

ALF THULIN (Lund)

“THE THIRD TRIBE” OF THE RUS

The terms *Rus'*, *Rhos* and *Rūs* in medieval Russian, Byzantine and Arabic sources respectively are commonly understood as the name of a people or a tribe. The ethnic origin of the *Rus'** is, however, a question to which scholars have no commonly accepted answer: according to the „Normanists” the *Rus'* were of Scandinavian origin; according to the „Anti-Normanists” they were Eastern Slavs. In this article I shall try to interpret some enigmatic Arabic names which are relevant to the discussion of the *Rus'* in general.

According to several Arabic sources the *Rūs* are divided into three tribes. One of them has its centre in *Kūyāba*. Another is called *Salāwiya* and its king lives in *S. lā*. The third tribe is called *Arthāniya* (there are many variations of this word) and its king lives in *Arthā* (also found in many variations). There is general agreement that the identity of *Kūyāba* is Kiev, and that of *Salāwiya* the Slovenes in the Novgorod area. The interpretation of the names *Arthāniya* and *Arthā*, however, is still one of the most difficult and disputed questions in Old Russian philological and historical-geographical research, and has been so since the beginning of the 19th century. There have been many attempts to interpret the two names, and the geographic location of *Arthā* and *Arthāniya* has been ascribed to widely different regions, from the Black Sea area in the south to Scandinavia and Perm in the north.

A partial explanation for the widely divergent interpretations of the identity and location of *Arthā* and *Arthāniya* can be found in the written and oral characteristics of the Arabic language. Above all, precise notations exist in written Arabic only for the three long vowels *ā*, *ū* and *ī*, while the corresponding short vowels are usually not written down. Furthermore, the Arabic consonant system, despite its richness, lacks several sounds usually found in other languages.

It is not surprising, therefore, that a foreign name could assume obscure variations through transcription into Arabic. This difficulty was especially great when Arabic authors tried to repeat the geographical names which

* I use the word ‘*Rus*’ to denote these *Rus'*, *Rhos* and *Rus*. Correspondingly I call their country ‘*Rus*’ as well. As the adjective answering to ‘*Rus*’ I use ‘*Rus*’ian’. The names ‘*Russian*’ (in Russian *Russkij*) and ‘*Russia*’ (in Russian *Rossija*) are from a later period and it is a matter of dispute whether they cover the concepts of ‘the *Rus*’ and ‘*Rus*’ respectively.

belonged to little-known or unknown countries. And for these authors, northern and eastern Europe was terra incognita¹. Few of them are believed to have travelled further northwest from Arabia and Persia than the lower reaches of the Volga²: as a matter of fact we know of only one, Ibn Fadlān, who personally visited the regions further up the Volga. In 921/922 he made a journey to the land of the Volga Bulgars. His description of the different peoples he came in contact with is outstanding for its eyewitness accuracy and has rightly been widely appreciated. The other Arab writers obtained their knowledge of eastern and northern Europe from Muslim merchants travelling from Khoresm (Chiva, to the south of the Aral Sea) to Bulgar³, the capital of the Volga Bulgars at the big bend of the Volga. Another source of information was provided by merchants who travelled from northern and eastern Europe to Itil, the capital of the Khazars on the lower Volga, and to the Muslim countries⁴. A knowledge of these parts of Europe also came from Slavonic slaves in the Orient⁵, from Arabs who lived in Byzantium and from Greek geographic literature⁶. Thus, the greater part of Arab knowledge of these regions came second-hand, with the consequences thus entailed: increased risks that geographical and ethnical names were corrupted, a lack of precise and concrete information.

A further difficulty in deciphering geographical names in Arab works arises from the fact that most of the texts which deal with the *Rūs* and Slavs are later compilations and corrections⁷. Furthermore, these usually lack information about the sources used in the copying procedure⁸, and it is therefore impossible in most cases to determine whether the information contained is original or is taken from an earlier author⁹.

The compilatory character of the texts means that an author who writes, for instance, in the 11th century does not necessarily repeat information

¹ G. Kochin, *Pamjatniki istorii Velikogo Novgoroda i Pskova*, Leningrad 1935, p. 174.

² B. N. Zachoder, *Kaspijskij svod svedenij o vostočnoj Evrope*, Moskva 1962, p. 181.

³ F. Kmiotowicz, *Niektóre problemy naplywu kruszcu srebrnego na ziemie polskie we wczesnym średniowieczu*, Wiadomości Numizmatyczne, XVI, 1972, p. 66, p. 71; idem, *Artāniya-Artū*, Folia Orientalia, XVI, 1972 - 1973, pp. 235 - 236.

⁴ Cf. H. Birkeland, *Nordens historie i middelalderen efter arabiske kilder*, Oslo, 1954, p. 11.

⁵ Ibidem.

⁶ H. V. Mžik, *Ptolemaeus und die Karten der arabischen Geographen*, Mitteilungen der K. -K. geographischen Gesellschaft, LVIII, Wien, 1915, pp. 157 - 158; A. P. Novoselceev, *Vostočnye istočniki o vostočnych slavjanach i Rusi VI - IX vv.* (in:) *Drevnerusskoe gosudarstvo i ego meždunarodnoe značenie*, Moskva, 1965, pp. 372 - 373.

⁷ J. Bielawski, *Księgozbiory jako wyraz kultury świata muzułmańskiego*, Przegląd Orientalistyczny 2, 1960, p. 131; I. Ju. Kračkovskij, *Putešestvie Ibn-Fadlana na Volgu*, Moskva - Leningrad 1939, p. 43.

⁸ V. V. Bartol'd, *Očerki istorii turkmenskogo naroda*, Turkmenija, Leningrad 1928, p. 16; Novoselceev, op. cit., p. 356.

⁹ Zachoder, op. cit., p. 6.

of a later date than one who writes in the 10th century¹⁰. The possibility of relating information in the Arabic texts to information in other sources is thereby rendered more difficult, and as a result the chance of identifying geographical names diminished. In addition to this, the greater part of these texts are extant only in very late and sometimes corrupted manuscripts¹¹.

All in all, there is little wonder that the interpretation of non-Arabic names in the Arabic sources often causes great difficulties¹². Examples of this, to a certain degree, are the names *Arthāniya* and *Arthā*.

The first work to mention *Arthāniya* and *Arthā* is al-Istakhri's *The Roads of the Kingdom*, written about 930, but not made public until 951¹³. Al-Istakhri narrates¹⁴: "The *Rūs* are made up of three tribes: one near Bulgar (the capital of the Volga Bulgars); their king dwells in a town called *Kūyāba*. This is larger than Bulgar. Farthest away is another tribe. It is called *Salāwiya*. The third tribe is called *Arthāniya*. Their king resides in a place called *Arthā*. The people there go for purposes of trade to *Kūyāba*. As regards *Arthāniya* it is said that no stranger ever entered their town, because there they put to death any stranger who comes to their country. They go down the rivers (literally 'the water') for trading purposes only. But they tell nothing of their business and goods. They do not allow anyone to come into contact with them or to enter their country. They export from *Arthā* black sables and lead (or possibly 'tin'¹⁵)."

Whether this passage is of al-Istakhri's own hand or is taken from a geographical work by al-Balkhi, who wrote about 920, can not be ascertained, as the latter is now lost; it has been established that al-Istakhri based his *The Roads of the Kingdom* on al-Balkhi's work, but it is also known that al-Istakhri added his own, not distinguishable contributions¹⁶.

¹⁰ Bartol'd, op. cit., p. 16.

¹¹ Zachoder, op. cit., p. 6.

¹² T. Lewicki, *Świat słowiański w oczach pisarzy arabskich*, Sl. Ant. 2, 1949 - 50, pp. 323 - 325.

¹³ M. J. de Goeje, *Die Istakhri-Balkhi-Frage*, Zeitschr. d. Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft 25, 1871, p. 19. V. V. Bartol'd, *Preface to Hudūd al-'Ālam, The Regions of the World*, ed. V. Minorsky, E. J. W. Gibb Memorial Series, XI, 1937, p. 19.

¹⁴ This passage has been translated by, among others, Birkeland (op. cit., p. 29), I. Hrbek (*Der dritte Stamm der Rus nach arabischen Quellen*, Archiv Orientalní 25, 1957, p. 649) and Novoseleev (op. cit., pp. 411 - 412).

¹⁵ A. Zeki Validi Togan, *Ibn Fadlans Reisebericht*, Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, XXIV/3, Leipzig, 1939, p. 320; Birkeland, op. cit., p. 29; Novoseleev, op. cit., p. 412.

¹⁶ de Goeje, *Die Istakhri-Balkhi-Frage*, p. 50; A. Seippel, *Praefatio to Rerum Normannicarum Fontes Arabici*, 1926, p. 16; J. Kramers, *La question Balhi-Istakhri-Ibn Hauqal et l'Atlas de l'Islam*, Acta Orientalia, X, 1932, p. 13; Bartol'd, *Preface to Hudūd al-'Ālam*, pp. 18 - 19; Zachoder, op. cit., p. 50, p. 75; Novoseleev, op. cit., p. 408; M. B. Sverdlov, *Lokalizacija rusov v arabskoj geografičeskoj literature IX - X vv.*, Izvestija geografičeskogo obščestva, 102/4, 1970, p. 363, p. 366.

The information handed down by al-Istakhrī on the three Rus'ian tribes is copied almost word for word by Ibn Hauqal¹⁷, who wrote in 976/977, and by Yāqūt¹⁸, who wrote in the 1220's. However, Ibn Hauqal gives some additional details on the three tribes of the *Rūs*. Firstly, he tells us that the people of *Arthā*, besides furs and lead, also export the furs of black foxes and mercury (it is probable that we should read 'slaves' for 'mercury' here¹⁹). Secondly, Ibn Hauqal notes that the Prince of *Salāwiya* resides in the town of *S. lā*, which is probably just a gratuitous construction in the sense that Ibn Hauqal named the town after the tribe²⁰.

The anonymous author of *Hudud al-'Ālam* ("The Boundaries of the World"), who wrote in the 970's, also used al-Istakhrī as a source, but added the new item that *Arthā*, as well as *S. lā* and *Kūyāba*, is situated on the *Rūs* river²¹ (according to Mongajt, Novoselev and Minorsky, this is the Volga with its tributaries²²). Moreover, *Hudud al-'Ālam* tells us that the *Rūs* of *Arthā* make "blades and swords, which can be bent double, but as soon as the hand is removed, they resume their original shape".

Individual manuscripts of al-Istakhrī's work add some new details on *Arthā*. Thus, according to the so-called Gotha MS, „*Arthā* is situated between the land of the Khazars and Great Bulgaria (on the Danube), which borders on the northern parts of Rome (Byzantium)”²³. The "Chester-Beatty" MS relates: "Further away than the desert which extends behind *Arthā* — this is the last (i.e. "the remotest") province of the *Rūs* and no one ever goes to this place — there is nothing, neither trees nor water, as far as to the mountains which were erected by Alexander the Great as a barrier against (the peoples of) Gog and Magog²⁴. And these mountains are located on the borders

¹⁷ The passage referred to has been translated by, among others, Birkeland (op. cit., p. 50), Hrbek (op. cit., p. 649) and Novoselev (op. cit., p. 412).

¹⁸ A translation can be found in Hrbek, op. cit., p. 651.

¹⁹ Hrbek, op. cit., p. 645; Novoselev, op. cit., p. 412. There was no mercury in eastern or northern Europe, whereas there is an abundance of instances in Arabic literature of an export of slaves by the *Rūs*.

²⁰ Hrbek, op. cit., p. 628, p. 635.

²¹ This passage has been translated by, among others, V. Minorsky (*Hudūd al-'Ālam*, p. 75), Birkeland (op. cit., p. 52), Hrbek (op. cit., p. 649) and Novoselev (op. cit., pp. 412 - 413).

²² A. Mongajt, *K voprosu o trech drevnich centrach drevnej Rusi*, *Kratkie soobščenija Instituta istorii material'noj kul'tury*, 16, 1947; Novoselev, op. cit., p. 379; Minorsky, *Hudūd al-'Ālam*, p. 216.

²³ Hrbek, op. cit., p. 634, p. 646; Novoselev, op. cit., p. 418.

²⁴ By the half — legendary peoples of Gog and Magog, known from the Bible (Ezekiel, 38 : 2 f.; 39 : 1) and the Koran (18 : 93; 21 : 96) the Arabs indicated peoples in northernmost Europe, in the 9th and 10th centuries most often the Norsemen (R. Hennig, *Der mittelalterliche Handelsverkehr in Osteuropa*, *Der Islam*, XXII, 1935, p. 243; idem, *Die Namengebung nordeuropäischer Länder bei den mittelalterlichen Arabern*, *Zeitschrift f. Namenforschung*, XV/2, 1939, p. 180; Kmietowicz, *Artāniya-Artā*, p. 243, p. 247, p. 254 f.).

of a deep valley, the bottom of which is impossible to reach. And these mountains gleam like an immense cloth above the valley. Gog and Magog are a tribe of the *Rūs* and they are Turks"²⁵.

Information on the three tribes of the *Rūs* can also be found in a compilation by ad-Dimashqī (†1327). There he quotes a passage from a work by al-Idrīsī (1099 - 1166) that "in his time there were four tribes of the Slavs: *S. lāwīya*, *B. rāsiya* (probably Perm), *K. rāk. riya* (*Kūyāba*) and *Arthāniya*. All these tribes except *Arthāniya* were named after their lands"²⁶. He goes on to say that *Arthāniya* live on the coasts of the Atlantic Ocean. Another piece of information, provided by al-Idrīsī, is that *Arthā* is situated between *Salāwīya* and *Kūyāba*²⁷.

It appears from the above that there are certain firm criteria for the identification and location of *Arthā* and *Arthāniya*. The interpretation of the two names is rendered difficult by the fact that they are found in several variants. These have been listed by Hrbek²⁸. As a basis for their interpretation of the two names, however, the great majority of scholars have chosen either one of the commonly found forms *Arthā* (-), *Artsā* (-), *Arbā* (-), and *Arqā* (-) or *Armā* (-).

The last of these is by some scholars considered to be the original one, which might easily have been distorted into any one of the first-mentioned forms. As regards the initial short vowel, it must be either *ǎ* or *ǔ*, for in the copies where it is marked, forms with initial *ǎ* alternate with forms with initial *ǔ*²⁹.

Provisionally I will hold to the readings *Arthā* and *Arthāniya*.

Since the beginning of the 19th century the question of the identity of *Arthā* and *Arthāniya* has puzzled scholars³⁰. The first one to study al-Istakhri's narrative was Ch. M. Fraehn³¹. He deciphered the name of the third Rus'ian centre as *Artsa* or *Erza* and suggested that in this name was concealed the name of the later-known town of *Arzamas*. Fraehn identified *Arthāniya* or *Artsāniya*, as he read the word, as *Erza*, one of the main tribes of the Mordva, at that time living in the Oka region³².

Fraehn's theory has found several supporters: Tomaschek, Marquart, Lewicki and Sverdlov³³ among others.

²⁵ Hrbek, op. cit., p. 634, p. 647.

²⁶ Ibidem, p. 651.

²⁷ Novoselcev, op. cit., p. 419.

²⁸ Hrbek, op. cit., p. 630.

²⁹ Cf. A. Zeki Validi Togan, op. cit., p. 320, note I; Birkeland, op. cit., p. 52.

³⁰ The most thorough survey of the historiography of this research can be found in Hrbek, op. cit., pp. 630 - 634.

³¹ Ch. M. Fraehn, *Ibn Foszlans und anderer Araber Berichte über die Russen älterer Zeit*, St. Peterburg, 1823.

³² Ibid., p. 141, p. 162.

³³ Tomaschek, *Kritik der ältesten Nachrichten über den skytischen Norden*, Sitzungsbericht d. Wiener. Ak. d. Wissenschaften, Phil. -hist. Klasse, 1888, II, pp. 7 - 16; J. Mar-

While accepting the identity of *Arthāniya* with *Erza*, some historians and philologists have objected that the town of *Arthā* is Rjazan', not *Arzamus*. Thus, for instance, A. Šachmatov has shown that the name *Rjazan'* is of Mordvan provenance and is derived from the tribal name *Erza*; hence the connection of *Rjazan'* with *Arthā* becomes possible³⁴. A. Mongajt, among others, is of the same opinion³⁵. He points out that according to the anonymous author of *Hudūd al-'Ālam*, *Arthā* is situated on the *Rūs* river; in Mongajt's opinion the *Rūs* river refers to the Volga and its tributaries, including the Oka on which Rjazan' stands. The Arabic writers have rewritten the name *Rjazan'* as *Arthā* and named the tribe living at Rjazan' after the town. Moreover, Mongajt assumes that the Arabic writers confused the Mordvan tribe of *Erza*, which lived there earlier, with the Slavonic tribe, the Vjatičians, which settled there later. Mongajt adds substance to his theory by referring to archaeological and other arguments: in the Vjatičian habitation many Arab coins have been found, which proves that the Vjatičians took part in the trade with the Arabs; in the vicinity of the village of Beztuševo traces of ancient lead mining have been uncovered; the Vjatičian area was rich in fur-bearing animals.

