

ABHANDLUNGEN

Andrii Danylenko, New York

The name “Rus” In search of a new dimension*

1. Introduction

Ever since the appearance of Gottlieb Siegfried Bayer's "Geographia Russiae" (1737/1744) and Gerhardt Friedrich Müller's "Origines gentis et nominis Russorum" (1749), the Varangian-Rus'ian controversy has known but a few historiographic turns.¹ At first sight, a wholly new vista, in particular of the name "Rus", has recently arisen in a study of a prolific Ukrainian Canadian historian George D. Knysch.² Yet his interpretation proves on closer inspection less convincing than originally envisaged inasmuch as it is all the more patterned on the same patriotic vantage point as outlined first by Mikhail Lomonosov and subsequently cultivated by Russian anti-Normanists, in particular in the Soviet and early Post-Soviet period.³ One should not disregard, however, a recent attempt to reconcile extreme points of view, which has been made by Håkon Stang in 1996.⁴ The latter tried to substantiate the Greek origin of the name "Rus" which might have referred primarily to the ancient Northmen, purportedly the Heruli or, to use the author's spelling, "Eruls", in the 6th century. This name was allegedly transmitted from Byzantium to Old Ladoga and subsequently incorporated into the whole of the Novgorod and Eastern Krivichi region. According to this author, the term "Rus" could have been influenced by a local Baltic Finnic ethnic group, the Veps, who similar to the Finnish "ruotsi" (cf. BFinn. *rōtsi), called the Swedes "roč", a form which is likely to account for the palatalized final dental in "Rus". In the 9th century, more precisely in 839, the East-Finnic (Veps) form "roč" reached the Byzantines, and was rendered by a Greek scribe as "Ρῶς".

* I am grateful to Dr. Diana Gosselin Nakeeb (Pace University, New York) for valuable comments on an earlier draft of this paper. Yet, any opacity is my own.

¹ GOTTFRIED SCHRAMM *Altrußlands Anfang: Historische Schlüsse aus Namen, Wörtern and Texten zum 9. und 10. Jahrhundert*. Freiburg im Breisgau 2002, p. 30.

² GEORGE D. KNYSH *Kyiv's original Rus'*, in: *Ukrainian Quarterly* 55 (2000) 2, pp. 150–185.

³ Cf. I. P. Shaskol'skii's study, published in 1970 (IGOR P. SHASKOL'SKII *Recent developments in the Normanistic controversy*, in: *Varangian Problems*. Copenhagen 1970, pp. 21–38) and one of the recent books of V. V. Sedov (VALENTIN V. SEDOV *Drevnerusskaia narodnost'*. Moskva 1999; see also *IDEM Slaviane: Istoriko-arkheologicheskoe issledovanie*. Moskva 2002, especially pp. 570–574), which, in some places, appears a pure reiteration of obsolete theses, e. g., about the Old-Russian state/people as a unity in the 10th to 13th centuries. Accordingly, an alleged Varangian impact on the formation of this state comes to naught (cf. SIMON FRANKLIN, JONATHAN SHEPARD *The emergence of Rus' 750–1200*. London, New York 1996, p. 28, fn. 26). A comprehensive survey of the recent, especially Post-Soviet interpretations of the above controversy is provided by DITTMAR SCHORKOWITZ *Die Herkunft der Ostslaven und die Anfänge des Kiever Reiches in der post-sovietischen Revision*, in: *JBfGOE* 48 (2000) 4, pp. 569–601 and SCHRAMM *Altrußlands Anfang* pp. 21–32.

⁴ HÅKON STANG *The Naming of Russia*. Oslo 1996, especially pp. 267, 272–276, 282.

This scenario, however, is not novel at all. Its rationale may easily be traced back to Joseph Marquart's hypothesis,⁵ which, in fact, appears highly conjectured to be accepted without reservations.⁶ In completing his "logical, philological and historical circle," Håkon Stang had it in mind to elaborate a sophisticated interpretation. Unfortunately, while bringing to light, and rightly so, the parochialism of the contest between the Normanists and anti-Normanists, his theory failed to break through the limits of the *circulus vitiosus*.

It comes therefore as no surprise that in recent publications⁷ the Varangian-Rus'ian controversy tends to be reduced to the etymology of the core term "Rus'". Without proposing any new vista of the provenance of this name conceived of as a separate lexical entity, I shall instead attempt a structural treatment of the material under consideration. In light of the plethora of both historiographic and philological data which are recoverable in the Byzantine, western (German) Latin, and Arabic records, it would be instructive not only to reconstruct the underlying form(s) but to construe correspondences between the well-known Byzantine, German Latin, and Arabic attestations which may serve as a basis for further discussion. Based on a thorough survey of these attestations, such a structural approach appears all the more useful since no one has so far succeeded in bringing into logical unity these three basic sources related to the etymology and early history of the name "Rus'".

2. *The Byzantine and Other Southern Records*

2.1. "Who called themselves" or "who were called by others"?

The name "Rhōs" first appears in a well-known, ever since its publication by Gottlieb Siegfried Bayer in 1744 (1737), entry under the year A.D. 839 in the official Carolingian royal annals ("Annales Bertiniani")⁸ which recounts about an embassy from the Byzantine Emperor Theophilos (829–842) to the Frankish Emperor Louis le Débonnaire and mentions, specifically, some emissaries from the people called "Rhos" (Rhōs): "qui se, id est gentem suam, Rhos vocari dicebant" ("they, that is, their people, were called Rhos").⁹ In

⁵ JOSEPH MARQUART *Osteuropäische und ostasiatische Streifzüge: Ethnologische und historisch-topographische Studien zur Geschichte des 9. und 10. Jahrhunderts* (ca. 840–940). Leipzig 1903, p. 65 ff.; VLADIMIR A. MOSHIN *Variago-russkii vopros*, in: *Slavia* 10 (1931) pp. 109–136, 343–379, 501–537, here pp. 522–523.

⁶ GOTTFRIED SCHRAMM *Die Herkunft des Namens Rus'*: Kritik des Forschungsstandes, in: *Forschungen zur osteuropäischen Geschichte* 30 (1982) pp. 7–49, here pp. 33–34.

⁷ BOHDAN STRUMIŃSKI *Linguistic Interrelations in Early Rus': Northmen, Finns, and East Slavs* (Ninth to Eleventh Centuries). Edmonton, Toronto 1996; ALEKSANDR A. KHLEVOV *Normanskaia problema v otechestvennoi istoricheskoi nauke*. S.-Peterburg 1997, p. 87.

⁸ L'Abbé C. DEHAISNES (ed.) *Les Annales de Saint-Bertin et de Saint-Vaast, suivies de fragments d'une chronique inédite*. Paris 1871, pp. 19–20; GEORGIUS HEINRICUS PERTZ (ed.) *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* [hereafter MGH]. Volume 1. Hannoverae 1826, p. 434.

⁹ Apart from the citations from the Lavrentian and Hypatian copies of the Kyiv [Kiev] Primary Chronicle which are given in folios, all other examples and citations are identified by pages, and quoted as they are represented by editors or compilers in the corresponding publications. The names of the languages will be abbreviated as follows: Arabic – Arab., Baltic Finnic – BFin., East Slavic – ESL., Finnic (Finnish) – Finn., Frankish Latin – FLat., Germanic – Gmc., Gothic – Goth., Greek – Gr., Hebrew – Heb., Latin – Lat., Middle Greek – MGr., Middle High German – MHG, Middle Low German – MLG, Middle Russian – MRuss., Old Armenian – OArm., Old Icelandic – OIc., Old

view of the “rh” transliterating the Greek letter “ρ” (“rho”), Jonathan Shepard¹⁰ assumed that the form “Rhos” could have derived from the written word, and thus directly or indirectly from Theophilus’ letter, rather than from a transcript of the spoken word.¹¹ From this one might tentatively infer that the correct translation of the above phrase should be based on a reflexive form, i.e., “who called themselves”, but not on a mere passive interpretation, i.e., “who were called by others”.¹² Profitable as this conjecture may seem, it is, however, poorly supported by linguistic arguments proper,¹³ thus presenting a specific case of “wishful translating”.

2.2. The Middle Greek Evidence

The Greek name “Ρῶς” is first directly attested to in the “Life of St. George of Amastris” written by Ignatius the Deacon (d. after 845). Premised on the extensive study of this document, V. G. Vasil’evskij¹⁴ assumed that the Rus’ were likely to have raided the city of Amastris on the northern shore of Asia Minor in Paphlagonia between 816 and 842. To outline their itinerary more precisely, the Rus’ began their raid from the Sea of Azov, turning southeast along the coast of Georgia, then extending west along the Pontus coast of Anatolia from Trebizond to Amastris. Although corroborated subsequently by other

Indo-Aryan – OIAr., Old Iranian – OIr., Old Nordic – ONord., Old Norwegian – ONw., Old Ossetian – OOss., Russian – Russ., Slavic – Sl., West Arabic – WArab.

As for the Semitic languages, transliterations from Arabic and Hebrew are based chiefly on the “transcriptional principles” as provided by Tadeusz Lewicki in his compendium (TADEUSZ LEWICKI *Źródła arabskie do dziejów słowiańszczyzny*. Wrocław, Kraków 1956, pp. x–xii), and letter-for-letter correspondences in HEINZ-JOSEF FABRY, HELMER RINGGREN (eds.) *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament*. Volume 7. Stuttgart, Berlin, Köln 1993, pp. 271–284. If cited from specific publications, the editors’ transliterations are generally preserved, see, e. g., ABDURRAHMAN ALI EL-HAJJI (ed.) *Abū ‘Ubayd Al-Bakrī. The Geography of al-Andalus and Europe. From the Book “Al-masalik wal-mamalik”* [“The Routes and the Countries”]. Beirut 1387/1968; HANS MŽIK (ed.) *Das Kitāb sūrat al-arḍ des Abū Ġa’far Muhammad Ibn Mūsā al-Ḥuwārizmī. Arabischer Text*. Leipzig 1926.

¹⁰ JONATHAN SHEPARD *The Rhos guests of Louis the Pious: whence and wherefore?*, in: *Early Medieval Europe* 4 (1995) 1, pp. 41–60, here p. 43.

¹¹ From the philological point of view, this argument appears more persuasive in comparison with the view recently revived by E. A. Mel’nikova (ELENA A. MEL’NIKOVA [ed.] *Drevniaia Rus’ v svete zarubezhnykh istochnikov*. 2e izdanie. Moskva 2001, p. 101) and her colleagues (MIKHAIL V. BIBIKOV, ELENA A. MEL’NIKOVA, VLADIMIR IA. PETRUKHIN *Rannie étapu russko-vizantiiskikh otnoshe-nii v svete istoricheskoi onomastiki*, in: *Vizantiiskii vremennik* 59 (2000) pp. 35–39, here pp. 37, 39). They strongly believe that this form as encountered in “*Annales Bertiniani*”, in particular in “*Prudentii, Trecensis episcopi, annales a. 835–861*” (MGH volume 1, pp. 429–454), must have been directly borrowed from the Scandinavians. Interestingly enough, this claim is based exclusively on the long *o*, which is purported to have sounded in the Scandinavian word. As I shall show this sound is, in fact, crucial, for the reconstruction of the name *Rus’*, but should be treated on more solid linguistic grounds.

