

МОСТОСТРОИТЕЛИ

**История нидерландистики
в России и русистики
в Нидерландах**

BRUGGENBOUWERS

**Russische neerlandistiek en
Nederlandse russistiek
in historisch perspectief**



САНКТ-ПЕТЕРБУРГ
НАУКА
2026

Ответственный редактор

Е. Д. Векшина

Редакторы:

Я. Граве, Э. Метц, И. М. Михайлова, О. Б. Овечкина

Мостостроители: История нидерландистики в России и русистики в Нидерландах. — СПб.: Наука, 2026. — 223 с.

ISBN 978-5-02-041439-6

В сборнике представлены материалы конференции «Мостостроители: История нидерландистики в России и русистики в Нидерландах» (Санкт-Петербург, Амстердам, 4—5 июня и 29—30 октября 2021 г.). Доклады, включенные в издание, охватывают широкий спектр актуальных вопросов, связанных с историей славистики и нидерландистики, лексикографией, языкознанием и переводоведением. В них представлены результаты исследований ведущих ученых, аспирантов и специалистов в этих областях.

Сборник адресован исследователям, преподавателям, студентам, а также всем, кто интересуется историческими, культурологическими и лингвистическими аспектами российско-нидерландских научных и культурных связей.

Bruggenbouwers: Russische neerlandistiek en Nederlandse russistiek in historisch perspectief. — SPb.: Nauka, 2026. — 223 p.

ISBN 978-5-02-041439-6

Deze bundel bevat de bijdragen van de conferentie *Bruggenbouwers: Russische neerlandistiek en Nederlandse russistiek in historisch perspectief* (Sint-Petersburg, Amsterdam, 4—5 juni en 29—30 oktober 2021). De opgenomen bijdragen behandelen een breed scala aan relevante vraagstukken met betrekking tot de geschiedenis van de slavistiek en neerlandistiek, lexicografie, taalkunde en vertaalwetenschap. De artikelen presenteren de resultaten van onderzoek verricht door vooraanstaande wetenschappers, promovendi en specialisten op deze gebieden. Deze uitgave is gericht op onderzoekers, docenten, studenten en allen die geïnteresseerd zijn in de historische, culturele en linguïstische aspecten van de wetenschappelijke en culturele relaties tussen Rusland en Nederland.

© Редакционно-издательское оформление.
ФГБУ «Издательство «Наука», 2026
© Голландский институт в Санкт-Петербурге, 2026

ISBN 978-5-02-041439-6

VOORWOORD

Bruggenbouwers. Onder deze naam vonden in 2021 twee congressen plaats: op 4 en 5 juni in Sint-Petersburg in het Nederlands consulaat-generaal en de Hermitage Amsterdam (inmiddels H'Art); op 29 en 30 oktober in het Nederlands Instituut in Sint-Petersburg (NIP) en de Universiteit van Amsterdam.

De term heeft betrekking op alle mensen die bij de twee congressen 'Bruggenbouwers: Russische neerlandistiek en Nederlandse russistiek in historisch perspectief' betrokken waren. Het betreft de organisatoren in Amsterdam en Sint-Petersburg, de mensen die tijdens de congressen lezingen hebben gegeven, de gespreksleiders, de vertalers, het publiek, de auteurs van de artikelen in deze bundel (vak-historici, lexicografen, taalkundigen en vertaalwetenschappers), de samenstellers van de bundel en de redacteurs van de uitgeverij.

Een brug is nodig, aldus het *Woordenboek der Nederlandse Taal* (*WNT*), 'om twee door een water of ook door eene droge aardverdieping (kloof of diepte) van elkander gescheiden punten te verbinden [...]'. Verder vermeldt het *WNT* dat ook mensen een brug kunnen vormen, 'personen, die dienen als middel om iets te bereiken, een overgang tot iets gemakkelijk te maken'. Vaak zijn die bemiddelaars of bruggenbouwers vertalers, schrijvers, docenten in het vreemde talenonderwijs, wetenschappers aan hogescholen en universiteiten, journalisten, migranten en reizigers. Zo'n brug is nodig om communicatie tussen vertegenwoordigers van verschillende culturen en landen mogelijk te maken maar het is geen uitzondering dat een brug wordt opgehaald en mensen de toegang tot de overzijde wordt ontzegd of dat zij zelf besluiten — of anderen voor hen besluiten — dat zij met die andere kant niets meer te maken willen of mogen hebben. Wie de geschiedenis van de uitwisseling tussen Rusland en het Nederlandse taalgebied kent, weet dat de wetenschappelijke en culturele uitwisseling tussen beide landen nooit vanzelfsprekend is geweest, eerder stroef. Wat bemiddelaars opbouwen, breken machthebbers en regeringen op gezette tijden af.

Jos Schaeken and Emma de Klerk

Leiden University

IL'IA KOPIEVSKIJ NOMENCLATOR OF 1700: NOTES ON THE FIRST DUTCH-RUSSIAN DICTIONARY

In this article we are going to study the first Dutch-Russian dictionary (so called *Nomenklator na latinskom, russkom i gollandskom iazyke*) which was written by Il'ia Kopievskij in 1700. We will focus on the quality of the nomenclator compared to a very similar version that was published the same year, but now with a list of words in German rather than Dutch (*Nomenklator na latinskom, russkom i nemetskom iazyke*). It turns out that the Dutch nomenclator is an updated version of the German nomenclator. The translation of the German word list into Dutch gave Kopievskij the opportunity to scrutinize the text on different levels: misprints (including word stress) were repaired; doublets or near-equivalents were eliminated; Slavonic words of western/Polish/Ruthenian provenance were omitted or replaced; the same holds for obsolete or formal (Church Slavonic) lexemes; other translations of Dutch words were added, partly to clarify the intended meaning. However, this was not done systematically, and other mistakes and misunderstandings crept into the text. But in general it can be argued that the Dutch nomenclator was a modest attempt to improve on the German version. As for the high quality of the Dutch translation, it can be assumed that Kopievskij was assisted by a native speaker.

Keywords: Kopievskii, Kopievskij, Dutch-Russian dictionary, Dutch nomenclator, German nomenclator.

