

Copyright © 1975, 2007 Daniel C. Waugh

This paper was prepared for the International Conference on Muscovite History, held at New College, Oxford, in 1975. While most of the papers from the conference were published subsequently in *Forschungen zur Osteuropäische Geschichte*, I elected to hold back from publishing the piece in order to work further on it. As the cover letter explains, it was intended as the opening chapter to a book on the *kuranty*. One footnote is “empty”, since I had been unable to re-locate the reference at the time the paper was distributed. Of course a great deal is now needed to update this work, including incorporating analogous material and examples from E. I. Kobzareva’s 1988 dissertation, which has a similar discussion written independently of my work, which she had not seen.

Daniel Waugh
Uppsala
October 2007

Department of History DP-20
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington 98195
August 3, 1975

Dear Colleagues:

Attached with my apologies for the late date is what I hope will serve as the basis for the first chapter of a book on the kuranty--the seventeenth-century Muscovite compilations of news and curiosa based largely on translations from imported newspapers and pamphlets. Since I have been anxious to press ahead to later portions of the book before returning to undertake basic revisions, the text I have given you is still rather rough. Some annotations need to be filled in, repetition eliminated, perhaps some material added, and so on. Nonetheless, I would think that there is sufficient material in the paper to promote some fruitful discussion in conjunction with discussion of Professor Rasmussen's admirable paper.

Just to give you an idea of where this material fits, the contents of the book will be the following:

- Ch. I. Diplomatic Channels as a Source for Foreign News.
- Ch. II. Foreigners in Muscovy and the Establishment of the Postal System in the Time of Aleksei Mikhailovich.
- Ch. III. The kuranty: contents and sources.
- Ch. IV. Pamphlet curiosities: the accounts about Shabbatai Zvi and the apocryphal "Correspondence" of the Sultan.
- Ch. V. The significance of the kuranty in Muscovy and the Muscovite Experience in Comparative European Perspective.

I anticipate with pleasure our meeting at Oxford.

Sincerely,


Dan Waugh

Diplomatic Channels as a Source for Foreign News in Muscovy

(Paper for Presentation at Conference on Muscovite
History, September 1-4, 1975)

by Daniel Clarke Waugh, University of Washington (Seattle)

One of the traditional functions of diplomatic exchange has been the acquisition of intelligence. Embassies offered opportunities for first-hand observation that might otherwise be totally unavailable, and aside from the obvious possibilities for clandestine intelligence operations, there was ample opportunity in the process of negotiations to learn valuable information about the international relations of the parties involved. Certainly one important aim of Renaissance governments in establishing permanent diplomatic missions in other states was to ensure a regular supply of news from abroad; along with this evolution of regular diplomatic contact went the development of communications that would facilitate the rapid transmission of news. ¹ These general observations hold for Muscovite Russia, where, if anything, the value of diplomatic contact as a means of acquiring news about the outside world was even more important than elsewhere in Europe due to the very slow development of other means for the acquisition of news.

In this chapter I propose to examine the way in which diplomatic exchange provided Muscovy with foreign news. My initial impression was that one would discover a steady evolution of techniques and procedures with increasing sophistication as one moved from the period of consolidation of political power around Moscow at the end of the fifteenth century down to the beginning of the eighteenth century. The documentation which I have been able to examine suggests on the contrary that from the very beginning of this period the basic approach to the gathering of foreign news that was to be maintained for the succeeding centuries was rather completely

developed. We do, of course, find improvements, especially in the seventeenth century, but there is a remarkable continuity in technique throughout. For this reason, I feel that the clearest exposition of the material will be to take a number of aspects of information-gathering--the government's aims, the means of acquisition, the means of transmission, and results--and treat them successively over the whole period rather than adhere to a strictly chronological approach throughout the chapter. First though, it seems advisable to make a few observations about the sources in order that their limitations be clear.

Although the evolution of Muscovite chancellery practice is a subject that still awaits its historian, we can establish that during the reign of Ivan III (1462-1505) there seems to have been a regularization of record-² keeping procedures. It is precisely from this time that we begin to get regular series of documents dealing with foreign affairs,; while the evolution of ~~the~~ the Diplomatic Chancellery apparatus was not to be complete for more than half a century, the procedures established in the latter fifteenth century in general seem to have been the norm down into the time of Peter the Great (1682-1725). In the early part of the period with which we are dealing, the documentation while precise is telegraphic. The records beginning roughly in the middle of the sixteenth century, while³ covering the same points, tend to do so in much greater detail than earlier. It would be a mistake then to assume simply from the brevity of the earlier documents that over time there was an increasing attention to matters that earlier had been virtually ignored, for it may well be that the documentation simply is becoming a more accurate record of the reality which it reflects.

To illustrate, take the ambassadorial report (which comes to be known as stateinyi spisok). The earliest records we have of diplomatic exchange rarely tell us details of the ambassador's journey, the ceremonial receptions and even the course of negotiations, but include simply the notation that the am-

bassador returned and provide the texts of the documents which he was given for transmission to the Grand Prince of Moscow. As we move along in the sixteenth century, these records of embassies become fuller, so that ultimately they come to include all the details of the journey and every official contact along the way, every minute of every negotiating session, detailed reports on international relations and internal affairs, and often descriptions of places visited. It would be wrong to conclude from this change that initially there was no reporting of news and no description of foreign places, for we know that an oral report of the mission's success was standard, and the ambassador's instructions almost invariably included the acquisition of news which might be recorded in writing but⁴ more often than not (throughout much of the sixteenth century) was in any event to be told to the Grand Prince. Similarly, the absence of descriptive passages concerning the places the Muscovite ambassadors visited need not be taken to mean that ambassadors were interested in nothing but their missions. The very nature of the ambassadorial report in Muscovy was such that such extraneous description really had no place. The reports as they developed by the middle of the sixteenth century were supposed to be a precise record of how the instructions given the ambassador had been fulfilled, no more. I dwell on this particular point, for it seems to me that historians have tended to ask of the ambassadorial reports more than they should be expected to give if we wish to establish what Muscovy knew about foreign parts beyond the dry facts of war and peace. The exceptions to the established rules by which the records were kept are of course very suggestive, but they are only part of the story.⁵

Another observation that should be made with regard to the documents on which we must rely is that once established, the procedures and formulae often were markedly conservative. We can see this quite clearly in the instructions to ambassadors, which in their developed form of the sixteenth and

seventeenth centuries attempted to encompass all contingencies that the diplomat might encounter. Part of the instruction contained responses that were to be given if queried on various aspects of Muscovite foreign relations; we find in these sections as in others that over a period of years or even longer, those compiling the new instruction might simply quote previous ones without change. Taking one of the instructions in isolation from the others thus might provide the impression that relations with a particular state or people were important to the Muscovite government at that particular moment, whereas in fact the broader view might suggest just the opposite because of the fact that the instructions had not been altered for years. We shall see this phenomenon when we examine the instructions regarding the gathering of intelligence.