W. Swoboda, too, looks for *Arthā*/*Arthāniya* in the area between the Oka and the middle reaches of the Volga. Swoboda considers the name *Arthāniya* to be derived from the Finnish tribal name *Ar*+Finnic-Ugric **taniya*, 'delimited area'. *Arthāniya* thus means 'the area of the tribe *Ar*'. The name *Arthāniya* is a *nomen appellativum*, not *proprium*. *Ar* is mentioned by the Khazarian Chagan Josef (the middle of the 10th century), by the Arabic traveller al-Garnati (the 12th century) and in the Russian chronicles for the first time at the end of the 14th century. No sources give any clues as to the identity and habitat of this tribe; still, Swoboda thinks it probable that *Ar* should be identified with the Mordva in the area between the Oka and the middle Volga. The centre *Arthā* was allotted to the *Arthāniya*, because al-Balkī's (al-Istakhri's?) informant associated the tribal name *Ar* with Finnic-Ugric **arta*, 'castle, fortress'³⁶.

Some scholars have based their localization of *Arthā* on the statement in the Gotha MS of al-Istakhri that "*Arthā* is situated between the land of the Khazars and Great Bulgaria, which borders on the northern parts of Rome". Accordingly, they have placed *Arthā* and *Arthāniya* either in Tmu-

quart, *Über das Volkstum der Komagen*, Abh. d. kgl. Gess. d. Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Phil.-hist. Klasse, 13, 1914, p. 30; T. Lewicki, *Świat słowiański*, p. 360; idem, *Znajomość krajów i ludów Europy u pisarzy arabskich IX i X w.*, Sl. Ant. XVIII, 1961, p. 103, p. 123; Sverdlov, op. cit., p. 367.

³⁴ A. Šachmatov, *Drevnejšie sud'by russkogo plemeni*, St. Peterburg, 1919, p. 35 ff.

³⁵ A. Mongajt, *K voprosu*, pp. 103 - 112; idem, *Staraja Rjazan'*, *Voprosy Istorii*, 4, 1947, p. 90 ff.

³⁶ W. Swoboda, *Arū-Arisū-al-Artānīja*, *Folia Orientalia*, XI, 1969, pp. 291 - 296.

torokan' on the Taman peninsula³⁷ or in the area to the north of the Black Sea³⁸.

Reinaud draws attention to the information in the Chester-Beatty manuscript to the effect that *Arthā* and *Arthāniya*, or *Arbā* and *Armāniya*, as Reinaud reads the words, are situated in or near the lands of Gog and Magog, which he locates to the north of the (Volga-) Bulgarian land. On this basis he concludes that *Arthā* (*Arbā*) is identical with **Barmā* or Perm, the capital of the area with the same name³⁹. Reinaud does not, however, offer any factual arguments for this identification. D. A. Chvol'son reads **Barmā* and **Barmāniya* and accepts Reinaud's identification of the two names. By **Barmāniya* Chvol'son understands the people of Perm, i.e. *Bjarmaland*, the appellation found in the Icelandic sagas. He explains the absence of the initial B's in *Armā* and *Armāniya* in the following way: after the Arabic verb meaning 'call, name' the name follows in conjunction with the preposition b. Sometimes this preposition is omitted, sometimes it is written out. In the relevant passage the author or the copyists have taken it for granted that b did not belong to the name, and therefore he, or they, omitted it. To substantiate his theory Chvol'son points to some material facts: lead was mined in the Ural mountains; sables and black foxes were found only in the northern regions⁴⁰. The readings **Barmā* and **Barmāniya* are to some degree supported by Minorsky in a 1955 paper. However, Minorsky points out that the *Bjarmaland* of the Icelandic sagas is not identical with Perm but with the area between the white Sea and Lake Ladoga⁴¹.

P. Smirnov⁴² and A. P. Novoselecov⁴³ look for *Arthā* in the upper Volga region. In this connection Novoselecov refers to the variant reading, provided by al-Idrīsī, that *Arsā* (as Novoselecov reads the word) is situated between *Salāwiya* and *Kūyāba*. Although Novoselecov does not make it quite clear, he apparently sides with those few scholars⁴⁴ who do not accept the identi-

³⁷ D. I. Il'ovajskij, *Razyskanija o načale Rusi*, Moskva, 1876, p. 246; B. A. Parchomenko, *Tri centra drevnej Rusi*, Izv. otd. russk. jazyka, 1913, pp. 79 - 87; B. A. Rybakov, *Anty i Kievskaja Rus'*, Vestnik drevnej istorii, 1939, pp. 335 ff; A. N. Nazonov, *T'mutorokan' v istorii Vostočnoj Evropy*, Istoričeskie Zapiski, 6, 1940, pp. 40 - 41; B. D. Grekov, *Kul'tura Kievskoj Rusi*, Moskva, 1944, p. 55; S. V. Juškov, *Obščestvenno-političeskij stroj i pravo Kievskogo gosudarstva*, Moskva, 1949, p. 57; G. Vernadsky, *The Origins of Russia*, Oxford, 1958, p. 198.

³⁸ V. Mošin, „Treće" rusko plemo, *Slavia*, 5, 1927, pp. 763 - 781; idem, *Rus' i Chazary pri Svjatoslave*, Seminarium Kondakovianum, VI, 1933, p. 201.

³⁹ M. Reinaud, *Géographie d'Aboulfeda*, II, Paris, 1848, pp. 305 - 306.

⁴⁰ D. A. Chvol'son, *Izvestija o chazarach, burtasach, bolgarach, mad'jarach, slavjanach i russach*, St. Peterburg, 1869, pp. 174 - 177.

⁴¹ Minorsky, *Addenda to the Hudūd al-'Ālam*, Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, XVIII : 2, 1955, p. 268.

⁴² P. Smirnov, *Volž's'kij sljach i starodavni Rusy*, Zapiski istorično-filologičnogo viddilu, Kyiv, 1928, p. 194.

⁴³ Novoselecov, op. cit., p. 419.

⁴⁴ This been questioned by Smirnov (op. cit., p. 194) and G. F. Korzuchina

fication of *Kūyāba* with Kiev, but claim that *Kūyāba* was a place somewhere on the upper Volga or near the confluence of the Oka with the Volga.

F. Kmietowicz has devoted an exhaustive study to the problem of *Arthā*/*Arthāniya*. He lays down some general principles which must be observed in the interpretation of non-Semitic names in medieval Arabic sources. First of all he emphasizes the difficulties which accompany every attempt to interpret such names on an exclusively philological basis: it is wrong to „let oneself be misled by formal, external similarities between Arabic name-forms and names of other languages ...”⁴⁵. The main attention should instead be given to an historical and geographical approach. This means that the information on the tribes of the *Rūs* must not be looked at in isolation, but has to be related to what other sources have to say about the Rus’⁴⁶. Kmietowicz examines the term *Rūs* in the Arabic sources and concludes that by this term the Arabs referred to Swedish merchants living in Rus’, especially in the northern regions⁴⁷. On the basis of an exhaustive analysis of the complete source-material on *Arthā*/*Arthāniya*, he argues that *Arthā* is identical with Staraya Ladoga and *Arthāniya* with the Swedish merchants living there⁴⁸.

F. Vestberg⁴⁹ and Zeki Validi Togan⁵⁰ look for *Arthā* and *Arthāniya* in Scandinavia. Their most important argument in favour of this hypothesis is the statement by ad-Dimashqī that *Arsāniya*, as Vestberg reads the word, live by the Atlantic Ocean. A further testimony to the Scandinavian habitation of the *Arsāniya* is, according to Vestberg, contained in the information on the exports from *Arthā*: sables and black foxes were widely distributed in northern Europe; lead was mined in Sweden; the swords were probably of Frankish manufacture and only Scandinavian merchants could have brought them by way of the Volga to the Muslim countries in the east. However, neither Vestberg nor Validi Togan are able to identify *Arthā* and *Arthāniya* with any Scandinavian names. J. Kolmodin⁵¹ and W. Thomsen⁵² also place *Arthā* and *Arthāniya* in Scandinavia.

Of the remaining theories on the identity and location of *Arthā* and *Arthā*-

(*Russkie klady IX - XIII vv.*, Moskva—Leningrad, 1954, p. 34). However, in an article especially devoted to this problem, V. Beilis has shown the legitimacy of the commonly held view that the *Kūyāba* of the Arabs is identical with Kiev (*Pro nazvu Kyjiva u arabs’kych geografiv X st. ta sprobu ii tlumačennja v istoričnij literaturi*, Ukrain’skij istoričnij žurnal, 1960, pp. 81 - 86).

⁴⁵ Kmietowicz, *Artāniya-Artā*, p. 233.

⁴⁶ Ibidem, p. 234.

⁴⁷ Ibidem, pp. 234 - 246.

⁴⁸ Ibidem, pp. 246 - 260.

⁴⁹ F. Vestberg, *K analizu vostočnych istočnikov o vostočnoj Evrope*, Žurnal Ministerstva narodnogo prosvěščenija, 1908, pp. 397 - 400.

⁵⁰ Validi Togan, op. cit., pp. 320 - 321, note I.

⁵¹ J. Kolmodin, *De fornsvenska Volgafärderna*, Historiska studier tillägnade Harald Hjärne, Uppsala—Stockholm, 1908, p. 20.

⁵² W. Thomsen, *Det russiske riges grundlaeggelse ved Nordboerne, Samlede Afhandlingene*, I, København—Kristiania 1919., p. 287.

*niya*⁵³ Hrbek's attempt to identify *Arthāniya* with the Slavs of Rugia deserves special mention⁵⁴. As Hrbek's theory raises a fundamental issue, I shall choose it as the starting point for an examination of earlier research.

In appraising the different theories on the location and identity of *Arthā* and *Arthāniya* we must keep in mind that the Arabic sources unequivocally state that *Arthāniya* is a Rus'ian tribe and *Arthā* a Rus'ian centre. This must be emphasized in view of Hrbek's attempt to identify *Arthā*, which he reads *Arqā*, with the town of Arkona on the island of Rugia, and *Arthāniya* (*Arujāniya* in Hrbek's deciphering) with the Slavonic population there⁵⁵. In defence of this theory Hrbek claims that al-Istakhri or his informant „betrachteten ... alle slawischen Völker als Russen”⁵⁶.

Nothing could be more mistaken! The Arabic authors, including al-Istakhri, Ibn Hauqal and the author of *Iudūd al-'Ālam* make a very sharp distinction between the *Rūs* and the Slavs⁵⁷. Thus, al-Istakhri and his followers⁵⁸ note that „the *Rūs* live between the Bulgars and the Slavs”. According to Ibn Rosta⁵⁹ (the beginning of the 10th century) the *Rūs* and the Slavs live in

⁵³ A. Udalcov (*Osnovnye voprosy proischozdenija slavjan*, Obščee Sobranie Akademii Nauk SSSR, 14 - 17 Oktjabrja, 1944 goda, 1945, p. 109) is of the opinion that the home of the *Arthāniya* was Volyn' and the Carpathians; B. A. Rybakov (*Problema obrazovanija drevnerusskoj narodnosti v svete trudov I. V. Stalina*, Voprosy Istorii, 1952, pp. 40 - 62) identifies *Artha* with Černihov.

⁵⁴ W. B. Vilibachow, too, wants to find Baltic Slavs in these *Arthāniya* (*Przyzyczynek do zagalnienia trzech ośrodków dawnej Rusi*, Materiały Zachodnio-Pomorskie, VII, 1961, pp. 517 ff.).

⁵⁵ Hrbek, op. cit., pp. 640 - 645.

⁵⁶ Ibidem, pp. 636 - 637.

⁵⁷ This is a fact, which has been noted by many scholars (both “Normanists” and “Anti-Normanists”), e.g. Vestberg (op. cit., pp. 26 - 27), S. H. Cross (*The Russian Primary Chronicle*, Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature, XII, 1930, pp. 129 - 130), V. A. Mošin (*Načalo Rusi*, Byzantinoslavica, III, 1931, pp. 39 - 41), V. O. Ključevskij (*Kurs russkoj istorii*, I, Moskva, 1937, p. 129), V. V. Mavrodin (*Obrazovanie drevnerusskogo gosudarstva*, Leningrad, 1945, p. 388), Paszkiewicz (*The Origin of Russia*, 1954, pp. 119 - 120; *The Making of the Russian Nation*, 1963, pp. 152 - 153), Novoselcev (op. cit., pp. 402 - 405), O. Pritsak (*An Arabic Text on the Trade Route of the Corporation of ar-Rūs in the Second Half of the Ninth Century*, Folia Orientalia, XII, 1970, pp. 248 - 250) and Kmietowicz (*Artāniya-Artā*, pp. 241 - 242, pp. 245 - 246). The fact that the Arabs made a distinction between the *Rūs* and the Slavs seems to be contradicted by our source, which numbers the *Salāwiya* among the *Rūs*'ian tribes. However, this should not surprise us: the Slovenes at this time had been incorporated in the State of Rus'.

It is true that according to Ibn Khurdādhbih (Birkeland, op. cit., p. 11) the *Rūs* were a tribe of the Slavs (*as-Saqāliba*), but it is also a fact, generally acknowledged by scholars, that the term *Saqāliba* (and not the term *Rūs*!), except to Slavs, also referred to all peoples in northern Europe with a light complexion (see for instance F. Vestberg, op. cit., pp. 365 - 371; M. I. Artamonov, *Istorija chazar*, Leningrad, 1962, pp. 219 - 220; H. Paszkiewicz, *The Making of the Russian Nation*, pp. 145 - 151).

⁵⁸ Birkeland, op. cit., p. 28, p. 48, p. 51.

⁵⁹ Ibidem, pp. 15 - 17.

different places: the *Rūs* live on an island⁶⁰ and, coming on ships, attack the Slavs, ravage their country and take prisoners, whom they carry off down the Volga and sell as slaves to the Bulgars and the Khazars. In other contexts, too, it is evident that Ibn Rusta differentiates between the *Rūs* and the Slavs: the former are warriors and merchants, while the latter are agriculturists and cattle-breeders. Their burial customs and rituals are described differently⁶¹. Gardīzī (by the middle of the 11th century) used the same sources as Ibn Rusta⁶². He adds, however, some details not to be found in Ibn Rusta's narrative. Among other things, he says that the *Rūs* fall upon the Slavs in groups of 100 - 200 men and that many Slavs „come to the *Rūs* in order to serve them, and thereby get protection”⁶³. Ibn Fadlān describes the Slavs differently from the *Rūs* and in different chapters. According to him the *Rūs* are men of great strength and valour, well armed and oppressive to other tribes⁶⁴, whereas the Slavs recognize the sovereignty of the Khazars with submissiveness⁶⁵. Al-Mas'ūdī, in the first half of the 10th century, says that there were *Rūs* and Slavs serving in the Khazarian retinue and that the *Rūs* and the Slavs had their own judge in Itil⁶⁶, the capital of the Khazars. Ibn Ya'qūb, who in 965/966 visited the court of Otto I, notes that „Mieszko's country [Poland] in the east borders on *Rūs*”⁶⁷.

Thus it is evident — and the examples could be multiplied⁶⁸ — that the Arabic authors make a sharp distinction between the *Rūs* and the Slavs. In stating this I will not, however, in this paper take sides in the dispute concerning the ethnic origin of the Rus'. As is known, two schools are represented in this controversy: the “Normanists” and the “Anti-Normanists”. According to the former, the Rus' were Scandinavian (Swedish) invaders of Eastern Europe and were the chief organizers of political life in the Novgorod area and on the shores of the Dnepr. The „Anti-Normanists”, on the other hand, consider these conquering Rus' to have been an Eastern Slavonic tribe from the middle Dnepr region. The reason why I here choose to pass

⁶⁰ The interpretations as to the location of this “island” are widely diverging; some scholars are of the opinion that the Taman peninsula is referred to here (which is quite out of the question), others maintain that the information refers to a northern area.

⁶¹ Cf. Chvol'son, op. cit., pp. 29 - 30; C. Macartney, *The Magyars in the ninth century*, 1930, pp. 210 - 213; R. Frye, *Remarks on some new Islamic sources of the Rus*, Byzantion, XVIII, 1948, pp. 121 - 122.

