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This Festschrift celebrates a highly esteemed colleague, who has devoted his life to teaching Russian and research about the Russian language and Russia, Finland’s neighbor to the East. Arto Mustajoki has been and is, so to say, an intermediary between two cultures. My contribution deals with cultural intermediaries of an earlier period, more specifically with people who lived in Russia and enabled cultural and political contacts with foreign countries some centuries ago, when foreign languages could neither be learned at school nor studied at university level. This short overview covers the period up to the early 17th century, that is, the time during which knowing a foreign language – especially a West-European one – was still something very exotic for a Russian citizen.

Some introductory remarks about the communication between the East Slavs and their non-Slavic neighbors during the middle ages might be appropriate. We can assume that bilinguals from frontier regions were used as interpreters in early commercial contacts. However, as H. Raab (1955–1956, 342f.) points out, these “naturally generated” interpreters did not satisfy the needs, and at least from the 13th century young men from the Hanseatic cities – who should not be more than twenty years old – were sent to Novgorod and Pskov specifically to learn Russian. In the 15th century, this practice had become a firm tradition. Incidentally, learning Russian was an exclusive right for men from Hanseatic cities; Dutch and English pupils were not allowed to make use of these privileges (ibid. 343). The young Germans stayed not only in the German Court in Novgorod, but also in the houses of Russian boiars both in Pskov and in Novgorod, and presumably in other places such as Torzhok, although there are no written documents regarding the latter (Goetz 1916, 131). This means that some of those young men certainly obtained a native-like competence at least in spoken Russian, albeit not in the written language. In the 16th–17th centuries this tradition was still

Before the 15th century, the reasons for Russian studies were purely practical: to promote commercial transactions between German-speaking (Hanseatic) and Russian merchants. Moreover, language learning seems to have been one-directional. We do not have any examples of Russian citizens learning West-European languages before the end of the 15th century. At that time in Novgorod at the court of Archbishop Gennadii (1484–1504) for the first time a sizeable group of Latin and German texts was translated into Russian. There was no causal connection between the medieval Hanseatic language learners in Novgorod and Gennadii’s group of translators, no direct continuation. On the contrary, the initiative for the translation activities in Novgorod at Gennadii’s time came from Moscow (Wimmer 2005, 34–40). However, the preconditions in Novgorod were favorable: there were some people knowing foreign languages, and embassies from Western countries who could supply foreign books passed through the city on route to Moscow (ibid. 39).

One of the translators of the Gennadii circle, Dmitrii Gerasimov (born about 1465), is the earliest known example of a Russian citizen who learned Latin and German in another country. According to his own testimony, he already knew some Russian (the written language?) when he started learning foreign languages at school abroad: “Ась же се писахъ собъ памяти для поелику уразумѣь, пребывая и учася во училище двѣмъ грамотам и двѣмъ языки, латыньская и немецкая, а по руски прежде того поучиися от части” (Jagić 1896/1968, 532). From a report written by Paolo Giovio, bishop and humanistic writer in Rome, we know that Gerasimov went to school in Livonia as a young boy: “in Liuonia a teneris annis in ludo prima literarum rudimenta didicerit” (quoted by Wimmer, ibid.). Unfortunately, no details are known. E. Wimmer seems to regard Pskov as the most likely place of Gerasimov’s origin and Dorpat the place where he went to school (another possibility would have been Riga). If Gerasim Popovka – another translator of the Gennadii group – was Dmitrii’s elder brother, as assumed by L. N. Maïkov (1900, 373), the Pskov origin would be true for him, too. This assumption was, however, questioned by A. I. Sobolevskii (1903, 43), who claimed that Popovka, judging from his language, was from the Moscow region, whereas Dmitrii’s origins undoubtedly were in the Novgorod region. Among the other Novgorod translators were Vlas (Ignat’ev) and Veniamin. According to Sobolevskii (1903, 257f.), the latter was of Croatian origin. As a catholic, he knew Latin, and he also knew Church Slavonic.

1 For details about this translator, see Kazakova (1972; 1988); Wimmer (2005, 72–93).
2 Also quoted by Wimmer (2005, 58 note 134).
Vlas might have been a Polish-Russian bilingual since his language use points to a Belorussian origin (Wimmer 2005, 71).