One final word of warning with regard to the documentation of Muscovy's acquisition of foreign news concerns the quantities of that news regarding individual states. Perhaps the point is too obvious, but I think that it should be stated that quite logically one would expect the Muscovite government to focus its attention on those states closest to its borders and hence most central to its foreign policy concerns. Not surprisingly therefore, we find that the countries of Western Europe receive rather short shrift in the news reports obtained through diplomatic means. One might, by considering primarily the information about Western Europe, come away with the impression that the acquisition of news by the Muscovite government was so inadequate that the subject is hardly worth closer examination. Yet one wonders-- could not the same thing be said, say, about the French knowledge of Muscovite affairs? What does emerge from the sources is the quite logical conclusion that intelligence and news gathering functions were developed to the extent that they were needed. Where the news concerned countries of critical importance in Muscovite foreign policy the acquisition of news was strikingly efficient at a very early stage; an interest in other states developed only slowly.

It is logical to begin our enquiry into diplomatic exchanges as a source for news in Muscovy by asking what it was that the Muscovite government wished to learn and how it instructed its diplomats and officials in this regard.⁶ The earliest records we have in the series of documents beginning in the reign of Ivan III include instructions to ambassadors with regard to the acquisition of news; in parallel fashion, from the middle of the sixteenth century, the government would instruct those officials who were assigned to conduct foreign embassies and negotiate with them to attempt to learn news of international relations. It appears that the Muscovite government saw the process of acquiring news as a normal part of diplomatic exchange in that the instructions regarding the acquisition of news are invariably coupled with the instructions concerning the ambassador's responses to inquiries regarding Muscovy's internal or external affairs. It was logical to expect that inquiries regarding news would be met by similar inquiries in response; to a certain degree, this kind of exchange of information appears to have been above board, with clandestine inquiries often specified for only some portion of the information sought if at all.

Practically from the earliest of the instructions we have--that is from the end of the fifteenth century-- we find two types of requests for information. The Muscovite government was interested in general in the foreign relations of the country to which the ambassador was being sent and often beyond this the foreign relations of one or more of the important neighbors of that country. Such requests for information came to assume a fairly standard form in the sixteenth century: what are the relations of country A with countries B, C, and D; is A at war or at peace with B, C, and D; are there diplomatic exchanges; what are the relations between B and C, etc.? For ambassadors to Poland beginning in the 1520's, a typical instruction thus might include the following:

And Ivan and Elizar are to enquire what are [the relations] now of the King with the Crimean and with the Turkish and with the Wallachian and with the Hungarian [rulers], and what are they with the Germans--that

is, with the Livonians and with the Swedes and with the Prussians--and what is said with regard to [the relations of] the Turkish and Hungarian [rulers]...and they are to learn accurately about all affairs there. And with regard to the Crimean [khan], they are to learn accurately what are the relations of the king with the Crimean [khan]; whom has the King sent as ambassador or courier to the Crimea to the Khan; and if he has sent an embassy, with what purpose; and has the khan sent his messengers to the King, and if he has sent them, how long ago and with what purpose...? 7

While it is true that the Muscovite government had a continuing and genuine concern over relations between the Polish-Lithuanian state and the Crimeans, since an alliance between the two could pose a serious threat to Muscovy, the fact that such instructions were repeated verbatim over several decades suggests that they may have represented a kind of general request for news rather than a specific inquiry designed to solve some immediate problem of Muscovite foreign policy.
8

In contrast, one finds as well in the instructions regarding news acquisition items that clearly relate to some pressing concern or reflect the receipt of recent news which the Muscovite government wished to check. For example, in 1501, the instruction to a courier to Lithuania ran as follows:

Memorial to Mikhailo Korostalav. He is to inquire politely in Lithuania of whomever he sees fit: which notables were killed in the battle? Here it is said that they killed Schiastnii and Dalagub and Drozhdia; are they there or not? And regarding those who they say are absent or any notables about whom they should ask him, he is to write them down...

In this case the government was attempting to learn what the results were of one encounter in the war between the two states; the instruction goes on to enquire with regard to whether Lithuania is hiring mercenaries and what the are the relations of Lithuania with the Turks and the Tatars.

On occasion the instructions regarding the acquisition of news could be quite detailed and the range of subjects might be expanded to include matters involving the internal politics of the country. In the time of Ivan IV's Livonian War, which began in 1558 and ultimately brought the Polish-Lithuanian state in on the side of Moscow's enemies, the ambassadors to Poland were to find out not only what news there was about foreign relations but also

to ask with regard to the activities of particular magnates and to report on the relations of the king and the magnates and the relations between the Polish and Lithuanian councils of magnates. ¹⁰ The fate of Muscovite defectors to Lithuania was a matter of particular concern, as evidenced by very specific instructions regarding Prince Andrei Kurbskii and others in the latter 1560's, instructions that were repeated several years later with little change even though they had lost their immediate relevance. ¹¹ The detail of these instructions is not indicative of a continuing trend to ask increasingly specific questions however, for we find during the seventeenth century that the use of very condensed and general formulae with regard to the international affairs of the state to which the embassy was sent remained the norm. In some instances, once the acquisition of news through other channels was well established, the instructions were in fact generalized into a single phrase--to find out about ¹² all possible news.

While the subject of an ambassador's enquiries might be specified with some degree of precision, he generally was provided little guidance with regard to the manner in which the information might be obtained. The earliest instructions say little other than "find out accurately" or "ask whomever you see fit," although with increasing frequency we find admonitions to "ask secretly" at least with regard to some portion of the information sought. Elaborations on such a formula might include the additional explanation to keep the information obtained secret in order that no one learn what it was that the ambassador had himself learned. ¹³ Yet the normal expectation seems to have been that the officials assigned to deal with the embassy might be asked about news. One of the rare cases where the information was to be obtained specifically from the junior officials and none whatsoever from the senior one would seem to indicate that the latter, who provided the official channel of communication with the government to whom the ambassador was accredited, was considered the ¹⁴ normal source of information. The Muscovite government was thus obviously

aware of the limitations of official informants, who might not tell the story straight and in the process of answering questions would learn how much the Muscovite government knew and what it wished to learn. Alternatively, the ambassador might turn to merchants; in some instances where information was to be kept secret, merchants were preferred to other sources.

15

Since the establishment of permanent Muscovite diplomatic representatives abroad only just begins toward the end of the period with which we are dealing, it is evident that Muscovite diplomats lacked the opportunities their counterparts who were in residence in the major European capitals had for the establishment of networks of informers who might provide fuller and more reliable news than that obtained through official channels. We do find in the seventeenth century expense accounts for embassies listings of payments to those who provided the embassies with news; more often than not, the informants are the same officials with whom the ambassadors had regular dealings or with whom there had been contact during earlier diplomatic exchanges. For example, when Ivan Korob'in was in Vienna in 1663, he gave two sables to the pastor who had been in Moscow the previous year with Baron von Mayerberg's embassy, "because he brought to the ambassadors all kinds of information relevant to the Tsar's business and for news and for all of his services." Four years later the ambassador to the Emperor Leopold recorded a payment to the imperial official who had been assigned to the mission, "for the fact that he had accompanied the ambassadors from Vienna to the Polish border, had provided assistance in obtaining provisions, and had related all kinds of news in conversations." The documents that are available do not allow one to establish with any certainty how long the practice of paying for information had been the norm for Muscovite embassies. One is struck by the fact that the number of paid informants seems to have been small; apparently informal conversations engaged in by the translators brought with the embassy served to supplement that which was obtained from the official and paid informants.

