women played in it, and the
very ways this role has evolved.40 The fact that France was the home of freemason
women, far more than any other country, should come as no surprise. And yet, given the manifold published and unpublished sources on such a controversial phenomenon, we still have not adequately explored its historical implications. For this reason and more, masonry for and by French women deserves further attention.

How Else Civil Society—and Freemason Women—Matter

Bear with me a bit as I unpack some technical issues critical to this work. Let us begin with civil society. This term is bedeviled by multiple, conflicting, and vague notions whose instantiations range widely—from municipal and regional councils, pressure groups, and religious sodalities to mutual societies, professional associations, and international nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), but also sports clubs, apartment coops, food pantries, and more. Clearly we need a sharper definition. For the purposes of the present monograph, drawing on an array of voices, the political theorists Jean Cohen and Andrew Arato posit a useful construct reasonably compatible with French usage, at least since Tocqueville: “a sphere of social interaction between economy and state, composed ... of the intimate sphere (especially the family), the sphere of associations (especially voluntary associations), social movements, and forms of public communication.” Key elements are places or spaces in addition and in relation to the state and the economy. They are not necessarily engaged in politics or business, but in independent, self-directed, and sustained endeavors protected by law and effective institutional organization. In short, civil society—or the third sector, as it is also known—is a complex of functions and linkages, not dependent in principle upon the gender identity of the people involved in them, crucial to identifying, communicating, and promoting their collective interests.

Note the components specifically missing from this conception of civil society, viz., private and public corporations, labor unions, state agencies, and political parties. The for-profit and governmental sectors are excluded, by French law, in large measure because they are based, strictly speaking, not on societal but economic and state apparatus. As scholarly commentators like Michel Crozier and Dominique Colas have observed, agents of the economy and of the state wield disproportionate resources, while social actors do not share directly in the distribution of goods and services in the economy, nor do they participate fully in the political process; activists are left to their own expedients, bringing people together and speaking out. Civil society’s power is “soft” or moral (to borrow an archaic term) that is of necessity grounded in legal rights and supported by
organizational agency. This is in marked contrast to the overt power derived from economic means or assumed by state authority (even so, their boundaries invariably blur). As Cohen and Arato put it, “modern civil society is created through forms of self-constitution and self-mobilization . . . institutionalized and generalized through laws, and especially subjective rights, that stabilize social differentiation. . . . In the long term, both independent action and institutionalization are necessary for the reproduction” of the third sector whose perpetuation as praxis in time and space makes it a historical (and gendered) phenomenon.47

Other terms, of course, are used as inaccurate proxies for this notional framework, so some distinctions bear mention here. One term in particular, public space as it appears in the present book’s title, is much broader and more encompassing than civil society. It indicates activities in the market and the neighborhood, at work and in church, but it generally precludes one feature deliberately attributed to civil society: the private sphere of the family and its domestic imperatives. In older social history and feminist commentary, evident in the works of Maïté Albistur and Daniel Armogathe, among others, this preserve is most frequently assigned a functional status in isolation from the world at large.48 “Hearth and home,” in the long nineteenth century anyway, were the presumed enclave of married couples and their offspring, even though this constraining ideology elided women’s many other, more visible roles, such as their presence on the land and in the shop, their place in the church as parishioners and members of religious orders, their charitable outreach in the community, their personas on the theatrical stage, and their management of literary and cultural salons open to nonfamily members.49 These other spaces, like masonic lodges, provided sites for women to connect, to exchange, to engage, to act together as a form of social capital distinct from but not unlike that of the household. In effect, public/private relations were never altogether binary.50

As for the public sphere, it is central to but not the whole of a political culture, itself apart from the third sector. In the parlance of the German philosopher of communication, Jürgen Habermas, this structure consists primarily of the makers of public opinion in the eighteenth century: salon-keepers, publishers, journalists, academicians, critics, intellectuals, publicists (otherwise known as philosophes), and their audiences. They assisted in the formation of consensus on national issues, most notably in opposition to the absolutist state on the eve of the French Revolution.51 To the extent that voluntary and involuntary associations—the latter groups included the Old Regime’s corporations, councils, parlements, and estates whose members had privileged if not exclusive access by
birth—helped shape public sentiment of abiding concern to the king and his court, these groups can be considered part of the public sphere. Nonetheless, this domain had other purposes. This is especially true with respect to the unique social and cultural aspects of the church, as François-René de Chateaubriand explained on its behalf. Otherwise, the Gallican Church (during the Old Regime and then with the Concordat and Organic Articles of 1801) was virtually under state control until the formal separation legislated in 1905 made it an organization like any other (notwithstanding a number of important exceptional provisions).

The word *sociabilité* also needs attention. Like the civility and civilization implied by a civil society, sociability refers to the agreeable nature of social life, but it is much more than that. In France, it entails what Anglo Americans term association, the gathering of individuals for a variety of purposes, most often as instrumental as promoting women’s rights or organizing neighborhood watches, even if there is also eating, drinking, and chatting (what is a French meeting without its conviviality?). Despite casual recreation, mixed company, and regional peculiarities, such fellowship can lead to concerted action, as French social historians have shown for the past sixty years. It remains, however, distinct from civic life in the United States, some of whose associations are specifically tied to political interests and efforts undertaken by parties, think-tanks, and PACs working to elect candidates for public office. In the middle decades of the last century, American social scientists Gabriel Almond and Sidney Verba appropriated *civic culture* as a technical term referring to the related attitudes and behavior necessary to democratic government. Since then, it pertains mainly to citizens, cities, citizenship, or community affairs.

These observations about a national community’s “habits of the heart,” as Tocqueville likened them, are apt for clarifying the multiple, endogenous sources of political stalemate in France that have frustrated its stability since 1789. French liberalism’s development, especially as it applies to the right to association, has long been regarded as slow, torturous, and uncertain. This is in large part because of France’s tentative pluralism. According to the politologue Stanley Hoffmann, “the weakness of intermediate bodies prevented France’s style of authority from becoming fully democratic, for a liberal society requires vigorous associations in which many citizens join for positive purposes.” The contrast of France with Britain and the United States in this regard seems obvious. Reinforced by the proclivity for strong central authority, the French Jacobin tradition certainly favored Rousseau’s general will over Locke’s version of the social contract. One apparent result of this tendency was a notable propensity for political extremism.
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until at least the second decade of the Fifth Republic. From this perspective, Tocqueville’s incongruous trust in “the social state,” one affirmed earlier by Germaine de Staël-Holstein, Benjamin Constant, and François Guizot, clearly affected much of subsequent liberal thought.58

In the absence of rights such as free speech, assembly, and association, all necessary for an effective civil society, French liberalism emphasized other concerns, so much so that the question often arises as to whether it ever existed in the Anglo American sense.59 Abiding faith in free markets, the rule of law, the minimalistic state, and the rational individual, not just in civil liberties, was never the norm in France. This generalization, however, surely oversimplifies French political thought and political reality, since the eighteenth century. As the philosopher Larry Siedentop has argued, there are at least three distinctive features to the French variant of liberalism: a nuanced notion of the individual’s inherent social “situatedness”; an understanding of what collective action, political or otherwise, owes to concrete historical processes; and a strong belief in freedom for commitment as opposed to freedom from constraint. These differences with classical liberalism result in part from an influential civic republicanism derived from Ancient, Renaissance, and Enlightenment thinkers like Plato, Machiavelli, and Rousseau, respectively.60 There was also the forceful example of French republics created during—and long after—the Revolution of 1789–94, whose radical appeals to public virtue discredited the quest for individual liberties. The right to association in particular had fewer champions in France than elsewhere.61 As a consequence, French liberals have wrestled with the conundrum formulated recently by the intellectual historian Lucien Jaume, to wit, how to “reconcile the emancipation of society and the individual with the prestige and legitimacy of the state?”62

In France, liberals’ failure to defend associational life, in light of the state’s strictures to control it, affected women much more than it did men.63 It began with the Le Chapelier law (on the guilds) and the Allarde law (on the corporations), both enacted in 1791, which served as the basis for Napoléon Bonaparte’s legal restrictions on functional groups larger than twenty people without administrative authorization under the terms of article 291 in the Penal Code. Subject to police surveillance until the 1901 Waldeck-Rousseau law, such public organizations were long regarded as a dangerous, male prerogative before the new law’s provisions provided immediate impetus to the women’s movement. The nineteenth-century’s patriarchal cultures of public and private spheres, as well as jurisprudence, finally faltered.64 Then as social scientists began to rethink public space in France after the events of May 1968—especially with the subsequent
proliferation of NGOs—civic action (involving women) took on greater salience thanks to the intellectual leadership of the Second Left: Alain Touraine, Pierre Rosanvallon, and Claude Lefort. According to the latest statistics, there are now about 1.4 million officially recognized associations (seventy-two thousand were added in 2018–19), mobilizing 12.5 million unpaid volunteers (one-half of whom are female).

Accordingly, theorists and historians have recast the role of the state, both before and after the French Revolution and the Napoleonic Empire. They have focused on identifiable social groups pursuing their objectives during a succession of repressive regimes. At least since William Sewell’s Work and Revolution in France (1980), after extensive research in social history informed by the cultural turn—as suggested by anthropology practiced by the likes of Clifford Geertz—we know that much of French associational life for nonelites survived or revived soon after the revolutionary and imperial decades; it thus deserves examination in its continuity at least as much as in its alleged destruction. For instance, Sewell documents how hierarchical corps and états under the Old Regime became class-conscious corps d’états or corporations (to the exclusion of women) by the July Monarchy. The new, gendered language of labor reflected comparable changes in the assertive bourgeoisie and its associations, which did not wait for Victor Cousin’s “government of minds”—a term echoed by Guizot—to mark the inception of civil society in France. Serious studies of these enduring sociocultural developments are notable.

Rosanvallon, for one, was not the first scholar to examine the organized resistance to the Jacobin-statist controls. Notwithstanding repressive measures added to the Penal Code, such as the ones framed in 1834 and again in 1852, the jurists Émile Worms, Paul Nourrisson, and Jean Morange were also alert to the century-long efforts of workers to unionize, officially as of 1884, and of groups serving the public interest like those sponsored by the church before the legal separation imposed by the Combes legislation in 1905. The Office du Travail estimated, on the eve of the Waldeck-Rousseau law, that there were no fewer than 45,148 such associations in France that were technically illegal but allowed to exist at the discretion of local prefects. As some liberals proclaimed the right to associate as foundational to civil society—despite lingering suspicions of radicals mobilizing discontent for violent political action—old communal ways continued at the local level, including literary salons, shooting clubs, lending libraries, musical societies, and the like. Historian Carol Harrison has characterized such organizations as markers of bourgeois status in provincial towns, whatever they might have meant politically. Other scholars, like
Dena Goodman and Margaret Jacob, have appropriated sociability, as a form of both pleasure and association, for their work on French cultural practices in the Old Regime.

Like men, women have long been joiners, just of another, gendered sort, as they negotiated the changing boundaries of the public and the private domains from the eighteenth century onward. Thanks to the historical monographs on women and gender for the last forty years or more, their collaborations are now more visible in the master narrative the French tell about their past. For example, salon culture was generally animated by women. Their names are legendary, beginning with Marie-Thérèse Geoffrin, Julie de Lespinasse, and “Minette” Helvétius before 1800. Juliette Récamier, Sophie Gay, Delphine de Girardin, Marie d’Agoult, Mathilde Bonaparte, Juliette Adam, and the various celebrities disguised as characters in Marcel Proust’s *A la recherche du temps perdu* (1913–22, *In Search of Times Past*) followed in the nineteenth century.74 Among others, Judith Gautier, Anna de Noailles, and Adrienne Monnier maintained the tradition thereafter. Women also took charge of numerous charitable organizations. They did so often under the auspices of the church, like the Sisters of Charity of Saint Vincent de Paul or other confraternities at the parish level, but increasingly in lay associations, many of whose aristocratic leaders and their assistants—126 of them—died in the Charity Bazar fire in 1897.75 Briefly but intensely, during revolutionary events in 1789, 1830, 1848, and 1871, assertive women played roles in political clubs, in the streets, even on the barricades. Their subsequent participation in politics grew as the first feminist movement pushed for female education and training, married women’s property rights, fertility control, and integral suffrage. The two world wars would have been very different without women collecting supplies, volunteering as nurses, and joining the Resistance (during the Occupation).76

As a general rule, freemasonry fits this associational profile appropriate to French civil society, presumed to be one of equality, as reflected in one eighteenth-century observation, “Everyone is equal; that is to say, in the lodge, everyone is suited to become a Mason.”77 Moreover, masonry was purely voluntary (easy to exit from), primarily social in nature (as opposed to political or lucrative), fully vested in its commitments (monetary as well as ideational), and exclusive in its membership (determined by current members, subject to their bylaws). Its contributions to democratic forms were obvious to its adherents; it diffused information, it deliberated collectively, it represented its characteristics properly, and it required individual members to furnish material resources, just as any group would in an open society supportive of a constitutional,
representative regime.\textsuperscript{78} To adapt the political scientist Mark Warren’s felicitous
turn of phrase, freemasonry helped develop “democratic associational ecologies”
underlying modern Western politics as we know them today, even if women
were initially excluded.\textsuperscript{79}

In this gendered context, then, freemason women moved into public space
where their activities assume an added significance to French history. Their place
in a fraternal organization, one of the more visible in France since its “official”
origins in 1725, promised a privileged opportunity to escape from the domestic
sphere. But as historians Gisèle Hivert-Messeca and Yves Hivert-Messeca write,
“the only acceptable view of Freemasonry’s origins and the presence of women
within it is, if not less glorious, at least more recent.”\textsuperscript{80} Until 2010, when the
Grand Orient de France permitted individual masonic lodges under its juris-
diction to initiate women, freemasonry remained of and for men engaged in
the particular sociability of the craft or royal art (as it is frequently called in
foundation stories). Guilds of stonemasons, it was believed, built the ancient
Egyptian pyramids, the Temple of Solomon, and the medieval cathedrals back
when there were “operative” masons, as opposed to the present-day “speculative”
or “symbolic” sort. This was men’s, not women’s work, even though there are
historical instances of women stonemasons as well as freemasons. The original
bylaws, James Anderson’s \textit{Constitutions} (1723), explicitly forbade the initiation
of women because, like slaves and bondmen, they were not free as men in the
trades or of property were.

To be more accurate: French women were inducted into masonry only under
very specific circumstances set for them. As early as 1744, \textit{soeurs} (sisters) were
initiated by identifiable adoption rites, notwithstanding the prohibitions against
lodges “working” such degrees, i.e., performing these rituals. Several papal bulls
condemned them (which the Gallican faithful safely ignored). In time, as more
women expressed an inclination for the craft, the brethren established special
lodges to accommodate them, using a rite specially created for their purposes.
Most masons, and some women, never considered adoption a truly legitimate
form of masonry. But its disrepute did not deter the growing number of initiates
from this variation, overseen first by the Grande Loge de France (1738–94) and
then by the Grand Orient de France (beginning in 1773) before the revolution.
Again, toward the end of the nineteenth century, under pressure of women’s
rights activists who did not accept the renewed promotion of adoption as an
option, one all-male lodge in the Grande Loge Symbolique Écossaise deliberately
initiated a woman in the face of unyielding opposition by the governing body.
Some dissenters, like Georges Martin and Maria Deraismes, then proceeded to
fashion their own mixed masonic obedience, the Droit Humain (DH), in 1893. The DH has always initiated all its members by the same rite and mandated leadership in the lodge without regard to sex. By the outbreak of the war in 1939, co-masonry was ensconced in the craft’s panoply of organizations, plurality of ritual, and diversity of membership. The variety has not altered appreciably.

Into this institutional setting, French women inserted themselves and the men relented, for the most part. In due course, the women changed this association and the civil society that it shared in. Once more disposed to females, free-masonry provided them a valuable mechanism, a vehicle if you will, to redefine the royal art, its organizational profile, and its contributions to an open society, an engaged public culture, and a liberal as well as secular, unitary republic. As the chronicler Mireille Beaunier-Palson remarks, masonry is widely known “as the art of governing, to make oneself better in order to make society better,” one more enlightened, more universal, more democratic, more tolerant.81 So it was for the women whose public commitments and historical agency are studied more extensively in the next three chapters. Let us now, at last, turn to them.
In the summer of 1773, the widowed Claudine-Thérèse Provensal of Lyon made a painful public confession. During her initiation into Martinès de Pasqually’s Ordre des Chevaliers Maçons Élus Coëns de l’Univers, she took full responsibility for the miseries of humankind arising from Eve’s fall in the Garden of Eden. “People, I have caused your woeful destiny; only in trembling do I dare appear before you,” she intoned before a mixed audience of men and women in the temple. “I declare myself the source of your shackles and your miseries.” In so doing, as a woman, she assumed the heavy burden of Original Sin in a gendered ceremony that, despite its Judeo-Christian roots, shared in the origins of civil society in modern France.

This awful moment was specific to the Martinist rite, the first of its kind in France used to initiate women in the same lodge with men beginning in 1760. Only a few years earlier, the Grande Loge de France had barely tolerated the presence of women in separate lodges of their own, much less in mixed company. Although many masonic rituals for women echoed the Genesis story of Adam and Eve—who are reputed to have constituted the very first masonic lodge—the Élus Coëns (chosen priests) singled out womankind for the terrible consequences of Eve’s failure to resist temptation. In this way they kept faith with masonic Martinism, as it came to be known, an eclectic, esoteric form of Christian mysticism based upon the frailty of all humans who endured a profound spiritual privation. Their redemption was possible only by a re-integration or illumination. God’s unitary universe, this order believed, could be attained by channeling a hierarchy of divinities to whom the elite among the Élus had special access. Such was a decidedly religious side to the eighteenth-century Enlightenment.

In Provensal’s initiation, this doctrine also called for defiance, leading the candidate to promise bravely, “I will deliver you by stomping on the Serpent’s head.” From self-abasing confession came forthright action. The subsequent catechism moved the postulant through the stages of her reconciliation that resulted from full initiation into the ritual’s mysteries, a symbolic retribution...
for the original source of evil in the world. Not unlike the church’s absolution of sin by apostolic succession derived from Jesus and his disciples, the power of masonry’s collective virtue exonerated every member who pledged to live an upright life according to the stern precepts of the lodge. Otherwise, the “very powerful master” of the temple remarked, Provensal’s demise was imminent: “You can only avoid it by following precisely all the rules that I have prescribed for you.” This strict engagement drew on the examples of biblical figures for the initiate to imitate.

In due time, during an initiation to a higher grade in this order, the neophyte renders to God an invocation, a supplication rather. It was written by Martinès de Pasqually evidently with the assistance of none other than Provensal herself. It reads in part:

You have promised to grant your creature all she would ask of you in your name, but she only wishes to offer you the pure wishes and desires that bring her closer to you. Such are those that my heart presents to you at this moment. Accept them as you accepted them from Judith your faithful servant when she called out your name and implored your help against the enemies of her people. Pour onto me the same grace that you poured onto Miriam, Esther, Elizabeth, and onto those men and women who, since and before the selection of your chosen people, have always invoked your holiness.

Notwithstanding the self-denigration evident in the initiatory ritual, imagine what sense of agency the Élus Coëns women must have felt from the story of Judith in her apocryphal book in Deuteronomy, which recounts the heroine’s single-handed beheading of Holofernes, the Assyrian general eager to destroy the Israelites; or from the prophecies of Miriam in the book of Exodus, sister of Moses and Aaron, one of the seven most important female prophets of ancient Israel, according to the Talmud; or from the influence of Hadassah in the book of Esther, the Jewish queen of the Persian king Ahasuerus; or, again, from the genealogy of Elizabeth, wife of Zechariah, mother of John the Baptist, and relation of Mary the mother of Jesus, according to the Gospel of Luke in the Christian Bible. These figures defined vastly expanded roles for Martinist women to complement those defined for men in the same order.

This was the symbolic adumbration of Provensal’s confession and of her commitment to a secret society. Claudine-Thérèse Provensal (1729–1810) was no ordinary mistress Élu(e) Coën. She was the older sister and spiritual adviser of Jean-Baptiste Willermoz, vénérable of the lodge La Parfaite Amitié and founder of the Rectified Scottish Rite of the Strict Observance in Lyon, who
described Provensal as “the support, the exemplar, the consolation for many others,” “full of merit and virtue.” She was also a fount of philosophic inspiration to Louis-Claude de Saint-Martin, redactor of the Martinist rite; he frequently addressed her as “maman” (mama), his “dear good mother.” Widely regarded for kindness, generosity, and other-worldliness—characteristics her brother admired and shared—this imposing woman commanded the respect of more than her immediate entourage. She was part of a larger circle of female initiates in the Élus Coëns, among whom were Marguerite Angélique Collas (Martinès de Pasqually’s wife) in Bordeaux, Mlle. de Chevrier and Comtesse de Brancas in Lyon, Comtesse de Lusignan and Marquise de La Croix (perhaps) both in Paris, and Élisabeth Du Bourg-Cavaignes in Toulouse. Others, like Mme. de Coalin elsewhere in France, had also committed themselves to the order’s sect-like regulations. But Provensal was undoubtedly among the best-known participants in the eighteenth century’s mystical masonry.

Provensal’s example provides the historian of freemason women a glimpse of the manifold permutations of gender at work during the early stages of civil society. The masonic lodge and its rites varied in the way they regulated relations between men and women in this influential association, in its share of public space, social networks, and civic morality in France on the eve of the French Revolution. Even in minor masonic orders that initiated women in mixed lodges, besides those that established special lodges of adoption, the men never regarded their female counterparts as full-fledged masons. Sexual difference did not make for equality, only hierarchical complementarity at best, in the minds of these well-meaning brethren. It was the norm in these lodges. But in the magical byways of minor masonic orders, such as the Élus Coëns, the Illuminés d’Avignon and the Haute Maçonnerie Égyptienne, women also played an active role in the sociability offered them, as evidenced by Provensal. By 1789, the revolution would begin to reconfigure these gendered norms in the Old Regime; under the pressure of the tumultuous 1790s and their imperial aftermath, the associational activities of masonic women—and those of many other women like them—would be transposed. By then, however, Provensal and her generation no longer figured in the rapidly changing public status of French women. Only the legacy of their witness remained in a new historical context.

The Eighteenth Century’s Mixed Orders and Adoption Lodges

Historians have discovered that the craft, as a symbolic organization with its own lodges and distinctive rites, began in France in the 1720s after it had
originated in Scotland and appeared in London. Irish lodges in Saint-Germain-en-Laye just to the west of Paris in the 1690s may have anticipated the introduction of masonry across the Channel, but these foreign precursors did not linger. Like them, the first French initiates were men, who soon sought to regularize their activity. They elected grands maîtres (grand masters) to oversee the brethren, in keeping with Marquis de La Tierce’s translation of Anderson’s *Constitutions* in 1733 (and other founding texts), whence the establishment of a Grande Loge by 1738. Though not the first grand maître, Louis de Bourbon-Condé, Comte de Clermont, assumed nominal direction of French masonry’s administration for twenty-eight years (1743–71). But he dodged several serious problems: the police crack-down on irregular masonry, the public revelations of the craft’s mysteries, the wayward independence of the lodges (especially in the provinces), and the pressing interest of women in initiation (stoutly resisted by the brethren).

The masonic conundrum about women was more than a matter of the organizational bylaws banning them and the eighteenth century’s particular aristocratic-haut bourgeois sociability; it was also a matter of social reputation. The mixed company of earlier secret societies and maçonniforme (mason-like) lodges was notorious for its alleged gallant behavior. French masonry’s early recruitment efforts could ill afford such guilt by association. Then in 1771, when Comte de Clermont died, the issue came a head. The Grande Loge de France begrudgingly recognized the schismatic Grand Orient de France (GODF), which decided how best to handle women’s participation. The GODF’s circular of June 1774 authorized separate lodges and rituals exclusively for them by adoption, i.e., under men’s tutelage. With effective safeguards in place, the brethren were no longer tempted by the possibilities of untoward behavior. And so masonry for both sexes, under the GODF’s aegis, expanded dramatically. It would take a whole century before such a broad segment of French society was as fully engaged in a comparable associational innovation (see fig. 1).

This convenient arrangement, however, continued to elicit divided views. The vast majority of male masons still resisted the least intrusion of females even in their own lodges. They gave ample voice to their concerns, which revealed the ideological basis for the male hierarchy in Old Regime freemasonry, despite or perhaps because of the craft’s secrecy about its initiation ceremonies. The main objections, which hardly changed for more than two centuries, were: (1) as daughters, wives, or widows—each of them subject to well-defined social roles and constraints—women are not independent actors in the same way men are; (2) nothing is sacred, not just masonic secrets, to the congenital indiscretion of
women; (3) women’s proclivity to share in French gallantry disrupts the masonic brotherhood predicated, as it is, on personal trust; (4) the standing of men but also of women in society is likely to suffer from all rumors, however ill-founded, about masonic misbehavior; and (5) with women in the lodges, civil and ecclesiastical authorities will impose still more restrictions on the craft. These are familiar allegations, based for the most part on enduring stereotypes of women, which had long been used to maintain their subjection in French society. Masons, in fact, did not need Jean-Jacques Rousseau’s subsequent views on how “woman is made to please and to be subordinated to man” to justify these arguments against masonic adoption as well as against mixed masonry.¹⁷ As the influential Chevalier Andrew-Michael de Ramsay stated in 1738 concerning le Sexe in the lodge, “its presence could change insensibly the purity of our principles and behavior.”¹⁸

A more detailed statement on masonic women appeared in the anonymous Apologie pour l’ordre des francs-maçons (1744, Apology for the Order of Freemasons) six years later. It deserves some attention. Cast in sympathetic defense of women, this document reworks the contentions mentioned above in more specific terms, identifying the dependent social relations that exclude women a
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**Figure 1: Estimated Number of Mixed and/or Adoption Lodges and Women Initiated into French Masonry, 1750–1950**

priori from public space. As the author put it, “Whatever the Creator assigned to Man & to Woman, certain characteristics . . . distinguish them, & . . . fix to each of the two its Vocation.” Aside from all other justifications of male-only masonry, there are two here concerning scandal, in keeping with Ramsay, likely arising from the insecurities of a secret society before establishing a firm reputation as an upright association. But five of the remaining ten points entail the adverse implications of male supremacy:

a. Only men are truly free. “Woman, on the contrary, is subject to & under the Laws of a Husband.”

b. A woman is always restrained in action. “Woman can never answer for her Liberty.”

c. A single woman lives in dependent relations with her parents or her tutor.

d. A woman is not accountable to her truest self. “She cannot answer for her Heart.”

e. A married woman with children is even more circumscribed in her activities outside the home. “She is no longer in a condition to dispose of Herself.”

The remaining concerns, seven through twelve, are framed as rhetorical questions that seem almost irrelevant: Can women in religious orders really be masons? Will not a nonmason father or husband frustrate a woman’s ability to keep masonic secrets? . . . The author here seems to be grasping for additional objections.

In conclusion, the writer notes shrewdly, the exclusion of women “from our Order comes, not from what the Order would deem unworthy of our mysteries, but uniquely from the dependence to which [women] find themselves subjected in every way.” It is society that imposes these limitations on women, not scandal or masonry itself. This forthright statement underscores the prevailing concept of gender relations in the eighteenth-century French lodge. In a widely circulated document in the 1740s, first in manuscript then in published form, the author lays bare the assumptions underlying women’s very limited place in public space. It prefigures the emphatic case made by Carole Pateman about the subordination women by the sexual contract.

Yet there were significant variations in the way some lodges responded to these prescriptions. Beginning with the masonic adoption of aristocratic women, including members of the queen’s court, differences in status, wealth, and influence considerably modified the interactions of these initiates with men—and other women—in scores of lodges across the country (see app. 2). The objections described above were raised less forcefully in the most famous Parisian lodges.
of adoption—Saint-Jean de la Candeur (established in 1775), Les Neuf Soeurs (1775), and Saint-Jean d’Écosse du Contrat Social (1766, 1774)—arguably the three largest and most exclusive in eighteenth-century France. Their initiates represented the most exclusive social circles.

In La Candeur, at one time or another, could be found Marie-Antoinette herself (though she was never initiated), Princesse de Lamballe, Duchesse de Bourbon, Comtesse de Polignac, Comtesse de Montmort, and Comtesse de Brienne. They were joined in the lodge, almost invariably, by their titled husbands, brothers, or brothers-in-law, in what seems to have been a mixed atelier. Their focus on charity—such as a proposed subscription for the outfitting of a warship during the American war for independence—took precedence over formal rituals of initiation, though during a ten-year period La Candeur did admit fifty-nine women, whose participation was decided by the maçonnnes (women masons) themselves and their initiation overseen by the grande maîtresse (grand mistress) alone—in flagrant contravention of the Grand Orient’s rules. The ceremonies were nothing less than grandes fêtes (big celebrations) whose information about guests, initiates, speeches, banquets, and balls was detailed for the public over the course of nearly eight years (1775–83). This lodge was a world apart, its registers a testament to the elite status of the Old Regime’s highest aristocracy amidst an increasingly varied nobility.

In Les Neuf Soeurs appeared a somewhat more circumspect circle led by the mason sans tablier Anne-Catherine de Ligniville d’Autricourt (1722–1800), the lively Mme. Helvétius who regularly opened her home in Auteuil to members of the lodge. Most of them were Enlightenment leaders in philosophy, literature, and art: Nicolas Chamfort, Jacques Delille, Pierre-Jean-Georges Cabanis, Jean-Baptiste Greuze, Claude Joseph Vernet, and Jean-Antoine Houdon, among others like Benjamin Franklin and John Paul Jones. In 1775 she joined with the astronomer Jérôme de Lalande to establish a men’s lodge in the memory of her late husband, the philosophe and physiocrat Claude-Adrien Helvétius. Les Neuf Soeurs began initiating women shortly thereafter. The number of them was never large, perhaps fewer than a dozen and with none of the public stature the men enjoyed; but their unorthodox engagement became the object of the governing Grand Orient’s attention, to the muted embarrassment of the lodge’s commitment to adoption.

In November 1778, when Les Neuf Soeurs memorialized Voltaire, who had died the previous May, the solemn ceremony introduced two women into the lodge. One was Voltaire’s niece and companion, Marie-Louise Denis, the other his “adopted” daughter, “Belle et Bonne” Reine-Philiberte Rouph de Varicourt,
Marquise de Villette. Exposing them to the brethren in full regalia was a major masonic indiscretion. Officials at the Grand Orient were not amused and authorized a new, much smaller meeting space for the lodge. Apart from the public controversies over Voltaire, they were concerned about women’s involvement in the lodge’s activities, primarily the public revelations of masonic secrets and the mixed audience for the readings of scandalous literary works. At Lalande’s insistence for written notification of the decision, the adjudicating chamber relented, even though the following March in Paris’s very public Cirque Royal, there was an embarrassing effort to initiate three young women whose parents objected during the long, badly bungled tenue (ceremony). The Grand Orient responded more forcefully this time, but the lodge again escaped censure after agreeing to dissolve itself, only to resume operations two months later. The Grand Orient’s failure to enforce its own rules was a function of its relative weakness vis-à-vis Les Neuf Soeurs; it was also a reflection of the willingness of the men, in particular the vénérable and abbé Edmond Cordier de Saint-Firmin, to defend the lodge’s openness to women members.

The third lodge, Saint-Jean d’Écosse du Contrat Social, previously known as Saint-Lazare, has a comparably complicated story. It too had a powerful woman champion, the grande maîtresse of its adoption lodge, none other than Princesse de Lamballe, who hosted a number of well-attended gatherings for its members, men and women alike. So renowned was the princesse, her praises were sung effusively by brother Robineau de Beaunoir in his Hommage maçonnique [sic] de la mère-locale d’adoption (1781, Masonic Hommage for the Scottish Mother Lodge of Adoption): “Venus, Love, the Graces, Cythère, and all that,” remarked one historian snidely. Her reception as grande maîtresse in February 1781 was accompanied by an elaborate festival far more than worthy of her reluctant willingness to participate. She ostensibly endured the pomp for the sake of her philanthropic intentions. Despite its reputation for indiscriminate mixing of social ranks—fully half of the brethren, for example, were artists, literati, musicians, and composers, and one of the sisters, Marquise de Saint-Huruge, was a former courtesan—Le Contrat Social was decidedly royalist and Catholic, and won begrudging forbearance from the arch conservative abbé Augustin Barruel in his long, polemical account of the French Revolution’s masonic origins. Dedicated to the established order, the lodge featured enough prominent members of the aristocracy to require proper titles in formal addresses and to permit their servants to assist them during banquets and balls (so much for the masonic principle of brotherly—and sisterly—love).
servants or artists, were rarely mentioned in Le Contrat Social’s register of activities.

Given how visible were the women in these Parisian lodges and given how independently they functioned in cooperation with men, it is hard to imagine why adoption was necessarily secondary to the regular lodges that presumably sponsored them. In the historians Gisèle Hivert-Messeca and Yves Hivert-Messeca’s view, based on their findings on the best documented groups, “adoption [was] . . . a mixed masonic regime given to egalitarian androgyny, disequilibrated complementarity of the sexes, [and] hierarchical mixing.”

The gendering of its sociability was, at least for the privileged elites in Paris, far more polite than were the levelling initiation rites and the extensive commentary, often scathingly critical, of them. One gets another view from the correspondence concerning a lodge in Anjou, near Beaufort, whose grande maîtresse, Louët de Cordaiz, competently administered its affairs, including the recruitment of new masons and the operations of its rite, an extraordinary role for a woman to play.

Adoption practices in the French provinces, and beyond, suggest considerable variation on women’s inclusion, often because they existed far from their watchful loges-mères (sponsoring lodges) and the Grand Orient in Paris. In Bordeaux, for instance, historians have unearthed tantalizing traces of women’s interest in masonry at perhaps the earliest of adoption lodges in France. In 1734, women imitated the bordelaise L’Anglaise for both Irish and French men. The prestige of the brethren was so much at stake, however, that they took steps to stop the women’s experiment, though the women’s curiosity persisted. In 1742, L’Anglaise reprimanded one of its members, Curé de Rions, “for his extraordinary indiscretion . . . of having led women inside the temple.” The curé actually charged the women money for this service. Similarly, in 1746, the men’s lodge decided “in its wisdom to warn the other Lodges of this Orient in order to inform them about the abuses which have slipped into these assemblies of adoption.” Despite the Grande Loge’s best efforts to regulate lodge activities before 1750 everywhere in France, the vogue of women’s masonry continued to spread rapidly outside of Paris.

Especially in ateliers initiating the less socially august, the strictly gendered condition for women generally was mitigated by what the initiates themselves expressed about their masonic experiences. The sisters of two French adoption lodges in particular, La Juste in The Hague and La Concorde in Dijon, asserted agency, freedom, and dignity comparable to what the women in La Candeur enjoyed (thanks to a virtually independent lodge by the authority of the Duchesse
de Bourbon, the Grande Maîtresse des Loges d’Adoption de France under the auspices of the Grand Orient). But as members of prominent families, in addition to those from wealthy bourgeois households and sanctioned royal institutions, these women far from Paris were privileged in their own right, empowering them to pursue broader conversations about a more important place for them in the lodge. Their embrace of reason, equality, and community moved them well beyond the ideals that their brethren envisaged for them, so much so that historians like Margaret Jacob, Janet Burke, and Francesca Vigni insist that these sisters shared “an inclination for emancipation,”⁴⁵ that they “experienced the Enlightenment,”⁴⁶ “a uniquely eighteenth-century feminism,”⁴⁷ however speculative their judgments. All the same, these atypical ideas were impolitic to air so far, so wide, so insistently during the Old Regime.

Like other lodges working degrees elsewhere in Europe—so many in fact that historian Pierre-Yves Beaurepaire speaks of a European masonic network—La Loge de Juste in The Hague left records in French as the language of the educated classes nearly everywhere in the West.⁴⁸ Much of its masonic practice seems to have been imported from France, since a number of active participants were actors and actresses from the Comédie-Française. Even so, the initiation of men and women into the same grades by the same rite in the same lodge was very unusual in the eighteenth century, even in northern Europe which had a reputation for welcoming masonic women.⁴⁹ As Jacob states, La Juste “invented its own rituals so that the female and male members might express their equality, ‘fraternity,’ and mutual search for virtue and wisdom.”⁵⁰ In particular, for the higher grade of architect, one apparently unique to the lodge, “the mystical language of the degree permitted the women and men to become something other than they were, to reach out through gestures and words for an illumination of the spirit that would be individually experienced as well as socially recognized.”⁵¹ These notions were remarkable for women to profess in 1751, and they did not endure; no subsequent records exist for La Juste. The lodge seems to have lasted less than a year and never worked the architect degree. In an ironic twist, the atelier may well have been ahead of its time because it was not sufficiently masonic in form and substance to benefit from the craft’s early institutionalization.⁵²

Thirty years later, however, another adoption lodge, La Concorde, provided the forum for a more pronounced challenge to the eighteenth century’s gender norms. In 1782, a soeur compagnonne (journeyman sister), Présidente Fardel de Daix (née Jeanne-Chantal Séguin de la Motte) gave voice to a diplomatic but daring response to women’s subordination in the lodge but also in Old
Regime Dijon. Addressing the other women in attendance, after acknowledging the special favors the male masons had extended by adoption, she stated forthrightly:

Oh, my sisters, let us ensure that we are not condemned solely to the regard that goodness accords to weakness, to the praise that diversion lavishes on frivolity, or that enticement prepares for vanity. . . . In short, let us prove that the charm of peace, that the ties of respect, that the heavenly sentiment of friendship, that the hard work of reason, in a word, that even the challenge of discretion can also be ours.\(^{33}\)

A woman is like a man, capable of virtue and deserving of respect like everyone else, however unremarkable such sentiments were among the Lumières. Clearly, the *soeur présidente* (presiding sister) Fardel de Daix was taking aim at masons who found their adoption counterparts unworthy of the craft because of their subjection to men by law and custom. In this way, advancing a claim that the women in La Juste felt disinclined to make in 1751, the sister faced squarely the critique of women’s second-class status in freemasonry, which the anonymous *Apologie pour l’ordre des francs-maçons* had detailed in 1744. How effectively she spoke truth to power on behalf of her sisters cannot be verified, yet as the noble wife of the Conseiller au Parlement de Dijon, Seigneur de Verrey and Daix, she could afford to take risks. In another decade, during the revolution, however, less entitled women affiliated with masonry had more to say.\(^ {54}\)

In the independent spirit of these adoption lodges—for La Juste anyway, it was envisaged—at least three minor orders also kept their distance from Parisian enforcement of the craft’s constitutions and encouraged women to take charge of their initiations. Martinès de Pasqually (a.k.a. Jacques Delivron Joachin Latour de La Case), prime mover of the Élus Coëns, was certainly not alone in his regard for women’s potential for spiritual enlightenment, whatever his reservations about women’s true vocation. In Bordeaux from 1762 to 1772, he elaborated something of a doctrine. His disciple and secretary, Saint-Martin, drafted a rite for ten degrees—from apprentice to sovereign judge—for the dozen or so working temples in the country before Martinès de Pasqually’s departure for Saint-Domingue (present-day Haiti). He left behind about a hundred adepts, like Willermoz, to appropriate for their own purposes what they had learned from the theurgist (in Willermoz’s case, it was a variation on the Rectified Masonry from the Strict Observance).\(^ {55}\)

At least ten women were initiated into Martinès de Pasqually’s order. They, too, embraced this synthesis of Judaic, Christian, and Islamist traditions in
which initiates accessed *la Chose* (What Matters), i.e., the redemptive capacity of Jesus Christ through the intercession of the divine mediator Sophia, the embodiment of spiritual wisdom. Martinès de Pasqually’s *Traité de réintégration des êtres* (Treatise on the Reintegration of Beings, not published until 1899) propounded the theoretical basis for much of Provensal’s contemplation, such as when she recalled how her agitations had ceased at “a delightful moment similar to what I tasted... upon returning from a communion [for] which God had allowed me to be better prepared some time ago.” Despite the remotely masonic character of these particular rituals, and despite the short duration of the lodges—most of them closed in the 1770s—the Élus Coëns’s symbolic practices embraced a complementary equality as men and women alike worked through the positive spirits for their redemption. This visionary dynamic was very much Saint-Martin’s handiwork; he framed the rite that the members worked in their mixed lodges together.

Another mystical masonic order welcoming women on equal footing with men was the Illuminés d’Avignon (1782–96), inspired by another charismatic figure, Antoine-Joseph Pernety (1716–96). Originally a member of the Benedictine Congregation of Saint Maur, Pernety’s penchant for spiritual varieties of masonry arose from his passion for alchemy. This interest he carried with him to Berlin in 1767 when he left the Maurist order to serve as a librarian for Frederick the Great of Prussia. He soon established a heterogeneous circle based on Swedenborgian ideas, the Illuminés de Berlin, some of whose members moved with him in 1782 to Valence where his younger brother lived. Hosted by a generous benefactor in the Château Mont-Thabor at Bédarrides near Avignon, he recruited some actual masons who were also eager for union with the Virgin Mary as Pernety drifted back from theosophy. His death in 1796, in the wake of the Revolution of 1789 and the Holy Office’s censure in 1791, left the Illuminés too fragmented to continue in France much beyond 1800. Nevertheless, Pernety has long been attributed, incorrectly it turns out, as the source for the chevalier de soleil ritual, the 28th degree in the Rite Écossais Ancien et Accepté (Scottish Rite). This misattribution, however, underscores how much in tune with symbolic masonry the Illuminés d’Avignon were; the lure of pure symbolism would long haunt the craft. Like the Élus Coëns, given to the philosophical inclinations of Martinès de Pasqually, Saint-Martin, and Willermoz, Pernety’s lodges in Avignon also initiated a small number of women in their own quest for the divine.

The best known of the minor masonic orders of the eighteenth century was undoubtedly the Haute Maçonnerie Égyptienne, created single-handedly by
the flamboyant Giuseppe Balsamo (1743–95), better known as Alessandro, Comte de Cagliostro (and late in life, Comte de Phénix). This controversial figure was internationally (in)famous for his attention to the sick, to the rich and notable, and to long-deceased people, whose incarnation he claimed at various times to be. The Egyptian Rite, which he created during an interminable itinerary of towns all over Europe, including Strasbourg, Bordeaux, Lyon, and Paris, was based on the masonic belief in the origins of civilization in ancient Egypt. Derived in part from the Strict Observance, the adoption rites for his lodge Isis specifically recognized the spiritual equality of men and women. As the ritual for the apprentice grade states, echoing the feminist François Poullain de la Barre, “a day will come when you will be distinguished not by your sex but by your mind, which must work to raise itself and adopt sentiments appropriate to your new state.” Hence the long list of female aristocrats in Paris who joined this lodge: Comtesse d'Ambrugeac, Comtesse de Brienne, Duchesse de Polignac, Comtesse de Choiseul-Praslin, Comtesse de Genlis, and many other prominent women. Cagliostro’s own wife, Lorenza “Serafina” Feliciani, oversaw the adoption lodge’s initiations, in the same way the Grand Cophté—as the mage (magician) styled himself—did for the men’s. After initiating dozens of women in 1785, this lodge ceased its operations when a lettre de cachet (king’s warrant) cast Cagliostro and his wife into the Bastille for his alleged role in the Diamond Necklace Affair. But one legacy of this type of masonry and many others like it was the women’s claim to a very particular public setting.

Freemason Women’s Social Networks in the Old Regime

These exceptional lodges and their orders foreground the selective flexibility of gender relations evident in the craft (and the Old Regime) before 1789. The elite social status of their participants, like the relative independence of provincial lodges and of minor orders, informed the way women and men related in their rites. This was true whether they belonged to a mixed atelier with separate initiations or they worked their degrees in separate lodges. As it is, masonic fellowship provided privileged women a brief respite from their subordination, one otherwise inherent to French cultural prescriptions in the eighteenth century. Freemasonry carved out space for women to develop a sense of their own civic morality. It lay at the heart of an evolving civil society, apart from Habermas’s notion of the (male) public sphere that appeared to define literate opinion in opposition to the absolute monarchy during the Enlightenment. To the extent
that lodges shared in the social capital of personal networks underlying the growing interest of men and women in something bigger than themselves, masonry proved to be an early and, in the eyes of some fearful commentators during the revolution, outsized factor in major changes to French society, culture, and polity. Eighteenth-century women may not have “lived” the Enlightenment to its fullest, as some observers have variously suggested, but a number of them did indeed acquire a role in masonry’s initiation rituals, charitable activities, and associational life.67

How self-conscious were these women of their place in public as well as private life represented by the lodge? This question is difficult to answer, even in light of a growing respect for equality-in-difference during the eighteenth century. But a number of extraordinary individuals left signs of their awareness, if not exactly of feminist aspirations than of their possibilities in public. Subject to further study here, their memoirs, correspondence, and other writings with like-minded men and women, in a web of relationships within and beyond the lodge, indicate an enlarged sense of themselves in relationship with others. As Vicomtesse de Mathan asked rhetorically of her adoption lodge, in keeping with Old Regime sociability and its notion of a civic ethos, “where else does one learn by forgetting oneself to be occupied instead with one’s Brothers?”68 It is important to see more precisely what freemason women made of this apparent shift. Salons, academies, journals, studios, even some political intrigue beckoned them in ways that were consistent with their masonic commitments. This occurred well before the revolution when masonic adoption reached its apogee in France and long afterward in mixed mystical masonry that would wax and wane over the course of the next century.

Hardly typical of all freemason women but well documented is Louise-Marie-Thérèse-Bathilde d’Orléans, Duchesse de Bourbon (1750–1822), the Grand Orient’s first and only Grande Maîtresse de Toutes les Loges d’Adoption en France (1781–85).69 Her commitment to masonry was exemplary. She willingly accepted the prestigious position on behalf of the obedience, delaying her appointment until she had been initiated into the fourth and highest degree at the time, maîtresse parfaite, in order to maintain ritualistic order in the lodge. “I believe myself obliged to set . . . the example of regularity,” she said primly.70 As Jan Snoek describes the ritual, the grade “is about the passage from slavery to liberty,” based upon a summary of the previous three degrees (from apprentice and journeywoman to mistress) and a long catechism in large part about Mary’s husband Joseph.71 What adoption masonry meant to Bourbon is difficult to say, other than to note that she took her responsibilities seriously.72 She is known to
have visited lodges, such as in Bordeaux, during her extensive travels in France. She also remained active in her mother lodge, La Candeur, and its remarkable sisters, with at least one princesse, one duchesse, fifteen comtesses, and ten marquises, as active members (though not everyone was as involved as she was). Some six hundred of France’s aristocracy celebrated her induction in 1781. An accomplished musician, Bourbon was well read, exceptionally generous to the poor and sick, and deeply religious to the point of mysticism. Her trusted guide Saint-Martin warned her in his *Ecce homo* (1792) that she needed to restrain her visionary proclivities. She even shared them with Suzette Labrousse, who lived with her briefly during the revolution, whose collection of prophetic visions of the revolution Bourbon had printed at her own expense. Clearly, this otherworldly propensity of the grande maîtresse complemented her oversight of the adoption rite.

Much later in life, long after her leadership in masonry ended in 1785, Bourbon engaged in a prolonged correspondence with a young man, Michel Ruffin. In 1797 he had served as her government-appointed escort into Spanish exile. For thirteen years, they expounded upon their religious beliefs, with Bourbon making an earnest effort to convert her interlocutor to a more Catholic faith. It did not take her long to suggest that Ruffin meet Saint-Martin in Paris. “I would wish,” she wrote in the summer of 1800, “that you make the acquaintance of a man who is a fount of natural and spiritual knowledge in the most modest manner possible, who is so kindly disposed to everyone who speaks with him.” She knew this from personal experience after her own quest for consolation when her infant son nearly died and then in the wake of a disastrous marriage with Philippe d’Orléans. “It is [Saint-Martin], my dear angel, who will show you the light and will lead you, step by step, past the rationality that you so value.” She recommended a number of Saint-Martin’s books. Although this introduction to mystical masonry did not lead to an initiation—Ruffin only met with Saint-Martin a few times before the oracle died in 1803—it did serve to enfold him into an extensive social network, which Bourbon had marshalled in masonry and which had helped her to cope with the many tragedies of her life. “Saint-Martin’s writings, as well as our conversations, have affected me for a long time,” Bourbon explained, “while the evils, the prisons, and the trials of every kind weighed on my unhappy existence and drew upon the worst that was in me. This is how it comes to all who have strayed from the direct path that leads to God.” Before the divine as in the lodge, everyone, male or female, was equal.

A member of Bourbon’s masonic circle was Marie-Thérèse-Louise de Savoie-Carignan, Princesse de Lamballe (1749–92), one of Marie-Antoinette’s
closest confidantes at court. Lamballe was appointed Superintendante de la Maison de la Reine in 1775, after she had been widowed by her libertine husband who died very young, at age twenty, most likely of venereal disease. The pressing matters of running the queen’s social life may well have been welcome relief from that agonizing experience (during which she herself was infected and nursed her undeserving husband in his dying days). The capable, devoted, and decent Lamballe managed the queen’s affairs until Marie-Antoinette tired of her efficiency and asked Duchesse de Polignac to serve as governess to the queen’s children. Lamballe carried on, true to her pious faith and personal ties, pursuing her longstanding interest in philanthropy and refurbishing the Parisian residence, the Hôtel de Toulouse, of her doting father-in-law, Duc de Penthièvre. Eventually Marie-Antoinette realized Lamballe’s value, a realization for which she was rewarded in the princesse’s testament in 1791: “I beseech the Queen to receive a mark of gratitude from one to whom she had given the title of her friend, a precious title that has been the happiness of my life.”

Like other members of the queen’s court, Lamballe was initiated by adoption in La Candeur in February 1777; but unlike most of them, she participated actively in its tenues, once signing herself “Soeur princesse de Lamballe” on the lodge’s register. At La Candeur’s gathering a year later, Lamballe shared in the elaborate festivities to hear the last verse of a song sung by one Soeur Comtesse Descelles:

It is thus that the Goddesses,
Disposing of their Majesty,
Go forth from pure tenderness
To enjoy equality.