¹² STANG *The Naming of Russia* p. 298.

¹³ See RAPHAEL KÜHNER *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache*. Volume 2, part 1. Hannover 1912, pp. 104–111.

¹⁴ VASILII G. VASIL’EVSKII *Trudy*. Volume 3: *Russko-variashskie issledovania*. Petrograd 1915, pp. cviii–cxi.

scholars,¹⁵ this view, however, remains open to doubt, especially in the face of some historiographic and philological limitations¹⁶ regarding the form “Ρῶς”.¹⁷

The first reliable record of the Middle Greek name “Ρῶς” dates back to the mid-9th century, when the patriarch of Constantinople Photius (d. 891) described in two homilies the attack of “a people from the north” on Constantinople in June 860. It is remarkable that the indeclinable form “Ρῶς” occurs only in the titles and not in the text of the homilies. Apart from rhetorical embellishments, particularly in the famous passage which reads “An obscure nation, a nation of no account, a nation ranked among slaves, unknown, but which has won a name from the expedition against us”,¹⁸ this people was once identified with a “fierce and barbarous Scythian tribe”,¹⁹ i.e., “Τὸ δὲ Σκυθικὸν τοῦτο καὶ ὠμὸν ἔθνος καὶ Βάρβαρον”,²⁰ which prompted quite a reasonable comment by M. V. Levchenko²¹ that the invaders with the name “Scythian” were not Scandinavian but Slavs.²² It is noteworthy that the name “Ρῶς” first occurred, not in the title, in Photius’s “Encyclica ad sedes orientales”, written in 867. Having referred to “Rhōs” by name, “τὸ καλούμενον Ῥῶς”,²³ Photius characterized them in terms which leave little doubt that he identified them with the invaders of 860.

Of far greater importance, in this respect, is a form, which is found in Bishop Liudprand’s (d. 972) evidence of 958–962, that is, “ρουσίοι” [ρούσιοι].²⁴ Vilhelm Thomsen²⁵ stated that this new Middle Greek form as compared with the form “Ρῶς”, was more

¹⁵ FIEDRICH WESTBERG *O zhytii sv. Stefana Surozhskogo*, in: *Vizantiiskii vremennik*, izdavaemyi pri Imperatorskoi Akademii nauk 14 (1907) pp. 227–236; OMELJAN PRITSAK *At the dawn of Christianity in Rus’: East meets West*, in: *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 12/13 (1988/1989) pp. 87–113; CONSTANTIN ZUCKERMAN *Deux étapes de la formation de l’ancien état russe*, in: *Les centres proto-urbains russes entre Scandinavie, Byzance et Orient*. Ed. by Michel Kazanski [et al.]. Paris 2000, pp. 95–120; MEL’NIKOVA (ed.) *Drevniaia Rus’* p. 92.

¹⁶ CARL DE BOOR *Der Angriff der Rhos auf Byzanz*, in: *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 4 (1895) pp. 445–466, here p. 446 ff.; ALEKSANDER A. VASILEV *The Russian Attack on Constantinople in 860*. Cambridge, MA 1946, pp. 71–79. For the attempt to show that the passage in the “Life of St. George of Amastris” is in Photius’s style, see ATHANASIOS MARKOPOULOS *La vie de Saint George d’Amastris et Photius*, in: *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 28 (1979) pp. 75–82.

¹⁷ VASIL’EVSKII *Trudy* p. 64.

¹⁸ CYRIL MANGO *The Homilies of Photius Patriarch of Constantinople*. English Translation, Introduction and Commentary. Cambridge, MA 1958, p. 98; KARL MÜLLER, THEODORUS MÜLLER (eds.) *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*. Volume 5: *Photii de Russorum incursione homiliae duae*. Paris 1883, p. 168.

¹⁹ MANGO *The Homilies of Photius* p. 89.

²⁰ MÜLLER, MÜLLER (eds.) *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum* p. 165.

²¹ MITROFAN V. LEVCHENKO *Fal’sifikatsiia istorii vizantiisko-russkikh otnoshenii v trudakh A. A. Vasil’eva*, in: *Vizantiiskii vremennik* 4 (1951) pp. 149–159.

²² DIMITRI OBOLENSKY *The Byzantine sources on the Scandinavians in Eastern Europe*, in: *Varangian Problems*. Copenhagen 1970, pp. 149–169, here p. 151.

²³ VASILEIOS LAOURDAS, LEENDERT GERRIT WESTERINK (eds.) *Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana*. Volume 1: *Photii Patriarchae Constantinopolitani Epistulae et Amphiloquia*. Leipzig 1983, p. 50.

²⁴ RUDOLF BUCHNER (ed.) *Ausgewählte Quellen zur deutschen Geschichte des Mittelalters*. Volume 8: *Widukinds Sachsengeschichte. Adalberts Fortsetzung der Chronik Reginos. Liudprands Werke*. Darmstadt 1971, p. 460.

²⁵ VILHELM THOMSEN *Det Russiske riges grundlæggelse ved Nordbørne*, in: *IDEM Samlede afhandlinger*. Volume 1. København 1919, pp. 231–414, here pp. 266, 350.

closely connected to the Slavic „Rus“, but assumed that the Greeks, albeit wrongly, might have identified this name with the homophonous MGr. ῥούσιος (“red-haired”). In view of different chronologies of the two Middle Greek forms, “Ῥῶς” and “ῥούσιοι”, a student is, in fact, at a loss as to whether he can treat the latter Byzantine expression as a “spoken Byzantine Greek designation for the *Rūs*”²⁶, although its popular Greek etymology appears more than obvious in Bishop Liutprand’s “Antapodosis”: “Gens [...], quam a qualitate corporis Greci vocant Ρουσιοι, Rúsios, nos vero a positione loci nominamus Nordmannos”²⁷ (“A people [...], whom the Greeks call in quality of body Ρουσιοι, Rúsios, but we call them Nordmanni because of geographical position”²⁸).

Contrary to the form “Ῥῶς”, Håkon Stang²⁹ is too quick to define the latter word-form, “Ρουσιοι” [ῥούσιοι], traditionally labeled as “colloquial”, as a pre-Christian term, which might have appeared in the era of the first mass invasion of far-northerners in the very heart of the Byzantine empire. This dichotomy, however, turns out to be rather murky in light of some well-known facts. Suffice it to recall here the name “Ῥωσία” which was first attested in the Byzantine sources, in particular in “De Caerimoniis” and “De Administrando Imperio”,³⁰ while competing with the expressions “χώρα τῶν Ῥῶς”³¹ and “χώρα τῆς Ῥωσίας”.³² As a toponym, the name “Ῥωσία”, derived with the help of the

²⁶ OMEJAN PRITSAK The origin of the name *Rus*, in: *Passé turco-tatar. Présent soviétique. Études offertes à Alexandre Bennigsen*. Ed. by Chantal Lemerrier-Quellejey [et al.]. Louvain, Paris 1986, pp. 45–65, here p. 56.

²⁷ MGH volume 3. Hannoverae 1839, p. 331.

²⁸ *Ibidem* p. 277.

²⁹ STANG The Naming of Russia p. 23.

³⁰ CONSTANTINE PORPHYROGENITUS *De caerimoniis aulae byzantinae*. Ed. by Johann Jacob Reiske. Volume 1. Bonn 1829, book 2, chapter 15, p. 594 ff. For a survey of ethnic and political information related to this term in Constantine Porphyrogenitus’ treatise “De Administrando Imperio” (948–952), see IRÈNE SORLIN *Voies commerciales, villes et peuplement de la Rôsia au Xe siècle d’après le De Administrando Imperio de Constantine Porphyrogénète*, in: *Les centres proto-urbains russes* pp. 343–355.

³¹ GYULA MORAVCSIK (ed.), ROMILLY JAMES HEALD JENKINS (transl.) *Constantine Porphyrogenitus. De administrando imperio*. New revised edition. Washington, DC 1967, 4:11.

³² MORAVCSIK (ed.) *Constantine Porphyrogenitus* 37:43. It would be instructive to cite here a hapax legomenon from chapter 9 of this treatise, “ἡ ἔξω Ῥωσία” (“the Outer Rus”). Providing no term to denote “the Inner Rus”, the relevant passage seems to give evidence of a clear dichotomy of political structure along the Dnieper route in the 10th century. The long-standing controversy lies, however, in where the other, Inner Rus, was situated. Leaving aside numerous commentaries, sometimes mutually contradictory (see PAVLO SMIRNOV *Volz’kyi shliakh i starodavni rusy [narysy z rus’koï istorii VI–IX vv.]*. Kyiv 1928, p. 119 ff.; ALEKSANDR POGODIN “Vneshniaia Rossiia” *Konstantina Bagrianorodnogo*, in: *Mélanges linguistiques et philologiques offerts à M. Aleksandar Belić*. Beograd 1937, pp. 77–85; OMEJAN PRITSAK *Where was Constantine’s Inner Rus?*, in: *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 7 [1983] pp. 564–567), one can hardly endorse the “most simple and satisfying” thesis about Kyiv and its territories as Ῥωσία proper (cf. SORLIN *Voies commerciales, villes et peuplement de la Rôsia* p. 347). Poorly convincing appears also A. Soloviev’s hypothesis (ALEKSANDR SOLOVIEV Ἡ ἙΞΩ ῬΩΣΙΑ, in: *Byzantion* 13 [1938] pp. 227–235) according to which the whole of Rus, including the territories of Kyiv proper with adjacent Vyshgorod and Vytychiv, belonged to the “ἡ ἔξω Ῥωσία”. The validity of this hypothesis is challenged in view of a similar term in the “*Kitāb Ruḡār*” (“*Liber Rogerii*”, ca. 1153) of al-Idrīsī (ALEXANDER SEIPPEL [ed.] *Rerum normannicarum fontes arabici*. Osloae 1896–1928, pp. 29–30). While writing about the sixth section of the sixth climate, he mentions the country of “the Outer Rus” (“الروسية الخارجة”) (Al-

suffix *-ia*, could have been in use along with terms derived from the parallel root *ῥούσ-*, e. g., “*τῶν Ῥουσικῶν*” next to “*τῶν Ῥουσίων*” in Constantine Porphyrogenitus’ “*De Caerimoniis*”.³³ Otherwise, one could hardly explain the attestation, in 1142, of the adjective form *ῥούσικος* in an inventory of possessions of the Rus’ian St. Pantelejmon monastery on Mount Athos, inhabited by the Rus’ians since 1030. Remarkably, in 1177 and 1182, the Rus’ian monks were called by the Greek “*οἱ Ῥῶς*” (indecl.) or rather frequently “*οἱ Ῥούσοι*”, “*Ῥούσσοι*” (decl.). The parallel word forms were still commonplace in 1188 and 1194, i.e., “*τῶν Ῥουσσῶν, τῶν Ῥουσσῶν, τῶν Ῥῶς*”.³⁴

2.2.1. The Arabic “*الروسية*” (“*ar-Rūsīja*”)

A similar parallelism is evidenced in Middle Russian, which knew orthographic pairs like “*Rusiia*”/“*Russiia*” (15th century) and “*Rosiia*”/“*Rossiia*” (16th century).³⁵ To explain this parallelism, Antoine Martel was obviously too hasty to advance a twofold influence, i.e., Polish Latin (cf. Lat. *Russia*) in the former case and Byzantine in the latter case. Leaving aside peculiar forms of the type MRuss. *rossiisti* and *rustyi* (16th century) which are surely patterned on the Byzantine counterparts, it would be quite reasonable to posit both indigenous and imported tradition operating in case of “*Rusiia*”/“*Russiia*”.