⁶² Zachoder, op. cit., p. 69.

⁶³ V. V. Bartol'd, *Arabskie izvestija o rusach*, Sovetskoe Vostokovedenie, Moskva — Leningrad, 1940, p. 42; C. A. Macartney, *The Petchenegs*, The Slavonic and East European Review, 8, 1929 - 1930, p. 215.

⁶⁴ Birkeland, op. cit., pp. 19 - 20.

⁶⁵ Cf., for instance R. Blake - R. Frye, *Notes on the Risala of Ibn-Fadlān*, Byzantina Metabyzantina, I, 1949, pp. 7 - 37.

⁶⁶ Birkeland, op. cit., p. 34.

⁶⁷ Ibidem, p. 44.

⁶⁸ Kmietowicz has summed up 30 Arabic authors who contrast the *Rūs* to the Slavs (*Artāniya-Artā*, pp. 241 - 242).

over the question of the descent of the Rus' is that, whether they were Scandinavians or Eastern Slavs, the *Rūs* of *Arthū* must, on the whole, be looked for in one and the same territory, i.e. either in the territory in Eastern Europe which was ruled over by the Rus'ian princes and which had its two nuclei in Kiev and Novgorod or, as a second possibility according to the „Normanists", also in Sweden. In either case, it is obviously a gross mistake to identify the Rus' with Western Slavs, the more so since no other sources (Russian, Greek or West European⁶⁹) do so.

Hrbek also expresses the opinion that the Arabic coins dating from the 8th - 10th centuries, which have been excavated on the southern shores of the Baltic, in East and West Prussia, in Pomerania, in Mecklenburg and on the island of Rugia, testify to direct commercial contacts between the Baltic Slavs and the Arabs⁷⁰. Vilinbachov reaches the same conclusion⁷¹. However, R. Jakimowicz's fundamental investigation of the Arabic coins found to the south-east of the Baltic and in eastern Europe refutes every such hypothesis⁷². Jakimowicz makes it clear beyond doubt that the Arabic coins which have been unearthed in the lands of the Baltic Slavs were brought there through the intermediation of Scandinavian merchants and via the Volga, the Scandinavian peninsula and Gotland⁷³. Jakimowicz's conclusions are shared by most „Normanists" and „Anti-Normanists". No earlier than in the 960's and 970's Arabic coins began to arrive in the Baltic area by another route, viz. from southern Russia and via the Vistula and the Oder⁷⁴.

⁶⁹ It is true that a small number of West European sources mix up the terms 'Rus' and 'Rugians' (A. Kunik - V. Rozen, *Izvestija al-Bekri i drugich avtorov o Rusi i slavjanach*, II, St. Peterburg, 1903, p. 161; B. Unbegaun, *Le nom des Ruthènes slaves*, *Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientales et Slaves*, X, 1950, pp. 611 - 618), but there is no reason at all to believe that al-Idrisi made the same mistake. The reason for this confusion of the two notions in Latin sources was that the older Latin form *Russi* (*Ruci*, *Rusci*, *Ruzi*, *Ruzzi*), meaning 'the Rus', was discarded by some West European writers in favour of the younger form *Rutheni* with the dual sense of 'Rus' and 'Rugians'. The form *Rutheni* was the result of an archaistic tendency to use the classical Latin suffix *-enus* when rendering the names of peoples; the same tendency can be observed when *Pruzzi* was transformed into *Prutheni* (Ad. Stender-Petersen, *La conquête danoise de la Samlande et les vikingi prussiens*, Varangica, Aarhus, 1953, p. 45).

⁷⁰ Hrbek, op. cit., p. 640.

⁷¹ Vilinbachov, *Baltijsko-Volzskij put'*, *Sovetskaja Archeologija*, III, 1963, p. 128 f.

⁷² R. Jakimowicz, *Über die Herkunft der Hacksilberfunde*, *Congressus secundus archaeologorum balticorum*, Rigae 19 - 23. VIII, 1930, Rigae, 1931.

⁷³ *Ibidem*, p. 255. Lately, the results achieved by Jakimowicz have been confirmed and further developed by Kmietowicz (*Niektóre problemy*).

⁷⁴ H. Arbman, *Une route commerciale pendant les X et XI siècles*, *Sl. Ant.* I, 1948; *Idem*, the article *Birkahandel*, *Kulturhistoriskt lexikon för nordisk medeltid*, I, 1956, column 584; M. Stenberger, *Die Schatzfunde Gotlands der Wikingerzeit*, Stockholm - Uppsala, 1958, p. 350; Ch. Warnke, *Die Anfänge des Fernhandels in Polen*, *Marburger Ostforschungen*, 22, 1964, p. 90, pp. 109 - 112; P. H. Sawyer, *The Age of the Vikings*,

Furthermore, there is no early literary evidence that the Baltic Slavs were a seafaring people, neither as merchants nor as warriors⁷⁵. Adam of Bremen and Saxo Grammaticus are the first to supply written testimony to such activities. Adam mentions that Slavonic merchant ships used to come to Birka (in Lake Mälaren)⁷⁶, and Saxo says that as late as the 990's the Slavs „extremely seldom indulged in piracy”⁷⁷.

Of course, the lack of other written testimony does not mean that the Baltic Slavs were no seafaring people, but it is quite evident that their activities at sea cannot have been of any great extent. For this reason it seems out of the question to identify them with the *Rūs*, who, according to our source, go down the rivers for trading purposes and whom the sources constantly depict as Seamen, roving for and wide.

When attempting to locate *Arthā* and *Arthāniya* we must follow the absolute norm that they be looked for where the Rus' held sway, i.e. either within the boundaries of the Kievan State or, according to the “Normanists”, in Scandinavia as well; below we shall see that also from the “Anti-Normanistic” view-point it should be possible to locate the two concepts in Scandinavia. Attempts to place *Arthā* and *Arthāniya* outside Rus' and Scandinavia must, in my opinion, be dismissed, as they leave too much to pure arbitrariness: the Arabic sources unequivocally state that *Arthāniya* is a Rus'ian tribe.

The same facts that eliminated the island of Rugia from our discussion can be advanced against locating the *Rūs* of *Arthā* to the Taman peninsula: Rus'ian sovereignty did not extend to this region in the first half of the 10th century or earlier. There are strong indications that this region was then controlled by the Khazars. Al-Mas'ūdī relates that, during a naval campaign in 912/913 against the countries to the west of the Caspian Sea, the *Rūs* were stopped by the Khazar troops posted at the entrance to the straits of Kerch off the Taman peninsula. The Khazar Chagan exacted from the *Rūs* a promise of half the booty captured from the nations living by the Caspian Sea. The *Rūs* were then permitted to continue their voyage⁷⁸. It is obvious that at this time Tmutorokan' was in the hands of the Khazars. The Emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus is also unfamiliar with Rus'ian possessions in these

2nd ed., London—Southampton, 1971, p. 116; G. Hatz, *Handel und Verkehr zwischen dem Deutschen Reich und Schweden in der späteren Wikingerzeit*, Stockholm, 1974.

In the latter half of the 10th century there was a remarkable influx of Arabic coins into Poland (M. Gumowski, *Moneta arabska w Polsce IX i X wieku*, Zapiski towarzystwa naukowego w Toruniu, XXIV, 1959, p. 24).

⁷⁵ A. Kunik - V. Rozen, op. cit., II, p. 30; J. Steenstrup, *Venderne og de danske*, Kjøbenhavn, 1900, pp. 8 - 22; H. Schüek, *Svenska folkets historia*, I, Lund, 1914, p. 172; Cf. Warnke, op. cit., pp. 56 ff, p. 89, p. 112.

⁷⁶ Adam of Bremen, ed. and transl. by F. Tschann, New York, 1959, p. 52. This reference concerns the period before circa 975, when Birka ceased existing.

⁷⁷ Lib. X, Hafniae, 1839, p. 492.

⁷⁸ Birkeland, op. cit., pp. 34 - 35.

regions; at least he does not mention any such in his treatise *De Administrando Imperio*, written about 950. Another matter of telling significance is that Constantine Porphyrogenitus advises his son — for whom *De Administrando Imperio* is intended as a guide in his future reign — to use Ghuzes and Alans, not Rus', to protect the Byzantine colonies on the Crimea against Khazarian inroads. Only with Prince Svjatoslav's victory over the Khazars, which, according to the oldest extant Russian chronicle, *Tale of Bygone Years* (also named *Nestor's Chronicle* after the monk Nestor, the supposed compiler), occurred in the year 965, did the conditions necessary for Rus'ian sovereignty over Tmutorokan' arise⁷⁹.

Nor by the help of archaeology is it possible to prove that the Rus' held sway on the Taman peninsula as early as the first half of the 10th century⁸⁰.

The situation was the same for the coastal area to the north of the Black Sea as for the Taman peninsula: it is nowhere attested that the Rus' extended their sovereignty to this area as early as the first half of the 10th century. The literary sources give quite another picture of the situation there. Constantine Porphyrogenitus' description of the Black Sea coast from the Danube to Sotiriupol (*De Administrando Imperio*, chapter 42) makes it quite clear that the Pečenegs controlled the mouths of the Dnepr, the Dnestr and the Danube as well as the northern coastal area of the Black Sea from the Danube to the Khazarian stronghold Sarkel on the Don⁸¹. That the Pečenegs controlled the land to the north of the Black Sea is confirmed by *Nestor's Chronicle*⁸².

Still another strong objection to locating *Arthā* and *Arthāniya* in this

⁷⁹ F. Vestberg, *Zapiska Gotskogo toparcha, Vizantijskij Vremennik*, XV, 1909, p. 262; A. Šachmatov, *Recenzija na knigu Parchomenko 'Načalo Christianstva'*, *Žurnal Ministerstva narodnog prosvješćenija*, 1914, p. 314; M. I. Artamonov, *Belaja Veža, Sovetskaja Archeologija*, XVI, 1952, p. 44, p. 46; idem, *Istorija chazar*, p. 431; M. V. Levčenko, *Očerki po istorii rusko-vizantijskich otnošenij*, Moskva, 1956, pp. 85 - 86; P. O. Karyškovskij, *Lev Diakon o Tmutarakanskoj Rusi*, *Vizantijskij Vremennik*, XVII, 1960, p. 5; *Vnešnjaia politika Drevnej Rusi*, ed. V. T. Pašuto, Moskva, 1968, p. 9.

⁸⁰ N. Repnikov, *O drevnosti Tmutorokani*, *Rossijskaja asociacija naučno-issledovatel'skikh institutov obščestvennykh nauk*, IV, 1928; I. Ljapuškin, *Slavjano-russkie poselenija IX - XII st. na Donu i Tamani po archeologičeskim dannym*, *Materialy i issledovanija po archeologii SSSR*, VI, 1941, p. 236; Artamonov, *Belaja Veža*, p. 50 ff.

⁸¹ Cf. C. A. Macartney, *The Petchenegs*, p. 343; D. A. Rasovskij, *Pečenegi, torki i berendeji na Rusi i v Ugrii*, *Seminarium Kondakovianum*, VI, 1933, pp. 3 - 5; D. Obolensky, *The Byzantine Commonwealth*, London, 1971, p. 165.

⁸² When Prince Svjatoslav was on the Danube, in Bulgaria (971), he discussed with his retinue his difficult plight in the newly conquered land. He says: "The Rus'ian Land is far away, the Pečenegs are at war with us, and who then will help us" (if the Byzantine forces move to the attack); see D. S. Lichačev, *Povest' vremennykh let*. *Tekst, perevod, stat'i i komentarii*, I, 1950, p. 51. Svjatoslav said nothing of Rus' reaching as far as the Black Sea, whilst his remark concerning the Pečenegs indicates that he could not return to Rus' without passing through their territory (Paszkievicz, *The Making of the Russian Nation*, p. 144).

southern area is that no such fur-bearing animals — sables and black foxes — as were exported from *Arthā* were found there.

In fact, scholars have been able to adduce only one substantial argument for this southern theory, viz. the passage in the copy of al-Istakhri's manuscript, which reads: "*Arthā* is situated between the country of the Khazars and Great Bulgaria, which borders on the northern parts of Rome [Byzantium]". But since this copy is of late provenance and abounds with miswritings, and since the relevant passage leaves room for different interpretations⁸³, no scientific value is attached to it by modern Arabists⁸⁴.

The location of *Arthā* and *Arthāniya* in the Erza-Mordvan region to the east or the Vjatičian region to the west of the Oka river⁸⁵ is in most respects more plausible. It agrees well with the conception of the homeland of the *Rūs*, as expressed by al-Istakhri, Ibn Hauqal and the anonymous author of *Hudūd al-'Ālam*. Thus, al-Istakhri notes that "the *Ātul* [the Volga] is the river which flows there [to Itil] from the *Rūs* and the Bulgars"⁸⁶; Ibn Hauqal says: "The *Rūs* are a people living in the neighbourhood of the Bulgars, between the latter and the Slavs, on the *Ātul*"⁸⁷; in *Hudūd al-'Ālam* it is stated that the three Rus'ian towns of *Arthā*, *S. lā* and *Kūyāba* are situated on the *Rūs* river (the Volga)⁸⁸.

As has been pointed out above, it would be wrong to let the statement that the *Rūs* live on the Volga determine the situation of *Arthā* (after all, *S. lā* as well as *Kūyāba* are also supposed to be located on the banks of this river!): from the accounts of several Arabic authors and also from the density of the Arabic coins around the upper and middle reaches of the Volga⁸⁹ we may infer that the Volga constituted the main commercial route connecting the Rus' with the Caliphate. Therefore the Arab writers may easily have got the mistaken impression that the three centres of the *Rūs* were situated on the Volga.

What other Arabic authors have to say about the general geographic orientation of the Rus'ian land might also seem to indicate that *Arthā* was situated in the Oka region. Thus, several Arabic authors, e.g. al-Munadjjim⁹⁰ and al-Birūnī⁹¹, state that the *Rūs* live in the seventh clime. (The concep-

⁸³ Chvol'son, op. cit., pp. 179 - 180; Hrbek, op. cit., p. 646; Novoselcev, op. cit., p. 409, p. 418; Kmietowicz, *Artāniya-Artā*, p. 250, note 31.

⁸⁴ Novoselcev, op. cit., p. 418.

⁸⁵ For the location of the Mordva and the Vjatičians, see B. A. Vasil'ev, *Problema burtasov i mordva*, Voprosy etničeskoj istorii mordovskogo naroda, Moskva, 1960, pp. 180 - 202.

⁸⁶ Birkeland, op. cit., p. 28.

⁸⁷ Ibidem, p. 48.

⁸⁸ Hrbek, op. cit., p. 649.

⁸⁹ Korsuchina, op. cit., p. 34, p. 36.

⁹⁰ Birkeland, op. cit., p. 12.

⁹¹ Ibidem, p. 61.

tion of the world as divided into climes, i.e. concentric zones parallel with the equator, had been borrowed from Ptolemy⁹². The seventh clime ran through Caucasia to the Volgabulgarian towns of Bulgar and Suvar, then through the land of the Rus'⁹³). Al-Munadjjim⁹⁴ also writes that the *Madjūs*⁹⁵, the Slavs and the *Rūs* live in the northernmost regions. He goes on to say that "the longest day in their lands lasts 20 hours, the shortest four hours". Ibn Hauqal relates: "The best furs come from the lands of Gog and Magog; these furs come to the *Rūs* because they are neighbours of the peoples of Gog and Magog"⁹⁶. In *Hudūd al-'Ālam* it is noted that "to the north of the *Rūs* there are the uninhabited northern lands"⁹⁷. Finally, there is an anonymous Arabic description of eastern Europe from the end of the 9th century which positively places the *Rūs* in the northern regions⁹⁸.

Also the climatic conditions said to prevail in the land of the *Rūs* point to a northern orientation. Thus Ibn Miskawayh notes that "the land of the *Rūs* is very cold and trees do not grow there. Fruit is brought to them only in small quantities from distant parts"⁹⁹. Al-Fidā', too, says that it is extremely cold in the land of the *Rūs*¹⁰⁰.

It is noteworthy that the Arabic writers have so little to say about the southern parts of the Rus'ian realm. Even on Kiev they have, as we have seen, only very obscure information. The reason for this silence is that southern Rus' engaged in commerce with the Arabs not earlier than the 10th century, and it was mainly through commercial contacts that the Arabs obtained their knowledge of the Rus'. As has been shown by Korsuchina, from this time we have the first hoards of Arabic coins in the Kievan area, but the paucity of these finds testifies to the fact that even in the 10th century commercial relations between Kiev and the Orient were comparatively limited. No hoards

⁹² V. J. Beljaev, *Materiaty po istorii turkmen*, Moskva—Leningrad, 1939, p. 15; L. S. Bagrov, *Die Geschichte der Kartographie*, Berlin, 1951, p. 33, p. 38.