During Gennadii’s time as Archbishop of Novgorod two Russian citizens from that region are documented as university students in Rostock: Sil’vestr Malyi from Novgorod in 1493, registered as “Siluester Minor alias Maloy in Ruteno de Nouagardia” (Raab 1955–1956, 359), and a certain “Georgius Polman” from Pskov in 1496 (ibid. 360 note 183). N. Angermann (1966, 39; 1994, 206) presumes that these two students could have been sent abroad by Novgorod’s archbishop in order to be able to participate in the translation activities later. E. Wimmer (2005, 58) follows Angermann in this respect and concludes that Gennadii might have prepared them for their studies abroad by teaching them some basic Latin.³

As soon as Gennadii had been removed from his office as archbishop, in 1504, the translation activities in Novgorod stopped. The translators apparently left the city immediately: a letter from the Novgorod governors Danilo Vasil’evich and Vasilii Shuiskoi to the Grand Prince, dated 16 June 1505, states that since there was nobody who could translate letters received from the Emperor and the Spanish King, they were being forwarded to Moscow (PDS I, col. 125). These letters were certainly written in Latin. At least two translators of the Novgorod group, Vlas and Gerasimov, are later known as translators in the service of the Grand Prince in Moscow, as was the German Nicolaus Bülow, who was at the archbishop’s court at the same time, but in the first instance as a consultant in questions regarding the calendar and probably not as a translator – at least his participation in any Novgorod translations cannot be proved. Yet we can assume that he learned Russian during his time in Novgorod, since when he came to Russia next time, he served as an interpreter for a Russian legation on its way back to Moscow from the German Empire in 1506 (Dumschat 2006, 580). Bülow was forced to stay in Russia because his knowledge was needed (Angermann 1998, 229). He had now become a medical doctor, and from 1508 he served Grand Prince Vasili III as his personal physician and as a translator. The Lübeck-born Bülow was undoubtedly the translator of the Low German herbal Gaerde der suntheit (printed 1492 in Lübeck) into Russian, the first medical tract in Russian, completed in Moscow in 1534. Bülow’s translation was to become a culturally important, very popular book. Many hand-written copies are still preserved (Dumschat 2006, 580; Prokhladnyi vertograd 1997, 9).

³ Another possible explanation for the reasons of Sil’vestr Malyi’s university studies in Rostock is given by P. N. Berkov (1962, 358–361), who suggests that Sil’vestr was a Judaizer who fled from Gennadii’s persecutions, thus opposite to Angermann’s assumption.
As already mentioned, the Novgorod translators Vlas and Dmitrii Gerasimov also were later in the service of Grand Prince Vasilii. Vlas already appears in the records for June 1505 – very soon after Gennadii’s removal from office – when he had to deliver letters, one from Vasilii to Emperor Maximilian’s courier in Ivangoord, another to the governors of Novgorod (PDS I, col. 131, 139). In 1517 he served as an interpreter for negotiations with Sigismund von Herberstein in Moscow (ibid. 195–197) and with the Prussian branch of the German order (Wimmer 2005, 69). Dmitrii Gerasimov must have been in the service of the Grand Prince in Moscow at least from the year 1519. Along with his Novgorod colleague Vlas, he helped Maksim Grek to translate Greek texts into Russian. Apparently Maksim at that time was not yet capable of translating into Russian on his own. In a letter to d’iak Misiur’ Munekhin in Pskov from the year 1519 Dmitrii Gerasimov described the method: “Now, Sir, he [Maksim Grek] is translating the Psalter and commentaries from Greek for the Grand Prince. Vlas and I sit next to him, taking turns. He tells [us] in Latin and we tell the scribes in Russian.”4 Obviously before Maksim Grek had become proficient in Church Slavic, there was nobody in Moscow who could make translations directly from Greek to Slavic; the few foreign-language specialists that were available had to resort to “relay translation”, Latin being the intermediate step.

After the dispersion of the Novgorod translation circle it would be about half a century before another Russian citizen was sent abroad to study a foreign language: we have a testimony about one “Obriuta Mikhailova syn Grekov”, sent to Constantinople in 1551 by Tsar Ivan IV (“the Terrible”) in order to learn Greek (Savva 1914, 151–153). In 1557, Tsar Ivan wrote a letter to Patriarch Joasaph II of Constantinople, asking to send Obriuta back home. The Patriarch answered that “Fedor Mikhailov Mamalakh” now had learned some Greek (“научился отчасти Эллинской грамоте”) and will be sent to Moscow “when we send our men”. Exactly when Fedor Obriuta returned to Moscow is not known, but in 1562 he acted as an interpreter in Moscow. V. Savva (1914, 153) assumes that Obriuta might have been of Greek origin (on the basis of the “family names” Grekov and Mamalakh), yet without any knowledge of Greek at the moment when he was sent to Constantinople. The same scholar reports a similar case from the 1580s when two Russian men, Ushakov and Vnukov, were sent to Constantinople (Savva 1914, 154). In 1583, Patriarch Jeremias II wrote to Tsar Ivan about