Tracking down the indigenous tradition, it is expedient to cite the above Arabic form “*الروسية*” [ارض] as found in al-Idrīsī’s “*Opus geographicum*”³⁶. While identifying sometimes “*ar-Rūsīja*” (“*الروسية*”) with an isle, or, better yet, a peninsula (“*الجزيرة*”, “*al-ğazīra*”),

Idrīsī. *Opus geographicum*. Ed. by Enrico Cerulli [et al.]. Part 8. Neapoli, Romae 1978, p. 914), a term which he might have borrowed from the secret handbook of Byzantine diplomacy written by Constantine Pophyrogenitus (PRITSAK *Where was Constantine’s Inner Rus’?* p. 558). Geographically, he contrasts this kind of the Rus’ with another one in the title of the fourth section of the sixth climate, “*بلاد الروشبة القصوى*” (Al-Idrīsī. *Opus geographicum* p. 892) “*the farthest Rus’*” (cf. “*l’extrême Russie*” in PIERRE-AMÉDÉE JAUBERT [ed., transl.] *Géographie d’Édrisi traduite de l’arabe en français*. Volume 2. Paris 1840, p. 382), which comprises settlements in the Carpathian region: “*There are two kinds (صنف) of the Rus’. One kind of them is that one which we are treating in this section. And the other one is those who live in the vicinity of the country of Hungary (أكرية) and Macedonia (مقدونية)*” (Al-Idrīsī. *Opus geographicum* p. 920; see JAUBERT [ed., transl.] *Géographie d’Édrisi* p. 404). In this respect, I. G. Konovalova (IRINA G. KONOVALOVA *Vostochnaia Evropa v sochinenii al-Idrisi*. Moskva 1999, p. 152) seems quite right to state that the opposition “*far/near*” as applied in the toponymy reflects here the geographical egocentrism, which is likely to depend on a particular vantage point.

It should be noted parenthetically that in the Parisian manuscript (Parisiensis 2221, a. 1300) there is, as has been cited above, a slightly different spelling, “*الروشبة الخارجة*” (“*ar-rūsīja al-hāriġa*”). Yet, taken palaeographically, this difference (see JAUBERT [ed., transl.] *Géographie d’Édrisi* p. 399) does not have any bearing on the subject under consideration.

³³ ALEKSANDR SOLOVIEV *Le nom byzantin de la Russie*. La Haye 1957, p. 12; IDEM *Vizantiiskoe imia Rossii*, in: *Vizantiiskii vremennik* 12 (1957) pp. 134–155, here p. 137; see also “*ἡ Ῥωσικῆ*” in Leo the Deacon’s writings (BARTHOLD GEORG NIEBUHR *Corpus scriptorum historiae byzantinae*. Volume 11: Leonis Diaconi Caloënsis *Historiae*. Bonnae 1828, p. 151).

³⁴ ALEKSANDR SOLOVIEV *Histoire du Monastère Russe au Mont-Athos*, in: *Byzantion* 8 (1933) pp. 213–238, here pp. 219, 221.

³⁵ ANTOINE MARTEL *Un point d’histoire du vocabulaire russe: Россия, Русский*, in: *Mélanges publiés en l’honneur de M. Paul Boyer*. Paris 1925, pp. 270–279, here pp. 272–273, 275.

³⁶ See also fn. 32.

this geographical name was known in the Islamic descriptive school of geography³⁷ as early as the 10th century, e.g., in the works of Ibn Rosteh (922), Ibn Faḍlān (ca. 922), Ibn Ḥauqal (ca. 978) and other authors,³⁸ reserving a special place for a 13th-century Spanish geographer, Ibn Saʿīd, and 14th-century Syrian writers, Abuʿl-Fidāʾ and ad-Dimašqī.³⁹ Premised mostly on al-Idrīsī’s work, Ibn Saʿīd,⁴⁰ who is closely followed by Abuʿl-Fidāʾ, provides a rather detailed account about an isle (= peninsula), situated not far from this city, in the center of a great lake, “tūmā”.⁴¹ Many towns were erected on the shores of this lake; the inhabitation of these towns was largely mixed Muslim and Christian. According to V. Bartol’d⁴², one can hardly define this locality. This author, however, is inclined to situate this “isle/peninsula” not in the estuary of the Don and the Dnieper, but somewhere in the southern Rus’ contrary to the opposite view, situating such an “isle/peninsula” in the Novgorod region or in the surroundings of Old Ladoga.⁴³ In any case, the Islamic authors provide no reliable evidence as to the real landscape, save that the Rus’ian “isle/peninsula” was most likely surrounded by rivers and lakes. To draw a telling parallel in the Islamic descriptive school of geography, one can mention Abuʿl-Fidāʾ who identified towns, located in the Tigris-Euphrates Mesopotamia, with an “isle/peninsula”.⁴⁴ On the whole, Abuʿl-Fidāʾ seems to have followed, in this case, a long-standing Oriental tradition, since, much earlier, al-Muqaddasī wrote in his “Aḥsan at-taqāsīm fī maʿrifat al-aqā

³⁷ FERDINAND WÜSTENFELD (ed.) *Jacut’s geographisches Wörterbuch*. Volume 2. Leipzig 1867, pp. ٨٣٦–٨٥٠.

³⁸ HARRIS BIRKELAND (ed.) *Nordens historie i middelalderen etter arabiske kilder*. Oslo 1954, pp. 16, 19, 49–50, 53–58, 66–67, 70–71, 74, 91–92, 99, 103, 116, 119, 123, 127–128; SEIPPEL (ed.) *Rerum normannicarum fontes arabici* p. 11.

³⁹ IRINA G. KONOVALOVA *Sostav rasskaza ob “ostrovo rusov” v sochineniiakh arabo-persidskikh avtorov X–XVI vv.*, in: *Drevneishie gosudarstva Vostochnoi Evropy*. 1999 g. Vostochnaia i Severnaia Evropa v srednevekov’e. Moskva 2001, pp. 169–189.

⁴⁰ SEIPPEL (ed.) *Rerum normannicarum fontes arabici* pp. 35–36, ١٠١.

⁴¹ CHRISTIAN MARTIN FRÄHN *Ibn-Foszlān’s und anderer Araber Berichte über die Russen älterer Zeit*. St. Petersburg 1823, p. 31; SEIPPEL (ed.) *Rerum normannicarum fontes arabici* p. ١٠٢. A 14th-century version may be found in the *Geography of Abuʿl-fidāʾ* (JOSEPH TOUSSAINT REINAUD, MAC GUCKIN DE SLANE [eds.] *Géographie d’Aboulfédaʾ*. Texte arabe. Paris 1840, p. ٢٠٤; for a French translation, see JOSEPH TOUSSAINT REINAUD [ed., transl.] *Géographie d’Aboulfédaʾ*. Volume 2, part 1. Paris 1848, p. 288; AUGUST FERDINAND MEHREN [ed.]. *Cosmographie de Chems-ed-Din Abou Abdallah Mohammed Ed-Dimichqui*. Texte arabe, publié d’après l’édition commencée par M. Fraehn. St.-Petersbourg 1866, pp. ٢٦١–٢٦٢. It is interesting to mention here “جزيرة الروسية” (“the Rus’ian isle”) which was added by Jākūt in al-Iṣṭaḥrī’s “Masālik al-mamālik” (“Viae regnorum”, ca. 951) (MICHAEL JAN DE GOEJE [ed.] *Bibliotheca Geographorum Arabicorum* (hereafter BGA). 2nd edition. Volume 1: *Viae regnorum*. Descriptio ditionis moslemicae auctore Abu Ishāk al-Fārisī al-Istakhrī. Leiden 1927, p. ٢١٨, fn. (k). It is also noteworthy that the term “tūmā” is most likely a corrupted form of the name “طرمى” (“ṭirmi”) as found in al-Idrīsī (Al-Idrīsī. *Opus geographicum* pp. 921, 957; see JAUBERT [ed., transl.] *Géographie d’Édrisi* pp. 405, 434).

⁴² VASILII V. BARTOL’D “Geografiya Ibn-Saʿīda”, in: *Recueil des travaux rédigés en mémoire du Jubilé Scientifique de M[onsieur] Daniel Chwolson*. Volume 2. Berlin 1899, pp. 226–241, here pp. 232–233.

⁴³ FRÄHN *Ibn-Foszlān’s und anderer Araber Berichte* pp. 47–50; PETER B. GOLDEN *The question of the Rus’ Qaḡanate*, in: *Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevi* 2 (1982) pp. 77–97; STANG *The Naming of Russia* pp. 187–188. For a bibliography, see KONOVALOVA *Sostav rasskaza ob “ostrovo rusov”* pp. 69–170.

⁴⁴ REINAUD (ed., transl.) *Géographie d’Aboulfédaʾ* volume 2, part 2. Paris 1848, p. 50.

līm” (“Optima dispositio in scientia orbium terrestrium”, ca. 985–986) about “Ġazīrat Ibn ‘Umar”, a city named after his founder, and situated in the estuary of the Tigris.⁴⁵

All in all, the account about both the Rus’ian country/city and the Rus’ian isle/peninsula may be conceived of as a compilative composition of two, both chronologically and geographically, different traditions, i.e., a more ancient Oriental tradition as cultivated in Central Asia, and a younger tradition of the Mediterranean geographers. What is more remarkable is that the two traditions reflect most likely “different areas of the outer activities of the Rus’”. The above dichotomy is most convincingly corroborated by two complementary versions of the account about the Rus’ian isle as encountered in the writing of Ibn Iyās (1448–1524).⁴⁶ While following, on the whole, both Persian and Arabic geographers, this author believes that the Rus’ are a kind of Turkish people who speak an exotic language.

It stands therefore to reason that the form “ar-Rūsīja” (“الروسية”) may represent a rather ancient East Slav term (stem) borrowed into Arabic either directly or via the Byzantines.⁴⁷ This borrowing might have taken place in the prehistoric time, thus demanding a closer consideration of phonological traits of the borrowing process.⁴⁸

2.3. The Hebrew “נשיא ראש” (“nāsī rōš”)

The parallelism of the above derivatives both from “Rhōs” and “Rus[s]-” warrants here some additional comments, especially vis-à-vis another form, which may be connected with the historical appearance of the Rus’. After the first clashes with the ferocious and cruel Rus’ in the 9th century, Byzantine writers referred to, phonetically, a similar archaic name cited twice in the Greek Septuagint translation of the Old Testament. Most scholars⁴⁹ maintain, especially in view of a detailed study of A. Florovskii⁵⁰ who closely followed some of his predecessors,⁵¹ that the Hebrew words “נשיא ראש” (“nāsī rōš”) were mistakenly translated as “ἄρχοντα ‘Ρώς”.⁵² At the end of the 10th century the Byzantine historian Leo the Deacon,⁵³ referring to Ezekiel’s prophecies, identified the chief Ros (Rōš), mentioned along with the fabulous destructive peoples of Gog and Magog (from the North), with the name of the Rus’ who were also known in Byzantium as Tauroscythians. This biblical and, at first glance, phonetic similarity (cf. “‘Ρώς” [ros] next to “‘Ρώς”

⁴⁵ ANDRÉ MIQUEL (ed., transl.) *Al-Muqaddasī Aḥsan at-taqāsīm fī ma‘rifat al-aqālīm* (la meilleure repartition pour la connaissance des provinces). Damas 1963, pp. 79, 275.