INTRODUCTION

As is well known, Peter the Great (1672—1725) took a great interest in many aspects of Dutch culture and society, ranging from shipbuilding, military affairs, book printing, to the Dutch language. On the first of October 1707, Peter wrote to Prince Aleksei Grigor'evich Dolgorukov that one should not only learn everything about navigation, but also about the Dutch language as much as possible: 'Языку Галанского такожь по возможности учитьца' [PiB, 1912, p. 119]. Ten years earlier, during the Great Embassy when he visited the Netherlands for the first time (1697—1698), Tsar Peter even jot-

ted down a few very short Dutch-Russian word lists, including the names of various ships and some colloquial phrases, e. g., *Что это по галански — ватысь дать отъ голансъ* (Dutch: 'wat is dat op Hollands?') 'what is that in Dutch?', *Поддай сюды — эвъ гурь* ('geef hier') 'give here', *Будеть — дат саль зеинъ* ('dat zal zijn') 'that will be' [PiB, 1887, p. 229—230, 680].¹

In this paper, we will discuss a much longer Dutch-Russian word list, viz. the *Nomenklator na latinskom, russkom i gollandskom iazyke*,² which was published in 1700 by Jan Thesingh in Amsterdam.³ It can be considered the first dictionary with Russian words translated into Dutch [Croiset van der Kop, 1913, p. 28; Baar, 1973, p. 23].⁴ In the same year, a very similar version of this particular nomenclator was published, also by Thesingh in Amsterdam, but now with a German instead of Dutch word list: *Nomenklator na latinskom, russkom i nemetskom iazyke*. The 'Russian' part of both versions of the nomenclator was 'actually a quite alien Slavonic', as Cracraft rightfully puts it [Cracraft, 2004, p. 290]. Henceforth we will refer to the two versions as the 'Dutch nomenclator' and the 'German nomenclator', respectively, and to the 'Russian' part as 'Slavonic' (sometimes also referred to as Slavo-Russian or Russo-Slavonic; Славяно-русский).

The Dutch nomenclator of 1700 was never reprinted. According to Bykova and Gurevich (1958: 285), the German nomenclator was republished in St. Petersburg in 1718 and 1720 (retitled as *Vokabuly ili rechi na slavenskom, nemetskom i latinskom iazykakh*). To this we may add the edition of 1732, now under the title *Lateinisch-Rußisch und Teutsches Vocabularium. Latino-rossiiskaia i nemetskaia slovesnaia kniga* [Croiset van der Kop, 1913, p. 129; Cracraft, 2004, p. 290, 544].⁵

¹ On the interpretation of Peter's short Dutch-Russian word lists [Van der Meulen, 1913, p. 131—133; Iakimovich, 1985, p. 39—40].

² Although the book does not have a title page, it is usually known and catalogued under this name.

³ On Thesingh (also spelled Thessingh, Thessing, Thesing, Tessing, Tesing), see: [Rapschinsky, 1935, p. 15—16; Driessen, 1989, p. 91—94; 1996, p. 105—107; Moser, 2020, p. 69—73].

⁴ However, see now Levičkin's recent research on a peculiar fragment of a Dutch-Russian glossary, which may have been compiled as early as the beginning of the seventeenth century [Levičkin, 2017] and http://www.oldlexicons.ru/otryvok_rus_holl_text.

⁵ For bibliographical references, see <http://oldlexicons.ru/kopievsky>. In addition, the Slavonic and Latin text of the nomenclator was for the most part incorporated in Polikarpov-Orlov's trilingual (Slavonic-Greek-Latin) glossary *Kratkoe sobranie imen, po glaviznam raspolozhennoe tremi dialektami, v polzu*

The Dutch and German nomenclators of 1700 are nowadays easily accessible on the website <http://www.oldlexicons.ru/nomenklator>.⁶ We will focus on the Dutch nomenclator and will examine the quality of the word lists (Latin, Slavonic and Dutch) in relation to the German nomenclator (Section 3). But first we will discuss the contents, authorship and source of both nomenclators (Section 2). Our general goal is to bring together two strands of research in this field, namely research conducted by Dutch and by Slavic (Russian and Polish) scholars. Both groups of scholars seem to be hardly aware of the results of their investigations, which is apparently due to the language barrier.

CONTENTS, AUTHORSHIP AND SOURCE

Nomenclators are topical glossaries which came into use in the sixteenth century during the period of Renaissance Humanism. The classical languages, Greek and/or Latin, formed the basis of the glossary, along with one or more vernaculars. Vocabulary is not arranged alphabetically as we know nowadays, but organized in a strict thematic manner, usually starting with words related to God. See [Hüllen, 1999, p. 346—360]. Our nomenclators each comprise 128 pages and approximately 2,000 entries, which are arranged in 48 chapters (numbered in Roman letters). For an overview, see the Appendix below. The last two chapters give word lists of adjectives (chapter 47) and verbs (chapter 48, not numbered in the publications of 1700), which are presented in the first-person singular, divided into four conjugation paradigms. On the final page of both nomenclators we find the monogram ITS, which represents the name of the publisher, Jan Thesingh.

The author of our nomenclators must have been Il'ia Kopievskij (Elias Kopiewitz, ca. 1651—1714), of whom little is known [Rapschinsky, 1935, p. 25—27; Berkov, 1958, p. 14—15; Bykova, 1958, p. 318—320; Nowak, 1968—69; Đurovič and Sjöberg, 1987, p. 257—258; Myl'nikov, 2000, p. 126—127; Cracraft, 2004, p. 264—265; Moser, 2020, p. 66—76]. As a native of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, Kopievskij was a Belarusian from Poland, who converted to Calvi-

khotiashchym vedeti svoistvo ellinogrecheskago i latinskogo dialekta, which is part of his *Bukvar' slavenskimi, grecheskimi, rimskimi pismeny* (1701) [Pekarskij, 1862 I, p. 190; Markov and Eselevič, 1957; Alekseev, 1968, p. 91, fn. 62; Berezina, 1980, p. 6, fn. 2].