4 «А ныне, господине, [Максим] переводить Псалтирь со греческаго толковую великому князю, а мы со Власом у него сидимъ перемѣняя: онъ сказываетъ по латыньски, а мы сказываемъ по руски писареь» (quoted by Wimmer 2005, 61 note 137). The same information can also be found in some redactions of the Skazaniia o prepodobnom Maksime Greke (Sinitsyna 2006, 81; 87; in one version of the Skazaniia the names of the interpreters are Vlas and Nikita; ibid. 94).
the great difficulties of teaching the Greek language to such old students; it would have been better if they had been ten or twelve years old. Probably we can conclude from this statement that the teaching method employed was an early variant of a “direct approach”, a method which usually works much better with young children than with adults. When after Ivan’s death, in 1584, the new Tsar Fedor Ivanovich sent his envoy to Constantinople, Ushakov, apparently, was acting as an interpreter (ibid. 155). According to a letter from the Tsar to the Patriarch in August 1586, Ushakov was still in Constantinople at that time, whereas nothing was said about Vnukov; Savva assumes that he had died. In 1594 another student, the young man Tarasko Elizar’ev, was sent to Constantinople together with a Russian envoy to the Sultan in order to learn Greek (“для наученья греческому языку и грамотѣ”; ibid. 160). It should be stressed that these were very rare cases – for the whole 16th century the documents tell us only about a handful of persons sent out from Russia to learn one or more foreign languages. Of course, we cannot exclude that there were other cases not reflected in the preserved documents, but we can be sure that they were not many.

Foreign-language specialists were needed, albeit in a very limited number, to serve as interpreters and translators. Since Tsar Ivan IV, as we have seen, sent two students to Constantinople (not five or ten), we can conclude that the estimated need was one or two interpreters. To have only one would be risky since this person could die, so it was a good idea to educate two specialists. We see the same pattern – two specialists – in another example, the need of specialists for Swedish. Sending Russian citizens to Sweden apparently was not feasible, so Tsar Ivan resorted to another method of supplying Muscovy with translators for Swedish: two Swedish specialists of Russian, “Obram Nikulaev/Mikolaev” and “Vlaska Panteleev”, who had come to Russia with a Swedish embassy, were retained by the Tsar in order to teach Swedish to two Russian boys (Savva 1914, 156–159). Here, again, the estimated need is two specialists (or one, and one in reserve). The Swedish King wrote to the Tsar in 1573 and threatened that he would keep the Tsar’s messenger until the two Swedish interpreters were sent home. From the Tsar’s answer we learn that one of the two, Panteleev, had died by that time; the other one, Nikulaev, was to be sent back as soon as his students had learned enough Swedish: “... Обръмъ Миколаевъ учить у насъ двухъ учениковъ свейскому языку, а живеть безо всякие нужи, а ваши толмачи прежъ сего у насъ въ нашемъ государствѣ нашей руской

---

5 A Taras Elizar’ev is documented as a translator at the Diplomatic Chancery for the years 1604–1607 (Liseitsev 2003, 151; 171; 360).
6 I have not been able to identify those translators. K. Tarkiainen (1969, 69–95; 1972) – whose investigation period starts some twenty years later (in 1595) – does not mention them.
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gramot' uchivались же, а часа того Обрам толмачь отдъляетца, и мы его тогда къ теб' отпустимъ” (quoted by Savva 1914, 157). In 1574 the retained interpreter returned to Sweden with a letter from the Tsar: Obram Nikulaev had not only taught Swedish to two Russian boys, but during his time in Novgorod he also had learned to write in Russian (“…учивался руской грамотъ въ нашей же отчинѣ въ Великомъ Новѣгородѣ”). In other words, by retaining the Swedish interpreters the Tsar almost had done the Swedish King a favor! The letter also stated that the Swedish interpreter actually would have been sent home earlier, but was detained since he had stolen books and collected secret information and thus committed a crime for which he could have been sentenced to death. (Apparently, he had compiled a genealogical table of the Tsar’s family.) However, since the Tsar is a Christian sovereign, the interpreter was not sentenced to death but sent home: “… и мы, какъ есть государи крестьянские, толмача твоего Аврарыа смертью казнити не велѣли есмѧ, то есмѧ учинили тебя для, Аврара толмача къ тебѣ отпустили есмѧ …” (ibid. 158).