Lamballe probably did not consider the members of even this august lodge her equals, with perhaps one exception; they were all initiated into masonry. She longed for a community of sisters, albeit of another sort from the all-female dinner with the queen she is reputed to have hosted at the Hôtel de Toulouse, causing a minor scandal at court. She did not stop there. In January 1781, some five years after she had been initiated in Saint-Jean d’Écosse du Contrat Social, Lamballe was named Grande Maîtresse de Toutes les Loges Écossaises Régulières de France. The elaborate installation ceremony occurred a month later. This responsibility, too, she took seriously in the context of virtually the same social networks as Bourbon. The adoption lodges in the Scottish Rite took Lamballe into the world of side degrees and their complex symbolism, far more than existed in the Grande Loge’s lodges practicing the first suite of degrees. Such was a
portion of Lamballe’s substantial social capital, a combination of the country’s very highest aristocracy and masonry’s fastest growing order on the eve of the French Revolution.

The queen’s court was hardly the only source of masonry’s contribution to an incipient civil society in Old Regime France. Far more representative of the craft’s membership were Mme. Helvétius’s social connections, i.e., if the Enlightenment’s cultural elite can be considered typical. “Minette,” as she was known by close family and friends, honored her husband’s masonic attachments, first to the short-lived lodge Les Sciences, which he jointly founded with Lalande in 1766, and again to the better-known Les Neuf Soeurs, after Helvétius had died. Her husband’s ceremonial apron, for example, was Voltaire’s to wear (and to kiss in his honor) when he was initiated into Les Neuf Soeurs in April 1778; the symbolism was no afterthought, in the same spirit as Helvétius’s gift of a special, posthumous printing of her husband’s long, contemplative poem, *Le Bonheur* (1772, *Happiness*). Copies of the title were distributed to brethren in the new atelier.

In the ensuing years, she regularly and deliberately blurred the line between lodge and salon, such as hosting the Les Neuf Soeurs celebrations of Saint-Jean d’Été at her garden in June 1776 and 1777. She welcomed informal and at times unorthodox visits of lodge members to her home. “Notre Dame d’Auteuil,” as she came to be known, favored Pierre-Louis Lefevbre de La Roche the liberal abbé, Cabanis the future Idéologue, Jean-Antoine Roucher the struggling poet, and, most notoriously, Franklin the emissary in vogue from America. Although his initiation is not well documented, another frequent guest, Nicolas de Caritat, Marquis de Condorcet participated in both the Société Olympique and the Lycée sponsored by the brothers. States the historian Jean-Paul de Lagrave, “there existed a tie between this salon and the lodge of Les Neuf Soeurs . . . which gathered the French and foreign epitome of the philosophical spirit.”

Minette’s household was thus home to far more than her clowder of angora cats. She opened her doors to notable friends who enjoyed her spirited personality, one grounded in firm commitments to family, masonry, and their ideals as expressed by the very people who got to know her over the years. The lapsed Jesuit and academician André Morellet, in fact, lived with the widow in a place far safer to work than the Bastille where he was imprisoned for three months over his ill-timed, ill-tempered critique of a satire on the *Encyclopédie*. Soon after Condorcet married in 1786, he brought by his bright new bride, Sophie de Grouchy, who observed how Helvétius planned and conducted a successful salon, much like the one she was to establish at the Hôtel de la Monnaie. Similarly, Helvétius and Franklin were well suited, praising each other’s charms
flirtatiously. “In your company we are not only pleased with you,” Franklin confessed in 1778 not long after they had met, “but better pleased with one another and with ourselves.”96 Nine years later, she admitted to Franklin, “your letter produces nearly the same effect on me, by which it reminds me more strongly of all your virtue and this fine, noble and simple character that I admire so much in you.”97 Perhaps it is not too much to suggest that Helvétius’s masonic sentiments evident in her numerous, sustained relationships, with lodge members and philosophers alike, made her a virtual sister in the craft and its public ethos in the final decade of the Old Regime (see app. 3). Her social world was smaller than Bourbon’s and Lamballe’s—just fifty-five correspondents, one-third of whom were masons—but to judge from the tenor of their letters, her circle was close.

The social influence of another masonic woman, Lorenza Feliciani, Comtesse de Cagliostro (1754–94), was derived from a mystical faction of the royal art; the Egyptian Rite incorporated women much earlier and more directly than was usual among the principal obediences.98 In part this inclusion was recognition of the equality of men and women in occult masonry during the Old Regime. The daughter of a Neapolitan artisan in bronze-making, Feliciani became interested in the lodges that her husband, Giuseppe Balsamo, created in The Hague, Courland, Warsaw, Strasbourg, Bordeaux, Lyon, and Paris between 1778 and 1785. As Giacomo Casanova described Feliciani, she had a quiet presence that contrasted sharply with her husband’s flamboyance. The memoirist noted “the nobility, the unpretentiousness, the naïveté, the sweetness, and this shy modesty which lends charm to a young woman.”99 A self-confident bearing served her well during the initiations of candidates, known as colombes (doves) in the Haute Maçonnerie Égyptienne; she supervised the meeting rooms, the recruitment and training of the child-participants, the crystal vase filled with magnetic fluid, and, in Paris, the adoption ceremonies.100 For the few months that the lodge named after the Egyptian goddess Isis operated in the capital, Feliciani led the initiation of the first thirty-six aristocratic women who paid the very steep fee to join (100 louis were far more than the average Parisian artisan made in a year). And for those neophytes who became a maîtresse, they heard familiar notions from the presiding maîtresse agissante (efficacious mistress): “Let us leave [the men] to make their murderous wars or to disentangle the chaos of their laws, but let us charge ourselves to govern opinion, to purify customs, to cultivate the mind, to promote refinement, to diminish the number of the unfortunate.”101 Those who ruled did not necessarily know better.102

Whatever these women understood of their participation did not last long. After Balsamo was released from the Bastille in 1786, he headed for London,
leaving Feliciani to break-up the household and to follow him in his frantic itinerary across Europe to Rome by 1789, just after the outbreak of violence in Paris. We will never know precisely why Feliciani informed the Holy See of a desire to clear her conscience and share information of interest concerning her husband. Her confession of casual adultery was less critical than the details she provided of Balsamo’s lodge activities; he was arrested, tried, and convicted of masonry by the Roman Inquisition. “Baptized Christian but wretched, heretical, sadly celebrated after having propagated in all of Europe the impious dogmas of the Egyptian sect and after having attracted, by his prestige and his speech, a mob of nearly innumerable adepts,” a good number of them women, Balsamo had violated two papal pronouncements (1738, 1751) condemning the brotherhood.

In 1790, Feliciani retreated to the convent of Santa’Apollinare where she faced a repentant death less than a year before Balsamo died in his Castel Sant’Angelo prison cell under mysterious circumstances. As a leader of masonic activity herself, Feliciani had profound regrets about her conduct. She had shared in Balsamo’s masonic commitment, whose object seemed sacrilegious in retrospect: when all is said and done, “ego sum qui sum” (I am who I am). But we have no documents in her hand to confirm what she thought; Feliciani never learned to write in either French or Italian; and the lodge Isis, which she oversaw so deftly, dissolved shortly after her departure from Paris, its circle of maçonnnes dissipated as they returned to (or sought out) other adoption lodges.

The Egyptian Rite’s promised spiritual union with the world of the dead, as offered equally to men and women alike, suffered comparison with the regular adoption lodges in vogue on the eve of the revolution. Egyptian masonry, as Feliciani practiced it, never set deep roots in either French society or in the craft itself. But it provoked more than a century of historical speculation, literary invention, and cultural imagery about the maîtresse agissante. This interest arose in part from the role played by the Queen of Sheba in the initiations, at the expense of principles that Feliciani and her fellow sisters espoused during their initiatory experiences, as reflected in the tree of knowledge in the Garden of Eden. For the women, not eating the apple’s seeds promised the redemption of humankind, “the means of repairing this loss, the fruit of our glory, and the recovery of the power that the Supreme Being accorded to everyone,” a notion antithetical to Feliciani’s renewed Catholic faith.

Historically of longer duration and of deeper significance to the women who embraced it was the mysticism of another iteration of masonry, the Élus Coëns, whose sisters were enthusiastic participants in its creation. The conversant Provencal was hardly the only woman immersed in this rite crafted by Saint-Martin.
They drew inspiration from his mentor Martinès de Pasqually, with the help of the better focused and organized Willermoz. From 1776 to 1785, Élisabeth Du Bourg-Cavaignes (1721–94) and her prominent aristocratic family in Toulouse also corresponded with the self-styled “Unknown Philosopher” Saint-Martin; he requested their advice in the ritual practices he had in mind. As the theosophist mentioned in February 1777, “what you have said about your new discoveries fills me with pleasure and proves more than ever that you do not need any help from men.” Obviously, Du Bourg-Cavaignes had as much to inform Saint-Martin in such matters as he had to inform her, particularly where the material and the immaterial meet, as in his choice of a spouse. Three of his letters requested her views of his plans to marry the kind of woman who would guide him in his future work. Toward that end, he worried about a wife with a very different religious background from his. Later, Saint-Martin mused about the purposes of gnosis and belief: “knowledge values the mind, virtue values God,” thereby suggesting that what one knows must always be seen in the image and substance of God if one is ever truly to know. In eighteen such letters (two of them sent jointly to the présidente and her husband, Valentin Du Bourg-Cavaignes), Saint-Martin elaborated as well as confirmed the principles of his variations on the craft, thanks to the substantive contribution of more than one female initiate among the Élus Coëns. Their network was geographically wide, but no less important to him.

Saint-Martin learned still more from another female counselor, albeit less directly, in his efforts to make sense of the eleven anonymous notebooks that Willermoz received unsolicited from an “Unknown Agent” in April 1785. Saint-Martin never knew whose voice it was that revealed the Virgin Mary’s guidance in the Élus Coëns’s quest to communicate with the angels of the highest sphere. After two full years (1785–87) of correspondence, during which a total of 120 notebooks and forty-two other communications were received, Willermoz unveiled the author: Marie-Louise de Monspey, otherwise known as Eglé de Vallière (1733–1813), the younger sister of Alexandre de Monspey, a mason in the Stricte Observance Templière and close acquaintance with Willermoz in Lyon. All of them had found the occultist side of Franz Anton Mesmer’s magnetic fluid—“a material whose subtlety penetrates all bodies without especially losing its activity”—a promising source of healing (though, for most contemporaries, Mesmer’s influence was more social than therapeutic). The anthropologist Christine Bergé has since combed through the substantial body of materials that Saint-Martin and Willermoz together used to frame a new rite. Their “Livre des Initiés” (“Book for the Initiated”) owed much to
Vallière’s graphic visions, thanks in part to her reputation as the canoness at the renowned abbey of Remiremont in Lorraine; she was widely revered by her peers in the church as “an ardent mystic . . . initiator, writer, and therapist . . . an erudite woman.”

Saint-Martin’s compilation of materials, a third of which came from Vallière, defined the doctrine and practices of a renovated Élus Coëns rite, whose first lodge was to be the Élue et Chérie de la Bienfaisance, convening primarily the adepts of the original order. “It is Mary who holds the pen,” Vallière stated, “chief of the abode inaccessible to reintegrated forms, an agent of reparation.”

But when the Unknown Agent delivered only inconsistent and contradictory pronouncements, Saint-Martin lost patience and moved back to Strasbourg, leaving Willermoz to decide what to do next. At Willermoz’s insistence and her brother’s urging—Monspey was the courier for all of Vallière’s communications—Vallière finally visited Lyon to interpret her cryptic views. Willermoz then decided that the Unknown Agent was less sincere than he had hoped and explained this to the lodge in 1788. Vallière continued a communion with the Virgin in her psychic writing, and published her first book, *Extraits de la Philosophie* (1827, *Philosophical Extracts*), under her own name. She received no further notice until the archivist Alice Joly rediscovered her portion of Saint-Martin’s manual in the 1960s and secured copies of many more notebooks by the 1960s. Although Vallière knew nothing about the craft, she was at the origin, if not the founding, of a paramasonic rite; but its influence on women drawn to the spiritualist side of masonry—like the Élus Coëns—promised far more than it delivered.

Masonry’s more tangible benefits to women were evident elsewhere. For instance, they appear in how brethren partnered with the women editors of the *Journal des dames*, viz., Mesdames de Beaumer (1761–63), Maisonneuve (1763–69), and Montanclos (1774–75). It is unlikely that any of them was ever initiated, but they depended upon the support of the craft to sustain a monthly publication of interest to both men and women, off and on, from October 1761 to April 1775. In her research on the *Journal des dames*, Nina Rattner Gelbart discovered the intervention of several masons, most notably Louis-François de Bourbon (Prince de Conti), Joseph Mathon de La Cour and Louis-Sébastien Mercier, to keep it operating. The journal’s expressed ideas, like those of masonry itself, were well ahead of its time and social milieu. As historian Christine Fauré put it, the first female editor Beaumer was a bit “too combative” in her ardent vindication of women’s equality with men, which she thought in time would change French, then European, customs enough to create lasting
social peace at home and abroad. Bourbon provided Beaumer refuge from the censors in 1762, but it was not enough for the self-styled editrice (woman editor) to manage her work, and so she sold the journal to her successor, Catherine Michelle de Maisonneuve, who modeled better “the bounds of respectability.”

Maisonneuve may have been more diplomatic in her editorial practice, yet in 1763 she actually ran an article declaring, “all people are not made to be philosophes, but all are made to be active citizens.” (The active citizenship she had in mind was much more modest than it was during the French Revolution and long afterward.) In this work, Maisonneuve was seconded by the ambitious Lyonnais, Mathon de La Cour, who printed masonic poems and the reviews of books by brethren in the journal, including large excerpts of Mercier’s incendiary writing. It did not take the censors long to close the journal for nearly five years. Picking up the pen from her predecessor, Marie Émilie de Montanclos (a.k.a. Baronne de Princen) defined a still more conservative editorial policy, dedicating the journal to Marie-Antoinette and directing more attention to the safe topic of family life in the mode of Rousseau. She pledged to publish “all that relates to the health of mothers and their children, all that is useful to the education of young ladies,” despite her preoccupations as an actress. Eventually, Montanclos also grew weary of the intrigues at court and distracted by her own family life; she happily turned the journal over to Mercier for very little return on her initial investment. It had been perhaps a worthy cause, with considerable assistance from masons and their regard for autrices (women authors), a decidedly daring deviation from conventional gender expectations in the period.

There were, of course, other freemason women in the eighteenth century than the ones featured here, about one thousand of them on the eve of the French Revolution (see fig. 1). At first glance, one is hard pressed to ascertain what these women had in common, apart from the varying degrees of their engagement—for some of them very little—in the craft’s adoption lodges. They were hardly a mirror image of Old Regime society; fully 82 percent of them inserted an aristocratic particle in their name. Many were interested in masonry through family members and through the charitable opportunities that the lodges afforded them in the community with the funds collected from members at each initiation. The women we know were also atypical of freemasons generally, if only because of the imperfect retention of lodge records over the past two centuries. The archives favor the famous, the powerful, and the wealthy, many of whom were Parisian; the capital city hosted adoption masonry’s largest and most prestigious lodges. In the provincial cities, however, the mystics roamed more freely, presumably because these adepts felt more welcome there (see fig. 2 and
app. 2). Ultimately, the gender relations of freemason women were modified by social privilege; as elites, they realized a peculiar sisterhood, one set within a fraternal organization, during the early decades of a civil society-in-the-making. These historical actors had a sense of obligation to others, or some variation on it, that would become much more evident during the revolution. After the Old Regime’s tentative inception of a political culture, the year 1789 would redefine the public space that these women had come to know and, in some cases, to appropriate for themselves.

Revolution: The Communities of Freemason Women Transposed

Women played a visible role in the French Revolution. Their march from Paris to Versailles in October 1789, ostensibly to bring the king and his power closer to the people, was one of several such dramatic events in the first year alone. Much less well known is what freemason women did to further—or to impede—the precipitous changes that destroyed the Old Regime and led to a new, less stable order. Because the vast majority of women masons were aristocrats, they were quickly engulfed by the loss of absolute monarchy, social deference, and landed wealth. And their lodges, like La Candeur and Le Contrat Social, were closed or entrées en sommeil (put to sleep), as masons put it. Many maçonnies thought differently about their participation and, more perhaps, that of the maçons in their families who were blamed early on for plotting revolution in their lodges. “Be on your guard there against any freemason associations,” Marie-Antoinette warned her brother Emperor Léopold II in 1790. Two years after Marquis de Luchet’s extended essay on the Illuminés in 1789, Abbé Jacques-François Lefranc published a more pointed account of masonry’s alleged conspiracy, Le Voile levé pour les curieux (The Veil Lifted for the Curious), whose second edition appeared just months before he was killed during the September massacres in 1792. In due time, this explanation, based in part on revived fears of earlier religious controversies like Jansenism, became received wisdom of the bien-pensants (right-thinking conservatives) who emigrated from France to escape the violence. All the same, convinced revolutionary enthusiasts neglected their lodges; they had more consequential matters to attend to. By its very nature, with some notable exceptions in the provinces, the revolution preempted the attention of masons, women masons in particular, from the pleasures and purposes of the royal art.

Historians have long discussed what impact masonry actually had in 1789. Church leaders and monarchists were not the only ones to pose the question.
Some masons took credit for the upheaval, citing the democratic aspirations and operations of their lodges; they proudly adopted the revolutionary credo, liberté, égalité, and fraternité, as their own. Leaving their temples behind, brethren flocked to the new political clubs, like the Société de 1789 and the Cercle Social. Accordingly, historians have assessed these claims to note that masonry continued to function long after 1789 even as many individual masons became active politically. Of greater historical import is the question of how instrumental masonry was to the revolution. Conservative scholars like Augustin Cochin, Bernard Faÿ, and Reinhardt Koselleck saw the lodges at the heart of an esprit de société (associational tendency). In François Furet’s words, masonry was “an exemplary embodiment of the chemistry of new power, which transformed a social phenomenon into politics and opinion into action. In this sense, it embodied the origin of Jacobinism.” Feminist historians, for different reasons, have tended to agree. For Dena Goodman, masonry’s place in the new political culture was central, even though she believed that women masons simply did not share in it; they were “the displaced objects of male desire . . . and the submissive subjects of male-defined morality.” But Francesca Vigni had already argued quite the opposite: “In denouncing the iniquity of a world where the feminine being was forced to live a false and truncated life, the woman mason evoked, like other women from the same social milieu, the most urgent problems that social inequalities posed.” Let us consider another approach to masonic women’s involvement in developments leading to 1789.

The French historian of Old Regime France Roger Chartier did not discuss women in freemasonry per se, but he did propose an analogous explanation for men in the craft. In his analysis, it was “more than the invention of a modern concept of equality, democratic in the manner of the Revolution, it was doubtless [a] new formulation of the relationship between morality and politics that gave Freemasonry its power, at once secret and critical.” This politicization of masonic ideals complemented the rise of a new culture that challenged the authority of the king by subjecting it to the scrutiny of public opinion. Because politics were formally banned from atelier meetings and decisions were not always fully democratic, no more so than equality and fraternity always prevailed among its members, masonry was not actually a “school for democracy,” a manner of living the Enlightenment, so much as a space for juxtaposing principle and behavior that should have been better aligned in public life than it was. In this regard, the Bourbon monarchy, the Gallican Church, and the division of society into three separate estates fared badly. Similarly, women masons were confronted on a daily basis by a comparable disjuncture between belief and action, at home.
and elsewhere, that they must have used to judge the nature of extant gender relations, most obviously, but also an absolutist regime, more discreetly, on the eve of the revolution. It was this particular set of juxtapositions, the basis of a new civic consciousness, that informed the views and commitments of women masons during the revolutionary decade.\textsuperscript{137}

What space did freemason women occupy in the proliferation of associations starting in 1789? Within six months of the Bastille’s fall, dozens of political clubs, like the Société de la Révolution and its successor, the Société des Amis de la Constitution, appeared in Paris and provincial towns all over the country. These forerunners of the Jacobins, as they came to be known, organized a network of national affiliates with the mother society in the capital, much as the masonic lodges had with the Grand Orient in the 1780s. But very few masons, all of them male, participated. As historian Michael Kennedy pointed out, echoing Jules Michelet, “the clubs of the revolution were essentially new entities” with members of a more varied social profile.\textsuperscript{138} In lieu of the aristocracy that predominated in lodges of adoption, the professional and commercial middle class pervaded in the political societies, while artisans and shopkeepers animated the popular clubs. No known women masons joined these groups (and thus were not immediately disenfranchised when the Jacobins closed the ones for women in October 1793). Bourbon, Lamballe, Fardel de Daix, and Feliciani all disappear from their respective lodges, nor do they reappear in any of the political organizations that drew so much public attention. Those women who became active politically often disassociated themselves from the craft even as they continued to draw on an extensive social network of freemasons, as the astute editors of the \textit{Journal des dames} did many years earlier. As evident below, figures like Sophie de Condorcet, Stéphanie-Félicité de Genlis, Michelle de Bonneuil, Julie Candeille, and Rosalie Jullien belonged to a younger generation of women at the center of a broader masonic community.

The three most notable examples of these trends in the history of masonry after 1789 are Mme. Helvétius the salon-keeper in Paris, Mme. Provensal the mystic in Lyon, and Mme. Fardel de Daix the wife of a privileged public official in Dijon, all for widely different reasons. Helvétius’s salon, whose guests were mainly drawn from Les Neuf Soeurs, continued to receive these masons after the lodge became the Société Nationale in 1789 and ceased operating in 1792. Much of this (temporary) continuity was owed to Girondist moderation espoused by its adherents and to Helvétius’s discretion during the Terror (1793–94). Moreover, she mentored the youthful Cabanis “like a tender and devoted son” who, as a philosophical radical but political opportunist,
survived the turbulent events of the 1790s to become a deputy under the Directory (1795–99) and a senator under the Consulate (1799–1804). No doubt he provided Helvétius and her salon some protection they might not otherwise have had, such as in the wake of her timely and generous assistance of Condorcet as a refugee from revolutionary justice in 1793. A masonic network served Helvétius well as it turned to support the lodge’s other auxiliary, the Lycée (1785–1803), which operated under difficult circumstances, much to the benefit of women, like Bonneuil, who took advantage of its intellectual and cultural activities. When Helvétius died in 1800, the bulk of her estate was bequeathed to Cabanis (and to Lefebvre de La Roche who had edited her husband’s collected works in 1784).

As for Provensal, she tried desperately to remove herself, like her brother Willermoz, from the revolution in Lyon, with only partial success. Even before 1789, but more fully so thereafter, the effects of the Unknown Agent’s guidance became divisive; some initiates in the new lodge retained their faith in the ritual book based on her writings, despite Willermoz’s grave doubts. Saint-Martin in particular had a spiritual crisis of his own; in the end, “like marble stone,” he lost faith in this new variation on the Élus Coëns, but not before he sought Provensal’s intercession. It failed, much to her own deep disappointment. Meanwhile, the revolution complicated all other forms of masonry in Lyon just as thoroughly as it did elsewhere in France. The only survivors, it seems, were the masonic visionaries and the pseudoscientific mesmerists, in large measure because no one understood their political or religious tendencies. Then local revolutionary authorities suspected Willermoz of insufficient republican enthusiasm, forcing the wealthy silk merchant into seclusion for more than six months, from December 1793 to July 1794. Provensal and her sister-in-law, Jeanette Pascal, offered cover for his safety as well as provisions for his comfort. Correspondence kept up their spirits in trying times, except when Provensal let down her guard. “Nothing new for you to note if not for the many arrests, so they say,” she sighed to her brother in despair. Three years after Thermidor, the family liquidated Willermoz’s business at a considerable loss and retreated to the bucolic idyll of rural life far from the occult intensity of Lyon’s masonry. In her old age, after decades of engagement in the outer fringes of symbolic masonry, Provensal’s support for Willermoz evolved from the mystical to the practical.

Fardel de Daix, for her part, seems to have disengaged entirely from her lodge and its precious circle of titled ladies well before the revolution struck Dijon and its landed elites. In the municipal archives there are no fewer than one printed and four manuscript copies of her remarks during the initiation in 1782, but
nothing more; by comparing texts written by her husband, one historian of masonry in Dijon has even questioned the authorship of her speech.\textsuperscript{143} Certainly Fardel de Daix faced the revolutionary violence with no ostensible help from her fellow masons. After her spouse fled their Verrey and Daix estates, Fardel de Daix retreated to her own family’s property, Le Leuzeu, near Fleury. For years she fended off repeated outbreaks of hostility from local patriots. Her letters to the village mayor indicated that she had no intention of surrendering the firearms used by her servants to keep the wolves at bay; nor was she willing to attend masses celebrated by a revolutionary priest, much less turn over to authorities the refractory priest, nun, and the family of a Girondist living with her at the time. It took until April 1794 for her lands to be confiscated and sold, forcing her to flee to unknown parts. Long after her death during the First Empire, her sister recovered the property. It is difficult to fathom how Fardel de Daix survived the revolution. Her husband the former parlementaire was persona non grata; she faced off the Jacobins at her ancestral home; and yet there was no arrest, no trial, no execution.\textsuperscript{144} In addition to an indomitable personality, her Old Regime social network, whether or not it involved freemasons, apparently worked in her favor.

With the lodges and their initiations in retreat, the revolutionary decade witnessed a transition in masonic activity. Increasingly, freemasons left their lodges, drawing upon the secrets of the craft less than they did the benefits of social networks that masonry created for its members. Not all masons were aristocrats like Bourbon, Lamballe, Fardel de Daix, and Vallière; many others enjoyed somewhat more modest social status like Helvétius the widow of a retired tax farmer, Provensal the part owner of a textile trading company, and Feliciani the daughter of an artisan and wife of a roving impresario. Their fates during the revolution were just as varied. Bourbon, Lamballe, and Fardel de Daix sought safety wherever they could, leaving their family properties for confiscation. The queen’s loyal friend Lamballe returned home to be arrested and brutally murdered; Feliciani died, likely filled with remorse, sequestered in an Italian convent; Vallière’s exclusive abbey in Remiremont was suppressed and her divinely inspired notebooks destroyed; Helvétius and Provensal lived much as before, but kept lower profiles to protect their closest relations. The politics of these masonic women were far from safely republican. From what we know of their views, they differed on one or more of the painful issues that tore families and communities apart: the constitutional monarchy, the civil constitution of the clergy, the impending war with Austria and Prussia, the king’s flight to Varennes, the First Republic, the war at home and abroad to defend it, the Committee of Public Safety, the Terror’s summary executions by guillotine, and finally Thermidor itself.
Still others sought out opportunities to learn and to network in public institutions that owed their existence to masonry. Perhaps the best known of these was the Société Olympique in Paris. It was hosted first at the resplendent Hôtel de Soubise, then in the fashionable arcades of the Palais Royal, to stage regular concerts by its accomplished musicians. Established in 1779 by the Loge Olympique de la Parfaite Estime, the Société was sponsored by the Mère-Loge Écossaise du Contrat Social whose adoption lodges were overseen by the Princesse de Lamballe until 1785. According to the published list of member and subscriber names and addresses in 1786, “its main object, of interest to the largest number of masons who came together again to form it and to those who have been associated with it since, is the establishment in Paris of a Concert that could in some respects replace the Concert of Amateurs,” which had been closed in 1781.

The performances were exclusively reserved for society members. In 1786, all 363 men had been initiated into the mère-loge and all 151 women into its lodge of adoption. Because the royal family attended the concerts, the membership costing 120 livres a year (about an artisan’s weekly earnings) posed no obstacle to the court. There were no fewer than two princesses (Lamballe and Broglie), six duchesses, twenty-six marquises, thirty-seven comtesses, baronnes, and présidentes. The *Almanach du Palais-Royal* (*Almanach of the Palais-Royal*) enthused, “its assemblies are striking by their pomp and glitter. . . . This society has had some extraordinary gatherings,” such as the performances of Joseph Haydn’s six Parisian symphonies commissioned by the Société. Associated musicians from other lodges, like Les Neuf Sœurs’s Pierre-Joseph Candeille—the father of Julie Candeille, the singer, actress, and dramatist—did not have to be initiated, but they were just as immersed in a masonic social circle and its cultural habits. A week before the Bastille fell in July 1789, a mob sacked the society’s premises, forcing the concert to cease operations permanently.

Similarly, for two years (1789–91) the Société Nationale supported the Parisian institution of the Lycée. It proved a lively source of scientific, philosophic, and literary exchange in the tradition of Les Neuf Sœurs’s short-lived Société Apollonienne in 1780, which became the Musée de Paris for arts and sciences in 1781, the Lycée’s proximate predecessor in 1785. According to historian Louis Amiable, “as much by the name of Lycée as by that of Athénée [as it became known in 1802], this intellectual foyer grew and cultivated in French society the taste for serious study.” The lectures and courses offered at this cultural venue, however, were only remotely masonic in style or substance. They were directed by academicians, like Jean-François Marmontel in history and Antoine-François
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de Fourcroy in chemistry, few of whom were masons. Not subject to formal initiation, the “subscribers” had no obligations but to pay their annual dues; depending upon their programs, membership lists turned over rapidly from year to year. This organization was thus masonic by sponsorship only, which likely helped it with the shifting political scene of Paris in the 1790s. For the women who attended the Lycée, their participation was more of moment to them than masonic memories of life in the lodges before the revolution. The craft’s attenuated legacy remained through the masons, male and female, who met in these courses, thereby sustaining networks they drew on during the revolution and long afterward. The implications, the stakes rather, for women were substantial, enduring, and in some cases life-threatening.¹⁵²

After 1789, anything to do with the craft was anathema to the very social circles that had once found it so intriguing. Prominent aristocrats, like the skilled harpist Stéphanie-Félicité Du Crest, Comtesse de Genlis (1746–1830), were unfazed by the sociability and rituals they witnessed in their lodges.¹⁵³ Genlis remarked archly in her memoirs that as a member of the queen’s court, she did not think much about her creation of a paramasonic rite, De la Persévérance, in 1777: “I took, in order to piece together this obedience, a part of the prettiest costumes from the old knighthood, and I added to it a thousand novelistic things of my own invention.”¹⁵⁴ Her hated arch rival, Lamballe, of course, was not inclined to participate, nor was Marie-Antoinette. But that did not stop Genlis from La Candeur’s festivities and initiation into Feliciani’s adoption lodge in the Haute Maçonnerie Égyptienne in 1785 (whose membership list resembles the one for La Candeur). During the revolution, she reserved her salon at Bellechasse each Saturday for belles-lettres and each Sunday for politics, hosting her masonic cousin-lover-friend Phillipe Égalité (who gave Genlis control of his children), Charles-Maurice de Talleyrand-Périgord, Jacques-Louis David, and members of the Constituent Assembly (Comte de Lameth, Bertrand Barère, and Antoine Barnave). This was dangerous company to keep in the First Republic, which forced her to leave for Switzerland and Britain.¹⁵⁵ Neither her husband nor Philippe escaped the guillotine, and two of her young charges died in prison. For the last three decades of her long life, she continued to write—controversial memoirs, biographies, fiction, and reflections on childhood education—for an audience of young women who, after the revolution, had another kind of adoption to consider, one discussed in the next chapter.¹⁵⁶ Genlis left a rich legacy of more than eighty published titles, in part drawn on the directed, experiential learning of nineteen pupils she personally groomed, such as the future king, Louis-Philippe (1830–48).
The craft’s passing fashion is also evident in the lives of women who were even more marginal to the lodges and their rites. The strikingly attractive Marie-Michelle Guesnon de Bonneuil (1748–1829), for one, was interested in Les Neuf Soeurs’s early variant on its Lycée. According to a published list of Musée members in 1785, she counted among the “subscribed ladies” who signed up to take at least one course from the likes of Jean-François Pilâtre de Rozier in the sciences and Jean-François de La Harpe in letters. About the same time, Bonneuil’s fellow denizens from Île Bourbon, Évariste de Parny and Antoine Bertin, invited her and her two sisters to join the soi-disant Société de la Caserne, a veritable parody of secret societies, whose initiations were little more than ritualistic gallantry:

This Barrack, a happy abode,
Where Friendship, by foresight,
Received no rogue of Love
But by an oath of obedience.

These masonic indiscretions were all that Bonneuil affirmed before she joined the counter-revolution, much of it in secrecy for obvious reasons. They nearly led to her execution during the Terror. For years, she engaged in espionage on behalf of multiple regimes—and other countries—on special missions to Spain, Russia, and Britain. She made deliberate use of her persuasive social and physical charms, remarking to the academician Georges Brifaut, in 1808, how well they continued to serve her: “I have fought well with time. If I told you that I turned sixty today, would you believe it?”

Much of this less-than-selfless public service, however, is enshrouded by occulted documents in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and in the mistaken identity of another woman, Jeanne Rilhon, whose name Bonneuil used in her work abroad. This was not the secrecy she learned from freemasons.

Truer to the spirit of the craft, though still far from the atelier, was Marie-Louise-Sophie de Grouchy, Marquise de Condorcet (1764–1822). Unlike her husband and her brother, she was never initiated—no more than their contemporary, the outspoken Fanny Raoul—but her salon drew masons from Les Neuf Soeurs. The marquis lectured on mathematics at the lodge’s Lycée, “truly an academy for women and for men of the world,” according to Baron von Grimm. The couple had only been married for a few years before the revolution disrupted their intellectual and personal lives. Revolutionary events moved the marquis to write “Sur l’admission des femmes au droit de cité” (1790, “On
Granting Women the Rights of Citizenship”) before he was elected to the National Assembly in 1791 and then again to the National Convention in 1792. His fateful vote not to execute the king put him at odds with the Jacobins; his sharp criticisms of the First Republic’s constitution prompted a warrant for his arrest in 1793. While hiding from political authorities, he wrote, at Grouchy’s insistence, his *Esquisse d’un tableau historique des progrès de l’esprit humain* (1795, *Sketch for an Historical Picture of the Progress of the Human Mind*). A brother in Les Neuf Soeurs, Cabanis, is believed to have given him the poison that the marquis shared with Jean Debré in order for both of them to avoid the guillotine in 1794. Impoverished by the loss of family property, Grouchy undertook portraits on commission and kept a lingerie shop to support her little girl, an ailing sister, and an aging governess, sacrificing her own writing and literary salon until she recovered Condorcet’s property in Auteuil in 1795.

The works for which Grouchy is best known are her French translation of Adam Smith’s *Theory of Moral Sentiments* and her own *Lettres sur la sympathie* (*Letters on Sympathy*), both published in 1798. She also edited Condorcet’s complete works (1804) in twenty-one volumes. These publications owe much to the Idéologues—close colleagues of the late marquis, such as Cabanis and Antoine Destutt de Tracy—who attended the salon Grouchy re-opened and used to develop her ideas. She was particularly attentive to Cabanis, in part because he had married her sister Charlotte; she nominally addressed her letters on sympathy to him. She was very much a part of his effort to establish “the science of man.” But Grouchy’s letters owe most to Adam Smith’s treatise; all eight of them gloss Smith’s work and were published in the second volume of her translation.

Grouchy’s very first missive notes Smith’s omission of the causes of sympathy, which she considers as a natural response to another’s pain, an observation derived from sensible not social experience. In her third letter, Grouchy elaborates on sense impressions: “The first signs of this sympathy arrive the very moment when the objects which are able to excite it are offered to our attention... [they are] only a very natural effect of our moral sensibility.” Smith’s “invisible hand” had nothing to do with it. How right Grouchy got her science of morals for a female audience is testified by Germaine de Staël-Holstein. “You helped me rediscover,” she exclaimed, “a pleasure, for a long time lost, in emotion & admiration which the heart & virtue render palpable.” This affirmation explicitly recognizes an instinctive responsibility for others arising from Grouchy’s masonic network, including that of her husband’s, in the waning years of the Enlightenment.

One final woman benefiting from her contact with the web of masonic relations during the revolution was Rosalie Jullien (1745–1824). Her correspondence
with family lasted nearly thirty-five years (1775–1810), most of which was written in Paris. She was an astute and sensitive witness to momentous events that she felt compelled to recount. Again, like Grouchy, she was not initiated into an adoption lodge and never wrote anything about the craft; but her husband, Marc-Antoine, was a brother in Les Frères Réunis of Romans in rural Dauphiné and served as its deputy to the Grand Orient for four years before he moved his family to Paris and returned home to work its ancestral farms in 1787. Neither of her two sons expressed interest in the craft—the eldest boy Jules would become the Committee of Public Safety’s special agent in the provinces—most likely because they came of age at a time when freemasonry seemed irrelevant to the revolution. Jullien’s masonic relations were surprisingly discreet; they appeared at critical moments in her family’s life, if only because the social circles that she and her husband had cultivated in Paris were filled with brethren and at least one sister, at a time when masons, like the philosophes, were everywhere around them. A virtual Jacobin in her faith in the new republic, “she was an enlightened woman by virtue of her optimism,” writes her biographer Lindsay Parker. “Her ‘daring to know’ through great quantities of reading, her interest in science . . . , her reverence for virtue, and her belief in humankind’s potential” suggested an Enlightenment credo that was shared by masons.

At two moments during the revolution this enlightened faith might well have been so obvious to Jullien that she failed to notice. In early 1792, sensing the imminent danger to the adolescent Jules who had just joined the Jacobin club in Paris, Jullien worked to get him out of the country to England. She made plans, starting with the solicitation of introductions that Jules would need while he learned English to see the events in France from another, safer perspective. Almost all the letters she secured were written by prominent figures who, if not freemasons, were closely affiliated with masonry, among them Condorcet, Marquis de La Rochefoucauld, Jérôme Pétion de Villeneuve, Charles-François Dumouriez, Jacques Pierre Brissot, and Charles-Alexis Brulart de Sillery. This extensive network must have served Jules well upon his arrival in London where one of his contacts would be a mason somewhat later, Talleyrand, who was there on diplomatic mission.

The other revolutionary incident when masonry touched Jullien personally occurred as Jacques-Louis David, a friend of her husband’s in Paris, sketched Marie-Antoinette on her way to the guillotine in October 1793 (see ill. 2). The artist inscribed at the foot of this stark ink drawing, “Portrait of Marie Antoinette, Queen of France, taken to execution; drawn with an ink pen by David, a spectator of the convoy, & seated at the window with citizeness Jullien, wife
of the representative Jullien, for whom I am drawing this piece.” David was, of course, an artist, but also a brother in La Modération, whose wife, Charlotte Pécoul, had been initiated into its adoption lodge and served as its oratrice (woman orator), an important leadership position. 178 With or without Jullien’s
knowledge, masonry literally ventured into her home to bear witness to a stunning historical moment.

From the available evidence, it appears that an incipient civil society in eighteenth-century France mediated features of gender relations in associational life. This sociability, especially its social networks, changed over time as women (and men) conceived something of a collective ethos. Freemasonry, as practiced by the women most closely associated with the craft, reveals how social class, region, and rite could affect the sexual hierarchy: the higher the social status, the farther away from Paris, and the more mystical the rituals, the more flexible that hierarchy became, permitting certain individuals more agency than would seem possible in a fraternal organization. The lodges La Candeur and Les Neuf Sœurs in Paris, La Concorde in Dijon, and Les Chevaliers Maçons des Élus Coëns de l’Univers in Lyon, for example, provided opportunities for aristocrats (in Paris and Dijon) and wealthy bourgeois (in Lyon) to exercise more sway in their lodges than the statutes accorded them. Their relationships with other women at the margins of masonry—family members, salon-keepers, friends, and neighbors, particularly those who attended social and cultural events sponsored by the lodges—raised the likelihood that women charted a larger place in public life for themselves. It seems quite possible that individuals who would otherwise have no connection at all with masonry were drawn into its sphere of influence, whose context during the revolution turned much more political, ironically, when all lodges lost sisters and many lodges ceased functioning. What seemed inconsequential actually became substantial as the pressures of revolutionary events bore down on everyday life, fatally for some, irrevocably for all.

Masonry’s gendered contribution to civil society in eighteenth-century France is well worth considering to illustrate its web of relationships and the historical implications for its women. Such is the case of Charles d’Éon de Beaumont, Chevalier d’Éon (1728–1810), a freemason since 1768, who embodies the themes of the present chapter. This cross-dressing nobleman from Tonnerre southeast of Paris was hardly unique in French society—recent historians have shown just how fluid gender identities were in France—but Éon managed to crisscross their boundaries in unexpected ways. At first, as a member of the foreign service, he used women’s clothes to disguise his espionage on behalf of Louis XV in Saint Petersburg and London. Eventually he decided to continue this ruse long after it was necessary. He adopted a bifurcated persona and earned some notoriety in the London press, much of it satirical, when in 1771 a public bet was made on his sex. By 1775, Éon’s return to France required royal consent to approve a pension
and other payments negotiated by a better-known colleague in the King’s Secret Service, Pierre-Caron de Beaumarchais. The new king, Louis XVI, insisted that Éon’s repatriation be conditional upon his staying dressed as a woman. “All Europe learned with astonishment and with admiration that this Negotiator of consummate experience, that this Warrior of tested courage, that this Writer of such agreeable erudition & of such sound judgment, was in effect a woman,” read the transaction agreement. It was now official, Éon was a chevalière. For the next thirty-five years of her life, in France and in Britain where Éon died, she dressed appropriately. She also proudly wore on her breast, for all to see, the honorific Croix de Saint-Louis awarded only to men.

When Éon arrived home in Tonnerre by 1779, after twenty-three years of distinguished service to the king, she had finally come to terms with her identity, converted to Catholicism, and started rebuilding her mother’s estate. Such was the new normal. Well-known by her neighbors as one of the largest landowners in the area, the chevalière was accepted on her own terms. So it seems from the petition of the local masonic lodge, Les Frères Réunis, to the regional orient’s authorities for her to participate in its initiations. “Despite [her] change,” the brethren insisted, “we would have failed not only in patriotic sentiments, in ties of blood and of friendship, but also in the name of brethren.” The chevalière already knew the mysteries from her initiation in the French lodge L’Immortalité in London overseen by the Grand Orient de France. Alas, the official response is missing from the archives, and there is no record of her further role in masonry. What the masons in Tonnerre understood, however, the obedience did not.

The difference between the lodge (about a brother) and the orient (about a sister) adduces evidence of how the place of women in French masonry remained subject to change. Here as elsewhere, the craft sought to strike a balance between competing principles of brotherhood: Was fraternity specific to men or was it general to all humankind? This woman question was addressed in each lodge, in its own way, according to the complexities of class, region, and practice. In some places, circumstances favored co-masonry (among the mystically inclined); in others, they led to separate lodges for and by women (as social elites); and in still others, they created the networks of personal relationships taking masonry beyond the lodge (as in the case of Éon, but also in those of Helvétius, Grouchy, and Jullien). In eighteenth-century France, the sociability of civil society, as exemplified by freemasonry, clearly made room and provided agency for women in public space, despite the resistance of most men and other women before the French Revolution.
Meanwhile, the chevalière struggled with her gender identity amidst occasional echoes of masonry. In the privacy of her soul-searching, Éon returned time and again to themes familiar to the craft’s cognoscenti. A draft essay, written before 1774, on the virtues of freemasonry, considered how such a fellowship, which privileged eating, drinking, and singing, “diffused the light of the sun, the consolation of God and the true Happiness in the heart of all humans sensible to simple virtue.”188 Eleven years later, from the perspective of her religious conversion as well as her gender transformation, the chevalière maintained her faith in masonry’s quest for virtue. “God is the first principle of all things by which everything is produced and everything moves,” she informed Duchesse de Montmorenci-Bouteville in 1785. “The principles of honor [as the masons knew them] can only come from a moral code, and the principles of conscience [as Éon had come to know them] only from religion.”189 In the secrecy of her atelier and of her conscience, the chevalière unveiled who she was and what she believed in the context of keeping virtue a private, personal concern.190

It was this same belief in inner goodness, at first masonic, later Catholic, that appeared in Éon’s championing of causes she held dear. She did so in her new incarnation as a Christian woman, much like the androgynous Jeanne d’Arc and the apocryphal Pope Joan during the Middle Ages.191 Éon was deeply committed to the possibility that gender identity, however malleable, was no bar to sanctity in this life or the next. As she explored at length in her incomplete autobiographical writings (left unpublished when she died in 1810), she created a virtual lodge-cum-convent, a “space where [she] could experiment with male and female attributes and still retain [her] virtuous virginity . . . space within which [she] could explore [her] ambivalence toward gender.”192 The chevalière’s former masonic experience, hardly inhibiting this exploration, seems to have factored in it. It captured, despite herself, the changing gender relations in the lodges for French women of the eighteenth century, much as they understood who they were and what they believed in a maturing sense of responsibility to others. Before and after the French Revolution, the chevalière d’Éon and others like her experienced a compelling transition in the early history of civil society in France.
**CHAPTER 2**

The Craft’s Long March to Mixed Orders, 1799–1901

In the fall of 1805, as Emperor Napoléon I and his Grande Armée hastened to engage Austrian forces in Bavaria, Empress Joséphine was entrusted with continuing to elicit domestic support for the newly created First Empire. This task of hers meant an official visit to Strasbourg that same year. Joséphine looked forward to being the guest of honor at a masonic adoption ceremony there; the initiation was to be a grand celebration. A freemason herself since at least 1790, the empress took special pleasure on such occasions. Besides sustaining dizzying rounds of parades, concerts, balls, and receptions of foreign and local dignitaries, including a premiere performance of Gaspare Spontini’s opera *La Vestale* (*The Vestal Virgin*), Joséphine soon learned what had happened to masonry for women since the revolution. It had become instrumental, that is, almost exclusively ceremonial, and its reinforcement of women’s subordination far more marked. Adoption had transitioned to one more manifestation of the empire’s consolidation of social control, a ritual “apotheosis of . . . sexual separation and inequality,” to appropriate historian Robert Nye’s appraisal of the Civil Code of 1804.

The initiation festival in October 1805 reflected this shift in masonry’s practices. The lodge’s name alluded to the new regime, the Loge Impériale des Francs Chevaliers, receiving its authorization from the orient in Paris, not in Strasbourg. As the French state centralized, so did freemasonry. The published account of the tenue that Joséphine attended made this fact even more obvious; on the title page, an imperial eagle hovered by the lodge’s motto: *L’Empereur, Dieu, Les Dames* (*The Emperor, God, The Ladies*). A second title page explained that the publication was “to invite obliging S[sisters],” such as Grande Maîtresse Louise Sybille Ochs, Baronne de Dietrich, widow of Strasbourg’s mayor during the revolution, “to embellish the Garden by the charm of their presence.” The temple was transformed into a stylized Eden; and the two speeches after the initiation of Félicité de Carbonnel de Canisy, the distinguished lady of honor in Joséphine’s court, provided the rationale for this new setting. “The Majesty
of the Throne, tempered by the Empress’s graces, gives all hearts this love which constitutes the strength of Sovereigns and the happiness of Peoples,” declaimed the first orator Mathieu Favier, a commissioner for the criminal court in Strasbourg. The second speaker, François Jaubert, member of the tribunal in Paris, led the lodge in a variation on a familiar masonic chant: “To express our sentiments, one word is enough: Éva is our motto, for us Éva is ‘Long live Joséphine!’ . . . ‘Long live Napoléon!’” Here in one grand moment were conjoined sociability and gallantry in the service of imperial politics.

These modifications affected freemasonry generally, not just lodges of adoption. They also reflected the deliberate policy of a new authoritarian regime. Soon after Bonaparte declared the end to revolution during his Brumaire coup d’état in Year VIII (November 9, 1799), he sought to create an administrative police state and to refashion French society in its interest. The coup was the first step toward fusing loyal and compliant elites drawn from select members of the Old Regime’s nobility and many more from the notability created since 1789. In keeping with the first consul’s plans in 1802 to found the new regime on “masses of granite,” such as the departmental prefects and the Légion d’Honneur, masonry was no longer the expression of civic morality; it was marshalled explicitly in support of the state. Lodges soon flourished under the watchful eye of the emperor’s designated Grand Maître du Grand Orient, Joseph Bonaparte, who worked with his deputies, Jean-Jacques-Régis Cambacérès and Alexandre-Louis Roëttiers de Montaleau, to administer a reorganized Grand Orient de France from 1803 to 1814. Independent Scottish Rite lodges fell under the aegis of Alexandre de Grasse-Tilly’s Suprême Conseil de France (SCF) overseen by Louis Bonaparte to ensure loyalty to the regime. At the same time, Joséphine was appointed Grande Maîtresse des Loges d’Adoption en France. Napoléon’s rise to power, in short, entailed a revival of freemasonry and the role that women played in it, but the state now impressed the craft to its own ends. Despite masonry’s lease on its former glory—with 1,219 lodges and chapters by the end of the empire—its contribution to France’s civil society was much diminished. By 1811, masons were little more than “a crowd of devoted servants.”

Thus marked the beginning of a new era of masonic life for women, one much altered from its gendered variations before 1789. For nearly a century, with exceptions among Saint-Simonians during the Restoration and July Monarchies and social networks in the Third Republic, masonry put its sisters on display in the name of another ideal defined by men and by their efforts to restrict women’s activities to the domestic sphere. It directed their accomplishments to a singular purpose that did not foster women’s independence in public. In this way,
the craft became an instrument for sustaining male domination. But the sociability of masonry was instrumental in another way. In spite of their relegation to masonic ornamentation, or rather because of it, women increasingly seized upon an objective of their own: a redefined participation that would ultimately evolve into new forms—mixed masonry and lodges for women only. Some seventy years later, in the first decades of the Third Republic, activists like Maria Deraismes and Léon Richer would recast the craft. As Deraismes put it in 1882 to a temple full of men, “we like it here, we’ll stay a while.” These pioneers would conduce substantially to the growth of the women’s movement by the fin de siècle; their masonry was not a repudiation of the nineteenth century’s adoption rituals so much as a culmination of women’s rising aspirations for individual and collective agency. The elaborate imperial ceremonies in Strasbourg can thus be seen as a prelude, a preamble if you will, to the development of a new masonry, one of and for men and women both.