16

17

18

Foreign diplomats who came to Muscovy were questioned on the latest news

as a matter of course by those officials who were sent to meet them at the border and accompany them to the capital. Whether this practice antedates the middle of the sixteenth century is uncertain, but beginning then the documentation dealing with the reception of foreign embassies includes instructions to those sent to meet the envoys that they find out what the latest news is concerning the international relations of the state from which the envoys had come and in some cases those through which they had passed. ¹⁹ The scope of these instructions tended to be narrower than that in the instructions to Muscovite ambassadors sent abroad, since matters of internal policy were rarely included. As with the Muscovite diplomats sent abroad though, the officials dealing with the foreigners in Muscovy were instructed as to what to reply should they be questioned on Muscovy's own news. More often than not, such instructions would be brief--indicating that such questions were to be turned aside as relating to matters in which the given official had no competence.

The querying of diplomats on their way to Moscow appears to have produced mixed results; it would appear that what information was obtained rarely went beyond a simple listing of what states were at war and which at peace. However, on occasion it was in the interests of the visiting ambassadors to make a deliberate effort to provide all the latest news. Giles Fletcher, the English Ambassador to Muscovy, reported to Lord Burghley in September 1589:

When I arrived at the Mosko, I found a League in hand betwixt the Emperour and the King of Spain, about an opposition against the Turk. To which purpose an Ambassadour was appointed to goe into Spain... This treatie of League with the Spaniard was a cause of more sad countenance towards mee at my first arrivall. But after your Highnes victorie against the King of Spain was well known thear, (which I understood by Lettres sent mee by Sir Francis Drake which I caused to bee translated into the Russ tooogwe together with your Highnes Oration made to the Armie in Essex) all this conceipt of a Spanish League vanished away...²

A few years later in 1594, on his arrival in Muscovy, a messenger from the Holy Roman Emperor turned over to the Muscovite officials who had been sent to meet him pamphlets dealing with the recent Habsburg successes against the Ottoman Empire. ²¹ Similarly, in the 1660's, when Baron Mayerberg was in Moscovy trying to persuade Muscovy to make common cause against the Turk, he took pains to

provide the Muscovite government with any fresh news that he received by courier, and the Muscovite officials in turn passed on any information they had acquired through other channels regarding international affairs. Once a degree of cooperation had been established in this manner it might continue to benefit the Muscovite government after the embassy's departure. On completing his mission to Moscow, Mayerberg became the Imperial resident in Poland and there provided the Muscovite ambassador who was being sent to Vienna the latest news as he passed through. Toward the end of the century, we find the head of the Diplomatic Chancellery Vasilii Golitsyn receiving news through correspondence with Habsburg diplomats who had been in Moscow earlier.

One of the most serious drawbacks to the useful acquisition of information through diplomatic contacts was the fact that such contacts were usually infrequent, at best were irregular, and more often than not would provide news that was obsolete by the time it reached Moscow. Of course the picture is by no means uniform. The proximity of Lithuania-Poland to Muscovy and its importance in Muscovite foreign affairs meant that embassies moved between the two states quite regularly and took at most a few months to complete the round trip. Similarly, Muscovite contacts with the Crimea were frequent in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; at least for a time in the middle of the sixteenth century, the Muscovite government had what amounted to a resident ambassador in the Crimea, who reported frequently by courier. As one moves to states further away from the Muscovite borders though, the frequency of diplomatic exchange becomes less and the elapsed time between the departure and return of an embassy could be as long as from one to two years. Until the second half of the seventeenth century, it appears that the submission of interim reports on the progress of an embassy and the news it had obtained was relatively rare. The ambassadors were instructed to find out the news, write it down so as to have an accurate record, and report orally and/or in writing on their return. The exceptions to the rule in the early part of the period

with which we are dealing were cases where the ambassadors were passing through the lands of Muscovy's immediate neighbors on their way to a more distant destination and had an opportunity to send word back by a messenger. Occasionally too a message might be sent with a merchant or with the party of an embassy that was headed to Moscow from another state.

The establishment of regular postal service to the West in 1665, about which we shall say more in Chapter II, and the reorganization of this postal service under the supervision of the Diplomatic Chancellery in the latter 1660's changed radically the communications between Muscovy and its embassies in Western Europe. Instructions regarding the gathering of news now stipulated that it be sent "through the established postal service"; we see that already in the 1670's embassies to Vienna reported weekly or biweekly. One well-documented example will serve to illustrate the efficiency with which the system worked by the late 1690's. Table I provides the dates of dispatch and receipt of mail between the government and the secretary Koz'ma Nefimov, who was sent to Vienna in December 1695 with instructions that among other things stated that "having learned [the news], he is to write all of it down precisely in the record of his embassy and write it on ahead to Their Majesties immediately through the post using the established cipher." He was to use the Imperial post that went to Warsaw, and the Russian resident in Warsaw would forward the mail immediately to Moscow. Before the end of Nefimov's mission he began to use as well the post that went north to the Baltic and through Riga, since the service through Warsaw and Vilna was proving to be slower and less reliable. Nefimov's experience may not have been typical, even in the last three decades of the seventeenth century. Peter I felt a certain urgency about obtaining the latest news from the Habsburg front against the Ottomans during the period of his own Azov campaigns. Yet clearly the Muscovite government took advantage of the postal service for regular communications with its embassies abroad once that service had been established; as we shall see, the postal service was important for the transmission of news irrespective of when and where Muscovy's

Table I

A. Dispatches sent by Nefimov (from Vienna unless otherwise indicated)

date sent	date rec'd in Moscow	date read to Tsar	remarks
1696 Jan. 8 (Mogilev)			
Jan. 16 (Minsk)			
Feb. 8 (Warsaw)			
Feb. 15 (")			
Feb. 20 (border)	Mar. 22		
Mar. 22	by Apr. 25		sent from Warsaw Apr. 4
Apr. 5	May 7		
Apr. 12			
Apr. 26			
May 10	June 12		
May 24	June 27		
June 13	July 10		
July 5	Aug. 14		
Aug. 2	Sept. 12		
Aug. 16	Sept. 13	Sept. 26 (in Dubrovitsy)	
Aug. 30	Oct. 3		
Sept. 13	Oct. 17		
Sept. 20	Oct. 30	Nov. 3	
Sept. 27	Nov. 10	Nov. 13 (in Preobrazhenskoe)	sent from Warsaw Oct. 10
Oct. 4	Nov. 18	Nov. 20	
Oct. 11	Nov. 25	Nov. 26	
Oct. 18	Nov. 25	Nov. 27	
Oct. 31	Dec. 6	Dec. 8	

Table I (ctd.)