In all these cases the students were forced to learn a certain language because of the needs of the state – and, in the case of the two retained Swedish interpreters, the teachers were forced to teach them! But V. Savva (ibid. 160f.) also reports one case of a Russian citizen, a Petrushka Luk’ianov from Kola, who went to Antwerp and Denmark in 1583 on his own initiative to learn foreign languages.

During the late 16th century Russian citizens also could learn German and Latin from foreigners in Moscow, albeit not officially. A concrete case was reported by Samuil Maskiewicz, a citizen of Poland-Lithuania who was fighting for Sigismund III during the Polish intervention of the “Time of Troubles”, e.g. in the battle of Klushino. Maskiewicz kept a diary from 1594 to 1621 (a Russian translation can be found in Skazaniia sovremennikov 1859, 13–124). In 1611 he made the acquaintance of the boiar Fedor Golovin in Moscow. The two men became friends, and Golovin told Maskiewicz about his brother, who had been very interested in foreign languages. Since he was not allowed to invite foreigners, a German living in Moscow regularly came to his house in secret, dressed in the Russian manner, to teach him German, whereas another person, a Pole, was teaching him Latin in the same way. Apparently, Golovin’s brother also knew Polish, since Maskiewicz reports that he had seen translations from Latin into Polish, made by him; he also saw many Latin and German books that Golovin had inherited from his brother. “What would happen”, Maskiewicz ends his tale about this case, “if education were to be combined with such intelligence?” (Skazaniia sovremennikov 1859, 56).

7 It is not known when this brother died; in 1611 he was no longer alive (Skazaniia sovremennikov 1859, 55f.).
Apparently, during the whole 16th century no students were sent to Western Europe. It was only more than a century after the first Russian students had been sent to the University of Rostock (at the end of the 15th century) to study German and Latin that another such effort was undertaken. According to Conrad Bussow, a soldier from Lower Saxony who spent some years in Russia at the beginning of the 17th century (1601–1611), in 1603 Tsar Boris Godunov sent about 15 young men to different European countries to learn foreign languages. Some of them were sent to England, some to France and some to Germany. Although the exact number of the “foreign-language students” is not known, we can see that the number is much higher than the two students sent to Constantinople to learn Greek and the two who were forced to learn Swedish during the 16th century – about five each for German, English and French. Very little is known about the fate of the boys sent to England and France; not a single one seems to have returned to Russia. Much more successful was the group of five boys sent to Lübeck with a Hanse delegation. We are very well informed about their travel to Germany, since we still have the Lübeck ambassadors’ report from their visit to Russia. On their way home the ambassadors had already passed Novgorod, when an envoy handed over a letter from the Tsar – and the five boys at the same time. According to the Tsar’s instruction, the boys should be sent back to Russia when they had learned to speak and write in Latin and German. The ambassadors agreed to the Tsar’s request (Blümcke 1894, 65f.; Raab 1955–1956, 348). After having passed through Pskov, Wend, Riga, Memel, Königsberg, Danzig, Stettin and other places, the travelers arrived in Lübeck on 29 August 1603 (Otchet 1991, 206). In a letter to his brother in Moscow from the following year one of the five, Ignatii Andreevich Kuchin (who, incidentally, was eleven years old when he was sent abroad), reported that during this time he had studied a German abc-book, a prayer-book and the Psalter, and he had learned some German: “A
я ныне, братец, выучил немецких книг Аэбуку и Часовник, и Псалтырю и языку сполжую [sic, с большую? – I.M.] половину умъю, а токо (sic) братец не латынском." He had not yet started learning Latin; if he was to study this language, too, he would not be able to return within four years: “И я бы начался к Москве на четвертой год приехал, а с латынским языком ино был, лъть десять в Нъмцох учаться языку.” He asked his brother to write him letters and send towels and other Russian rarities: “Ни однои ты грамоты ко мнъ не присылвал, а я тебъ послал грамот з десем [...] Да пожалуй, миленко братец, пришли ко мнъ ширинок, сколько ни пожалуешь, для того што здьсь в Любках ширинки дороги, или иные руски диковины для того, которые добро люди меня жалуют и я бы их подарил и онъ бы до меня лутче были.” At the bottom of the letter we find the date and a sentence written in broken German: “Anno… 7000… 100… 12… Jar. Mein eins [?] leber brudur schrif mi In gotheß wille brif.” He seems to have meant “In the year 7112 [1604]. My one dear brother, write to me, for God’s sake, a letter.” The short sentence in German makes it clear that the boy still had a long way to go before he eventually would master the German grammar and spelling!