⁹³ V. Minorsky, *Géographes et Voyageurs musulmans*, Bulletin de la Société royale de Géographie d'Égypte, XXXIV, 1951, p. 26; Zachoder, op. cit., p. 95.

CF., however, al-Idrīsī, the famous geographer, who locates the seventh clime to the northwestern parts of Europe, including Scandinavia and Poland (Birkeland, op. cit., pp. 72 - 73).

⁹⁴ Birkeland, op. cit., p. 12.

⁹⁵ *Al-Madjūs*, 'fire-worshippers, pagans', was the common West Arab name of the Northmen (Danes and Norwegians) who attacked Spain on several occasions (A. A. Vasiliev, *The Russian Attack on Constantinople in 860*, Cambridge, Mass., 1946, p. 3; A. Melvinger, *Les premières incursions des Vikings en Occident d'après les sources arabes*, Uppsala, 1955, p. 43).

⁹⁶ Birkeland, op. cit., p. 50.

⁹⁷ Ibidem, p. 51.

⁹⁸ T. Lewicki, *Świat słowiański*, p. 350; V. Minorsky, *Géographes et Voyageurs musulmans*, p. 26.

⁹⁹ Birkeland, op. cit., p. 56.

¹⁰⁰ Ibidem, p. 119.

containing Arabic coins and dating from the 9th century have been unearthed in the Kievan area¹⁰¹.

Another matter deserving attention is that *Nestor's Chronicle*, which is written from a Kievan perspective, does not say anything about Rus'ian commercial contacts with the Arabs. Nor does the Chronicle mention the campaigns or the pillaging expeditions which the *Rūs*, according to the Arabic sources, undertook against the Muslim countries to the south and to the west of the Caspian Sea (one between the years 864 and 884, one 909/10, one 912/13, one 943/44 and finally a couple towards the end of the 10th century and in the first half of the 11th century¹⁰²). This is all the more remarkable as other passages in the Chronicle devote ample space to the Rus'ian warlike campaigns against Slavonic and Finnish tribes and against Greeks, Bulgars, Khazars and other peoples. The explanation for this silence on the part of the Chronicle is in all probability that the warlike expeditions against the Arabs had come from northern Rus' or, according to some "Normanists", from Scandinavia (it may here be noted that such expeditions are in fact known to Old Norse literature and Swedish rune-stones¹⁰³).

Thus, the common view of the Arabic authors is that the *Rūs* had their homeland in a northern region. Such a description is not incompatible with the Oka territories of the Vjatičians and of the Mordvan tribe of Erza.

A strong argument for locating *Arthā* and *Arthāniya* in the territory of the Vjatičians is, according to Mongajt, that a number of hoards containing Arabic coins have been found there. This Mongajt maintains, bears witness that trading expeditions went from this area and down the Volga. But is this really a well-based assumption? We learn from *Nestor's Chronicle* that as late as the 12th century the Vjatičians were the most backward of the tribes which at that time belonged to Rus'¹⁰⁴. Such a state of matters is hardly consistent with their would-be role of important merchants on the Volga in the 9th and 10th centuries. In all probability the coin-hoards in the Oka region should not be associated with any far-reaching commercial activity on the part of the Vjatičians, but rather with the Khazarian push forward to this river¹⁰⁵ or with Bulgarian mercantile activity in the Oka basin¹⁰⁶.

¹⁰¹ G. Vernadsky, *Ancient Russia*, 3rd ed., New Haven, 1946, pp. 328 - 329; Korzuchina, op. cit., p. 34; cf. V. L. Janin, *Numizmatika i problemy tovarno-denezhnogo obrašćenija*, Voprosy Istorii, 8, 1955, p. 137.

¹⁰² V. Minorsky, *Rus' v Zakavkaz'e*, Acta Orientalia, III, 1953, pp. 207 - 210.

¹⁰³ A. Thulin, *Ingvarståget — en ny datering?*, Arkiv för nordisk filologi, 90, 1975, pp. 19 - 29.

¹⁰⁴ Lichačev, op. cit., I, p. 15.

¹⁰⁵ P. G. Ljubomirov, *Torgovye svjazi Rusi s vostokom v VIII - XI vv.*, Učenyje zapiski gosudarstvennogo saratovskogo universiteta, Saratov, 1923, p. 23.

¹⁰⁶ Cf. Kmietowicz, *Artāniya-Artā*, p. 245. That Bulgarian merchants used to visit the Oka region is evidenced by Prince Vladimir's treaty of 1006 with the Volga

Still another strong reason for placing *Arthā* and *Arthāniya* in the Oka region is, according to Mongajt, that archaeologists have found traces of ancient lead mining in the village of Beztuševo¹⁰⁷. However, for several reasons no decisive importance in the debate about *Arthā* and *Arthāniya* should be attributed to the information on the export of lead from *Arthā*. Firstly, lead in those days was mined at many places in northern Europe, e.g. in Poland, Pomerania, Mecklenburg, Silesia¹⁰⁸, Finland, Sweden and the Ural mountains¹⁰⁹. Secondly, no other sources mention any Rus'ian export of lead to the Muslim countries; and, certainly, if lead had been a Rus'ian export, it would have been mentioned by al-Mukadassi (end of the 10th century) in his exhaustive list of the different goods which were brought from Bulgar to Khoresm and then distributed to the Muslim countries¹¹⁰. Thirdly, what we know of the general character of the Rus'ian trade with the Arab countries and with Byzantium arouses further doubt as to whether lead was really an export of the Rus'. The Arabic sources inform us that the predominant Rus'ian exports were furs, slaves, swords, honey and wax. According to Ibn Rusta and Ibn Fadlān the *Rūs* take coins as payment¹¹¹. From the archaeological finds in Russia and Scandinavia we can infer that products of precious metals as well as silks were another part of the Arabic export to the north-west. The Rus'ian-Byzantine trade consisted of the same kinds of goods. The literary sources tell of Rus'ian export of furs, slaves, honey and wax, whereas the imported goods, according to the literary sources and the archaeological material, were silks, ornaments, glassware, ceramics, wines and spices¹¹². Thus, the goods exchanged between the Rus' on the one hand and the Greeks and the Arabs on the other consisted of luxuries or such goods as demanded a high price in relation to their volume and weight. The suggestion of a Rus'ian export of lead so flagrantly clashes with this general pattern that strong doubt must be cast on its trustworthiness.

The information handed down by al-Istakhri and Ibn Hauqal that sables and black foxes are a Rus'ian export is confirmed by other Arabic sources.

Bulgars (cf. M. Martynov, *Dogovor Vladimira s Volzskimi bolgarami 1006 goda*, Istōrik Marksist, 1940, pp. 116 - 117).

¹⁰⁷ *Staraja Rjazan'*, p. 90.

¹⁰⁸ Hrbek, op. cit., p. 645.

¹⁰⁹ Vestberg, *K analizu*, p. 399; Hrbek, op. cit., p. 645; P. Foote - D. Wilson, *The Viking Achievement*, London, 1970, p. 184; A. A. Jesson, *Rannie svjazi Priural'ja s Iranom*, Sovetskaja Archeologija, XVI, 1952, p. 230.

¹¹⁰ I. Hrbek, *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, I, 1960, p. 1306.

¹¹¹ According to Ibn Rusta, "the sole occupation of the *Rūs* is trading in furs, sable and minivers, which they sell to those who buy from them. As payment they take coins..." (Birkeland, op. cit., p. 16). Ibn Fadlān tells how the *Rūs* merchant speaks to his god and says: "I wish that you bring me a merchant with many dirhams and dinars..." (ibidem, p. 20).

¹¹² Obolensky, op. cit., p. 224.

As regards the black fox, it extended as far south as the Volga region in those days. On this matter al-Mas'ūdī states¹¹³: "From the country of the Burtas¹¹⁴ come pelts of black foxes. They are the most valued furs".

The sable, on the other hand, was not spread so far to the south. Its range in medieval times encompassed the desolate and thinly populated conifer belt of Siberia to the Ural mountains¹¹⁵. This is corroborated by Marwazī, who says that the best sables come from the Jugra¹¹⁶ (a Finnish tribe near the Pečora). It is hard to imagine that the Mordva or the Vjatičians had anything to do with the trade in sables.

There is, however, a more important argument against the localization of *Arthā* and *Athāniya* in the lands of the Mordvan Erza and the Vjatičians: neither of these tribes was of Rus'ian (= Eastern Slavonic) descent, nor were they under Rus'ian sovereignty in the first half of the 10th century.

As regards the Erza, their Finnish provenance is beyond doubt. Likewise, there is little doubt as to the Polish origin of the Vjatičians. In this matter *Nestor's Chronicle* gives unambiguous testimony. The Chronicle relates: "The Poljanians — — belonged to the Slavic race — —, as did the Derevljans — —, but the Radimičians and the Vjatičians sprang from the Ljachs (*ot ljachov*; the Poles)¹¹⁷"; it is obvious that the Polish Radimičians and Vjatičians are contrasted with the Eastern Slavonic Poljanians and Derevljans. The Chronicle goes on to say that "there were in fact among the Ljachs two brothers, one named Radim and the other Vjatko. Radim settled on the Sož, where the people are known as Radimičians, and Vjatko with his family settled on the Oka. The people there were named Vjatičians after him". The Polish descent of the Radimičians is again documented in the Chronicle under the year 965, where it is noted that "the Radimičians sprang from the Ljachs"¹¹⁸. Paszkiewicz pertinently remarks that no later chroniclers correct Nestor's statement of the Polish origin of the Vjatičians and the Radimičians, which indicates that they considered it to be true¹¹⁹. It is also noteworthy that the dialects in the Sož and the Oka regions have characteristics reminiscent of the Polish and the White Russian languages. This proves, Šachmatov maintains, that the Vjatičians and the Radimičians were of Polish descent¹²⁰. This point is further confirmed by the occurrence of place-names of Polish origin in the

¹¹³ Birkeland, op. cit., p. 41.

¹¹⁴ The Burtas lived on the Volga, between the Bulgars and the Khazars, see B. A. Vasil'ev, *Problema burtasov i mordva*, maps.

¹¹⁵ J. Bernström, the article *Sobel*, *Kulturhistoriskt lexikon för nordisk medeltid*, XVI, 1971, column 355.

¹¹⁶ *Sharaf al-Zamān Tāhīr Marwazī on China, the Turks and India*, ed. V. Minorsky, J. G. Forlong Fund, XXII, 1942, p. 34.

¹¹⁷ Lichačev, op. cit., I, p. 14.

¹¹⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 59.

¹¹⁹ *The Making of the Russian Nation*, p. 353.

¹²⁰ A. A. Šachmatov, *Drevnejšie sud'by russkogo plemeni*, pp. 35 - 37.

Soż and Oka regions¹²¹. It is possible that another testimony to the habitation of a Polish tribe in Eastern Europe could be found in Constantine Porphyrogenitus' *De Administrando Imperio*. Constantine twice, in chapters 9 and 37, refers to a tribe by the name of *lenzanénoi* and *lenzeni'noi* respectively; Constantine assigns their place of living first to the neighbourhood of the Derevljans and the Pečenegs, then to the vicinity of the Krivičian territory. Among modern scholars the opinion prevails that the words *lenzanénoi* and *lenzeni'noi* correspond to the Old Slavic form *leđjaninŭ* from which *lečŭ* is a shortened form, found in the medieval Russian chronicles as *ljachŭ*. The exact identity of this Polish tribe is a question of dispute¹²², but there are good reasons for its identity with the Radimičians and the Vjatičians¹²³.

Nor is it probable that the Vjatičians were submitted to the Rus' in the first half of the 10th century. It is true that *Nestor's Chronicle* enumerates the Vjatičians among the tribes which, under the leadership of Prince Oleg, undertook a campaign against the Greeks in 907, but it is open to some doubt whether such a campaign actually took place¹²⁴ — the Byzantine sources know of no Rus'ian attack in this year. In other contexts when 'Nestor' lists the different Slavic and Finnish tribes which, in the 9th and 10th centuries, were either tributary to or otherwise linked to Rus', he does not make any mention of the Vjatičians.

They were, we are informed, under the sovereignty of the Khazars. In the long version of the letter of the Khazarian Chagan Josef, which he wrote in the 950's to a Jew in the Western Caliphate, he mentions a tribe, *V. n. tit*, which was subject to the Khazars¹²⁵. In all probability Josef here has in mind the Vjatičians¹²⁶. The Khazarian supremacy over the Vjatičians is confirmed by *Nestor's Chronicle*, which, under the years 964 and 966, states that earlier the Vjatičians were tributary to the Khazars but had now been vanquished by Prince Svjatoslav, who made them pay taxes to Rus' instead¹²⁷. Even in

¹²¹ F. Bujak, *Skąd przyszli Radymicze i Wjatycze na Ruś?* Światowit, XX, 1948/49, pp. 72 - 89; J. Czekanowski, *Wstęp do historii Słowian*, 2nd ed., Poznań, 1957, pp. 195 - 199.

¹²² Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De Administrando Imperio*, II, Commentary, ed. R. Jenkins, London, 1962, pp. 34 - 35; I. Sorlin, *Le témoignage de Constantin VII Porphyrogénète sur l'état ethnique et politique de la Russie au début du X^e siècle*, Cahiers du monde russe et soviétique, 2, avril-juin 1965, p. 160, note 1.

¹²³ Paszkiewicz, *The Origins of Russia*, pp. 365 - 380.

¹²⁴ S. V. Bachrušin, *Nekotorye voprosy istorii Kievskoj Rusi*, Istorik Marksist, 3, 1937, p. 172; H. Grégoire, *Miscellanea epica et ethymologica*, Byzantion, XI, 1936, p. 602; idem, *La légende d'Oleg et l'expédition d'Igor*, Bulletin de la Classe de Lettres, XXIII, 1937, pp. 80 - 94; R. H. Dolley, *Oleg's mythical campaign against Constantinople*, Bulletin de la Classe de Lettres, XXXV, 1949, pp. 106 - 130; idem, *Pseudo-Symeon and the Oleg Controversy*, The Slavonic and East European Review, XXX, 1951, pp. 551 - 555.

¹²⁵ P. K. Kokovcov, *Evrejsko-chazarskaja perepiska*, Leningrad, 1932, p. 98.

¹²⁶ T. Lewicki, *Znajomość krajów*, p. 101.

¹²⁷ Lichačev, op. cit., I, p. 47.

later times the Vjatičians continued to resist the Rus'ian dominion, and in 981 Prince Vladimir had to wage war against them¹²⁸. As late as the beginning of the 13th century the Vjatičians raised a rebellion against the Rus' and in 1208 Prince Vsevolod vanquished the people of Rjazan' and destroyed the town with fire¹²⁹.

It is more difficult to ascertain whether the Mordva were linked to Rus'. The written sources give few clues, but these, each and all, speak against such a state of affairs. Thus *Nestor's Chronicle* does not list the Mordva among the tribes which the Rus'ian princes, in the latter half of the 9th century and in the 10th century, summoned for their wars against hostile tribes as well as against the Greeks, the Bulgars and other peoples. Nor does the Chronicle list the Mordva among the tribes which in those days were made tributary to the Rus'. Furthermore, on several occasions the Chronicle mentions different towns, which were governed by the "men" of the Rus'ian princes, but no mention is made of any Mordvan town in such a capacity. Nor does the Old Norse *Orvar Odd's saga*, which lists a number of Rus'ian towns with their princes, know of any such towns in the Mordvan territory¹³⁰. But we also have positive evidence that the Mordva were independent of Rus': in *Discourse on the Ruin of the Rus'ian Land (Slovo o pogibel'i russkoj zemli)*, from the 13th century, the Mordva are enumerated among the neighbours of the Rus'¹³¹.

Another argument against the existence of a Rus'ian centre at Arzamas or Rjazan' is that these places were situated at some distance from the Volga, the all-important trade route; and it was on the Volga that the Rus' focused their commercial interest, along that river they had their strongholds and points of support.

Lastly, neither Arzamas nor Rjazan' was of such an importance as to deserve mentioning on a par with Kiev and Novgorod. It is particularly in this respect that the identification of *Arthā* with Rjazan' or Arzamas must be submitted to criticism: in the ancient Russian chronicles, Rjazan' is mentioned for the first time under the year 1096, while no mention at all is made of Arzamas. It is therefore a highly gratuitous construction to allot to Rjazan' or Arzamas the same important role of a Rus'ian commercial centre which *Arthā* has according to our Arabic text.