Nov. 7	Dec. 26	Dec. 20	
Nov. 14			
Dec. 5		1697 Jan. 17	
Dec. 26	1697 Feb. 4	Feb. 10	
1697 Jan. 2	Feb. 4	Feb. 10	via Vilna post
Jan. 6	Feb. 4		via Riga post; duplicate of Jan. 2 dispatch
Jan. 20		Feb. 14	via Riga post
Jan. 23		Feb. 25	via Vilna post; dupl. of Jan. 20
Jan. 27		Feb. 23	via Riga post
Jan. 30		Feb. 28	via Riga post
Jan. 31	Mar. 12		via Vilna post; dupl. of Jan. 30
Feb. 7	Mar. 12		via Vilna post
Feb. 13	Mar. 16		via Riga post
Feb. 13			via Vilna post

B. Dispatches sent to Nefimov from Moscow

date sent	date rec ^d (in Vienna except as noted)	remarks
1696 Jan. 25	Feb. 20(?) (at Imperial border)	
Apr. 25		opened by mistake in Warsaw, June 9
Apr. 26	May 30	
May 10	June 19	
June 6		lost on the road to Smolensk
July 11	Aug. 21	
July 22	Aug. 28	
July 30	Sept. 4	
Aug. 7	Sept. 16	
Aug. 25	Oct. 2	

Table I (ctd.)

Sept. 25	Nov. 6	
Oct. 9	Nov. 27	
Nov. 3		
Nov. 5	Dec. 19, 26	same dispatch, one copy sent through Riga and the other through Vilna, with latter presumably arriving second.
Nov. 14	Dec. 19	
Nov. 15		duplicate of Nov. 14
Nov. 27	1697 Jan. 2	
Dec. 8	Jan 8, 15	copy first received, via Riga, and second via Vilna

ambassadors were.

While Nefimov's residence of nearly a year in Vienna gave him ample opportunity to develop contacts for obtaining news, the Muscovite resident in Warsaw, who transmitted Nefimov's dispatches in theory should have been in an even better position to supply news. The residency in Warsaw was recent, and for Muscovy, as far as its western neighbors were concerned, a unique phenomenon. It had first been established in 1673, with a Polish resident coming to Moscow in exchange. Presumably the primary purpose of this arrangement was to provide not only a regular means for transmitting news but also a regular channel for coordinating action with regard to the Turks. That this latter concern was important is underlined by the fact that in 1676, due to Muscovite anger with the Poles for their having signed a separate peace with the Turks, the residents were withdrawn. It was only subsequent to the reestablishment of the anti-Ottoman coalition along with the conclusion of a definitive peace treaty between Muscovy and Poland in 1686 that the residencies were reestablished. What information I have on the degree to which the residency in Poland benefitted the muscovite government with regard to the acquisition of

news suggests that the results were not entirely satisfactory. The first Muscovite representative in Warsaw, Vasilii Tiapkin, complained bitterly in the 1670's about his treatment and the fact that he was denied access to sources of news. He requested that he be able to send his translator to the Royal Chancellery to receive news and that he be sent avizy regularly; the Polish response was a denial that there were any to be had. Subsequently he lamented, "living in Warsaw, I purchase all kinds of news dearly. Even those who were my friends have begun to refuse, they wish rewards, and admit shamelessly that they themselves purchase news dearly, they risk³⁴ even their health and attract suspicion." To make it worse, his own government failed to keep him informed; as a result, the Poles, who in any event were dissatisfied with the degree of Moscow's participation in the war, suspected that he was holding back information and thus they supplied even less in return. He requested in vain that the Muscovite government send him a regiment so that he might join the Polish forces and thus see first hand what he otherwise could learn only by purchasing avizy in Warsaw. There is no indication that Tiapkin was able to solve his problem satisfactorily, and what news he did obtain often was held up by inefficiencies in the postal system.³⁵

What information did diplomatic contacts provide? We might somewhat arbitrarily divide it into two categories: that which pertained directly to the purpose of the mission and Muscovite diplomacy, and that which was extraneous, since it dealt with matters that had little or nothing to do with the formulation of foreign policy. ~~Under the~~ Under the latter I would group descriptions of cities, tales about events long past, and the like. As I have mentioned earlier, those studying ambassadorial reports have tended in the past to look very hard for the second type of information, on the assumption that it is the more revealing of a developing Muscovite curiosity about other countries, and as a result have tended to slight that which the Muscovite government asked its ambassadors to provide--namely, the latest news.

We will in due course take up the extraneous information, but it is appropriate to begin with the news reports.

Many of the earliest Muscovite reports of diplomatic missions do not contain news items. This may be explained in several ways: no such news reports were compiled; the reports were given orally; or they were filed separately and hence not included in the series of documents that have been published. I am inclined to think, given the regularity with which the instructions to the ambassadors include the gathering of news and the wording which indicates that the reports to the Grand Prince were to be oral, that initially the news may not have been preserved regularly in written form. ³⁶ We do find, however, beginning with the 1520's, that an increasing number of ambassadorial reports contain a section in which they report all the news gathered during the mission. ³⁷ These separate sections in some instances open with quotation of the instructions about news-gathering before they proceed to the news itself. In some cases, there is a separate heading such as "Concerning the News," or "On the Lithuanian News." The separate collection of news items in this manner becomes standard for the reports; once printed newspapers and pamphlets became readily available in the seventeenth century, they would simply be appended to the report in the same manner. ³⁸ The ambassadors apparently kept a running record of their mission while it was underway and then organized their notes and wrote up the final report on the journey home in order to be able to submit it immediately when they reached Muscovy. ³⁹ At least initially the news reports tended to be distillations of all that was learned, arranged according to the questions posed in the instruction rather than in the order of the actual acquisition of that information. We do find as well, especially in the seventeenth century, that the ambassadors move away from an ordering of the news according to the specific questions asked in the instructions and provide instead a chronological account of the news as they acquired it, often indicating the date and the source for the individual items. ⁴⁰ In form and content, these

standard news reports by Muscovite ambassadors are really no different from the typical newsletter, the occasional pamphlet containing news, and then ultimately the printed newspaper that circulated in Europe. The kuranty of the seventeenth century are similar compilations, put together in Moscow from a variety of sources, including some of the ambassadorial news reports that we are considering here.

A typical example of an ambassador's news compilation is in the report Fedor Pisemskii submitted in 1583 on his return from his mission to England:

The Queen of England is at peace with the Kings of France and Lithuania and with the Emperor--there are no wars or hostilities between them. But there is great hostility between the Queen and the Pope, because England formerly was Roman Catholic and Elizabeth abandoned Catholicism and established in all England Lutheranism. But it is rare that there is a major war between the Queen and the Pope, because England is distant from the Roman Land; this with one exception three years ago, when the Pope sent soldiers to Ireland, which is subject to the Queen...⁴¹

The report adds a few details and moves on to other matters: the Emperor is at peace with France but at war with the Turks; there is friction between England and the Danes, who are unhappy about the English trade with Muscovy via the north cape rather than through the Baltic, where the Danes can collect tolls. Finally, Pisemskii includes a one-paragraph description of England, indicating the size of the island and the estimated size of the military forces it can raise if there is threat of invasion.