⁴⁶ AUGUST ARNOLD *Chrestomathia arabica. Pars I textum continens*. Halis 1853, pp. 73–76; see ANATOLII P. NOVOSEL’TSEV *Vostochnye istochniki o vostochnykh slavianakh i Rusi VI–IX vv.*, in: *Drevnee gosudarstvo i ego mezhdunarodnoe znachenie*. Ed. by Anatolii Petrovich Novosel’tsev [et al.]. Moskva 1965, pp. 355–419, here pp. 401–402.

⁴⁷ See also § 4.4.

⁴⁸ See also § 5.1.

⁴⁹ PRITSAK *The origin of the name Rus’* p. 47; STANG *The Naming of Russia* pp. 26–28.

⁵⁰ ANTONII FLOROVSKII “Kniaz’ Rosh” u proroka Iezekilia (gl. 38–39) (Iz zametok ob imeni Rus’), in: *Sbornikъ vъ chest’ na Vasilъ N. Zlatarski*. Sofia 1925, pp. 505–520.

⁵¹ ADAM CLARKE (ed.) *Holy Bible, containing the Old and New Testaments: The text with a commentary and critical notes. Volume 4*. New York 1833, p. 267; EDUARD KÖNIG *Zur Vorgeschichte des Namens “Russen”*, in: *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 70 (1916) pp. 2–96; THOMSEN *Det Russiske riges grundlæggelse ved Nordbørne* p. 342.

⁵² HENRY BARCLAY SWETE (ed.) *The Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint*. Cambridge, MA 1905, Ez. 38:2, 39:1.

⁵³ NIEBUHR *Corpus scriptorum historiae byzantinae* p. 150.

[rōs]) allowed M. Ia. Siuziumov⁵⁴ a thousand years later to trace back the name “Rus” directly to the Biblical people ‘Ρῶς as mentioned in the Old Testament.⁵⁵ According to Håkon Stang,⁵⁶ this case may be treated as a philological and logical blunder, since there was originally no “prince of ‘Ros” whatsoever, for Heb. *rōš* signifies merely “head, leader, chief”,⁵⁷ cf. “Fili hominis, pone faciem tuam contra Gog, in terra Magog, principem summum Mosoch et Thubal”.⁵⁸ This is why Håkon Stang offers for consideration three forms of interest to the appearance of the name “Rus”, i.e., “rus-”, “ros”, and “rōs”, which were all allegedly used by the Byzantines.

2.4. The Islamic “Rass”

The above line of reasoning, however, raises some questions.⁵⁹ It is noteworthy that most students are unaware of the identification of the Biblical “Ros” with the Islamic “Rass” as outlined by Joseph Hammer-Purgstall⁶⁰ for “aṣḥāb ar-rass” (“اصحاب الرس”, “the men [people] of ar-Rass”) is encountered twice in the Qur’an.⁶¹ “As also ‘Ād and Thamūd, and the Companions of the Rass”.⁶² Remarkably, commentators are not sure as to, who the “companions of the Rass” were, thus adducing widely divergent and even fantastic explanations.⁶³ One example is an oasis town named al-Rass in the district of Qasim about thirty-five miles south-west of the town of ‘Unaiza, reputed to be the central point of the Arabian Peninsula, and situated midway between Mecca and Basra. The “companions of the Rass” might well have been the people of Shu‘aib, as they are mentioned along with the ‘Ād and Thamūd, and Lot’s people in a similar context.⁶⁴ Among other interpretations, Jāqūt (d. 1229) treats this name in his “Mu‘ğam al-buldān” (“Regiones ordine literarum dispositae vel Lexicon geographicum”) as a geographical name, i.e., “the valley

⁵⁴ MIKHAIL IA. SIUZUMOV K voprosu o proiskhozhdenii slova ‘Ρῶς, ‘Ρωσία, *Rossija*, in: *Vestnik drevnei istorii* 2 (1940) 11, pp. 121–123.

⁵⁵ SOLOVIEV *Le nom byzantin de la Russie* pp. 10–11; IDEM *Vizantiiskoe imia Rossii* p. 135.

⁵⁶ STANG *The Naming of Russia* p. 27.

⁵⁷ KÖNIG *Zur Vorgeschichte des Namens “Russen”* p. 94.

⁵⁸ *Bibliorum Sacrorum editio sacros. Oecum. Concilii Vaticani II ratione habita. Iussu Pauli PP. VI recognita. Auctoritate Ioannis Pauli PP. II promulgata.* Vaticano [s.a.], Ez. 38.2.

⁵⁹ WILHELM GESENIUS *Hebräisch-deutsches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament.* Leipzig 1815, p. 578; FRANTS BUHL (ed.) *Wilhelm Gesenius’ hebräisches und aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament.* 14th edition. Leipzig 1905, p. 674.

⁶⁰ JOSEPH DE HAMMER *Sur les origines russes. Extraits de manuscrits orientaux.* St. Pétersbourg 1827, p. 26.

⁶¹ HANNA E. KASSIS *A Concordance of the Qur’an.* Berkeley, Los Angeles, London 1983, p. 1033.

⁶² ABDULLAH YUSUF ALI *The Holy Qur-an. Text, Translation and Commentary.* Volume 2. Lahore [s.a.], Sura 25.38, see also Sura 50.12.

⁶³ ALI *The Holy Qur-an* p. 934, fn. 3094; ELWOOD MORRIS WHERRY *A Comprehensive Commentary on the Qur’an: Comprising Sale’s Translation and Preliminary Discourse.* Volume 3. London 1896, p. 214; cf. FRÄHN *Ibn-Foszlan’s und anderer Araber Berichte* pp. 34–35. For a synopsis of various interpretations in Islamic, and especially Arabic literature, see HAMMER *Sur les origines russes* pp. 12–17, 24–29, who offered, however, rather a dogmatic explanation of the fate of these legendary people.

⁶⁴ ALI *The Holy Qur-an* Sura 26.176–190.

ar-Rass” (“الرس وادی اذربيجان”)⁶⁵ which is situated in Azerbaidzhan,⁶⁵ although elsewhere⁶⁶ he calls it “the river ar-Rass” (“نهر الرس”) in the same country.

In the context of our study, however, of utmost importance are semantic and morphological particularities of the above Arabic term. The root meaning of Arab. *rass* differs obviously from that of Heb. *rōš* (“head”) as Arab. رأس means “head”, but not الرس.⁶⁷ Having conducted an extensive study of the designations of the well in Ancient Arabia, E. Bräulich⁶⁸ asserted with good reason that the noun “rass” (pl. “risās”) should be treated as a “neuter expression” for a well, or shallow water-pit.⁶⁹ Moreover, he assumed that the meaning of this appellation might have been influenced by an apparent or real proper noun. This is why some commentators hold that ar-Rass, a remnant of Thamūd, cast (*rassa*) their prophet into a well (*rass*) and were consequently exterminated.⁷⁰ It is then obvious that the semantic difference is brought about by structural particularities of the above roots. Thus the Hebrew root pattern differs from the Arabic two-consonant root with the second geminated consonant and without a long vocal. One is wondering therefore whether the Greek Septuagint translation, “ἄρχοντα Πώς”, of Heb. *nāsī rōš* was a philological and logical blunder, as has been recently asserted by Håkon Stang. This claim becomes even murkier, if one recalls that this wording is rendered in the Arabic translation of the Old Testament as “raīsu ruš” (“رئيس روش”).⁷¹ All in all, Heb. *rōš* (“head”) with a number of the figurative meanings ranging from the “head, leader” of a social group to the “New Year”, e. g., “*rōš haššānāh*” as attested in the Bible (Ez. 40:1)⁷² should in fact be opposed to the homonymous “*rōš*” in reference to the Biblical people.

2.5. The Syriac “Hrōs”

The above philological controversy resists comprehensive explanation, especially if one recalls the name “Hros” (“Hrōs”) as first attested in the Syriac Chronicle which was compiled in the 550’s A.D. by an anonymous Syrian writer, Zachariah of Mitylene, commonly known as Zacharius Rhetor or Pseudo-Zacharias Rhetor. I shall leave aside the historical validity of a fantastic description of the “Hrōs” along with other legendary tribes of the Ammazartē, pygmies, dog-men and the like,⁷³ to say nothing of the alleged identifi-

⁶⁵ WÜSTENFELD (ed.) Jacut’s geographisches Wörterbuch p. ۷۷۹.

⁶⁶ Ibidem p. ۷۸۰; see HAMMER Sur les origine russes p. 27.

⁶⁷ EDWARD ROBINSON (ed., transl.) A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, Including Biblical Chaldee. Boston 1844, p. 964.

⁶⁸ E. BRÄULICH The well in Ancient Arabia, in: *Islamica* 1 (1925) pp. 41–47, 288–343, 454–466, here p. 330; see JOSEF HOROVITZ *Koranische Untersuchungen*. Berlin, Leipzig 1926, pp. 94–95.

⁶⁹ While not so numerous, there are some deviating explications of the basic meaning of this noun. To adduce a less obvious instance, however, one can mention such an authoritative source as Reinhart Dozy’s “Supplément aux dictionnaires arabes” (REINHART PIETER ANNE DOZY *Supplément aux dictionnaires arabes*. Volume 1. Leiden 1881, p. 525) where the noun “*rassa*” is translated as a “mine”, although this meaning is not corroborated by not a single example.

⁷⁰ HAMILTON ALEXANDER ROSSKEEN GIBB [et al.] (eds.) *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*. New edition. Volume 1. Leiden 1960, p. 453; HAMMER Sur les origine russes pp. 15, 87.

⁷¹ *الكتاب المقدس أى العهد القديم و العهد الجديد. القاهرة* [The Holy Book, that is, The Old and New Testaments]. Cairo [s.a.], here Ez. 38.2, 39.2.

⁷² FABRY (ed.) *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament* pp. 271–282.