Like Mongajt, Swoboda wants to see in *Arthāniya* a Mordvan tribe. Under the name of *Ar* this tribe is mentioned in a small number of sources. Swoboda himself is well aware of the weak point in his theory — that the *Ar* were not a Rus'ian (= Eastern Slavonic) tribe. The reason for this confusion, in Swoboda's view, is that al-Balkhī's (al-Istakhri's?) informant had little know-

¹²⁸ Ibidem, p. 58.

¹²⁹ *Polnoe sobranie russkich letopisej*, I, p. 434.

¹³⁰ C. Rafn, *Antiquités russes*, Hafniae, 1850, p. 105.

¹³¹ M. Gorlin, *Le dit de la ruine de la terre russe*, Revue des Études Slaves, XIII, 1947, pp. 5 - 35.

ledge of the political and ethnical changes in the basins of the Upper Volga and Oka in the 9th century. There, the indigenous Finnish population had been subject to a constant infiltration by the Rus'ian (= Eastern Slavonic) tribes of the Krivičians and the Vjatičians (Swoboda numbers the Vjatičians among the Eastern Slavs). As a result, centres with a mixed Slavonic-Finnish population arose in this region. I shall not here dwell upon the question whether the Eastern Slavs started their eastward migration as early as the 9th century (I leave out of account the well documented Vjatičian push to the east). Suffice it to say that this question is one of the most controversial in Russian historical-geographical research: many historians and archaeologists express themselves in the negative on this point, and among the scholars who declare themselves for an early Slavonic eastward migration there is no unanimity as to whether the colonizers were Krivičians (living in the area where the Western Dvina, the Volga and the Dnepr arise) or Slovenes (in the Novgorod area)¹³². On the whole, Swoboda seems to me to have placed too much weight on the formal similarities between the Finnish name-forms *Ar*, **taniya*, *arta* and the Arabic *Arthā* and *Arthāniya*, while, like other scholars who have localized *Arthā* and *Arthāniya* to the region between the Oka and the Volga, he has allowed historical and geographical considerations to come in second place.

Summing up the arguments for the localization of *Arthā* and *Arthāniya* in Vjatičian or Mordvan territory, I do not find them convincing. The reasons against this theory seem to me decisive, viz. firstly, that neither the Mordva nor the Vjatičians were of Rus'ian (= Eastern Slavonic) descent; secondly, that none of these tribes, in the first half of the 10th century, was linked to Rus' or had any Rus'ian centre in its territory; thirdly, that it is improbable for geographical reasons that any of these tribes had anything to do with the export of fables.

Reinaud and Chvol'son decipher *Arthāniya* and *Arthā* as **Barmāniya* and **Barmā*. In their opinion **Barmāniya* corresponds to the Old Norse *Bjarmaland*, whereas **Barmā* denotes the capital of that same area. Minorsky considers the interpretations **Barmāniya* and **Barmā* possible. He prefers this hypothesis to the identification of the two names as *Erza* and *Arzamas*, for „the identity of *Artha* with the Finnish *Erzya* is far from conclusive.

¹³² Paszkiewicz has submitted the theory of an early Eastern Slavonic colonization of these lands to a critical examination. He states that neither the literary sources nor the archaeological remains support such a theory (*The Origin of Russia*, pp. 257 - 278; *The Making of the Russian Nation*, pp. 247 - 302). Modern Soviet archaeologists have pointed out that the defective archaeological material does not permit any farreaching conclusions as to the time and scope of the Slavonic infiltration into the region between the Volga and the Oka (I. I. Ljapuškina, *Archeologičeskie pamjatniki slavjan lesnoj zony Vostočnoj Evropy nakanune obrazovanija drevnerusskogo gosudarstva (VIII - IX vv.)*, *Kul'tura Drevnej Rusi*, Moskva, 1966, pp. 127 - 136; L. S. Klejn, G. S. Lebedev, V. A. Nazarenko, *Normanskije drevnosti Kievskoj Rusi na sovremennom etape archeologičeskogo izučenija, Istoričeskie svjazi Skandinavii i Rossii IX - XX vv.*, Leningrad, 1970, p. 230).

By no means would the Arabs have confused the appearance of a Finnish people with the Rus of Kūyāba and Novgorod"¹³³. Minorsky is, however, sceptical of Reinaud's and Chvol'son's attempts to identify *Bjarmaland* with Perm, and as for the objections to such an identification he refers to A. Tallgren's article *Biarmia*. There Tallgren maintains that the Old Norse literature and King Alfred's *Orosius* (Ohthere's travel account, chapter 17) attest that the Norse *Bjarmaland* was a vaguely delimited zone between Finnmark, the White Sea, Lake Onega and Lake Ladoga, and he emphasizes that Perm (in the Kama and Vjatka regions) was not identical with the Norse *Bjarmaland*¹³⁴. As regards Tallgren's localization of *Bjarmaland*, it is rather doubtful: the majority of scholars is of the opinion that *Bjarmaland* denoted a strictly northern area by the White Sea and the Northern Dvina¹³⁵. It is also questionable whether Tallgren and, later also e.g. V. Jansson¹³⁶, are right in assuming that the words Bjarmians and Permians represent two different concepts. A majority of scholars, among others K. Vilkuna¹³⁷, maintain that the West Norse *bjarm* and the Anglo-Saxon *beorm* are the same word as the Finnic-Ugric *perm* (a weak *p* of the Finnic-Ugric languages is often rendered by a *b* in other languages). In regard to the interrelation between the concepts 'Bjarmians' and 'Permians', as well as to many other problems touching on *Bjarmaland* and Perm, there is no consensus among scholars¹³⁸. In the discussion of *Arthā* and *Arthāniya* it is, however, not necessary to devote an exhaustive study to these problems, for whether the *Rūs* of *Arthā* are identified with the Bjarmians (the Permians as the case may be) in the northwest or with the Permians on the Kama and the Vjatka, the strong objection could be raised that neither the Bjarmians nor the Permians were of Rus'ian (=Slavonic or Scandinavian) descent — they were a Finnic-Ugric people.

Furthermore, there are no indications in the literary sources that there was any Rus'ian-Scandinavian or Rus'ian-Slavonic centre in *Bjarmaland* or Perm. As regards *Bjarmaland* the Old Norse literature tells us that the Scandinavians went there for trading purposes and that they had no permanent settlements there. During these expeditions they acquired furs, e.g. sables, in exchange for articles of every-day use. Also from Eastern Slavonic territory, especially from Novgorod and Staraja Ladoga, trading expeditions went out to the northern lands in quest of furs. The first written

¹³³ *Addenda to the Hudūd al-Ālam*, p. 268.

¹³⁴ A. Tallgren, *Biarmia*, *Eurasia Septentrionalis Antiqua*, VI, 1931, p. 105, p. 107, pp. 117 - 118.

¹³⁵ See B. Steckzèn's survey in *Var bolde bjarmerna*, *Ymer*, 84 : 4, 1964, pp. 247 ff.

¹³⁶ V. Jansson, *Bjarmaland*, *Ortnamnssällskapet i Uppsala årsskrift*, I, 1936, pp. 45 - 48.

¹³⁷ K. Vilkuna, the article *Bjarmer och Bjarmaland*, *Kulturhistoriskt lexikon för nordisk medeltid*, I, 1956, column 648.

¹³⁸ Jansson, *op. cit.*, pp. 42 - 45.

testimony to such an activity dates from the 11th century¹³⁹, but such expeditions were most certainly a common occurrence already in the 9th and 10th centuries. The medieval Russian chronicles give us, however, no reason to assume the existence of any early Rus'ian (Scandinavian or Slavonic) centre in these northern regions.

Ibn Hauqal, too, informs us that the *Rūs* obtain their furs in the northern parts of Europe. He says that „the finest furs come from the lands of Gog and Magog; these furs come to the *Rūs* because they are neighbours of the peoples in the lands of Gog and Magog”¹⁴⁰.

R. Hennig has assumed that the Bjarmians were directly engaged in the trade with the Arabs¹⁴¹. As we shall see below, this assumption has a certain backing in the Arabic sources. A possible indication of mutual trading-contacts are the finds, although scarce¹⁴², of Arabic coins in the northern Finnish lands. Nevertheless, these observations should not lead us into identifying the *Arthāniya* with the Bjarmians. There are valid reasons against such a conclusion. First and foremost, the Rus' were the most important merchants on the Volga, and whatever interpretation is given to the term 'Rus', it cannot have included the Bjarmians. Moreover, we can infer from the literary sources and from the archaeological finds that the Bjarmians were half-nomadic trappers¹⁴³ — they were not merchants travelling far and wide — and hence it follows that the coins uncovered in *Bjarmaland* were not brought there by the Bjarmians.

As regards the localization of *Arthā* and *Arthāniya* in the Permian regions around the Kama and the Vjatka, there is nothing in the written sources to indicate that Perm in the 10th century or earlier belonged to Rus' or that there was any Rus'ian centre there. Furthermore, the finds of Arabic coins dating from the 9th and 10th centuries are scarce in Perm¹⁴⁴, and these coins

¹³⁹ In the year 1032 the chronicles note the appearance of the Novgorodians in the valleys of the great northern rivers flowing into the Arctic (Archeografičeskaja Komissija, *Polnoe sobranie russkich letopisej*, IX, St. Peterburg, p. 49). Under the date 1079, the chronicles narrate that the Novgorodian Prince Gleb Svjatoslavič was killed in the country beyond the Portage (ibidem, III, p. 3). The country beyond the Portage (Zavoloč'e) extended east of the lakes Onega and Beloozero and embraced the valley of the Northern Dvina (R. J. Kerner, *The Urge to the Sea*, Berkely, 1942, p. 26). In 1096 the chronicles describe the Novgorodian barter trade with the Jugra (*Polnoe Sobranie*, I, p. 107). Under the year 1114 the Hypatian redaction of *Nestor's Chronicle* notes that the governor of Ladoga, Pavel, and “all the men of Ladoga have much to tell about the northern lands” and “about the ‘older men’ who used to go beyond the Jugra and the Samojets into the land of midnight” (ibidem, II, 2nd ed., St. Peterburg, 1908, p. 276).

¹⁴⁰ Birkeland, op. cit., p. 49.

¹⁴¹ *Der mittelalterliche arabische Handelsverkehr*, p. 251.

¹⁴² Jakimowicz, op. cit., map, p. 252; Tallgren, op. cit., p. 109; F. Balodis, *Handelswege nach dem Osten und die Wikinger in Russland*, K. Vitterhets- och Antikvitets Akademiens Handlingar, 65, 1948, p. 337.

¹⁴³ Steckzén, op. cit., p. 247, p. 263.

¹⁴⁴ Tallgren, op. cit., p. 109; Jakimowicz, op. cit., p. 253.

arrived there mainly through the intermediation of the Volga Bulgars¹⁴⁵ — they were not brought there by merchants from Perm. Hence, there are no grounds at all for identifying the *Arthāniya*, who, as is stated in our source, „go down the rivers for trading purposes”, with Permian merchants.

Novoselev places *Arthā* and *Arthāniya*, which he reads *Arsā* and *Arsāniya*, in the upper Volga region. The only real arguments that he adduces for this theory are that *Arthā* must have a northern location and that *Arthā*, according to a variant reading found in a copy of al-Idrisi's manuscript, is situated between *Salāwiya* and *Kūyāba*. Although Novoselev does not say so explicitly it is evident that he sides with the few scholars who discard the probable identification of *Kūyāba* with Kiev and who instead give preference to the hardly acceptable opinion that *Kūyāba* was a place on the upper Volga. Another weak point in Novoselev's theory is that he has not been able to find any prototype for the names *Arthā* and *Arthāniya*.

A summary of the above critical survey of the different theories on *Arthā* and *Arthāniya* shows that in Eastern Europe there was no Eastern Slavonic tribe which meets the requirements that must be made on *Arthāniya*, viz., firstly, that this tribe must have a northern location, secondly, that it must live within the boundaries of the State of Rus', thirdly that it must be well-known for its trading expeditions „down the rivers”, fourthly, that it must have a name which may reasonably have been rewritten as Arabic *Arthāniya* (with variants). Furthermore, none of the places, Rjazan' and Arzamas, which have been associated with the name *Arthā*, meet the necessary prerequisite, namely to be of such importance as to deserve mentioning on a level with Kiev and Novgorod; besides, it is not probable that Rjazan' and Arzamas as early as the beginning of the 10th century were Russian towns.

To the general criteria which have been arrived at above for the localization and identification of *Arthā* and *Arthāniya* can be added the more precise geographical information from ad-Dimashqī (al-Idrisī?) that the *Arthāniya* live on the coasts of the Atlantic (which here refers to the Baltic¹⁴⁶). Another clue of some value for the localization of *Arthā* and *Arthāniya* is the statement in the Chester-Beatty MS that *Arthā* “is the *Rūs* province situated furthest away” (from Bulgar, Kmietowicz).

Using all this as a basis I would suggest that the *Arthāniya* were Scandinavian, or more precisely Swedish, merchants.

¹⁴⁵ Ljubomirov, op. cit., p. 26; K. Vilkuna, op. cit., column 649.

¹⁴⁶ That the Arab geographers considered the Baltic to be a part of the Atlantic Ocean has been noted by many scholars, i.e. Kmietowicz, *Artāniya-Artā*, pp. 252 - 253; cf. Kunik-Rozen, op. cit., I, 1878, p. 77; J. O. Thomson, *History of Ancient Geography*, Cambridge, 1948, p. 241; Paszkiewicz, *The Origin of Russia*, pp. 419 - 420; idem, *The Making of the Russian Nation*, p. 132; T. Lewicki, *Die Vorstellungen arabischer Schriftsteller des 9. und 10. Jahrhunderts von der Geographie und von den ethnischen Verhältnissen Osteuropas*, Der Islam, 1960, pp. 31 - 32.

The necessary prerequisite, if this hypothesis is to be considered at all, is of course that the Swedes were included in the term *Rūs* (*Rus'*, *Rhos*).

For the „Normanists” there has never been any doubt that the Rus' were originally of Scandinavian descent. The evidence found in the medieval literature to support this theory has been given a comprehensive survey by Paszkiewicz¹⁴⁷. It will therefore suffice here to quote the most important literary testimony for the „Normanistic” theory. When in 839, according to the *Bertinian Annals*, there came to Emperor Louis the Pius, from Constantinople to Ingelheim, certain persons who called themselves Rus' (*Rhos*), the Emperor enjoined that their nationality be most diligently investigated: it transpired that they were Swedes (*Sucones*; inhabitants of Central Sweden). Liutprand, bishop of Cremona (10th century), twice testifies that Rus' denoted Norsemen and was their other name (*Rusios, quos alio nos nomine Nordmannos; Graeci vocant — — Rusios, nos vero a positione loci nominamus Nordmannos*). Constantine Porphyrogenitus lists the Rus'ian as well as the Slavonic names of the Dnepr cataracts; it is an indubitable fact that the Rus'ian names are Scandinavian. Al-Ya'qūbī and al-Mas'ūdī relate that Seville was plundered by the *Rūs* in 844, while the Spanish *Chronicon Albeldense* calls the invaders Norsemen (*Lordomanni*). Also to 'Nestor' the Scandinavian origin of the Rus' is indubitable. To Paszkiewicz's list should be added the observation that the *Rūs*, who, according to the Arabic *A History of Bāb al-abu'āb, Sharvān and Arrān*, in 1030 - 1032 warred in the regions to the west of the Caspian, in all evidence were Swedes¹⁴⁸.

The conclusion that the Scandinavians were included in the term *Rūs* is strongly confirmed by the ethnographical information found in the Arabic sources on the *Rūs*. In this connection Ibn Fadlān's famous narrative of a Rus'ian ship burial on the shore of the Volga is of outstanding interest. The burial customs and ritual as described by him are typically Scandinavian¹⁴⁹. Ibn Miskawayh tells of the *Rūs* who in 943/944 captured the town of Bardaa to the west of the Caspian Sea. His narrative is full of details concerning the customs, weapons etc. of the *Rūs*¹⁵⁰. Alluding to this source, the Swedish archaeologist M. Stenberger states that „there could hardly be found a more appropriate description of the Norse Viking-warrior”¹⁵¹. Al-Istakhri's¹⁵²

¹⁴⁷ *The Origins of Russia*, pp. 109 - 181; *The Making of the Russian Nation*, pp. 110 - 175.

¹⁴⁸ A. Thulin, op. cit., pp. 19 - 29.