⁶ Note that the website (last consulted on 10 September 2021) contains a beta-version of the word lists and is still in need of several corrections.

nism and who knew Latin, Polish, Russian, Dutch and 'to a certain degree' [Bykova, 1958, p. 320] also German. He must have lived in the Netherlands already before Tsar Peter visited Amsterdam in 1698, when he commissioned him to compile and translate books which would be printed by Jan Thesingh. The collaboration was short-lived because after an argument with Thesingh, Kopievskij started his own press in Amsterdam in 1700. Already in 1699, he reported to Tsar Peter that within seventeen months he had managed to publish four books, and that thirteen books were to be printed and another four in preparation. The list totaling 21 books has come down to us in three different sources: in a bilingual Latin-Slavonic document from 1699, which is now kept at RGADA [Bykova, 1958, p. 324, *infra*]; in Slavonic at the end of Kopievskij's *Latina grammatica in usum scholarum celeberrimae gentis sclavonico-rosseanae adornata* of 1700; and in a slightly extended version (25 titles) in Latin at the end of his *Rukovedenie v grammatiku. Manuductio in grammaticam* of 1706. In the 1699 list we find the title *Nomenclator trium lingvarum, Latine, Russicè & Germanicè / Номенкляторъ на латинскомъ, рускомъ и немѣцкомъ* [sic] *языкъ*. Our Dutch nomenclator is not mentioned in the lists, but in view of its close resemblance to the German version, Bykova and Gurevich surmise that Kopievskij was the compiler of both nomenclators and that he considered them both as one publication: 'Очевидно, [Копиевский] считал оба «Номенклатора» одним и тем же изданием' [Bykova, 1958, p. 286].

Kuznetsova [Kuznetsova, 2009a, p. 322–324; 2009b, 2013, p. 51] as well as Vlasov and Moskovkin [Vlasov, Moskovkin, 2009, p. 82] have established (independently?) that the source of our nomenclators must have been a Latin-German-Polish nomenclator, which was published for the first time in 1591 by Petrus Artomius (Piotr Artomiusz Krzesichleb): *Nomenclator, selectissimas rerum appellationes tribus linguis, Latina, Germanica, Polonica, explicatas indicans*. This Polish source makes sense considering Kopievskij's provenance. Artomius' work is also not original; its structure closely resembles an older Latin-German nomenclator, first published in 1572, viz. *Nomenclatura in usum scholae Gorlicensis* by Johann Byber [Hüllen, 1999, p. 310–311; Jones, 2000, p. 64–65].

Artomius' nomenclator was republished seven times until 1684 (Kuznetsova, and Vlasov and Moskovkin), or even eight times until 1698 [Stankiewicz, 1984, p. 47]. Kuznetsova assumes — without providing evidence — that one of the later editions, presumably the one from 1684, might have been the direct source of our nomenclators [Kuznetsova, 2013, p. 51]. The 1684 edition is extremely rare and not

available online,⁷ where we only find the editions of 1591, 1603, 1638, and 1643. In all online editions we encounter the same structure and composition, which only slightly differs from our Dutch and German nomenclators. First, Artomius' nomenclator has two extra chapters, viz. *De mensuris et ponderibus* 'of measures and weights' (chapter 47) and *De numeris* 'of numbers' (48). Second, Kopievskij moved Artomius' chapter 24 (*Nomina civitatum* 'names of cities') to the end of his nomenclator (46). And third, he simplified the name of chapter 14 (Artomius: *De arboribus et fructicibus* 'of trees and plants') as *De arboribus*.

Regarding the Slavonic part of our nomenclators, several scholars have already written on the strong Polish and Belarusian (or more broadly: Ruthenian) influences, most notably Markov and Eselevič (1957) and Fałowski (2013a, b; 2015a, b); see also Croiset van der Kop [Croiset van der Kop, 1913, p. 30], who already pointed out some obvious Polish influences, especially in chapter 24. This does not come as a surprise considering the Polish source of our nomenclators and Kopievskij's provenance.

In view of the close resemblance of the Dutch and German nomenclators, Bykova and Gurevich [Gurevich, 1958, p. 286] and Driessen [Driessen, 1989, p. 93] surmise that they were printed at the same time. Without adducing evidence, Croiset van der Kop [Croiset van der Kop, 1913, p. 27] claims that the Dutch version was printed first and the German later. However, the chronology must have been in reversed order: if you look at the catchword under the right-hand side of the last line of each page, which repeats the first word on the following page (also called *custos*), you see that the Dutch nomenclator follows this practice based on the German version, even when the Dutch word on the next page is different. For instance, page 11 shows the catchword *Hornus*, which indeed is the first word of page 12 in the German nomenclator. The Dutch version also has *Hornus* on page 11, but *Præsentis Anni* on the next page. This is also the case on page 77 (*Pix*, with the same word on page 78 in the German nomenclator, but *Linter Alveus* in the Dutch version) and page 109 (*Pe-* = *Pera* in the German version, but *Pe-* is followed by *Loculus* in the Dutch edition). The catchword *Ju-* on page 100, followed by *Comes* on page 101, in the Dutch nomenclator is a bit more complicated; it seems to be *Ju-* = *Judex* on page 98 of the German version. It is logical to conclude that the general layout of the German nomenclator was

⁷ A copy is available at the Herzog August Bibliothek in Wolfenbüttel (Sign. M: Kb 75).

used for the Dutch edition and that the printer overlooked to adapt the catchwords in those cases where the page layout or word order was changed.

THE DUTCH NOMENCLATOR

Our observation on the chronology of the Dutch and German nomenclator is supported by Kuznetsova [Kuznetsova, 2009b, p. 87–90; 2013, p. 51], who points out that the Dutch version shows a number of editorial changes in comparison to the German nomenclator.

First, Kuznetsova mentions fourteen entries from the German nomenclator, which were not included in the Dutch version [Kuznetsova, 2009b, p. 88]. The entry *Vectis* ‘pole, lever’ (21/78)⁸ is erroneously listed: it does appear in the Dutch text, viz. *Vectis* — *шестъ*, *жердь* — *Hantspaak*. In the German nomenclator we find *Vectis* — *рычагъ* — *Hebebaum*. However, the preceding word in the German text is missing in Dutch: *Pertica* — *шестъ*, *жердь* — *Rickstangen* ‘pole’ (21/78). Perhaps the subtle distinction between *Vectis* and *Pertica* was considered too complicated: in the Dutch text *Vectis* was combined with *шестъ*, *жердь*, and *Pertica* simply left out.