Variations on Mixed Orders and Adoption Lodges

Slowly, after the “Reign of Terror” in 1793–94, freemasonry revived, lodge by lodge, beginning with those affiliated with the Grande Loge de Clermont, “under the auspices of nature, the law and the republican government.” The Grand Orient elected Roëttiers de Montaleau as its grand vénérable, who bravely supported the renewal despite close police surveillance. Like all associations with twenty or more members, masonry was tolerated so long as it did not disturb public order, even though in some towns—Châlons-sur-Saône, Reims, Toulon, and Valognes, in particular—it remained deeply suspect. New impetus came from agreement between the Grande Loge de Clermont and the Grand Orient in 1799 to combine into one obedience under Roëttiers de Montaleau’s guidance. A year later there were as many as seventy-four lodges in France working degrees, up from just eighteen in 1796. With Bonaparte’s rapid rise to power as first consul and then as emperor, masonry returned to its former prominence of the 1780s, albeit with a very different ethos: to support the regime and the military during the empire’s numerous wars with the rest of Europe. In historian Albert Lantoine’s apt turn of phrase, Napoléon’s imperial ambitions were realized with the help of the regimental lodges “beneath the French angle.” Masonry was no longer a conspicuous feature of the bourgeois public sphere as Jürgen Habermas described it for the eighteenth century; it played much less of a role in France’s political culture under its first modern authoritarian regime. In a quirk of historical fate, a much diminished but independent craft would participate more
fully in civil society, such as it was, under the ensuing monachies than it did under France’s first Napoleonic Empire.

The return of monarchical rule after Waterloo in 1815 disappointed many masons in large part because the influential ultraroyalists blamed them for the revolution and its bloody aftermath. Among the aristocratic émigrés, this conspiratorial myth was taken as sacred writ, notwithstanding ample evidence to the contrary, such as the initiation of Duchesse de Bourbon and the future king Louis XVIII. Nearly the entire Bonaparte family participated; for the bien-pensant that was proof enough. Close prefectural and police surveillance of masonic activities continued long after the First Republic and the First Empire had disappeared, despite Louis XVIII’s hand-picked Grand Commandeur of the Suprême Conseil de France, Élie Decazes (1818–21, 1838–60). But it did not take long for masonic conspirators, such as the Charbonnerie, to make their presence known. Die-hard revolutionaries, like Auguste Blanqui and Armand Barbès, and utopian communities, like the Saint-Simonians, adopted their practices of exclusivity and federated organization well into the July Monarchy.18

Although the vast majority of masons thought more about initiations and sociable gatherings than they did about radical politics, they were deemed guilty by association. This unwarranted reputation pushed the most apolitical of lodges—and their affiliated sisters—into ever more inconsequence after the July Revolution of 1830.19 Their idealism muted, only 278 lodges were operating in 1832. (Re)adopting in 1848 the revolutionary slogan—Liberty, Equality, Fraternity—masons embraced the Second Republic until they were repressed and then tightly regulated by the Second Empire under a succession of grands maîtres appointed by Napoléon III.20 During the Paris Commune, they reappeared and eventually thrived under the long Third Republic, the most mason-friendly regime in French history.21 At long last, after fifty years of cautious activity, free-masons would finally enjoy unfettered activity, not unlike that of professional organizations, political parties, labor unions, and interest groups, well before the Waldeck-Rousseau law in 1901 guaranteed the right to association. Masonry for both men and women, in at least 470 officially authorized lodges, finally came into its own on the eve of World War I.

As Pierre Rosanvallon has shown, the nineteenth century’s efforts to curtail French associations clearly did not succeed, allowing much freer access to them than earlier historians have recognized. But the question is, exactly what kind of sociability did women have? Whatever the apparent failures of seven different regimes, the male-dominated sexual hierarchy, documented by the Napoleonic Code, remained intact. With the Bourbon Restoration, for instance,
conservative social norms reinforced the legal codification of married women’s subordination to curb mixed and adoption rites. “The adoption lodges,” writes the historian Françoise Jupeau-Réquillard, “gave way to adoption ceremonies.”

Initiations were no longer the centerpiece of women’s new roles; children—louvetons in masonic parlance—shared the stage with their mothers as a general audience of friends and neighbors, not all of whom were masons, waited politely for the ceremony and speeches to end and for the evening’s festivities to begin. The masonic character to the initiations also disappeared. The working of degrees for women nearly ceased altogether for much of the nineteenth century, as the focus shifted from the initiatory lives of sisterhood to the collective celebration of families; the temples were left almost exclusively for the brethren to work their own degrees and to socialize among themselves. “Although this is a long period [1815–1870],” the historian Jan Snoek notes, “rituals for Adoption lodges from this time are rare, reflecting the fading prominence of the phenomenon.”

Their vogue had passed.

In lieu of previous practices—especially the masonic partnership of brothers and sisters—there arose a new type of sociability whose instrumental qualities had changed. This trend was especially marked outside of Paris. Individual responsibility to community, which underlay the many gendered variations in masonry before the revolution, gave way to a more domestic emphasis on individual responsibility to the household, which defined the nature of masonry long afterward. Revised, standardized rituals and conventional masonic discourse indicate as much. “The dresses of a swarm of our Sisters were delightfully fresh,” states one typically insipid account of a tenue blanche (public ceremony) in 1853. But there is much to be said for Georg Simmel’s view of sociability as inherently pleasant as well as purposeful that underlies the new culture of women’s participation in masonry. What appears is a very different civil society in which women were more symbolic than active, more ideal than real, more subaltern than egalitarian, even though a number of them embraced the social side to masonry in the nineteenth century and eventually turned it to a new, more public objective. A closer look at the array of orders and lodges reveals this new tendency from the First Empire to the Third Republic.

Adoption’s brief revival began under the Directory. There were initiations by no fewer than three lodges, most notably the Océan Française in 1799, to which the Consulate added seven more, like Amitié and Vraie Union, by 1804. Much of this renewed interest resulted from the repatriation of aristocratic émigrés, who recalled the glamour and charity of masonry for women during the Old Regime. These privileged elites had been concentrated in just thirty lodges in
Paris and were ill-disposed to the independent ideas of the royal court, the literary salons, and the provincial centers of parlementaire resistance to the king before 1789. Consequently, the empire set the tone for a worldly masonry driven by a good measure of nostalgia for another era, especially in exclusive lodges like Anacréon, Saint-Eugène, and Sainte-Josphine. The rites they worked were throwbacks to those collected by Louis Guillemin de Saint-Victor before the revolution and subsequently by E. J. Chappron and others. With only some exaggeration did historian René Le Forestier observe, “In yet another paradox, [the craft] found itself again, coming out of its torpor, much as it was before: with its degrees, its ceremonies, its emblems, its jargon, its theoretical humanitarianism, both sentimental and rhetorical.” In these lodges, brothers spoke on behalf of sisters, who rarely spoke at all; and when women did speak, they never strayed from prescribed sentiments. Two new variations on initiation were instituted by the Impériale des Francs Chevaliers (one of whose ceremonies was open to the public) and the Écossaise de la Vraie Réunion (a lodge reserved for former royalist and aristocratic émigré women), which expanded the number of degrees. Otherwise, the seeds of adoption’s demise were planted early in the Consulate.

Emblematic of the First Empire’s masonry is the lodge La Colombe. It was renamed Sainte-Caroline in 1805 after Napoléon’s sister in a gesture appropriate to the state’s use of the craft to rally support from the regime’s new elites. There were no fewer than nineteen such eponymous lodges in France and another nineteen elsewhere in the empire, so many in fact that Jean-Claude Béuchet de Saunois, an early historian of masonry, believed Napoleonic rites were created just for them. In the social profile of its members, drawn in large part from the empress’s court, Sainte-Caroline was the imperial equivalent of La Candeur before the revolution. An old-school noblewoman, Princesse de Vaudémont, presided over the elaborate working of adoption degrees at the annual tenues, whose lavish elegance impressed even Charles-Maurice de Talleyrand-Périgord’s first biographer. “The lodge welcomed warmly all there was in Paris of brilliant, pretty, elegant, and agreeable ladies,” Charles-Maxime de Villemarest reported. “As for the masonic activities of the privileged lodge, we must believe that they were deliberately dedicated to pleasure, because for a long time it was mostly a matter of the brilliant parties that [the lodge] organized in Paris.” Banquets, concerts, balls, and philanthropy all evinced this Napoléonolatrie, one expressed by the plethora of verses offered by the regime’s obsequious poetasters. In this vein Jean-Louis Brad described the initiation of Venus: “Hasten everyone, Love, Grace, Pleasures, / You whose Cythère is the endearing domain; / The fairest day of your fine queen / In a moment will fulfill all wishes.” Given how dedicated
these lodges were to glorifying the empire, it is easy to see how 80 percent of the maçonnes disappeared from the registers soon after the regime fell in 1814. Imperial masonry, especially the regimental lodges, also came and went with the empire, but other innovations did not last very long, either. For example, paramasonic rituals, such as those for the Stricte Observance Templière’s Chevaliers de la Croix and the Rite Écossais Philosophique’s Commandeurs du Mont-Thabor, attracted a more professional, less regime-dependent membership (that still had a major change of heart in 1814). During the First Empire, thanks to their earnest founders, both groups had created distinguished lodges of adoption whose ethos was masonic in inspiration if not in symbolism. The Chevaliers defined a system of degrees, among the last of which was the chevalières professes with an appeal to women in special ceremonies. By 1810, these rituals were converted into a fully developed lodge for women with the intentions of focusing their attention on charitable work in keeping with the chivalric order of Hospitallers. According to their statutes, “the welfare exercised by a woman lavishes on all evils a moral balm that nature denied to men & that women provide variously and spontaneously.” This gendered notion was confirmed by one postulant in particular, the outspoken Soeur-Orateur [Élisabeth-Sophie] Raoul, at the lodge’s inaugural ceremony: “How sweet it is for me to be associated with this great work! I dare assure you, my Brothers and Sisters, that I will consecrate myself wholly to it.” The Dames Écossaises du Mont-Thabor was instituted toward much the same end, in order to “give bread & work to people of the female sex of good reputation, first of all to help them, then to console them, to preserve them, by the benefits of hope” whenever they yielded to sexual temptation. Such a generous gesture was given the full-throated support of the Chevaliers, as well, hailing from the same upper echelons of imperial society as the affiliated Sainte-Caroline.

Perhaps the only mixed masonry from the period was the curious Ordre Sacré des Sophisiens. It was established in 1800 as part of Les Frères Artistes in Paris but soon developed statutes and rituals of its own, thanks to the French fascination with Egypt after Napoléon’s unsuccessful campaign there in 1799. A rash of regimental lodges like the Impériale des Francs Chevaliers de Saint-Jean d’Acre and of oriental fraternities like the Souveraine Pyramide des Amis du Désert resulted. In its openness to women adepts, however, the Sophisiens followed Cagliostro’s Egyptian Rite before the revolution and that of the all-male Les Frères Artistes which had initiated Marie Henriette Heiniken, a.k.a. Mme. de Xaintrailles, a war hero during the Consulate. The Sophisiens craved a mythology of their own.
The order’s *Livre d’or* (*Golden Book*) provides for initiating women on the same terms as men; it also specifies parallel leadership positions for men (Isiarques) and women (Isiades). But the Sophisiennes were not listed in the membership rolls. What sketchy information we have about them comes from the printed invitations to a sumptuous celebration, an “Homage to the Ladies,” in 1821. They were often the spouses of distinguished men in Les Frères Artistes as well as the Ordre Sacré des Sophisiens, such as the artist Marie-Nicolas Ponce-Camus and the printer-publisher Auguste-François Dondey-Dupré. The robust ties of mutual adherence to a recognized masonic lodge and its paramasonic branch ensured that some ideals and practices would be shared. Accordingly, the order’s founder, Jean-Guillaume-Augustin Cuvelier de Trie, fashioned a new syncretic rite by drawing on Alexandre Lenoir’s *La Franche-maçonnerie rendue à sa véritable origine* (*Freemasonry Traced to Its Actual Origins*), which located the symbolic sources of masonry (and world religions generally) in ancient Egypt. In this way Cuvelier anticipated the more enduring Rite de Misraïm, established in 1814 by the brothers Marc, Michel, and Joseph Bédarride, as well as the Rite de Memphis, created in 1839 by Jacques-Étienne Marconis de Nègre (who expressed an intention to initiate women). The Sophisiens were thus not alone in their efforts to trace their spiritual roots in the distant past in order to define a new mixed paramasonry.

One of the most prominent mainline lodges in France was La Clémente Amitié, another of the few to survive the demise of the Napoleonic Empire to host, somewhat belatedly, its own adoption rite. Founded in 1805 under the auspices of the Grand Orient, La Clémente Amitié responded to the growing interest of women in masonry by a/f ter moving under the direction of the Suprême Conseil. Its first initiations replicated the empire’s self-conscious grandeur, ad-mixed with masonry’s serious sense of public responsibility, in the best manner of the former regime. In 1831, the lodge returned to the oversight of the Grand Orient, but could not resist putting itself again at odds with that governing body. At the behest of its vénérable, Louis-Théodore Juge, the lodge’s adoption initiation in 1838 employed the rituals for men. This was a major violation of masonic secrecy justified by Juge’s remarks during the ceremony attended by no fewer than nine hundred guests. His daring “Speech on the Emancipation of Women Considered from the Perspective of Freemasonry” asserted that the maçonne must work like her brethren “for the love of her fellows, . . . [for] . . . the cult of virtue and . . . [for] the moral regeneration of civil society”; in so doing, everyone abides by masonic principles as opposed to “the apparent misogyny” of Jean-Jacques Rousseau and “the utopian fantasies” of Charles Fourier.
the proper initiation rituals would facilitate this fraternal partnership to make a better world, so Juge believed, in the same spirit as the lodge’s poet-in-residence, Désirée Pacault, who had composed an elegy for the occasion. “The poet,” she rhymed, “lives only in the midst of silence: / No one else knows of his reclusive existence”; but his work, like masonry for women, is immortal. Four years later, the lodge dropped the initiative and adopted instead the festive family celebrations that other masons had embraced. Evidently, Juge envisaged too ambitious a vision for the craft.

Masonry during the empire had thus set the tone for women’s participation for a good seventy-five years (see ill. 1). On the one hand, the brethren defined the chivalrous terms for their partners in the lodge; they vaunted their beauty, virtue, grace, and generosity, albeit in a subordinate relationship that was implicitly understood. On the other hand, the poetry and song created for initiation ceremonies, nearly all written by men, made this inequality overt. According to typical lyrics, first sung during a tenue in 1804, addressed the women in Le Zèle of Paris,

Charming Sisters, whom Nature
Made to embellish the points of our compass
And who, beautiful without deception,
Owe your sweet attractions to it:
In you whom nothing obliges,
Everything charms the heart and the eyes.

Despite the tortured French syntax, the drift is clear: the sisters are a masonic ornament, a valuable one no doubt, but still very much less than an equal partner in the craft’s working of degrees, its principal means of spreading enlightenment in a profane society. Here the verses highlight a familiar, gendered message for both brothers and sisters.

This piece appeared in a collection of unremarkable poetics, but it did include one intriguing exception. After some fifty pages of stilted poetry, all by frères, one Soeur Cathelin introduces a dissonant note. In lieu of the brethren’s patronizing, her stanzas celebrate the masonry that she and the other sisters shaped by their initiation. She addresses the assembled men,

In your respected secrets,
 Few women are admitted;
If the vulgar ones speak ill of them,
One must distrust their outbursts.
Worthy of your deference,
And to share your works,
We abjure the vaunted flaws
Of the ever-flattered sex.\textsuperscript{50}

In brief, men mistake the women in their midst, most of them close family members, who do not fall for false gallantry. Instead of scolding the brethren, however, Cathelin turns to her sisters, finding in “prudence and candor . . . the tie that links you” to the brothers, of course, but also to the other sisters in the lodge.\textsuperscript{51} Its unity truly matters. Through comparable relations with the grand maître, “whom we love as a father,” the familial gathering of masonry advances a special blend of hierarchy and comity, to the extent that elements of it—sociability, charity, and fellowship—survived the selective loss of women’s responsibility and agency thanks to the revolution and the empire.\textsuperscript{52} So it would seem from the few words that the soeurs felt entitled to speak in their lodges.

Other expressions of women’s special interests in masonry appear in the record every now and then. For example, in November 1806, the sisters initiated in Strasbourg the previous year under the auspices of Empress Joséphine requested to be attached to a local lodge, La Concorde. One-time, public ceremonies, like the one described at the beginning of this chapter, left the women subject to the Impériale des Francs Chevaliers far away in Paris. They much preferred a more attentive mère-loge in Strasbourg. Toward this end, their petition was drafted and submitted by the grande maîtresse, Baronne de Dietrich, to the men of La Concorde. The sisters “are proposing to take the Title of an Adoption Lodge by the name of Joséphine de la Bienfaisance,” she wrote tactfully.\textsuperscript{53} The next dossier in the file indicates that the brethren decided, without discussion or opposition, to incorporate the unaffiliated sisters directly into their lodge; and they did so, as Dietrich’s petition stated, “in order to cooperate with you for the relief of suffering Humanity.”\textsuperscript{54} Their earnest sentiment deserves to be taken at face value.

A similar leeway in women’s masonic governance appears in the 1820 statutes of an unnamed adoption lodge in Nancy (according to app. 2, there had been at least two, overseen by Saint-Louis and Les Bons Amis, before the revolution). The hand-written document suggests that the women themselves had a role in framing the rules, “since they contravene nothing in the principal beliefs of the order.”\textsuperscript{55} A sense of community, solidarity rather, is also expressed forthrightly in the ceremonial recitation of the candidate’s obligation for the featured sublime écossaise degree: “I promise to love, protect and imitate my brothers and sisters on all occasions even at the peril of my life.”\textsuperscript{56} This manuscript is most
similar to the one prepared for the elite members of La Candeur in Paris; it reflects carefully calibrated efforts to adapt the lodge’s practices to the sisters’ own inclinations even as they worked the degrees in the presence of their brothers. Within this tight fraternity, the women claimed space of their own, however limited, in their obligations to themselves and to the brethren everywhere, not just in Nancy.

The further removed from the masonry regulated by the Grand Orient and the Suprême Conseil, it seems, the more innovative became the rituals and the larger the responsibilities accorded to the female initiates. It is as if masonry were too conservative in word and deed to accommodate the community that women sought. This trend applies to nearly the entire nineteenth century. There developed considerable variation on the craft, often by the brethren on their sisters’ behalf, beyond the acknowledgment (much less recognition) by a mainline obedience. Such appears to underlie the curious connection of masonry to the highly influential Saint-Simonian movement (see app. 4).

Barthélemy-Prosper Enfantin’s charismatic leadership of the related sect in the late Restoration and early July Monarchies (1825–36) drew a disproportionate number of female adepts, as many as 430 in Paris and Lyon by 1832.57 They joined a cluster of freemasons like Claude-Henri de Rouvroy, Comte de Saint-Simon and his other disciples Saint-Amand Bazard, Philippe Buchez, and Gustave d’Eichthal.58 Their advocacy of a positive exploitation of the world by association, in lieu of the negative exploitation of man by man, echoes a fundamental masonic principle of enlightened solidarity. Both utopians and masons sought to address problems posed by social dissolution in the wake of political and industrial revolution, notwithstanding the heretical Saint-Simonian religion—“the New Christianity,” as Saint-Simon likened it—practiced by its most enthusiastic adherents.59 Freemasons like Juge had serious reservations about the socialists; but to other masons, like T.-F. Bègue Clavel and Pierre Leroux, the craft itself needed reform if it were to be taken seriously as an agent of progress. All the same, Saint-Simonianism, the creation of several socially conscious masons, provided a controversial but instructive lesson in obligations to others. This lesson was evident in the epigraph of the movement’s best-known newspaper, Le Globe: “Social institutions must have as a goal the moral, intellectual, and physical amelioration of the most numerous and poorest social class. Privileges by birth, without exception, will be abolished. To each according to his capacity, to each capacity according to his work.” As the historical record shows, this precept was meant to be inclusive.

The parallels and borrowings from masonry by Saint-Simonianism are numerous, including the role of women.60 Saint-Simon had said almost nothing
about them, but his disciples, especially Enfantin, actively recruited them into their organization (variously known as a school, a family, a church, and a cult) until internal differences, financial problems, and criminal charges splintered the sect in 1831–32. Before then, while its adepts lived at the Hôtel de Gesvres on the rue Monsigny in Paris, women were chosen for key positions in the privy council—Claire Bazard—and in the college—Cécile Fournel, Eugénie Niboyet, and Aglaé Saint-Hilaire, among them. They shared in the oversight of regular mason-like ordinations to second, third, and preparatory degrees of responsibility for the group’s operations, such as the “family houses” in every Parisian arrondissement. This group’s hierarchy resembled a grand orient in its ties to daughter branches in other French towns like Lyon. The Saint-Simonian doctrine itself was derived from Enlightenment ideals of equality and fraternity, to the extent that they guided the organization to progressive reform, according to the principles of the New Christianity.

Ultimately, the Saint Simonians sought to restore the social fabric by a technocratic elite, the acclaimed “artist, savant, and industrialist,” whose authority Rodrigues promoted. Although women were not counted among these visionaries, a few benefited directly from their generosity; years later Julie Victoire Daubié became the first French bachelière (female baccalauréat) with the support of the Lyonnais businessman and Saint-Simonian François Arlès-Dufour. After their exclusion from the organization and the men moved to Ménilmontant, Saint-Simonian women edited their own journal under various titles. Suzanne Voilquin’s Tribune des femmes (1832–34, The Women’s Tribunal), for instance, detailed their economic concerns about the new society. Thanks to Enfantin’s obsessive documentation, this mixed community made possible the copious Saint-Simonian archives at the Arsenal Library of Paris, in size and scope comparable to the masonic collection in the National Library of France. It is replete with the participating women’s writings to form the basis for studying their activism—and discontent—in the Romantic period.

The Saint-Simonians were far from the only utopians to accord women more opportunity to participate in public space resembling the one provided by masonry. Charles Fourier’s protégé Victor Considerant, a polytechnicien and freemason since 1832, sought to rethink the role of women in social relations. He was converted to Fourierism by Clarisse Vigoureux, who subsequently became his mother-in-law and partner in establishing the La Réunion phalanstery near Dallas, Texas, before the American Civil War (which weighed in Vigoureux’s decline and death). But Considerant and Vigoureux were just two of the many ardent reformers with ties to masonry in the first half of the nineteenth
century. Already in 1822, for example, François-Vincent Raspail had called on the adoption lodge of Les Amis Réunis to embrace Saint Liberty; even though he did not champion women’s emancipation per se, his impassioned appeal was addressed to them in particular.67 Similarly, Pierre Leroux, another visionary mason, worked with Saint-Simonians on their newspaper Le Globe (not to be confused with the one by the same name dedicated to the craft) to circulate various utopian proposals worthy of various female readers like the mutualist Pauline Roland and the novelist George Sand.68

As the objects of such special attention, women were caught up in the wave of discussion about the need for radical change; and they took advantage of the revolutionary events in spring 1848 to demand their political rights.69 Eugénie Niboyet (1796–1883) and her fellow Saint-Simoniennes—Suzanne Voïlquin (1801–77), Élisa Lemonnier (1805–65), Pauline Roland (1805–52), Désirée Gay (née Véret, 1810–91), and Jeanne Deroin (1805–94)—joined with occasional contributors like Jenny P. d’Héricourt (Jeanne-Marie-Fabienne Poinsard) to produce a newspaper, La Voix des femmes (The Voice of Women). Together they pushed hard for women’s suffrage, an issue that the Fourierist Considerant brought before the National Constituent Assembly in June to no avail.70 A convinced Christian Socialist looking to the longer term, the likely (though later) masonic initiate Deroin wrote eloquently on the fraternity required for France’s moral regeneration; it followed from “woman’s mission . . . to realize the kingdom of God on earth, the reign of brotherhood and universal harmony,” a vision akin to that of the craft and the Saint-Simonians.71 Here, after a half century of near absence from public space, some women re-engaged with an emerging French civil society; and they did so in the context of a growing web of relationships, thanks to their manifold connections with freemasonry.72

Freemason Women’s Expanding Social Networks in the Nineteenth Century

The First Empire, no doubt, marked the appearance of new elites whose turnover accelerated as the nineteenth century progressed. The older nobility, émigré remnants of the Old Regime, remained prominent during the Restoration. But with the July Revolution, the Bourbon supporters among them returned to private life altogether, often to their country estates, in disdain for the self-proclaimed bourgeois monarch, Louis-Philippe d’Orléans. In their place stepped the new notability, i.e., the aristocracy created by service to the empire, the wealthy bankers and industrialists in a new economy, and the large landowners whose
speculations enabled them to acquire the domains of former peers of the realm. But these new men and women did not embrace freemasonry with anything like the fervor of their titled counterparts before 1789. After the fashionable lodges of the empire disappeared with the regime these elites ostensibly supported, the Restoration and Bourgeois Monarchies’ repressive tendencies discouraged their interest in such associations under police surveillance. According to historian André-Jean Tudesq, fully 20 percent of the Chamber of Peers in 1840 had been masons, but they were no longer active. At most they held honorific positions in the Suprême Conseil. The craft now attracted men (and women) of more modest social standing: members of the traditional professional bourgeoisie, businessmen in commerce and older manufacturing sectors, and independent landowners who leased out their farms. These new brethren came to freemasonry out of loyalty to local traditions of fellowship and, where their families were involved, to sentimental ties at home. For instance, by 1841 a satire of masonic life in Paris featured not a freethinking count but an amiable grocer, M. Badoulard, and his inquisitive wife. His lodge, she learned, harbored “overseas commercial agents . . . merchants without much business, unassuming men living on their investments, employees in the ministries and in the wings of investment banking . . . industrialists, artists of all sorts, secondary employees, shopkeepers, and honest workers,” but no one to impress Mme. Badoulard.

This changing societal context after the empire is reflected in the lodges where women (femmes, not dames) felt welcome. With a few exceptions—such as in La Clément Amitié, as mentioned earlier, but also L’Arc-en-Ciel in the obedience of the Misraïm under the personal supervision of the Bédarride brothers since 1815—the grand ladies of the Old Regime and imperial notability disappeared from masonry. There were now fewer women of independent standing; rather, there were the wives, sisters, and daughters beholden to the nineteenth century’s domestic ideology of a self-consciously bourgeois brotherhood. Because these women did not have lodges of their own and were not initiated by any authorized ritual, they were generally on display with and for their family members; and they left very few, mostly unrepresentative accounts of their masonic experiences. The gracious remarks by a leading lady of the lodge, with no formal title, tended to be offered during ceremonies with little in common other than fancy clothes and grand eloquence. As Esther Salvador rejoiced at a Misraim ceremony in 1819, “Our solicitude is ever ready . . . All[elujah]! All[elujah]! All[elujah]!” Very little else is known about her. In time the women were no more notable than their children at the same gathering. This phenomenon existed even among the lodges, such as Jérusalem des Vallées Égyptiennes, that adoption enthusiasts
like Jean-Pierre Simon Boubée and César Moreau created in the 1830s. Such masonic anachronisms soon reverted to family affairs; the sisters remained just as faceless and self-effacing as they had been, a neglected aspect of masonry, for more than twenty years. It is hard to imagine any social capital they acquired apart from their families.77

It is thus all the more striking to encounter such august figures as Louise-Auguste-Élisabeth-Marie-Colette de Montmorency, Princesse de Vaudémont (1763–1833), from one of the oldest, most prominent aristocratic families in France still associated with masonry after the revolution.78 Much of this lingering allegiance to the craft was owing to her fellow masons, such as Louis-Philippe d’Orléans II, the Grand Maître du Grande Loge de France, and Talleyrand-Périgord, her closest political confidant, off and on, right into the early July Monarchy. For years, during the First Empire, she was the grande maîtresse of the Sainte-Caroline adoption lodge, which exemplified the maçonnerie de mondanité (high-society masonry) whose elaborate ceremonies had attracted the attention of the old and new elite.79 In 1807, she presided over a particularly noteworthy adoption initiation; the guest list included the Grand Orient’s Grand Maître Cambacérès, accompanied by Comte Michel Regnaud de Saint-Jean d’Angély, another imperial notable, in addition to more than four dozen women with particles to their names. “One found there all the etiquette of the court united with the most refined elegance and politeness,” as historian Pierre Chevallier put it.81 Such sociability may have been the principal reason why the princesse deviated from her otherwise inflexible routine of maintaining a salon every day of the week and still retiring for the evening precisely at 9:00 p.m.82

Vaudémont’s calculated network of seemingly incompatible relationships helped her political influence to persist after the Old Regime.83 In the first years of the revolution, her willingness to promote a constitutional monarchy allied her with Philippe Égalité until his imminent demise forced her to emigrate in 1791. Her legitimist husband, Joseph-Marie de Lorraine, left her to join the Austrian forces against France, so the princesse’s return to France during the Consulate lent Napoléon’s regime some credibility, but it also hid from the emperor her intent, with Marquis de Boigelin, Talleyrand-Périgord, Emmerich de Dalberg, and Baron de Vitrolles, to restore a Bourbon monarchy in 1814. This opportunism, at least as Vaudémont’s conservative peers viewed it, was of little use to her politically during the Restoration and the
increasing recklessness of the ultraroyalists. Louis-Philippe’s unexpected rise to power in 1830, however, made her contacts with the Orléanistes, especially Madame Adélaïde, of keen value to Talleyrand-Périgord once again. It is no surprise then that his memoirs append copies of his letters to Vaudémont on matters of state. “When a country like ours is far from peaceful, the others should remain stable,” he wrote from London at the death of King George IV. Despite her diminutive stature—a physical disability like Talleyrand’s deceptive lameness—Vaudémont played an active role, by the transmission of secret correspondence, in the transition to the July Monarchy. In this way, her many and varied masonic connections meshed with Talleyrand’s to overcome intractable political conflicts.

During the Restoration, few women seemed courageous or foolish enough to participate in freemasonry, and those who did had an obvious personal motive. For most sisters, it was a family matter; but for a few others, it was a more public one. Sydney Owenson, Lady Morgan (1781–1859), was among these latter figures. She is unusual here because she was not French but Irish, though she had written a book about France based on her extended visit there in 1816. Nor was Morgan particularly committed to the craft at first. Her initiation in the lodge Belle et Bonne during an adoption ceremony at the Hôtel de Villette—the townhouse of Voltaire’s adopted daughter—seemed incidental to her visit to Paris in 1819 (see ill. 3). Her most reliable source of information, Comtesse de La Rochefoucault-Liancourt, was not at home the day before the ceremony to tell her “whether we are going to faire nos farces [play parlor games] or whether to assist at a political reunion.” Morgan soon discovered how serious the occasion was in some illustrious company; she mentions, among others, the monarchist Frédéric Gaetan de La Rochefoucault-Liancourt, the archeologist Dominique Vivant Dénon, the actor François-Joseph Talma, and the general Mathieu de Favier. What impressed her most, however, was the sincerity of the female postulants. “That so many women, young and beautiful and worldly should never have revealed the secret, is among the miracles which the much-distrusted sex are capable of working,” she enthused in appreciation of the two-hour event, which gave the grande maîtresse, Marquise de Villette, a chance to speak at length. Morgan’s admiration for this lodge during Louis XVIII’s brief flirtation with Decazes’s liberalism survived long after its rituals.

Lady Morgan’s engagement with the craft is also worth noting because of the interest that the police took in her ten years later. It was bad enough that her travel book had been so critical of the Bourbons. But by 1829 she had also become a proponent for Irish emancipation. Worse, her visit to the French
capital coincided with the transition to the reactionary Polignac ministry. A spy, normally assigned to freemason lodges, reported on the banquet of republican notables headed by Rosalie Jullien’s eldest son, “Jules,” which Lady Morgan, her husband, and niece attended.90 “At the end of the third service, M. Jullien, the master of ceremonies, requested silence to propose a toast in honor of Lady Morgan, first of all as an author of European reputation and then as a representative of Ireland whose emancipation was to be the happy anticipation [sic] of a regeneration everywhere. France and Charles X were acknowledged in the same toast,” to murmurs of disapproval from the audience.91 The implications of the report were less about masonry, still less about Lady Morgan, than they were about the political opposition to the king. But the connection was clear to the police who felt compelled to watch carefully the company kept by an otherwise innocuous freemason woman. To the authorities tracking this association more closely, she supported a still more disreputable cause during her latest trip to France; the revolutionary potential was all too real. Like Princesse de Vaudémont, Lady Morgan received more attention, not always for the right reason, because of the social capital she had developed in her on-going efforts to promote Irish culture and independence.
Far less controversial but more in keeping with specifically masonic notions was Désirée Pacault (1798–1881), a poet featured at several adoption ceremonies during the July Monarchy (see ill. 4). She was best known at the Loge Chapitrale, Aréopagiste, Française et Écossaise de la Clément Amitié, whose flamboyant vénérable, Théodore Juge, asserted the importance of masonry in the emancipation of women, as discussed earlier, but also the primacy of the craft to reform more generally. Pacault’s romantic idealism suited perfectly Juge’s cause, leading to her performances at most of the lodge’s festivities. Her voice must have had a dramatic flair that moved her brothers and sisters to more than their usual bonhomie, which was duly noted in the procès-verbaux published in *Le Globe* (edited by Juge). She also had a proclivity for dedicating poems to notable people—Princesse Constance de Salm-Dyck, Alphonse de Lamartine, King Louis-Philippe and his queen, for example—not all of whom were masons. The tone struck by her poetic work certainly appealed to the haunting melancholy in fashion at the time. And so, by her father’s tomb in their native Burgundy, Pacault wrote:

It is here that more than glory
Shines on memory
Of those who have fled;
And it is here that I put down,
By a nearly closed humble flower,
These first songs for the future!

Such familial nostalgia appealed to her supportive brothers and sisters in the lodge, evidently a company sympathetic to sensitive souls like hers.

Pacault made a modest living in Paris as a bookseller, editor, and lyricist, plus whatever she earned by her poetry. For a brief while, she edited the fashion journal *Caprice parisien* (*Parisian Whimsy*), though this publication struggled under various subtitles; *Journal des modes* (1836–37, *Fashion Journal*) soon gave way to *Journal de la lingerie* (1837, *Lingerie Journal*). A collection of published poetry, *Inspiration* (1840), earned her praise from Augustin Challamel in *La France littéraire*: “we will note some remarkable poems, like the Fable dedicated to Mme. Amable Tastu, whose fine talent does not falter.” Pacault was affiliated with three honorary associations for writers in France, one in Vienna, and another in Florence, the latter two presumably by correspondence. These extended cultural networks provided the poet literary fellowship well beyond the masonic lodge, with direct appeals to some unlikely sources, such as to Richard Cobden after the free-trade agreement he reached with the Saint-Simonian (and mason)
Michel Chevalier in 1860. In her admiration for that deal, Pacault penned lines reflective of masonic principles:

So we will be grand; so our wisdom
Will be strength and liveliness;
For we will have conquered, by brotherhood,
The peace that transforms the world and its prosperity.95

As masonry’s domestic intentions for adoption subsumed the public lives of the craft’s increasingly modest women like Pacault, their historical traces are harder to follow. But others made names for themselves. This was certainly true of the Saint-Simonians steeped in masonic practice, however far removed in time its uses grew. Some women followers, like Suzanne Voilquin, had close personal relationships with various freemasons; in Voilquin’s case, it was her husband, who also shared in the extended Saint-Simonian family. This quasi-masonic clan,
imbued with certain ideological principles and ritualistic practices, brought elements of the craft to a wider circle. It pervaded their lives while they attended the sermons on the rue Taitbout, shared meals with the residents of the rue Monsiogny, chatted with members of the college, and confided in Père Enfantin. This is particularly true for Voilquin, whose father had joined a compagnonnage during his tour of the country as a journeyman hat maker before the revolution. “This energetically social character,” she recalled appreciatively, “produced the latent seed, so to speak, of the future and made me love much later the religious thought of unending progress,” like freemasonry and Saint-Simonianism. For her, they evidently had much in common.

Distanced from this sect even before Enfantin’s trial in 1832, Voilquin and other Saint-Simonian working women, including Marie-Reine Guindorf and Désirée Gay, began writing for a larger public. Their vehicle, the weekly *La Femme libre* (*The Free Woman*) provided these proletarians the means to do so, which soon became Voilquin’s responsibility to edit when Guindorf and Gay defected to Fourierism. She altered the title to *La Tribune des femmes* to dodge the ridicule attached to “free women,” a decision that became all the wiser when Claire Démar and her male companion committed suicide in 1833. Years later Voilquin famously queried in a letter to Enfantin, “should I not finish proving to my sex that even in the midst of social conditions suffocating us, a woman can still be free in dignity and faith despite the world?” During the tragic trip to Cairo, when many in the Saint-Simonian contingent died or grew disaffected, Voilquin trained to become a midwife to help the local women, but also others back in Paris and then in Saint Petersburg where she stayed seven years (1839–1846). She returned in time to participate actively in the Revolution of 1848, writing for *La Voix des femmes* edited by Niboyet, until the conservative backlash to the June Days moved republican authorities to close their journal and political organization. Voilquin was forced into exile to New Orleans, where her sister’s family was living, for a decade in service to suffering pregnant women in antebellum Louisiana. She spent the last years of her life publishing her memoirs on the trips to Egypt and Russia. What she learned along the way was “enough to make you revolt!” she wrote in testament to her small but intense circle of women friends. Their vision of the future was inflected by the lingering legacy of masonic idealism that survived the failure of the Saint-Simonian adventure.

In fact, the enduring enthusiasm of the Saint-Simoniennes is worth noting here (see app. 4). Although their efforts to expand women’s rights in 1848 were cut short, they continued to pursue these and closely related issues, notably education and association. After the revolution, for instance, Niboyet went into
exile in Geneva where she translated books by the American abolitionist Lydia Maria Child and the Anglo-Irish educationalist Maria Edgeworth as well as the novelist Charles Dickens. She kept the faith on women’s issues, returning to France in 1860 to publish *Le Vrai Livre des femmes* (*The True Book of Women*, 1863), in which the moderate reformer Niboyet stated characteristically, “we live in *this century eager to innovate* that tried to improve more than to turn everything upside down.” Networking with other women’s rights advocates, such as Léon Richer, later editor of *Le Droit des femmes* (*Women’s Right*), she briefly published *Le Journal pour toutes* (*The Journal for All Women*) with a focus on education. Niboyet’s decades of living in relation to others would be rewarded by being recognized as a member of the craft active in the Paris Commune. Similarly, Élisa Lemonnier turned to female professional training after she and her fellow-traveler husband, Charles, had devoted themselves to the Saint-Simonian cause in Sorèze for eight years. After a shorter stay in Bordeaux, where the labor organizer Flora Tristan had died in their home during her tour of working-class France, Lemonnier and her husband moved to Paris to be in closer contact with other reform-minded organizers. Several masonic lodges soon became interested in supporting her initiatives in secular education (in lieu of the religious indoctrination empowered by the Falloux Law of 1850). So Lemonnier was not at a loss for resources, thanks to the interventions of former Saint-Simonian businessman Arlès-Dufour, but also to the Rothschild and Pereire families. Again with support from masonic lodges, she started the Société pour l’Enseignement Professionnel des Femmes in 1862 to create vocational schools for hundreds of young women. These ventures concluded her life’s work.

A lesser-known intermediary between the Owenites, the Fourierists, and the Saint-Simonians, Gay also raised money from beneficent brethren to found a clothier cooperative on the rue de la Paix in Paris. For this work she received a prize at the Exposition Universelle in 1855. When the Second Empire’s censorship forced Gay and her publisher-husband Jules to seek refuge at last in Brussels, they joined the Association International des Travailleurs. It quickly accorded her a leadership role. In keeping with her passion for primary instruction, Gay published a manual—*Éducation rationnelle de la première enfance* (*A Rational Education for Early Childhood*)—to propose a new regard for children’s socialization. “Sustained in [my] studies written by benevolent and distinguished people,” she wrote, “I have come to understand that a human being, destined for life in society, is better educated together with others.” Gay harkened to this principle in her subsequent attempts to reconcile with former members of utopian communities.
Like Gay and her fascination with women’s collective action was another Saint-Simonienne, Pauline Roland. She was committed to workers’ cooperatives, a natural outgrowth of her work with the Club Républicain des Femmes during the 1848 Revolution. Together with Deroin and Gustave Lefrançais, Roland established the Association des Instituteurs, Institutrices, et Professeurs Socialistes and then the Union des Associations de Travailleurs. These allegiances prompted her conviction and imprisonment in 1850 for illegal associational activity. When Louis-Napoléon Bonaparte staged his coup d’état in December 1851, Roland took to the streets, leading this time to her deportation to Algeria. She never recovered from the wretched conditions of her detention, despite the best efforts of George Sand and Pierre Leroux to save her. Roland’s contribution to the success of the mutualist movement, however, played a role in the emergence of a civil society during the Second Empire. As Victor Hugo penned in 1852, “Humankind was for her a family / Just as her three children were humanity. / She cried: Progress! Love! Brotherhood! / She opened sublime horizons to all who suffer.”

For Sand (1804–76) and Leroux, Roland was an acquaintance of longstanding. It probably dated from the Saint-Simonians’ quest for La Mère (the female messiah); it was an offer Sand rebuffed in July 1832 when Roland was associated with the redaction of La Femme nouvelle (The New Woman). In time, Sand learned of Roland’s writing in La Revue indépendante (The Independent Review), whose expenses she underwrote in the 1840s. Roland also sought from Sand an urgent loan to support herself and her three children during a painful separation from Jean-François Aicard in 1844. Roland’s participation in Leroux’s Fourierist phalanstery in Boussac in 1847, her involvement in La Voix des femmes during the 1848 Revolution, and finally her exile and imprisonment for socialism, feminism, and debauchery in 1852 brought Roland back to Sand’s attention in ways that once again elicited the latter’s reluctant sympathy (as a matter of principle she was appalled by Saint-Simonian free-love feminism, namely Roland’s refusal to marry either father of her children). It was thus with some ambivalence that Sand rejected the April 1848 invitation to stand for a seat in the Constituent National Assembly at the quixotic request of the Central Committee of the republican left, Roland conspicuously among them. Under the terms of women’s subaltern status inscribed in Napoléon’s Civil Code, Sand stated, there was little point in engaging in such a fruitless, self-indulgent quest for political power. “What bizarre whim led you to parliamentary combat?” she asked tartly. “All you can achieve here is the [remote] possibility of your personal independence.” These women would have been shrewder politically to invoke
the principles of the revolution in petitions to the Provisional Government (as an official delegation from the Grand Orient had done a month earlier).

The threads tying these relationships together were drawn from utopian socialist reform, the woman question debates, and freemasonry. Sand was enmeshed in a remarkable masonic web, beginning with her father, Maurice Dupin, who had been initiated while a military officer during the First Empire. Her *Histoire de ma vie* (1854–55, *The Story of My Life*) quotes in extenso her father’s letter describing the ritual in 1801. “For want of real dangers, one may seek imaginary ones, which is what inspired me to become a Freemason,” he quipped sarcastically. Although Sand never joined a lodge—she was too busy writing for a living—she studied up on the craft in preparation for her novels in the 1840s, in particular *Consuelo* (1842–43) and *La Comtesse de Rudolstadt* (1843–44); they drew heavily on Leroux’s philosophical idealism as well as his background in various fraternities besides the Saint-Simonian sect. As she remarked in a letter to Leroux in June 1843, “You have no idea what maze you have pushed me with your Freemasons and your secret societies. . . . There is so much unknown in all that, it is fine material for elaboration and invention.” In Sand’s social network, no fewer than fifty-eight (or 15 percent) of her 382 correspondents in the 1840s were, at one time or another, active freemasons: Leroux himself was in the Charbonnerie (Paris) in the 1820s, then Les Amis Réunis (Limoges) in 1848; Frédéric Degeorge had been an active recruiter for Amis de la Vérité during the Restoration Monarchy; and Adolphe Crémieux, long after his role in the Second Republic’s Provisional Government, became the Grand Commandeur du Rite Écossais Ancien et Accepté and head of the Suprême Conseil in 1869. Four others shared books on masonry. Certainly no other woman since Minette Helvétius in the 1780s and 1790s had more extensive connections to the craft than Sand (see app. 5).

Perhaps only one other maçonne approaches Sand in the extent of her masonic kinship: Juliette Adam (née Juliette Lamber, 1836–1936). Her salon in the Third Republic was one of the most influential operating in Paris, despite what the mid-nineteenth-century observers Marie d’Agoult, Virginie Ancelot, and Delphine de Girardin had claimed about the decline of this social institution since the Old Regime (see ill. 5). Adam sustained relations with several members of the craft. Like her younger contemporary, Augusta Holmès (1847–1903), the composer who orchestrated the grandiose centennial celebration of the French Revolution (see ill. 4), Adam was thoroughly versed in masonic lore, epithets, and projects, including the Panama Canal planned by Ferdinand de Lesseps, a Saint-Simonian entrepreneur. Her *La Nouvelle Revue*
(The New Review), with its circulation in masonic circles and beyond, helped de Lesseps raise the capital to launch the enterprise that would ultimately squander the substantial investments of its shareholders. Adam also played an instrumental role in the political career of a prominent mason, Léon Gambetta, head of the Union Républicaine during the early Third Republic (1871–82). And Adam used her connections to promote France’s closer ties with Russia in an unquenchable thirst for revenge over the loss of Alsace and Lorraine to a united Germany at the conclusion of the Franco-Prussian War.124 So, while Holmès borrowed masonic ritual and assembled brethren to produce her Ode Triomphale in 1889—“Evohe! Soleil! Evohe!” chanted the chorus of hundreds in Paris’s Palais de l’Industrie125—Adam the “princess of the Third Republic” demonstrated the powerful interventions of various freemason women.126 By then, thanks in part to the

ILLUSTRATION 5. Anonymous, Les Soeurs Maçonnes Indépendantes (1892), lithograph from ink drawings, [Taxil and Hacks], Diable au XIXe siècle, 1:705, Bibliothèque Nationale de France.
masonic communities extending far from the masonic lodge, the reforms necessary to create an equal place for women there—and in its civic morality—found many more champions.

Revolution(s): The Successive Redefinitions of Women’s Masonic Communities

From 1848 onward, freemasonry and French political thought generally, each in its own fashion, incorporated the mixed legacies of the eighteenth-century Lumières. As a matter of principle dating from Anderson’s *Constitutions*, for example, the craft recognized the authority of each political regime as legitimate, just as it did the different religious commitments of its members. This happened despite the contested nature of the transitions from one regime to the next and despite the dissonance of minority voices within masonry itself. Freemasons participated in the banquet campaign that precipitated the 1848 Revolution, then shared in the Second Republic’s Provisional Government; they resisted Bonaparte’s coup in 1851, but acquiesced to the Second Empire’s control of the Grand Orient and the Suprême Conseil; and they welcomed the tentative initiatives of the Liberal Empire not long before they endorsed the conservative Third Republic’s compromises in quest of political stability after the Paris Commune in 1871. All the while, this new regime kept close tabs on freemasonry. As a recent study of historical amnesia concludes acerbically, “the Third Republic . . . hardly concerned itself with the revolutionary aspirations that previous republics had incarnated.”

Like France itself, the craft remained more liberal than not in its politics. Its brethren assumed public responsibilities consistent with Enlightenment ideals as they had evolved since the eighteenth century. By the 1880s, in the disparaging view of the historian Ernest Renan, republican bywords had become a “banality,” clichés to reassure bourgeois property owners that revolution was no longer a possibility.

As the Third Republic turned to other issues—populism, anti-Semitism, and colonialism—outliers in the craft moved to initiate women on the same footing as men. This movement toward masonry’s expanded inclusiveness naturally encountered fierce resistance from most brethren, but also some accommodation and diversion. What we know of masonry in France today is, in fact, derived from important developments from 1870 to 1900. In a gesture of complete religious tolerance, for instance, the Grand Orient in 1877 eliminated the requirement of official reference to the Great Architect of the Universe (GAOTU), thereby creating what it called “adogmatic liberal masonry.” The largest French
obedience thus distinguished itself from the United Grand Lodge of England, which since its inception in 1813 had made recognition of the GAOTU obligatory. Drawing a different, less provocative conclusion from the international masonic convent[i]on of Lausanne in 1875, the jurisdictions of the higher degrees in the Rite Écossais Ancien et Accepté (Scottish Rite) decided to reorganize. By 1894 a new Grande Loge de France was conceived to encompass the Suprême Conseil de France’s former blue lodges and the Grande Loge Symbolique Écossaise (GLSE). But that lengthy process kept the activists in the GLSE from establishing co-masonry; for that they had to establish a new order, Le Droit Humain (DH). In effect, the formation of the Grande Loge de France (GLDF) instigated this turn in French masonry. The GLDF went on to promote a revised version of adoption in the first years of the twentieth century, an arrangement that would not survive to the outbreak of World War II. In these ways, freemasonry contended with the same historical forces as the early Third Republic: secularism first and foremost, but also the incipient women’s movement.

Reconfiguring the craft required efforts by both men and women as well as pressure from both inside and outside of masonry itself. For much of the century, extraordinary women like Lemonnier, Sand, and Holmès were assumed to have been initiates for reasons that ought to be familiar by now: they were related to or tied to actual members of the craft; they shared in well-publicized masonic initiatives; they professed views that were long associated with freemasonry; in sum, they resembled masons even though they were never initiated within a recognized order. By their very prominence, these women moved men to reconsider, repeatedly, their exclusion. Reformers during the Second Empire, such as J.-P. Simon Boubée, Léon Richer, and Luc-Pierre Riche-Gardon (a.k.a. Bénédicte Noldran), tried valiantly to work in tandem with the brotherhood without directly challenging the hegemonic masculine privilege defined by French law and culture. Their calls to address women’s place in masonry met with some limited success, primarily because they did not threaten the regularity of the craft for men in their own lodges in the same or other obediences. Given adoption’s visibility in the Old Regime, these men based their appeals on what they regarded as masonic precedent. It was time, they believed, to focus more on the Grand Orient’s 1774 authorized version of adoption practices, rituals and all. Moreover, the Egyptian Rite of Misraim continued this initiation tradition, whatever its putative debts to Comte de Cagliostro’s irregular Haute Maçonnerie Égyptienne in the eighteenth century.