We do not know whether Ignatii’s brother reacted to this most affecting letter, written by a 12-year-old boy.

Also Ignatii’s probably somewhat elder colleague Dmitrii Mikolaev complained in a letter still preserved that his mother does not send him any letters (see illustration 2 and the transcription in note 13).

158.1 (Kuchin)). The transcriptions in Zverev (2006, 267f.) were made on the basis of a microfilm, kept at the Russian State Archives of Ancient Acts (RGADA), which explains why Zverev could not read everything correctly. Examination of the original shows that Zverev’s «столову половину» is not a correct reading; the word is clearly «спол- жую», which I interpret as a mistake instead of «с большую (половину)», meaning ‘about half’ or ‘more than half’. (Reproductions from the Moscow microfilm can be found in Zverev 2005.)
Illustration 1: Ignatii Kuchin’s letter to his brother in Moscow, 1604 (Stockholm, RA, Extranea 158.1).\textsuperscript{12}

\textsuperscript{12} Many persons have helped me to locate the original letters in the State Archives of Stockholm. My special thanks to Sergei Zverev, Moscow, and Gennadii Kovalenko, Novgorod. Alexander Pereswetoff-Morath (Stockholm) has kindly made photographs and allowed me to publish them.
Illustration 2. Dmitrii Mikolaev’s letter from Lübeck to his mother in Moscow. No date [1604?]. Stockholm, RA, Extranea 156.113

A short time later Tsar Boris Godunov died. During the “Time of Troubles” in Moscow not much attention was paid to the students abroad, but in 1606 Tsar Vasilii Shuiskii asked the military governor of Ivangorod to write a letter to Lübeck, asking to send back the students when they had learned to speak and write German (“А как выучат накрепко грамоте и языку, и они б их прислали к нашему царскому величеству”\footnote{Shuiskii’s letter is quoted by Liseitsev (2002, 5); see also Zverev (2006, 265).}). However, in 1610 the now 17-year-old Ignatii decided to go home on his own. On his way he stayed in Copenhagen for some time and learned Danish \footnote{Ignatii Kuchin is not mentioned in Tarkiainen 1969.} (Liseitsev 2003, 369). While he was on a Danish ship to the Baltic countries, the Kalmar war between Sweden and Denmark broke out, and the Danish ship was captured by the Swedes near Reval (today’s Tallinn). Ignatii Kuchin was taken prisoner and sent to Sweden, where he was employed by King Charles IX (1604–1611). He learned Swedish and became a translator for Russian under Gustav II Adolf.\footnote{In 1619 he received the permission to go back to Russia, where he became a translator at the Diplomatic Chancery and died in 1633, only 40 years old (ibid.).} In 1619 he received the permission to go back to Russia, where he became a translator at the Diplomatic Chancery and died in 1633, only 40 years old (ibid.).

One more of the “Godunov students”, Dmitrii Mikolaev, first served the Swedish King as a translator for Russian and later the Russian Tsar as a translator for German and/or Swedish. He was either a brother or a cousin of...
Taras Elizar’ev, translator for Greek at the Diplomatic Chancery.\textsuperscript{16} (The two men are among many examples for translators belonging to the same family; we can see some clear patterns of “dynasties”.) He seems to have been some years older than Ignatii Kuchin, since he must have left Germany already before 1608, when Ignatii still was a child. Also Dmitrii Mikolaev served in Sweden as a translator for Russian before he returned to Russia. He is first mentioned in the Swedish documents during the year 1608 (Tarkiainen 1969, 76).\textsuperscript{17} The preserved documents do not reveal whether he came to Sweden deliberately or as a prisoner, like Ignatii Kuchin. Probably Mikolaev interpreted for Jacob De la Gardie and his mercenary troops when the latter met Prince Mikhail Skopin-Shuiskii in Novgorod (1609), together with a whole battery of translators. Many of the translators who accompanied the Swedish troops, among them Hans Flörich and Hans Brakel, both born in Russia, went to Sweden with De la Gardie after the Russian defeat at Klushino in 1610. Mikolaev, however, stayed in Russia and thus became the first of the Godunov students to serve a Russian Tsar. Many years later, in 1619, Ignatii Kuchin returned from Sweden. Thus two of the “Godunov students” first served as Russian translators in Sweden and later as translators for German and Swedish in the Muscovite Diplomatic Chancery.