In contrast to the brevity and, one might add, rather dubious worth of Pisemskii's report and many of the other ambassadorial reports dealing with Western Europe, the information obtained about Muscovy's neighbors was much more extensive even from much earlier in the period which we are covering.

An example would be in a report compiled in Poland in 1549:

And after that on the 24th of September, a messenger came to Kraków and said that a large force of Crimeans had come and seized prince Fedor Vishnevskii in his new castle along with his wife and all the other people there; they burned the castle but did not proceed as far as Vishnevets itself. And after that a messenger arrived and reported that the commandant of Volodimer chased the Crimeans and killed them and took

captives. And the captives say that the tsarevich Imin Saltan has come with 40,000 Crimeans, and they had marched against Your Majesty's borders, and the rumor came that your voevody are at Kolonna with a large force, and for that reason the Crimeans have gone no further but marched instead to the Lithuanian border. It is said that they were in Lithuania three weeks and devastated much of the land. And, Sire, these same captives say that as soon as snow falls the Crimeans wish to march on Your Majesty's borders...

And the old king Sigismund had concluded eternal peace with the Turkish Sultan, but his son Sigismund Augustus was not inclined to peace. And this year the Sultan's messenger Mehmet was at the King's court, and the King gave him his leave two weeks before we arrived; and now the King is sending his own ambassador Baush to the Turkish Sultan, and the King did not send him off before we came, since he expected from us falcons as gifts.

And the King is at peace with the Emperor and with the Hungarian and Czech kings and with the Germans, and it is said that their ambassadors were at the King's court this year.

And the Turkish Sultan has truced with the Emperor and with the Hungarian and Czech kings, but is at war with the Persian Shah...⁴²

Ambassadors who were especially successful in obtaining information might keep very detailed records of conversations which had provided them with news and in the process record material which had no bearing on Muscovy's immediate foreign policy concerns. One of the best examples we have is in the report submitted by Ivan Novosil'tsev, who was sent to Istanbul following the unsuccessful Tatar-Turkish campaign against Astrakhan⁴³ in 1569. Novosil'tsev kept a very precise record of his conversations with those who had first-hand knowledge of the recent campaign both in the Crimea and in Istanbul itself. He was thus able to provide the Muscovite government with valuable details of the planning that had gone into the expedition and the factions amongst the Ottomans and Tatars who had advocated it. Among the stories he recorded in Istanbul was one concerning the effort that Bayezid, son of Suleiman II, had made a decade earlier to seize the Ottoman throne from his father and eliminate the future sultan Selim II (1566-1574) as a contender for the crown.⁴⁴ Bayezid was forced to flee to Persia, where Selim arranged to have him murdered. The tale may have been of interest for the insight it gave into Ottoman dynastic politics, but the events were, after all, of a decade earlier. What I find striking about the inclusion of the account is that we find in published Euro-

pean pamphlets of the middle of the sixteenth century remarkably similar tales
of Ottoman dynastic intrigue. ⁴⁵ While the nature of the Muscovite interest in
the Turk may not have been at this point the same as the interest in the West,
which would lead there to the appearance of plays based on the same subject,
nevertheless we can see already in the sixteenth century how diplomatic reports
in the process of relating the news, might include as well material that could
lead the Muscovite reader beyond the day-to-day concerns of diplomacy and war.
In this particular case, there is no evidence that the information got beyond
the walls of the Chancellery, but as the importation of similar items increased
in the seventeenth century, some ^{id} spread to non-official circles, as we shall
see below.

Among the other kinds of apparently extraneous information provided by
ambassadors are descriptions of noteworthy sights in cities--churches, zoos,
gardens and the like. ⁴⁶ Such items in the reports in a strict sense fall beyond
the instructions given the ambassadors; this fact undoubtedly explains why such
extraneous material is relatively rare and, where it is found, may be exceedingly
brief. In a sense though, the inclusion of such descriptive material is little
different from the description of court ceremonial which the ambassador was ex-
pected to report in precise detail in order that there be no question about the
dignity of the Tsar having been preserved. If part of the ambassador's activi-
ties involved a guided tour of a church or a visit to the royal zoo or treasury,
these activities were to be reported, since the ambassador was never in public
in anything but an official capacity. The evidence of the ambassadorial reports
is thus at best equivocal if one wishes to apply it toward a solution of the
question as to whether Muscovite curiosity about the outside world was increas-
ing in the late sixteenth and in the seventeenth century. What we do see is an
increasing interest in the politics of parts of Europe that had earlier been
of little concern in the formation of Muscovite foreign policy, but the evi-
dence of such concern is in the reports of what may be termed the latest news
rather than in the occasional digressions.

One reason for the rather narrowly-defined interest of the Muscovite government in foreign news was the fact that the trade which existed between Muscovy and many countries of Europe was in the hands of foreign merchants. Thus, while commercial news does find its way into the sources of information the government received, there is little evidence of any serious efforts to obtain such news or any information which might provide a useful supplement on the society and economy of most other states. ⁴⁷ There are, however, some significant exceptions precisely where we would expect them to be--in the cases of those countries where the Tsar's government had an interest in direct Muscovite commercial involvement. The most striking example concerns the diplomatic materials dealing with the establishment of relations with China in the seventeenth century. Because of the fact that the Muscovite government was interested above all in trade with China, instructions to the missions sent there included detailed requests for information on all aspects of trade and economic life that might have some relevance for Muscovy, in addition to the usual requests for news regarding foreign relations (especially with various Mongol tribes that lived between the two states). In response to these instructions, the Muscovite envoys brought back reports that provide a much broader variety of information about China than do the corresponding ambassadorial reports for Western Europe. Not only was there information on economic life, but there was as well descriptive material on the way people lived and dressed. ⁴⁸ Presumably one reason for the inclusion of such descriptive passages was the fact that, in contrast to Europe, China was virtually unknown to Muscovy. The Muscovite rulers of the seventeenth century--especially the insatiably curious Aleksei Mikhailovich--were interested in learning more than the latest news about political events, as their instructions make perfectly clear.

Whereas contact with foreigners from the West was increasingly frequent and knowledge about the West during the seventeenth century could be obtained as well from an increasing variety of cosmographies and geographies that were translated, the same was ^{less} true for the East. In fact there is considerable

evidence to suggest that while the profound intellectual achievements of the West may have been for the most part beyond Muscovy's ken, at the same time the knowledge of what was happening in Europe that might affect Muscovite interests was surprisingly good by the end of the seventeenth century and probably before then. One reason certainly was the fact that in addition to the normal channels of information provided by diplomatic exchange, other channels opened up that ultimately would provide the government with even more news of the West than it could digest. The development of these sources is the subject to which I shall now turn.