¹⁴⁹ See e.g. G. Dumézil, *De nordiska gudarna* (transl. from French), 2nd ed., Stockholm, 1966; H. R. Ellis Davidson, *Nordens gudar och myter* (transl. from English), Stockholm, 1966; idem, *Scandinavian Mythology*, 1969; F. Ström, *Nordisk Hedendom*, Lund, 1967.

¹⁵⁰ Birkeland, op. cit., pp. 54 - 58.

¹⁵¹ *Die Schatzfunde Gotlands*, p. 340.

¹⁵² Birkeland, op. cit., p. 29.

and Ibn Hauqal's¹⁵³ texts also contain a detail showing that their *Rūs* were Scandinavians: they note that some of the *Rūs* "twist their beards like a horse's mane or plait it" — a Scandinavian custom¹⁵⁴.

The „Anti-Normanists” on their part maintain that the reason why so many sources identify the Rus' (=Eastern Slavs) as Scandinavians is that there were also Scandinavians among those Rus'ian (=Eastern Slavonic) warriors, envoys and merchants, who came in contact with the Greeks, the Arabs and other peoples, and this had as a consequence that the medieval sources constantly confused the Rus' with the Scandinavians¹⁵⁵. I will here leave it an open question which of the two theories is the correct one. Still, the „Anti-Normanistic” standpoint deserves attention inasmuch as it presupposes in the literary sources a confusion of the Rus' with the Scandinavians. Hence, there is nothing to prevent al-Balkhī (or al-Istakhri) from having made a similar mistake, confusing the Scandinavians with the Eastern Slavs who travelled down the Volga — particularly not since no „Anti-Normanists” deny that the Scandinavians undertook trading expeditions along the Volga; some „Anti-Normanists” even agree with the „Normanists” in allotting to the Scandinavians the main part in this trade¹⁵⁶, others concede that they had an important part in it¹⁵⁷.

Thus, all „Normanists” unite in the view that the Scandinavians had a leading role in the Volga trade, while some, though not all, „Anti-Normanists” acknowledge that they had an important part in it. The Arabic authors who tell of the *Rūs* and their trading expeditions down the Volga must have included the Scandinavians in the term *Rūs*, since it was the *Rūs* who, according to the Arabic authors, were the leading merchants on the Volga and since the Arabic authors know of no other designation which might possibly have embraced the Scandinavian merchants.

The source material on *Arthā* and *Arthāniya* provides some interesting information on the different goods, among them swords, which the *Rūs* carried down the Volga. The export of swords is confirmed by Ibn Khurdādhbih. He tells us that Rus'ian merchants carry swords, among other goods, to Baghdad¹⁵⁸. In all probability, the swords, which according to *Hudūd al-'Ālam* were exported from *Arthā*, were not made in Rus' or Scandinavia: the Arabs,

¹⁵³ Ibidem, p. 51.

¹⁵⁴ P. Paulsen, *Axt und Kreuz in Nord- und Osteuropa*, Bonn, 1956, p. 243; V. Michelsen, the article *Hår- og skægmoder*, *Kulturhistoriskt lexikon för nordisk medeltid*, VII, 1962, column 222; B. Almgren, *Vikingen*, 1968, p. 206.

¹⁵⁵ See e.g. V. P. Šušarin, *Sovremennaja buržuaznaja istoriografija drevnej Rusi*, Moskva, 1964, p. 241; I. P. Šaskol'skij, *Normanskaja teorija v sovremennoj buržuaznoj nauke*, Moskva—Leningrad, 1965, p. 84, p. 89.

¹⁵⁶ P. I. Ljaščenko, *Istorija narodnogo chozjajstva SSSR*, I, 1947, pp. 97–98.

¹⁵⁷ A. Ja. Gurevič, *Pochody Vikingov*, Moskva, 1966, p. 53 f.; A. N. Kirpičnikov, *Connections between Russia and Scandinavia in the 9th and 10th centuries, as illustrated by weapon finds*, *Scando-Slavica, Supplementum I*, 1970, p. 51.

¹⁵⁸ Birkeland, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

who themselves were very skilled in the manufacture of weapons, could hardly have been interested in importing swords of a comparatively low quality from Rus' or Scandinavia¹⁵⁹. In a survey of the Arabic sources which tell of European swords, Zeki Validi Togan has rightly maintained that the pliant swords which are said to be exported from *Arthā* were of Frankish manufacture¹⁶⁰. Several good reasons justify such an assumption. Firstly, the elasticity of the Frankish swords is attested in medieval literature. Thus, an Arabic source notes that these swords were so pliant that they could be „folded like a paper”¹⁶¹. In *Gesta Caroli Magni* there is testimony to the same effect. There it is told that Scandinavian envoys came to the Frankish Emperor Louis the German. They brought with them gifts, including swords. The Emperor himself tested the blades with the result that only one of them proved so resilient as to meet the Frankish standards¹⁶². Secondly, the Frankish swords were highly appreciated in the Orient¹⁶³, and the import there of swords directly from the land of the Franks is well documented in the Muslim sources¹⁶⁴. It would seem, however, that there is general agreement that the Frankish swords were brought to the Orient also by way of the Baltic and the East-European rivers. In the opinion of many scholars this transit trade was in the hands of Scandinavian merchants¹⁶⁵. This conclusion is corroborated by the results arrived at through an investigation of all the swords of the 9th - 11th centuries found in Rus'. Thus, Soviet laboratory tests, conducted in 1963 - 1964, have revealed that the Frankish swords constitute more than 60% of these swords¹⁶⁶. The Frankish swords were brought to Rus' by Scandinavian merchants — on this there is general unanimity among Soviet archaeologists¹⁶⁷. But nothing that we otherwise know

¹⁵⁹ I. Brøndsted, *Vikingarna hemma och i härnad* (transl. from Danish), Stockholm, 1962, p. 93.

¹⁶⁰ Zeki Validi Togan, *Die Schwerter der Germanen nach arabischen Berichten des 9 - 11. Jahrhunderts*, Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, 90, 1936, p. 29.

¹⁶¹ Ibidem.

¹⁶² *Monachi Sangalensis de gestis Caroli Imperatoris*, lib. II, Mon. Germ. Hist., Ser. II, p. 761.

¹⁶³ An Arabic source reports that a Frankish sword could cost up to 1000 Egyptian dinars (Zeki Validi Togan, *Die Schwerter*, p. 29).

¹⁶⁴ S. Bolin, *Muhammed, Karl den store och Rusik*, Scandia, 12, 1939, p. 206 (English translation in *The Scand. Economic Hist. Rev.*, I, 1953); R. S. Lopez, *East and West in the Early Middle Ages: Economic Relations*, Relazioni del X congresso internazionale di scienze storiche, III, Firenze, 1955, p. 143.

¹⁶⁵ Vestberg, *K analizu*, p. 398; H. Arbman, *Schweden und das Karolingische Reich*, Kungl. Vitterhets Historie- och Antikvitets Akademiens Handlingar, 43, 1937, p. 231; Bolin, *Muhammed*, p. 217; idem, *Gotlands vikingatidsskatter*, Historia kring Gotland, Stockholm, 1963, p. 39; S. U. Palme, *Kristendomens genombrott i Sverige*, Stockholm, 1959, p. 17 f.; Ad. Stender-Petersen, *Der älteste russische Staat*, Hist. Zeitschr., 191, 1960, pp. 14 - 15; Brøndsted, op. cit., p. 92 f.

¹⁶⁶ Kirpičnikov, op. cit., p. 58 ff.

¹⁶⁷ B. A. Rybakov, *Remeslo drevnej Rusi*, Moskva, 1948, p. 228; I. P. Šaskol'skij,

of the Scandinavian (Swedish) trading expeditions to the east gives cause for presupposing that they turned over to other merchants the subsequent transportation further east, with Bulgar and Suvar as the main destination¹⁶⁸.

Particularly at the beginning of the 10th century, i.e. the time when our Arabic source was composed, the Swedish merchants were in a favourable position to keep up direct trading contacts with Western Europe. Then, from about 890 to 934, the Swedes held sway over Hedeby (situated a few kilometres to the south of Slesvig, where the isthmus of Jutland is at its narrowest), the dominant centre, controlling the trade-route between the Baltic area and Western Europe¹⁶⁹. From this period of the Viking age date most of the hoards of Oriental silver found in Western Europe. This silver was re-exported there from Sweden, which can be inferred from the composition of the Arabic coin-hoards found in Sweden¹⁷⁰. That Frankish swords were among the goods most coveted by the Swedish merchants is beyond doubt.

All this considered, I find in the information of an export of swords from *Arthā* — and here I agree with Vestberg¹⁷¹ — a strong argument in favour of the Swedish identity of the *Arthāniya*.

Thomsen, Kolmodin, Vestberg, Validi Togan and Kmietowicz are also of the opinion that the *Arthāniya* were Swedish merchants. Concerning the localization of the *Arthāniya*, however, their opinions differ. The four first-mentioned scholars think that the *Arthāniya* were merchants living in Sweden, whereas Kmietowicz holds the view that they had their domicile in north-western Rus'.

According to Vestberg and Validi Togan, the most important argument for the Swedish domicile of the *Arthāniya* is ad-Dimashqī's (al-Idrisī's?) statement that the *Arthāniya* live on the coasts of the Atlantic (the Baltic). The information on the export of swords, lead and the furs of sable and black fox, is also considered a significant argument for their Swedish domicile (Vestberg).

Normanskaja teorija v sovremennoj buržuaznoj nauke, p. 121; Kirpičnikov, op. cit. p. 64; O. I. Davidan, *Contacts between Staraja Ladoga and Scandinavia*, Scando-Slavica, Supplementum I, 1970, p. 89; L. S. Klejn, G. S. Lebedev, V. A. Nazarenko, op. cit., p. 233.

¹⁶⁸ Al-Muqaddasī, a Persian author writing at the end of the 10th century, gives an account of the various goods coming from Bulgar via Chiva to the Moslem countries. Among other things, he mentions swords (Bolin, *Muhammed*, p. 213; I. Hrbek, *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, I, 1960, p. 1306).

¹⁶⁹ S. Lindqvist, *Hedebyväldets varaktighet*, Namn och Bygd, 17, 1929, pp. 1 - 22; idem, *Sveriges handel och samfärdsel under forntiden*, Nordisk kultur, XVI, 1933, p. 64; B. Nerman, *Sveriges första storhetstid*, Stockholm, 1942, pp. 177 - 198; Sawyer, op. cit., pp. 196 - 197.

¹⁷⁰ S. Bolin, *Gollands vikingatidsskatter och världshandeln*, p. 43; N. Rasmusson, *Vikingatidens gravfynd*, Nordisk tidskrift, 1957, p. 243; Sawyer, op. cit., pp. 196 - 197.

¹⁷¹ Vestberg, *K analysu*, p. 398.

Kmietowicz has devoted an exhaustive study to the meaning of the term *Rūs* in the Arabic sources, as well as to the problem of *Arthā*/*Arthāniya*. He reaches the conclusion that by the term *Rūs* most Arabic writers referred to Swedish merchants with their domicile in northern Rus', but not to merchants travelling from and living in Sweden¹⁷². Since "there is no reason to assume that al-Balkhī's (al-Istakhri's?) statement on *Arthāniya* is in discord with this general pattern", he also localizes *Arthāniya* to a northern area in Rus'¹⁷³. In the statement on exports of furs of sable and black fox he finds a confirmation of the correctness of this hypothesis¹⁷⁴. More precisely, Kmietowicz locates *Arthā* and *Arthāniya* in north-western Rus'. A support for this theory is ad-Dimashqī's statement that the *Arthāniya* live on the Atlantic (the Baltic), and the statement from the Chester-Beatty MS that „*Arthā* is the *Rūs* province situated furthest away" (from Bulgar, Kmietowicz)¹⁷⁵.

At the same time, *Arthā* and *Arthāniya* must be looked for at a point not too far from Bulgar. An implication that this was the case is, in Kmietowicz's opinion, the fact that al-Balkhī's (al-Istakhri's?) informant (who, according to Kmietowicz, in all probability was a Moslem merchant who had visited Bulgar) gives such exhaustive information on *Arthā* and *Arthāniya*¹⁷⁶. The only place in Rus' that answers to these premises and which is at the same time of such importance as to deserve mentioning on a level with Kiev and Novgorod, is Staraja Ladoga¹⁷⁷. The *Arthāniya* thus refers to the Swedish merchants living in Staraja Ladoga and having their field of operations in Eastern Europe and further to the east¹⁷⁸.

It seems to me that Kmietowicz is completely right in emphasizing Staraja Ladoga's role in the trade with the Arabs, as well as in pointing out that in this particular respect Staraja Ladoga, with its excellent situation from a mercantile point of view, is the only town in northern Rus' that answers to the description of the trading town of *Arthā*. Staraja Ladoga's importance in the trade with the Arabs is confirmed by the great amounts of Arabic coins brought to light in the town and the area around¹⁷⁹. Furthermore, when Kmietowicz emphasizes the role of the Swedes in the commercial activity of Staraja Ladoga, his position seems to be fully motivated: in Staraja Ladoga and the surrounding area, archaeologists have found abundant traces of Swedish settlements; the place-name material from these regions

¹⁷² Kmietowicz, *Artāniya-Artā*, pp. 239 - 247.

¹⁷³ Ibidem, p. 246.

¹⁷⁴ Ibidem, p. 251.

¹⁷⁵ Ibidem, pp. 252 - 255.

¹⁷⁶ Ibidem, p. 248.

¹⁷⁷ Ibidem, p. 247, p. 255.

¹⁷⁸ Kmietowicz points out that also the scholars who are inclined to minimize the influence of the Swedes in Eastern Europe appreciate their political and commercial importance in the Ladoga region (ibidem, p. 257).

¹⁷⁹ Ibidem, p. 257.

bears witness to Swedish colonization; anthropological characteristics of the population point to an admixture of Nordic elements; according to the Hypatian redaction of *Nestor's Chronicle* it was in Staraja Ladoga that Rurik settled, the first Swedish prince to take permanent abode in Rus'¹⁸⁰.

In many respects I find Kmietowicz's identification of *Arthā* with Staraja Ladoga and of the *Arthāniya* with the Swedish merchants there to be well founded and his argumentation well worth considering. Nevertheless I hesitate to give Kmietowicz's hypothesis an unreserved precedence to the view, advocated by Thomsen, Kolmodin, Vestberg and Validi Togan, that the

¹⁸⁰ Ibidem, p. 256. It appears to be a well-founded assumption that until the 980's or 990's Staraja Ladoga was in some kind of dependence on or incorporated in the Swedish realm. That this was the case is shown by a comparison between the Arabic coins, minted between the years 965 and 983, which have been uncovered in Sweden and in Rus'. Scholars have noted that such coins are extremely rare in Swedish (and Baltic) hoards, but they have also observed — which is of particular interest to us — that the same goes for the area to the south and the southwest of the Ladoga. On the other hand, the coin hoards from Novgorod, the Volga and Dnepr regions and from other areas in Rus' do not display such a chronological break, but form a continuous chain (F. Vasmer, *Ein in Dorfe Saryi Dedin in Weissrussland gemachter Fund kufischer Münzen*, Kungl. Vitterhets Historie och Antikvitets Akademiens Handlingar, 40 : 2, 1929, pp. 25 - 28; Sawyer op. cit., pp. 197 - 198; cf. Linder-Welin, the article *Arabiska mynt*, Kulturhistoriskt lexikon för nordisk medeltid, I, 1956, column 189). The only reasonable explanation I can find for this remarkable fact is that Prince Svjatoslav, through his wars in the 960's against the peoples on the Volga (the Vjatičians and the Khazars) and in northern Caucasia (the Jasians and the Kasogians), pursued — and attained — his objective of concentrating the trade with the Orient in his hands and, thereby, excluding the Swedish merchants, among them those in the Ladoga region, from this profitable trade.

Old Icelandic literature helps us to form a clearer picture of Staraja Ladoga's political role during the period from the end of the 10th century to the 1020's and 1030's (Rydzevskaja has devoted a paper especially to this subject, *Svedenija o Staroj Ladoge v drevne-severnoj literature*, KSDPI, 1945). Snorri Sturleson (Fagrskinna, c. 24) relates that in 997 Erik Jarl of Norway ravaged Staraja Ladoga (*Aldeigjuborg*). This took place without any interference by King Olaf of Sweden. Obviously the town at this time no longer belonged to the Swedes. That Staraja Ladoga had been lost is confirmed by the words that law-man Torgny addresses to King Olaf in his famous speech at Uppsala assizes (*thing*), in c. 1018 (Snorri Sturleson's *Heimskringla*, II). Torgny calls upon Olaf to try to regain the formerly Swedish territories in the east and give up his political ambitions towards Norway. One result of the pressures from Torgny and his adherents was that in 1019 Olaf gave his daughter Ingigerd, who had earlier been betrothed to King Olaf Haraldsson (St. Olaf) of Norway, in marriage to the Rus'ian Prince Jaroslav. Ingigerd secured as a stipulation in her marriage contract that her relative, Jarl Ragnvaldr of West Gautland, should receive the principality of *Aldeigjuborg*, with the adjoining principedom (*jarlsriki*; its extension has been sketched by A. N. Nasonov, *Russkaja Zemlja*, Moskva, 1951, pp. 79 - 80). Ad. Stender-Petersen (*Das Problem der ältesten byzantinisch-russisch-nordischen Beziehungen*, Relazioni. X Congresso internazionale di scienze storiche, Firenze, 1955, p. 178) holds the view that Ingigerd's demand for the territory around Staraja Ladoga is an expression of the old Swedish claims to these areas, an opinion that appears reasonable.