To Kuznetsova’s list of omitted words in the Dutch nomenclator we can also add *Malum* ‘apple’ (15/65), *Pix* ‘pitch, tar’ (21/78), and *Multra*, *Multrale Multrum* ‘milk pail’ (21/78). In some of these cases, there may be further *ad hoc* reasons why words were omitted. For instance, on page 65 the Slavonic word for ‘apple’ is listed twice in the German text: *Poma* — *яблыка* — *Obst* and *Malum* — *яблека* — *Apffel*. Apparently, in the Dutch text the choice was made to keep only one of the two options, namely *Poma* (glossed as *Appel* ‘apple’). Also, *Pix* is listed twice in the German text, on pages 68 (*Pix* — *деготъ* — *Pech*) and 78 (*Pix* — *смола* — *Pech*); Dutch only has the entry on page 68, with a different Slavonic word: *варъ* (*деготъ* is the translation of *Axungia* — *Wagensmeer* ‘car grease’ 21/77, where the German version has *къ мазанію оси*; cf. [Kuznetsova, 2009b, p. 90], who refers to the same phrase in the Polish source). Similarly, *Cibus Cibarium* — *браино* — *Speise* ‘food’ (8/44) may have been omitted in the Dutch nomenclator because of its close resemblance with the following word *пища* ‘food’; possibly, *пища* was considered more colloquial and *браино* more formal (Church Slavonic). The same holds for the omitted entry *Cella apum favus*

‘honeycomb’ (12/59), which is close to the next word *favus* (12/60). *Pera* ‘big bag’ (39/110) may have been left out because of the dialectal (western/Ruthenian) provenance of the translation: *морба* — *Breite Tassche* (cf. [Fałowski, 2013b, p. 108]). Furthermore, several omitted words may have been overseen because they appear as the first or last word of a page or chapter: *Musculus* ‘armpit, mouse’ (6/37), *Multra*, *Multrale Multrum* ‘milk pail’ (21/78), *Saltarius* ‘forester’ (33/102). But in some cases, we simply do not know the reason for omitting words: why was *Nissus* — *нисса рѣка* — *die Neisse* ‘Neisse river’ (4/21) left out, but *Spera* — *спира рѣка* — *die Spreu* (German) / *de Spreu* (Dutch) ‘Spree river’ (4/21) retained?

A few words in the Dutch nomenclator lack a translation into Dutch: *Tuffis* — *кашель* (German: *der Husten*) ‘cough’ (7/40), *Lagopus* — *стринадка* (*Goldammer*) ‘yellowhammer (bird)’ (11/58), *Merula* — *косъ* (*Amsel*) ‘blackbird’ (11/58), *Sepes Sepimentum* — *плетень* (*Zaun*) ‘fence’ (20/74), *Falx messeris* — *сѣръ* (*Sichel*) ‘sickle’ (21/76). In the case of *Tuffis* and *Falx messeris* the translation was perhaps left out because the following word has a very similar meaning: *Tuffis* is followed by *Asthma* — *дыхавица* — *Kuchen* ‘cough’ and *Falx messeris* is followed by *Falx saenaria* — *сѣнная коса* — *Seys* ‘scythe’. The two ornithological terms were perhaps too difficult to translate, especially *Lagopus*, which would have been *geelgors* in Dutch. Also note that Fałowski classifies *стринадка* and *косъ* as Polonisms/Ruthenisms [Fałowski, 2013b, p. 110, 115].

Second, Kuznetsova draws attention to the fact that the Slavonic part of the Dutch nomenclator differs quite often from the German version [Kuznetsova, 2009b, p. 88–90]. Sometimes the changes can be regarded as corrections, e.g. Dutch *возъ телѣга* instead of German *возъ телега* ‘car, carriage’ (21/77); *отчына, отчизна отечество* instead of *отчына, отчизна отечества* ‘homeland’ (22/79); *главныи градъ столныи* instead of *главыи градъ столныи* ‘capital’ (22/79); *пѣсочные часы* instead of *пѣсочные часы* ‘hourglass’ (22/81); *персійская, земля* instead of *персійская, земая* ‘Persia’ (23/82); *франкфортъ* instead of *фракфортъ* (46/119); *магдебургъ* instead of *магдебуръ* ‘Magdeburg’ (46/119). Also, in some twenty instances the corrections concern word stress, e.g., Dutch *имбѣрь* instead of German *имберъ* (no word stress indicated) ‘ginger’ (19/73), *садъ яблечныи* instead of *садъ яблѣчныи* ‘orchard’ (20/74), *карѣта* instead of *карета* ‘carriage, coach’ (21/77), *дѣнги* instead of *денги* ‘money’ (45/117). However, we also find a number of clear mistakes, such as *каменная стѣна* ‘brick wall’ (24/85) and *лавка* *книжная* ‘bookshop’ (30/96).

⁸ The first number refers to chapter numbers, the second one (after the forward slash) to page numbers.

In other cases, we seem to be dealing with additional equivalents of the Slavonic words and phrases in the Dutch nomenclator in comparison with the German nomenclator. For instance, *лосось* in the German version is supplemented by *семга* 'salmon' (13/63); *линь* by *угры* 'eel' (13/63); *менюокъ* by *налымъ* 'burbot' (13/63). In these instances, Kuznetsova suspects that the supplemented words look like an attempt to 'overcome' the Polish norm [Kuznetsova, 2009b, p. 89]. This might also apply to *грышпанъ* (cf. Fałowski, 2013a: 66, who refers to Polish *grynszpan*), which was complemented by *яръ* 'verdigris' (44/116). Some other examples: *платъ котиранію поту* is supplemented by *утиралник* 'cloth for wiping off perspiration, dishcloth, towel' (29/94); *басна* by *прича* (and *басна* is corrected in *басня*) 'fable, parable' (30/96); *епископъ* by *владыка* 'bishop' (31/98); *шерсть* by *пухъ* 'wool' (38/108); *мушкетъ* by *пишадъ* (which should be read as *пицаль/пишаль*) 'musket' (41/113).

On the other hand, we also find cases where Slavonic equivalents in the German nomenclator have been eliminated in the Dutch version: cf. *зимно* in German *студено, холодно, зимно* 'cold' (2/7); *рокъ* in *лѣто, годъ, рокъ* 'year' (3/11); *года* in *полтора лѣта, года* 'a year and a half' (3/11); *лоньскіи* in *лоньскіи сеголѣтныи* 'this year' (3/12); *сучец* in *зеленая вѣтѣ сучец* 'green branch' (17/69), *подьяы* (i. e. *подьячий*) in *писецъ, подьяы* 'scribe' (30/96), *литеръ* in *слогъ литеръ* 'syllable' (30/96). In the case of *зимно, рокъ* and *литеръ* we are probably dealing with western/Polish/Ruthenian words (cf. [Fałowski, 2013b, p. 106—108]); *лоньскіи* and *подьяы* may have been considered too formal (Church Slavonic).