Notes

1. On this development, see Garrett Mattingly, Renaissance Diplomacy, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1971, passim.
2. Some other aspects of the evolution of chancellery practice at this time are treated in L. V. Cherepnin, Russkie feodal'nye arkhivy, 2 v., M., 1948-1951.
3. Contrast, for example, the ambassadorial report of Vladimir Plemianikov, who was sent to the Holy Roman Empire in 1513, with that of Ivan Novosil'tsev, sent to the Ottoman Empire in 1570. The former is published in Pamiatniki diplomaticheskikh snoshanii drevnei Rossii s derzhavami inostrannymi (hereafter abbreviated PDS), vol. I, StPb., 1851, cols. 343-356; the latter text is in Puteshestviia russkikh poslov XVI-XVII vv. Stateinye spiski, M.-L., 1954, pp. 63-99. Note also the comments of D. S. Likhachev in his article "Povesti russkikh poslov kak pamiatniki literatury," ibid., pp. 325-327.
4. See, e.g., in the instructions to Timofei Zabolotskii, December 1531: "i o vsem emu o tamishnikh delakh pytati podlinno, da priekhav, Timofeiu skazati to velikomu kniaziu" (Sbornik Imperatorskogo Russkogo istoricheskogo obshchestva [hereafter cited as SRIO], vol. 59, SPb., , p. 10); cf., the instructions to Fedor Ivanovich Umnyi-Kolychev, February 1567: "i to im sebe pisati na spisok da tot spisok privezti ko tsariu i velikomu kniaziu" (SRIO, vol. 71, SPb., 1992, p. 466).
5. I have in mind here the otherwise excellent study of this material in Alexander Brückner's Culturhistorische Studien. I. Die Russen im Auslande im 17. Jahrhundert, Liga, 1878, and the recent survey by M. A. Alpatov, "Chto znal Posol'skii prikaz o Zapadnoi Evrope vo vtoroi polovine XVII v.," in his Russkaia istoricheskaia mysl' i Zapadnaia Evropa XII-XVII vv., M., 1973, pp. 323-363.
6. For a thoughtful and much more rigorous analysis of this material than I am able to provide here, see Knud Rasmussen, "On the Information Level of the Muscovite Posol'skij Prikaz in the 16th Century," unpublished paper for presen-

tation to the Muscovite History Conference, Oxford, 1-4 September 1975. Rasmussen provides a careful diplomatic analysis of the instructions for ambassadors to Lithuania-Poland in the sixteenth century.

7. Instruction to Ivan Vasil'vich Liatskii and Elizar Tsypliatev, December 9, 1526, SRIO, vol. 35, p. 741. The basic formula given here is found as early as 1520 (instruction to Boris Kamenskii, January 1520, SRIO, vol. 35, p. 550) and in a number of subsequent instructions down to 1571 (instruction to Ivan Magmetevich Kanbarov, January 1571, SRIO, vol. 71, pp. 772-707). For details on this and other formulae in the instructions, see Rasmussen, "On the Information Level," pp. 11-15. Although Rasmussen rightly sees the first full rendering of the formula quoted here as occurring in 1522, it seems to me that the 1522 text is merely an expansion of that found in the instructions of 1520 to Kamenskii. Variants of this basic formula continued to be used in the seventeenth century; see the instruction to Iakov Nikitich Likharev, sent as ambassador to the Holy Roman Emperor March 27, 1658, in ES, vol. III, col. 921.

8. Again, see Rasmussen, "On the Information Level," for a more extended analysis of the significance of the instructions as far as indicating Muscovite information levels is concerned. He provides some interesting examples of where the instructions repeated formulae that were no longer applicable.

9. Instruction to Mikhailo Korostolev, who was sent by the Boyar Iakov Zakhar'ich Koshkin-Zakhar'in, vovoda, of Kolonna, to Jan Zaberozski, wovoda of Trock, in March 1501; in SRIO, vol. 35, p. 326. It appears that this was an attempt to learn more about the consequences of the Muscovite victory over the Lithuanians on the River Vedrosha in the preceding year. Another good example is in the instructions to Vasilii Grigor'evich Morozov, sent to King Sigismund at the end of November 1522 (SRIO, vol. 35, pp. 650-651). Among other things, he was to check the rumor that Belgrade and Rhodes had fallen to the Turks ("lichto u nikh slukh, kak turettskoi so ugorskim, i Belgorod u nego

vzial, i on taki li i nyne za nim; i kak nyne s nim turettskoi; i skazali, chto butto on Rodos vzial, ino pro to chto u nikh slukh, vzial li turettskoi Rodos?"). The former had in fact fallen in the previous year, but the rumor about Rhodes was a bit premature, as its capture by the Turks after a long siege took place a month later.

10. Such instructions regarding domestic affairs appear as early as 1550 in approximately the same form that they follow during the Livonian War. See the instructions to Iakov Ostaf'evich Andreev, December 1550, SRIO, vol. 59, p. 344; cf. instructions to Roman Vasil'evich Olfer'ev, February 1553, ibid., p. 544.

11. Cf. instruction to Fedor Ivanovich Umyi-Kolychev, February 1567 (SRIO, vol. 71, pp. 467-468) and instruction to Ivan Magnetevich Kanbarov, ibid., p. 778.

12. A typical example of very condensed and stereotyped instructions are those given Grigorii Bogdanov, January 7, 1656, for his mission to the Holy Roman Emperor (PDS, vol. III, cols., 557-558); the ultimate generalization was in the instruction for the Grand Embassy of which Peter the Great was a "disguised" member in 1697: "provedyvati u pristavov...takzhe u inykh liudei, podlinnikh vsiakikh vedomostei tainym obychaem" (PDS, vol. VIII, col. 698). Cf. the instructions of the Dutch States General to Reynout van Brederode, who was being sent to mediate between the Swedes and Muscovites in 1615: "Van all importante saecken sullen de heeren gesanten aen haere Ho. Mog. adviseren..." (SRIO, vol. 24, p. 9).

Compare, for example, instructions to the following: to Asanchiuk Zabolotskii, May 1493 ("i pytati im, kogo budet prigozhe"), SRIO, vol. 35, p. 97; to P. M. Zabolotskii, May 1503 ("popytati o tom v Vilne nakrepko"), ibid., p. 427; to V. G. Morozov, November 30, 1522 ("Da pytati Vasil'iu i Andreiu...i o vsem pytati podlinno. Da kogo budet prigozhe...pytati sebe taino, a ne slushno, kogo prigozhe..."), ibid., p. 650.

14. "O vsem o tom Nikite sebe rozvedyvati podlinno taino ot molodykh

liudai, a pristava ne vprashivati ni o chem" (instruction to Nikita Semenovich Sushchev, April (?) 1560, SRIO, vol. 59, p. 614); cf. the instruction for the Grand Embassy quoted above in n. 12 and the report of Koz'ma Nefimov in 1697 about his embassy to Vienna (PDS, vol. VIII, col. 453: "po tainomu provedyvanii u sekretarei i po rozhovorem s tsesarskimi dumnymi liud'mi, i po mnogomu domoganiu..."). Aside from information obtained from official diplomatic exchange, apparently Ivan IV's government felt other Polish officials had a moral obligation to keep their Muscovite counterparts informed with respect to the Crimean Tatars: "a kakovy vesti u tvoikh namestnikov pro Tatar budut, i oni b nashikh namestnikov potomu zh bez vesti ne derzhali, chtob khristianstvu ot poganykh oberezhen'e bylo" (letter of Ivan to King Sigismund Augustus, June 1551, SRIO, vol. 59, p. 354).