Nothing is known about the fate of the three other boys sent to Germany in 1603; yet already in November 1606 the Lübeck authorities informed Vasily Shuiskii that two of them had run away, “неведемо за что” (Zverev 2006, 265). Maybe they had heard about the difficult times in Muscovy and decided to stay in Germany.

The “Godunov students” Mikolaev and Kuchin were two of the very few “Russian” translators – i.e., born in Russia by Russian parents – employed by the Posol’skii prikaz during the first decades of the 17\textsuperscript{th} century. (Another example was Taras Elizar’ev, apparently Mikolaev’s brother or cousin.) Before that time, nearly all translators for European languages apparently were real foreigners, i.e. people born and brought up outside Russia; some, like Hans Flörich and Hans Brakel, were born in Russia but had foreign parents. There are some documents attesting that most of the early interpreters did not reach a high professional level. For instance, a report from 1575/76 by

\textsuperscript{16} Probably the same person as Tarasko Elizar’ev, who was sent to Constantinople in 1594 to learn Greek (see also note 5).

\textsuperscript{17} Demetri Ivanus “brukes i Cantzlit för Rysetolk” (Tarkiainen 1969, 124 note 100). (This is the only document which mentions a patronym; his full name seems to have been Dmitrii Ivanovich.) Conrad Bussow mentions this person in his chronicle (“Demetrius”; Bussow 1851, 9) as the only one of the students Godunov had sent abroad who returned to Russia. While this was true in 1613 when he wrote his chronicle, it was not true any more when Ignatii Kuchin had returned, too. But to this day scholars repeat Bussow’s statement about only a single person ever returning to Russia (cf., e.g., Liseitsev 2003, 369, according to whom Kuchin was that person).
the imperial envoys Daniel Brintz and Hans Kobenzl, quoted by Angermann (1998, 233f.), characterized the persons who acted as interpreters during the negotiations as “very inept and worthless people”. However, as N. Angermann points out, at the time of these critical remarks Kaspar Hopper — certainly the most qualified translator during the time of Tsar Ivan IV — was not staying in Russia. Generally speaking, we probably should not rely too heavily upon Western authors’ critical remarks about Muscovite translators, since their own knowledge of Russian usually was not good enough to assess the interpreters’ proficiency. Moreover, they might well try to blame the translators for their unsuccessful negotiations with the Russian tsars.

There are several reasons to end this small overview at the beginning of the 17th century. The “Time of Troubles” is a dividing line for Muscovy in several ways. During the reign of the Romanov tsars the Russian state’s contacts with foreigners increased substantially. Many foreign doctors, merchants, military specialists and craftsmen were invited; diplomatic contacts with foreign countries increased. From 1605 periodical newspapers appeared in Western Europe; at least from 1621 we can prove that German and Dutch newspapers were being delivered to Moscow more or less regularly and translated for the information of the Tsar and the boyars, together with political pamphlets from Germany and the Netherlands (occasionally also from other countries). For the period 1613–1615, D. V. Liseitsev (2003, 159) has documented 29 interpreters (for oral translation) and 30 translators (for written translation) employed at the Posol’skii prikaz, for a large number of European and Asian languages; the corresponding numbers for the whole period 1613–1645 are 61–66 interpreters and 18–26 translators, working at the same time (Kunenkov 2007, 198). We do not have exact numbers for all years and there was, of course, some fluctuation over time, due to several reasons, but 40–80 foreign-language specialists is normal for most of the 17th century. 

Author’s email address: ingrid.maier@moderna.uu.se

---

18 Born in Löwenberg in Silesia, sometimes called “Kaspar from Wittenberg” because he has studied at that university (Angermann 1998, 231).

19 About specific aspects or specific translations made at the Posol’skii prikaz from German, Dutch, Polish and Latin see Maier 1997, 34–82; 2003a; 2003b; 2004; Maier & Pilger 2001; 2003a; 2003b and the forthcoming monograph Maier 2008 with many further references. Most of the publications (including the monograph Maier 2008, albeit without illustrations) can be downloaded as pdf files from http://www.moderna.uu.se/slaviska/ingrid.

20 Muscovite translators in the 17th and early 18th centuries will be the subject of a section in the book the author of this article is writing with Daniel C. Waugh concerning Muscovite acquisition of foreign news.
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