In 1815, the Misraïm order had actually moved to resuscitate the adoption rite not long after the Bédarride brothers established the Suprême Conseil
Général de Misraïm.135 Their first initiation of women occurred four years later in a grand ceremony to which all the brethren were invited. Despite the festive character and familiar sentiments, this occasion aroused the suspicions of the police, forcing the order to cancel its plans for a lodge and to reconvene under more auspicious circumstances only after the 1830 Revolution. It also earned the ire of Juge, the self-appointed guardian of masonic reform. In Le Globe, Juge’s rhetoric got the better of him in response to “the Franco-Egyptio-symbolico-philosophico-mystico-cabalistic frippery and more, the arch absurdities of Misraïm.”136 Indeed. The Bédarride brothers had proceeded with their Grande Loge d’Adoption in 1838, which perjured into the Second Empire, while the occasional fête drew the attention of more modest social groups. Instead of the aristocracy and haute bourgeoisie of the Old Regime and First Empire, members of the petite bourgeoisie from the workshop and the boutique appeared on the rosters of participants in the nineteenth century. As the Le Franc-Maçon noted archly in 1854, times had changed; the journal lamented, “it is enough to have seen one of these fine meetings to regret that they were not more frequent, to be astonished that they have even been relegated to nearly complete oblivion.”137 Adoption lodges had become an anachronism, despite the gendered equality-in-difference that its initiates expressed, especially during the Second Empire.138

Clearly, if the adoption rite were to revive, it needed the support of the mainstream obediences, the Grand Orient and the Suprême Conseil. This fact drove the former Misraïm brother Boubée to remind the Grand Orient in 1860 of its official authorization of the practice in the eighteenth century. He did so by informing the Chambre Symbolique of its response, many years earlier, to Les Amis de la Paix’s formal request to celebrate a fête d’adoption in 1851: “[The lodges of adoption] were the most powerful and most effective lever of future progress, and [the Chambre] welcomed the request of a recipient [lodge].”139 Such was the origin of the Jérusalem des Vallées Égyptiennes, the locus of the most adoption initiations from the end of the Second Republic in 1851 to the eve of the Franco-Prussian War in 1870. Several accounts of these tenues, following more or less the eighteenth-century formats, were published during the Second Empire, echoing the publicity enjoyed by the more renowned soeurs in the Old Regime. The lodge’s orator Alexandre Roy declared in 1870, “Yes, my sisters, your presence here is not solely an ornament of our festivities and our meetings, but also the most congenial approbation there could be accorded to our humanitarian doctrines.”140 In time, however, even this lodge (apparently under the pressure of its brothers and sisters) reverted to tenues blanches for its
initiates, who by the late 1860s were nearly all children. Under the aegis of the
Suprême Conseil, Scottish Rite lodges such as Osiris, Les Coeurs Unis, and Les
Philadelphes maintained the “classic” initiatory ritual for women, but by the
1870s they were the only ones.

Until his death in 1870 Boubée was tireless in his promotion of adoption. He
spoke on its behalf as often as possible and with considerable vigor, raising points
that looked to the future as well as to the past. During the First Empire, “these
lodges distinguished themselves,” Boubée wrote in 1854, “by the regularity of
their rituals, by the amiability with which women were feted, by the abundance
of the help given to the unfortunate, and above all by the outpourings of friend-
ship, which are so expressive when the etiquette of social rank is observed.”141
This argument was not particularly new; nearly every adoption initiation fea-
tured a speech providing the same justification: by their virtue, character, and
grace, women deserve to be masons. But in Boubée’s hands, this argument be-
came more emphatic. It keyed on the status of women in a patriarchal society
and what masonry should do about it:

Shall women, to whom men owe so much, be treated like slaves or pariahs?
No, that is simply impossible; Freemasonry will restore all their rights; this
wholly divine institution would never be so useless, . . . Wherever it is to be
found, it will seek to lavish onto women the love, respect and recognition
which are owing to their charm and their virtues! . . . By the influence of
Masonry, women will one day be truly emancipated.142

If the craft were to be consistent in its principles drawn from the golden rule,
Boubée concluded, it needed to include women as part of its community: “Truth
enlightens them; it speaks to their heart; it tells them that if all men are their
brothers, then all women are their sisters.”143 Masonry simply could not fulfill
its mission of promoting human betterment without involving everyone, he in-
sisted; and adoption would make that possible.

Boubée was not alone in his work on behalf of women masons. During the
Second Empire, Jean-Marie Ragon de Bettignies added his voice to Boubée’s to
resurrect the adoption rite, less through the working of degrees than through the
systematizing of them. According to the historian of religious practice Jan Snoek,
Ragon’s two manuals published in 1860–61 are among the last compilations of
rituals in use.144 Of particular interest is Ragon’s introduction in the guise of an
imaginary dialogue between Adèle (an initiate) and an unnamed mason. After
detailing the apocryphal initiation of Mme. de Xaintrailles during the golden
age of festive adoption in the First Empire, Adèle turns to the pernicious effects
of men’s refusal to open up the craft, an eighteenth-century lament about women’s limited education:

How inconsequential and brutal men would be, for the most part, if they just received what little knowledge is accorded to women. And how much happier and better governed the world would be if the minds of women were not ruined by the false, superstitious ideas that are repugnant to conscience, to reason; by absurd prejudices; by vain fears, inculcated in childhood, rooted in time, and which are used to mislead men of all conditions!\(^{145}\)

The remedy for this deplorable situation is obvious: educate women by initiating them, sharing with them the enlightenment of the masonic lodge and thereby ensuring that mothers of future citizens are well-informed as well as virtuous. In light of Ragon’s own masonic career, in the regimental La Réunion des Amis du Nord in Bruges (1804) and the secretive, elitist Ordre des Priseurs (1820s), it is not at all clear why he was so keen on freemason women; but by 1900 his publications would foster the re-creation of rituals for them.

The reanimation of adoption lodges coincided with a more ambitious endeavor: the initiation of women, just as men, into regular freemasonry with little or no revision of its rites. In the wake of Juge’s fulminations in the 1830s, nothing much had happened, but by 1864 the lodge Mars et les Arts engaged in serious discussions of what its vénérable Léon Richer termed “a right for women, but a duty for [men].”\(^{146}\) Full induction of women would counter the clerical influences to ensure the rational development of their offspring. It was not because they were all ready for emancipation, he contended, but because they needed to be freed from the grip of religious superstition. Others soon joined the conversation: Charles Fauvety the mystically inclined vénérable of La Renaissance par les Émules d’Hiram; Eugène Pelletan the writer and republican politician of Huguenot descent; Eugène Thirifocq the future Parisian Communard; and Jean-Claude Colfavru the radical republican journalist and vénérable of Le Travail, the successor lodge to Riche-Gardon’s Le Temple des Familles.\(^{147}\) Their interventions induced Frédéric Desmons (a protestant pastor, future vénérable of Le Progrès and president of the Grand Orient’s Conseil de l’Ordre) to introduce the issue at the order’s annual convent in 1869.\(^{148}\) Desmons elaborated on Richer’s idea that proper masonic initiation would liberate mothers and their children. He reminded his brethren of the craft’s principles of illumination and perfectibility, which can only be enhanced by the participation of sisters, for the sake of the brothers as well as society generally. Of course, the convent rejected
further consideration of this proposition, as did the Conseil de l’Ordre, but the matter was not so easily dismissed.

An intriguing compromise solution to the conundrum had been Riche-Gardon’s Temple des Familles (1860–64). It offered something for men, women, and children, separately and together, under the uneasy authority of the Grand Orient. For four years, this masonic experiment attracted thirty-five brothers and twenty women, relatively few of whom were related to the men. Moreover, while the brethren came from more modest social circumstances—a bit fewer than half of them were artisans and shopkeepers—the sisters tended to be aristocrats, wealthy bourgeois, artists and writers, well-educated and feminist in their views on matters pertaining to the lodge: Angélique Arnaud the republican journalist and novelist, Marie Guerrier de Haut the translator and writer of children’s books, Jenny P. d’Héricourt the feminist writer and activist (initiated just before she left for Chicago), “Maxime” Fauvety the former actresse sociétaire (board member actress) of the Théâtre Français, and Jeanne Lydy Roger the resourceful cofounder with Riche-Gardon of the review *La Vie humaine* (*Human Life*). There were at least two musicians in this rich mix of cultural capital.

As the historians Gisèle Hivert-Messeca and Yves Hivert-Messeca describe this lodge, it was an “atelier, neither fully of adoption nor completely mixed,” part of which was exclusively for brethren and another exclusively for sisters, otherwise given to tenues blanches for family and friends. Two of the lodge’s rituals were accepted by the Grand Orient—the Murat version in the French system as modified for the men, the Guillemain de Saint-Victor adoption ritual as modified by Ragon and Riche-Gardon for the women—and a third ritual that was not entirely new and used only for special occasions. Riche-Gardon’s amalgamation of widely different societal groups, professional interests, and initiation rituals marked a tenuous effort to accommodate competing views of masonry for both sexes. It ended in a painful schism, if only because the compromise was still entirely on the women’s side of the lodge’s activities. Even for the liberal-minded *Journal des initiées* (*Journal for the Initiated*), the moment had not yet arrived “when our subscribers and members of different philosophic, religious, and social schools will appreciate the reiterated invitation to follow up the work accomplished by the Ateliers of the Masonic Order,” such as “the constitutive law of moral and social regulation . . . to assure for each individual and collective entity the conditions for their harmonious development.” To wit, a more dramatic solution was required.

It seems, then, that the inflection point for freemason activism was not the February 1848 Revolution, which had witnessed a national political
re-engagement. Such enthusiasm was muted by the June days and the subsequent conservative regime that prepared the way for Louis-Napoléon Bonaparte’s rise to power, first as president then as emperor. This generation of revolutionaries dispersed, leaving the moderates to establish the women’s movement during the Liberal Empire. But the Paris Commune had a greater impact on others who were more closely associated with the craft. Surviving the Prussian siege, replaced soon thereafter by that of the Versaillais forces, made radicals of many more women. Besides the republican André Léo (Victoire Léodile Béra), subsequent freemasons like Louise Michel, Paule Mink, and Eliska Vincent, among other advocates of women’s interests like Maria Deraismes, Louise Koppe, Juliette Adam, and Marie Bonnevial, would recollect their experiences during nearly a year of suffering and two months of resistance to the newly proclaimed Third Republic. For most of them, their rite of passage in spring 1871 ignited some twenty years of social action leading to their initiation in the mixed lodges of the GLSE (Michel, Bonnevial) and the DH (Vincent, Deraismes, Koppe, Bonnevial, and Mink) by century’s end. For these women, one can almost speak of a masonic revelation that marked their quest for a more substantive civil society in keeping with the Commune itself. It was thus no accident that so many of them wrote about this major historical event.

The Commune’s freemason women-in-the-making were not alone in March–May 1871. There were others who also felt compelled to work in concert with the men. Brethren had spearheaded an effort to seek a peaceful settlement between the city in revolt and the provisional government. On April 21, a masonic delegation met a military representative of the Chief Executive Authority, Adolphe Theirs, to negotiate an armistice, but it failed. Little did they know it was too late. Five days later, masonic representatives informed members of the Commune’s Committee of Public Safety, a number of whom like Jules Vallès and Félix Pyat were also freemasons; the delegation detailed their plans for a procession on April 29. More than fifty lodges and six thousand brothers marched for peace on the ramparts in full regalia, as did an unspecified lodge of women. “Some women wearing masonic sautoirs were also mixed into the procession,” explained one observer, “and a Zouave, who carried a banner, was accompanied by two of the sisters.” The revolutionary slogan officially adopted by the Grand Orient in 1848 was now on full display to the city when time had run out. In less than a week, the masons had to take sides. As Adam remarked long afterward in her memoirs, “the freemasons finally decided to stand for something. They stood for the Commune.” The city was attacked and soon in flames, marking the masonic participants, men and women alike, for a lifetime. Freemason women
drew their own conclusions; they needed to do more on behalf of their brothers and sisters, whoever was responsible for the civil war. They sought to ratify this commitment, which had to wait until the craft finally permitted them to join a lodge on the same basis as men. This was freemasonry, at last, perhaps, at its most inclusive after a long, frustrating campaign.

Louise Michel confirmed this notion directly soon after her second initiation in 1904. “A long time ago I would have been one of you,” she averred in her oft-quoted conference presentation on feminism at the Diderot, “if I had known of the existence of mixed Lodges. But I believed that, to be part of masonry, one had to be a man. As for me, before the grand ideal of liberty and justice, there is no difference between men and women; for everyone there is work to do.”

Among the most ardent Communards, who were tried hastily then deported for nearly a decade, Michel knew firsthand why liberty and justice mattered. And it was freemasonry that taught her in 1871 (by the maçonnes on the ramparts) and again in 1903–04 (during her two initiations) what it meant for women as well as for men in more modest social circumstances than was apparent in the Old Regime’s adoption lodges. Much had happened since 1789. Instrumental, gendered sociability finally made space for masonic equality.

The notable experiments in reconstituting variations on eighteenth-century adoption succeeded briefly, but they did not engage many men—or women. The latter clearly wanted more agency than these reforms accorded, given that they were created and defended by brothers in their sisters’ name. As the feminist Maria Deraismes understood the matter, “the women, not just the men, are called to take their share of human knowledge.” This could occur only in the right historical context. The women’s movement in masonry as well as in France appeared after the consolidation of a secular, middling middle-class, republican regime in the face of resistance from new, radical political voices on the left (appealing to the collective tendencies of laborers) and on the right (calling for an end to the apparent decadence of French society). Notwithstanding—or perhaps because of—the slowness of the country’s industrialization relative to Britain and Germany, this conflicted process built on the positivist implications of science and technology, improved secular education and professional training, and an expanding overseas colonial empire to bolster France’s European alliances and alignments. Here the women’s movement, and masonry’s share in it, gathered force. It was what the craft needed to take seriously the determined ambition to claim a broader range of rights and protections for women, including their place in the lodges authorized by the Grand Orient, the Suprême Conseil, and the Scottish Rite variations on the Grande Loge. And this was what
Deraismes and her masonic colleagues set out to do in 1882. The years of dilatory discussion gave way to concerted action.

Deraismes's daring was inevitable, or so it seems in retrospect. Her story invites a straight-line narrative of utter tenacity. This second daughter of a wealthy republican family refused to marry as a matter of principle. Deraismes put her extensive education to work, writing for the stage and the press and giving public lectures, on behalf of women's rights. In 1866 Richer invited her to speak on feminist issues in masonic venues; and in 1869 they began an active collaboration with André Léo in the Société pour l’Amélioration des Femmes, thanks to the Liberal Empire’s lifting restrictions on public assembly. The Franco-Prussian War delayed this work, though Deraismes did write to defend the pétroleuses (women arsonists) during the Paris Commune; she just could not support its socially divisive radicalism. After 1871 she continued to publish in liberal newspapers like L’Opinion nationale (The National Opinion) and periodicals like L’Avenir des femmes (Women’s Future); she organized and spoke at banquets promoting women’s interests; she responded to Alexandre Dumas fils’s attacks on women’s emancipation; she joined the Libres-penseurs; and she fended off efforts by the Ordre Moral to crack down on political dissent (as in her professional partnership with Richer).

When the 1881 press law authorized women’s directorship of newspapers, Deraismes bought Le Républicain de Seine-et-Oise (The Seine-et-Oise Republican). Favorable publicity in this publication leveraged her initiation into an all-male lodge. She approached first La Clémente Amitié (politely declined), then Les Libres Penseurs (happily accepted). But this lodge in Le Pecq, just to the west of Paris, had to scheme in order to accommodate her. It withdrew from its obedience, the Grande Loge Symbolique Écossaise (GLSE), to sidestep the order’s refusal to authorize Deraismes’s initiation. Ultimately, Les Libres Penseurs acquiesced to the GLSE and dropped the sister from its roster of members. But as Deraismes proudly stated in the company of more than four hundred celebrants following the ceremony, a precedent had been set. A more propitious occasion would soon arise. Eleven years later, it prompted the creation of a whole new masonic order, Le Droit Humain, devoted to initiating both men and women by the same rituals and according them equal leadership responsibilities in lodge governance.

So, after decades of debate, Deraismes succeeded where her predecessors had failed—by creating a rival masonic order to the Grand Orient, the Suprême Conseil, and the GLSE. A compromise with the mainline obediences, it turned out, could not be reached; accordingly, Deraismes took direct action on behalf
of gender equality. She now had an association whose doctrines were based on absolute parity consistent, in its repudiation of the status quo, with the many other, larger, better-known revolutions in the nineteenth century: the political upheavals in 1830, 1848, and 1870–71; the industrialization of the French economy; the anticlerical republicanism’s triumph over Gallican Catholicism (by 1905); the cultural paradigm shifts marked by literary and artistic movements from romanticism to impressionism, among others. The DH marked a step towards a mature French civil society, creating an egalitarian sociability that relied in large part on women to effect and to operate.

By nature, Deraismes was not a revolutionary; she sought to reform republican politics, to make the state more accessible and amenable to women, to expand educational opportunity for girls, to squelch the pernicious denigration of women in everyday life, and to open the doors to a richer, fuller associational life, such as she found in freemasonry. She understood that gender equality was essential to a fundamental social transformation, to a civic morality. “Virtue, polite manners,” she wrote in 1891, “are only another thing that justice establishes in the [proper] relations between men and women.” By cofounding the DH in 1893, a year before her death, Deraismes and Senator Georges Martin created an order that welcomed some extraordinary women activists, viz., Clémence Royer, Eliska Vincent, Maria Pognon, and Maria Martin, but also Marie Bonnevial and Louise Koppe, who joined somewhat later just as the women’s movement finally took shape. In this manner, women’s initiation moved from a mere precedent to a permanent fixture of the craft.

**HOW DID DERAISMES DO IT?** A number of factors led to this upheaval in masonry, for sure, but also to the social consciousness of French women. In the limited sociability of the tenues blanches, these festivals—increasingly in the company of their children—no longer afforded women the occasion for participating, together with others, in something larger than themselves and their families. The inculcation of moral virtue was not enough. Well educated, they sought new roles in organized activities with their peers, especially in philanthropy, publication, and association, to address the stultifying effects of male privilege in public as well as private space. The poet Clémence Robert had expressed this insistent quest for emancipation and agency in her ironic poetic refrain from 1840, “I am a woman.” The question continued to rage, but it did so now in a more progressive spirit. The larger personal networks and the social capital these networks made possible had opened up the political culture of the
public sphere to many more women during key moments in the Revolution of 1848 and more substantively during the Paris Commune of 1871.

Deraismes shared in this historical context. By the 1860s she understood well the politics of gender as a cultural construction. “The inferiority of women,” she affirmed, “is not a fact of nature, to say it once again, it is a human invention, it is a social fiction.” With no husband or children to restrain her, notwithstanding a substantial household of her own, Deraismes’s revolt actually arose from propitious moments during the Liberal Empire, the Paris Commune, and the Opportunist Republic (after 1876). She joined a number of associations on behalf of the women’s issues she espoused, starting with Virginie Griess-Traut, Aline Valette, and Hubertine Auclert to found the Société pour l’Amélioration du Sort de la Femme. From there her activism accelerated, helping organize the first Congrès International du Droit des Femmes in 1878. From the outset, her life’s work thus unveiled the truth of women’s rights.

This truth was also a masonic truth, to which Deraismes formally subscribed during her initiation in 1882. On the reverse side of her certificate of lodge membership was a standard but eloquent philosophical testament that all initiates were expected to endorse:

Freemasonry is, in essence, human solidarity. It has as a goal the moral perfection of humanity, as a means the constant improvement of its material and intellectual situation, and as a slogan Liberté, Égalité, Fraternité. . . . It is open to everyone without distinction of nationality, race, [or] religion, and only requires its members to be independent and of good character.

To the extent that women were then (and still are) at least half of adult humanity, it was easy for Deraismes to embrace this notion, despite the omission of sex from the list of distinctions. It was certainly a widely shared sentiment in the GLSE. All the same, Deraismes felt compelled to add a significant qualifying preface, in her own hand, that accentuates the intersection of masonry and women’s rights as she and other freemason feminists understood them during the Third Republic:

My work, my writing, my speeches [she wrote] say enough about what has been my life’s goal: to struggle against error and injustice. Certainly, I make no pretense in bequeathing a grand example when I die. But I swear that I will leave a more profound conviction in the unending progressibility of humanity and a more sincere love of my fellow creatures.
Her faith and mission in life as a feminist were in effect of a piece with her commitment to the craft, as reflected in the 1893 patent of the DH, “to affirm everywhere and for always the rights of Human Beings and to pursue the triumph of social justice.”

One way or another, this development in Deraismes’s lifetime marks the culmination of a long line of efforts by masonic women in the nineteenth century. Their experiences became major moments in the history of French civil society. Like many observers and historians, they recognized how the Code Civil enforced the legal subordination of wives; such binding impediments required most married women to accept life and income controlled by their husbands (per arts. 213-25). The sexual contract was embedded in French law. But as the examples of Princesse de Vaudémont and Lady Morgan indicate, there were ways women could insert themselves into society powerfully enough to draw the attention of statesmen like Talleyrand-Périgord and the police spies filing reports on tolerated gatherings. The connections Désirée Pacault enjoyed in masonic lodges, where she read her poetry and revellers sang her lyrics, provided an audience for her work that translated into books to sell in her bookstore. Although few of them were initiated, the Saint-Simonian women had developed valuable networks with masons to launch newspapers and to form alternative communities. Suzanne Voilquin, Eugénie Niboyet, Désirée Gay, Pauline Roland, Élisa Lemonnier, Jeanne Deroin, and the more-or-less sympathetic George Sand sustained their relationships in the expectation that a new world would emerge, especially in the heady days of the February 1848 Revolution. A younger but savvier generation represented by Juliette Adam, Augusta Holmès, and Maria Deraismes built on these experiences to create alliances with kindred men—and with older women like Niboyet and Lemonnier who stayed the course—to pave the way for the women’s movement in the Third Republic. These alliances were owed in part to the social capital, including the exchange of resources, the overlap of memberships, and the sharing of common ideals, that arose from their affiliations with freemasonry during a turbulent period in the history of France.
Women’s Masonry and the Women’s Movement from the Fin de Siècle to 1944

Dorothee Chellier (1860–1935) departed for Algeria a few months after her initiation by Le Droit Humain in 1894. Because she was planning to leave Paris soon, her situation was unusual enough for her to be accorded three degrees in one tenue.1 Chellier had recently completed her studies at the Faculté de Médecine de Paris, but she preferred not to start a medical practice in the French capital. Instead, she arranged through the members of her lodge, Georges Martin and Marie Béquet de Vienne in particular, for appointment to a government-sponsored healthcare project in Algiers. Martin was himself a doctor, while the philanthropist Béquet de Vienne served as a reference to Jules Cambon, the governor-general, who greeted the territory’s first woman physician not long after her arrival.

Chellier had, in fact, grown up in Algeria’s largest city and looked forward to returning to friends and family there. This was home for her. She was fully aware of the compromises she needed to make at her new job in order to bring modern medicine to the indigenous population, especially the women who resorted to traditional, often ineffective remedies for their serious hygiene-related illnesses. Accordingly, Chellier accepted the premises of France’s mission civilisatrice in North Africa. “I knew,” she noted in her diary, “that M. Cambon was looking to use doctors, not just to bring enlightened care to the local people . . ., but also to hasten the process of assimilation.”2 She engaged in four forays into the hinterland to ascertain the health needs of distant localities, many of them accessible only by mule. Preparing for her government reports kept her in the saddle for weeks on end, but Chellier and her team persevered. Meanwhile, she established a private practice in Algiers, one of fifty-three Western-trained physicians in the city. She ultimately managed to persuade a new governor-general to create a clinic in Maison Carrée for Algerians, which she directed for four years.
Chellier’s masonic connections not solely got her back to Algiers, they enabled her to navigate the departmental administrative system that she helped make responsive to the proper medical treatment of women. In her pre-initiation philosophical testament, she had written, “I wish to enter Freemasonry in order to unite my efforts with those of my Sisters and my Brothers to effect equality of the sexes and of all social conditions.” So, with the support of her fellow masons, Chellier undertook the improvement of healthcare for the poorest among the varied peoples of Algeria and Tunisia. Her professional and masonic commitments drove her expanded calling despite the prejudice she felt as a woman physician, with the exception of her female patients. “What really struck me during my mission,” she remarked in 1895, “was the eagerness with which [these women] sought my care, the complete trust in the treatment provided, [and] the rapid influence I was able to have on them.” She described in detail the horrific illnesses she encountered on her journeys to rural outposts in Aurès and Kybalie, but she did not wait for the authorities to act. Each time, she exceeded her mandate by setting up temporary clinics; she brought medication and equipment with her wherever she went. She treated these women herself, as any ethical physician would, at a time when French doctors were not required to take an oath of medical practice. But her interventions were entirely consistent with the oath she swore to uphold as a mason.

After four years in Algiers, Chellier moved briefly to Paris, then to Nice where she and her family settled so she could focus on her specialties, obstetrics and gynecology. She helped inaugurate a DH lodge in 1911 and took part in its meetings until her death in 1935. What makes her story worth telling is how much of masonry for women, in both mixed and separate lodges, attracted sisters of a new social profile; they were much more likely to be middle-class professionals like Chellier and to work in international settings, not just in the French hexagon. Because records of these mostly bourgeois lives are better detailed, their activism is easier to document than their predecessors in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The women no longer felt compelled to be so discreet about their engagement in the craft; they left ample records of their masonic ties. The sisters are thus more visible historically as well as more influential figures well beyond their place of origin in France and its capital city of Paris.

In short, these figures went public, albeit subject to many of the same constrained gender roles and assumptions that had been prevalent since the Old Regime. The Napoleonic Code of 1804 as it pertained to wives had hardly changed (aside from the Naquet divorce law of 1884). Not surprisingly, by World War I
the women’s movement had grown dramatically. In 1922 the Conseil National des Femmes Françaises alone boasted more than one hundred thousand members in 148 affiliated organizations, despite the war’s traumatic interruption of France’s third sector. Initiatives to address women’s subordination had the support of more politicians, especially the noted freemasons Léon Bourgeois, René Vivani, Ferdinand Buisson, and Paul Strauss who lent these endeavors prestige and notoriety. The obediences joined the chorus calling for reform of the Civil Code, so much so that one might consider the coincidence of another, complementary movement, that of women in masonry. For good reason the historian Christine Bard classified the DH order as a feminist society. As their numbers and visibility increased, freemasons made more of a contribution to women’s issues. And they stayed the course of social action during the political instability of the Third Republic’s interwar years.

Maçonnnes’ new historical context provided more than images of the garçonne (the boyish woman), the French version of the 1920s flapper, though that too, as Mary Louise Roberts and Annelise Maugue, among others, have shown. What the first half of the twentieth century promised was somewhat more fluid gender relations within a much wider range of associations made possible by the Waldeck-Rousseau law of 1901. Masonry’s variety of rites accommodated women in the DH, of course, but also in the Grande Loge de France’s newly conceived adoption lodges, the first of which were the pioneering L’Examen Libre and La Nouvelle Jérusalem. Some women like the educator Marie Bonneval and the actress Véra Starkoff (a.k.a. Térésa Ephron) were initiated by affiliates of both the DH and the Grande Loge. They often joined groups for the promotion of women’s rights and interests, like those allied with the Conseil National des Femmes Françaises and the Union Française pour le Suffrage des Femmes (UFSF). These same women found kindred spirits in other federations, such as the Société des Libres Penseurs and the International Committee of the Red Cross.

As a consequence, freemason women marshalled sizeable, more complex social networks and benefited from the larger measure of social capital that these networks afforded them. Without the vote, their role in political culture was certainly not as substantial as that of men, but they operated more fully in a mature civil society. By World War II, after fighting for the 1938 revision of the Civil Code’s articles 213-16 (and the abrogation of 217-25), these women faced the collapse of the Third Republic with many more collective resources at their disposal. Thus in 1945 they would be better positioned to pick up where they left off five years earlier.
Renewed Mixed Orders and Adoption
Lodges, at Home and Abroad

While the DH stimulated interest in co-masonry, including the likes of Dorothée Chellier, the reform-minded members of the Grande Loge Symbolique Écossaise (GLSE) were also active. Since its inception in 1879, the GLSE had accorded its member lodges considerable autonomy, much more than did either the Grand Orient de France or the Suprême Conseil de France; the Rite Écossais Ancien et Accepté (Scottish Rite) regulated both side and its own blue degrees. Then in 1896 the GLSE joined with the Grande Loge de France and its sixty ateliers. But the Diderot preferred keeping the old GLSE in operation; this independently inclined lodge liked the relative freedom within an obedience more congenial than the new Grande Loge. So, in cooperation with Les Inséparables de l’Arc-en-Ciel, it formed the GLSE II Maintenue in late 1897. This arrangement established other lodges—a total of five more by 1907—that survived until the order finally dissolved and its last remaining holdout joined the Grande Loge in 1911. However ephemeral, the GLSE II Maintenue was important to the development of mixed masonry by offering another, more radical option than the one extended by the DH, which had become a comparatively moderate, bourgeois community of reformers.19

By 1897 a small, but progressive cluster of GLSE II lodges chose to initiate women, thereby founding the GLSE II Maintenue et Mixte (M&M) by the flexible terms of the GLSE’s constitution. It was this latter group of masons who earned a reputation for innovation and advocacy, especially the members of the Diderot and La Philosophie Sociale, within a highly democratic organizational structure that fostered rituals for both men and women, together and independently of each other, as their lodges chose. They were also notorious for their tolerance of free-thinkers, neo-Malthusians, and above all feminists. Louise Michel and Madeleine Pelletier were among the more outré of these sisters and brothers, who sponsored numerous conferences not only on feminism, but also on anticlericalism, atheism, and social democracy. This order’s initiates assumed other visible (and controversial) guises in civil society during the belle époque: the syndicaliste teacher Marie Bonnevial, the socialist journalist Gustave Hervé, the socialist-feminist Caroline Kauffmann, the anarchist Charles Malato, the reproductive rights advocate Nelly Roussel, and the Russian-émigré playwright Véra Starkoff.20

The overlapping memberships of feminist organizations and the lodges of the GLSE II M&M in the seventeen years before World War I is remarkable. Almost every possible reform for the emancipation of women found one or more of its
champions affiliated with this strand of masonry. They had no trouble engaging allies, all of whom attracted others to share in the craft’s mysteries as an extension of their allegiances freely discussed in the lodge (a major break with earlier masonic practice). There were, however, fewer fellow travelers in the provinces; only one short-lived GLSE II M&M lodge functioned very far from France’s capital city, La Solidarité in Nevers (1904–06). This version of masonry was too advanced for the rest of the country, even for Lyon, long the heart of nontraditional masonry and resistance to central authorities. This order was strictly a Parisian phenomenon. There was nothing quite like it anywhere else in French masonry.

One of its lodges in Paris, La Raison Triomphante, drew the utopian feminist and scientific theorist, Céline Renooz (1840–1928), one of many eccentric personalities in the period.21 There, briefly, she found sympathetic colleagues who welcomed and offered her material assistance at a sad moment late in life. In 1903 when Renooz was initiated, she had already surrounded herself with a small circle of supporters outside the lodge, the Néosophes; they pledged subventions for her voluminous publications on the spiritual origins of scientific advances and the special role that women played as priestesses and goddesses in the history of world religions. “Social renewal will occur,” she affirmed not long afterward, “only by re-establishing in the world NATURAL RELIGION, which will re-create the moral life of humanity,” a sentiment consistent with masonry’s own ethos.22 The lodge supported her ideas by providing meeting halls to host her conferences, to sell her books, and to expand her following. While Renooz did not remain active in the craft, though she also contemplated initiation in La Nouvelle Jérusalem, she benefited from the special brotherhood of a GLSE II M&M lodge.

A more enduring mixed masonry parallel to the GLSE tradition was the DH.23 Much of its success was owed to Maria Deraismes’s special combination of vision and persistence (see ill. 6). But even more is owed to the Martins—Georges (1844–1916) and Marie-Georges (1850–1914)—both of whom outlived the pioneering Deraismes by some twenty years. As one DH sister stated soon after her initiation in 1896, “they gave us the superb example of perseverance in the future accomplishment of a great duty! They proved that mixed Lodges are looking to unite what . . . others are seeking to separate, man and woman in the home [and] in Society.”24 From the moment the middle-aged Martins married in 1889, they were inseparable in their activities. They embraced a host of closely related causes, women’s rights in particular, as manifested in the DH which they founded in collaboration with a dozen others and led for the remainder of their lives. Before 1900 the Martins made every effort to have the new obedience recognized, first by the Grand Orient and the GLSE, then by the Grande Loge,
whatever the widespread resistance to the feminist premises of the DH (clearly inscribed in its proclamation of “Le Droit Humain,” which echoes the Constituent Assembly’s “Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen” of 1789 and Olympe de Gouges’s “Declaration of the Rights of Woman and Citizenship” of 1791). Given the Scottish Rite’s inclusiveness for much of the nineteenth century, the DH chose its rituals, leaving the French Rite degrees for the all-male Grand Orient to work. It even underscored its commitment to sexual equality on the bond certificates issued in 1896 to build a temple on the rue Jules Breton in Paris with the new order’s name and subtitle—“Center of Action for the Feminist Movement”—redeemable in twenty-five years. Like retiring its debts early, the DH had an optimistic timeline for achieving its goals.

This co-masonry soon caught on. Thanks to the aggressive outreach of the brothers and sisters at first, it realized new centers in Blois (briefly), Lyon, Rouen, and Zurich. Such ambition soon made the DH a true obedience in its own right, one that required a better-defined structure with administrative and oversight councils and a regular convening of convents (annual meetings of delegates) representing the larger number of lodges in the order. Its new temple in Paris was solemnly inaugurated in 1897. By then, the DH had created a masonic culture in keeping with its mission to promote equality, peace, and solidarity in the interest of humanity. Much of that culture emphasized a fellowship of men and women striving for a common purpose, in effect a civic morality, that enabled the DH to subsist in a difficult climate. The Grand Orient and the Grande Loge were far from welcoming; the new order’s lodges and their initiates needed careful mentoring; and the press found mixed masonry an object of fear and derision that cynical right-wing journalists like Léo Taxil and religious zealots like Mgr. Amand-Joseph Fava exploited for their own purposes. The public hysteria arising from the Dreyfus Affair contributed much to the antimasonic—and anti-Semitic—rhetoric often deployed by the same sources. Consequently, the DH’s leaders turned discreet about their recruitment, politics, and public image, lest they provoke the authorities any more than the existence of a tolerated association already did. As it is, the police had maintained a hefty file on Maria Deraismes, whom they viewed as a social (and masonic) renegade.

By 1900 the new order’s growth had stalled everywhere in France—it would establish just its fifth lodge in 1902—but this disappointment was not reflected abroad. Several formal requests in the same period for affiliations in the Netherlands, Britain, and the United States suggested that the DH had earned widespread recognition. In time, as it achieved international status, the order required an administrative structure more like the Suprême Conseil de France.
Accordingly, the DH elaborated a Suprême Conseil Universel Mixte to include authorization of the higher degrees (from the 4th to the 33rd) as an incentive for more initiations at every level and everywhere. Proclaimed Georges Martin after a select group of members instituted the organizational changes, “we must be united in our Ordre Mixte et International (OMMI), everyone gathered into a single Suprême Conseil Universel Mixte for the entire world, [to serve as] a generative power, a source of regulation, direction, and maintenance of our Ordre Mixte’s law.”29 Thus marked the official justification for the DH’s version of mixed masonry worldwide, the OMMI, in 1901.30 It seemed to be a natural evolution from the order’s modest beginnings among a select mix of politically progressive masons, but the secretive process leading to a fait accompli came at the expense of democratic principle.

Such a bold step encountered immediate and fierce opposition within the DH, led by Albert Lantoine and his wife Blanche Côte d’Arly. They raised a host of concerns; transparency, lodge autonomy, nationalist sympathies, and ritualistic focus on the first three degrees headed the list.31 By secretly elaborating a new governing structure, fostering expansion and working side degrees, they felt, the DH was sacrificing its tight sense of community. It did not take long for the obedience’s annual convents to turn divisive, and they remained so for fifteen years before World War I. The upshot was a split in 1913; two lodges (Nos. 4 and 5) and parts of two others (Nos. 12 and 27), out of twenty-one in France at the time, formed the Grande Loge Mixte Symbolique Écossaise (GLMSE). “A certain nerve is necessary to impose a new federation on the masonic world,” the dissidents declared. “The innovators [i.e., of the OMMI], in effect, are disturbing the order to which everyone is accustomed, . . . their gesture [is] inspired less by a desire to make things better than it is to satisfy ambitions.”32 All did not go well for the GLMSE once war broke out in 1914. Its outreach was frustrated by the extensive military mobilization of potential brothers and by the new responsibilities of potential sisters. Moreover, a sizeable recruitment base in the northeastern quadrant of the country was disrupted by military hostilities. Discouraged, the dissidents finally lost interest; and the remaining lodges rejoined the DH in 1920. Despite Lantoine’s postmortem, recounted at length in his history of the craft, Martin’s organizational legerdemain prevailed.33

The DH remained intact in large measure because of the Ordre Maçonnique Mixte International.34 It made possible renewed and sustained growth in lodges and in membership. Already by 1914, the new order had recognized about five hundred lodges and more than twelve thousand members worldwide, while the French federation represented about twenty lodges and one thousand members
in France, notwithstanding the schism with the Grande Loge Mixte Symbolique Écossaise. The Great War would check this uptick, reducing the total number of operating lodges to 285 while holding steady in France and its outre-mer territories with twenty-seven by 1921. Renewed increases occurred in the 1920s only to level off in France during the 1930s; on the eve of World War II there would be about eighty lodges and four thousand members, little more than a decade earlier. Much of the obedience focused on the 227 lodges working the blue degrees, leaving a minority of master masons to seek side degrees from the other lodges if they so wished. Meanwhile, the OMMI mushroomed in the United States, Britain and its colonies. Those lodges and their membership represented the bulk of co-masonry overseas, thanks largely to the strenuous efforts of Louis Goaziou and Annie Besant. The global extent of the new order, whose constitution was formally approved at its first convent in 1921—the same year that the Grand Orient recognized the DH—substantiated the Fédération Française’s claims of responsibility when its by-laws were ratified in 1923. By odd happenstance, lodges in the capital city of Paris also proliferated between 1920 and 1940, from four to twenty-one, a jump from 15 percent to 25 percent of the order; the vast majority of the others were in cities of fifty thousand or more inhabitants (with the curious exception of towns to the west in Charente-Inférieure). This domestic trend toward urban association was due, most likely, to social and demographic shifts in the general population since the mid-nineteenth century.

As the third largest masonic obedience in France, though well behind the Grand Orient and Grande Loge with membership in the tens of thousands by 1940, the DH represented the order most clearly committed to the initiation of women. Their participation marked the DH in distinctive ways. Sisters constituted two-thirds of their members; one-third of them were married to another mason in the order; and if one considers the brethren in the Grande Loge and the Grand Orient, fully half of all DH sisters were “married” to the craft. About sixty DH couples had louveton children. Still more extended family—siblings, aunts, uncles, cousins, nieces, nephews, and in-laws—confirmed the familial feel of the lodges. By the 1930s, as Yves Hivert-Mesecca and Gisèle Hivert-Mesecca point out, virtual masonic “dynasties” made their appearance, such as the Cambillards, the Desbordes, and the Martins (unrelated to Georges and Marie-Georges). This density of relation replicated precisely the intimacy of an earlier era, which the festive adoption ceremonies of the nineteenth century sought to achieve. But it also contrasted sharply with the fears still expressed by the Grand Orient and the Grande Loge, the same concerns expressed in the eighteenth century, that sisters would disrupt the fraternity of the brothers.
Women’s presence did indeed affect the nature of relations among the brothers—both masonic and actual—primarily because close relatives tended to join the lodge with them. Ironically, as more wives of masons shared in mixed masonry, the all-male obediences also experienced the shift at home, if not at the lodge, to a species of masonic domestication. “The Droit Humain [order],” writes historian Marc Grosjean with some exaggeration, “was above all and especially a family between the two world wars.”

At the same time, as masonic clans matured, the DH extended its reach to a broader middle section of the population. The rapid turnover of lodges—during the interwar period, roughly a third of them disappeared and were replaced by new ones—afforded opportunities to a different social profile. As mentioned earlier, the DH attracted more professional women like Dorothée Chellier, but also a wider spectrum of the middle class: primary and secondary school teachers, office administrators and their staff, technicians, engineers, artists, and authors, as well as commercial and industrial personnel. By 1938, the plurality of sisters remained without occupation outside the home (21 percent); many more were engaged in clerical work (17 percent), small businesses (14 percent), education (12 percent), and the civil service professions (6 percent). For the most part, this employment made room for more independent women, but in circumstances that profoundly limited their abilities to sustain a household of their own (their possibilities were still ruled by men in their chosen occupational fields). Members of farming families, the industrial working class, artisanal and retail shops were nearly absent, as were representatives of the aristocracy and the upper middle class. For all intents and purposes, workers were never part of masonry, and the independently wealthy abandoned the lodges. On the eve of World War II, the craft’s membership trended to the middling bourgeoisie, particularly in the provincial cities and towns, giving masonry much of its distinctive social character, which owed much to France’s relatively slow process of modernization.

This trend is less apparent in the DH lodges of France’s overseas departments. While French colonies were underrepresented—for example, there were no DH lodges in the Pacific Ocean, the Indian Ocean, or Guyana before 1940—north Africa was in much better touch with developments in the métropole. Lodges in Tunisia (1), Algeria (3), and Morocco (1) undoubtedly benefited from French citizens in residence because of these territories’ strategic importance to France. In September 1938, during the last OMMI convent (a year before the outbreak of World War II), there were no fewer than eleven national federations, nine of them active (fascist Italy and post-Pilsudski Poland were notably absent); there were also eleven multinational jurisdictions, seven of them active for much the
same reason: relatively open, stable political regimes (Argentina, Bulgaria, Costa Rica, Greece, Netherlands, Peru, and Switzerland, for example, were eligible to send delegates). These counts subsume the various DH administrative units in the British Empire (see app. 6). But this is not all. The order’s outreach also accorded visiting privileges for brethren of other obediences to attend DH tenues (at the appropriate grade of the guest); eighteen in Europe, eighteen elsewhere in the world, plus the region-and state-specific orders in the United States, were recognized in this way. Similarly, the DH earned additional bona fides internationally by its participation in the Association Maçonnique Internationale, the brainchild of Édouard Quartier-La-Tente in 1902 who had been a member of the Swiss lodge Alpina in Berne. By 1923, sixty obediences, mostly in Europe, had ties to this transnational masonic interest group open to mixed orders.

The major impetus of the geographical expansion of interest in the DH was the British Empire and its anglophone reaches in North America (Canada, the United States, West Indies), South Africa, south Asia (India, Ceylon), Australia and New Zealand. This component of growth was owed most to Annie Besant (1847–1933), among the earliest British citizens to be initiated in 1901. She carried her allegiance to the craft back to London where she founded its first DH lodge, Human Duty No. 6, in 1902 and then some four hundred others elsewhere in the world. Besant’s theosophy, her feminism, her activism, her perseverance, her charisma, and her many allies all played into this singular achievement. As fellow mason Francesca Arundale observed years later, “With her tireless energy, and her characteristic devotion to a Cause, which she has reason to believe was considered important to some of those great Agents of the Grand Architect of the Universe, to whose service she was utterly dedicated, Sister Annie Besant had set to work to interest [others] in the new project.” Given differences with the DH over her religious beliefs, which resulted in revised rituals invoking a supreme being, Besant moved to a more congenial milieu, the late Hélène Blavatsky’s theosophical commune in Adyar near Madras, to build a center of her own to recruit for the DH. This transplantation fostered the creation of mixed masonic lodges in India—more than a dozen of them before its independence in 1947—where theosophical reflection and humanitarian action were welcome, indeed integral to Indian interest in freemasonry. Besant’s work made the DH a truly global phenomenon.

These pioneers labored together at a propitious moment everywhere but especially in France. Historical factors favoring co-masonry included the legacy of the so-called New Woman, a significant cultural icon originating in the fin de siècle. During the Great War, women contributed their own blood, sweat,
and patriotic fervor in support of the troops at the front, despite concern on the part of reformers, like the freemason Hélène Brion, who advocated and worked for peace. Given the DH’s provision for political (and religious) discussion in the lodge, controversial matters could be hashed out for brothers and sisters to reach some modicum of consensus. Much could also be said about masonry’s social and deeply humane commitments, which attracted initiates keen on promoting progressive ideas and their application in the community by the 1920s.49 The widespread support that these masons expressed for the women’s movement clearly attracted the attention of others of like mind. Notwithstanding the DH’s socially conscious members, the labor and socialist movements remained suspicious of freemasonry’s bourgeois tenor. Yet Georges Martin and his successors understood that membership in the craft had to be within the financial means of all its brothers and sisters. For this reason, the order’s initial bylaws set fees and dues appropriate to workers and women. In 1900 the annual capitation of 11 francs was a bit more than three days’ wages for the average laborer nationally, much less than two days’ wages for a stonemason in Paris.30

The DH also drew adherents by its tolerance for religious speculation. Besant was merely the best known of those initiates who found the order congenial to their extralodge engagements, such as the mystical musings of Hélène Blavatsky and her Theosophical Society, which had organized its own mason-like lodge (Isis) in 1886. Its Parisian headquarters settled on the Square Rapp fifteen years later. Based on Blavatsky’s six-volumed The Secret Doctrine (1888), this syncretic occultism derived from Hinduism, Buddhism, and other esoteric traditions made for passionate supporters but also schisms within the society itself. The overlap with freemasonry is hard to overlook.51 In 1891 the spiritually restless feminist (and subsequent DH mason) Alexandra David-Néel was inspired to visit Adyar, India, to learn more from the theosophical gurus there; it marked her for life.52 Because of concerns with the society’s false premises, lest they lead the craft further astray, René Guénon the self-appointed guardian of masonry’s legacy spent considerable time and energy attacking theosophy for its “théosophisme.”53 Meanwhile, Marthe North-Siegfried the wealthy benefactor started a chapter in Strasbourg to complement the philosophical interests showcased in her Pythagoras Library, but also in her humanitarian work with the Red Cross, the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, and efforts to help lepers and the orphaned. For mystically inclined masons, such synergy of word and deed characterized both mixed masonry and theosophy.54

Perhaps the most ardent adept of this synergy—or Synarchy, as it was called in the fin de siècle—was the mage Gérard Encausse. He was better known as
Papus of the minor neo-Martinist paramasonic order for men and women. He pursued his interest in the occult as one of the original members of Isis, but soon grew disenchanted with Blavatsky and the Theosophists. In 1889 Papus informed the subscribers of his journal *L’Initiation*, “The Theosophical Society has said that we are not exclusively Theosophical enough, the spiritualists have accused us of being too much so, Catholics have suspected us of too much Freemasonry, and Freemasons of too much Catholicism.” By 1892 he had moved on to other organizations to explore the mystical knowledge underlying the secret rituals of freemasonry; and in 1896 Papus’s Ordre Martiniste started working degrees, but it struggled after his death twenty years later. This mixed variant of masonry remained unrecognized by the Grand Orient, the Grande Loge, or the DH, for a host of reasons concerning its principles, its rituals, and its membership (like many other entrepreneurial masons, Papus monetized the lodges he oversaw; members all paid steep initiation fees, membership dues, conference costs, and journal subscriptions). The intersection of masonry, theosophy, and the occult, culminating in the secret initiation, fascinated Papus and his devotees like Grande Maîtresse Anna de Wolska (a.k.a. Anna Wronski) and his wives Mathilde Innard d’Argence and Jeanne Charlotte. A half dozen other women participated in a ritual practice that was tied, albeit distantly, to the ideas of Martinès de Pasqually as mediated by Louis-Claude de Saint-Martin in the eighteenth century. It provided for the induction of women in the same lodge as men, though not necessarily by the same rituals or with the same enthusiasm.

Of importance to more women was the effort of the Grande Loge to modernize adoption masonry for women in their own lodges. The pioneers in this revival were found in *Le Libre Examen* (No. 217), which held its first tenue in March 1901. At the heart of the lodge was recognition that the regularity of adoption had never lapsed since the Grand Orient confirmed it back in 1774. But what made this instance so enticing to some was the lodge’s dedication to both the initiation of women and the social action on their behalf. For example, it championed the protection of unmarried mothers and their children, as evidenced in the revision of the women’s initiation rituals. A summary of the official welcome of eight new women masons, nearly all of them wives or daughters of brothers, underscored their commitments to abandoned mothers: “[The orator spoke to] the spirit of the old Adoption lodges, the work which they accomplished, the work of solidarity, of assistance, protection of the unfortunates, of the young women so disgraced and so despised, when [on the contrary] their state of holy motherhood ought to make them deserving of everyone’s support.” The lodge’s first year did not proceed smoothly after it was discovered that Grande Maîtresse
Blanche Muratet had helped establish a competing mixed lodge, La Raison Triomphante, soon after her election in Le Libre Examen. The result was a decision to close the adoption lodge just months after it had begun. It picked up again in a comparable format by 1912 at the request of Suzanne Galland during a tenue blanche. This time Le Libre Examen encountered no further complications until the unexpected loss of its oversight by the Grande Loge in 1937.