15. For example, when Ivan III wished to explore routes for the safe return of the Danish ambassador, whose presence in Moscow he wished to remain secret from Lithuania, he instructed Semen Ivanovich Stipishin in February 1495: "i vy by veleli Vasil'iu Kuleshinu ot sebia v rozhovore vyprostiti kuptsov tamoshnykh vilenskikh..." (SRIO, vol. 35, p. 176). Another example of the resort to merchants for secret information is in the instructions to Nikita Semenovich Sushchev, January 1553 (SRIO, vol. 59, p. 376).

16. PDS, vol. IV, cols. 530-531.

17. Ibid., cols. 671-672; for other examples of payments to informers, see ibid., col. 1140; in the same series, vol. V, cols. 878-886, 1237-1242, vol. VIII, cols. 450-462, vol. X, col. 1184. The last of these, from 1657, is the earliest example I have found. The full list of expenditures by the embassy of Koz'ma Nefimov, who was in Vienna in 1696 and 1697, included payments for news and other services to the Polish and Imperial postmasters, to an Imperial Chamberlain assigned to deal with the mission, to the Imperial translator of Latin and German, and to a translator who was hired to accompany Nefimov on the return trip (PDS, vol. VIII, cols. 453-456).

18. For example, see the news reported by Boris Petrovich Sheremet'ev

in his relation turned in July 27, 1637, on his return from Vienna: "i velikiye i polnomocniye posly veleli o tom v Vene provadyvat' taino perevodchikui Stepanu Chizhinskomu. I chto on provedal, i o tom podal pismo, a v pisme napisano..." (PDS, vol. VII, col. 275).

19. For examples, see instructions to those sent to meet Polish ambassadors, in 1566, 1570 and 1615, in SRIO, vol. 71, pp. 343-344, 621-622, 626-628, and vol. 142, pp. 603-604; to those sent to meet ambassadors from Persia in 1590 and 1595, in N. I. Veselovskii, ed., Pamiatniki diplomaticheskikh i torgovykh otnoshenii Moskovskoi Rusi s Persiei, vol. I, SPb., 1890, pp. 117-118, 289; to those sent to meet ambassadors from the Holy Roman Empire in 1593, 1661, and 1683, in PDS, vols. I, cols. 1260-1261, IV, cols. 87, 272-3, VI, cols. 221-223.

20. Fletcher to Lord Burghley, 21 September 1589, in Lloyd E. Berry, ed., The English Works of Giles Fletcher the Elder, Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1964, p. 371. I am indebted to Robert Crook for this reference.

21. The messenger, called Mikhailo Shel' in the Russian sources, arrived in Pskov in February 1594; on interrogation by the local commandant, he related the latest news about successes against the Turks, and then he gave to the official who was sent to accompany him to Moscow two pamphlets, the translations of which are in PDS, vol. I, cols. 1440-1445. Later in the same year the Imperial ambassador to Moscow passed along to the Diplomatic Chancellery dispatches with news he had received about the Turkish war while in Moscow (PDS, vol. II, cols. 83-85, 88-89).

22. See PDS, vol. IV, cols. 29-32, 55-60, 87, 131-132, 166-167, 196-199, 203-204, 206-207, 215-218, 243-246, 255-268, 283-285, 291-292.

23. See the ambassadorial report of Ivan Zheliabuzhskii, relating his meeting with Mayerberg in August 1667, PDS, vol. IV, cols. 580-582.

24. Among them are: a letter in Latin from the Imperial ambassador Baron

Slunberg, who had just left Moscow and was in Warsaw on his way home, August 15, 1684 (PDS, vol. VI, cols. 805-807); a German letter sent from Vienna by an Imperial secretary Georg Gotfried Koch, February 3, 1685 (ibid., cols. 865-868); Latin letters sent from L^viv by the Imperial Ambassador Jan Kristofor Zierowski, September 13 and October 2, 1685 (ibid., cols. 971-973 and 974-976); a Latin letter sent from the Imperial resident in Poland, Jerzy Szymanski, who was at Jan Sobieski's campaign headquarters at Podlazlowiec, August 28, 1687 (PDS, vol. VII, cols. 288-289).

25. [need to add some statistics on frequency...]

Ambassadors to Lithuania-Poland generally took from two to six months to complete the round trip, with the average being about four months; see SRIO, vols. 35, 59, 71, 137, 142 passim.

26.

27. The round trip time for embassies to Vienna ranged from 4 1/2 months to slightly more than a year, with normal missions taking 7 to 9 months (see PDS, vols. I-X passim); embassies to England would normally take the better part of a year, since most went via the north cape from Kholmogory and later Arkhangel'sk and could not make a round trip during the short navigation season (SRIO, vol. 38, pp. 15, 62, 154, 161, 315,); embassies to Italy seem to have taken a year on the average (PDS, vol. X, cols. 5, 17, 509, 664, 671, 795, 931, 938, 1145); embassies to Persia appear to have taken at least 1 1/2 to two years (Veselovskii, Pamiatniki, passim).

28. One of these exceptions is quite striking since it appears right at the beginning of the period: the Greek Iurii Trakhaniot, who was working as a translator for the Muscovite government and went on a mission to the Holy Roman Emperor in 1492, sent a series of dispatches containing rather detailed reports from Kolyvan¹ and Lubeck (PDS, vol. I, cols. 99-108). Sending news from across the border in Poland at Orsza was quite common for ambassadors going to Prague or Vienna: Rezanov's instructions of January 1588 indicate

that he was to report immediately news learned on crossing the border into Poland and to write down whatever other news he learned subsequently and report to the Tsar on his return (PDS, vol. I, cols. 1030-1031); M. I. Val'iaminov in 1595 sent dispatches from Poland both going and coming from his mission to the Habsburgs (PDS, vol. II, cols. 274-278, 290-294).

29. Note that the instructions to Peter Marselis, who was sent to Brandenburg and Denmark in February 1555, stipulated that he send back dispatches through people who would be designated by the Duke of Courland or through reliable people in Riga. This was just prior to the establishment of the postal service to Riga under the supervision of the Tsar's Privy Chancellery. See PDS, vol. IV, cols. 540-541.

30. In 1663, just before the reorganization of the Muscovite postal service under the Diplomatic Chancellery instead of the Privy Chancellery, the ambassador sent to Venice through Habsburg territories was instructed to bring back the news he had collected (instructions to Tomas Kelderman, April 1663, PDS, vol. IV, col. 711). Already in 1673 though, the postal service was to be used for news dispatches by Pavel Menazius (Minius), who was to deliver a communication from the Tsar to the Pope in Rome ("i pro to pro vse, rozvedav podlinno pisati k V. G-riu taino chrez ustanovlenniu pochtu"--PDS, vol. IV, col. 770; see also cols. 799-800). In 1679, Ivan Vasil'evich Buturlin went from Vienna via Poland and the Vilna post an unbroken series of dispatches dated as follows: May 20, 29, June 11, 14, 22, July 7, 14, 23, August 7 (?). See PDS, vol. V, cols., 730-733, 747-748, 970-971.