Arthāniya were merchants from Sweden. There are two reasons for my hesitation: first, I cannot fully accept the interpretation of the term *Rūs* given by Kmietowicz, and secondly, his linguistic interpretations of the words *Arthā* and *Arthāniya* are hardly satisfactory.

As distinguished from Thomsen, Kolmodin, Vestberg and Validi Togan, Kmietowicz considers that the term *Rūs* in the Arabic sources comprised only Swedish merchants living in Rus', but not merchants who, from their domicile in Sweden, made trading expeditions on the East European rivers and further to the east; he thus excludes a priori that the *Arthāniya* came from Sweden.

It is true that most Arabic sources locate the *Rūs* in the north-western parts of Rus', but there are also some Arabic sources, which more or less expressly state that Scandinavia is the native territory of the *Rūs*. Thus, al-Mas'ūdī notes that Rus'ian merchants bring their goods to Spain, Rome, Constantinople and to the Realm of the Khazars¹⁸¹. Their commercial activity consequently embraced western, southern and eastern Europe, which is in good keeping with the part played by the Scandinavians in the world commerce of those days. Al-Mas'ūdī and al-Ya'qūbī tell of a Rus'ian naval attack on Spain in 844; from other sources we know that this campaign originally issued from Scandinavia. According to Ibn Hauqal, the *Rūs*, who in 969 ravaged the lands of the Volga Bulgars and the Khazars, returned by way of Rome (i.e. Byzantium) and Spain¹⁸². Ibn Ya'qūb says that the *Rūs* come on ships from the west and fall upon the Prussians¹⁸³.

Kmietowicz's basic thesis, that the *Rūs* in the Arabic sources included solely the Swedes living in Rus', thus appears hardly tenable. Furthermore, such an interpretation would have the unacceptable corollary that the Arabic writers did not have a name for the merchants who, coming from Sweden, travelled down the Volga, to Bulgar and further to the east. And such travels are well documented, for both the Viking age and the preceding centuries, in the written sources as well as by archaeological finds. Already the Gothic history-writer Jordanes, in the 6th century, says that the Swedes (*Suehans*; in Central Sweden) in his days used the Volga route for their trading expeditions to Byzantium¹⁸⁴. Their most important goods were furs, e.g. „glossy black furs”, which may refer to both sables and black foxes. From the same time a large number of amber beads has been found among the Goths, then living on the Crimea; these beads came from the Baltic area¹⁸⁵. Also the finds

¹⁸¹ Birkeland, op. cit., p. 34.

¹⁸² Ibidem, p. 48.

¹⁸³ Ibidem, p. 44.

¹⁸⁴ B. Schier, *Wege und Formen des ältesten Pelzhandels in Europa*, Archiv für Pelzkunde, I, 1951, p. 13; T. Lewicki, *Źródła arabskie do dziejów Słowiańszczyzny*, I, Wrocław—Kraków, 1956, p. 135; *Jordanes' Scandiakapitel*, transl. by J. Svennung, Saga och Sed, 1960, p. 57; M. I. Artamonov, *Istorija chazar*, p. 403.

¹⁸⁵ H. Jankuhn, *Der fränkisch-friesische Handel zur Ostsee in frühen Mittelalter*, Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte, 14, 1953, p. 201.

in Sweden of artefacts from the Permian regions testify to early Scandinavian familiarity with the Volga route¹⁸⁶. The turn of the 8th century witnesses the beginning of a time of increasing Scandinavian commercial activity on the East European rivers¹⁸⁷. Sometimes the trading expeditions of the Scandinavians reached as far as the Muslim countries, but most probably the Bulgarian towns of Bulgar and Suvar on the middle Volga were their chief destination¹⁸⁸. These relations, direct or indirect, between Scandinavia and the Orient are evidenced, first and foremost, by the finds of Arabic coins (circa 80 000) and of Oriental artefacts in Sweden¹⁸⁹. Also the simultaneous occurrence of similar and characteristic reniform plaques of the 9th century in the vicinity of Birka in Sweden and in southeastern Russia (but in no intermediate region) points to the reopening by the Swedes of the trade route via the Volga at about this period¹⁹⁰. The Swedish expeditions to the Orient are further confirmed by six runic stones mentioning *Särkland*, i.e. the land of the Saracens, situated to the west and to the south of the Caspian Sea¹⁹¹.

Thus, an extensive literary and archaeological material testifies that merchants from Scandinavia, more definitely Sweden, kept up close connections with the Eastern Muslim world.

Starting from a wider interpretation of the term *Rūs* than that advocated by Kmietowicz, the statements by ad-Dimashqī (al-Idrisī?) and in the Chester-Beatty MS seem to lose the unambiguousness that Kmietowicz wants to attribute to them. Thus it appears to me more likely to understand ad-Dimashqī's statement that the *Arthāniya* live "on the coasts of the Atlantic [the Baltic]" as alluding to Sweden. One may here observe an almost identical description of the domicile of the Swedes by al-Bīrūnī in a work from 1030. He says that the *Warank* (the Varangians', a designation for the Swedes, or for all the Northmen, which gains a footing in the Arabic literature in the 1030's; cf. Old Scandinavian *vāringar*, Old Russian *varjazi*, Greek Βάρανγοι) is "a people living on the coasts" of the *Warank* Sea¹⁹² ('the Baltic'; cf. Old Russian *Varjažskoe more*).

¹⁸⁶ T. J. Arne, *La Suède et l'Orient*, Uppsala, 1914, p. 221 f.

¹⁸⁷ The politico-commercial causes that brought Swedish merchants out on the east-European water-ways have been given a brilliant and comprehensive treatment by S. Bolin in his article *Muhammed, Karl den store och Rurik*. See also his *Gotlands vikingatidsskatter och världshandeln*.

¹⁸⁸ Schier, op. cit., p. 17, p. 34; H. Arbmán, *Svear i österviking*, Stockholm, 1955, p. 64 f.; Sawyer, op. cit., p. 181. Cf. al-Mas'ūdi who says that "among them (the *Rūs*) there are merchants who keep up constant mercantile relations with the town of the Bulgarian king" (Birkeland, op. cit., p. 35).

¹⁸⁹ Arne, op. cit., pp. 117 - 204; H. Christiansson, the article *Orientaliskt stilmflytande*, *Kulturhistoriskt lexikon för nordisk medeltid*, XII, 1967, column 697.

¹⁹⁰ Arne, op. cit., p. 19 f.

¹⁹¹ S. Jansson, *Några okända runinskrifter*, Fornvännen, 1946, p. 246; Arne, „*Austr i Karusm*” och *Särklandnamnet*, Fornvännen, 1947, p. 303.

¹⁹² Birkeland, op. cit., p. 60. Al-Bīrūnī's text has been analysed by Zehi Validi Togan (*Die Nordvölker bei Biruni*, ZDMG, 90, 1936, pp. 38 - 51) and H.-J. Graf (*Die Stadt der Wavāger 'b-l-n-d'*, *Beiträge zur Namenforschung*, 7, 1972, p. 291).

However, it is to the Chester-Beatty MS that Kmietowicz gives the decisive word in the discussion of *Arthā* and *Arthāniya*. In its description of *Arthā's* situation as related to that of the mythical people of Gog and Magog, he finds a clear geographical reference as to where *Arthā* is to be found. Kmietowicz's premise when adopting this position is that the concept of Gog and Magog refers in the inhabitants of the Scandinavian peninsula. From the description the Chester-Beatty MS he then concludes that since *Arthā* was situated at some distance from the land of Gog and Magog, it must be situated at some distance from Scandinavia, i.e. *Arthā* must be found in Rus'; in this connection Kmietowicz makes the interesting observation that the Chester-Beatty MS numbers Gog and Magog among the Rus'ian (in his view=Scandinavian) tribes¹⁹³. But the question is whether the picture painted in the Chester-Beatty MS is sharply enough delineated to permit such a definite localization of *Arthā*. In that case, a necessary condition would be that Gog and Magog could be conclusively identified and their place on the map clearly pinpointed. This condition seems to exist only to a certain extent. It is true that the concept of Gog and Magog in most East Arab sources from the 10th century referred to the inhabitants of the Scandinavian peninsula, but, in my view, only to the Scandinavians living in the farthest North. Indicative of this is not least the description in the Chester-Beatty MS of the mountainous, desolate and treeless landscape stretching beyond *Arthā* to the land of Gog and Magog. Furthermore, it should be stressed that by the concept of Gog and Magog the East Arabs (as does Old Norse literature¹⁹⁴) referred sometimes to the Finnish tribes in the northernmost parts of Eastern Europe. Two Arabic maps of northern and eastern Europe point in that direction; on these the *Rūs* are located in the far north while having Gog and Magog as their eastern neighbours¹⁹⁵. Ibn Hauqal would also seem to treat Gog and Magog as Finnish tribes. He tells us that Arab buyers of fur from Khoresm travelled to the land of Gog and Magog¹⁹⁶. It seems to me quite improbable that the land of Gog and Magog here alludes to Scandinavia: nowhere in the Eastern Arabic sources is it attested that the Arabic merchants extended their travels so far to the northwest. On the other hand, Arabic literature gives testimony that trading expeditions went out to the Finnish regions between the Northern Dvina and the Peçora, the fur El Dorado of Europe, and it is not impossible that sometimes they got as far as the Arctic Ocean¹⁹⁷.

¹⁹³ Kmietowicz, *Artāniya-Artā*, pp. 253 - 255.

¹⁹⁴ Cf. „*Kylfingaland, där bigde Magog, det kallar vi Gardaryke*” (Rimbegla, ed. Björnsen, 1801, III, c 9, § 32).

¹⁹⁵ V. Minorsky, *Géographes et Voyageurs musulmans*, p. 226. A. R. Anderson (Alexander's Gate, Gog and Magog and the Inclosed Nations, Cambridge Mass. 1932, p. 89) has noted that some of the geographers of the neax east located Gog and Magog to the region of the Upper Volga or the Urals.

¹⁹⁶ Kmietowicz, *Artāniya-Artā*, p. 255.

¹⁹⁷ Schier, op. cit., pp. 26 - 29, p. 45. There is ample testimony in the Arabic sources that these regions had already been explored by Bulgarian fur merchants, who travelled especially to the lands of the *Wlsū* (the Ves', near Beloozero) and the *Yāra*

But even if there is a certain vagueness in the orientation and identification of the half-legendary people of Gog and Magog, one thing is certain: by the concept of Gog and Magog the Arabs never referred to the merchants who went from Sweden down the Volga on trading expeditions. This is why I cannot find that the Chester-Beatty MS contradicts the theory that the *Arthāniya* were merchants from Sweden. On the whole, the description of *Arthā* and Gog and Magog in the Chester-Beatty MS seems to me so vague and legendary that it can be used solely for the general conclusion that *Arthā* was situated in a northern region.

There is a more concrete and reliable stamp to the statement by ad-Dimashqī that "in his time (al-Idrisī's) there were four tribes of the Slavs: *S. lāwiya*, *B. rāsiya* (Perm), *K. rāk.rīya* (*Kūyāba*) and *Arthāniya*. All these tribes except *Arthāniya* were named after their lands." Kmietowicz considers this note a weighty argument in favour of identifying the *Arthāniya* with the Swedish newcomers in Rus'¹⁹⁸. Although Kmietowicz's assessment of this statement is convincing and, as he has shown, can be supported by indirect arguments of both historical and geographical nature, the sources do not provide enough direct evidence to justify an incontestable localization of *Arthā* and *Arthāniya* in Rus'.

Since, in my opinion, the previous findings do not permit a conclusive clarification as to *Arthā*'s situation, I choose for the moment to pass over this question. I proceed instead, first, to a supplementary examination of the factual data on *Arthā* and *Arthāniya*, and then to a linguistic interpretation of the two names.

In the above survey of the earlier research I examined most of the factual data supplied on "the third tribe" of the *Rūs*. There remains, however, to assess the information that the *Arthāniya* "kill all strangers". This item has been used by scholars to locate *Arthā* and *Arthāniya* in the Oka region, *Bjarmaland*, Rugia, or Sweden. However, because of its legendary character this information, in my opinion, lacks scientific value, all the more so as it cannot be associated with unambiguous testimony from other sources.

It remains to find the name-form, or name-forms, which have been rendered as *Arthā* and *Arthāniya* in Arabic. In my opinion, concealed in the names *Arthā* and *Arthāniya* there is a designation for the Swedish merchants who went down the Volga for trading purposes. The same hypothesis has been propounded by Kolmodin, who surmises that instead of *Arthā* and *Arthāniya* we should read **Izwā* and **Izwāi* (the Swedes; *z* for *r*, *w* for *th*). He gives the following explanation for this interpretation: „The s-sound in

(the Jugra, near the Pečora); see *Sharaf al-Zamān Tāhīr Marwazī ...*, ed. Minorsky, p. 34, pp. 112 - 113. The reason why the Arabs got access to these fur-rich regions was that the Volga Bulgars, who from their capital Bulgar at the big bend of the Volga controlled the important waterways, established close relations with the Arabs after having embraced the Moslem faith in the 9th century.

¹⁹⁸ Kmietowicz, *Artāniya-Artā*, pp. 257 - 258.

the word *Svear* (Swedes; in Central Sweden) is also rendered as *z* by al-Idrīsī; the long vowel is rendered as *ā*, which, of course, should be pronounced with 'imala (=a tinge of *i*). That a double consonant was dissolved by prothetic 'alif is no uncommon occurrence"¹⁹⁹. In response to an inquiry, Professor Vitestam, Lund, kindly informed me that this reading, though technically possible, is highly improbable, as it means an extremely drastic graphical stretching of the name-forms.

Kmietowicz proposes two possible linguistic interpretations of the names *Arthā* and *Arthāniya*. One alternative is that *Arthā* is derived from Old Scandinavian *austr* (meaning 'east'), which is found as an element in compounds and phrases (*austrvegr*, *austrriki*, *austr i gordum*, *austan i gordum*, etc.), all referring to an eastern region beyond the Baltic Sea — sometimes to the coastal regions east of the Baltic, sometimes to Rus', and sometimes even to the Orient²⁰⁰. The word *austr*, "severely distorted", may have been rendered as Arabic *Arthā*²⁰¹. The second alternative is that *Arthā* comes from *Aldeigjuborg*, the Old Scandinavian denomination for Staraja Ladoga. The element *borg*, 'castle, fortress', in its Finnish translation **artu*, "may well have been adopted by the Finnish population in the Ladoga region as a designation for the fortified town, where the Swedish ruler over these territories had his residence"²⁰². To the form *Artā* (*austr* or **artu*) was then added the suffix *-niya*²⁰³.

In my opinion, several rather improbable conceptions have to be cogitated in order to reconcile Old Scandinavian *austr* or Finnic-Ugric **artu* with Arabic *Arthā*, but since Kmietowicz himself does not attribute any special significance to his etymological hypotheses ("La proposition d'éty-mologie, présentée, [...] ne prétend cependant pas être la seule interprétation possible; [...] nous n'attachons pas une grande importance à la liaison d'une façon plus ou moins ingénieuse, de la forme arabe du nom avec les toponymes, connus d'autres sources"²⁰⁴), it does not seem necessary to enlarge upon this part of his argumentation.

As the starting-point for my interpretation of the two names I will choose the form *Armā* (*-niya*), i.e. the alternative form which is considered to be the original one by Reinaud, Chvol'son and Minorsky. However, Professor Vitestam questions the assumption (advanced by these scholars and developed in more detail by Chvol'son) that the Arabic author or the copyists omitted the initial *b* of **Barmā* and **Barmāniya* because he, or they, took it for granted that this *b* was the preposition *b*, which may be omitted in the position after the Arabic verb 'call, name'. Professor Vitestam concedes that this is techni-

¹⁹⁹ Kolmodin, op. cit., p. 20.