A last category within the Slavonic word list concerns the replacement of words in the Dutch nomenclator, most importantly: *жерело* in the German nomenclator is replaced by *воденои ключъ* 'water source, spring' (4/20); *журавей* by *крыница* 'cistern' (4/20); *чермныи* by *красныя* 'red hair/head' (6/29); *ланиа* by *щока* 'cheek' (6/31); *уста* by *усъ* 'jaw, cheek; mustache' (6/31); *устнѣ* by *губа* 'lip' (6/31); *толсто усы* by *толсто губыи* 'with big lips' (6/31); *домовитъ, хозяин* by *домовыи, хозяин* (8/45); *бѣлка, сибирка* by *бѣлка* (with the correct inclusion of -л-), *вѣкса* (i. e. *вѣкша*; see [Fasmer, 1986—87] s.v.) 'squirrel' (10/55); *деготъ* by *варъ* (17/68; see above); *къ мазанію оси* by *деготъ* (21/77; see above); *стѣна скирпичу* by *каменная стѣна* 'brick wall' (24/85 — cf. the preceding entry where *каменная стѣны* was replaced by *стѣна* 'wall'). Again, in a number of cases it seems that formal (Church Slavonic) and/or dialectal/obsolete were replaced by equivalents that were

considered more 'Russian': *чермныи* (cf. [Fasmer, 1986—87] s. v.), *ланиа* (cf. *ibid.*, s. v.), *устнѣ* (cf. [Sreznevskij, 1893—1903], s. v. *устна*), *уста* 'mouth, also lips' (cf. *ibid.*, s. v.), *домовитъ* (cf. [SRJa, XI—XVII], s. v.).⁹ The word *жерело* may have been substituted because of its Ruthenian provenance [Fałowski, 2013b, p. 112; 2015b, p. 112], but note that both German *журавей* and the Dutch substitute *крыница* fall in the same category (cf. *ibid.*, p. 113). The Slavonic/Dutch translations of *Murus* and *Paries lateritius* in 24/85 (*стѣна* — *Muur* and *каменная стѣна* — *Steene muur*) seem to be more appropriate than the Slavonic/German translations (*каменная стѣны* — *Mauer* and *стѣна скирпичу* — *Ziegelwand*).

Third, with regard to the order of the entries, the Dutch nomenclator usually runs parallel with the German one. There are very few deviations, such as in chapter 34 (cf. [Kuznetsova, 2009a, p. 88]), where the entries *Cosmographus* 'cosmographer', *Mulomedicus Veterinarius* 'horse doctor' and *Hariolus, Divinus* 'fortune teller' have been moved from the middle to the end of the chapter (34/103 as opposed to 34/102 in the German text). In chapter 11 the Latin word order *Noctua Ulula* (*сова* — *Nacht Eule, Huhu*) and *Bubo* (*пугачъ* — <die> *Eule, Schu* <h>u) (11/58) in the German text has been reversed, but not the Slavonic translation: first we have *Bubo* — *сова* — *Uyl* 'owl' in the Dutch version, then *Noctua Ulula* — *пугачъ* — *Nacht Uyl* 'lit. night owl'.

Finally, when we look at the Dutch translations, we can observe that the overall quality is high¹⁰ and that they usually follow the German translations. The typesetter even seems to have taken the layout of the entries in the German nomenclator as a template for the Dutch version. This explains why Dutch entries can have an extra empty line, which in the German version is filled with the final part of the translation. The first time this happens is on page 4, where *Luna corniculata, vel falcata* is translated in Dutch as '*t Eerste quartier* (one line) 'the first quarter (of the moon)' and in German as *Spitziger Mond wenn er nicht halb voll ist* (three lines) 'lit. pointed moon when it is not half full' (cf. the Slavonic text *рогатыи мѣсѣцъ* или

⁹ Note the superfluous comma between *домовыи* and *хозяин* in the Dutch version: *домовыи хозяин* literally means 'house master', which equals the Dutch translation *Meester des Huys*.

¹⁰ Croiset van der Kop [Croiset van der Kop, 1913, p. 31] observes that *Drumpel* 'threshold, doorstep' (24/86) and *Boškruyt* 'gunpowder' (41/113) reveal dialectal influence (cf. standard Dutch *drempel/dorpel* and *buskruit*, respectively).

сѣрном).¹¹ This example also shows that the Dutch translation does not always run parallel with the German. It can be shorter, such as *Twee Weeken* 'two weeks' (3/13) instead of German *Zwo Wochen oder vier zehen Tagen* 'two weeks or fourteen days' for *двѣ недѣли*, or longer like in the case of *Jaarmarkt of Kermis* 'year market or fair' (22/80) instead of German *Jahrmарсkt* 'year market' for *ярма<р>ка*. Sometimes the Dutch translation is clearer than the German, e. g., *Kind dat na zyn Vaders dood ter werelt komt* 'child born after the father's death' (6/26) instead of German *Kind das nach des Vaters Tode jung wird* 'child who becomes young after the father's death' for *дитя родившееся посм<е>рти о<т>ца*. In 9/50 the Dutch translation *Alicantse wyn* is clearly based on the Slavonic *вино алакантъ* 'wine from Alicante', whereas German *dicker rother Wein* 'thick red wine' comes close to Latin *Vinum atrum*.

We can also find a small number of mistakes in the Dutch translations, some more obvious than others. Among the obvious flaws, we find in 2/3 *Novem orbes cœlestes* — *девять круговъ н<е>б<е>сныхъ* the wrong translation *den nieuwe Hemel* 'the new Heaven' instead of German *die neun Himmel* 'the nine Heavens'; the close resemblance of German *neu(e)n* 'new' and *neun* 'nine' was probably the cause of the Dutch misinterpretation *nieuwe* 'new' instead of *negen* 'nine'. In 5/24 *чeskія горы* 'Sudetes' is very loosely translated as *Bosachtig Gebergte* 'forest mountains' instead of the more correct German translation *das Boemische Gebirge* 'the Bohemian mountains'; perhaps *Boemische* was misunderstood as German *Baum*, Dutch *boom* 'tree'. Similarly, the translation of *лѣсными дубъ* as *Eiken Haagh* (14/64) suggests the incorrect interpretation of 'oak hedge', which was probably due to the similarity of *Haagh* with German *Hag* in *Hag Eiche* 'forest oak'. In 15/66 the Dutch translations of *всякія грибы* 'all sorts of mushrooms' as *Duyvels broot* 'brittle gills' and the following *рыжки* 'brittle gills' as *Paddestoelen* 'mushrooms' should clearly be the other way around (cf. the correct German translations).