31. The text of his instructions from December 1695 reads: "a provedav, o tom o vsem napisat' v stateinyi spisok imanno, i napred' o tom o vsem k V. G-rem...pisat' obratsovoiu azbukoiu chrez pochtu naskoro" (PDS, vol. VII, col. 1034). A supplementary instruction spelled out the details of the system and indicated that he was to send news with every post ("po vsia pochy"). A further reference to this instruction indicated that that meant every week

("po vsia nedeli"). See the instructions to Nefimov of January 25, 1696, and the one to the resident in Warsaw, Boris Mikhailov, with the same date, FDS, vol. VII, esp. cols. 1063-1064 and 1066-1067. Table I has been compiled from FDS, vols. VII and VIII, passim. As was standard in European practice, the Muscovite dispatches generally mention the date of writing and date of receipt of the previous dispatch.

32. See the explanation of the delay and the decision about using the Riga post as explained in the Tsar's dispatch to Nefimov of November 3, 1696, FDS, vol. 8, col. 370.

33. For this material on the residency in Poland, I am relying primarily on S. M. Solov'ev, Istoriia Rossii s drevneishikh vremen, vol. 6, M., 1961, pp. 504 et seq.

34. Quoted in ibid., p. 514.

35. It is worth noting that the postal route from Moscow via Smolensk to Vilno, which the Muscovite government opened in 1669, shut down with the removal of the resident in 1676, due to lack of business, and reopened with fits and starts only late in 1685. Of the two postal routes used by Muscovy for obtaining news from the West, the one through Poland was that most consistently plagued with delays. For details see my next chapter.

.....
add to n. 33 above: There were other foreign residents in Moscow beginning with the Swedish one in 1631. Partly because their main function seems to have been less diplomatic and more commercial, I have chosen to discuss them in the next chapter along with the other foreigners in Moscow who supplied news.
.....

36. For example, we have no responses to the instructions on gathering information issued to Simeon Ivanovich Stipishin in 1495, Ivan Grigor'evich Mamonov in 1499, and Iakov Zakhar'ich in 1501; see SRIO, vol. 35, pp. 176, 276, 326-327. For one of the seventeenth-century missions (in 1677), we have no stateinvi spisok (perhaps it was lost?) and merely an oral report to the Diplomatic Chancellery. See FDS, vol. V, beginning on col. 1230.

37. The earliest ones that have been published are attached to the reports of Ivan Kuritsyn (1524), Vasilii Morozov (1542), Vasilii Iur'ev (1554), all of whom were ambassadors to Lithuania-Poland; see SRIO, vol. 35, pp. 691, vol. 59, pp. 202-203, 434-435. Note, however, the dispatches in 1492 of Iurii Traikhaniot (cited above in n. 23), which contain extensive news reports, and the report of Nikita Moklokov on his return from Lithuania in February 1504, regarding the information he was to learn from Ivan III's daughter Elena (the Grand Duchess of Lithuania) regarding eligible princesses who might marry her brother, the future Vasilii III (SRIO, vol. 35, pp. 452-453.).

38. Every dispatch of Nefimov's in 1696-1697 from Vienna contained news, frequently in the form of printed newspapers and pamphlets. See the material in PDS, vols. VII and VIII, passim.

39. There is evidence that in many cases the final report was completed as soon as the mission had crossed the border back into Muscovy. See...

For some interesting observations on the process by which the ambassadorial report was compiled, see S. O. Schmidt, ...

40. For the early type of news reports, see that of Ivan Kuritsyn (1524) (SRIO, vol. 35, p. 691) and that of Vasilii Grigor'evich Morozov (1542) (SRIO, vol. 59, pp. 202-203). Pisemskii's report cited below is another good example. The "zapiska vestovaia" at the end of the report submitted by Grigorii Bogdanov on returning from Vienna in 1656 is a good example of the second type, in which he names several informants and keeps each of their accounts separate. Attached at the end of this report are translations from Latin newsheets which he had acquired. See PDS, vol. III, cols. 650-672.

41. SRIO, vol. 38, pp. 63-64.

42. This particular example is in a dispatch sent by the ambassador to Lithuania-Poland, Mikhail Iakovlevich Morozov, via a courier in November 1549 published in SRIO, vol. 59, pp. 330-331. The items at the end of the passage

quoted are obviously stereotyped answers to the stereotyped questions:

instruction to Morozov
(SRIO, vol. 59, p. 320)

news in dispatch sent with Fedor
Bezobrazov (ibid., p. 330)

kak nynе korol' s krymskim i s turetskim i s voloshskim i s ugorskim, i kak s Nemtsy s Livonskimi i s Sveiskimi, i s Prusskimi, i s Ferdinardom, cheshskim korolem, i chto u nikh slukh, kak turetskoi s ugorskim...

A krymskogo tsaria posol v Litve... A s turskim saltanom... Zhigimont Avgust ne zamiren... A s tsesarem i s koroli s ugorskim i s chashskim s Nemtsy korol miren, i posly ikh, skazyvalut, na sem lete u korolia byli. A turskoi saltan s tsesarem i s koroli s ugorskim i s cheshskim v peremire, a voiuettsa s Kizylbashem. A s voloshskim korol' v niru...

43. Novosil'tsev's report has been published in Puteshestvia russkikh poslov, pp. 63-99.

44. Ibid., pp. 80-81.

45. See Samuel C. Chew, The Crescent and the Rose: Islam and England during the Renaissance, New York: Octagon Books, 1974, pp. 497-503.

46. Istoma Shevargin made some rather precise observations on churches in Rome in 1531--describing decoration, services, and relics in them. See his report in PDS, vol. X, cols. 23-26. Petr Potemkin's guided tour of Imperial delights in Vienna in 1674 included the royal treasure chamber and zoo, both of which he describes at some length (PDS, vol. IV, cols. 1241-1244); during his excursion he was treated as well to what seems to be a typical tourist-guide's account regarding the Turkish siege of the city in 1529 (ibid., col. 1244). The zoo seems to have been one of the standard attractions; see the report from the Grand Embassy of 1697-1698, PDS, vol. IX, col. 72. For a variety of other such descriptive passages, see PDS, vol. I, col. 876, vol. V, cols. 63-66; vol. VIII, cols., 815-818, 921, 926, vol. X, cols. 589-590, 731-732.

47. The most noteworthy exceptions are in letters received by foreign merchants in Muscovy and turned over to the Tsar's officials because of the news they contained. A good portion of that news might deal with the merchants' commercial interests. For some examples, see a number of letters

received from English merchants in the 1530's and 1590's, in SRIO, vol. 33, pp. 227-231, 234- , 415-417, 436-440. For more on merchants as sources of news, see the next chapter.

48. The most extensive example is in the documentation of the mission by Nikolai Spafarii-Milescu, which left Moscow in 1675 and returned two years later after the death of Aleksei Mikhailovich. His instructions are contained in Russko-kitaiskie otnosheniia v XVII veke, vol. I, M., 1969, pp. 335-346; his report follows on pp. 346-458. For an analysis of the information obtained by the ambassadors to China, see D. M. Lebedev, Geografiia v Rossii XVIII veka, M.-L., 1946, pp. 106-164.