⁷³ The Syriac text is found in ERNEST WALTER BROOKS (ed.) *Historia ecclesiastica Zachariae Rhetori vulgo adscripta*. Paris 1919, p. 215; “And the tribe which lives near them [the Amazons] is the Harus [Hrus/Hros], tall, big-limbed men, who have no weapons of war, and horses cannot carry

cation of the “Hrōs” with Jordanes’ “Rosomoni” as posited by Joseph Marquart.⁷⁴ According to the latter author, the old name of the Heruli, “Hrōs”, was applied in the 9th century to the Northmen-Vikings because of their physical resemblance to the erstwhile Heruli invaders⁷⁵ thereby demonstrating a direct semantic connection between the form “Hrōs” and the name of Rus’.⁷⁶

This view has been recently revived by Alf Thulin⁷⁷ who assumed that Zacharius Rhetor, while closely following the Syrian-Christian legend of Alexander the Great,⁷⁸ identified the Huns with the Magog and attributed to them (the Huns) a neighboring people “Hrōs”. Premised also on the oldest Greek Bible translation, Septuagint, Alf Thulin stated that the latter Syriac word form might be a direct transcription of Biblical “Pōς”.⁷⁹ Disregarding a misleading citation of “Pōς” instead of the more appropriate form “Pός”, as is found in the Old Testament, the latter hypothesis turns out to be poorly corroborated linguistically. Firstly, it appears tempting to posit the appearance of “hr” word-

them because of the bigness of their limbs” (FREDERICK JOHN HAMILTON, ERNEST WALTER BROOKS [transl.] *The Syriac Chronicle known as that of Zachariah of Mitylene*. London 1899, p. 328); for a German translation, which appeared simultaneously with that of Frederick John Hamilton and Ernest Walter Brooks in 1899, see KARL AHRENS, GUSTAV KRÜGER *Die sogenannte Kirchengeschichte des Zacharias Rhetor*. Leipzig 1899; cf. NINA V. FIGULEVSKAIA *Siriiskie istochniki po istorii narodov SSSR*. Moskva, Leningrad 1941, pp. 165, 166.

⁷⁴ MARQUART *Osteuropäische und ostasiatische Streifzüge* p. 355 ff. Imitatively and less persuasively, George Vernadsky (GEORGE VERNADSKY *Sur l’origine des Alains*, in: *Byzantion* 16 (1942–1943) pp. 81–86, here pp. 83–84) postulated the derivation of “Hrōs” from the first stem in the compound “Rukhs-As” (“the radiant As”); cf. O.Oss. rūxs/roxs (“light”) in MANFRED MAYRHOFER *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoirischen*. Volume 2, number 16. Heidelberg 1994, pp. 463–464.

⁷⁵ This approach has been recently implemented, albeit in a somewhat awkward way, by George D. Knysh (KNYSH *Kyiv’s original Rus’* pp. 169 ff.). The latter student mentioned also a well-known appellation, originating supposedly from Scythia Sindica (to the South of the estuary of the Dnieper), “Roxolani”, which is purported by him to be in some way linked to the basic form “Rus-a”. George D. Knysh obviously vacillated between the Indo-Aryan reflex with a typical grade *u* as in the form “Rus-a”, and the Old Iranian reflex characterized by the *o*-grade, which is represented in the term “Ros”. Interestingly enough, “Indo-Iranian arguments” can also be found in SCHRAMM *Die Herkunft des Namens Rus’* p. 33, who advanced a sophisticated notion of the Indo-Iranian stratum in order to account for an ancient layer of linguistic data. Thus, the above mentioned “Pωξολανοί” (Strabo), “Rhoxolani” (Plinius), “Roxulani” (Sarmatae Tab.), which is traditionally, after D. I. Ilovaiskii’s suggestion (DMITRII I. ILOVAISKII *Razyskaniia o nachale Rusi: vmesto vvedeniia v russkuiu istoriiu*. 2e izdanie. Moskva 1882, pp. 171, 273 ff.), interpreted as “ραῶξῆνα” + “Αλανοί”, i.e., “the radiant Alans” (MAX VASMER *Schriften zur slavischen Altertumskunde und Namenkunde*. Volume 1. Berlin 1971, p. 147), could hardly be reduced to a purely Iranian form, since the first stem doesn’t reconstruct clearly in Strabo’s transliteration. The same is likely to hold true of a more ancient ethnicon, dating from the 2nd to 1st centuries B.C., i.e., “Πευξίναλοι” (OLEG N. TRUBACHEV *Lingvisticheskaia periferiia drevneishego slaviansva*. *Indoariitsy v Severnom Prichernomor’e*, in: *Voprosy iazykoznanii* 6 [1977] pp. 13–29, here p. 27).

⁷⁶ Cf. SCHRAMM *Die Herkunft des Namens Rus’* p. 33–34.

⁷⁷ ALF THULIN *The southern origin of the name Rus’*. Some remarks, in: *Les pays du Nord et Byzance (Scandinavie et Byzance)*. Actes du colloque nordique et international de byzantinologie tenu à Uppsala 20–22 avril 1979. Ed. Rudolf Zeitler. Uppsala 1981, pp. 175–181, here p. 181.

⁷⁸ See ANDREW RUNNI ANDERSON *Alexander’s Gate, Gog and Magog, and the Inclosed Nations*. Cambridge, MA 1932, pp. 3–9.

⁷⁹ THULIN *The southern origin of the name Rus’* p. 182.

initially in place of the Greek “ῥ” with the rough breathing under Armenian influence, if the addendum in Book XII in the Syriac Chronicle is in fact based on an Armenian source, e.g., OArm. hroma as a rendition of “Ῥῶμα” (“Rome”).⁸⁰ Secondly, there is another form, “Herōs”, actually a Greek word “Ἡρώες” (“heroes”), which occurs in the classical German translation of Karl Arens and Gustav Krüger⁸¹ and may be also reconstructed in the Russian translation of N. V. Pigulevskaia⁸² who quite purposively introduced “eros” (Russ. narod eros, literary “the people of *eros*”). Yet, despite a certain persistency in using the above word form, it is not clear whether one deals with the Greek term, as first reconstructed by Karl Arens and Gustav Krüger, or some other transcription, which should be taken at face value.

If Zacharius Rhetor really relied on an Armenian informant,⁸³ re-producing in the Syriac language Armenian transcription of most legendary names, one has to account for a vocalic prothesis which, in classical Armenian as in Old Greek, is likely more often than not to appear before the Indo-European sound *r, be it *e* (cf. OArm. erek or erekoy [“evening”], OGr. ὀφθαλμός [“dark”] next to Goth. rigis [“darkness”]), *a* (cf. OArm. Arew next to Skt. ravi [“soleil”]),⁸⁴ or *o* (cf. OArm. orcam, Gr. ἐρεύγομαι, Lat. erugere [“belch out, disgorge”]).⁸⁵ Yet, and one should admit it, even this could hardly bring to light the original form which stands behind four Syriac letters, *HRWS*, to refer to a people commonly identified with the Huns. Granted that the vowel-sounding of “wau” in the middle of a word denotes any long or short *u* or *o*,⁸⁶ a student may build up four combinations, *HRūs/HRŭS*, *HRōS/HRōS*, which are likely to leave him at a loss as to which one may prove to be authentic.⁸⁷ At any rate, vis-à-vis this assertion, one can hardly endorse, with

⁸⁰ NINA V. PIGULEVSKAIA Imia “Rus” v siriiskom istochnike VI v. n. è., in: Akademiku Borisu Dmitrievichu Grekovu ko dnu semidesiatiletiia. Sbornik statei. Moskva 1952, pp. 42–48, here p. 47; SOLOVIEV Vizantiiskoe imia Rossii p. 135. For Armenian forms rendering Greek words with an aspirated ῥ, see HEINRICH HÜBSCHMANN Armenische Grammatik. Part 1: Armenische Etymologie. Leipzig 1897, pp. 374–377.

⁸¹ AHRENS, KRÜGER Die sogenannte Kirchengeschichte des Zacharias Rhetor p. 253.

⁸² PIGULEVSKAIA Siriiskie istochniki p. 166.

⁸³ SCHRAMM Die Herkunft des Namens Rus’ p. 34.

⁸⁴ JULIUS POKORNY Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch. Volume 1. Bern 1959, pp. 857, 873; MONIER MONIER-WILLIAMS A Sanscrit-English Dictionary. New edition. Oxford 1899, p. 869.

⁸⁵ HENRY GEORGE LIDDELL, ROBERT SCOTT A Greek-English Lexicon With a Supplement 1968. 9th edition. Oxford 1977, p. 686; ANTOINE MEILLET Esquisse d’une grammaire comparée de l’arménien classique. Vienne 1903, pp. 24–25.

⁸⁶ CARL BROCKELMANN Syrische Grammatik mit Paradigmen, Literatur, Chrestomatie und Glossar. 5th edition. Leipzig 1938, p. 7; THEODOR NÖLDEKE Kurzgefasste Syrische Grammatik. 2nd edition. Darmstadt 1966, pp. 2, 5.

⁸⁷ Remarkably, the same holds true of the hypothesis of Karoly Czeplédy (KAROLY CZEGLÉDY Bemerkungen zur Geschichte der Chazaren, in: Acta Orientalia 13 [1961] pp. 239–251, here p. 243). While mentioning rather a common rendition of the Greek ῥ through *hr* in Middle Persian, this author posited the existence of a Pahlavi text as a basis for the Syriac Chronicle of Zacharius Rhetor. This Persian text, in turn, might have been based on a Byzantine *Vorlage*. It is noteworthy that, although sometimes without direct referring, Håkon Stang (STANG The Naming of Russia p. 104) is heavily premised on Karoly Czeplédy’s views who, among other things, believed that “Hrōs” was likely to denote not a people, but simply “the Red” (CZEGLÉDY Bemerkungen zur Geschichte der Chazaren p. 244).

out serious reservations, a highly simplified thesis of Omeljan Pritsak that “in the Syriac adaptation, this Greek term [i.e., “Ἡρώες”] assumed the form Hrōs”.⁸⁸

2.6. The Byzantine Stemma.

All this allows us then to omit not only the Syriac form(s) but also the Biblical ‘Ρῶς from any further consideration in the present study, thereby challenging a common claim that the indeclinable form “‘Ρῶς” might have produced a new official designation for the piratic “Rūs”, the name “‘Ρῶς”, which is also indeclinable.⁸⁹ This said, we arrive at the following forms for the Rus’ name in the Byzantine sources: (1) “‘Ρῶς” [rōs] along with (2) “ῥούσιοι” [rūs] leaving aside *‘Ρῶς [ros]/rōš and *Hrōs as superfluous in this case.

3. The Latin German Records

3.1. The Earliest Evidence

The oldest known forms in the western European sources occur in Latin texts of German provenance. Although meticulously analyzed and represented both geographically and chronologically by A. V. Nazarenko,⁹⁰ it would be most useful to recall their main derivative patterns, which may prove decisive in this study.

At first glance, early attestations of the name Rus’ in Old German records are disproportionately multifarious, especially if compared to the Byzantine terms, “‘Ρῶς” and “ῥούσιοι”, which differ from each other chiefly by the quantity of the root vowel. Despite its obvious geographical inconsistencies,⁹¹ the so-called “Der Bayerische Geograph”, commonly known as “Geographus Bavarus”, composed around or before A.D. 900⁹² for

⁸⁸ OMELIAN PRITSAK *The Origin of Rus’*. Volume 1. Cambridge, MA 1981, p. 6.

⁸⁹ PRITSAK *The origin of the name Rus’* p. 47.