¹¹ Sometimes the differences in the Russian translation influenced the layout of the Dutch nomenclator. As mentioned above, *зимно* was eliminated in *студено, холодно, зимно* 'cold' (2/7); this left an empty line below the entry, although the accent mark on *зимно* (viz. *зімно*) remained and is still visible in the edition.

CONCLUSION

Kuznetsova's investigations and our own observations can substantiate the hypothesis that the Dutch nomenclator is an updated version of the German nomenclator and that it is too simple to say that they were one and the same publication. The translation of the German word list into Dutch gave Kopievskij the opportunity to scrutinize the text on different levels: misprints (including word stress) were repaired; doublets or near-equivalents were eliminated; Slavonic words of western/Polish/Ruthenian provenance were omitted or replaced; the same holds for obsolete or formal (Church Slavonic) lexemes; other Slavonic words were added, partly to clarify the intended meaning. However, this was not done systematically at all and other mistakes and misunderstandings crept into the text. But in general, it is justified to claim that the Dutch nomenclator was a modest attempt to improve the German version. As for the high quality of the Dutch translation, we may suspect that Kopievskij was assisted by a native speaker, perhaps his business partner Jan Thesingh.

REFERENCES

- Alekseev M.P., *Slovari inostrannykh iazykov v russkom azbukovnike XVII veka*. Leningrad: Nauka, 1968. 156 p.
- Artomius P., *Nomenclator, selectissimas rerum appellationes tribus linguis, Latina, Germanica, Polonica, explicatas indicans*. Toruń: ex officina typographica Andreae Cotenij, 1591. 216 p.
- Baar A.H. van den, *An Early Eighteenth Century Russian Dictionary* (Vilima Šěvela Iskustvo Nederlandskago Jazyka). *Dutch contributions to the seventh International Congress of Slavists, Warsaw, August 21—27* / Ed. A.G.F. van Holk. Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 1973. P. 19—32.
- Berezina O.E., *Dva tematicheskikh leksikona nachala XVIII v. (sravnitel'naia kharakteristika)*. *Slovari i slovarnoe delo v Rossii XVIII v.* / Eds L.L. Kutina and E.E. Birzhakova. Leningrad: Nauka, 1980. P. 6—22.
- Berkov P.N., *Russkaia kniga kirillovskoi pečati kontza XVII — pervoi četverti XVIII veka*. *Opisanie izdanii napechatannykh pri Petre I. Svodnyi katalog* / Comp. by T.A. Bykova and M.M. Gurevich. Moscow; Leningrad: Izd. otel b-ki Akad. nauk SSSR, 1958. P. 9—28.
- Byber J., *Nomenclatura in usum scholæ Gorlicensis*. Görlitz, 1572.
- Bykova T.A., *Prilozhenie IV. Knigoizdatel'skaia deiatel'nost' Il'i Kopievskogo i Jana Tesinga*. *Opisanie izdanii napechatannykh pri Petre I. Svodnyi katalog* / Comp. by T.A. Bykova and M.M. Gurevich. Moscow; Leningrad: Izd. otel b-ki Akad. nauk SSSR, 1958. P. 318—341.