Le Libre Examen’s troubled development was reprised elsewhere in feminine masonry, as adoption with new rituals came to be called by the Grande Loge in the first four decades of the twentieth century. La Nouvelle Jérusalem had a more successful launch in 1907, as did its sister lodges nationally. Paris was not the only city where women expressed interest, whether it was by adoption, a freestanding or mixed lodge. In fact, there was sharp competition for initiates, particularly during World War I and immediately after the Grande Loge’s refusal to recognize adoption. The upshot was a limited number of ateliers (twenty-five) and a relatively small membership (three hundred) by 1937. Internal divisions over the legitimacy of the rite were well represented by Marie-E. Bernard-Leroy (1885–1960) and Jeanne van Migom (dates unknown), both of La Nouvelle Jérusalem; they responded forcefully to assertions expressed by Amélie André-Gedalge (1865–1931) of the DH over the nature of their initiation rituals. As Bernard-Leroy put it, “it is not so much a question of making ourselves the equals of men as one of achieving the greatest perfection of which we are capable.” In no way did women in feminine masonry consider the working of degrees in their lodge as inferior to those worked in the DH. The principle was a masonry for women, a craft of their own making, as authorized by the Grande Loge. In short, their rite was not mixed, proudly so, even if the Grande Loge ultimately abandoned the sisters and they struggled to maintain their craft on their own just before World War II. In the interim, by 1938, a small number of other like-minded women in Marseilles founded a lodge under the aegis of the Memphis-Misraïm order.

Freemason Women’s Feminist (and Labor) Networks

In the history of French masonry, Louise Michel’s initiations demonstrate the utility of social networks. The “Red Virgin,” as Michel was known after the Paris Commune, was nearly consumed by her oppositional politics, tapping into a long list of impromptu allies also working for grass-roots democracy, indigenous populations, labor unions, and women’s rights. These issues central to her work—like her lengthy terms in prison and exile in New Caledonia—meant a lifetime of engagement well before she came to masonry. Michel was already
seventy-three years old and in failing health when fellow feminists sponsored her first for the DH (1903) and then for the GLSE II M&M’s La Philosophie Sociale (1904). Association with these mixed lodges, filled as they were with Dreyfusards, radical republicans, anarchists, and neo-Malthusians, can be viewed as a culmination of Michel’s longstanding commitments. Her death in January 1905, while she was on a speaking tour to recruit other activists to her vision of freemasonry, ensured that her ties within the craft were relatively circumscribed, as evidenced by only twenty-three masons (or 19 percent) of the 120 people she had corresponded with since her adolescence (see app. 7). Notwithstanding a close affiliation with her lodges, Michel took after the elusive swallow she addressed in a poem with all too little time to make the fullest use of her newest connections: “I know not what echo of yours carried me / From distant shores; to live, a supreme law, / I must have, like you, air and freedom.”

Unlike the two earlier masons sans tablier, Anne-Catherine Helvétius in the 1780s and George Sand in the 1840s, Michel faced serious obstacles cultivating relationships, which often came at great risk during successive revolutionary uprisings and the state’s repressive responses to them. By 1901 when the Waldeck-Rousseau law on associations was enacted, however, civic activism in France reached an inflection point; it tipped at long last in favor of coordinated activities, including the promotion of women’s rights. It was much safer for dozens of officially sanctioned groups to contend nationally for controversial Civil Code reform, child welfare, coeducation, contraception, employment, and living wages in the job market (as well as the right of married women to keep those wages beginning in 1907). The Third Republic now afforded freemasons working in concert a remarkable range of options for long-term cooperative ventures.

In a new legal context, extended networks became easier to cultivate and to sustain, turning many lodges into public forums. According to historian Françoise Jupeau-Réquillard, the four principal obediences devoted the plurality of their discussions to women’s rights. The DH in particular deferred to its sisters—some two-thirds of its lodge members—whose interests were featured in the order’s annual questions for discussion after the lodges had provided their views.66 Later, between the wars, the DH proposed such topics as coeducation (1923), equality of men and women before the law (1925), reorganization of the family (1927), prostitution (1929), approaches to rationalism, collectivism, and individualism (1931), organization of work and leisure (1933), and extracurricular life of children and adolescents (1937). Most conferences held in the temples by masons (and nonmasons) spoke to these and other pertinent themes, underscoring masonry’s progressive social agenda in the period: strategies for disarmament, the socialist
renewal of society, the democratization of education, and the reform of the craft itself. As for the DH’s explicit advocacy, historian André Combes explains, “its work was not much different from that of other obediences. It concerned mainly education and social problems, [such as] the emancipation of women.”

Well before World War I, the organizational reach of freemason women had been extensive. The pioneering Eugénie Potonié-Pierre (1844–98), for instance, was an early member of the DH. A primary school teacher like several of her lodge sisters, she came to masonry via feminism and socialism. Already by the 1870s, Potonié-Pierre had joined the Société pour l’Amélioration de la Condition des Femmes, where she met Maria Deraismes and Léon Richer. Eventually she would become the Société’s secretary while she expanded her array of interests. Together with Léonie Rouzade in 1880 she founded the Union des Femmes, the first feminist group of socialists in France. Internal differences over leadership and focus of this organization led to the creation of the Ligue des Femmes in 1889 and the Solidarité des Femmes in 1891. The next year, Potonié-Pierre teamed up with Maria Martin and Julie Pasquier, the DH’s first initiates in 1893, to establish the Fédération Française des Sociétés Féministes (FFSF). This federation’s charter and its congress of feminist organizations in 1892 gave wide currency to the term féminisme as it is known today. Living with Edmond Pierre, the founder of the Ligue du Bien Public and a sincere pacifist with utopian leanings, Potonié-Pierre in time became more idealistic as she coauthored prose fiction with him. This partnership was a useful antidote for the antithetical politics of her socialist colleagues who refused to recognize the importance of women’s rights, especially at the congress of Jules Guesde’s Parti Ouvrier Français in 1893. One upshot of that failure was her implausible collaboration with a (likely) freemason, Paule Mink, in the pages of La Question sociale (The Social Question). But Potonié-Pierre’s sudden death by cerebral hemorrhage at age fifty-three cut short her masonic alliances with workers and feminists alike.

Nor was the indefatigable Madeleine Pelletier (1874–1939) altogether atypical a full generation later. At one time or another, she was a member of five lodges (La Philosophie Sociale, Diderot, Stuart Mill—which she instituted, La Nouvelle Jérusalem, and Le Droit Humain) plus five other associations. During World War I, given her medical training, she also tended the wounded on both sides of the conflict under the auspices of the Red Cross. The extent and depth of her social networks in and beyond these groups grew despite Pelletier’s well-known proclivity for ideological purity at the expense of personal relations. She developed strong bonds with other determined activists, such as Louise Michel whom she recruited into masonry and later, in the 1930s, the labor organizer
and pacifist Hélène Brion who faithfully visited Pelletier at the psychiatric ward (where she had been committed during the last months of her life after a debilitating stroke). Much of what we know about Pelletier comes not from her personal theatrics but from her abundant publications. By her writing as well as by her lodge involvement, Pelletier touched many others besides her most ardent followers.

Pelletier’s views were much less amenable to her contemporaries than they have since become to us. Given her understanding of the cultural construction of gender, what she called “psychological sex,” she rejected widely accepted assertions of those who believed that men and women could be equal in their complementary gender-role differences. An ardent individualist, she dressed as a man because she expected to be accorded the rights of a man. As she bluntly explained in an unpublished letter to another gender-bending female, Arria Ly, “My clothes say to men, ‘I am your equal.’” When the Section Française de l’Internationale Ouvrière (SFIO) organized the Groupe des Femmes Socialistes in 1912, she refused to be shunted aside by participating in what she viewed as a sideshow to the main tasks at hand. Moreover, she performed and supervised abortions in explicit violation of the law (for which she was ultimately arrested in 1939). By comparison, Pelletier’s campaign for women’s suffrage was more of interest to the middle class than it was for workers, the very women she sought to rally as a socialist until the SFIO split in 1920 and she joined the Parti Communiste Français. By this time, Pelletier had long since ceased attending initiations at her masonic lodges. She no longer needed their networks to further the rights of women, preferring to tap into those offered by the all-male Grand Orient that she considered far more influential, “the most interesting portion of freemasonry.” One can imagine what the brethren of the oldest and largest obedience in France made of her overtures.

Potonié-Pierre and Pelletier represented one commitment that dozens of other freemason women also embraced, the labor movement, particularly after the 1884 law permitting unionization. These masonic sympathies had appeared much earlier among the Saint-Simonians such as Suzanne Voilquin, Pauline Roland, and Eugénie Niboyet in the 1830s and 1840s and Élisa Lemonnier and André Léo in the 1860s and 1870s. The anarchist Louise Michel, the socialist Marianne Rauze, and the unionist Hélène Brion translated these sentiments into more concerted action also apart from masonry (like Michel, Potonié-Pierre was late to be initiated, Rauze chose a more conservative adoption lodge, and Brion’s initiation was mis-recorded and has been easily overlooked). But their civic morality was consistent with the craft’s social activism. Influenced by
Pelletier’s socialism, for example, Brion (1882–1962) organized primary school teachers like herself into sociétés amicales.® Contending that there could be no victors in the war—neither women working on the home front nor men fighting in the trenches—Brion was brought before a military tribunal and convicted of defeatism in 1918. Her cause célèbre—the trial was well covered in the popular press—blazed a path for pacifist women during the interwar period when the stakes were lower.® As Brion stated during her trial, “The accusation alleges that under the pretext of feminism, I am a pacifist. This distorts for convenience sake the logic of my cause: I affirm that it is the just reverse. . . . I am an enemy of war because I am a feminist. War is the victory of brute strength, feminism can only prevail by moral force.”® The masonic Brion owed this insight in part to her active participation in six women’s rights organizations, in addition to those she organized on behalf of working women.®

It is clear that lodges in the GLSE II M&M were given to more radical tendencies than either the Grande Loge or the DH. If some socialists like Louise Saumoneau expressed disdain for the bourgeois nature of freemason women during the Third Republic, they surely overlooked the politics of Potonié-Pierre, Pelletier, Rauze, and Brion, but also that of three equally formidable sisters initiated in the Diderot: Véra Starkoff, Nelly Roussel, and Marie Bonnevial.®° Their sensitivity to the struggles of working-class women belied their nominally middle-class origins. Starkoff, for example, was a Russian immigrant; as a teenager, she had been drawn to anarchism in her home country; in °°° she fled the secret police to Switzerland and then to France. Like other freemason women of her generation, Starkoff supported a variety of causes: free thought, women’s rights, child welfare, and international peace. But even advocacy of free love in her play, L’Amour libre (1902) staged for the first time in her lodge, was deliberately addressed to workers: “Dear comrades, I dedicate to you my first theatrical work, in witness of my profound gratitude.”®° As actress and dramatist, Starkoff performed for the Universités Populaires, which highlighted problems of interest to her intended audiences, such as the oppression of domestic service work in M. C. Poinsot and Georges Normandy’s Les Vaincues (The Defeated, 1909). An elegant translator of the Russian novelist Tolstoy, Starkoff had a broad vision of social justice. Quoting Tolstoy, she wrote, “everything that unites humankind is good and attractive, everything that separates us is evil and unseemly.”®°° Peace, justice, and egalitarianism are the natural results of this masonic tenet.

Nelly Roussel (1878–1922) shared this vision, as a matter of principle, in her promotion of reproductive freedom for everyone, rich or poor, middle or working class.®°° After her initiation in 1902, Roussel sustained her work on behalf of
masonic ideals as they pertained to women in particular, especially in her first years as the Diderot’s oratrice.⁸⁹ She knew firsthand the pain and complications of childbirth—she had three children, one of whom died in infancy— and was impressed by how theatrical performance, on and off the rostrum, could convey powerful messages. A disciple and distant relation of Paul Robin, who taught contraception to women in his clinic, Roussel committed herself to generalizing this effort in opposition to the sacrificial ideal of the suffering female.⁹⁰ She started lecturing in 1901, first in Paris, then elsewhere in France, Belgium, and Switzerland, as her reputation for effective public speaking grew. It did not take Roussel long to broach related topics, such as women’s rights, world peace, and free thought, in various fora, including masonic lodges.⁹¹ Her principal themes drew from a doctrine of individual happiness grounded in justice and harmony. “The war between the sexes, alas! has existed since the day man arrogated to himself an illogical and unjustifiable power over woman!” she exclaimed in her lecture on “the eternally sacrificed” in 1903. “There is no peace possible between the master and the slave.”⁹² She invariably finished her speeches with readings from her play *Par la révolte* (1903, *By Revolting*).⁹³ Roussel believed firmly in reproductive rights, just as did her fellow neo-Malthusian, Émilie Lamotte (1876–1909), with equivalent masonic connections.⁹⁴

The lodges of the GLSE II M&M were not the only ones to attract a cadre of social activists. The adoption lodges in the Grande Loge also spoke out, albeit with more attention to reforms of masonry itself. A member of Le Libre Examen Adoption, Marianne Rauze (1875–1964) participated in the Section Française de l’Internationale Ouvrière and later in the Parti Communiste Français.⁹⁵ But there were others like Suzanne Galland (1882–1961), the lodge’s grande maîtresse for twenty-eight years (1912–40), and Marie Linval-Lantzenberg, the lodge’s delegate to the 1920 congress of pacifists in Geneva, both of whom enjoined their sisters to consider women’s rights as a natural extension of their masonic practice. From a privileged position in Le Libre Examen, Galland exhorted the newly initiated and the audiences of her lectures sponsored by the lodge. She was tireless in her call for a purely secular education for children. “School should train secular minds open to the light,” she stated. “Secularity is the liberation of conscience, the hatred of falsehood, the love of enlightenment, the mastery of oneself, the freedom of thought.”⁹⁶ Secular thinking was “the religion of Humanity,” masonry’s special charge, she asserted, one fully in keeping with the inclinations of its sisters and the tradition of masonic sagesse (philosophical truth) since the eighteenth century. Closely allied to this theme were, not surprisingly, the childrearing practices women needed to learn so that such an education could have its greatest impact.
Speaking to a larger audience about the rights of children, she extended her social network of influence during her long masonic engagement, which continued for another decade after World War II. Her attention then turned to *loges féminines* (lodges for women) during the establishment of the Union Maçonnique Féminine de France in 1945 and the Grande Loge Féminine de France in 1952.²⁷

Less well known but no less tied to progressive adoption masonry was Marie Linval-Lantzenberg (1889–1944?), a talented musician married to the Spinoza scholar and fellow mason Raoul Lantzenberg.²⁸ Her idée fixe was world peace. Soon after World War I, during the meeting of the Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom in Geneva, Linval-Lantzenberg was persuaded by others in attendance that they had identified a feminist issue. “The effort of women in all countries,” she reported to her lodge soon afterward, “tends entirely towards peace, and women must not rest until they are distanced forever, at last, from war.”²⁹ Accordingly, Linval-Lantzenberg believed, there could be no better expression of what masons meant by universal brotherhood, or more compelling interest for women who were anxious to protect their families. These two aspirations for her were one and the same, which stuck with her for some time. In 1925, not long before the Treaty of Locarno outlawing war was signed, she founded the Union et Bienfaisance adoption lodge and in 1936 its successor, La République Sociale. As these lodges’ grande maîtresse, she supported in her numerous lectures and publications, travels to international conventions, and Franco-German interlodge relations to advance a better-informed understanding between the two former adversaries (it helped that she spoke fluent German). Masonry was, in effect, her platform for coordination beyond her lodge, spearheading masonic adoption’s participation in the fraternal reconciliation of the Grand Orient, the Grande Loge, and the DH, as part of the French federation in support of the League of Nations. She maintained this vision during the Vichy-led restrictions on the craft before she was deported; she never returned after World War II.

What these women’s networks indicate is the variety of their connectedness. Much of this fellowship was focused on the lodge, as nearly all the grandes maîtresses and oratrices like Bernard-Leroy, Galland, and others demonstrated, very early on in their masonic careers. It is easy to understand the natural ardor of recent initiates for their new-found solidarity in adoption. As a consequence, their early networks tended to be limited but intense. In time, however, the masonic connections attenuated as sisters pursued their ideals outside the lodge, sometimes in other lodges (whether or not they were in the same order), more often in other associations (generally those more focused on social action).
These figures joined other communities, especially for the promotion of women’s rights, which made their networks more expansive but their masonry less central to their identities. In many cases, like those of Roussel and Rauze, these civic-minded joiners found more satisfaction and support in other groups, thereby drifting away from their lodges. This tendency was particularly evident in adoption orders, which were smaller, more intimate, and occasionally more conflicted (Pelletier was alleged to have waved a pistol at a fellow mason in La Nouvelle Jérusalem). Eventually, the larger, mixed lodges in the DH became more cosmopolitan, less constraining, much less of a family. More sisters like Dorothée Chellier moved on soon after their initiations, even if they remained active in another lodge elsewhere within the obedience. The DH’s familial quality had its limits even before Georges Martin and Marie-George Martin had died. The DH became more an institutionalized organization with an extraterritorial reach in a larger, more fully elaborated third sector during the interwar years.

An active participant in this organizational trend is Ghénia Avril de Sainte-Croix (1855–1939), arguably the best networked member of the masonic community during the last decades of the Third Republic. The “Josephine Butler of France,” the leading French feminist of her generation, Avril de Sainte-Croix enjoyed the modest resources of a respectable bourgeois woman residing in Paris’s 16th arrondissement. There she briefly hosted at-home gatherings for remarkable individuals like Clémence Royer (the scientist and DH lodge member) and Maude Gonne (the Irish revolutionary and initiate in the paramasonic Hermetic Order of the Golden Dawn). Her first calling was as a journalist and writer; early in her career, she published in no fewer than five Parisian dailies, such as Marguerite Durand’s La Fronde (The Rebellion). In 1907 she published her foundational study _Le Féminisme_. Whatever her masonic affiliations, Avril de Sainte-Croix developed a long list of causes to champion, hosting international conferences in order to bring public attention to women’s rights (including universal suffrage), abolitionism (ending the traffic in women and children), and gainful employment for women. Her preferred organizations sponsored a number of collaborative efforts before, during, and after World War I. She led a long, busy, consequential life.

Mixed masonry seems dwarfed by Avril de Sainte-Croix’s manifold associational allegiances. They centered on issues of concern to many more people than the members of a masonic lodge, however engaged brothers and sisters were in their own work on behalf of others. But Avril de Sainte-Croix did not ignore the place of co-masonry in her telling book on French feminism. The chapter on the
early organizations of the women’s movement makes a point of mentioning not only Maria Deraismes’s pioneering initiation at Les Libres Penseurs (Le Pecq) in 1882, but also her founding of the first DH lodge in 1893. Although the account is brief, it is central to the chapter, which quotes a feminist principle stated in Georges Martin’s rare, privately printed *Étude abrégée de la franc-maçonnerie mixte et de son organisation* (1893–98, *An Abridged Study of Mixed Freemasonry and its Organization*, 1893–98) specifically for DH initiates: “woman, the equal of man in the family, in society, in all of humanity, is one of the primary reforms needed to achieve an ideal social state.” Avril de Sainte-Croix clearly understood this masonic aspiration.

Mixed masonry’s dense links to women’s rights during the Third Republic are thus far from coincidental. As this book contends, one cannot understand the one without reference to the other, so convergent were the objectives of both movements. Their networks overlapped and drew upon one another, making possible the personnel and resources necessary to achieve the gender equality so earnestly sought by freemason feminists. Indeed, little distinction exists between the two currents when the likes of Avril de Sainte-Croix advocated their mutually reinforcing goals. Antimasonic publications in particular, such as the so-called exposés by Jean Tourmentin, Gabriel Soulacroix, Abel Clarin de la Rive, and Ernest Jouin, underscored this connection time and again to the delectation of reactionary readers who were as hostile to women’s rights as they were to the craft.

Avril de Sainte-Croix was no anomaly. There were no fewer than twelve DH masons who held leadership positions in organizations of serious interest to such women from the fin de siècle onward. These pioneers of the nineteenth century, the most extensively networked among them at least, also laid the associational infrastructure for the French women’s movement, often in concert with others. Marie Bonnevial (1841–1918), in particular, was a member of several groups with converging interests in women’s rights and work. An unyielding freethinker, caring teacher, eloquent speaker, passionate *syndicaliste*, and contributor to Marguerite Durand’s *La Fronde* and to Benoît Malon’s *Revue socialiste* (*Socialist Review*), Bonnevial was much more than a creature of mixed masonry. But the conjuncture of her innumerable activities appeared, by and large, in the prominent roles she played in lodges of two different orders, the DH and the GLSE II M&M. Her masonic connections to multiple causes were intentional—they were how she got things done—in keeping with her belief in masonry’s vision of fraternity for the public good, starting with wage earners. “The moral and material as well as the economic and political emancipation of workers,” she explained in 1903, “must be pursued without distinction of either sex or race.”
In masonry, as elsewhere in French civil society, progressive women often had multiple connections. In the meetings of representatives to the Conseil National, for example, the socialist Maria Martin (1839–1910) frequently crossed paths with her fellow masons from the DH, Bonnevial and Potonié-Pierre, but also Eliska Vincent, Maria Pognon, and Louise Wiggishoff, all of whose activism closely resembles one another’s. DH members were omnipresent at feminist gatherings in Paris. But these women with a wide array of affiliations did not necessarily accomplish more than those with a narrower range of ties to a more single-minded purpose. Tighter social networks were remarkably effective given the right context for their particular sphere of engagement, be it scientific inquiry, community work, or national welfare. In this regard, more focused commitments are also recognizable among DH masons, like the scientist Clémence Royer (1830–1902) and the philanthropists Louise Koppe (1846–1900) and Marie Béquet de Vienne (1844–1913). Their achievements, especially in their respective domains, were considerable. Royer, Koppe, and Béquet provide another view of women’s sociabilité outside the masonic lodge, just like their counterparts who in other masonic orders turned to symbolic ritual at home and abroad, such as Annie Besant the theosophist and Alexandra David-Néel the Buddhist. Each in her own way pursued related masonic passions for self-discovery and exploration, journeys both inward and outward in the world, the two sides to masonic initiation as described much later by other freemason women.

For more effective collaboration, associations promoting women’s interests were gathered very early, in 1892–93, into the Fédération Française (FFSF) under the initial direction of Eugénie Potonié-Pierre (and then the nonmason Aline Valette). Altogether in this group there were eleven other DH sisters at the head of or representing their respective constituents at one time or another (one of which was also led by a mason from another obedience). That so many personal connections arose from one masonic lodge suggests some kind of coordination at the local level, albeit with a national impact (see table 1). One sees a similar apparent “collusion” in this order among the leaders of the Conseil National des Femmes Françaises. The cofounders and driving forces behind this federation in 1901, Pognon and Avril de Sainte-Croix, also had ties to the DH, as did Bonnevial (in 1901–18) and Wiggishoff (1901), each of whom played instrumental roles in the Conseil National. It is this density of relationship that gave co-masonry a special place in the women’s movement on the eve of World War I. In fact, as sociologists have amply demonstrated, women’s rights organizations depended upon such federated, cross-associational networks to achieve their goals despite—and because of—the substantive differences among the activists themselves.
What the Great War of 1914–18 meant was not so much a dramatic break with the past, we know, as it was an acceleration of trends that had their origins earlier in the long nineteenth century.116 This historical continuity was evident in gender relations, mass democracy, industrial technology, and the fading legacy of the eighteenth-century Enlightenment, a complex of developments affecting French civil society and the public space of women.117 The war sharpened the divide between men in the trenches and women at home; bearing arms in wartime was a man’s job, while literally everything else required women to backfill the loss of men in the household, on the assembly line, in the fields. Remarked historian Françoise Thébaud, “France at war found its feminine side” as women made considerable sacrifices of their own.118 Meanwhile, combat casualties were of massive proportions and touched nearly every family in the country. To pursue victory, whatever the cost, the regime proclaimed a state of siege (a legal contrivance
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**Table 1. Leadership of Associations in *Fédération Française des Sociétés Féministes* (1892)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>*Marie Béquet de Vienne</th>
<th>Société d’Allaitement Maternel et le Refuge-ouvroir des Femmes Enceintes (with assistance of <em>Marguerite Cremnitz)</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Julie Pasquier and *Yvonne Netter</td>
<td>Société pour l’Amélioration du Sort de la Femme et la Revendication de ses Droits (aided by <em>Louise Wiggishoff)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Maria Pognon and *Marie Bonnevial</td>
<td>Ligue Française pour les Droits des Femmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmond Potonié-Pierre</td>
<td>Ligue du Bien Public (with assistance of *Myrtille Renget and <em>Eugénie Potonié-Pierre)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Marie Pierre</td>
<td>Ligue pour la Réforme du Costume Féminin et la Liberté du Costume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Marya Chéliga-Loewy</td>
<td>Union Universelle des Femmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Eugénie Potonié-Pierre</td>
<td>Solidarité des Femmes (with *Caroline Kauffmann, *Madeleine Pelletier, and <em>Maria Martin)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Marie Bonnevial (delegate)</td>
<td>Syndicat des Membres de l’Enseignement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


---

**The Communities of Freemason Women across Two World Wars**

What the Great War of 1914–18 meant was not so much a dramatic break with the past, we know, as it was an acceleration of trends that had their origins earlier in the long nineteenth century.116 This historical continuity was evident in gender relations, mass democracy, industrial technology, and the fading legacy of the eighteenth-century Enlightenment, a complex of developments affecting French civil society and the public space of women.117 The war sharpened the divide between men in the trenches and women at home; bearing arms in wartime was a man’s job, while literally everything else required women to backfill the loss of men in the household, on the assembly line, in the fields. Remarked historian Françoise Thébaud, “France at war found its feminine side” as women made considerable sacrifices of their own.118 Meanwhile, combat casualties were of massive proportions and touched nearly every family in the country. To pursue victory, whatever the cost, the regime proclaimed a state of siege (a legal contrivance
from 1849 and 1878), thereby holding in abeyance fundamental civil liberties. The union sacrée stifled political differences; the popular press voiced no dissent; unauthorized public assembly was strictly forbidden. The result was in stark contradiction with a liberal republic since its inception in the 1870s. For all intents and purposes, an independent third sector, like truth and trust, was the war’s first casualty. Its leaders, men and women alike, whether or not they were feminists or freemasons, preserved a unity largely imposed by the state for five long years.

In this context, what happened to masonry for women? Like much else in French associational life unrelated to the war, it was neglected for the duration of the conflict. As men left for the front, lodges ceased to meet, freeing the sisters to engage in other activities more directly supportive of the country’s defense. No hard numbers exist for mixed or adoption lodges, but the Grand Orient can serve as a crude proxy. During the war, it lost about a third of its brethren—down from thirty-three thousand to twenty-three thousand members—and about 12 percent of its lodges—down to 410, sixty fewer than it had in 1914.119 The decline of lodges in the Ordre Maçonnique Mixte International was greater abroad, about a third, but not at home; all twenty-seven French DH lodges survived. Sisters were also lost to the craft, though for different reasons: volunteer work, paid employment, and familial dislocation. Although no women died in combat, their fathers, brothers, sons, and husbands disappeared (by 1916 there were six hundred thousand war widows); and they made accommodations to the carnage as best they could. Moreover, they confronted an increasingly smaller pool of eligible men to (re)marry; 1.4 million men between the ages of twenty and thirty-nine died during the war; there were only one thousand eligible grooms (including those maimed at the front) for nearly 1,200 eligible brides (including those with children).

The potential disruptions to women’s lives in the lodge are obvious, and yet their allegiance as masons to the nation went unchallenged. Like many others, they responded to Prime Minister René Vivani’s exhortation in August 1914 for women not solely to harvest the crops that men had left behind, but to rise to a higher calling. “There is, at this grave hour, no demeaning work,” he proclaimed. “Everything is grand that serves the country. Get up! Get going! Get to work! Tomorrow there will be glory enough for everyone.”120 A well-known mason thereby made community a patriotic duty. And so the philanthropy organized by the Conseil National des Femmes Françaises and the Union Française pour le Suffrage des Femmes, in cooperation with the DH, drew sisters to help unemployed women find work, to provide soldiers with warm clothing, to nurse the wounded on behalf of the Red Cross, and to create a registry for refugees and separated family members in order for them to trace their loved ones. In all this
activity, freemason women with a feminist leaning solidified their reputation for good works, a respected image of heroic self-sacrifice for the nation.

Freemason women’s passions for feminist causes remained firm despite the war and the nationalist enthusiasms that sustained it. But the reinforcement of traditional gender norms, the self-censorship on women’s rights, the competing full-time jobs at work and at home, in short, the retreat from social action required a creative response to the situation that temporarily silenced the feminists. As the historian Margaret Darrow points out, “In the main, French women were left to find their own way to acceptable female war service amid the pitfalls already identified by pre-war commentators. . . . A misstep meant undermining gender” roles more pointedly prescribed during the conflict. While basking in the reprieve from the insistent antifeminist rhetoric that had belittled the women’s movement in the long nineteenth century, freemason women still had to find ways to assert their views publicly, discreetly but no less firmly than earlier, on reproductive rights, women’s suffrage, white slavery, and, yes, international peace. Activists thus confronted a new, more dangerous double-bind.

In this regard, Nelly Roussel was exemplary. Distraught about the war from the outset, often too ill to speak in public, she gave voice to her feminist ideals as a member of the Union Fraternelle des Femmes. She addressed women’s rights in articles for three different newspapers written with an eye to the considerable personal sacrifices that women were making for the nation; good citizens deserve their rights, not the selective provision for war widows and grieving mothers that Maurice Barrès had proposed in 1916. Moreover, she regretted the armed conflict and the hatred that the press had whipped up to drive it onward. In response to Romain Rolland’s gratuitous critique of women’s failure to exercise their moral authority to have stopped the war before it began—a theme Roussel herself would take up briefly after the war—she drew careful distinctions between bellicose regimes and their otherwise peaceful citizens. “We women,” she declaimed in 1916, “have the responsibility to guard jealously the sacred flame . . . just and generous, a source of love and happiness, a safeguard for Peace.” Roussel subsequently did what she could to oppose the draconian 1920 law limiting women’s access to information about contraception, but by then she was already too ill with tuberculosis to do any more. She died, age forty-four, in 1922, a year after the publication of her hauntingly wistful, melancholic verse: “I am weary, sick and sad; everything hurts me; / Life is stupid and the world mean; / My ideal is dying, and hope deserts me, / Fast flees my youth.”

As noted earlier, the multifaceted Marie Bonnevial had been active in Conseil National des Femmes Françaises since its inception in 1901. Her commitment
to national solidarity during the war was an outgrowth of her understanding of solidarity in the labor and feminist movements; what was good for the working class and women was also good for the country. With workers and middle-class progressives united, Bonnevial felt, France would defeat Germany; and the people whose interests she defended would reap the benefits of their contributions to victory. She remained deeply engaged with masonry, serving as the DH’s grande maîtresse, as well as with women’s rights, especially women’s employment and suffrage. She allowed herself to be elected president of the Ligue Française pour les Droits des Femmes and to head the suffrage section of the Conseil National (all with a particular focus on the concerns of women working at home). But in April 1915, like her associates in the CNFF and the UFSF, she could not agree to proposals for a peace conference, certainly not so long as German troops continued to occupy northeastern France. As a volunteer nurse, she had seen firsthand the results of their presence on French soil. Germany must withdraw its forces, she said, before there could be any efforts to reach an armistice. Ironically, Bonnevial was herself a victim of the conflict; while crossing a street in Paris, she was struck and killed by a military ambulance from the front in early December 1918. It was just days before the Conseil National’s first public meeting since 1914, during which she was to speak on women’s suffrage. As the CNFF president Julie Siegfried stated at the funeral, Bonnevial was “one of the most eminent feminists of our time,” ever sensitive to the needs of the children she taught for many years, of her fellow teachers whom she helped to organize, of poor workers whose subsistence wages were never paid, and of her brothers and sisters in the lodge.126

Arguably Bonnevial’s antithesis was the provocative mason Hélène Brion whose anticipation of peace was much less patient and whose patriotism was indeed questioned. Like others at the beginning of the war, Brion called for a cessation to German hostilities before disarmament could be discussed. Her name headed the list of socialist feminists writing to La Française (The French Woman) in early 1915 to propose that women be invited to sit on any future peace commissions.127 But Brion’s concerns with the never-ending war moved her to prepare pamphlets on peace without victory, la paix blanche (a peace with no preconditions), an instance of defeatism after the horrific battle of the Somme in 1916. She did so with the tacit support of the Confédération Général du Travail, for which she served as secretary-general during the conflict. Her secret meetings with other pacifists did not go unnoticed. Remarked one unnamed police spy, “Hélène Brion, a teacher in Pantin, an unkempt woman, an hysterical in speech and writing, . . . stimulates the ardor of her comrades, union members, all over the country.”128 In short, she was a threat to the war effort.
After a police raid on Brion’s home, which uncovered incriminating evidence of her peace work, she was fired from her teaching job in July 1917. Four months later, she and her godson, Gaston Mouflard, were arrested and held for trial by a military commission in March 1918—during Big Bertha’s shelling of Paris. At least one freemason feminist testified on Brion’s proper “morality”: Nelly Roussel, vice president of the Union Fraternelle des Femmes, of which Brion was also a member. But to no avail. Even the journalist Séverine (Caroline Rémy), an imposing presence dressed in mourning, could not dissuade the judges of their inevitable decision. “I have given myself over to a study of Hélène Brion,” she testified. “It reminded me a lot of another woman I have known and who has also been defamed, who has often been tried by her country, who has been sent to prison for nine years, and whose statue stands in Montmartre. I mean Louise Michel” (another mason).129 Brion got a three-year suspended sentence, and quickly moved to establish a newspaper, La Lutte féministe (The Feminist Struggle), which earned her invitations to lecture at various masonic lodges. Her death in 1962 left behind a huge, disorganized archive on French feminism now at the Bibliothèque Marguerite Durand in Paris.

A masonic life parallel with Brion’s, but one full step ahead of the police during the war, was that of the dramatist and Tolstoy specialist Véra Starkoff (1867–1923). Starkoff, too, championed the pacifist cause, beginning long before hostilities erupted; and she managed her politics at Le Libre Examen in a tactically shrewd manner. In May 1913, for instance, she persuaded her sisters to endorse a resolution, what masons call un voeu (an appeal), against the impending conflagration. It called on the vénérables in German lodges to press a campaign against war on both sides of the Rhine. Her intentions were to bring about a Franco-German rapprochement, which she actively promoted against daunting odds. Her strategy was simple and, under the circumstances, simplistic: appeal to the women of Germany to turn against the perpetrators of their misery, “the wretches who keep women and children in their trenches, who rape and mutilate these poor creatures.” Starkoff’s manifesto was adopted unanimously by her lodge and without the slightest concern of a police informer in their midst. She continued her campaign in May 1917 with a lecture to her lodge about Bertrand Russell’s arguments for pacifism. “We must fight the savage beast,” she concluded, “that draws on our fighting instincts, our pride, and our mental laziness. And this beast can only be defeated by our force of will developed in freedom.” Such sentiments made it much easier and more effective to fundraise in her lodge to help the families of POWs. When the October Revolution in 1917 brought the Soviets to power in Russia, Starkoff’s sympathies for the poor in her former homeland drew her to
support the new regime briefly. Her lectures on this topic prompted publications like *Le Bolchévisme* (1922), expressing sentiments that her memorial service in 1923 emphasized: “Tolstoy would not admit the recourse to arms; civilized people have other means, they ought to expose the lie and appeal to human reason.”

Undoubtedly the most visible, and formidable, freemason feminist during the war was Ghénia Avril de Sainte-Croix, otherwise known by her journalist pseudonym Savioz. As Conseil National des Femmes Françaises’s secretary-general, she was responsible for leading French women through a fraught time. Accordingly, she coauthored a circular in August 1914 to the Conseil National’s member organizations in support of national defense. She figured as everyone else did that feminists’ selfless, patriotic efforts would eventually be repaid by legislative action on women’s issues, notably women’s suffrage, which had been sidetracked by the outbreak of war. It was a calculated tactic that in retrospect did not succeed, just as Gabrielle Duchène, head of the Conseil National’s section on work, had warned. Avril de Sainte-Croix did what she could to rein in such defiance to this strategy. In January 1917, she ventured to lead the coordinated protest of the Conseil National, the Union Française pour le Suffrage des Femmes, and other women’s groups against the German Reich’s plans to impress women in Belgium to work in Germany. This gesture, deliberately but diplomatically, cast the organizations in a prewar light by reasserting women’s rights.

The time for feminists to wait-and-see had long passed. In May 1919, as the Chamber of Deputies resumed work on women’s suffrage, the Conseil National joined forces with four other feminist organizations—including the Droit Humain order no less—to circulate a flyer, “La Femme Doit Voter” (Votes for Women). An officer as well of the International Council of Women, Avril de Sainte-Croix advised the peace conference in Versailles to ensure that the treaty respected women’s views. Ultimately, she was nominated to serve on the League of Nations’s Permanent Consultative Council pursuing global protections of women and children subject to human trafficking, which in time led to a number of other commission appointments during the interwar period. By 1922, Avril de Sainte-Croix succeeded Julie Siegfried as the Conseil National’s president, a position she held for a decade, presiding at each of the Estates General of Feminism for three years in a row (1929–31).

Avril de Sainte-Croix was not the only freemason woman in the transnational arena. Nearly all the participants in the Conseil National des Femmes Françaises’s allied women’s rights organizations found themselves meeting their counterparts from other countries during the many congresses over the decades. The year 1900 had witnessed no fewer than three of them convened in Paris. But
the Great War brought other far-reaching concerns to the fore. For instance, the Bolshevik Revolution saw a number of sisters sympathetic to communism who commented on events in Soviet Russia and what they meant to the first socialist state. Pelletier and Brion actually travelled there to see it for themselves. They both confessed their disappointment with the political chaos and the Bolshevik violence during the bitter civil conflict. Starkoff and Rauze also condemned it (sight unseen) in their publications. These women’s perspectives were consistent with the pacifist tendencies of other freemason women, well long before the 1930s when the threat of war with the fascist regime in Italy and the Nazi regime in Germany became increasingly real. Here the work of Avril de Sainte-Croix with the League of Nations and Linval-Lantzenberg with masonic lodges in Germany is worth recalling, as is that of the journalist Marcelle Capy (Marquès, 1891–1962), another DH sister, who supported the pacifist cause during World War I. Her *Une voix de femme dans la mêlée* (1916, *A Woman’s Voice in the Melee*) saw its choicest passages censored before publication: “It was war; and war kills the freedom to think, to write, to judge, and even to cry, in order to kill men.”

Like other women on the political left, though not the DH sister Marya Chéli-ga-Loewy (1853–1927), Capy found pacifism an issue far more compelling than either women’s rights or socialism.

The peace sought by the freemason Alexandra David-Néel (1868–1969) was far more otherworldly than it was political. She found true solace in her travels to distant lands. “What an unforgettable vision!” she enthused upon her arrival at Sikkim in 1912. For the next several years while Europe was tearing itself apart, she learned Sanskrit and Tibetan to study sacred Buddhist texts. As with other mystics in turbulent periods, David-Néel discovered a local spiritual guide, the revered Lachan Gomchen Rimpoche. She also adopted a traveling companion, the youthful Aphur Yongden, who introduced her to a hermit’s contemplative life in the caves on the mountainous border between Sikkim and Tibet. Together they plotted an improbable trip to Lhasa, a city forbidden to all foreigners. Early en route they visited Tashilhunpo Monastery, close to Shigatse in southern Tibet, where David-Néel had access to a library of rare Buddhist manuscripts. “The special psychic atmosphere of the place enchanted me,” she later mused, “I have seldom enjoyed such blissful hours.” At the height of the Great War, she turned eastward to Japan, Korea, and China on a personal voyage still farther from the miseries back home. Reaching Lhasa at long last in 1924, David-Néel returned to France. Another trip, again to China and Tibet (1937–1946), was prolonged by new hostilities: the Japanese invasion of the Chinese mainland and the outbreak of World War II in Europe. The inner peace she
experienced during her religious studies abroad was thus owed in large measure to the lack of peace nearly everywhere. She was not alone. Other idiosyncratic feminist freemasons, such as Renooz and André-Gedalge, indulged in similar quests at the time.\textsuperscript{145}

The German invasion of Poland in September 1939 returned the world to the unfinished conflict twenty-one years earlier, even though much had changed in the interim.\textsuperscript{146} The principal belligerents in World War II were very nearly the same as in World War I, but the public lives of freemason women had turned more international in scope, more professional in social profile, more transparent in organizational identity, more central to the women’s rights movement, and more fully invested in the social capital of extensive networks beyond the masonic lodge. There are in fact several gendered \textit{histoires croisées} (intertwined narratives) at work in the first four decades of the twentieth century. As women became more visible in a growing civil society, which even the Great War could not suppress completely—women continued to volunteer, albeit for different purposes than either before or afterward—their public engagements grew and evolved, slowly but discernibly, at home, in school, at work, in popular culture, and to be sure, with masonry. Various objectives grew more insistent, especially in the mixed lodges of the DH. A feminized masonry pushed women’s rights hard immediately after World War I when integral suffrage seemed so very close to being realized. Thanks to international developments, however, new issues loomed large: communism, antifascism, and transnational relations. Avril de Sainte-Croix exerted palpable influence in the organizations she led, but her younger counterparts went further; they took up many more causes. They defined a larger third sector in France in spite or because of the divisive, ineffectual national politics of the 1930s, which contributed much to the collaborationist regime in Vichy and the disastrous occupation of the country by Germany.

After the collapse of the Third Republic in June 1940, freemasons as well as Jews were particularly concerned about their future, and for good reason. Maréchal Philippe Pétain is known to have accepted a longstanding bromide from believers in a Judeo-masonic conspiracy: “A Jew is never responsible for his origins; a freemason is always one by choice.”\textsuperscript{147} This hostile assumption about the dangers posed by the craft drew no distinctions among the different obediences, including the DH, which took the precaution of burning records that might identify its members. “The fire was no longer a symbol,” commented Éliane Brault of the task undertaken by the two women who volunteered to destroy her lodge’s papers as German troops approached Paris. “It devoured the life of masonry and kept it from being sullied in the hands of its profane enemies.”\textsuperscript{148}
Myriad masons took similar measures to protect themselves and their families as soon as they heard that the Germans had seized the main offices of all the obediences. It did not take the Occupation forces and the Vichy regime long to confiscate the remaining records.

Proscriptions against the craft soon appeared in the *Journal officiel*. An August 1940 law banned “secret societies” and, in particular, required all public officials to swear that they had never been a mason, otherwise they would lose their jobs. In August 1942 another law authorized the publication of the names of masonic dignitaries (with some mistaken identities like Louis-Claude de Saint-Martin, the eighteenth-century’s mystical mason). As historian Pierre Chevallier put it, the brotherhood now faced “the Third Profanation of the Temple,” the desecration of lodges subject to the indignities exacted by five different antimasonic agencies. Rituals ceased in order to protect masons from Vichy (and German) efforts to identify, monitor, and interrogate them, to confiscate their property, and to execute or deport them. The craft still lost no fewer than 549 men and women. In due time, after the Germans occupied the Vichy regime’s portion of the country in November 1942, news of the Axis Power’s setbacks in north Africa, Soviet Russia, and Italy reached a broader French audience. The Resistance grew accordingly, linking the Free French with armed groups in the countryside to prepare for France’s eventual liberation in 1945. And the women, like the pseudonymous character in Marguerite Duras’s war memoirs whose husband was deported, waited anxiously for their men to return.

The actual number of freemason women—as victims of the Occupation, fighters in the Resistance and/or members of the Free French forces—is unknown. But we have more than anecdotal evidence of their activity. Masons who were also Jews faced few good prospects if they had not already fled the country. Their lodge activities made them vulnerable. Before the war, Camille Charvet (1881–1943), for instance, had been an exemplary activist in the DH in Besançon and Lyon. Teacher, journalist, and lecturer, active in a Conseil National des Femmes Françaises affiliate and several other progressive associations, she was arrested by the Gestapo in February 1943 and deported to Birkenau. Another Jewish DH mason who died in the camps was Berthe Bouchet (1896–1945), teacher, later writer for the Eaux et Forêts in Nancy, member of the Parti Radical and the Ligue des Droits de l’Homme, and Résistante. She, too, was arrested by the Gestapo in May 1943 and sent to die at Ravensbrück in March 1945.

Much trickier to verify are the surviving Résistantes—for many of them, we have only the evidence that they, their family, and their immediate entourage provided—but among the best documented was the Grande Loge Mixte
Symbolique de France and DH mason Marguerite Martin (1877–1956). Her interwar allegiances included the Parti Communiste Français (which she joined with Pelletier and Kauffmann), grande secrétaire of the Grande Loge Mixte Symbolique, and president of the Conseil National of the Ordre Maçonnique Mixte International. Her leftist resistance group worked in Landes where she and her husband had family.\(^{156}\) We know something about less prominent DH masons, Marie Rolland and Irène Rossel (née Chiot), who also joined the Resistance; Rossel the militant socialist and journalist, however, died two years after her deportation to Bergen-Belsen.\(^{157}\) Then there were the freemason women who joined the Free French, such as Eugénie Eboué-Tell, the wife of Félix Eboué (governor-general of the French colony of Chad who rallied to General Charles de Gaulle after his June 1940 plea in Brazzaville for the peoples of the empire to liberate the métropole). Initiated into the DH after the war, Eboué-Tell joined the Forces Françaises Libres Féminines as a nurse in the military hospital at Brazzaville. She was later awarded the Croix de Guerre and the Resistance Medal.\(^{158}\)

The exceptional war record of Éliane Brault (1895–1982) deserves special attention. Her accomplishments during the conflict came as a consequence of a lifetime of social action in response to the Great War when she shared in nursing the wounded and organized assistance to the families of fallen soldiers.\(^{159}\) Widowed in 1918, shortly before the armistice, Brault lost her faith and turned instead to everything she could do to see that another world war never occurred. Her pacifism was guided by her second husband, Louis Gallié, a freemason who also encouraged Brault to join two adoption lodges in Paris, Union et Bienfaisance (1927) and Général Peigné (1930). She led the latter for three years as grande maîtresse (1932, 1934–36). She eventually joined two other progressive lodges. Throughout her subsequent efforts, Brault sought answers to questions arising from her masonry: “What places would be more propitious than the masonic temple for progress with regard to tolerance, sensibilities, ideas, in a mutual respect and a total equality of rights and duties? Where can one build with more passionate reason a feminine emancipation as preparation for a better future?”\(^{160}\) She went on to publish newspaper articles on issues of specific interest to her—workers and women’s rights but also the Spanish Civil War—in no fewer than three regional newspapers. This work led her to join the journalists’ union, a step consistent with her participation in the Parti Radical and the Union Française pour le Suffrage des Femmes. When Léon Blum assumed leadership of the Popular Front government in 1936, Brault served the minister of commerce, Paul Bastid, by attending to the needs of youth, particularly those children who had been failed by social services under previous ministries.\(^{161}\)
But it was World War II that, by necessity, moved Brault in a very different direction.\textsuperscript{162} Besides her masonic work, her parents’ Jewish origins put Brault and her two children in harm’s way. In October 1940 she lost her civil service job and anticipated worse. “My escape is summarized in a few words,” she wrote later. “To go from Paris to London, it took me four months, 7,000 kilometers and two prisons.”\textsuperscript{163} Ultimately, Brault succeeded in reaching the Free French forces to join with other women the Auxiliaires Féminines de l’Armée de Terre, which she loyally served as a captain, assuming ever higher levels of responsibility for the rest of the war.\textsuperscript{164} Her first assignment was to organize a nursing and medical assistance corps, some of whose staff she took with her on a circuitous trip to Cairo by automobile via French Equatorial Africa and then on to Beirut and Moscow. Her next important assignment was to assemble teams of assistants, better known as “Help Liaisons,” to ensure the proper care of prisoners and deportees attached to the Free French First Army Corps. When French forces moved from Algeria into Provence, she accompanied them all the way to Alsace and Baden, where she supervised “vacation colonies,” paid for by the Provisional Government at her request, for the children of refugees. Brault was made an officer in the Légion d’Honneur in 1947.\textsuperscript{165}

As Eric Nadaud observed recently, Éliane Brault “deserves historians’ attention not only because of [her] different roles, but also because her story shares—to a degree yet to be evaluated—in the histories of the French political left, freemasonry, feminism, and the emancipation of women.”\textsuperscript{166} Brault indeed embodies an ethos of selfless service, whatever the difficult circumstances of France’s civil society during two world wars and its politically troubled interlude. The issues she embraced—such as the welfare of orphaned children—and the network of associations she joined to address them—such as the Parti Radical’s advisory councils—are familiar ones in the period. For this social activist and still others like her in the first half of the twentieth century, female suffrage, a major step proposed by de Gaulle in 1944, actually represented just another stage in an enduring, cooperative effort to expand women’s rights in modern France.\textsuperscript{167} After the war and the heroics of its female combatants, de Gaulle’s political gesture seemed anticlimactic to many more than the freemasons who had drifted away from this particular issue.