⁹⁰ ALEKSANDR V. NAZARENKO *Ob imeni Rus’ v nemetskikh istochnikakh IX–XI vv.*, in: *Voprosy iazykoznaniiia* 5 (1980) pp. 46–57; *IDEM Drevniaia Rus’ na mezhdunarodnykh putiakh. Mezhdunarodnye ocherki kul’turnykh, torgovykh, politicheskikh sviazei IX–XII vv.* Moskva 2001, pp. 11–50; see also MEL’NIKOVA (ed.) *Drevniaia Rus’* pp. 259–406. One should also mention here a contribution made by Omeljan Pritsak (PRITSAK *The Origin of Rus’* pp. 25, 117–122). Remarkably enough, his study of 1986, while containing valuable material, demonstrates its close dependence on A. V. Nazarenko’s reasoning and at the same time offers rather bold conclusions. For example, Omeljan Pritsak (PRITSAK *The origin of the name Rus’* p. 50) states that the form “Ruzara-” as attested in the compound “Ruzaramarcha” in a charter issued 16 June 863 by the East Frankish king Louis the German (PAUL KEHR [ed.] *Die Urkunden der deutschen Karolinger. Volume 1: Die Urkunden Ludwigs des Deutschen, Karlmanns und Ludwigs des Jüngeren.* Berlin 1934, p. 157) is the genitive plural of the toponymic suffix *-āri*. This claim, however, is open to doubt. Firstly, derivatives with the original German suffix *-ari* were intrinsically the nominative plural, e.g., “Tannāra, ad Tannaron” (“dwellers of the town of Tann”), while the corresponding genitive forms became commonplace much later (WILHELM BRAUNE *Althochdeutsche Grammatik.* 8th–9th edition. Tübingen 1959, p. 188; ADOLF BACH *Deutsche Namenkunde. Volume II, part 2.* Heidelberg 1954, pp. 401–402). Secondly, the vocal *-a* in “Ruzara-” is most likely to be interpreted not as a part pertaining to the flexion but as a mere link element (NAZARENKO *Drevniaia Rus’ na mezhdunarodnykh putiakh* p. 17), which is revealing in such parallel suffixal forms as *-ario/-ariu/-ari*, cf. “in Thuringheimaru marca” (ca. 821), “Froseri burgoward” (ca. 961) and the like (BACH *Deutsche Namenkunde. Volume II, part 1.* Heidelberg 1953, pp. 84–85).

⁹¹ MEL’NIKOVA (ed.) *Drevniaia Rus’* pp. 292–293.

⁹² NAZARENKO *Ob imeni Rus’ v nemetskikh istochnikakh IX–XI vv.* p. 47.

the use of the Frankish government, mentions for the first time the name Rus' in the form "Ruzzi" which follows immediately the name "Caziri".⁹³ Subsequently, in the 10th to 11th centuries this name occurs in similarly styled forms like "Rusci" (973), "Ruscia gens" (960) as found in the "Annales Hildesheimenses" and the "Lamberti Annales", or "Rusciani" and "Rusii" ("Rusorum naves") next to "Russii" ("Russorum naves") in the writings of Liudprand of Cremona (d. 972), finally "Ruscia" (1009) which is common in the "Annales Quedlinburgenses",⁹⁴ "Ruzia" as attested in the "Vita Stephani Regis Ungariae edente W. Wattenbach", or "Ruzzia" (1025, 1032) which is encountered in the "Vita Chuonradi II. Imperatoris".⁹⁵ Of utmost importance is the unique Old High German form "Ruizi" which occurs under the year 1032 in the "Annales Hildesheimenses" as "dux Ruizorum" referring to Henry, the son of St. Stephen, baptizer and founder of the Hungarian Christian Kingdom (997–1038).⁹⁶

With regard to word-final (di)graphs in names for the Rus', arresting attention is the Chronicon of Bishop Thietmar of Merseburg (975–1018) which has come down to us in its autograph. Thietmar resorted to three spelling variants, thus rendering the final consonant with the help of either *c* as in "Rucia"⁹⁷ or the digraphs *sc* as in "Rusciae prius" ("bishop of Rus'"),⁹⁸ "Ruscia",⁹⁹ "regis[que] Ruscorum Wlodemiri" ("the king of the Rus'ians [Vladimir]"),¹⁰⁰ "rex Ruscorum", or *sz* as attested in "Ruszorum regis" ("the king of the Rus'ians").¹⁰¹

3.2. The Formative Models

As follows from, in total, 48 attestations of names for Rus' in Old High German sources,¹⁰² all the extant forms fall roughly into two spelling patterns, i.e., with the final *c* as opposed to the final *z*, thus refuting the claim of Omeljan Pritsak about their interchangeability in High German writing practice.¹⁰³ Moreover, the stemma for the Rus' name should also account for the above-mentioned Old High German form, "Ruizi", which is found in the Annals of Hildesheim. Both final graphs and the so-called umlaut as rendered by the digraph *ui* need further consideration in the context of our study.

⁹³ MANFRED HELLMANN Karl und die slawische Welt zwischen Ostsee und Böhmerwald, in: Karl der Grosse. Lebenswerk und Nachleben. Ed. by Wolfgang Braunsfels. Volume 1. Düsseldorf 1965, pp. 708–713, here p. 713.

⁹⁴ MGH volume 3, pp. 60, 61, 69, 80, 331, 353(e), 355.

⁹⁵ MGH volume 11. Hannoverae 1854, pp. 232, 264, 269; see BORIS OTTOKAR UNBEGAUN L'origine du nom des Ruthènes, in: IDEM Selected Papers on Russian and Slavonic Philology. Oxford 1969, pp. 128–135, here p. 129.

⁹⁶ MGH volume 3. Hannoverae 1839, p. 98.

⁹⁷ ROBERT HOLTSMANN (ed.) Die Chronik des Bischofs Thietmar von Merseburg und ihre Korveier Überarbeitung. Berlin 1935, p. 385.

⁹⁸ HOLTSMANN (ed.) Die Chronik des Bischofs Thietmar von Merseburg p. 64; see DAVID A. WARNER (ed., transl.) Ottonian Germany. The *Chronicon* of Thietmar of Merseburg. Manchester, New York 2001, p. 108.

⁹⁹ HOLTSMANN (ed.) Die Chronik des Bischofs Thietmar von Merseburg p. 388.

¹⁰⁰ Ibidem p. 486; WARNER (ed., transl.) The *Chronicon* of Thietmar of Merseburg p. 357.

¹⁰¹ HOLTSMANN (ed.) Die Chronik des Bischofs Thietmar von Merseburg p. 478.

¹⁰² NAZARENKO Ob imeni Rus' v nemetskich istochnikakh IX–XI vv. p. 51.

¹⁰³ PRITSAK The origin of the name *Rus'* p. 54; cf. NAZARENKO Drevniaia Rus' na mezhdunarodnykh putiakh p. 35.

To start with, the graph *z* (“Ruzi”, etc.) was commonplace in Latin texts originating from Allemannia and Bavaria, while the graph *c* (“Ruci”, “Rusci”, etc.) used to characterize, on the whole, northern Germany. Adopted from the Romance practice to render the letter ζ in words of Greek provenance, the graph *z* was introduced to designate two new dental phonemes which evolved as a result of the second High German consonantal shift: the affricate /ts/ and the fricative /z/ similar to the modern German /s/ as opposed to the etymological /s/.¹⁰⁴ The graph *z* which is typical of Old High German styled forms in the 9th to 11th centuries might have served as a substitute for the Slavic /s/ as found in the self-designation “Rus”.¹⁰⁵ In Old Saxon, however, with a lack of the corresponding spirant, the forms written through the graph *z* were pronounced with the affricate sound which, according to the Latin orthographic tradition, was commonly rendered by the graph *c*, i.e., “Ruc-” in place of “Ruz-”.¹⁰⁶

Deserving special attention is the Old High German hapax legomenon “Ruizi” with the digraph *ui* which was sporadically used to render the umlaut (< *ū*) in the 10th to 12th centuries, thereby coalescing sometimes with the old diphthong *ui*. This is why beginning from the mid-10th to 11th centuries such forms were likely to be ousted by parallel Middle High German forms with another (mirror-like) digraph like “Riuze”, “Rūze” or “riu-zesch”/“riu-zisch” (“Rus’ian”) with the commonplace *iu* rendering the corresponding long or “umlauted” vowel in open stressed syllables.¹⁰⁷ From this point of view remarkable is the locus classicus “Reusse” (< MHG “Reuze”/“Reusze” resulting from the diphthongization of the umlaut) as encountered in the official Middle German records of the Slavic (Polish-Ukrainian) town Ruś¹⁰⁸ or in the official title of Russian emperors in the 18th century, “Kaiser aller Reussen”.¹⁰⁹ It is used now sporadically to distinguish, and rightly so, between “Rus” (“Reußland”) and “Rossija” (“Rußland”).¹¹⁰

Accordingly, in the late Middle Ages, forms with the umlaut might have come to the West European peoples via Germany. The Swedish *y*-quality (cf. “ryss” [“Russian”]) is therefore likely to have originated from German *iu* [y].¹¹¹ The latter German vowel is reflected in a remarkable Arabic lexeme, “brūs” (“بروس”), which, manifesting its morphological similarity with the form “Rūs” (“روس”),¹¹² is found in a traveler’s account composed in 966 or 973¹¹³ by Ibn Ja’qūb.¹¹⁴ What is remarkable in the form “بروس” is its

¹⁰⁴ BRAUNE *Althochdeutsche Grammatik* pp. 82–83, 151; NAZARENKO *Ob imeni Rus’ v nemetskikh istochnikakh IX–XI vv.* p. 51.

¹⁰⁵ NAZARENKO *Drevniaia Rus’ na mezhdunarodnykh putiakh* p. 49.

¹⁰⁶ BRAUNE *Althochdeutsche Grammatik* pp. 154–156; AGATHE LASCH *Mittelniederdeutsche Grammatik*. Tübingen 1974, p. 172.

¹⁰⁷ BRAUNE *Althochdeutsche Grammatik* pp. 42, 47, 56–57.

¹⁰⁸ BRONISŁAW CHLEBOWSKI, WŁADYSŁAW WALEWSKI (eds.) *Słownik geograficzny Królestwa Polskiego i innych krajów słowiańskich*. Volume 10. Warszawa 1889, p. 19.

¹⁰⁹ NAZARENKO *Drevniaia Rus’ na mezhdunarodnykh putiakh* p. 23–24; SCHRAMM *Altrußlands Anfang* p. 189.

¹¹⁰ STRUMIŃSKI *Linguistic Interrelations in Early Rus’* p. 87.

¹¹¹ THOMSEN *Det Russiske riges grundlæggelse ved Nordbørne* pp. 350, 355.

¹¹² EL-HAJI (ed.) *Abū ‘Ubayd Al-Bakrī* p. ١٦٨.

¹¹³ BERTOLD SPULER *Ibrāhīm Ibn Ja’qūb. Orientalische Bemerkungen*, in: *JBfGOE* 3 (1938) 1, pp. 1–10, here pp. 9–10.