- Bykova T.A., Gurevich M.M., Prilozhenie I. Zarubezhnye izdaniia s russkoi tematikoi, napechatannye kirillitsei v 1689—janvare 1725 g. *Opisanie izdaniia napechatannykh pri Petre I. Svodnyi katalog* / Comp. by T.A. Bykova and M.M. Gurevich. Moscow; Leningrad: Izd. otdel b-ki Akad. nauk SSSR, 1958. P. 277—306.
- Cracraft J., *The Petrine Revolution in Russian Culture*. Cambridge, MA; London: The Belknap Press of Harvard Univ. Press, 2004.
- Croiset van der Kop A., Nederland — Rusland. Vergeten boekjes. *Het Boek*, 1913, 2. P. 27—31, 129—142, 321—335, 353—374.
- Driessen J., *Russen en Nederlanders. Uit de geschiedenis van de betrekkingen tussen Nederland en Rusland 1600—1917*. Amsterdam; 's-Gravenhage: Rijksmuseum, 1989. 177 p.
- Driessen J., *Tsaar Peter de Grote en zijn Amsterdamse vrienden*. Utrecht; Antwerpen: Kosmos, 1996. 136 p.
- Đurovič L., Sjöberg A., Drevneishii istochnik paradigmatici sovremennogo russkogo literaturnogo iazyka. *Russian linguistics*, 1987, 11. P. 255—278.
- Ławowski A., Polonizmy w Nomenklatorze Eliasza Kopijewskiego z 1700 roku. *W Świecie Słowian. Szkice z dziejów leksykologii i leksikografii (Fs. W. Witkowski)* / Eds H. Chodurska et al. Kraków: Impuls, 2013. P. 65—76.
- Ławowski A., Rutenizmy w Nomenklatorze Eliasza Kopijewskiego z 1700 roku. *Slavia orientalis*, 2013, 62 (1). P. 105—117.
- Ławowski A., Leksyka wojenno-wojskowa w Nomenklatorze Eliasza Kopijewskiego z 1700 roku. *Zbrojne i ideologiczne konflikty w dawnym piśmiennictwie Słowian i ich echa w nowszej kulturze (Krakowsko-Wileńskie Studia Slawistyczne)*, 2015, 11. P. 121—129.
- Ławowski A., *Lexicon slavo-ruthenicum* Mathurina Veyssièrre de La Croze'a a Nomenklator Eliasza Kopijewskiego — nowe spojrzenie. *Slavia orientalis*, 2015, 64 (1). P. 109—116.
- Fasmer [Vasmer] M., *Etimologicheskii slovar' russkogo iazyka. V. I—IV*. Moscow: Progress, 1986—87. 576 p. + 672 p. + 832 p. + 864 p.
- Hüllen W., *English Dictionaries 800—1700. The Topical Tradition*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999. 525 p.
- Iakimovich Iu.K., *Deiateli russkoi kul'tury i slovarnoe delo*. Moscow: Nauka, 1985. 160 p.
- Jones W.J., *German Lexicography in the European Context. A descriptive bibliography of printed dictionaries and word lists containing German language (1600—1700)*. Berlin; New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2000. 754 p.
- Klerk E. de, *De Nomenclators van Il'ja Kopievskij. Een filologische analyse van het eerste Russisch-Nederlandse woordenboek uit 1700*. Unpublished BA thesis. Leiden, 2021.
- Kopievskij I., *Nomenklator na latinskom, russkom i gollandskom iazyke*. Amsterdam, 1700.
- Kopievskij I., *Nomenklator na latinskom, russkom i nemetskom iazyke*. Amsterdam, 1700.
- Kopievskij I., *Latina grammatica in usum scholarum celeberrimae gentis sclavonico-rosseanæ adornata*. Amsterdam, 1700.
- Kopievskij I., *Rukovedenie v grammatiku. Manuductio in grammaticam*. Stoltzenberg, 1706.
- Kopievskij I., *Vokabuly ili rechi na slavenskom, nemetskom i latinskom iazykakh*. St. Petersburg, 1718/1720. 119 p.
- Kopievskij I., *Lateinisch-Rußisch und Teutsches Vocabularium. Latino-rossiiskaia i nemetskaia slovesnaia kniga*. St. Petersburg, 1732. 103 p.
- Kuznetsova I.E., Ob istochnike 'Nomenklatora na russkom, latinskom i nemetskom iazyke' Il'i Kopievskogo. *Indoevropskoe iazykoznanie i klassicheskaia filologiya*, 2009, 9. P. 319—325.
- Kuznetsova I.E., Nomenklator na russkom, nemetskom i gollandskom iazykakh Il'i Kopievskogo. *Acta linguistica Petropolitana. Trudy instituta lingvisticheskikh issledovanii*, 2009, 5 (3). P. 86—91.
- Kuznetsova I.E., Uchebnye slovni pervaio poloviny XVIII veka i evropeiskaia leksikograficheskaia traditsiia. *Slovo i slovar'. Vocabulum et vocabularium. Sbornik nauchnykh trudov* / Eds L.V. Rychkova et al. Grodno: GrGU, 2013. P. 50—54.
- Levichkin A.N., Otryvok russko-gollandskogo slovaria XVII veka iz Pskova. *Severnorrusskie govory*, 2017, 16. P. 196—235.
- Markov V.M., Eselevich I.E., Zamechaniia o dvukh raznoiazychnykh leksikonax pervykh let XVIII veka. *Uchebnye zapiski Kazanskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta im. V.I. Ul'janova-Lenina*, 1957, 117 (9). P. 136—140.
- Meulen R. van der, Peter de Groote en het Hollandsch. *Onze Eeuw*, 1913, 13 (3). P. 117—138.
- Moser M., *'Junosti čestnoe zercalo' 1717 g. U istokov russkogo literaturnogo jazyka*. Münster; Wien: Lit Verlag (Slavische Sprachgeschichte. Band 10), 2020. 464 p.
- Myl'nikov A.S., Rossijsko-gollandskie knižnye svjazi Petrovskoj èpoxi v svete novyx dannyx. *Rossija — Gollandija. Knižnye svjazi XV—XX vv.* / Ed. N.P. Kopaneva. St. Petersburg: Jevropejskij dom, 2000. P. 124—133.
- Nowak Z., Eliaz Kopijewicz, polski autor, tłumacz, wydawca i drukarz świeckich książek dla Rosji w epoce wczesnego oświecenia. *Libri Gedanensis*, 1968—69, 2—3. P. 35—88. (n. v.)
- Pekarskij P., *Nauka i literatura v Rossii pri Petrě Velikom. T. I—II*. St. Petersburg: V tipografii Tovarishchestva Obshchestvennaja Pol'za, 1862. 578 p. + 694 p.
- PiB. *Pis'ma i bumagi Imperatora Petra Velikago. Tom pervyj (1688—1701)*. St. Petersburg: Gosudarstvennaja tipografija, 1887. 1010 p.
- PiB. *Pis'ma i bumagi Imperatora Petra Velikago. Tom sjestoj (ijul'—dekabr' 1707)*. St. Petersburg: Gosudarstvennaja tipografija, 1912. 750 p.

- Polikarpov-Orlov F.P., *Bukvar' slavenskimi, gretsjeskimi, rimskimi pismeny*. Moscow: Sinodal'naia tip., Petsjatnij dvor, 1701. 131 p.
- Raptschinsky B., Russische drukkerijen te Amsterdam. *Amstelodamum. Maandblad voor de kennis van Amsterdam*, 1935, 22. P. 15—16, 25—27.
- Sreznevskij I.I., *Materialy dlja slovarja drevne-russkago jazyka po pis'mennym pamjatnikam*. St. Petersburg: Tipogr. Imp. Akad. Nauk, 1893—1903.
- SRJa XI—XVII: Krivko R.N. (ed.) *Slovar' russkogo jazyka XI—XVII vv*. Moscow: Nauka, 1975.
- Stankiewicz E., *Grammars and Dictionaries of the Slavic Languages from the Middle Ages up to 1850. An Annotated Bibliography*. Berlin; New York; Amsterdam: Walter de Gruyter, 1984. 190 p.
- Vlasov S.V., Moskovkin L.V., *Iz istorii sozdanija utsjebnikov russkogo jazyka kak inostrannogo: 'Nomenklator ...' (1700) i 'Rukovedenie ...' (1706)*. I.F. Kopievskogo. *Mir russkogo slova*, 2009, 4. P. 80—85.

Appendix: Chapters of the Dutch and German nomenclators¹²

Ch.	Latin	Slavonic	Dutch	German
1	DE DEO ET SPIRITIBUS	О б<о>зѣ и дусѣхъ	Van GOD, en de GEESTEN	Von GOTT und den Geistern
2	DE MUNDO, COELO ET ELEMENTIS	О мирѣ стихіяхъ и небеси	Van de WERELT den HEMEL en ELEMENTEN	Von der Welt / dem Himmel und Elementen
3	DE TEMPORIBUS ET FESTIS diebus	О временѣхъ и праздникахъ	Van de TYT en HEYLIGE Dagen	Von Zeiten und Feyertagen
4	DE AQUIS	О водахъ	Van de WAT-REN	Von Wassern
5	DE LOCIS ET TERRIS	О мѣстѣхъ и земляхъ	Van de PLAATSE en de LANDEN	Von die Orthen und Landen
6	DE HOMINE ET EJUS PARTIBUS	О ч<е>л<овѣ>-ку и о его частѣхъ	Van den MENSCH en zijn DEELEN	Vom Menschen und seinen Theilen
7	DE MORBIS	О болѣзняхъ, немощахъ	Van SIEKTEN	Von Kranckheit
8	DE CIBIS	О брашнѣ, ествѣ	Van SPYSEN	Von Speisen
9	DE POTU	О питіи	Van DRANCK	Vom Tranck
10	DE ANIMALIBUS QUADRUPEDIBUS	О животныхъ четвероногихъ	Van Viervoetige DIEREN	Von vierfüßigen Thieren

¹² Some Pre-Petrine Cyrillic letters are transliterated according to modern practice: s is rendered as z; w as o (and w̄ as ot); oy and ѣ as y; ѡ as я; ѣ as кс; and v as и. Diacritic signs have been omitted.