The woman suffrage campaign had struggled before World War II. An intense burst of activity on its behalf occurred in 1919, when the Chamber of Deputies at last proposed a law according women the vote. Three years later, the Senate failed to take it up, much to the dismay of the suffragists. “Long live the Republic all the same,” cried Maria Vérone, president of the Ligue Française
pour le Droit des Femmes. The mainline Union Française pour le Suffrage des Femmes found itself besieged by fourteen other rivals above and beyond the catholic-conservative Union Nationale pour le Vote des Femmes (in 1920), then by the confrontational La Femme Nouvelle (in 1934). Meanwhile, the Senate ignored several more Chamber propositions broadening suffrage; one of them would have allowed women to participate in municipal and cantonal elections. Using ladies’ hatboxes as urns, La Femme Nouvelle’s Louise Weiss organized a parallel system for women to have their ballots counted. The town of Louviers went further and seated six duly elected females on its city council in 1937. By then the Popular Front’s Léon Blum had already named Cécile Brunschvicg, the grande-dame president of the Union Française, as his Under-Secretary of State for National Education. Weiss’s disdain for Brunschvicg’s putative compromise of principle—“I fought to be elected not to be appointed,” she sneered in perfect hindsight—reflected the less-than-optimal collaboration by suffragists. Nothing more advanced the cause before war erupted in 1939. It would appear that the delay in the vote for French women—fully twenty-five years after several west European states had granted it—occurred in spite of such a prolonged quest on the part of its beneficiaries. This stymied drive for reform begs analysis. Historians, like Siân Reynolds, Christine Bard, and Karen Offen, have already insisted that women were not to blame. From the perspective of freemason women who joined the rights movement earlier in the century, I would suggest, the relative lag may have owed not so much to the lack of direct action, the failure of leaders, religious or class differences, or the wrong strategy for eliciting the support of the Senate, as it did to a shift from one generation of women progressives to another. New groups stepped to the fore after the decisive legislative defeat of woman suffrage in 1922; the loss of élan in the Union Française seems to have invited competing societies to organize. But the last stage of the third sector’s historical elaboration may also have played a role. By 1918, if not earlier, the women’s rights movement entered a phase of bureaucratic and structural change, as was the historical norm for mature associations that attenuated much of their personal touch. The distant leadership of established federations like the Conseil National des Femmes Françaises and the Union Française made decisions without much regard for the militants of their affiliated organizations. As historian Steven Hause has shown for suffragists before the Great War, their meetings drew the same tiny numbers.

Finally, there seems to have been an uncoordinated expansion of women’s collective attention from suffrage to other worthy causes. It certainly bears further study, as well. Women’s new, wide-ranging interests turned to various aspects of
public welfare, international peace, communism, and antifascism, burning concerns in the period. Younger women at the head of many new societies, each one addressing different issues, felt reassured by the numbers of dues-paying members; but they had lost their more valuable resources, activists (not just freemason feminists). The third sector accorded them a plentitude of opportunities, not a paucity; and the impact of women’s disparate efforts suffered accordingly. There was only so much social capital in the networks, at home and abroad, that these women could mobilize to achieve a profusion of objectives. From the interpretive perspective of *A Civil Society*, the result may have been a diminishment of social and political pressure on any one matter. It was certainly not for trying. Freemason feminists (and their allies) had been better networked and more focused before the Great War; their frustration and disaffection between the wars thus arose from the liberalism of a regime whose political failure, thanks to intransigent men, bears ultimate responsibility for the undue delay of women’s rights in France. Suffrage was merely one of them.

Early on, freemason women like Pelletier, Brion, and Avril de Sainte-Croix had been active in the suffrage crusade. As a founding member of the Conseil National des Femmes Françaises, Avril de Sainte-Croix partnered with the Union Française pour le Suffrage des Femmes to drive home the issue with political friends in the Chamber of Deputies before and after World War I. But the repeated failure of the Senate to take it up led many sisters to turn to other causes of acute interest to them. Pelletier and Brion, but also Marianne Rauze and Marguerite Martin, joined the Parti Communist Français, a logical intensification of their longstanding socialist sympathies. Others like Marie Linval-Lantzenberg joined Brion in their ardent support for pacifism, while Eliane Brault and Rauze also became alarmed by the rise of fascism as a threat to world peace. Still other sisters disengaged from feminist activities almost entirely. Once a champion of emancipation, Alexandra David-Néel retreated to the study of Buddhism in the mountains of central Asia. It is unclear if Amelie Andre-Gedalge or Marie Bernard-Leroy ever worked for the vote, but in the interwar period they directed their energies toward masonic ritual and its symbolism. Consistent with French civil society otherwise at its best, freemason women exemplified the fullest range of activism long before World War II, which abruptly halted every initiative on behalf of women’s rights, including suffrage, for five brutal years. By then, however, the historic alliance between freemasonry and feminism had already paused for a host of other reasons, some of which were perhaps inherent to the limitations of the third sector itself whose associations had not yet become fully functional social institutions in France.
Contesting Imaginaries of Freemason Women

One of the curiosities of the German Occupation of France during World War II was how freemason women disappeared from view. After nearly two centuries of attention, primarily by brethren who felt authorized to speak about mixed and adoption lodges, the sisters seemed utterly irrelevant to the Propaganda Abteilung. One of its principal projects was the film *Forces occultes* (*Occult Forces*) directed by the former mason Jean Mamy (a.k.a. Paul Riche) in 1943. This purported cinematic exposé of the Judeo-masonic conspiracy for world dominion was written by Jean Marquès-Rivière and produced by Robert Muzard to reveal the craft’s dangerous subterfuge as men conceived it. The only women to grace the film were the unsuspecting wives of masons; they knew nothing about their husbands’ lodge activities; they were as innocent as the film’s intended audience of Vichy supporters. Besides propounding masonry’s threats to legitimate order, the message was clear: there were no freemason women. This deliberate erasure of a historical phenomenon, of course, belied the myriad instances of sisters in society, literature, opera, and popular culture since the Old Regime. The brethren were hardly alone in their representations. With a few major exceptions, their renditions were in effect emblematic of powerful imaginaries contesting the place of women in public space during the slow, conflicted development of civil society in France from the eighteenth century onward.

Among the earliest images of women in some sort of masonic community are those by none other than Donatien-Alphonse-François, Marquis de Sade. He was most likely never a freemason, despite much speculation on the matter; but he certainly knew a great deal about the craft. His perversely pornographic writings evince acquaintance with masonry’s rituals and practices, especially in *Histoire de Juliette, ou Les prospérités du vice* (*1797, Juliette, or The Rewards of Vice*). In the third part of this novel, Sade provides the bylaws of the Société des Amis du Crime, with forty-five statutes for its members to observe. Number 39, for example, stipulates, “The pain of death awaits any member who betrays the
Society’s secrets,” a version of which is inscribed in virtually every handbook in freemasonry since its origins, much as the ordinances on the usual housekeeping business of dues payment and active participation in the lodge. The disreputable Sade wrote enough about virtual masons to pass as one during his lifetime in line with the subsequent partisan commentary on his embodiment of the Enlightenment.

An unabashed aristocrat, whatever his early sympathies for the revolutionaries, he expressed a determined hostility to the craft. More to the point, women on display in his fiction turn masonry’s gallantry on its head. Sade’s literary misogyny, instances of which are featured on nearly every page of his mature novels, subjects women to a vicious, unrelenting degradation that no mason ever professed so openly. His imaginaries include mixed lodges; and their sexual initiations wallow in savage, excruciatingly painful cruelty, lending veracity to the noun that bears his name, sadism. Idols of perversity long before France’s fin de siècle, these women are the antithesis of adoption and mixed masonry, however remote the link between the craft and Sade’s fiction as it occurred to his mostly male readers. So offensive are his delineations, it comes as no surprise that there have been very few imitators. Most freemason imagery falls within one of the historically familiar topoi of women generally, like those of muse, madonna, temptress, and helpmeet. The cultural construction of women in masonry results in much the same gendered ambivalence that one finds more broadly, far from Sade’s angry loathing, but with just enough traces of it to suggest a peculiarity in how masonic sisters were seen over a two-hundred-year period. These literary and cultural figures were mostly the creations of men, many but not all of them freemasons, hence the curious banality and inanity of these depictions. The women are rebels from male masonic convention, without a discernible cause other than their presence in a lodge.

This thematic element to French poetry, theater, fiction, travelogue, opera, and song from the eighteenth to the twentieth centuries cannot be distinguished from the gender relations that informed it. As the literary scholar Lucienne Frappier-Mazur remarks, “From the *ars erotica*,” for instance, “Sade retains the idea of the search for pleasure as the only absolute possible and perhaps that of the subject’s particular relationship to the master and initiator,” i.e., man’s relationship with woman. This sexual dominance replicates gender relations in society, so much so that Frappier-Mazur feels compelled to trace the novel’s hierarchy of the orgy, founded on power and the law in the figural ownership of women, as often as not, in order to control them. “Woman as metaphor for the social represents a potential menace” arising from the Old Regime’s natural
order of inequalities among beings, estates, and sexes. This Enlightenment-era truism is expressed by a leading member of Juliette’s sadistic circle, Saint-Fond: “this respect [for women] was never in nature, one would waste his time looking for it there. This sex’s inferiority is too well established for it ever to give us a solid reason to respect it.” Such gendered discourse throughout Sade’s work ensures that the reader understands precisely who is the victim, even in the author’s bisexual universe. The women are subordinate, the men always prevail in the end, here as in other literary accounts of some otherwise remarkable representations of women in masonry.

Serafina, Comtesse de Cagliostro

The main sources we have about Lorenza Feliciani (1754–94), better known as Serafina, Comtesse de Cagliostro, are owed to one man in particular, her husband. During her brief life, she was married to the flamboyant impresario, Giuseppe Balsamo, better known as Alessandro, Comte de Cagliostro (among other useful pseudonyms). His renown brought Feliciani into the spotlight with him. There are no studies of this freemason woman, just passages in the copious biographies of the Grand Cophte, as her husband styled himself. She left no written record of her own; she never learned to write. Her only extant correspondence is what the comte wrote to her, most notably during his incarceration in the Bastille (1785–86) over the Diamond Necklace Affair. Similarly, all of Feliciani’s portraits were commissioned by men. The resulting images of this obscure woman, in her lifetime and long afterward, were the creations of hierarchical gender relations and the contradictory construal of her as Balsamo’s unwitting dupe, victim, or accomplice. Observers mistook her role in the lodge; she must have been a scandalous slut or a magician like her husband. At best, however, she was a self-possessed manager of her husband’s complex affairs, a polished salon-keeper and maîtresse agissante of the adoption lodges that she and Balsamo established. Ultimately, she seemed to be a troubled but sincere Catholic who retreated to a convent in the last year of her life. Whoever Feliciani actually was, no one knows. These representations of a woman’s place in French civil society are all we have—and perhaps all that matter. How else shall we consider the numerous theatrical and lyrical renditions of many other freemason women in the period? 

Gossip was the first to circulate about Feliciani, and the rumors said more about the mongers than they did about her. Marquis de Chefdebien, garrisoned in Strasbourg while the Balsamos were there in 1781, remarked her exotic
appearance in his report to curious masons back in Paris: “[The] woman is a Roman and has the face of one. To me she seems to have some éclat.” How she made her money was a concern that Vicomte de Barras did not share in his assessment years later in Paris: Balsamo “displayed much luxury in his home. He used it to embellish a pretty and attractive lady, whom he called his wife.” Her reputation for generosity to the poor, “as charitable as her husband,” was duly noted by M. de Kinglin, a priest in Strasbourg. On the other hand, an anonymous biography of the magician in 1787—Cagliostro’s Liber Memoriaalis (Gospel), translations of which circulated widely—denies that she was his wife; “she was merely an assistant for his hat tricks” and various tasks such as guarding their jewelry on feast days rather than attending mass (though late in life Feliciani evidently found solace in her discussions with a chaplain who aided her return to the church). Feliciani was overshadowed by her larger-than-life companion, who appreciated her willingness to step back from the limelight. This freemason woman preferred the dimmer aura of Cagliostro’s penumbra to create an independent space of her own, notwithstanding the many responsibilities he gave her to sustain the verisimilitude of his mystical illusions.

The most critical view was that of Marquis de Luchet, whose imagination ran amok in his descriptions of an orgy at the adoption lodge Isis in 1783. He was more than happy to embroider upon unseemly tidbits about the Cagliostros in keeping with Feliciani’s feminist critique of men’s dysfunctional institutions. More to the point, during the lodge’s inaugural initiation, the maestro as naked as Adam himself dangled from the ceiling to direct the women candidates to unveil their own unvarnished truths. Feliciani is then reported to have left with her rumored paramour, Chevalier d’Oisement. A half hour later, a bit disheveled, she returned to the festivities to justify the Egyptian Rite’s scandalous rituals. “That’s the point of our knowledge,” she announced to the banquet gathering of tipsy women. “Study twenty years, meditate like [John] Locke, reason like [Pierre] Bayle, write like [Jean-Jacques] Rousseau, all you know is how essential Pleasure is to the world. This temple is consecrated to it.” (The characters Justine and Clairwil in Sade’s novels said as much.) Because there is no other record of this pronouncement, Luchet’s account went down in masonic lore as true enough for Gérard de Nerval, a louveteau (child initiate) and son of a mason, to consider repeating it in his Les Illuminés (1852, The Illuminati); but he had second thoughts and excised the marquis’ most shameless exaggerations. Feliciani’s reputation, and that of the adoption rituals for women, was consistent with the dubious reputation of Balsamo himself, who is even alleged to have escaped Paris after the Diamond Necklace Affair with his wife’s diamonds, not the queen’s.
Feliciani’s image changes dramatically after she informed the Roman Inquisition of Balsamo’s masonic activities. Her confession to the Holy Congregation complained of her husband and led to his incarceration in the Castel Sant’Angelo in 1789. The Inquisition’s investigation, quickly translated into French, provided francophone readers enticing details about the Egyptian Rite, but also about her disaffection with Balsamo. She wearied of his language, particularly its “most boring, disconnected [and] incoherent prolixity,” but also of his “diabolical manner” during the initiations. She even testified, the official record indicates, that Balsamo considered extramarital sex permissible if it had an ulterior motive other than love. Elements of her confession, in two installments, one in September, the other the following January, were also included in the flurry of publications on Balsamo’s arrest, trial, and death sentence (commuted by the pope to life in prison), though with considerably less scrupulous attention to accuracy than the inquisitors. Although rumors continued to circulate, such as about her escaping the cloister Santa’Apollinare to become the mistress of a prelate—a belief more about the clergy than about Serafina—she is supposed to have found consolation in her faith, evident in her repentant testimony. Long afterward, in 1895, Jules Bois still defined her by her husband’s occultism, with a marked polemical twist. “The 18th century,” Bois writes, “believed it was radiant, decked with a diadem and a tiara promised by the Tarot, empress and pope, wife of the great Cophte Cagliostro, priestess of Isis. She instigated the revolution, she built the scaffold to revenge her funeral pyre.” This observation, by a putative ally of women’s causes, literally places Feliciani at the center of the conservative’s animus: masonry’s revolutionary conspiracy. By the end of the nineteenth century, her persona had shifted from person to ideology, from social scandal to political upheaval.

In the interim, after the revolutionary decade, Feliciani dropped from public view for nearly fifty years. There was instead a rash of theatrical interest in Cagliostro; his thaumaturgy was a natural source of popular titillation. At least six plays about the magician were staged in Paris, mostly comedies, between 1807 and 1844, likely reaching a larger audience than the correspondence, memoirs, and transcripts of the inquisition’s investigation. Among the earliest of these productions, Emmanuel Dupaty and Jacques-Antoine de Révéróni Saint-Cyr’s Cagliostro ou Les illuminés (1810, Cagliostro or the Illuminati), a comic opera, had no role for a Feliciani; there was just a young woman seeking enlightenment by initiation in the Illuminés de Bavière. Neither Johann Wolfgang von Goethe’s satirical Der Groß-Cophta (1791, The Grand Cophte), staged in French in 1825, nor Eugène Scribe’s comic opera in 1844, Cagliostro, offers any indication of
Feliciani’s existence. The closest approximation of Balsamo’s partner assumes the guise of Mathilde, the presumed sister to the fabulist Comte de Santa Vecchia, in Jean-François Boursault-Malherbe’s adaptation of Julius von Söden’s play, *L’Illuminé ou Le nouveau Cagliostro* (1807, *The Illuminatus, or The New Cagliostro*). Mathilde is seduced by the count and serves as an accessory in dramatic scenes calling up the dead at the special request of an impressionable patron. “From the man of honor,” the count’s jealous rival, Sédoc, predicts sarcastically, “the wench will finish by persuading herself that she was really a sister of her former lover, and that this former lover was actually Comte de Santa Vecchia.”

In her poised and commanding demeanor, Mathilde mimics Balsamo’s Feliciani, the willing tool of a confidence man, exposed (and repentant) in the end, while the disgraced Comte de Santa Vecchia is addressed crudely in the second-person familiar, “Scram, go to hell!” This final scene of the play echoes Feliciani’s part in Balsamo’s condemnation by the Roman Inquisition in 1790.

In the late 1840s, Feliciani as a literary type takes another turn, this time at the hands of the prodigious novelist, Alexandre Dumas père. In lieu of a once-active participant in Balsamo’s mystical charade, Feliciani becomes a double figure, an innocent at the mercy of a calculating mesmerist, but also a resentful, independent woman anxious to flee her tormentor. This refashioned cultural icon engenders Feliciani into a variation on Pierre-Joseph Proudhon’s contemporaneous stereotype of women as either compliant housewives (at home) or wily courtesans (in public). Dumas’s hugely successful *Les Mémoires d’un médecin: Joseph Balsamo* (*A Physician’s Memoir: Joseph Balsamo*) coauthored with Auguste Maquet and serialized in the Parisian newspaper *La Presse* (May 1846–January 1848), appealed to the mid-nineteenth-century’s expectations of utopian socialist and reform-minded women before the 1848 Revolution. Feliciani’s bifurcated character maps neatly onto divided notions of women at a critical moment of French social and political change. Evidently, the Old Regime and its institutions, including the Bourbon monarchy, masonic lodges, and Enlightenment salons on the eve of the Revolution of 1789, intrigued Dumas’s audience when comparable structures were in upheaval sixty years later. The banquet campaigns starting in summer 1847, the July Monarchy’s stiff resistance, and the drift toward yet another uprising predicted by Alexis de Tocqueville—“a wind of revolution . . . is in the air. . . . The storm is on the horizon”—promised women activists a new opportunity to be heard.

In this context, Feliciani resurfaced in another guise consistent with prerevolutionary circumstances. It comes as no surprise that after decades of complaisance and relative indifference, freemasonry anticipated its own renewal in troubled times.
Dumas’s novel is best known in masonic circles for its stunning depiction of an initiation in the very first chapters (and again in *La Comtesse de Charny*). Balsamo reveals his identity to take charge of a tenue of Illuminati, near Mont-Tonnerre (Donnersberg) deep in the Palatinate’s most impenetrable forest, to move the lodge against the French monarchy, a goal expressed in the group’s slogan, *Lilia Pedibus Destrue* (Trample the Lilies Underfoot). But Feliciani does not take part in this ceremony. At the time she is making her own way to Paris where she will eventually stage-manage, under Balsamo’s careful direction, his masonic activities described in the novel, set some twelve to fifteen years (1770–74) before the actual couple was in Paris (1785–86). Their story is intertwined, in five fat volumes, with that of the provincial Taverney family’s quest in Paris for the preferment of position and privilege appropriate to the old nobility of the sword. Their fortunes are tied, however, to more than the Cagliostros; they are entangled with the personal and political intrigues at the court of Louis XV, his meddling mistress, his contending ministers, and the future king and queen of France. The physician of the fictional series, featuring three other novels and extending chronologically right through the Revolution of 1789–94, is the unscrupulously ambitious Gilbert, initially a servant of Baron de Taverney, then the protégé of Jean-Jacques Rousseau and a gardener at Marie-Antoinette’s Trianon in Versailles; he will train as a medical doctor whose memoirs are played out in historical time. The anachronisms frequent in Dumas’s hastily written fiction are hard to ignore, such as the arrival of three entourages, those of Marie-Antoinette from Austria, the Taverney from Lorraine, and the Balsamo from Rome, all at the same time in Paris. With that coincidence, the stage is set for the rest of the novel (well before a months-long break in the *La Presse*’s serialization pending the author’s pledge to the reader, “To be continued”). Against this backdrop, Feliciani enables Balsamo’s rapid ascension into Parisian high society through his communications with the dead, his hypnotic magnetism à la Mesmer, and his mysterious rituals in the masonic lodges he convenes in Paris with the support of the Illuminati (who are funding his antimonarchist activities). The hypnotized Feliciani facilitates these endeavors at the expense of the lucid Feliciani who longs to break free from Balsamo’s control. As she says to Madame Louise, Louis XV’s eldest daughter, abbess of the Ursulines in Saint Denis, “with him there I am no longer myself, I am him; what he wants, I want; what he commands, I do; my soul no longer has any strength, my mind no longer has a will: a jail-keeper subdues and fascinates me.” This tension between enslavement and freedom, between clairvoyance and consciousness, is always there, whether or not Feliciani is in a trance, which renders her compliant without a
life of her own but always with the indelible traces of resentment. (The narrator’s sympathy for the young woman—and for others like her in Dumas’s oeuvre—is certainly worth noting.) Such is Feliciani’s condition throughout the novel as she seeks to escape her captor. It colors every scene where she plays the principal role until her tragic death at the hands of Balsamo’s demonic mentor, Althotas. Feliciani thus represents a masonic woman at odds with the craft represented by Balsamo, and thereby falls victim to its mystical elements that result in an insane—and deadly—quest for immortality. Feliciani, it seems, dies by someone else’s fatal mistake about her place in the masonic occult, a problem that Dumas the latter-day freemason claimed to understand.

This theme in Dumas’s novel—that of “two very distinct Lorenzas” and their implications for the mystical elements of freemasonry—unfolds in four key scenes: Feliciani’s attempt to escape to the convent in Saint-Denis (chapters 50–52), her confrontation with Balsamo over their marriage (chapters 55–57), her provision of secret masonic documents to the Lieutenant Général de Police Antoine de Sartines (chapter 123), and her sacrificial murder by Althotas (chapters 127–34). At each moment, Feliciani’s clairvoyance provides Balsamo the liberty, wealth, and power he craves, but at an emotional cost he can barely sustain without breaking her spell. She is his wife only figuratively speaking. The double existence of his spouse asleep and his spouse awake replicates fault lines in freemasonry itself, torn, like Balsamo, between Enlightenment and mysticism, between the perfection of humanity and the elixir of life, between rites for men and others for women. For this reason, it seems, Balsamo at last surrenders to his hypnotized wife the physical affection she so desired. “Love, which completes physical being, also enlarges moral being,” the mason explains. “Love, as with all generous passions, approaches God, and from this God comes all light,” presumably even that of the craft. As Balsamo’s Parisian townhouse burns to the ground, thanks to Althotas’s spiteful gesture when he realizes his imminent mortality, Feliciani is immolated along with all the trappings of Balsamo’s magic, including “the demons” she feared most in a world on the brink of revolution. These destructive tropes are pursued at much greater length in Dumas’s next three novels of Les Mémoires d’un médecin: Le Collier de la reine (1849–50, The Queen’s Necklace), Ange Pitou (1850), and La Comtesse de Charny (1853). The reader is thus left to contemplate the ambivalent image of a freemason woman destroyed by male privilege and history itself, both beyond her control.

Feliciani is not the only female character struggling against such constraints in Dumas’s novel. The lives of two others, Andrée de Taverney and Comtesse du
Barry, resemble Feliciani’s: they both are subject to Balsamo’s secretive practices with an eye to destroying the French monarchy; and they both find themselves in disgrace at the novel’s end, though Barry at least survives (only to die in tragic circumstances, comparable to those of Feliciani and Taverney, during the revolutionary terror twenty years later). These three women share a social status of someone else’s making. For Feliciani, though descended from old Roman nobility, she is a count’s spouse; for Taverney, she is from impoverished provincial nobility but elevated to the queen’s companion in Versailles; and for Barry, she is a commoner made a countess by marriage before becoming the king’s favorite. They are all torn by the same ambivalence, caught as they are between the rewards of their special talents as clairvoyant (Feliciani), as medium (Taverney), or as agent (Barry), on the one hand, and their enslavement to Balsamo’s mystical powers, on the other. For example, while Feliciani teeters on the verge of unconscious love and conscious loathing for the masonic magician, Taverney finds herself engaged in a secret struggle of her own, “this silent battle . . . between the girl and the mysterious traveler.”

In familiar poetic terms used to characterize Feliciani, the narrator explains, “in effect, Andrée, subjugated by an unknown, irresistible force, nodded her forehead softly, like a flower whose calyx just received a very heavy dewdrop,” in response to Balsamo’s projection of mesmeric fluid in the novel’s early action. Despite their exalted station in life, these women’s independent agency is compromised by a real as well as a figural gender hierarchy in a ruthless Parisian society at the mercy of contending forces—of the seditious Illuminati and a failing monarchy.

Perhaps the most suggestive of portraits of the three is Barry’s, not because she is a freemason like Feliciani—she had nothing to do with the craft—but because in her role as the king’s mistress she exercises the authority of an illegitimate, one might say, subversive sort—as if she were a freemason. “The [king’s] favorite, with her casual habits, her free spirit, her mirthful personality, her inexhaustible nature, her boisterous flights of fancy, had transformed the quiet chateau into a topsy-turvy place.” During her own morning ceremony, attended by high-ranking, favor-seeking members of the king’s government, Barry displays all the attributes of a powerbroker, making use of her relationship with the king, of course, but also with the penny-scribblers, songwriters, and pamphleteers of Paris whose influence on public opinion she openly mobilizes to her purposes. Accordingly, for example, the head of the police, Antoine de Sartines, is blackmailed into working to have the king dismiss his chief minister Duc de Choiseul, if need be, so she can be properly presented to the king’s court in time for the official reception of the dauphine Marie-Antoinette. “My word, Madame,” cries
Sartines before he bends to his knees in supplication, “I place my responsibilities in your hands. I no longer oversee the police, you do.” And the ruse works. The dauphine, under orders from the Austrian ambassador, greets the king’s mistress with sufficient wit and courtesy to stupefy the court. “Your Majesty is very happy to have so charming a lady friend,” she says to Louis, “and I am not surprised by the attachment she can inspire.” Without the help of Balsamo’s timely interventions via the mesmerized Taverney, this stunning event would have never occurred, or so the novel would have its readers believe.

These women characters’ sad ends bear witness to the tightening gender norms of the nineteenth century. Taverney is raped by an impetuous suitor who kidnaps her baby; deep in the emotional miseries of betrayal, loss, and the trance from which a distracted Balsamo forgets to release her, she retreats to a cloister. Similarly, Barry gathers with Louis XV’s family at his bedside, only for the king to pack her off to the château in Reuil before he dies of smallpox, less to protect her from the disease than in a belated fit of family scruple. “Matters had come to this,” the narrator muses, “the king lives and Madame du Barry is still the queen? Or the king dies and Madame du Barry is merely an execrable and shameful courtesan?” Balsamo lamented neither Taverney’s seclusion nor Barry’s disgrace, but he despaired of Feliciani’s accidental sacrifice to Althotas’s occult practices, the very ones Balsamo himself deployed for his own “masonic” ends. In the novel’s anachronistic confusion of freemasonry with the Illuminati, seers, charlatans, and enemies of the monarchy, Dumas’s literary achievement is, in part, to have portrayed the stakes of this confusion for the women caught up in it. These figures disappear from the narrative for the remaining novels in Les Mémoires d’un médecin, along with Balsamo himself who lurks on the margins at watershed moments in the Diamond Necklace Affair, the storming of the Bastille, and the bloodshed during the Terror. The women seem to be both his victims and his victors. They may not have stopped the alleged masonic conspiracy against the Old Regime, but they relegated its historical plans for the monarchy, not just Balsamo, to the background. Men and women masons alike are but one factor in the fatality that Dumas saw in the revolution and its aftermath.

This historical diffidence is reflected five years later in Jules de Saint-Félix’s Aventures de Cagliostro (1854, Cagliostro’s Adventures), a popular biography of Balsamo. It resembles fiction in its action and dialogue, re-creating the protagonist (and his wife) in terms not unlike those of Dumas’s novel. Saint-Félix wrote a forgiving assessment of Balsamo’s partner in their fraudulent activity together stretching across the face of Europe, from Rome to Saint-Petersburg
to Paris and back to Rome. Balsamo was the source of their evil, not Feliciani. As Saint-Félix put it, “this new Penelope . . . was an excellent preacher to bring in souls and charm imaginations,” not because she was so adept but because she was so sincere.49 “The beautiful Lorenza,” the biographer writes, “made no small contribution to her husband’s success. To the elixirs and potions that Comte de Fénix [Cagliostro] distributed, she added the magnetism of her gaze and the charm of her words . . . in the manner of a capable actress.”50 This ploy also marks Saint-Félix’s account of the Diamond Necklace Affair; well-versed in deception, Feliciani read aright the malevolent machinations of Madame de la Motte. Similarly, during the August 1785 initiation of thirty-six women into the Isis lodge, she oversaw a remarkably restrained ceremony, the most outrageous feature of which were her honest remarks about the condition of married women in Old Regime society, contrary to Marquis de Luchet’s salacious version of the event.51 Even when Feliciani turns to the Roman Inquisition in an effort to save her soul, she thought of her husband’s salvation, as well: “she strived to draw upon the religious sentiments she had maintained deep in her heart.”52 To no avail. The last image of Feliciani we have is remarkably generous, one atypical of the period of its redaction, the mid-nineteenth century.

Pamina and Balkis

The masonic symbolism of Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart’s Die Zauberflöte (1791, The Magic Flute) is well known.53 The composer and his librettist, Emmanuel Schikaneder, were brethren, though records indicate that only Mozart was a member of Zur Gekrönten Hofnung in Vienna while they were working together on the opera (Schikaneder had been initiated by Zu den Drei Schlüsseln sometime earlier in Regensburg). They were both aware of the Habsburg Emperor Joseph II’s concern about the craft in the wake of the French Revolution, so they agreed to depict freemasonry as they understood it, subject to some creative whimsies (such as the tomfoolery of a major character, the bird-catcher Papagano, in search of a companionable mate in the indulgent Papagana). The storyline was settled early on in their collaboration: Tamino, a young prince, is sent by the Queen of the Night to rescue her daughter, Pamina, from the control of the queen’s archrival, Sarastro. Sarastro turns out not to be a sinister figure, but rather a wise and benevolent high priest, a source of light in sharp contrast to the queen of darkness. He recognizes Tamino as a likely candidate for initiation, which entails a series of trials shared by Pamina and Papagano, for admission to Sarastro’s secret order. Despite the efforts of the queen to frustrate
Sarastro and his acolytes, the opera ends with the triumph of good over evil, knowledge over ignorance, and love over hate, as the chorus honors Tamino and Pamina together:

Hail to you on your initiation! You have pierced the night,
Thanks be offered to you, Osiris and Isis!
Fortitude has triumphed and rewarded
Beauty and wisdom with an eternal crown!
(Act 2, Scene 30, lines 23–26)\(^{54}\)

Mozart’s music reinforces this masonic fable, drawing on musical motifs familiar to the brethren in the audience. It borrows the threefold chord that begins the overture and punctuates it twice more to underscore the mystical significance of the rule of three, which is also evident in the three temples, the three virtues, the three qualifications for initiation, and the three concurrent plotlines at work in the opera. For masons these elements were obvious, for the profane far less so.\(^{55}\)

One feature to Die Zauberflöte still less apparent to everyone is women’s participation in the masonic mysteries. In keeping with the craft’s mythic roots in the ancient past, including the builders of pyramids in ancient Egypt, Schikaneder appropriated much from Abbé Jean Terrasson’s novel, Séthos (1731), translated into German in 1777, which Cagliostro also used for his Egyptian Rite in both mixed and adoption lodges.\(^{56}\) This ritual tradition was not well known in central Europe at the time, but with the nearly contemporaneous publication of the Roman Inquisition’s investigation of Cagliostro’s masonic activity, the opera’s symbolism assumes other meanings that cognoscenti would have recognized during the performance.\(^{57}\) The Grand Cophte was indeed a high priest like Sarastro, not just a grand maître at the head of a masonic order; he frequently invoked the male and female gods Isis and Osiris during the order’s tenues; and his wife Feliciani directed the initiation of women in the Parisian lodge Isis. These parallels became even more evident during the nineteenth century, in the cultural wake of Napoléon’s Egyptian campaign, when the Bédarride brothers established their own Egyptian order of Misraïm. A closer look at Pamina in Mozart’s opera certainly offsets its emphatic relegation of women, in part, to the forces of evil and to a subordinate place in Tamino’s initiation. Although Tamino and Pamina fall in love at first sight and develop a romantic equality-in-difference, Sarastro sternly warns the young woman, “Only a man must guide your heart, / For without him does every woman / Stray from her natural sphere” (Act 1, Scene 18, lines 24–26), an admonition that women hardly ever heard in a lodge or that Pamina necessarily heeded.
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All the same, Pamina faces her own initiation-like trials and reaps the rewards for facing them. While Tamino (and Papagano) are blindfolded and led off to the temple to begin their initiatory trial of silence, Sarastro takes Pamina away with him, as if to show her a separate path to the masonic mysteries. Accordingly, she is given a knife to kill Sarastro and then subjected to harassment at the hands of the archetypal outsider Monostatos, the mounting fury of her frustrated mother, and the firm vow of Tamino not to speak to anyone, including her. She is formally separated from her betrothed. In Pamina’s despondency, she contemplates suicide, which her faith in Tamino’s love overcomes. She finds him in time to join in his final trial by fire, water, air, and earth, encouraged through it all by his playing of the magic flute. The opera ends in the triumph over the Queen of the Night and her minions to the boom of thunder and the blaze of lightening, as the temple opens to both Tamino and Pamina. “What luck that we see each other again,” he sings, “Happy hand in hand to enter the temple. / A woman, who does not fear darkness and death, / Is worthy and will be initiated” (Act 2, Scene 28, lines 18–21). In the words of musicologist and conductor Jane Glover, “it is [Pamina] who leads her own ‘Mann’ through the trials which bring him his wisdom, his maturity and therefore his security.” Mozart seems to have understood this key component to masonry, the role of women, notwithstanding Sarastro’s severity reflecting the Old Regime’s gender relations. For the composer—and the opera he created with Schikaneder—the woman is an essential companion and guide to freemasonry and thus to (hu)mankind.

Much of this the opera’s Viennese audience may have recognized amidst widespread acclaim for the premiere far from revolutionary Paris. This singular success just months before Mozart’s death did not travel well to France, however. What Parisians experienced ten years later was nearly another work, Les Mystères d’Isis (1801, The Mysteries of Isis) by Étienne Morel de Chédeville and Ludwig Lenzel Lachnith, first performed at the Théâtre de la République des Arts. It was a medley of the opera’s most tuneful moments in another narrative and musical order, its elements mostly but not exclusively borrowed from Schikaneder’s book and Mozart’s composition. In part Morel and Lachnith needed to adapt a very Austrian work to French taste (for example, their production replaced Papagano’s impish pranks with sentimental ones) and they worried about the Consulate’s censors objecting to masonic references (the new work emphasized more religious themes instead). As a consequence, Morel adopted motifs from the ancient myth of Orpheus in Memphis and from spiritual initiations in Étienne-François de Lantier’s Voyages d’Anténor en Grèce et Asie (1797, Antenor’s Travels in Greece and Asia). Similarly, parts of the score were not from this opera.
at all but from three others by Mozart, *Le Nozze di Figaro* (1786, *The Marriage of Figaro*), *Don Giovanni* (1787) and *La Clemenza di Tito* (1791, *The Clemency of Titus*), plus some drumrolls by Franz Joseph Haydn. So different was it from the Viennese original—despite reference to Mozart’s music on the title page—better-informed viewers mistook it for a joke, which obliging wits quickly made explicit. Within three weeks of the work’s opening in Paris, *Les Mystères d’Issy* (*The Mysteries of Issy*) exaggerating the most egregious flaws of Morel and Lachnith’s so-called *Les Misères d’ici* (*The Miseries from Here*) was produced at the Théâtre de la Marais. As Hector Berlioz put it years later, “the libretto is itself a mystery that no one can decipher.”

The reviewers of the first French adaptation were just as confused and unsparing in their judgment. An anonymous writer in the *Album national* referred to Cagliostro’s “juggling acts”; they must have inspired the new opera, which “celebrated, in Paris, the bizarre mysteries that fashion and whimsy had given many adepts.” Similarly, François Guillaume Ducray-Dumenil stated, “*The Magic Flute* is a sort of farce, more or less bad with regard to interest [and] with regard to dramatic rules,” as one would expect in its very unclassical mixing of musical and theatrical genres of comic buffoonery and serious declamation, of fairytale fable and religious subject matter. “It is sad,” sighed Julien-Louis Geoffroy in the *Journal des débats*, “how Mozart had his heavenly music ruined by verses as trivial and as baroque as those for *The Magic Flute*” in Paris. As a general rule, critics like Berlioz were much more severe about the libretto than they were about the music. Mozart, they felt, managed to overcome “this extravagant play,” mused one in conclusion to his detailed synopsis. A full performance of Mozart’s opera (in German) did not occur in Paris until May 1829, and then only for two nights, at the Théâtre Italien. As a result, no one in France—beyond the three commentators Geoffroy, Brunot in *Affiches, annonces et avis divers* (*Postings, Announcements, and Various Notices*) and another in the *Album national*—thought of freemasonry in any connection with these works, much less the place of women in the craft as suggested in the original.

However arcane Mozart’s masonic references, they very nearly disappear altogether in the French version. Morel and Lachnith simply recast the work. Instead of Schikaneder’s two acts, there were four; all names but two (Sarastro and Pamina) of the characters were changed; their motivations were frequently inscrutable in a plot that had been reduced, except for extraneous diversions, to little more than Tamino’s preparation to become a high priest; and, perhaps the oddest modification of all, the magic flute had become an Egyptian sistrum. The basis for the opera’s original title was displaced entirely by another musical
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It was like reading a parody,” opined the irritated reviewer in *L’Encyclopédie* (*The Encyclopedia*). Consequently, the influence of the craft on the production is nearly impossible to discern. Tamino/Ismenor’s vaguely masonic initiation is central to Morel’s story—it *is* the plot—but it is obscured by inexplicable distractions throughout the narrative. At the very end, the chorus elides the masonic universalizing in Schikaneder’s book to sing happily, “How wedlock beckons; / For tenderness / Pluck the flowers. / Taste without ceasing / The sweet drunkenness / Of tender hearts” (Act 4, Scene 8, lines 10–15). And so, in a light-hearted mood focused on Tamino/Ismenor’s winning the hand of Pamina, “the initiate’s reception is the subject of the full ballet that ends the opera.” After the ceremony in the temple, this dance is as close to women in masonry as the adaptation gets.

A sizeable audience of Parisians had to wait until the Second Empire before they experienced anything resembling *Die Zauberflöte*. After sixty-nine performances by 1809, another seventy-five by 1825, the Morel/Lachnith version continued to be staged, off and on, until 1836. Its elaborate décor and many extended ballets minimized the influence of German culture on French music, which remained a burning topic for decades among cultural pundits. As with anything remotely seditious, Mozart’s opera appeared in French translation only after it had been meticulously vetted by the imperial censors; the 1865 version was no exception. Nüttier and Beaumont’s *La Flûte enchantée* restored the work’s original name, almost all of Mozart’s score, and much more of Schikaneder’s book, dramatically cutting the number and length of the dance scenes that had encumbered *Les Mystères d’Isis*. The two acts, the characters, and the plot were largely the same; Léon Carvalho’s musical arrangement hued truer to Mozart’s composition. But the masonic elements, lost in Morel’s revision, remained opaque in the changes to Schikaneder’s libretto that focused on religious mysteries to sanctify the love of Tamino and Pamina. In effect, the narrative was altered to conclude with Tamino’s initiation, alone, in the temple to make him worthy of Pamina. So, when the opera begins, the couple is already affianced; Tamino is a lowly fisherman corrupted by the Queen of the Night; Pamina is kidnapped by a slave merchant and sold to the divinities of the night; and the couple pick up where they left off only once Tamino has rescued her, with the assistance of the goddess Isis, and been ritually purified in the temple. Thus love, not Tamino’s (or Pamina’s) masonic virtue, conquers all in true popular theatrical form.

To underscore this revision of *Die Zauberflöte*, Cavalho’s musical arrangement during Tamino’s trials also deviates from the original. As the musicologist George Servières observed, “the scene for the trials is staged with a music from
melodrama having no relation to Mozart’s score.” The same is true after Taminio’s initiation in the temple (Act 4, Scene 2). Instead of going into the temple hand-in-hand with Pamina, Tamino sings of marching through life together: “Love shows us the way. / Let us walk! My hand presses yours” (lines 8–9). And their duet closes the scene of their reunification: “Together let us walk to the end. / For you here is salvation” (lines 31–32). There is no hint that Pamina has endured similar trials preparing her for initiation with Tamino. They go forth as a married couple, not as brother and sister in a masonic lodge. Accordingly, the chorus closes the opera on a downtempo note: “For our holy mysteries / Fathom the meaning. / Glory to the powerful gods! / Frank and sincere hearts, / From a deceptive world / Flee the miseries, / To you happiness!” (Act 4, Scene 5, lines 9–15). The finale fails to rescue so insipid a lyric.

Clearly, the concluding gesture here is a contraction. It marks a closing in on the married couple celebrated by Isis, not an opening up to the harmony of all men and women to the greater good of a civic morality, as apparent in Schikaneder’s original chorus. The Parisian critics were swift to point this out. “Its religious essence is effectively La Flûte enchantée’s music. It expresses faith [and] love, and breathes, from its first to its last note, I know not what sentiment of infinite gentleness, of heavenly peace,” of a private ceremony not a universal engagement, according to Henri Blaze de Bury. It is no accident that Schikaneder’s name is found nowhere in the published edition. Only in 1909, 118 years after its first Viennese performance, were Parisians able to attend a faithful rendering of Mozart and Schikaneder’s work, thanks to Paul Ferrier and Alexandre Bisson’s version of La Flûte enchantée at the Opéra Comique.

It is worth noting how another opera—and the book on which it was based—presented a masonic protagonist for French audiences to admire: Balkis, the Queen of Sheba in Charles Gounod’s La Reine de Saba (1862). The composer was not a mason, nor was Gérard de Nerval, the author of the travelogue that Gounod and his librettist used for their work. As evident in his Les Illuminés, Nerval was well versed in the craft and featured it in his Voyage en Orient (1856, Journey to the Orient), first published as a series of articles. A large section of the book was devoted to the “Histoire de la Reine du Matin et Soliman, prince des génies” (“The Story of the Queen of the Morning and Solomon, Prince of the Genii”) recounting the famous visit of Balkis to King Solomon. This occasion coincided with the building of Solomon’s magnificent temple by the master...
architect and bronze-maker, Adoniram, better known as Hiram or Hiram Abif in the Hebrew books of I Kings (7.13–45) and II Chronicles (2.12–17, 4.11–16). As with the Egyptian pyramids, the temple represents for freemasons a useful myth of an illustrious past, which lies at the heart of the initiation ceremony for the master mason in the rituals worked by the Scottish, French, and Memphis Rites.

By keeping secrets and by trusting one’s brethren in life-and-death situations, the master mason demonstrates that s/he, too, can honor Hiram’s martyrdom. (Reputedly three of Hiram’s journeymen—Phanor, Amrou, and Méthousaël—betray their guild secrets and kill him for the wages they felt were owing to them.) His death also symbolizes the necessity for an initiate to renounce the profane’s life in order to be resurrected as a member of the lodge. Nerval revises this foundation story in freemasonry to include a woman, the Queen of Sheba. In his account, she falls in love with Hiram/Adoniram, despite Solomon’s earnest courtship. Consumed by jealousy, so Nerval has it, Solomon instigates Adoniram’s murder at the hands of his workers. But Balkis remains true to her love and their unborn child by returning to her kingdom in present-day Yemen.

On the face of it, Nerval’s version of Hiram’s heroic demise does not substantially alter the mythic meaning of freemasonry’s most important ritual. Masons accepted his interpretation, in spite of Solomon’s baser instincts, as confirmation of their long-held beliefs about the proper origins of their rites. This was in large part because Nerval based his work on what was known from Abbé Calbre Pérau on its eighteenth-century origins and from Louis Guillemain de Saint-Victor on its adonhiramite variations. Although the accomplished writer Théophile Gautier was never a mason, he noted the critical role played by the self-evident mysteries in Voyage en Orient as a whole:

The Legend of the Calif Hakim [and] the Story of Balkis and Solomon indicate to what extent Gérard de Nerval is imbued by the mysterious and profound spirit of these strange narratives in which each word is a symbol. One can actually say that he guards certain implicit understandings, certain cabalistic formulas, certain manners of the initiated, which are made believable at moments when he speaks from experience.

The ritual connection was thus obvious to an outsider, even if he knew less about it than did the emperor Napoléon III (who at the time was much more worried about rebellious workers than he was about masonic arcanum). The craft is in fact difficult to overlook when Nerval reveals how much Balkis reveres Adoniram, “the veritable chief of this nation [of working masons], a sovereign of intelligence and genius, a peaceful and patient arbiter over the destinies of the
Seigneur’s elect.”82 In a fit of enthusiasm soon after the publication of Nerval’s work, the redactors of ritual in the Scottish Rite revised the maître degree in order to enhance the role of Sheba and to diminish that of Solomon. Evidently, Nerval’s narrative of the queen’s love for Adoniram made her a more sympathetic embodiment of freemasonry for everyone, including women, to ponder.83

Unlike Adoniram, who undergoes an extended, dramatic initiation, Balkis is not a mason; but she is certainly a masonic figure.84 Her attachment to the master mason is, of course, one sign of her affiliation and the source for the expression that brethren frequently use about one another as “the widow’s child.”85 Solomon saw in her “the ideal and mystical instance of the goddess Isis,” the patron goddess of the Egyptian Rite whose masonic virtue lies in her having chosen Adoniram instead of Solomon as her mate.86 With the master mason’s assassination, she returns to Sheba with a promising progeny: “Adoniram’s posterity remained sacred for [the brothers]; for a long time afterwards they always swore by the widow’s son; thus are Adoniram and the Queen of Sheba’s descendants so designated.”87 Without Balkis, the mythology about the craft’s master rite makes no sense; Nerval’s story explains it in a manner typical of his mystical romanticism. As the noted literary critic Edward Said points out, “The Orient symbolizes Nerval’s dream-loss and the fugitive woman central to it, both as desire and as loss. . . . The Orient is [thus] identified with commemorative absence,” one as fundamental to the West’s view of the East as it is to the West’s view of itself.88 Freemasonry’s search for its origins in and around bronze-age Egypt—and that region’s search for its origins in India—leaves the craft, much as Western civilization, bereft of firmer foundations for its symbolic edifice, except in the deification of a woman to join its panoply of divinities. Unfortunately, perhaps for the sisters, Balkis was a relatively late and short-lived addition to masonic ritual and history. But her cultural image retains all its luster in Nerval’s book and Gounod’s opera.

Nerval sketched the libretto to an opera entitled, “La Reine de Saba.” Its score, he thought, would best be composed by either Giacomo Meyerbeer or Fromental Halévy to launch the career of the soprano Jenny Colon in the role of Balkis. He circulated the idea without success, at least while he was alive. But the idea, if not the sketch, finally fell into the hands of Jules Barbier and Michel Carré to revise with Gounod.89 Their debt to Nerval is significant. The plotline remains the same, as do the characters, the setting, much of the dialogue and the tone. Despite the differences between verse and prose, portions of the opera’s lyrics, especially in the first act, are drawn directly from Nerval’s *Voyage en Orient*. And so Solomon states of Adoniram, “He is an odd fellow, / Somber and dreamy, almost wild, / That the King of Tyre sent me; / His origins are a mystery” (Act
But there are also notable variations in detail, many of which highlight Gounod’s difficulties in working with a recalcitrant cast, chorus, dance troupe, stage designer, and minister of state (such that Georges Bizet felt obliged to append the omitted fantastic furnace scene in his transcription for piano and voice). During the rehearsals, to accommodate the twelve dance sets and to finish the performance by midnight, several scenes were cut, obscuring the characters’ motivations. The resulting confusion irked one critic enough to ask, “What interest can a story create where . . . its most important personalities are dolts and fools, if not cowards, rascals, villains, and repugnant types?” This cast of apparent rogues was none other than the principals of the love triangle formed by Solomon, Balkis, and Adoniram in an opera reduced to melodramatic convention.

What remains, however, is the significance of Balkis the freemason woman on and off the stage. She visits Solomon as a potential spouse. He courts her in part by displaying the splendors of his temple and the masons, including Adoniram, at work on it. But her first gift, a pearl necklace, is not accorded the king but the master architect whose secret hand gesture creates order from the chaos of all the men in his employ. Such power moves the visiting queen. Comparing the mason’s artistic genius with the king’s material vulgarity, Balkis falls in love with Adoniram, who in declaring his own affection foreshadows her role in and after his death. “No, even if my dream faded away forever,” he declaims to her, “even if this sweet hope eludes me . . . / Oh, do not speak, leave me to doubt / This happy or fatal moment, alas. / My heart calls out to it, my heart fears it. / Let me die! . . . Oh, do not speak” (Act 3, Scene 5, lines 70–75).

Meanwhile, Solomon’s humiliation and jealousy move him to urge the three disgruntled journeymen against their master. The trio confront Adoniram, stab him, and escape in time for Balkis to discover her dying lover in time to place on his finger the wedding ring she had retrieved from Solomon. She holds him in her arms as he dies. This actual and metaphorical embrace of masonry’s mythic hero, an initiation in extremis, makes her a virtual member of the craft; and the child she conceived with him signifies the next generation of freemasons. In the last scene of the opera, Balkis speaks to and for all future masters who have survived comparable trials, “Let us take at night to the other shore / The venerable remains of the mason who is no longer! / And let his hallowed name be handed down through the ages / Until the last days of centuries to come!” (Act 5, Scene 3, lines 4–7). These lines of love and despair, so expressive of masonry’s ritualistic heritage, are among Gounod’s more melodious moments. From this point onward, the freemason Balkis, like Gounod’s opera, is elided from public sight.
Consuelo, Comtesse de Rudolstadt

The fullest portrait of a freemason woman comes from the pen of a mason sans tablier. George Sand, the author of the two-novel sequence *Consuelo* (1842–43) and *La Comtesse de Rudolstadt* (1843–44), was surrounded by masons from her earliest childhood—her father, first and foremost, but also several of her partners, Pierre Leroux especially, and the bevy of friends, colleagues and neighbors she corresponded with on a regular basis (see app. 4). In the early 1840s, she took time to learn more about the craft, whose aspirations influenced the idealist philosophy she had expressed in *Le Compagnon de tour de France* (1840, *The Journeyman’s Tour of France*) and would express later in *Les Maîtres sonneurs* (1853, *The Master Bell-Ringers*). By the time she started writing her second masonic novel in 1842, Sand was exceptionally well versed in the craft, its rituals, its lore, its history, and its ideals. Literary scholar Georges Lubin identified the relevant titles in her library, recommended and in some instances provided by Leroux. Among the most important were by Abbé Pérau (1758); Guillaume de Saint-Victor (1789); Joux (1801); De L’Aulnaye (1819), and Chemin-Dupontès (1819), most of them standard sources for studying the craft’s first century of existence in France. As Sand explained in a letter to Leroux in 1843, she was lost in the obscurity of its mysticism: “it is an ocean of uncertainty, a gloomy abyss.” But she immediately turned to describing what creative use she foresaw of this occult knowledge. “There is so much unknown in all this that... in fact the history of these mysteries can never be written, I believe, except in the form of a novel.”