¹¹⁴ SEIPPEL (ed.) *Rerum normannicarum fontes arabici* p. ٨٢; BIRKELAND (ed.) *Nordens historie i middelalderen etter arabiske kilder* p. 44; FRIEDRICH WESTBERG *Beiträge zur Klärung orientalischer Quellen über Osteuropa (erste Hälfte des Mittelalters)*, in: *Bulletin de l’Académie Impériale des*

lengthened vowel \bar{u} ¹¹⁵ which might reflect an “umlauted” or long vowel in the corresponding Old (High?) German form as attested in the name “Godke Pruceman” (1266) or “Otto de Prutzen” (1328).¹¹⁶ Diachronically, this assumption looks highly plausible, especially in view of such later derivatives as “Breusch”, “Preusch”, cf. MLG Prūß(mann).¹¹⁷

It should be also noted that the quality of the German vowel in forms like OHG Ruizi or MHG Riuze proves that the original Germanic form had a suffix beginning with j -, i.e., $-jan$.¹¹⁸ Since this consonant disappeared in the relevant written forms in the main bulk of southern dialects in the mid-9th century and in the Bavarian dialect already in the early 9th century,¹¹⁹ one can easily assume that the Old High German, and consequently Old Lower German, forms for the Rus’ name might have been patterned on the old Slavic self-designation “rouś” with a reflex of the new \bar{u}_2 not later than at the very beginning of the 9th century.¹²⁰

As concerns the learned forms “Ruten-” (“Rutenorum rex”) as first attested in the “Annales Augustani” under the year 1089¹²¹ and “Ruthen-” (“Ruthenorum”) which appears as early as in the *Annalista Saxo* (ca. 1139),¹²² one can easily put them ad acta, inasmuch as they both originated from the Gallic tribal name in Julius Caesar’s “*Commentarii de Bello Gallico*”, “Ruten”.¹²³ The same is likely to hold true of the Vulgar Latin form “Rugi”.¹²⁴

sciences de St. Pétersbourg. VIIIe série 11 (1899) 4, pp. 211–314, here p. 234. According to Ibn Ja‘qūb’s account, the “brūs” (“the Prussians”) were, in fact, one of the Germanic tribes. The “brūs” used to speak a “peculiar language” not known to the neighboring Slavs, and lived somewhere in the northern Europe, on the shore of the “Circumferential Ocean”, i.e., the Atlantic Ocean, not far from the Poles ruled by Miškuh (مشقه) (Mieško I, 962–992) and the Scandinavians (“Rūs”), see SEIPPEL (ed.) *Rerum normannicarum fontes arabici* p. ٨٢; GEORG JACOB (ed., transl.) *Arabische Berichte von Gesandten an germanische Fürstenthöfe aus dem 9. und 10. Jahrhundert*. Berlin, Leipzig 1927, p. 14; FRIEDRICH WESTBERG *Ibrāhīm’s-ibn-Ja‘kūb’s Reisebericht über die Slawenlande aus dem Jahre 965*, in: *Mémoires de l’Académie Impériale des sciences de St. Pétersbourg. VIIIe série* 3 (1898) 4, pp. 1–183, here p. 56; see also THOMSEN *Det Russiske riges grundlæggelse ved Nordboerne* p. 289.

¹¹⁵ MICHAEL JAN DE GOEJE *Een belangrijk arabisch bericht over de slawische volken omstreeks 965 n. Ch.*, in: *Verslagen en mededeelingen der koninklijke Akademie van wetenschappen Afdeling letterkunde*. 2. Reeks 9 (1880) pp. 187–216, here p. 203.

¹¹⁶ BACH *Deutsche Namenkunde*. Volume I, part 1. Heidelberg 1952, pp. 256, 260.

¹¹⁷ MAX GOTTSCHALD *Deutsche Namenkunde*. Berlin 1954, p. 472.

¹¹⁸ NAZARENKO *Ob imeni Rus’ v nemetskikh istochnikakh IX–XI vv.* p. 53.

¹¹⁹ BRAUNE *Althochdeutsche Grammatik* pp. 110–112.

¹²⁰ NAZARENKO *Ob imeni Rus’ v nemetskikh istochnikakh IX–XI vv.* p. 53.

¹²¹ MGH volume 3 p. 133.

¹²² MGH volume 6. *Hannoverae* 1844, p. 770.

¹²³ HEINRICH MEUSEL (ed.) *C. Iulii Caesaris Commentarii De Bello Gallico*. 19th edition. Volume 1. Berlin 1961, I/45:2, VII/5:1, 64:6, 75:3, 90:6. Unusual as it may seem at first glance, the form “Ruthenia”, i.e., *Ruthāniya, was reconstructed by Peter B. Golden (GOLDEN *The question of the Rus’ Qaghanate*) for the Arabic “ارثانية” as encountered in al-Iṣṭahīrī’s “*Masālik al-mamālik*” (“*Viae regnorum*”, ca. 951) (BGA 2nd edition. Volume 1: *Viae regnorum. Descriptio ditionis moslemicae auctore Abu Ishāk al-Fārisī al-Istakhri*. Leiden 1927, p. ٢٢٦). The latter book is based on al-Balḥī’s writings (SEIPPEL [ed.] *Rerum normannicarum fontes arabici* pp. 15–16, ٥٦; BIRKELAND [ed.] *Nordens historie i middelalderen etter arabiske kilder* p. 29) and recounts about a so-called “third tribe” of the Rus’ along with “كويابة” and “صلوية”. Contrary to the latter terms, which are generally identified as Kiev [Kyiv] and the Slovenes in the Novgorod area respectively (FRÄHN *Ibn-Foszlān’s und anderer Araber Berichte* pp. 145–149, 170, 257, 264; FRANCISZEK *KMIETOWICZ Artāniya-Artā*, in: *Folia Orientalia* 14 [1972/1973] pp. 231–260), the “third name” *Arthāniya still is

3.3. The Latin Stemma

Thus we are left with two derivative patterns depending primarily on the quality of the root vowel: 1) “Ruzi”/“Ruci”/“Rusci” with the graph *u* rendering tentatively a plain vowel and 2) “Ruizi”/“Riuze” with the umlaut resulting from the long *ū*. Taken chronologically, the second pattern precedes most likely the first model, especially if one accounts for the relative chronology of the shortening of the new Slavic *ū*.¹²⁵ The final consonant *-t as postulated for a hypothetical basic root *Rūt(j)-¹²⁶ has no significance in the quest for the etymology of the name “Rus”. As A. V. Nazarenko¹²⁷ himself pointed out, all similar reconstructions has so far proved to be unrealistic and are likely to come to naught in future.

Hence, the stemma of the Rus’ name in the Latin German records may be reduced to the following forms: 1) „Ruizi“/„Riuze“/„Rūze“ [ū] and 2) „Ruzi“/„Ruci“/„Rusci“ [ū]. As for *Ruten/Ruthen-, *Rug-, and other learned forms they fall conspicuously outside the scope of the Varangian-Rus’ian controversy.

4. The Arabic Records

4.1. The Earliest Evidence

The first, although indirect mention of the Rus’ in Islamic records occurs in an account, which dates from the 6th century but is documented in the Chronicle of Ṭabaristān from the earliest times to H. 881 (A.D. 1476).¹²⁸ This Chronicle was composed by a Persian statesman and historian, Ṣāhir al-Dīn Mar’ashī (b. A.D. 1412) not in the end of the 14th

not clear, despite manifold interpretations of this name (for a survey, see NOVOSEL’TSEV *Vostochnye istochniki o vostochnykh slavianakh* p. 417; ALF THULIN “The Third Tribe” of the Rus, in: *Slavia Antiqua* 25 [1978] pp. 99–139; KONOVALOVA *Sostav rasskaza ob “ostrove rusov”* pp. 169–189). As concerns Peter B. Golden’s *Ruthāniya which is modeled on the Arabic “Armānūs” (“ارمانوس”) for the Byzantine Greek Ρωμανός (see BIRKELAND [ed.] *Nordens historie i middelalderen etter arabiske kilder* p. 33), the author bases his transcription on the fallacious Arabic form *ارمانوس instead of “ارمنوس” (“Armanūs”) (SEIPPEL [ed.] *Rerum normannicarum fontes arabici* p. ٦٠). To adduce another example, one can cite Alf Thulin’s reading *Urmāniya (“Northmen”) which is patterned on the West Arabic form “al-urmān” (“الارمان”), see “Kitāb al-ġā’rāfiya” (“Liber geographiae”, ca. 1155) in SEIPPEL (ed.) *Rerum normannicarum fontes arabici* pp. 30, ٣٨; MAḤAMMAD HADJ-SADOK (ed.) *Kitāb al-dja’rāfiyya*. Mappemonde du calife al-Ma’mūn reproduite par Fazārī (IIIe/XIIe s.) rééditée et commentée par Zuhri (VIIe/XIIe s.). Damas 1968, pp. 202, 232, 259, 269. Of interest here is ad-Dimašqī’s (1256–1327) account of four “kinds” (“اجناس”) of the Rus’, i.e., “كرارية”, “صلاوية”, “ارثانية”, and “براصية” (MEHREN [ed.] *Cosmographie de Chems-ed-Din Abou Abdallah Mohammed Ed-Dimichqui* pp. ٢٦١–٢٦٢). The above classification is obviously a later interpretation of ancient information (BORIS N. ZAKHODER *Kaspiiskii svod svedenii o Vostochnoi Evrope*. Volume 2. Moskva 1962, p. 103).

¹²⁴ NAZARENKO *Drevniaia Rus’ na mezhdunarodnykh putiakh* p. 45–48; cf. PRITSAK *The origin of the name Rus’* pp. 57–60.

¹²⁵ GEORGE Y. SHEVELOV *A Prehistory of Slavic*. Heidelberg 1964, pp. 276–279, 506–507.

¹²⁶ NAZARENKO *Ob imeni Rus’ v nemetskikh istochnikakh IX–XI vv.* p. 56; PRITSAK *The origin of the name Rus’* p. 65.

¹²⁷ NAZARENKO *Drevniaia Rus’ na mezhdunarodnykh putiakh* p. 50.

¹²⁸ HAMMER *Sur les origines russes* pp. 50, 111.

century as was fallaciously posited long ago by Christian Martin Frähn¹²⁹ but in the beginning of the 15th century. The mentioned account, with an apparently anachronistic use of the term “Rūs”,¹³⁰ reads that at the coronation of the ruler of the areas around Derbent he was acknowledged as having authority over the lands of the Rus’, the Khazars, and the Slavs (“املاك روس و خزر و سقلاب”).¹³¹

More reliable attestation of the Rus’ (cited twice) is found in Ṭabarī’s (838–923) multi-volume Arabic Chronicle which was translated, in a shortened version, into Persian by Belamī in the 10th century. There is in this text particular information related to an Arabic war waged in 644 by the Rus’, Khazars, Alans, and Balanğars.¹³² A comparison with the Arabic original shows, however, that the term “Rus’” might have been inserted in the text by the translator or a copyist,¹³³ although the full text of Ṭabarī’s Chronicle is likely to have contained specific data about the Rus’.¹³⁴

One may therefore wish to rely on those Islamic sources, which furnish more convincing and profuse evidence about the earliest Scandinavian colonizers, commonly identified with the Rus’, who together with the East Slav, Finno-Ugric, and Turkish (the Bulghārs and Khazars) peoples, could have taken part in the formation of the Rus’ Kaganate along the Volga trade route.¹³⁵ The anti-Normanists, however, are accustomed to quote liberally from Ibn Ḥurdāḍbeh’s “Kitāb al-masālik wa’l mamālik” (“Liber viarum et regnorum”, ca. 849/850) in order to refute the above possibility, thus strengthening the theory of Slavic

¹²⁹ FRÄHN *Ibn-Foszlan’s und anderer Araber Berichte* p. 38; cf. AVRAAM IA. GARKAVI [ALBERT HARKAVY] *Skazaniia musul’manskikh pisatelei o slavianakh i russkikh (s poloviny VII veka do kontsa X veka po R. Kh.)*. S.-Peterburg 1870, p. 79, fn. 3.