²⁰⁰ Kmietowicz, *Artāniya-Artā*, p. 258; cf. E. Metzenthin, *Die Länder- und Völkernamen im altisländischen Schrifttum*, Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania, 1941, pp. 8 - 9.

²⁰¹ Kmietowicz, *ibidem*, pp. 258 - 259.

²⁰² *Ibidem*, p. 259.

²⁰³ *Ibidem*, pp. 259 - 260.

²⁰⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 257.

cally possible, but also tells me that it is more probable that the words originally read *Armā* and *Armāniya* rather than **Barmā* and **Barmāniya*.

Instead I would propose that the name **Urmāniya*, 'Northmen', is concealed in the forms *Armā* and *Armāniya*. The name **Urmāniya* would thus correspond to the forms *Normani*, *Nordmanni*, *Nortmanni*, *Lormanēs*, *Lordomani* etc. of the medieval West European and South European sources.

From the linguistic point of view I want to explain the reading **Urmāniya* as follows. In the manuscripts, where the initial short vowel of the names *Arthā* and *Arthāniya* is marked out, this vowel is either *ū* or, more often, *ā*. The forms with initial *ā* appeared because some copyists neglected to mark out the vowel signs which distinguish *ā* from *ū*. Moreover, I, like Reinaud, Chvol'son and Minorsky, read an *m* instead of *th*, *ts*, *q* or *b* — in writing, an *m* could easily be distorted into any one of these letters. The form *Urmāniya* is exactly attested in a West Arabic source, *The Book of Geography (Kitāb al-Djagrāfiya)* from the 12th century²⁰⁵; there the word means 'the land of the Norsemen', but in its capacity as a feminine collective in Arabic it can also mean 'the Norsemen'. However, the similar forms *Urmān*, *Urdumāniyyin*, *Urdāmāniyyūn* and *Urdumalīš* begin to appear already in 971 in the Western Arabic literature²⁰⁶. This denomination for the Norsemen, both those from Normandy and those from Scandinavia, replaces the older appellation *Madjūs*; sometimes the younger denomination is found side by side with the older one²⁰⁷. The immediate model for the West Arabic forms are the variants *Lormani*, *Lormanēs* (cf. *Urmāniya*, *Urmān*), *Lordomani*, *Lodormani*, *Leodormani*²⁰⁸ (cf. *Urdumāniyyin*, *Urdāmāniyyūn*, *Urdumalīš*) of the Spanish-Latin sources. In these sources the word sometimes, but less often, is written with an initial *n*²⁰⁹. The Western Arabs mistook the initial *l* to be part of the definite article *al-* and joined it to the latter (*al-Lor-* → *al-*Ur-*)²¹⁰. As regards the *ō* of non-Semitic languages, it is regularly rendered by *ū* in Arabic²¹¹, cf. for instance *Rūm* ('Rome'). Originally the Spanish-Latin and the West Arabic forms reflected the Frankish name for the Norsemen, viz. *Normanni*, *Nordmanni*, *Nortmanni*, *Nordomanni* etc. The Spanish-Latin forms with initial *l* originated as the result of a dissimilation of the initial *n* in *Nortmanni*²¹². Since, however, the Frankish forms throughout have an initial *n*, they cannot

²⁰⁵ Birkeland, op. cit., p. 78.

²⁰⁶ Ibidem, pp. 78 - 79; A. Melvinger, op. cit., p. 62.

²⁰⁷ The Vikings who ravaged the coasts of Spain in 968/72, were named by al-Idāri *al-Madjūs al-Urdumāniyyūn* (Birkeland, ibidem, p. 111).

²⁰⁸ Melvinger, op. cit., p. 69.

²⁰⁹ A. Fabricius, *Normannertogene till den spanske halvø*, Aarbøger for nordisk oldkyndighed og historie, 12, 1897, p. 77.

²¹⁰ A. Seippel, *Praefatio*, p. 7.

²¹¹ A. Kunik-V. Rozen, op. cit., I, p. 66, note I; V. Thomsen, op. cit., I, p. 348; cf. A. Seippel, *Praefatio*, p. 7.

²¹² M. Grammont, *Traité de phonétique*, Paris, 1933, p. 289; R. Menéndez Pidal, *Manual de gramática histórica española*, Madrid, 1958, p. 181.

have been the direct model for the Arabic forms: such a disappearance of *n* cannot be explained phonetically. Hence, the West Arabic *Urmāniya*, *Urmān* etc. must have been borrowed from the Spanish-Latin. This is the most probable explanation also for geographical reasons.

The original author of our Arabic text (al-Balkhī or al-Istakhri) may have become acquainted with the name **Urmāniya* in many different ways. One alternative is that he borrowed it from the Arabs in the Western Caliphate — the fact that this name for the Norsemen is not attested in West Arab sources earlier than 971 does not preclude that it was known already in the first half of the 10th century²¹³. What we know about the lives of al-Balkhī and al-Istakhri does not, however, indicate that any one of them ever visited the Western Caliphate. As to al-Balkhī, he spent 8 years in Iraq and Baghdad. He also made a journey to Mekka. Other than that he did not leave his native town Balkh in northern Afghanistan²¹⁴. About al-Istakhri's life we know very little, but nothing indicates that he made any far-reaching journeys. Al-Balkhī or al-Istakhri may, however, have become acquainted with the name **Urmāniya* through the intermediation of Arabs coming from Spain to the Orient. In those days the relations between the Western and the Eastern Arabic world were very close: Arabic merchant vessels sailed the Mediterranean; an important trade route went from Spain via Gibraltar and then on land along northern Africa to Egypt and the Orient²¹⁵; from east and west, Arabs went on pilgrimages to Mekka; Arabs from Spain often went to the Eastern Caliphate to study.

Assuming that al-Balkhī is the original author of the passage dealing with "the third tribe of the *Rūs*" he had good opportunities to get to know the name **Urmāniya* from West Arabic merchants visiting Baghdad, the leading commercial city in the Eastern Caliphate at that time. There he also had good opportunities to meet Rus'ian merchants, who, according to Ibn Khurdādhbih, at times brought their goods as far as that²¹⁶. That al-Balkhī himself saw these *Rūs* is possibly suggested in a passage not belonging to the text about *Arthā* and *Arthāniya*, which says of the *Rūs* that "some of them shave, while others twist their beards like a horse's mane or plait it". Since this remark is only found in al-Balkhī's text (as rendered by al-Istakhri²¹⁷ and Ibn Hauqal²¹⁸) he cannot have taken it from the literature or, if so the source is now lost.

Another possibility is that al-Balkhī became acquainted with the name

²¹³ Cf. Marquart, *Streifzüge*, p. 349.

²¹⁴ D. Dunlop, the article *Al-Balkhī*, *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, I, 1960, p. 1003; Bartol'd, *Preface*, pp. 15 - 16.

²¹⁵ E. Patzelt, *Die Fränkische Kultur und der Islam*, Veröffentlichungen des Seminars für Wirtschafts- und Kulturgeschichte an der Universität Wien, 4, 1932, p. 187.

²¹⁶ Birkeland, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

²¹⁷ *Ibidem*, p. 29.

²¹⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 51.

through the intermediation of Jewish merchants, travelling from Western Europe. The role of the Jews in the international commerce of those times has been elaborately pictured by Ibn Khurdādhbih. He relates that the Jewish rhaddanites speak Arabic, Persian, Romanic, Frankish, Spanish and Slavonic. They travel from the east to the west, and from the west to the east, at times on land, at times by sea. Sometimes they sail from the country of the Franks on the Western Sea to Antiokia and then go by way of Baghdad to Oman, Sind, Hind and China. The merchants who come from Spain and the country of the Franks betake themselves to Morocco, from there to Tangier, then by way of Egypt and Damascus to Baghdad, Faris, Kirman, Sind, Hind and China. It sometimes occurs that they go by the land-route behind Rome and travel through the land of the Slavs to the capital of the Khazars, then across the Caspian to Balkh and from there through Transoxania to China²¹⁹. — Of especial interest is Ibn Khurdādhbih's mention of Baghdad and Balkh as stop-overs for the Jewish merchants, since al-Balkhī is associated with both these cities.

Still another possibility is that the word **Urmāniya* was passed to al-Balkhī (al-Istakhri?) by an informant who had visited or had lived in Eastern Europe. If so, the intermediary may have been a Khoresmian merchant who had been to Bulgar²²⁰. It is also possible that the word was borrowed from an Eastern Slav — in the introduction to *Nestor's Chronicle* the word *urmane*, here meaning 'Norwegians'²²¹, is found twice. If the word was borrowed in this way, the intermediary may have been a Slavic slave; according to Ibn Rusta²²², slaves of Slavonic origin were carried off down the Volga and, according to Ibn Khurdādhbih²²³, they served as interpreters between Arabs and Rus'ian merchants in Baghdad. It seems less likely that al-Balkhī or al-Istakhri borrowed the name directly from a Scandinavian merchant, because in that case it cannot be explained why initial *n* was dropped.

Of course it is not a necessity that the word **Urmāniya* was borrowed by al-Balkhī or al-Istakhri, either through one of the channels mentioned or in some other way. The possibility that the name was already known to the Eastern Arabs must also be considered. The Eastern Arabic author al-Mas'ūdī gives us to understand that this may have been the case. In his book *Meadows of Gold and Mines of Jewels*, completed in 947, he mentions a Rus'ian tribe, *al-Lw'dnh* ('The Rūs are a numerous nation with various subdivisions. Among them are *al-Lw'dnh* who are the most numerous and, for trading purposes, con-

²¹⁹ *Bibliotheca geographorum arabicorum*, ed. and transl. by M. J. de Goeje, 6, 1889, pp. 114 - 116. See also M. Postan, *The Trade of Medieval Europe: The North*, The Cambridge Economic History of Europe, Cambridge, 1952, p. 287.

²²⁰ Kmietowicz, *Artāniya-Artā*, p. 248.

²²¹ Kunik-Rozen, op. cit., I, p. 43.

²²² Birkeland, op. cit., p. 16.

²²³ *Ibidem*, p. 11.

stantly visit the countries Andalus, Rome, Constantinople and Khazar"²²⁴). Several Arabists have interpreted this word as **al-'Urdumānah* or **al-Nurdumānah*²²⁵. From a factual point of view this interpretation is the most probable one, being, as it is, in good harmony with what we otherwise know of the Scandinavian mercantile activity in those days.

The statement that these **Urmāniya* have their centre in **Urmā/Arthā*, I interpret as a pure construction to the effect that the author of the relevant passage allotted to these *Rūs* a town which of his own accord he named after the tribe — consequently we may here discern the same pattern as was followed when he gave the name of *S. lā* to the tribe of *Salāwiya*. It is no uncommon occurrence in the medieval Arabic geographical literature that a country or a town is named after the people living there, cf. for instance al-Idrisī's²²⁶ and al-Magribī's²²⁷ statement that the *Rūs* have a town by the name of *Rūsīya* (Tmutorokan'?) in southern Rus'.

Returning now to the matter of the location of *Arthā* and *Arthāniya*, we find that the proposed linguistic interpretation does not seem to contribute to a conclusive solution of this problem, and we shall have to make do with the criteria established previously. According to these we must look for *Arthā* in north-western Rus' — and then Staraja Ladoga is the only valid alternative — or in Scandinavia. The most concrete statement on the situation of *Arthā*, the one made by ad-Dimashqī (al-Idrisī?) that the *Arthāniya* "live on the Atlantic", seems in fact to refer to Scandinavia. If *Arthā* was actually situated in Scandinavia, it is reasonable to identify it with Birka, the great commercial centre at the entrance to Lake Mälaren. Birka's contacts with the Orient are amply evidenced in the archaeological finds there²²⁸, and from a geographical point of view Birka is on a par with Staraja Ladoga in meeting the requirements made on the location of *Arthā*. However, at odds with the identification of *Arthā* with Birka is the statement by the self-same ad-Dimashqī that the *Arthāniya* do not have their name after the land they inhabit — a clear indication that ad-Dimashqī considered them to be alien settlers in Rus'.

The problem is not clarified either by the data on the exports from *Arthā*. The furs of sable and black fox may have been carried down the Volga by

²²⁴ Ibidem, p. 34.

²²⁵ Chvol'son, op. cit., p. 167; Seippel, op. cit., p. 28, p. 31; Minorsky, *Enzyklopaedic des Islam*, III, 1936, p. 1277; ibidem, *A History of Sharvān and Darband in the 10th - 11th centuries*, Cambridge, 1958, p. 151; Kmietowicz, *Artāniya-Artā*, p. 243.

²²⁶ Birkeland, op. cit., pp. 70 - 71.

²²⁷ Ibidem, p. 99.

²²⁸ Coins, silks, ornaments and other finds from the Islamic East confirm that Birka's main interests outside Scandinavia were in the East (Sawyer, op. cit., p. 181). The importance of the trade with the Orient is evidenced also by the fact that Birka ceased existing in about 975, evidently as the result of the Volga-route then being closed to the Swedish merchants (ibidem, p. 185; cf. note 180 above).

merchants from Birka as well as by merchants from Staraja Ladoga. As regards the information on an export of swords, in all probability of Frankish manufacture, I cannot agree with Vestberg, who considers this item a weighty argument in favour of the Swedish habitat of the *Arthāniya*. In my opinion, this piece of information strongly indicates that the *Arthāniya* were of Swedish descent, but this does not necessarily mean that they came from Sweden — since Staraja Ladoga in the first part of the 10th century seems in one way or another to have been affiliated to Sweden, it stands to reason that the Swedish merchants in Staraja Ladoga also had access to the trade-route via Hedeby to the Frankish mart. All in all, I find it impossible to give a categorical answer to the question of *Arthā*'s identity. However, even if the possibility that *Arthā* referred to Staraja Ladoga is conceded to be the most probable one this does not mean that the name *Arthāniya*/**Urmāniya* included only the Swedish merchants of this town — in this notion were also included the merchants from Sweden, who used Staraja Ladoga as a convenient stopover and a necessary basis for their operations further east.

When I had completed this article, I discovered that Minorsky in a work of 1958 (*A History of Sharvān and Darband in the 10th - 11th centuries*, translation and commentary, Cambridge, p. 111, note 1) had proposed a similar interpretation of the name *Arthāniya*. Minorsky says: "As a mere surmise (Minorsky's italics) I would restore the variant found in Hudūd al-Ālam, § 44,3²²⁹: *Urtāb as *Ur/d/mān (Northman, in Russian Murman, chiefly Norwegians) and associate them with the White Sea area (Biaromia?) from which Scandinavians could reach the Volga and bring lead (tin?) from Sweden. The furs were collected by Northern traders on their way to Bulghar on the Volga and to the southern marts". In some respects, I disagree with Minorsky. There is nothing in the Norwegian archaeological material or in the literary sources to support the view that the *Rās*, who "go down the rivers" with their goods and, according to Ibn Rusta²³⁰ and Ibn Fadlan²³¹, sell them for Arabic coins, were Norwegians. The numismatic material shows that it is improbable that the Norwegians had any part in the trade with the Arabs: the number of Arabic coins (fragments included) found in Norway is 300 - 400²³². This should be compared to the circa 80000 Arabic coins uncovered in Sweden (with Gotland)²³³. The coin material thus makes it highly improbable — provided that the interpretation *Arthāniya* = **Urmāniya* is the correct one — that the Scandinavians, who, as our Arabic text says, go down the rivers with sables and black foxes, with slaves and swords, were Norwegians; it would have been most remarkable if al-Balkhī (or al-Istakhri)

²²⁹ Minorsky here refers to his edition of Hudūd al-Ālam, pp. 159 - 160.

²³⁰ Birkeland, op. cit., p. 16.

²³¹ Ibidem, p. 20.

²³² H. Holst, *De kufiske mynter i sølvfunnet fra Grimstad*, Nordisk numismatisk årsskrift, 1936, p. 52; M. Stenberger, *Die Schatzfunde Gotlands*, p. 250.

²³³ U. S. Linder Welin, op. cit., column 183; G. Hatz, op. cit., p. 20.

had noted the, questionable, role of the Norwegians in this eastern trade but kept silent about the, indisputable, Swedish part in it. Furthermore, it is true that the Northmen entertained connections with the White Sea region, but they had no permanent settlements there. It is also improbable that lead or tin was a Swedish export to the Arabs. Concluding, I would like to modify Minorsky's characterization of the interpretation of **Urdmān* as a "mere surmise": It is true that this interpretation, from a linguistic point of view, is only one of several possibilities but in conjunction with the factual arguments I have adduced above, it must in my opinion be considered a sound hypothesis and not a "surmise".