Thus by her prose fiction, Sand propounded masonic principles as well as respect for the initiatory secrets she had learned from her well-informed sources.

The novel Sand had in mind was the one she was in the process of writing, *La Comtesse de Rudolstadt*. This sequel to *Consuelo* offers the most powerful and complex depiction of freemasonry in modern French literature. Its portrait of a clairvoyant mason-in-the-making is based on a superbly talented soprano, Pauline Viardot, one of Sand’s confidantes. Similarly, as the novelist began reconsidering her intimate relationship with Frédéric Chopin (1838–46), she used him as the principal model for Consuelo’s husband, Albert de Rudolstadt. But true to Sand’s most philosophical writing, the ideas embodied by these characters were almost exclusively her own. They were the product of her imaginative reworking of utopian socialism, or more accurately its romantic variety in which mysticism, republicanism, and women’s emancipation all play substantive, creative parts. In lieu of decrying capitalism and the laissez-faire ideology that justified an inexorable class war, her romantic socialism was a broader response
to the Enlightenment’s faith in natural law, human reason, and cultural progress that she felt had fallen dormant, tragically, during the bloodshed of the French Revolution and the loss of community during industrialization. Reform-minded thinkers, like Sand in her commitment to moral and spiritual renewal, sought instead to inspire humanity to achieve spiritual unity, political comity, and social equality, including between men and women. That these laudable goals were all too often at odds with one another, making them impractical if not unachievable, did not deter Sand’s determination to champion the significant benefits arising from such a lofty quest. The wretched, petty, staid status quo was not an option.

For Leroux—the most influential source of Sand’s idealism after the liberal Catholic theorist Félicité de Lamennais—the interests of the individual must not be pitted against those of society. Both would suffer. Rather, he saw the commonality of interests, as in religious faith, overcoming the alienation of individualism and the tyranny of the collectivity, especially institutional hierarchies like the state, the church, and the family. What Leroux had in mind was a return to the natural sense of fellowship that existed in primitive Christianity, which he subsumed in his religion of humanity and its promotion of revolutionary ideals, not their perversion during the Terror or their negation in industrial capitalism. A new spirituality, much as Saint-Simon had envisaged in his New Christianity, would restore the bonds of love and solidarity that Leroux advocated. In this way, he felt, not only would social-class conflict attenuate, but also possibilities for more equal gender relations would appreciate. The legal subjugation of married women enshrined in the Napoleonic Civil Code would yield to their liberation from patriarchy, their participation in politics, and their empowerment in a society modelled on their relational qualities. Less individualistic and selfish, more compassionate and forgiving, the result would be a new social order whose origins were described in Leroux’s exultant De l’humanité (1840, On Humanity). “Yes,” Leroux affirmed, “at heart, humanity is us.” However mystical and overly optimistic about human nature and a new society in an indeterminate future, this doctrine made eminent sense to Leroux, the former Carbonnerie egalitarian and later freemason enthusiast. This idealism also made sense to Sand as she was writing her initiation novels with other elements borrowed from Goethe’s Bildungsromane and Ann Radcliffe’s gothic fiction.

Sand’s work elaborates, at length, her own view of romantic socialism. It occurs first in Spiridion (1838), which introduces initiation among monks questioning Roman Catholic doctrine. Le Compagnon du tour de France (drafted the same year that Leroux produced De l’humanité) and Horace (1842) were
published shortly thereafter, both of them committed to a masonic perfection of humanity. To circulate these latter two works, however, Sand and Leroux joined with Pauline's husband, Louis Viardot, to found *La Revue indépendante* (*The Independent Review*) in 1842 because François Buloz of *La Revue des deux mondes* (*The Review of the Two Worlds*) had refused to print them for political reasons. The business-savvy Viardot put up the money, the editor Ferdinand François directed the journal, and the compositor Leroux printed it. Accordingly, *Consuelo* and *La Comtesse de Rudolstadt* were serialized in their journal over a three-year period, marking Leroux’s greatest influence on Sand’s feminist idealism as expressed by a secret society, the Invisibles. Their syncretic ideas welcomed the initiation of not one but two women: Wanda z Prachalitz (Comte de Rudolstadt’s mother) and Consuelo (Wanda’s daughter-in-law), the central figure of the novels. “George Sand is but a pale reflection of Pierre Leroux, a fanatic disciple of the same Ideal,” the novelist wrote in 1844. “I am a mere popularizer with a diligent and, at heart, impressionable pen.” She identified with Consuelo in her two novels, set mostly during the years 1742 to 1750, whose philosophic premises accord with those of Leroux and her masonic library.

The long and involved storyline of the singer’s life begins with her orphaned childhood in the streets of Venice. Her artistic genius catches the attention of Porpora, the teacher-composer-conductor. Mentored well, Consuelo achieves success in opera, despite jealous rivals and an unfaithful fiancé. La Porporina, as she is also known, escapes Venice to serve as the companion and tutor to the daughter of a prominent noble family in Bohemia. There Albert de Rudolstadt, the heir to the family estate, the gloomy Chateau des Géants/Riesenberg, falls in love with her. An important but shadowy presence, Albert is endowed (and cursed) by his Hussite ancestors, for whose misdeeds during long-past religious wars in the region he assumes personal responsibility; it is one manifestation of his moral reincarnation, a perverse legacy of guilt, clairvoyance, and catalepsy that drives him mad. Consuelo’s affectionate commitment to him, however, sustains her through the trials of a preliminary initiation to rescue Albert from his deep, underground sanctuary that can only be reached by a long, dark descent and through mysterious crypts. Her singular bravery results in an ambivalent reward: Albert offers to marry her. In the face of his physical and mental disabilities, La Porporina finds that she can never really love him enough to give up her career as a diva; so she journeys to Vienna, in the company of the young composer Haydn, to resume her professional singing. The Empress Maria Theresa attempts to recruit her for the court opera if she marries Haydn to give her a more respectable social standing. This opportunity Consuelo declines as she
heads off to Berlin with Porpora to sing in Frederick the Great’s theater at Sans Souci. Along the way, she learns that Albert is dying and must see her again. Just hours before he expires, Consuelo marries him out of pity, but renounces her title, privileges, and property as the widowed Comtesse de Rudolstadt in order to honor her obligation to sing for Frederick.

Here *La Comtesse de Rudolstadt* properly begins, with La Porporina at Sans Souci in Potsdam. It continues the twists and turns of her ongoing saga since Venice, but this time with a shift in focus from Albert’s mystical madness to the Invisibles’ humane conspiracy. As literary historian Léon Cellier remarked, “If *Consuelo* is the novel of clairvoyance, *La Comtesse de Rudolstadt* is the novel of initiation,” even though there is an initiatory quality to the earlier novel. It appears during Consuelo’s quest to save Albert from the symbolic dungeon of his need to redeem the sins of his ancestors. The setting for her trials is a treacherous passage to reach Albert’s subterranean refuge, that is, through a temporarily empty cistern, by a flooding passageway, up a wall to a landing above the rapidly rising water, and out from a funereal space where she is nearly buried alive. Having survived these life-threatening perils, La Porporina finds more than relief and some presence of mind; she is changed. She becomes a different person endowed with “a fervent soul, a resolution full of charity, a quiet heart, a pure conscience, an impartiality with every challenge.” In this new guise, she is ready to venture forth through a series of doors to confront and console Albert in an exchange more on his terms than on hers. Their incoherent dialogue ends with Consuelo’s fainting from sheer exhaustion. But as the Sand scholar Isabelle Naginski notes, “Consuelo’s discovery of Albert resembles a successful quest. The heroine’s suffering is given a purpose. The Romantic search ends in initiation and growth.” So the plot does not postpone the Comtesse de Rudolstadt’s transformation until the eponymous sequel; rather, it prefigures the later, more fully developed transition in Consuelo’s long journey to rebirth, to a realization of Leroux’s notions of love and solidarity. There is thus more continuity, thematic as well as symbolic, between the first and last volumes of Sand’s two-part novel.

*La Comtesse de Rudolstadt* resumes the narrative a year after Albert’s apparent death when Consuelo has become a widely respected soprano in Frederick’s opera. But she is now subject to the intrigues of the king’s family and court. She struggles to avoid them, only to find herself confronted by specters of her late husband, who is seen in the audience, consorting with Cagliostro and wandering the halls of the palace as a sorcerer. The apparitions do not dissipate after Consuelo’s subsequent three-month imprisonment in the Spandau fortress.
she encounters the jailor’s son Gottlieb who informs her of the mysterious Invisibles and carries their correspondence to her. They arrange for her escape from Spandau with an alluring masked member of this secret society; he escorts her to a safe haven far from Berlin. This is a key moment in the novel. Consuelo awakens to a passion she has never experienced before. Despite her resistance, she is strangely drawn to the disguised guard assigned for her protection, the so-called Chevalier Liverani. The rest of the novel turns on this emotional discovery.

The narrative details the various stages of Consuelo’s subsequent initiation into the Invisibles’ lodge—some two-hundred pages worth (chapters 2.6–4.1)—with a host of members, including a disguised Wanda z Prachalitz. They test her character to see if she is worthy of the order (see ill. 7). Again Porporina is subject to a dark and dangerous passage to a hidden, underground space in the isolated, aptly named Château de Graal. During her actual initiation, she discovers that her late husband Albert is not dead but the victim of a grand-mal cataleptic seizure. After his recovery, he adopted the persona of the enticing Liverani, the masked escort Consuelo embraced during her rescue from Spandau. The ceremony finishes with a marriage of true love and like minds—“this soul in two people, Consuelo and Albert”—who renounce together the prerogatives of their estate and leave, properly anointed by the Invisibles, to minister to the poor peasants in the Bohemian forests. An epilogue shows how, years later, they are faring in their sacred mission, notwithstanding Albert’s continued ravings and Consuelo’s having lost her voice.

Who precisely are the Invisibles, this mysterious sect at the heart of the novel’s storyline? It is actually the name given by Rosicrucians to their unknown superiors in the wisdom of esoteric knowledge handed down by generations of scholars since ancient times. The brotherhood prided itself on a privileged understanding of alchemical mysticism, religious doctrine, and revolutionary politics. By the eighteenth century, however, Rosicrucianism was undermined by the Enlightenment’s antipathy to religious speculation, even as freemasonry incorporated elements of the Rosicrucian order into some rituals. For Sand, as for others in the Romantic movement, this fascination with the otherworldly proved fruitful in her efforts to bring together the manifold ideals she appropriated from Leroux. It also confirmed her other sources on comparable societies, such as F.-T. Bégue Clavel’s controversial history of masonry in 1843, which was much discussed for its criticism of a moribund masonry and more, for revealing some of the craft’s ritual secrets, to the deep distress of his masonic brothers. The mainstream Grand Orient de France (for the craft degrees) and the Scottish Rite (for the side degrees as well) were implicated, in part, because of their willingness to develop a
validating mythology of their own from ancient Egypt, the Temple of Solomon, and the Knights Templar. Because freemasons were often confused with the Illuminati, the Illuminés de Bavière provided inspiration of a genuinely revolutionary sort, hence the Invisibles’ daring slogan for the 1750s: Liberty, Equality, Fraternity. Of more recent influence, the Saint-Simonians had captured Sand’s
attention in the 1830s, having invited her to become Prosper Enfantin’s La Mère; she did what she could for the women, like Pauline Roland, whom he misled with false promises of emancipation (Enfantin was masterfully manipulative). All of these societies shaped Sand’s depiction of the Invisibles and her “occult history of humanity.”

The religious overtones are as obvious as the masonic ones, especially the Rudolstadt family’s commitment to heresy since the Middle Ages. Albert’s insanity is driven mostly by his Podiebrad forbears, the Rudolstadts before they were forced to change the surname to something less heretical. A host of them died resisting religious oppression. As Hussites and their more radical Taborite brethren committed to egalitarian Christianity, they inveighed long before the Protestant Reformation in the sixteenth century (and longer still before Leroux’s interest in the idea). Albert believed that he was the reincarnation of their military leader, Jan Žižka, whose “patriotic independence and evangelical equality” affected Consuelo before she knew much about her husband. This religious theme naturally echoes the millenarians. They were influenced by the Lutheran pastor Jacob Boehme and the Bohemian nationalists avant la lettre like the Podiebrads. Their latest incarnation, Albert the Romantic musician, played only local folk tunes, hymns, and battle songs. These passions made it possible for the Bohemian martyrs to endure persecution, incarceration, torture, and assassination, artefacts of which Consuelo encountered during her trials in the dank, cavernous anti-chambers littered with the bones of these heroes. On her way to the Invisibles’ temple, “she saw other objects of a more refined barbarism: trestles, wheels, saws, melting pots, pulleys, hooks, a whole museum for the instruments of torture.”

Her fainting response to these horrors, she is later told, honored the sacrifices that these proud people made for their ideals at odds with a despotic Catholic Church. Consuelo had passed her ordeals and was ready to be accepted by the sect.

Another element, and not the least, of humanity’s occult history is the subordination of women, which appears as a major theme in Sand’s novels. Given her unhappy marriage to Casimir Dudevant and her difficulties with a roster of other men, the author did not need the romantic socialists to tell her about the long history of women’s domestic enslavement; their faithfulness and obedience to the patriarchal household under the terms of the Civil Code were merely its legal manifestation. Sand took pains in her novels of initiation to ensure that her readers, many of them women whom she addressed directly in the narrative, understood that their oppression was akin to that of the religious heretics and the Bohemian nationalists. The message here is clear: marriage must be based on true partnership, the mutual love and respect of a man and a woman (unlike
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much of what Sand had experienced). Consuelo adopts this perspective in her resistance to married life with Albert, in her passion for Liverani, and in her welcome discovery that Albert and Liverani are one and the same man. She is prepared for this initiation of another sort by Wanda’s story about her own loveless marriage with Christian de Rudolstadt and by her confessor’s explanation of God’s sympathy for women’s sexuality. “So be sure,” Consuelo is informed, “that God, far from imposing... sacrifices on your sex, rejects them and denies to anyone the duty to assume them. This suicide is even more guilty and cowardly than the renunciation of life.” Intimate freedom is the basis of the relational feminism for which Sand long contended, however ironically it is turned on its head by the end of the novel. Years after her initiation, Consuelo loses her voice. This fate marks the end to her singing career and the start of her marital responsibilities as the insane Albert’s helpmeet.

The thematic, symbolic, and historical implications of Consuelo’s initiation into the Invisibles are thus apparent. She now projects a striking posture with a laudable, discernable mission defined by the Invisibles. In both novels, this figure is high-minded, sensitive, courageous, wise, passionate, yet compassionate, an embodiment of freemasons’ civic morality in her commitment to more than mere selfish, parochial concerns. As a mythic oracle, variously like Orpheus, Psyche, Persephone, and Cyane, this talented musician descends to hellish depths to rescue her love in the pre-initiative trials related in Consuelo. A venturesome, independent-minded woman subject to a life-changing rite of passage evident in and through both novels, she still embodies the nineteenth-century’s equality-in-difference in her relationship with Albert, who is much her better in social status, mystical vision, and self-sacrifice, but much Consuelo’s inferior in social relations, artistic expression, and personal responsibility. Her initiation ensures that her determination triumphs over the adversity that Albert cannot ever overcome. Historically, she represents the place of women in French society, much as Sand herself, whose social activism was ultimately recognized but not rewarded with the success that their male counterparts generally assumed for themselves. “Such is the law of conspiracies,” the leader of the initiation informs Consuelo, but

you will know the secret of the freemasons, the great confraternity which, in the most varied forms and with the most diverse ideas, works to organize the practice and to spread the notion of equality. You will receive the degrees of all the rites, even though women are only admitted under the aegis of adoption and they do not participate in all the doctrine’s secrets. We will treat you as a man.
As such, Consuelo is charged to work with masonic lodges to help the Invisibles’ achieve their goal of establishing a true religion of humanity.

Sand’s novels tied their protagonists to a well-defined cause. In so doing, this image marks a break with earlier versions of freemason women. Although Feliciani, Pamina, and Balkis all challenged certain gendered norms, their objectives, beyond their freedom from the control of men, were not sharply delineated. Their motivations, and prospects, were vague if not implausible. The repentant Feliciani is murdered in a ritual, Tamino’s wife Pamina joins him in the temple, and the Queen of Sheba returns to her kingdom a widow; such was their undetermined quest for the greater good. But Consuelo’s initiation is predicated on grander ambitions, however muted by the end of the novel as she wandered the Bohemian forests, ostensibly to preach her revolutionary religion, with a delusional husband and three young children in tow, “like a true daughter of Bohemia, poetic like a generous goddess of poverty.” Her initiation marked the beginning of a new life, one more figuratively significant than first meets the eye, as scholars of such ritualistic transitions have characterized them.

Initiations for women are not entirely the same as those for men. The rites in adoption masonry, for example, differ considerably from those in mixed and male masonry. What these initiations have in common with Consuelo’s experience is equally obvious: a sacred space (better known as the temple where the rites are conducted in secret) and a rite of passage (requiring the willing participation of the candidate to face the ceremonial rigors to reach another state of being). Although the specifics of the ritual—the preparation of the candidate and of the lodge, the catechisms, the trials, the oaths, the speeches, the signs and symbols—vary from order to order for men and women, the candidate’s transition from profane to mason remains central to the ceremony. Many elements are shared, especially the tools of the craft, the secrecy, and the life of the lodge; they resemble the twin portico columns affixed to the Temple of Solomon, Jakin and Boaz, whose masonic symbolism as the sun and the moon, respectively, affirms gender complementarity in the roles and norms of the two sexes. But in her initiation novels, Sand felt compelled to elaborate upon these features to correct what she felt were serious deficiencies in masonry in the 1840s, namely, its empty rituals. “I found fault with this candidate whose courage and virtue were subjected to entirely material trials,” Consuelo remarks, “as if physical bravery sufficed to be initiated for the work requiring moral courage. I censured what I saw and deplored these cruel games of a grave fanaticism, or these puerile experiences of a wholly visible and idolatrous faith.” Such were Sand’s own criticisms, which her depiction of the Invisibles was meant, in part, to address.
She thus imagined an amalgam of rites from the Rosicrucians, the Illuminati, the Knights Templar, the Strict Observance, the Scottish Rite, as well as the craft, and what they meant for her deeply felt principles of liberty, equality, and fraternity. She knew that her creation was derivative and inaccurate, but she reveled in the reforms that she thought would come of it. “In sum I worked by telling myself *fiat lux,*” she wrote proudly.120

Since then, masons have marveled at Sand’s cheek, but also at her sincere interest in promoting some of their most cherished values. The specialists Léon Cellier and François Menard recognized her achievement as a non-initiate, despite reservations expressed by members of the craft whenever a profane writes about them.121 Literary critics like Paulin Limayric and Hippolyte Babou had been less kind. Their response to Sand’s romantic idealism, often resulting in interminable set-speeches by mouth-pieces posing as characters in her novel, was predictably harsh. “After having dragged out in ten long volumes the fantastic shadow of Comte de Rudolstadt, and after having taken an enormous amount of time analyzing her philosophical and amorous hobby-horses, the author . . . lost sight of the Heart,” opined Limayric in the *Revue des deux mondes.*122 But as the literary scholar Naomi Schor pointed out, this critique of Sand’s idealism was typical in the polarized gender beliefs of realists, almost all of them men. “In the age of romanticism, the ideal, idealism, and idealization traverse aesthetics, politics, and Eros, and provide important links among them,” even if Schor failed to examine them in Sand’s *Consuelo* and *Comtesse de Rudolstadt.*123 This omission has been amply corrected by Naginski and others especially sensitive to Sand’s initiatory vision across the entire novel sequence from Venice to Bohemia.124 After symbolic deaths and rebirths in no fewer than eight different initiatory experiences, “Consuelo was engaged in an adventure which is a Quest; the divine traced for her a destiny in which extraordinary encounters were but the sign of a superior will,” states Simone Vierne, an expert on initiation ritual in fiction.125 The implications of this work, discussed as well in her colleague Martine Watrelot’s important essay, lead the reader to understand the historical agency and transcendence that women have sought—and found—by their participation in freemasonry. “By her integration into a secret society,” concludes Watrelot, “woman becomes a subject of history,” no less.126

Diana Vaughan and Others

Sand considered Consuelo an admirable type well suited to please her female admirers, such as Marie-Sophie Leroyer de Chantepie, whose fan mail affirmed
the author’s character and her messianic message. Men were less favorably impressed. This was in part because as realists they disdained the idealist fiction Sand had perfected, but also because many of them felt threatened by her feminist views of relational equality in marriage. To hear her critics, the family, the bedrock of society, was at stake. Women’s role in secret societies, like the Invisibles, only made matters worse. A year after Sand’s La Comtesse de Rudolstadt was published, Jacques Collin de Plancy’s inflammatory Dictionnaire infernal (1845, Hell’s Dictionary) claimed how easily masons misled women (and in the case of Cagliostro, it was young children: “He established a sort of Egyptian cabal”). Freemasonry remained a danger to the social order.

The same conspiratorial organizations that destroyed the Old Regime still seemed to be at work in the years leading up to the 1848 Revolution. Once the July Monarchy had fallen, freemason men promptly adopted the Second Republic; and former Saint-Simonian women formed political clubs, published newspapers, and nominated female candidates for public office. It did not take long for an assertive literary figure like the Comtesse de Rudolstadt to be depicted as a menace to social and political stability, especially to Roman Catholics whose pope, Pius IX, insisted that the church must become a bulwark against modernity as represented by republicanism, socialism, feminism, and, yes, freemasonry. Antiquarians in the vein of Arthur Dinaux were happy to oblige with accounts of suspect societies and the social disruptions they continued to pose long after the eighteenth century; women “believed themselves to have been initiates, even though in fact they were only admitted into a meeting for pleasure and bombast,” Dinaux wrote in 1864. Accordingly, images of women in affiliated organizations, including the most innocuous in keeping with L.-P. Riche-Gardon’s Temple des Familles, appeared equivocal if not dark and insidious, because women were initiated in the same order as men.

An extreme example occurs in the prolific Charles Monselet’s gothic novel, La Franc-maçonnerie des femmes (1856, The Freemasonry of Women), written in the early years of the authoritarian empire that had cracked down on the craft. In Monselet’s novel, real authority rests in the hands of the truly sinister Marquise de Pressigny, grande maîtresse of her personal lodge of freemason women in a virtual “cavern beneath society.” True to Monselet’s chosen literary genre, the story’s plot turns on the evil marquise’s manipulation of her innocent niece, Amélie, whose marriage to Philippe Beyle (and elaborate masonic initiation) she personally arranges. But another freemason woman, the impulsive soprano Marianna, wants Philippe for herself, so she discredits Amélie by revealing her initiation to Philippe and in so doing betrays masonic secrets. Keen to regain the
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honor of her lodge, Amélie challenges Marianna to a duel, which results in her death and Marianna’s escape from justice thanks to masonic connections among the police. The grieving Philippe, however, confronts the real source of his misery, the marquise, to learn that she has used Marianna to revenge herself on Philippe’s lack of affection for her. The honorable Philippe foregoes vengeance of his own. The marquise, he felt, was unworthy of it, as with all freemason women who were little more than “street larva.”

Meanwhile, another well-intentioned but inept man, Blanchard, attempts to expose the lodge. Having spied on Amélie’s carefully orchestrated initiation—conducted in the dead of night—he is sequestered for his bizarre behavior in the mental hospital in Charenton near Paris where the attending physician is a masonic ally of the marquise. As a consequence, Blanchard can look forward to an indefinite stay and the freemasons can continue their dreadful work unimpeded by their most ardent opponents. Evidently, because of their weakness, the novel concludes (in Philippe’s words), “the most intelligent and most delicate women, the divinities of the family, the muses of amiable and elevated enterprises, desert their homes and become, in emotional fellowship, the equals of those creatures whose name is a troop of trumpeters and a life of scandal!”

Freemason women are thus portrayed at best as the victims of depraved creatures, at worst as the sources of real danger to home, community, and society, little different from the uncontrollable Marquise de Pressigny. Set in the 1840s in a small town on Arcachon Bay, this novel must have overwhelmed whatever notions of women and masonry Sand offered in a much more favorable light. Their slogan, borrowed from the better-known Alexandre Dumas père—“ALL FOR ONE, ONE FOR ALL”—in a solidarity to the decided exclusion of all men, may have been the worst nightmare for writers hostile to women’s emancipation. As the rest of this chapter shows, Monselet’s perverse image of women in masonry prevailed for the next seventy years, presumably because it captured for another, larger readership than Sand’s the demonic implications of her romantic socialism during the repressive Second Empire and unstable Third Republic. Otherwise, Monselet expressed no further interest in the cra

By the end of the nineteenth century, the best-known freemason woman, by far, was another threatening figure, the devil worshipper Diana Vaughan. She was the literary creation of the prolific and unscrupulous journalist, Léo Taxil, a.k.a. Gabriel Jogand-Pagès (and no fewer than five other aliases). Taxil cleverly used Monselet’s gothic literary devices to report on masonry as a worldwide conspiracy in which women like Vaughan, Pressigny’s alter ego, played a leading role. This campaign began perhaps as early as Taxil’s truancy years in a
Jesuit reformatory near Marseilles, his hometown, where he imbibed an intense, lifelong anticlericalism. His checkered career was a convenient combination of well-timed publicity stunts, adroit plagiarism, scurrilous reporting on nonexistent events, and shameless exploitation of certain fantasies—first those of secularist zealots for seven years (1878–85), then those of the Catholic faithful for twelve (1885–97). Twice Taxil made abrupt departures to unknown destinations just one step ahead of the police and members of his outraged public.

In keeping with the counter-Enlightenment’s mysticism, as studied by Éliphas Lévi, Papus, and Josephin Péladan in J.-K. Huysmans’s *Là-bas* (1891, *The Netherworld*), Taxil joined the freemasons in 1881. But he was ejected from his lodge eight months later over a plagiarism conviction; he had borrowed long sections of the late Auguste Roussel’s *Les Sermons de mon curé* (1848, *My Pastor’s Sermons*) and was ordered to pay Roussel’s estate 60,000 francs. He went on to attack the lascivious reputation of the clergy, as in *Les Amours secrètes de Pie IX* (1881, *The Secret Loves of Pius IX*), for which Taxil was sued and ordered to pay another 60,000 francs. Then came a sudden transformation in 1884. After Pope Leo XIII handed down his encyclical *Humanum genus* attacking freemasons, Taxil decided to target the craft instead. Here was a new market to explore. He published at least six book-length exposés of masonic turpitude and several serializations of varying length about the nonexistent Palladium—*Le Diable au XIXe siècle* (1892–95, *The Devil in the Nineteenth Century*), *La Restauration du paganisme* (1896, *The Restoration of Paganism*), *Le 33e Crispi, un palladiste homme d’état* (1896, *The 33rd Degree Crispi, A Palladist Statesman*), and *Mémoires d’une ex-palladiste* (1897, *The Memoirs of an Ex-Palladist*)—totaling 2,500 pages of monthly fascicles. In all these publications, Taxil featured women, like Vaughan who is the supposed author of the last three works, engaged in implausible, blasphemous rites.

Allegedly quoting Charles Fauvety, a proponent of mixed masonry, Taxil stated, for effect, “the Temple of our dear French Masonry recalls accurately enough the temples of ancient Babylon, consecrated to Venus Mylita, whose locale was filled with women praising the [physical] charms of foreigners.” These exposés involving women were notorious for their deliberate distortion of masonry’s professions of virtue, with an eye to emphasizing what Taxil considered the craft’s shameless hypocrisy. In these instances, women were nameless props appropriate to the author’s contentious accounts that were still well grounded in original masonic sources by the likes of Louis Guillemain de Saint-Victor in the eighteenth century and César Moreau in the nineteenth. In one description of adoption masonry, for instance, Taxil worries aloud more about the morals
of the brethren than he does about the sisters: “the adoption lodges were no
longer anything more than annexes of the men’s Ateliers, that is, nothing but
harem.” The rituals for the higher grades are given the most attention largely
because they are the most open to suggestive interpretation: “after the degree
of Maîtresse, one wallowed in complete obscenity.” They are described in al-
luring chapter subheadings like “The Reception of Venus” and “The Reception
of Love,” despite how few women ever sought a degree higher than the third;
the adoption rite had not been worked for decades. To believe Taxil, rituals
were an everyday excuse for endless orgies in masonic bordellos, i.e., in lodges
during the fin de siècle. In his first antimasonic volumes, the lubricious nature of
women, the allure rather of their unbridled sexuality, was Taxil’s favorite topic.

This crusading zeal in detailing prurience soon shifted to unveiling Satanism.
Taxil’s serializations began with Le Diable au XIXe siècle in collaboration with
Charles Hacks (under their collective pseudonym, Dr. Bataille). Hacks’s par-
ticipation in the irregular installments, however, ceased after the first fourteen
when the narrative of his erratic world travels in search of dark, arcane practices
came to an abrupt halt. His encounters with bizarre satanic rituals (such as the
baptism of a snake and the marriage of monkeys) had followed an itinerary, by
steamer, from China to the Straits of Gibraltar, with a prolonged stopover in
Ceylon (Sri Lanka), but no more. For the rest of what became two thick vol-
umes there appeared a more expository presentation of masonry, especially its
exotic higher degrees (of which the reading public knew little but suspected ev-
eything). Topics drew on tantalizing inferences from masonry’s initiations lit-
erally cut and pasted from titles in the public domain, if they were not rewritten
with special attention to their reputed devil worship. Such were the unexpected
visits of Moloch (as a winged crocodile who played strange tunes on the piano
and leered at the mistress hosting the séance) and Asmodeus himself during a
tenue. Incidents of this sort served to season the text.

As the 23rd installment skittered into spiritism, Vaughan makes her entrance;
she returns with increasing frequency in the remaining seventy-three (or so) seg-
ments. Taxil had seized on her persona as a literary device to lure more readers
than could Hacks’s diabolic, picaresque tales of secret societies and the faceless
women in them. The autobiographical side to Vaughan’s narrative expanded dra-
matically in subsequent serializations, which developed the voice of an “actual”
woman on her lodge experiences in the United States and France. The action fo-
cused on the on-going rivalry of Vaughan with another palladist, Sophie Walder,
a more conniving figure who serves as Vaughan’s antagonist in her (temporary)
detachment from various manifestations of the devil. So engaging was this new
storyline, larded with asides on related antimasonic topics, the pope himself
granted the author a personal audience in 1894 to thank him for his work on
behalf of the Holy Mother Church. Taxil must have assured him that there was
more to come.

As the story runs, Vaughan was born in Paris, the daughter of a wealthy mer-
chant from Lexington, Kentucky, and another Protestant from the Cévennes in
France. An early widower with an illustrious ancestry including the alchemist
Thomas Vaughan, Diana’s father destined her for leadership in the Palladium.
Albert Pike, the Supreme Commander of the Scottish Rite in the Southern Dis-
trict, presided over the girl’s first initiation in 1883 at age fourteen. Vaughan’s
subsequent initiations and satanic encounters on both sides of the Atlantic
Ocean—she was duly initiated as templar-mistress at the Parisian Triangle of
Saint-Jacques—form the core of her preparation to serve as Asmodeus’s protégé;
this fiend marks a dramatic moment in an affiliated lodge, the Onze-Sept, not
long before her initiation into the first female degree, the élue palladique, in
1889 (see ill. 8). “In sum, Diana Vaughan has the most original physiognomy
in the milieu of contemporary occultism,” the narrator states from the outset
of her curious trajectory in this presumably obscure masonic tradition. She
eventually becomes Lucifer’s grande prêtresse in Baphomet’s sanctum regnum
described in the three installments of La Restauration du paganisme. Recounted
at much greater length in Le 33e Crispi, Vaughan’s efforts prevail in Pike’s suc-
cession in the American Scottish Rite, but not without stiff resistance on the
part of Walder and her allies in Rome. The heir apparent to Universal Freema-
sonry and the Reformed Palladium, the Italian Grand Master of the Scottish
Rite, Signor Adriano Lemmi, was challenged by his nemesis, Signor Domenico
Margiotta. Needless to say, Vaughan’s invocation of satanic powers made it pos-
sible for Pike’s designated successor to remain head of the Supreme Council in
Charleston, South Carolina, not by an imposter in Rome. So it would seem.

In the midst of this internecine conflict, the fictionalized Vaughan joins the
Catholic fold. This sudden, unexpected conversion deserved explanation in yet
another long serialization, this time, of her memoirs relating still more amazing
activities, all of them in opposition to her new faith. The Mémoires d’une ex-pal-
ladiste was a welcome turn of affairs for Taxil’s French Catholic readers, even
though her confessions provided still more of the fantastic events that she de-
scribed before her conversion. Prayers and religious meditations, such as a “Hymne
à Jeanne d’Arc (Contre la Franc-Maçonnerie)” (“Hymn to Joan of Arc [Against
Freemasonry]”), appear every now and then to hearten her audience. “I will
write to make everything known,” she proclaims early on in her memoirs, “I will
say in my turn what occurs in the triangles [lodges], what I stopped to the extent I could, what I have always faulted, and what I believed to be right; the public will judge for itself.”

All the same, Vaughan’s extravagances continued as before. Taxil’s Catholic following soon detected inexplicable discrepancies between these recollections and what had transpired in earlier publications. Skeptical
church officials began requesting openly for Taxil, her presumed publicist, to adduce evidence of Vaughan’s existence at a conference in Trent. Photographs of the woman and various “authentic” documents were not enough (see ill. 4). Believers wanted to see her in the flesh, which Taxil finally agreed to arrange at an evening lecture held in Paris at the amphitheater of the Société Géographique on Easter Sunday, April 19, 1897 (mere days after the latest installment alluded to Vaughan’s trip to planet Mars). For a crowd of personally invited priests, prelates, monks, freethinkers, masons, and members of the press, Taxil proffered proof, not of Vaughan and her satanic practices, but of his elaborate hoax. “There is a freethinker,” he confessed, “who . . . has come to loiter in your company . . . : and it is yours truly.” Diana Vaughan the palladist did not exist, but Diana Vaughan the typist and sales representative of American typewriter manufacturers in Paris certainly did (she helped Taxil with his mail). Before retiring to Sceaux south of Paris to muse on more discreet matters, such as gourmet cooking and financial fraud, Taxil detailed his mystification about the presence of freemason women or, to put it more accurately, their menacing image in French society.

A year later, a rueful Louise Michel contemplated Vaughan’s portrait, one wildly at odds with what she knew about masonry from the Paris Commune (she had yet to be initiated herself). “Often, during the long nights in prison,” she wrote, “I still saw the long procession of freemasons on the ramparts, and I have a hard time imagining these believers in the future as writing, after having read these midnight stories of Dianah [sic] Vaughan, to arrange an interview with Lucifer.” She was, evidently, not fooled by Taxil’s fictive freemason women, but the impression lingered long enough for her to remember it, like freemasons participating in the Commune, to wonder in disbelief. Others, however, were more impressionable. The print runs of Taxil’s serial publications ran into the tens of thousands; he had an intrigued if credulous audience, whose appetite for his gothic horrors was insatiable and profitable. Despite Taxil’s disclosing the mendacity of his publications, consternation lingered among Catholic officials who continued to believe in Diana Vaughan and her Palladium; even their own colleagues had difficulty dissuading them. Jean Tourmentin (a.k.a. Abbé Henri Joseph), Gabriel Soulacroix (a.k.a. Gabriel de Bessonies), and Abel Clarin de la Rive, for example, were obliged to reconsider their compilations of documents and reports concerning Vaughan’s activities. According to Jules Bois, a firm believer in the unknowable, “The Religious Weekly of Paris, Catholicism’s official journal, recognized the existence of the anti-pope Lemmi, on whom the palladists, last September 20th, conferred Lucifer’s tiara. The Antichrist’s cult is now
a fact, and the church is no longer unaware of it.” René Guénon continued to call the gullible back to reality well into the interwar period, as he did in his review of Leslie Fry’s *Léo Taxil et la franc-maçonnerie* (1934, *Leo Taxil and Freemasonry*), a collection of documents questioning the fraud. Vaughan’s image refused to die.

A similar interest in the supernatural is developed in one of Papus’s few novels, *Au pays des esprits* (1903, *In the Land of the Spirits*). As one would expect from the fin-de-siècle’s foremost exponent of neo-Martinism, this fictional account self-consciously sets out to demonstrate to a female audience the virtues of masonry’s apparent mysticism. The preface states clearly that women can know the supernatural every bit as well as men, they just need to be exposed to it in a “manner apt to their mode of sensibility.” So the story Papus tells is predictably filled with visions, clairvoyance, mesmerism, out-of-body experiences, and magic, primarily through the auspices of an *âme volante* (spirit)—belonging to the beautiful Constance Mueller—in preparation for the main character’s initiation into another world. The autobiographical story, set in India, assumes such activities as perfectly ordinary occurrences even for the uninitiated. Louis B**, the scion of a distinguished but impoverished Hungarian nobility, recounts his introduction into the “Fraternity,” clearly a paramasonic association, which enables him to acknowledge the special powers he possesses, however coldly scientific this group’s mystical erudition. But the otherwise honorable brotherhood’s only initiated woman, Hélène Laval, is an evil figure, “a veritable Medea” intent upon securing Louis’s devoted wife, Blanche, for her brother. Blanche makes the mistake of allowing a hair-clipping of hers to fall into Laval’s hands, putting her at the mercy of this “witch.” In the end Louis cannot save Blanche and their newborn baby. As with Constance’s wandering soul, they pass on, but Laval’s spell is broken by the combined efforts of Louis and his Indian fakirs. Once Laval has been stripped of her powers, the protagonist can return home to the Austro-Hungarian Empire in order to tell his extraordinary tale to an appreciative audience.

Perhaps the last novel in the literary parade to portray women in freemasonry is the utterly incredible *L’Élue du Dragon* (1929, *The Woman Elect of the Dragon*) by Clothilde Bersone. Although the work is attributed to Bersone, this trope is a vehicle for the much better known antimasonic writer, Roger Daguet (a.k.a. Paul-Émile Boulin), who signed the preface to the second edition in 1932. The historical personalities enlivening the novel, much as Bersone herself, are true originals, and their activities, especially their soi-disant masonic initiations, grotesque. In the extended preface, however, Daguet claims:
This novel is drawn, nearly page by page, from the memoirs of Clothilde Bersone, who had been in Paris from 1877 to 1880 the mistress of J[ames] A. Garfield, elected president of the republic of the United States and assassinated in 1881. Garfield was secretly the chief of the High Lodge of the Illuminati, of which Bersone, by the title Nymph of the Night, was first the Affiliate, then the Initiated and the Inspired, Grand Mistress Elect of the Spirit.161

The problem with this story is, Garfield only visited France once, and then quite briefly, before his election to the White House, yet the novel shows him speaking perfect French and living in Paris almost continuously for three years. Other European notables—Otto von Bismarck, Jules Grévy, Victor-Emmanuel, and Benjamin Disraeli—occur in the most implausible of situations, destroying any shred of verisimilitude, much less authenticity, to the work. The novel was a transparent effort to discredit freemasonry and the Third Republic as well as to titillate a voyeuristic readership. It is strongly reminiscent of Diana Vaughan’s memoirs fabricated earlier by Taxil (Vaughan was herself an élue du dragon). In both cases, the image of freemason women engaged in damning activities suggests something of a fixation.

By now it should be evident that freemason women left discernible traces from the eighteenth century onward. They began with Cagliostro’s Feliciani, but also Sade’s Juliette and the host of memoirists, real and fictive, among the royal and aristocratic elites who participated in adoption rites. Even when masonry for women effectively disappeared after the First Empire, the nineteenth century provided its own cast of characters closely associated with the craft. The idealistic reputation of Feliciani in Joseph Balsamo, Balkis in La Reine de Saba, and Consuelo in La Comtesse de Rudolstadt improved upon that of their more frivolous sisters before the Revolution of 1789. In time, their presence among the accounts of actual freemason women, such as those initiated by the Temple des Familles and other minor orders, enriched the portraits left by novelists, composers, and their librettists. But it is the fin-de-siècle fascination with the occult and its antimodernist variations—spiritism, clairvoyance, mysticism, and Satanism—that marked a decided break in the literary tradition of freemason women. They were no longer depicted as innocent or committed figures in French society. The demonic side to masonry and its cognates, whether or not they belonged to a regular obedience like the Droit Humain, haunted the French cultural imagination in the guise of the malicious Marquise de Pressigny and the satanic Diana Vaughan.
The historical explanation for these changing imaginaries is more complicated than their documentation. But one can discern the influence of what Theodore Ziolkowski terms the “lure of the arcane,” i.e., “a basic human impulse to enjoy secrets, to be included in a special group that has privileged information about any subject that matters to the individual.” The result is the appeal of “secret societies,” as characterized by the German sociologist Georg Simmel, which in troubled times are blamed, by authorities and others fearing a loss of agency, for conspiracies against public order. Modern France is certainly not the only period and place for this phenomenon. It dates back to ancient times and is found in many different countries, though their literary manifestations are easiest to track in western Europe with the rise of the modern state in the eighteenth century, precisely when freemasonry emerged. With political revolution and rapid economic and social change leading to violent domestic and international conflict, it is easy to see how dangerous anything—or anyone, especially a woman—associated with such a society might seem to those excluded from it. Exclusion creates a natural impulse to mobilize a defense by demonizing others—ethnic groups (think: immigrants), socialists (after the Russian Revolution, Bolsheviks), and feminists (for their critique of gender hierarchies), not because they are secret so much as because they are deviant, alien, marginal, and thus little known. Freemason women fit this profile and lend themselves to stereotypical representations. The stranger they seem, the more dangerous they are perceived be.

From this perspective, it is easy to understand the historical forces underlying hostility to masons and their putative allies, the Jews, with daunting implications for maçonnes. The peculiarly French cultural construction of a Judeo-masonic conspiracy arose in the nineteenth century thanks to pervasive Catholic concerns with modernity well before Pius IX’s Syllabus of Errors (1864). Fear of such a plot actually stemmed from the father of antimasonry, Abbé Barruel. In 1806 he circulated a forged letter, probably sent to him by members of the state police opposed to Napoléon’s liberal policy toward the Jews, calling attention to their part in the conspiracy he had earlier attributed primarily to masons. This combination was given wider currency by the journalist-provocateur Édouard Drumont in his France juive (1886, Jewish France) and the monarchist Charles Maurras on the “four confederated states,” i.e., Jews and Freemasons, but also Protestants and métis (of mixed race). After the Dreyfus Affair and the separation of church and state—like the lesser-known file-card scandal—anti-Semitic and antimasonic animus prevailed among the same arch conservative groups. These reactionaries were joined by well-funded polemicists, some of whom compiled exceptional documentation on the craft and
its female initiates. Besides Tourmentin, Clarin de la Rive, and Soulacroix, there was Monseigneur Ernest Jouin, the influential director of the *Revue internationale des sociétés secrètes* (1912–39, *International Review of Secret Societies*) and a leading member of the Comité Antimaçonnique and its affiliate, the Union Antimaçonique. As Channone Joseph Sauvêtre wrote of Jouin, “he discovered above and beyond [freemasonry] two other accomplice powers: Protestants and Jews,” which, he believed, were also leagued against the Roman Catholic Church when his six-volume *Le Péril judéo-maçonnique* (1920–23, *The Judeo-Masonic Danger*) was published.167 Women in the craft, it seems, were no less a threat to the French nation.

One consequence of this distinctly French belief in a Jewish-masonic collusion was the forgery and distribution of *Les Protocoles des Sages de Sion* (1920, *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*). It allegedly documented a world conspiracy led by Jews with the help of freemasons. Despite credible reports on the fraudulent origins of its report on an 1897 meeting of the elders of the twelve tribes of Israel in Basel, this text—“the most widely distributed in the world after the Bible”168—was believed to be proof certain of an end to Western civilization. What links the *Protocoles* to freemason women is the apparent role they played in its transmission to the Russian agents who published it first in 1906. According to the American polemicist Leslie Fry (a.k.a. Paquita de Shishmareff), Justine Glinka, a close friend of Juliette Adam whose editorial colleague Élie de Cyon may have drafted a lost version of it, obtained a copy from Joseph Schorst, a Misraïm brother in Paris, for 2,500 francs and forwarded it to General Orgevskii in Saint Petersburg.169 But the introduction to a popular translation of the text in 1921 spoke of another connivance. The document, declared the royalist Raoul Loky, originated with the “wife or mistress to one of the initiates who had written it and who believed it her duty to transmit copies to a Christian susceptible to putting his coreligionists on guard against some dark and menacing plots.”170 Women’s freemason networks were directly incriminated.

Of course, there were other accounts. Recent historians have sifted through all of them to conclude, from archives maintained by the former Soviet Union, that the most likely source of the *Protocoles* was a Russian police agent, Matthieu Golovinski, working on assignment in Paris in 1900.171 But the myth of masonry’s collaboration, as revealed by an affiliated woman, remains one more insidious legacy in the rise of Nazi Germany and the use of the *Protocoles* to justify the final solution to the so-called Jewish question. Given how powerful the belief in a Jewish-masonic conspiracy was to leaders of the Vichy regime during the German Occupation, the demonic qualities of women in the craft were just as real
if not so visible a threat to combat during the war. These nefarious projections developed a life of their own comparable to images at work in the novels, travelogues, operas, and exposés of freemason women since the eighteenth century.

Whatever the topoi that French authors marshalled in their literary work, all of them ultimately portrayed aspects of gender relations. This historical force was ubiquitous and is implicit in the philosopher Charles Taylor’s relevant *Modern Social Imaginaries* (2004), which defines civil society as a broad understanding of the way a given population envisages its public life. By social imaginary, Taylor writes, “I am thinking . . . of the ways people imagine their social existence, how they fit together with others, how things go on between them and their fellows, the expectations that are normally met, and the deeper normative notions and images that underlie these expectations.” Such an idea is central to the gendered middle ground between the state, on the one hand, and the economy, on the other, as modern individuals search for meaning, despite their disengaged, self-responsible reason, in Taylor’s project to redeem a secular world. Cultural images of women (and men) in an associational context are a clear expression of this imaginary; novelists, poets, dramatists, and other literati conceive the structures of social trust and the challenges those structures face. At stake in this opposition is the civic morality that lends consequence, if not credence, to these depictions.

For freemason women over the two-hundred-year modernization of France, *A Civil Society* has captured much of their social reality, even though other writers have shown them in a less flattering light. The ambiguities of this gendered situation emanated from the space that women claimed for themselves, most often in the lodge, but also in their networks beyond it to other groups. The contested imaginaries studied in this chapter nuance the nature of these supposed lives as seen by everyone but the actors themselves (with the singular exception of George Sand). The views that others had of these women have had remarkable staying power and, in the wrong circumstances, a tragic impact on the lives of real people like them. It is what historian John Roberts referred to as the powerful mythology of secret societies, one which was fabricated not about their actual secrecy so much as it was, in this case, about the women who shared in those societies and the communities they represented since the eighteenth century. In the end, they endured and survived this pernicious legacy to help redefine civil society itself. Even Jean Mamy’s *Forces occultes* in 1943, it seems, could not erase freemason women from France’s historical memory for very long.
Conclusion

*Civic Morality in Modern France*

Every scholarly monograph ends with questions; this one is no exception. For example, how representative of French civil society was freemasonry for women? What did it mean to them? How liberal was in fact the French state in its tolerance of the craft? What is new here to the history of civil society generally? Answers to these particular queries, among others, are not intuitively obvious. After tracking a fraternal organization and the space women created within it since the 1740s, *A Civil Society* has neglected to say anything substantive about the historical features of the third sector itself. Just how typical was adoption and mixed masonry in its two-hundred-year trajectory studied here? At least one useful approach to addressing this latter question lies in historian Stefan-Ludwig Hoffmann’s comparative schema for associational life from the eighteenth to the twentieth centuries. It bears rehearsing here.

However brief, it is remarkably consistent with those framed by Maurice Agulhon, Albert Meister, Geneviève Poujol, Philip Nord, and Karen Offen, all scholars who have posited their own developmental models.¹

At the outset, during the Old Regime, the mediating function of organizations like masonry, positioned between the state on one hand and the economy on the other, was in expansion. Literary salons, provincial academies, lending libraries, and coffee houses, not just masonic lodges, grew rapidly on the eve of the French Revolution. Their élan, however, was quickly tempered well before the tumultuous First Republic. Shortly thereafter, voluntary associations picked up again in provincial towns nearly everywhere in France. Their numbers spiked, very briefly, in 1848 and again in 1871 during lapses in police surveillance and state repression that normally followed regime changes from the First Empire to the Third Republic (1804–1870). In the course of this uneven rise of a civil society, one challenged by closely related strictures on assembly and speech, there occurred a discernible democratization of participation and purpose in nonprofits. New elites, drawn from social classes more modest than the Old Regime’s aristocracy and landed notability, assumed responsibility for recruiting members...
and guiding group activities; they thus opened up social and political institutions in the wake of industrialization and revolutionary upheaval. After the affirmation of a free press and peaceful assembly in 1881, Hoffmann contends, civil society embarked on a pronounced politicization. Legal provisions for labor unions, business and professional associations in 1884, for instance, almost immediately favored their respective constituents in a phenomenon that Nord aptly terms “pillarization.” As a consequence, civil society developed serious contradictions—between inclusive and exclusive memberships, between corporate and state interests, between class, ethnic, and nationalist imperatives—thereby complicating the impact of the Waldeck-Rousseau law of 1901 and the separation of church and state in 1905. The resulting stalemate worsened during the major crises of economic depression and mobilization for World Wars I and II.