Appendix (continius)

Ch.	Latin	Slavonic	Dutch	German
11	DE AVIBUS	О птицахъ	Van VOGELN	Von Vogeln
12	DE VERMIBUS ET INSECTIS	О червѣхъ и мухахъ и змѣяхъ	Van Wurmen, Vliegen, Torren, en andere Bloedeloose Dieren	Von Würmen und Thieren denen das Köfflein mit einen äderlein am Leibe hanget
13	DE PISCIBUS	О рыбахъ	Van de VISSSEN	Von Fischen
14	DE ARBORIBUS	О древѣхъ	Van BOMEN	Von Baumen
15	DE FRUCTIBUS ET MENSIS SECUNDIS	О овощахъ что послѣ обѣда и ужины настоль даютъ	Van de VRUGTEN en Nageregtten	Von Früchten und Nachrichten
16	DE FRUMENTIS ET LEGUMINIBUS	О житахъ и пшеницахъ и зеліи огородномъ	Van 't VELD Gewas	Von Feld und Hülsenfrüchten
17	DE PARTIBUS PLANTARUM ET FRUCTUM	О частѣхъ деревей, купинъ и плодовъ	Van allerley Gewassen	Von theilen allerley Gewächs und Früchten
18	DE HERBIS ET FLORIBUS	О зеліи и цвѣтахъ	Van Kruyden en Bloemen	Von Kräutern und Blumen
19	DE AROMATIBUS	О ароматахъ или о кореніи и зеліи мноцѣнномъ	Van SPECERYEN	Von Specereyen
20	DE RURE ET AGRO	О деревни, полю и селѣ	Van 't VELD en den ACKER	Vom Feldt und Acker
21	DE SUPPELLECTILE RUSTICORUM	О сосудѣхъ деревенскихъ	Van Boeren MEUBILEN	Von Bauwren Haußrath
22	DE URBE	О градѣ, о городѣ	Van STEDEN	Von der Stadt
23	NOMINA REGIONUM ET GENTIUM	Имена странъ и народовъ	De Namen van Landen en Volken	Die Nahmen der Länder und Volcker
24	DE DOMO	О домѣ	Van Huysen	Vom Hause
25	DE HYPOCAUSTO, ET REBUS AD MENSAM pertinentibus	О избѣ и вещахъ къ столу прилежащихъ	Van Huysraat	Von der Stuben und Tischgereth
26	DE CULINA	О поварни	Van de Keuken	Von der Kuchen

Appendix (continius)

Ch.	Latin	Slavonic	Dutch	German
27	DE CUBICULO	О ложницы, о спални	Van de Slaap kamer	Von der Schlafkammer
28	DE STABULO	О конюшни	Van de Stalle	Vom Stalle
29	DE BALNEO	О мылни, или баини	Van Baden	Vom Bade
30	DE SCHOLA ET RE LIBRARIA	О школѣ и о книгах	Van de School boeken en aank-leven van dien	Von der Schulen/ Buchern und sei-nen zugehören
31	DE TEMPLO ET REBUS PERSONISQUE ECCLESIASTICIS	О цѣркви и овещахъ людяхъ цѣрковныхъ	Van de Kerk en Geestelyke dingen en Personen	Von der Kirchen/ geistlichen Dingen und Personen
32	DE RE FORENSI	О судовыхъ дѣлѣхъ	Van 't Gerecht	Von Gerichts händeln
33	DE OFFICIIS POLITICIS	О началѣхъ политическихъ или мирскихъ	Van Weereltlyke Bedieningen	Von Weltlichen Emptern
34	DE ARTIFICIBUS	О изрядныхъ мастерахъ	Van Konste-naars	Von Künstlern
35	DE OPIFICIBUS	О художникахъ или рукодѣльникахъ	Van Handwerk Lieden	Von Handwercks-leuten
36	DE MATRIMONIO ET AFFINITATE	О женитвѣ и о брацѣхъ и сроднитцѣхъ	Van 't Huwelyk Swagerschap	Von der Ehe und Schwägerschaft
37	DE COGNATIONE	О сроднитствѣ	Van de Maag-schap	Von der Vor-wandtschaft
38	DE LANIFICIO	О прядивѣ	Van Wolwerk	Von Wollwerck
39	DE VESTITU	О одѣянїи, или платїю	Van Kleeding	Von Kleidung
40	DE COLORIBUS	О краскахъ	Van Verwen	Von Farben
41	DE BELLO	О брани воинской	Van den Oor-logh	Von Krieg
42	DE NAVI	О корабли	Van 't Schip	Vom Schiff
43	DE LUDO	О игранїю, или игралищу	Van Spelen	Von Spiel
44	DE METALLIS, GEMMIS & LAPIDIBUS	О рудахъ, о жемчугахъ и драгоцѣнномъ каменїи	Van Metalen Edele en geme-ne Steenen	Von Metal / Edel und gemeinen stein
45	DE PECUNIA	О денгахъ	Van Gelt	Vom Gelde

Appendix (continius)

Ch.	Latin	Slavonic	Dutch	German
46	NOMINA CIVITATUM	Имена градовъ	Namen der Steden	Nahmen der Städt
47	QUÆDAM ADJECTIVA	Нѣкоторая прилагателня	—	—
[48]	QUÆDAM EXEMPLA CONJUGATIONUM	Нѣкоторыя парадигматы спряженїя	—	—

Jos Schaeken

Professor of Slavic and Baltic languages and cultural history,
Leiden University,
Reuvenplaats 3—4, Leiden, 2311 BE, The Netherlands

Emma de Klerk

Bachelor in Russian Studies,
Leiden University