To be sure, this analytical framework is too general to encompass all the peculiarities of a society like freemasonry and its place for women in one country. One might well say that, since its inception in the eighteenth century, French masonry expanded, democratized, and politicized more or less simultaneously rather than seriatim. These processes were imbricated historically, that is to say, they overlapped in time. Moreover, there were moments, such as during the First and Second Empires, when freemasonry ceased to share fully in civil society; it was repressed, albeit temporarily, until it was able to return to one or more of the historical phases that Hoffmann has identified. As for the role of women in masonry, its expansion was notable before 1789, as was its contraction during the nineteenth century until a new place for them appeared by the fin de siècle. Women’s politicization seems to have been a precondition for redefining a masonry attractive enough to activists who were inclined to social and political reform. The mixed craft certainly provided a complementary platform for committed feminists. So it is hard to see how Hoffmann’s timeline fully applies to French masonry in general and to adoption and co-masonry in particular. But there is enough utility to his phases to identify for freemason women a period of maturation in the eighteenth century, a (belated) openness to new adherents in the nineteenth century, and a subsequent turn to politics at home while the craft extended into the French Empire and other countries. As mixed masonry became a large-scale, multinational federation after 1900, one is even tempted to propose a fourth and final stage, internationalization, in a more detailed historical overview.

The early forms of the third sector are easily recognized on the eve of the Revolution in 1789. Public opinion, whether or not it constituted a new political culture, mattered to the monarchy, so much so that Louis XVI sought input.
from numerous groups in the compilation of the *cahiers de doléances* (lists of grievances) before the Estates General met for the first time in 175 years. That women participated in this new civic morality is also apparent, particularly in masonic adoption lodges whose sociability, as both civility and association, promoted some flexibility in the gender relations that structured Old Regime politics and society. Aristocratic networks in these lodges lent them greater influence in the political discussions, such as those entertained in salons led by women like Mesdames Helvétius and de Genlis, that predictably arose in the midst of the revolutionary crisis. This sphere may have been largely phallocentric, but it did provide space for the social capital of prominent women freemasons to play a visible role in 1789. The lesser-known likes of Rosalie Jullien, the prolific correspondent with her husband, the Conventionnel Marc-Antoine Jullien, were collateral beneficiaries.

As with much of civil society itself, the maçonnes’ activities were restrained by the First Republic. The elites, who had invented adoption masonry, disengaged; the politically suspect among them went into hiding or fled the country. As Napoléon I attempted to lay the social foundations for an enduring regime, a refashioned nobility under the First Empire re-created the forms but not the substance of this voluntary association; masonry was pressed into service to the regime and remained under close surveillance right through the nineteenth century. Even the police of the Third Republic felt it necessary to spy on sociable assemblies of a new type of masonry for women, largely festive family affairs whose inductions were open to the public, not the secret initiations prized by the men in their lodges. Women’s association, still subject to article 291 of the Penal Code (however mitigated by the right to assembly and a free press proclaimed in 1881), developed a system of informal networks, like those fashioned by George Sand, Juliette Adam, and Louise Michel, to affect the evolving political culture of liberal republicanism. Women masons as a community amassed sufficient social capital in their connections to make a difference, such as Augusta Holmès’s triumphal performance during the revolution’s centennial celebrations in 1889 or, more to the point, Maria Deraismes’s creation of a mixed masonic obedience, the Droit Humain, in 1893. Here one iteration of masonry was literally reshaped by women themselves; dozens of them did not wait for the men to do it on their behalf.

The twentieth century saw a civil society enhanced by the passage of the Waldeck-Rousseau law on the freedom of association in 1901. This law accelerated the growth in sociability, including a renewed masonry for women, namely the adoption lodges created under the auspices of the Grande Loge de France, not just the mixed lodges for men and women overseen by the Grande Loge
Symbolique Écossaise as well as by the Droit Humain. What made these phenomena possible in France reached its colonial empire and, to a great extent, other western countries in Europe and the Americas. As masonry for women spread in membership outside the French hexagon in the interwar period, it witnessed a surge of advocacy well beyond the Third Republic’s fragmented political culture. The theosophist Annie Besant and the explorer Alexandra David-Néel, idiosyncratic as they were, felt at home with the feminist activists like Madeleine Pelletier, Ghénia Avril de Sainte-Croix, and Éliane Brault who were eager to promote women’s suffrage, welfare measures, and international peace. By the time much of France was occupied by German armed forces in 1940, women masons were connected well enough to survive and then, in some cases, to resist by the end of the war. Their place in public space meant that they, too, were hunted down by Vichy authorities and deported to camps in Germany and elsewhere. For French sympathizers of German National Socialism, freemasons were no different from Jews. The liberation of France meant a liberation as well for its unexpectedly resilient civil society.

“To put it pointedly,” concludes Hoffmann, “one could say that nineteenth-century men (and, increasingly, women) had their first democratic and civic (but not necessarily ‘middle-class’) experiences predominantly in voluntary associations, with all their statutes, elections, offices, committees, speeches, rituals, rules, minutes, and courts. In a time when most continental European states were constitutional monarchies and not republics, associations served—from the 1830s at the latest—as schools of democracy.” This claim exaggerates what freemasonry did for French women, at least until feminist activism during the Third Republic created more extensive networks to drive an emancipatory movement. Whether or not lodges were schools of democracy is hard to say, but as schools of wisdom and virtue they certainly were centers of concerted action for both men and women. Many who were never masons at all were drawn to the craft’s national and international outreach on issues of importance to a larger portion of the population. Civil society did not just model democracy, it facilitated collective effort, a civic ethos that did more than goad the state or monitor the economy; at critical moments, it served in lieu of or in the face of both, even underground during war and occupation. This intervention involved women, freemason women, for more than two hundred years in modern France. Its past and its implications for the present are worth noting in a changing global, but still hierarchically gendered context.

Each in its own way, three lodges are emblematic of these developments: the Chevaliers Maçons Élus Coëns de l’Univers for its championing of mystical
masonry, as expressed in Louis-Claude de Saint-Martin’s prodigious writings, opening opportunities for women in ritual space before the Revolution of 1789 (chapter 1); the Loge Impériale des Francs Chevaliers for its commitments to the Napoleonic Empire, including its variant on adoption, to exemplify women’s masonic sociability for nearly the entire nineteenth century (chapter 2); and the Droit Humain for its establishment of co-masonry at home and abroad, which from its inception in 1893 set an ambitious feminist agenda (chapter 3). In each of these incipient orders, women stepped forward—like Claudine-Thérèse Provensal, Joséphine de Beauharnais, and Dorothée Chellier, respectively—albeit in markedly different ways. Provensal took part in the redaction of the Élus Coëns’s main rites that initiated women on much the same footing as men; Beauharnais brought widespread attention to the Francs Chevaliers’s adoption ceremony as its most prestigious and generous exponent; and Chellier made full use of the Droit Humain’s social networks to honor her masonic pledge “to effect equality of the sexes and of all social conditions” in French North Africa.7

These figures embraced the more visible goals—fraternité, charité, and sagesse—of the masonry that accorded women a place in French civil society. And maçonnnes did so, together, during the Old Regime, through the subsequent century of revolutionary upheaval, to the difficult and unstable period of colonial expansion, world war, and political deadlock in the last decades of the Third Republic.8 They served the craft—and France—by embodying Émile Durkheim’s conception of civic morality, of obligations to others, as embodied by Jacques France’s iconic “Marianne Maçonnique” (Marianne the Mason). Versions of this bust were found in town halls throughout the country for much of the Third Republic (see ill. 9).9 Without this express commitment within and beyond the lodge, it is hard to imagine how France could have become as liberal a republic, as open a society, or as engaged a public culture. Such were historical implications of freemason women.

Themes

From this perspective, six interwoven threads traced by A Civil Society from the eighteenth to the twentieth century are evident: civil society, gender relations, voluntary association, public sphere, social networks, and social capital. At the center of them lies the morale civique, as Durkheim conceived of it: “this subordination of particular interests to the general interest is, indeed, the source of all moral activity.”10 Here is Baron de Montesquieu and Alexis de Tocqueville’s social state at work, without direction from government or distortion by the economy, in a
world given to a social conscience such as this book has studied it among freemason women. Notwithstanding the overlap of sectors—masons did occasionally ignore their restrictions on talking politics or profiting by their activities in the lodge—NGOs spearheaded numerous initiatives when neither revolutionary aftermaths (as in 1793, 1834, 1849, and 1871) nor authoritarian regimes (the First and Second Empires) nor world wars (in 1914 and 1939) interfered. There were many propitious moments in French history for a fraternal organization whose
pervasiveness was widely acknowledged if not always understood for what it was, a manifestation of the third sector.

Civil society provided women some agency in navigating gender relations that relegated women by law and custom to private life primarily, though never exclusively. Even in freemasonry, women still worked rituals in lodges specially reserved for them prior to the establishment of mixed orders, such as the Droit Humain in 1893 and the Grande Loge Symbolique Écossaise II Mixte et Maintenue in 1901. Despite the increasing diversity of women’s work in industrial and service sectors of the economy, despite the sway of the women’s movement during the belle époque, not to mention women’s assumption of manifold male roles in World War I, some things remained much the same, including nearly all the reasons for excluding women from the craft in 1744: (1) “Woman is given to superstition”; (2) “Woman is credulous”; (3) “Woman is inherently conservative”; (4) “Emotion and not reason rules woman”; (5) “Woman lacks discretion”; (6) “Scandals could arise”; and (7) “Woman cannot be initiated [recevoir la lumière] all at once.” The one disabling trait from the eighteenth century missing in this official Grand Orient document of 1930 is woman’s lack of standing before the law. All the same, it may well be that feminist theorist Anne Philips is correct. In spite of the sexual contract, there is room for cautious optimism about an organizational challenge to gendered constraints: “A definition of civil society that highlights this space of social interaction would then seem peculiarly woman-friendly.” Such an assessment of a key element of the third sector proposes how social organizations like masonry, in making room for women to join and to lead its activities, offered them valuable opportunities to redefine the structural relations between the sexes in the institutions whose responsibilities they shared.

Sociabilité, as the French know association, was formative, productive, and decisive in this long, complex history. It was a singular achievement of a civil society that observers from Tocqueville onward had insisted was weak, ineffective, and inconsequential. Moreover, sociability was technically illegal under the terms of the Penal Code (art. 291), except at the discretion of prefects, who in this case did not intervene in gatherings sanctioned by elected political authorities. Accordingly, freemasonry was exemplary; it acted in keeping with its principles central to the Third Republic whose revolutionary slogan was chiseled over the doorway to nearly every official building in the country. Long before the 1901 Waldeck-Rousseau law guaranteeing the right to association, the craft operated, albeit with the police watching it and not always doing so for the common good. To be sure, women did not partake fully in the life of all lodges—even Derainmes was excluded after her initiation in 1882—but they did participate in their own
lodges as well as literary salons, philanthropic groups, and local organizations: Juliette Adam welcomed masons to her at-homes, Augusta Holmès performed to raise funds on behalf of nationalist causes, and Marie Béquet de Vienne created a foundation to assist unwed mothers. Women otherwise on the margins of masonry were drawn into its communities and thus into civil society itself.

In response to Jürgen Habermas’s flawed notion of the public sphere in the eighteenth century, historians like Margaret Jacob, Dena Goodman, and Carla Hesse have asserted women’s increasing presence and instrumental functions, including those in masonic lodges. These elites led reading clubs and disseminated their views in publications resembling the Journal des dames, whether or not they defied the masculinist tendencies of the craft’s Enlightenment ideals. In Hannah Arendt’s mind, this movement provided the basis for a self-conscious, personal, and communal agency consonant with Immanuel Kant’s clarion call for intellectual engagement. Freemason women, during the Old Regime and long afterward, dared to know, had the courage to use their own understanding, and created their own public sphere especially toward the end of the nineteenth century when feminist luminaries, like Maria Deraismes, Nelly Roussel, Madeleine Pelletier, Maria Pognon, Louise Koppe, and others, put their masonic initiations to good purpose. They promoted the affairs of women more broadly than masonry, perhaps because the craft was not an end in itself. As the Deraismes put it shrewdly, “the only worthwhile strategy is not to be intimidated and just follow one’s path.”

These social networks are easily discerned and have been much discussed in this book. Without equal rights, especially after 1804, married women were dependent upon the cooperation of others to accomplish anything of note, such as in the circles that freemason women created, especially in the women’s movement that originated during the Liberal Second Empire. Starting with the Société pour la Revendication des Droits Civils des Femmes, cofounded by Deraismes, Michel, Mink, and Léon Richer in 1869, all of them, at one time or another, were masons. In a mere twenty-five years, mixed masonry became a node for the various associational linkages at work on women’s issues. By World War I the nature of the masonic community had become far more inclusive than it had been a hundred years earlier. This had been true of elites generally in their associations by the end of the nineteenth century; following the model first developed by Agulhon, the historian Christophe Charle analyzed how “belonging to groups likely to enlarge social capital [was] . . . privileged.”

As for the social capital rising from this exercise in civil society, it is more difficult to characterize. In 1890 the German sociologist Georg Simmel


analyzed the different spheres individuals shared in as an industrial society differentiated new social identities. Before industrialization, almost everyone was born into a status that altered little in his or her lifetime; but since then people have a wider range of spaces that defined their status. “Thus, for example, it is only in the most recent period of our culture that large numbers of women have joined forces to agitate for social and political rights or to make the collective arrangements for economic support and other purposes which concern only women as such,” Simmel wrote.20 “We may suppose that hitherto every woman identified the general concept of ‘woman’ . . . with the particular variety that she herself embodied.”21 This broader identity was a form of social capital that valuable networks made possible, as well. Relationships among individuals within and outside of the family provided resources of different sorts—viz., symbols, materials, and affirmations—that strengthened their groups.22 Social network analysis (SNA) permits greater precision in assessing the configurations and patterns of these ties whose nodes, number, directedness, reciprocity, transitivity, density, strength, bridges to and brokerage between other groups define their centrality and structure. To some extent, the impact of networking can even be measured, but only by complex algorithms that are not always applicable to limited data sets, such as those from the 1800s.23 But there is sufficient empirical testing of the ideas at work in SNA to prompt some intriguing hypotheses.

For one, we know that networks function for organizations as well as for individuals; and the relations among them can be diagrammed, indicating the edges, the nodes, and the features that make up centrality and density. Such an analysis, though hard to simplify and quantify, can still be derived from the webs that maçonnés spun in the women’s movement, c. 1870–1914. The challenge is dealing with whole orders (Droit Humain [DH], Grande Loge Symbolique Écossaise [GLSE] II M&M) composed of numerous lodges (twenty-one for DH in 1910, seven for GLSE II M&M in 1906) and many women’s rights organizations (no fewer than fifteen by 1901).24 They exchanged the same type of resources—publication, mobilization of members, and commitment to goals—the outcomes from which varied considerably over time: women’s suffrage, for one, took until 1944 and came about only indirectly as a consequence of the relevant networks among mostly individual masons, however important their leadership and support. But a sociogram is at least worth attempting (see fig. 3) for future scholars to correct and to marshal the data necessary to determining centrality and structure over time, as much as possible, with the Droit Humain’s extant membership files.25
It is worth noting what even a preliminary sketch indicates about the networking of freemason women in Paris in 1900. First of all, these individuals had a remarkable associational reach; their ties led them to several other masonic lodges within and outside their own obedience and to the Conseil National des Femmes Françaises whose linkages extended to a dozen more organizations, most of which published a bulletin and, in some cases, a newspaper. In turn, no fewer than ten of these groups had direct relationships with one or more masonic lodges, lending the Droit Humain, for instance, a density of 0.05, five times the...
median for all linked and unlinked nodes, and a normalized actor degree centrality of 0.32, exactly one-half of the Conseil National’s. To translate these two measures in SNA: they indicate on a scale from 0 to 1—like a positive correlation coefficient—(1) how prominent (or dense) were the connections of the DH to associations in the women’s movement; and (2) how dominant (or central) were the DH’s connections to those associations. The preliminary data show that the Droit Humain was second only to (or more precisely, was half as central as) the Conseil National in its leadership of the movement at the turn of the century. Even without detailed membership lists from the other groups to measure the degree of effective overlap (thus adding to the relations among them), the number of founders in the craft (more than ten of them listed in table 1) means that co-masonry weighed more heavily than the SNA scores quantify. As it is, the Droit Humain participated disproportionately in the activities of the early women’s rights organizations in Paris.

Some masons of both obediences had working connections with the socialists through the Groupe Féministe Socialiste; this group attended to the interests of working-class women, who did not feel particularly welcomed by freemasonry, a predominantly bourgeois association, even though more approachable masons like Marianne Rauze, Maria Martin, Eliska Vincent, and Marie Bonnevial championed their cause. Conversely, regional and Catholic groups had no ties to either masonry or the Conseil National des Femmes Françaises. The weakness of provincial and religious networks in density, reciprocity, and strength of relationships underscores their marginality on women’s issues. Although the vast majority of groups, including the lodges, had fewer than one hundred active members, their varied connections through the Conseil National and the Droit Humain broadened their influence and built their capital of symbols, resources, and stature well before the women’s rights movement reached a peak before World War I. How they modified over time, what bridges they established or brokerage they managed—in short, what structure and prominence they commanded—remain to be measured and analyzed more rigorously. In due time, we will understand the specific contributions they made to near achievements (such as women’s suffrage in 1914) or to actual achievements (such as the revisions to the Civil Code in 1938) in an associational web lasting longer than three decades.

A Social Conscience

To be sure, not all voluntary associations were created equal. Nearly all of them were gendered to the disadvantage of women; many were subject to cooptation
Conclusion

by political authorities and economic interests; most rarely lasted more than a year or two (at least until the twentieth century); and all too few were truly agents for the unmitigated betterment of everyone, either within or outside of the group. Exclusionary practices led some of them to serve their own purposes first and foremost, a kind of associational tribalism of which freemasons were frequently accused. All-male lodges tended to find women a threat to their particular brand of sociability. Moreover, the resort to masonic secrecy hid much of what everyone, not just the state, felt a right to know. The lack of absolute transparency and thus accountability to others, including other masons, has long been at the heart of critical accounts in the press since the eighteenth century. In such cases, lodges were their own worst enemies. They left unscrupulous journalists to define the brethren as lechers and their sisters as luciferians. For nearly a decade, the publicity stirred by Léo Taxil ensured that freemason women were seen as demonic and dangerous. Their images factored in the concerns of sincere Catholics with a secularizing republic, but also in the fin-de-siècle hysteria about the emasculating New Woman and the demographic deficits endangering France’s national security against its formidable neighbor to the east, Germany.

As Dominique Colas observed, civil society long after the Protestant Reformation offered fertile ground for the seeds of extremism to grow among religious minorities, political dissidents, and nationalist ideologues; they formed their own groups and, as often as not, nurtured them with devastating hatred. The imaginary affiliations of freemason men and women with Jews led the Vichy regime to further the German Nazi vision of a New Europe—without an independent civil society and its civic morality.

Impartial accounts of such constructs are thus essential. But one has only to read the scholarly literature to see their other uses. Georg Simmel’s secret societies, Augustin Cochin’s sociétés de pensée, and Jürgen Habermas’s bourgeois public sphere, for example, propound comparable ideas ahead of the facts. Theories about the family’s place in civil society are also worth reconsidering. Political scientists Jean Cohen and Andrew Arato aver that the family is the quintessential association and is thus at the center of their proposed definition of the third sector. From a gender justice perspective, however, feminist scholars like Carole Pateman, Joan Landes, and Karen Hagemann are sharply critical of such a role for this patriarchal institution; women’s participation in it is hardly voluntary (even the German philosopher W. F. G. Hegel admitted as much in the notes accompanying his “philosophy of right”). But a case study of freemason women provides another way to consider the family in associations. Without familial relationships, most of the women in masonic lodges would
Conclusion

never have thought of joining them. Whole clans, it seems, appeared in free-
masonry: the Du Bourg-Cavaignes among eighteenth-century Toulouse’s Élus
Coëns, the Voilquin in nineteenth-century Saint-Simonian communities, and
numerous husband-wife couples in the lodges of the Temple des Familles (the
Riche-Gardon, the Fauvety) and the Droit Humain (the Martins, the Desbor-
des). Masonry could not have functioned as well as it did without such families.

Given A Civil Society’s history of the craft, other components of the third
sector—viz., its spheres of voluntary association, social movements, and public
communication—also deserve some reconsideration. Cohen and Arato’s prelim-
inary model separates these elements, if only to define them, but in so doing it
draws distinctions that are more theoretical than empirical. Masons, we know,
were often members of multiple groups supporting disparate aims and appealing
to widely different audiences. Historically, despite the tight networks of their
members, these organizations competed for personnel, resources, and allegiance,
as aristocratic soeurs found to their dismay during the French Revolution or as
their less august counterparts discovered after World War I. Moreover, freemason
women were active in matters concerning the state (as suffragists, for instance)
and the economy (as labor organizers, for another), both private and public sectors
they regarded as natural extensions of their civic morality. The likes of Eugénie
Potonié-Pierre and Éliane Brault freely crossed from one sphere to another, from
one sector to another, with less thought about their different purposes than about
their positive synergies. Less than a year after attending the Fédération Française
des Sociétés Féministes congress in May 1892, for example, no fewer than nine
representatives were initiated together in the same Droit Humain lodge (see
table 1). Similarly, on the eve of World War II, Brault regarded her activities as
freemason, journalist, union leader, party official, and pacifist as entirely compat-
ible with her notion of activism. The craft’s civic virtue in each case provided
these and other women a sense of agency within an otherwise oppressive context.

In this way, masonry created a gendered dynamic of its own, with surpris-
ing implications for the women’s movement. Feminist thought, at least since
Simone de Beauvoir, has sought to expand upon this dynamic, particularly in
female transcendence. Such subjectivity and volition run counter to a patriarchal
world that makes of women passive objects. The force of this train of thought,
with immediate relevance to a history of civil society and the social trust on
which it depends, is evident in Beauvoir’s own philosophical writings during
(and soon after) World War II. This is when existential, often fateful choices had
to be made by men and women seeking to sustain their own and others’ free-
dom in the face of oppressive circumstances during the Occupation. According
to philosopher Nancy Bauer, Beauvoir’s *Pyrrhus et Cinéas* (1944, *Pyrrhus and Cineas*) and *Pour une morale de l’ambiguïté* (1947, *The Ethics of Ambiguity*) foregrounded a more searching ethics that Jean-Paul Sartre’s *L’Être et le néant* (1943, *Being and Nothingness*) had left for others to develop. Beauvoir pursued this concern most expansively in *Le Deuxième Sexe* (1949, *The Second Sex*), the philosophical foundation for so-called second-wave feminism in France (and elsewhere) to justify the direct action required if women aspired to something more than the subordinate sex. It marked a decisive challenge to moderate feminism’s equality-in-difference by individualist feminism’s claim to equality, autonomy, and rights. This transition gave impetus to the Mouvement de Libération des Femmes in the wake of the May 1968 events.

How curious then is Beauvoir’s conclusion to *Le Deuxième Sexe*. It alludes to masonic beliefs significantly at both the beginning and the end of the coda to “Vers la Libération” (“Towards Liberation”). Quoting the impressionist poet Jules Laforgue speaking to and on behalf of men, Beauvoir’s final thoughts commence on a virtually regressive note:

“No, woman is not our brother. Out of inattention and perversity, we have made of her a being apart, an unknown, having no other weapon than her sex, which means not just perpetual warfare but also an underhanded hostility—adoring or hating, but neither a true companion nor someone familiar with esprit de corps or freemasonry—arising from the suspicions of an eternal little slave.”

This wretched situation is what Beauvoir spent two full volumes attempting to explain; and now she needs to look ahead to its resolution, to a more hopeful opening up of women’s transcendence into the freedom they cannot surrender to anyone, not even to loved ones. Her subsequent references to Marx’s vision of men and women in a socialist state—as naturally human when bourgeois capitalism no longer disrupts their relations—ought not to startle readers today; as historian Judith Coffin put it, “*The Second Sex* is very much a book of the Cold War” in a country torn between the United States and the USSR well into the French Fourth Republic.

All the same, Beauvoir reserves the very last gesture not to ideologies, much less to psychoanalysis, to existentialism, or to gender—all perspectives she developed at length in her book—but, oddly enough, to the masonic fellowship that Laforgue had invoked earlier in her final reflections. “Central to the world as it is,” Beauvoir concludes her book optimistically, “is that it is up to human-kind for the reign of freedom to triumph. To carry off this supreme victory, it
is among other things necessary, beyond their natural distinctions, that men and women affirm unequivocally their brotherhood.” Civil society, it appears, cannot exist without this interdependence of the two sexes. Their place in public must be shared for the betterment of everyone and the world they serve together as equals, aside from the dichotomy of their bodily differences. Echoing Martin Heidegger’s Mitsein (being-with Others), an important phenomenological concept, Beauvoir’s philosophical idealism was not original. It was in fact what freemason women had expressed for more than two hundred years.

Thus Beauvoir posits a familiar commitment to collective interests in her efforts to frame an existentialist ethics. Women as subjects in their own right, as no longer the Other, are here conjoined with men on equal footing, despite the tensions inherent to such a dialectical process. In comity, however utopian, men and women affirm a solicitude for their mutual freedom. Although it will take Beauvoir another twenty years to argue for women as such, working with men as a whole, rather than as individuals seeking to realize their existential freedom alone, she makes the case for an ethos supportive of a functional third sector. She stakes a substantial claim on behalf of Durkheim’s antidote to anomie, one that underscores the required social faith necessary to optimal states and economies: individuals must have confidence in one another enough to obey the law and pay their debts, to adjudicate disputes and negotiate contracts, to navigate the competing demands of every day. Here narrow, mundane engagements rise to broader, moral principles.

Beauvoir’s faith in communal action has been assumed by others keen to understand how public policy can be effective in solving problems we know all too well. One need not be a student of Heidegger to understand how association can remediate the failings, both large and small, of governmental power and the marketplace, notwithstanding the seemingly impossible challenge of addressing them. As Beauvoir argues in Pour une morale de l’ambiguïté, her first sustained attempt to posit a reciprocal moral freedom:

It is appropriate that the Black fights for other Blacks, the Jew for other Jews, the worker for other workers, the Spaniard for Spain. But the affirmation of these particular solidarities must not contradict the will of a universal solidarity and that each individual undertaking must be open to the totality of men [and women].

This insistence upon mutuality harks back to Durkheim’s explicit recourse to the social in his Bordeaux lectures fifty years earlier, the basis for the second preface
to his De la division du travail social (The Division of Labor in Society) in 1902. On their very different intellectual paths, the sociologist and the philosopher came to compatible civic moralities.

Apprantly, then, masonry for both men and women represents a more settled, liberal republic, subject to the scholarly cautions about the conflicted “French model.” The craft in effect embodies an informed confidence in others. It is how a proper civil society would work in conjunction with a just, democratic, constitutional regime and an equitable distribution of goods and services (so long as women play a collaborative role in all three sectors). Trust itself is central to freemasonry’s initiations and life in the lodge among the brethren and, now, the sisters; to be a mason requires utter faith in one’s fellow masons even in life-and-death situations. Accordingly, a better understanding of modern France’s allowance for freemason women also promises a better understanding of what constitutes a stable polity. It serves as a healthy corrective to the widespread assumptions, such as those of the political scientist Francis Fukuyama, that France has always been a “low trust society” with “a propensity for centralization and the corresponding weakness of associational life.” This sweeping statement simply cannot stand unqualified in light of the ample evidence of the country’s, at times troubled, development of a third sector, for women as well as for men, since the eighteenth century.

To conclude, one further question is worth pondering: What motivated freemason women to join their lodges? How did they come to such an obligation? It is odd to see and hear so many women in and about the craft, yet to know so little about what moved them to embrace public space in this way. Before the mid-nineteenth century, very few women had much of a hearing. In the published account of the newly established adoption lodge Saint-Louis in 1780, for example, Vicomtesse de Mathan the oratrice was allotted just fifteen pages, while several brothers claimed fully seventy pages more. Similarly, Jeanne-Chantal Fardel de Daix’s remarks during her initiation ceremony in the adoption lodge La Concorde in 1782 may well have been drafted by someone else. The historian is left wondering why the craft appealed to the women whose personal records remain in the archives, however well they lived up to its ideals long before and long after their active participation.

It took mixed and feminine masonry in the belle époque for substantially more women to explain what actually intrigued them. Even then, like Amélie André-Gedalge in Le Droit Humain and Marie Bernard-Leroy in La Nouvelle Jérusalem Adoption, they imitated the brethren in their affinity for the regularity of their rituals or the camaraderie of their lodges. These women do not
appear independent enough for an historian to determine the intensity of their ties to freemasonry—other than their sincere commitment to a community of like-minded people. Indeed, of that commitment, the historical record is replete from the eighteenth to the twentieth centuries: women as well as men gave voice to the group’s primacy over the self. For this reason, it has been much easier to document women’s promotion of brotherly love, generosity, and tolerance, if only because the craft’s sociability mattered to them as it did. As Jeanne van Migom told her lodge Le Libre Examen Adoption in 1920, “we want to work at the true emancipation of women” in masonry’s private journey inward during induction, before its public journey outward to action. In this individual and collective dynamic, so much a part of freemasonry since its origins in the Old Regime, these women evidently found the social conscience, a spirit of solidarity, that has come to define much of modern civil society in France.
Appendix 1: Glossary of Masonic Terms

(Source: Smyth, Reference Book; and Saunier, ed., Encyclopédie.)

**adoption**: A French variation on masonry for women in lodges sponsored and generally directed by men, mostly in the second half of the eighteenth century. Interest in it revived briefly during the First and Second Empires (1804–14, 1852–70). It also appeared in other countries. In much modified form, adoption evolved into femininemasonry beginning in the early twentieth century. Its initiations are significantly different from those for men in the craft and for women in the appendant Order of the Eastern Star in the United States.

**Antients**: The name adopted by masons in lodges overseen by the Grand Lodge of England, first formed in 1731. The present-day United Grand Lodge of England (UGLE) was created by the Union of 1813, which brought together the Antients and the Moderns (the Grand Lodge established in 1717) into a single federation. One legacy of the Antients appears in the rites still called Ancient Free and Accepted (or in the case of the Scottish Rite, Ancient and Accepted) in France and elsewhere.

**apprenti(e)** (Fr.): An initiate into the first masonic degree, better known as an (entered) apprentice in English. The final “e” indicates a woman.

**apron**: A decorative, ceremonial lap apron worn by freemasons during their formal rituals, much like other symbolic garb, sashes and gloves, in keeping with the stonemason’s guild. A mason “without apron” (sans tablier) is shorthand for one in spirit, who is often well-networked in one or more lodges.

**atelier** (Fr.): Workshop, another name for a masonic lodge, especially one working the first three degrees.

**blue lodges**: Lodges working primarily the first three degrees—apprenti(e), compagnon(ne), and maîtr(e)s— as opposed to the “side” or “higher” degrees also worked by the Scottish and Egyptian Rites. This term is used most frequently in American freemasonry.

**brother / brethren** (pl): A male freemason who has been initiated into a lodge of a recognized masonic order. It is also a term used for well-disposed allies and friends of masons who understand and embrace freemasonry’s quest for personal and social improvement.
co-masonry: Masonry operated by mixed lodges of both men and women usually working the same initiatory rituals together. The Grande Loge Symbolique Écossaise (GLSE) II Mixte et Maintenue and the Droit Humain (DH) were originators of co-masonry in France, though this practice had been a much older form in minor orders or paramasonry, such as the Élus Coëns and the Illuminés d’Avignon, in the eighteenth century.

compagnon(ne) (Fr.): The second masonic degree, better known in English as a fellow craft or journeyman. The final “ne” indicates a woman.

convent: The French word signifying an annual congress of lodge representatives adhering to a certain obedience or order to discuss questions of concern to their fellow masons. This practice originated in France in 1854.

craft: Freemasonry. This term is most often used by Anglo American masons reflecting their historic roots in the guild of working stonemasons, in what is known as operative masonry, especially for the first three degrees that are most closely associated with masonic symbolism.

degree: The level of initiation a particular mason has achieved, beginning with the first, the apprenti(e), ending with the third, maître(sses), in blue lodges. In rites that also work “higher” or “side” degrees, the level reaches the 33rd in the Scottish Rite, all of them subject to special names and rituals. At one time, the Memphis Rite actually had 92.

Egyptian Rites: The rituals worked in France since the early Misraïm and Memphis orders in the nineteenth century. They are not based on the Egyptian Rite created by Comte de Cagliostro in the 1770s and 1800s, but they were meant to honor the same impressive architectural achievements of ancient Egypt and its civilization.

feminine masonry: Masonry for women in lodges operated exclusively by and for women using rituals created specifically for them. Inspired by eighteenth-century adoption lodges, this form of masonry was first sponsored by the Grande Loge de France (GLDF) in 1907. It continues under the auspices of the Grande Loge Féminine de France (GLFF).

freemasonry: An international fraternal organization, based on the symbols and rituals attributed to practicing stonemasons. Originating in Britain, it was established in France by 1725. The “free” in freemasonry refers to the highest quality freestone worked in the building trades; it also pertains to freemen, a condition required of all prospective initiates. Until 2010, it was predominantly a male prerogative, hence the unusual nature of French masonry for and by women historically. Because many different groups adopted (and modified) masonic practices—as evident in the long list of related orders, obedience, and rites—freemasonry is difficult to define and is best rendered with a lower-case “f” in a more inclusive social history of this fraternity.

frère (Fr.): See brother / brethren.

grande maîtresse (Fr.): The obedience’s official responsible for overseeing the adoption rite in keeping with the governing order’s rules and regulations. This position (for women) is the counterpart to the grand maître (for both men and women) in obediences.
with oversight of mixed masonry and (for men) in obediences with oversight of all-male masonry. The term was also used for the lodge’s presiding sister in eighteenth-century adoption rituals.

**Great Architect of the Universe / GAOTU** (abrv.): A supreme being of any faith tradition. This deistic principle became controversial in France when arch republicans sought to enforce strict secularity in masonic doctrine, thereby allowing atheists to be initiated. This move by the Grand Orient de France (GODF) in 1877 put it at odds with the Scottish Rite (REAa) and various other obediences, including the Droit Humain (DH) somewhat later, that still honor the religious belief of their adherents.

**higher / side degree**: One of the additional degrees worked by obediences like the Scottish and Egyptian Rites, beyond the first three also worked by the **blue lodges**. One must first be a maître(sse) before becoming eligible for such an additional degree.

**Illuminati**: A term, meaning the illuminated or enlightened ones, primarily for Adam Weishaupt’s radical secret society originating in eighteenth-century Bavaria. Practiced mostly but not exclusively in the German states, ca. 1750s-1782 (when the order was disbanded), it required of its adherents unquestioning obedience to unknown superiors and was widely accused of fomenting the French Revolution of 1789. In popular parlance, however, the Illuminati also referred to Dom Pernety’s mystical Illuminés d’Avignon and other groups, even mainstream freemasons, however different their ideals and rituals.

**initiation**: The formal ceremony used to inform freemasons of their life in the lodge and beyond. It represents a self-conscious state of being, marking a sharp break with one’s prior existence as a nonmason, or **profane**, subject to the rites and mysteries of a new masonic condition. Each initiation takes the mason to a higher level of consciousness of his or her responsibilities to the lodge and to the ideals of the **craft**.

**louvetteau / louveton** (Fr.): A child initiate, most often the offspring of a freemason, recognized in a public ceremony stripped of its masonic mysteries. Although this ritual practice reflected the familial nature of the **craft** almost exclusively in the nineteenth century, its symbolism is derived from the small wolf seen on ancient Egyptian artifacts.

**maçon(nne)** (Fr.): A mason. The ending “nne” indicates a woman.

**maître(sse)** (Fr.): Generally, the third and last of the **craft** or blue degrees. It generally marks the completion of initiation into freemasonry. The ending “sse” indicates a woman.

**minor order**: An order or obedience of lodges not recognized by the largest masonic authorities, such as the United Grand Lodge of England (UGLE) or the Grand Orient de France (GODF). The term is used to designate a federation of lodges, such as the Egyptian Rite and the Élus Coëns in the eighteenth century, whose ritual symbolism deviated significantly from that of those honored by the UGLE and the GODF. Minor orders also tended to be very small.

**mixed masonry**: See **co-masonry**.

**Moderns**: The name adopted by masons in lodges overseen by the first English federation, the Grand Lodge, beginning in 1717, which merged with the Grand Lodge of England in 1813. Their early initiation rituals became the basis for the French (Modern)
Rite widely worked in France before the term was first coined by the Grand Orient de France (GODF) in 1783. It has since undergone a number of revisions, most notably by the GODF, the Grande Loge Féminine de France (GLFF), and the Grande Loge Mixte Universelle. Their rites are often still designated Free and Accepted in contrast with those derived from the Antients in eighteenth-century Britain.

- **mysteries**: The initiation rituals leading to personal illumination experienced by freemasons. The mysteries also refer to masonry’s secret signs of recognition in public.

- **obedience**: A masonic federation of lodges under the jurisdiction of a central authority regulating membership, ritual, and other matters of keen interest to the adhering masons. French examples include the Grand Orient de France (GODF), the Grande Loge de France (GLDF), and the Droit Humain (DH). The term is often used interchangeably with order and rite.

- **operative masonry**: The trade of masonry as practiced historically by guilds dedicated to the building of stone structures. Freemasons regard operative masonry as their symbolic origin.

- **order**: Used in masonry much as religious orders in Catholicism. See obedience and rite.

- **orient**: An area or region, a term used mostly in masonic rituals and regional federations or authorities, such as the Grand Orient de France (GODF). It is derived in large part by the architectural orientation of the medieval cathedrals, all of which were aligned with the East, i.e., the Judeo-Christian Holy Lands of the Middle East.

- **paramasonry**: A distinct variation on freemasonry. See minor orders.

- **pendant**: A distinctive piece of jewelry symbolizing the masonic allegiance and function of its wearer. It hangs from the sautoir or gold chain worn during masonic ceremonies.

- **profane**: A nonmason, i.e., someone who has not experienced the masonic mysteries during initiation and all they entail in the freemason’s symbolic odyssey.

- **regularity**: A lodge’s adherence to a recognized masonic federation, which regulates matters of significance to its membership. The term also refers to the claim of some obediences, such as the United Grand Lodge of England (UGLE) and the Grand Orient de France (GODF), to primacy in such oversight, to the exclusion of competing obediences in national and international settings.

- **rite**: An obedience or order associated with certain degrees and their rituals worked by authorized lodges. The Scottish Rite is perhaps the best known. Rite also refers to a suite of particular rituals worked by lodges in the same obedience or order, such as the adoption rite which was overseen in the eighteenth century by the Grand Orient de France (GODF).

- **ritual**: A formal ceremony, usually for masonic initiation. See rite.

- **royal art**: Freemasonry, a term in keeping with Reverend James Anderson’s first use of it in his landmark Constitutions (1723).

- **sash / sautoir**: The distinctive, decorative sash for members worn in the lodge during initiation ceremonies whose symbols indicate the type of masonry appropriate to the
lodge and its order. The ceremonial sautoir or gold chain, with pendant, is worn by masonic officials.

**Scottish Rite / REAA** (Fr. abrv.): The international obedience overseeing the working of “higher” or “side” degrees beyond the first three also worked by the blue lodges. Altogether there are thirty-three degrees regulated in France by the Suprême Conseil de France (Supreme Council of France, SCF). It is also known as the Rite Écossais Ancien et Accepté, i.e., the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite, its official designation since 1806. In fact, the rite was authorized even earlier in Charleston, South Carolina, with its own Supreme Council which now coordinates the oversight of the rite’s governing bodies worldwide. Cf. **Strict Observance**.

**secrets**: The closely guarded ritualistic features of freemasonry which all masons take an oath to guard at all costs from nonmasons (otherwise known as **profanes**).

**sister**: A woman initiated into a form of masonry exclusively for women or by a recognized ritual in a mixed lodge. It is also a term used by male masons for a close female relative, who is active in the social festivities sponsored by an all-male lodge.

**soeur** (Fr.): See sister.

**Strict Observance / Rectified Masonry**: A Scottish Rite, based loosely on myths of the medieval Knights Templar, founded by Karl Gottfried von Hund in 1751. It purported to purify freemasonry of occult influences and to subject its members to strict discipline by unknown superiors. After complications arising from its organization and leadership, the Strict Observance was reconstituted as the Rectified Scottish Rite in 1782, which was championed by Jean-Baptiste Willermoz in Lyon. No women were involved.

**symbolic / speculative masonry**: As practiced by nonstonemasons in the forms that are familiarly known today as freemasonry. It is a term used to distinguish this ritualistic practice from the actual trade of stonemasons (operative masonry) whose guilds inspired the distinctive symbols (such as squares, compasses, hammers) and practices (such as oaths, titles, signs of recognition) used in initiations since the seventeenth century.

**tenue** (Fr.): A ceremonial meeting, usually reserved for an initiation. A tenue blanche is open to the public and thus entails no masonic mysteries or secrets.

**vénérable maître(se)** (Fr.): The worshipful master of the all-male and mixed lodges (and mistress of the all-female lodges), elected by their maître(sse)s for a defined period of time to oversee the lodge’s proper operations.

---

**Appendix 2: Mixed and Adoption Lodges in France (c. 1745–1790)**

(Source: Hivert-Messeca and Hivert-Messeca, *Comment la franc-maçonnerie*, 63–65; and Burke and Jacob, “Freemasonry,” 546–49. Additional lodges discussed in chapter 1.)

**Abbeville**: L’Étoile Écossaise  
La Parfaite Écossaise

**Annonay**: La Vraie Vertu

**Arras**: L’Amitié
Bar-le-Duc: Les Frères de la Bienfaisance
Barjac-en-Languedoc: L’Inaltérable Amitié
Beaucaire: La Concorde
Beauvais: (lodge name not known)
Bédarrides: Illuminés d’Avignon (lodge name not known)
Besançon: La Sincerité
Bordeaux: L’Anglaise
La Française Élue Écossaise
L’Amitié
Haute Maçonnerie Égyptienne (lodge name not known)
Brest: L’Heureuse Rencontre
Caen: Saint-Louis
Calais: Saint-Louis des Amis Réunis
Castelnaudary: La Parfaite Harmonie
Castres: L’Amitié
Château-Thierry: La Vraie Espérance
Chinon: Les Bons Amis
Confolens: La Parfaite Union
Dieppe: La Félicité
Dijon: La Concorde
Doullens: Les Coeurs Choisis
Dunkerque: La Parfaite Union
Eu: La Parfaite Union
Fontaine-Française: Henri IV
Hesdin: La Parfaite Union
La Félicité
Libourne: La Fidélité
Loches: La Ferveur Éclairée
Lorient: L’Heureuse Alliance
Lyon: Saint-Jean du Patriotisme
La Sagesse Triomphante
Ordre des Chevaliers Maçons Élus Coëns de l’Univers
Mézières: Les Maîtresses Maçonnnes
Morlaix: La Noble Amitié
Nancy: Saint-Louis
Les Bons Amis
Narbonne: Les Philadelphes
Neufchâteau: Le Roi Stanislas
Nevers: La Colombe
Orléans: L’Union Parfaite
Paris: La Modération
Saint-Antoine
Saint-Jean de la Candeur
La Fidélité  
Saint-Lazare/Saint-Jean d’Écosse du Contrat Social  
Les Neuf Soeurs  
Isis  
**Rennes**: L’Union Parfaite  
**Rochefort**: L’Aimable Concorde  
**Saintes**: (lodge name not known)  
**Salins**: L’Union Parfaite  
**Saumur**: L’Union de la Famille  
**Strasbourg**: Haute Maçonnerie Égyptienne (lodge name not known)  
**Toul**: Les Neuf Soeurs  
**Toulouse**: La Parfaite Amitié  
**Touraine** (town name not known): La Ferveur Éclairée  
**Valognes**: L’Union Militaire  
**Versailles**: Le Patriotisme

Appendix 3: Madame Helvétius’s Masonic Network (1771–1800)

(Source: Helvétius, *Correspondance générale*, ed. Dainard et al., vols. 3 and 4  
[excluding close family members and merchants]; Le Bihan, *Francs-maçons parisiens*;  
and BNF FM Fichier Bossu. +indicates masons without apron.)

Alembert, Jean Le Rond d’
Cabannis, Pierre Jean Georges  
Chamfort, Sébastien Roch Nicolas, dit  
Condorcet, Marie Jean Antoine Nicolas de Caritat, Marquis de  
+Condorcet, Sophie Grouchy, Marquise de  
Diderot, Denis  
Franklin, Benjamin  
Franklin, William Temple  
Gallois, Jean Antoine Gauvin de  
Ginguené, Pierre Louis  
Marmontel, Jean François  
Mirabeau, Honoré Gabriel Riqueti, Comte de  
Morellet, André, Abbé  
Neufchâteau, Nicolas François  
Roederer, Pierre Louis  
Roucher, Jean Antoine  
Thomas, Antoine Léonard  
Turgot, Anne Robert Jacques  
Volney, Constantin François Boisgirais de Chasseboeuf, Comte de  
Voltaire, François Marie Arouet, dit
Appendix 4: Genealogy of the Saint-Simonian Family

(Source: Société des Études Saint-Simoniennes, BNF. *indicates a freemason, per BNF FM Fichier Bossu. +indicates a mason without apron, per chapter 2.)

Henri Saint-Simon (1760-1825)*
businessman, philosopher, publicist

Augustin Thierry (1795-1856)*
historian

Auguste Comte (1798-1857)
sociologist, mathematician, philosopher

Émile Durkheim (1858-1917)
sociologist, university professor

Olinde Rodrigues (1795-1851)*
mathematician, financier

According to Philippe Régnier, the men and women leaving evidence of their participation in the Saint-Simonian movement number between 500 and 600, and the known sympathizers and members of affiliated workers’ families tally between 2,500 and 3,000. A more detailed representation of all Saint-Simonians and their connections over time is thus too difficult to create, hence the present summary chart.

Course on Positive Philosophy
(opened by Comte in 1826)

Positivist Church for the “Religion of Humanity”
(founded by Comte and still active)

Émile Littré (1801-1881)*
positivist, materialist, agnostic, etymologist

School for Producers (1825-1826)
run by
Armand Carrel
Adolphe Blanqui*
J.B. Say*
Saint-Amand Bazard*
Prosper Enfantin*
Philippe Buchez*
Laurent de l’Ardèche*
et al.

Philippe Buchez (1796-1876)*
physician, historian, republican politician

“Saint-Simonists”
Jules Bastide
(1800-1879)
Auguste Boulland
Claude Corbon
(1808-1891)
Pierre-Célestin Roux-Lavergne
(1802-1874)
Appendix 5: George Sand’s Masonic Network (1840–1850)

(Source: Sand, Correspondance, ed. Lubin, vol. 4–9 [excluding close family members and merchants]; and BNF FM Fichier Bossu. +indicates mason without apron.)

Arago, Emmanuel
Arago, Étienne
Barrot, Odilon
Blanc, Louis
Bonaparte, Louis-Napoléon, Prince
Borie, Victor
Cavaignac, Eugène
Charton, Édouard
Crémieux, Adolphe
Degeorge, Frédéric
François, Ferdinand
Guépin, Ange
Heine, Henri
Ledru-Rollin, Alexandre
Leroux, Pierre
Mazzini, Giuseppe
Michel, Louis, dit Michel de Bourges
Pagnerre, Antoine
Pelletan, Eugène
Perdiguier, Agricol
Quinet, Édgar
Reynaud, Jean
Roland, Pauline+
Scheffer, Arnold
Sue, Eugène


(Source: DH, “Implantations.”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federations</th>
<th>Jurisdictions</th>
<th>Pioneer Lodges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>Argentinian</td>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>Cameroonian</td>
<td>Congo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austrian</td>
<td>Chilean</td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgian</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>Ecuador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazilian</td>
<td>Île Maurice</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>Rumanian</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgarian</td>
<td></td>
<td>Israel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian</td>
<td></td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombian</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lebanon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td></td>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
<td>Morocco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islandic</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td></td>
<td>Republic of Chad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malagasy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraguayan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Portuguese</th>
<th>Scandinavian</th>
<th>South African</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>Swiss</th>
<th>West African</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Appendix 7: Louise Michel’s Masonic Network (1850–1904)

(Source: Michel, “Je vous écris de ma nuit” [excluding close family members and merchants]; and BNF FM Fichier Bossu. +indicates masons without apron.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allemane, Jean</th>
<th>Malon, Benoît</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assi, Adolphe</td>
<td>Meurice, Mme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakounine, Mikhail</td>
<td>Mink, Paule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonnet-Duverdier, Édouard Guillaume</td>
<td>Nadar, Félix (Tournachon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camélinat, Zéphirien</td>
<td>Pain, Olivier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eudes, Émile</td>
<td>Passedouet, Auguste-Jules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayet, Georges</td>
<td>Pelletier, Madeleine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France, Hector</td>
<td>Place, Henri (Henry Verlet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gautier, Émile</td>
<td>Richer, Léon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girault/Giraud, Ernest</td>
<td>Rochefort, Victor Henri, Marquis de</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grousset, Paschal</td>
<td>Rochefort-Luçay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+Léo, André (Léonide Champseix)</td>
<td>Tennevin, Alexandre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malato, Charles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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134. All three reformers were masons. On Boubée, see Ligou, “Préface”; on Richer, see Bidelman, *Pariahs Stand Up!*, 34–60; and on Riche-Gardon, see Baylot, *Voie substituée*, 385–89; and Saunier, *Encyclopédie*, 730–32.
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40. Cf. data on DH masons from Hivert-Messeca and Hivert-Messeca, _Comment la franc-maçonnerie_, 370–71; and on adoption masons from Jupeau-Réquillard, _Initiation des femmes_, 98.
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