¹³⁰ STEFAN SÖDERLIND *The realm of the Rus’: A contribution to the problem of the rise of the East-Slavic kingdom*, in: PER STURE URELAND, IAIAN CLARKSON (eds.) *Scandinavian Language Contacts*. Cambridge, New York 1984, pp. 133–170, here p. 151.

¹³¹ HAMMER *Sur les origines russes* p. 111; FRÄHN *Ibn-Foszlan’s und anderer Araber Berichte* pp. 36–37.

¹³² STIG WIKANDER *Orientaliska källor till vikingatidens historia*, in: *Historisk tidskrift* 1 (1963) pp. 72–79, here p. 77; NOVOSEL’TSEV *Vostochnye istochniki o vostochnykh slavianakh* pp. 360–362, 364–365.

¹³³ GARKAVI *Skazaniia musul’manskikh pisatelei o slavianakh i russkikh* pp. 79–80; BORIS A. DORN *Caspia. Über die Einfälle der alten Russen in Tabaristan, nebst Zugaben über andere von ihnen auf dem Caspischen Meere und in den anliegenden Ländern ausgeführten Unternehmungen*. St. Petersburg 1875, pp. xliii–l. One can cite, for instance, the following most illustrative passage from the French translation of the Persian version: “Je me trouve entre deux ennemis: les Khazars et les Russes” (HERMANN ZOTENBERG *Chronique de Abou-Djafar-Mo’ammed-ben-Djarīr-ben-Yezid Tabari, traduite sur la version persane d’Abou-‘Ali Mo’ammed Bel’ami*. Volume 3. Paris 1871, p. 496; cf. GARKAVI *Skazaniia musul’manskikh pisatelei o slavianakh i russkikh* p. 74). As has been mentioned, the Arabic *Vorlage* does not contain any mention of the Rus’, although the Khazars are in the focus of the chapter, devoted to the Arabic war against Azerbajdzhan (MICHAEL JAN DE GOEJE [ed.] *Annales quos scripsit Abu Djafar Mohammed at- ibn Djabir Tabari*. Prima series. Volume V. Leiden 1893, pp. ۲۶۶–۲۶۶۲).

¹³⁴ NOVOSEL’TSEV *Vostochnye istochniki o vostochnykh slavianakh* p. 362.

¹³⁵ DANIIL A. KHVOL’SON *Izvestiia o khozarakh, burtasakh, bolgarakh, madiarakh, slavianakh i russakh Abu-Ali Akhmeda ben Omar Ibn-Dasta*. S.-Peterburg 1869, p. 23; GARKAVI *Skazaniia musul’manskikh pisatelei o slavianakh i russkikh* p. 267; SMIRNOV *Volz’kyi shliakh i starodavni rusy* p. 118 ff.; PRITSAK *The Origin of Rus’* pp. 26–28, 182, 583.

origin of the Rus'.¹³⁶ However, the information about the Rus' (“روس”) provided by this geographer is not clear at all. Moreover, according to B. N. Zakhoder,¹³⁷ who undertook an extensive comparative study of the relevant Arabic sources, this information should be treated as the corollary of a “complicated and naïve compilation of two different attestations”.

Suffice it to note that the corresponding data about the Rus' as a kind of Slavic people are mostly concentrated in a chapter which deals with two groups of international traders, i.e., the Jewish Radanites and the Rus' merchants,¹³⁸ and could have been inserted in the text much later by one of the copyists.¹³⁹ It is also noteworthy that the Jewish Radanites and the Rus' merchants are conspicuously confused in the text of Ibn Ḥurdāḏbeh. All this made Michael de Goeje introduce some changes in the translation of the corresponding passage.¹⁴⁰ Furthermore, two historiographic facts are likely to influence linguistic interpretation of the corresponding word form as evidenced not only in the writings of Ibn Ḥurdāḏbeh but also in other Arabic (or Persian) sources. To start with, the first reliable attestation of the form “روس” dates back several years earlier in comparison with Ibn Ḥurdāḏbeh account on the Rus' and Slavs in 849/850.¹⁴¹ Already in his “Kitāb sūrat al-arḍ” (“Book of the picture of the Earth”), which was compiled between 836 and 847 and came down to our time in the copy of 1037, Ibn Mūsā al-Ḥuwārizmī (d. 835/855), while commenting on the Greek name for “the country of Germany”, adds “and it is [also] the country of the Slavs”.¹⁴² What is more remarkable, he mentions also “the Rus'(ian) mountain” (“جبل روس”).¹⁴³ In this respect, A. V. Novosel'tsev¹⁴⁴ quite reasonably draws a parallel with the anonymous Persian geography entitled “Ḥudūd al-‘Ālam” (“The Regions of the World”, ca. 982). The latter geography cites “the Rūs mountain”¹⁴⁵ purportedly located to the north of “the Inner Bulghārs” which should be identified, according to A. V. Novosel'tsev, with the Volga Bulghārs.¹⁴⁶

¹³⁶ KHVOL'SON *Izvestiia o khozarakh, burtasakh, bolgarakh, madiarakh, slavianakh i russakh* p. 78 ff.; GARKAVI *Skazaniia musul'manskikh pisatelei o slavianakh i russkikh* p. 54; OLEKSII PETROVYCH TOLOCHKO, PETRO P. TOLOCHKO *Kyivs'ka Rus'*. Kyiv 1998, p. 44; see especially IRINA G. KONOVALOVA *Les Rūs sur les voies de commerce de l'Europe orientale d'après les sources arabopersanes*, in: *Les centres proto-urbains russes* pp. 395–408, here pp. 395–400.

¹³⁷ ZAKHODER *Kaspiiskii svod svedenii o Vostochnoi Evrope* p. 86.

¹³⁸ BGA volume VI: *Kitāb al-masālik wa'l-mamālik* auctore Abu'l-kāsim Obaidallah ibn Abdallah Ibn Khordāḏbeh. 1889, pp. ١٥٢–١٥٥.

¹³⁹ WESTBERG *Beiträge zur Klärung orientalischer Quellen über Osteuropa* p. 285; NOVOSEL'TSEV *Vostochnye istochniki o vostochnykh slavianakh* p. 382.

¹⁴⁰ ZAKHODER *Kaspiiskii svod svedenii o Vostochnoi Evrope* p. 89.

¹⁴¹ KONOVALOVA *Les Rūs sur les voies de commerce de l'Europe orientale* p. 396.

¹⁴² MŽIK (ed.) *Das Kitāb sūrat al-arḍ des Abū Ġa'far Muhammad Ibn Mūsā al-Ḥuwārizmī* p. ١١٥.

¹⁴³ *Ibidem* p. ١٣٦.

¹⁴⁴ NOVOSEL'TSEV *Vostochnye istochniki o vostochnykh slavianakh* pp. 373–374.

¹⁴⁵ VLADIMIR MINORSKY (ed.) *Ḥudūd al-‘Ālam. ‘The Regions of the World’. A Persian Geography*. 372 A.H. – 982 A.D. London 1937, p. 160.

¹⁴⁶ Strangely enough, Tadeusz Lewicki (LEWICKI *Źródła arabskie do dziejów słowiańszczyzny* pp. 13–39) who published excerpts from al-Ḥuwārizmī's geographical work omitted the account on “the Rus'ian mountain”. Håkon Stang (STANG *The Naming of Russia* pp. 181–182) has recently advanced a new reading of this name. Based on another attestation of this mountain, “جبل روس” (MŽIK [ed.] *Das Kitāb sūrat al-arḍ des Abū Ġa'far Muhammad Ibn Mūsā al-Ḥuwārizmī* p. ١١٧), he assumed that the author could have mistakenly taken the “l” for an initial hamza, i.e., “l”,

4.2. Al-Mas'ūdī on the *al-lūd'āna

Al-Mas'ūdī, one of the most prolific and successful Arabic polymaths and geographers, was inclined to compare the Rus', designated in Spanish Arabic as "al-maḡūs" ("the pagans"), with the Old Norsemen: "The Rus' [consists of] several different nations of diverse kinds; one of them is called *al-lūd'āna [اللودعانه]."¹⁴⁷ The rationale for this reconstructing may be well explained by Joseph Marquart's¹⁴⁸ hypothesis who took al-lūd'āna, used in the mid-10th century by al-Mas'ūdī in his "Al-Murūḡ aḍ-ḍahab [...]" ("Venae auri", ca. 943–947),¹⁴⁹ to be a corrupted rendition of the Spanish Latin counterpart "Lor-doman-" < "Nordoman-"¹⁵⁰ inasmuch as al-Mas'ūdī's information originated most likely from a Spanish source. Joseph Marquart supported this assumption by providing another characteristic misspelling in al-Mas'ūdī's "Kitāb at-tanbīh wa'l-iṣrāf" ("Liber communitonis et recognitionis", ca. 946), that is, "al-kūḍkāna" ("اللكوذكانه"),¹⁵¹ which, together with "al-lūd'āna"/"al-lūḍāna", might allegedly stand for the original form like *al-lurdumāna/*al-lordomāna.¹⁵²

The above reconstruction proves to be historically quite plausible. Hence it comes as no surprise that a similar form was first attested in the information relating to an attack of the Old Norsemen (Danes or Norwegians)¹⁵³ against the coast of Western Andalusia in 971, as described by Ibn al-Iḍārī, a 13th-century Arabic historian.¹⁵⁴ The latter historian

"arūs"/"urūs", although, according to Håkon Stang, the form "arūs" might have reflected a "faint pronunciation" of the sound [h] before the word-initial [r], cf. Zacharius Rhetor's "Hrōs". This is why Håkon Stang proposed to dismiss this passage from the description of Eastern Europe. Yet this suggestion appears highly conjectural and designed chiefly in the spirit of wishful thinking, cf. also Håkon Stang's (STANG *The Naming of Russia* pp. 181–182) interpretation of the Arabic "دربوس" as "D.rūs", a transcription of Danapros, i.e., the Don river; cf. BORIS A. RYBAKOV *Russkie zemli po karte Idrisi 1154 goda*, in: *Kratkie soobshcheniia Instituta istorii material'noi kul'tury* 43 (1952) pp. 3–44, especially pp. 12–13.

¹⁴⁷ SEIPPEL (ed.) *Rerum normannicarum fontes arabici* p. ٦١; SEMEN RAPOPORT *Mohammedan writers on Slavs and Russians*, in: *The Slavonic (and East European) Review* 8 (1929/1930) pp. 80–98, here p. 89.

¹⁴⁸ MARQUART *Osteuropäische und ostasiatische Streifzüge* pp. 348–349.

¹⁴⁹ BIRKELAND (ed.) *Nordens historie i middelalderen etter arabiske kilder* p. 30.

¹⁵⁰ D. A. Khvol'son (KHOVOL'SON *Izvestiia o khozarakh, burtasakh, bolgarakh, madiarakh, slavi-anakh i russakh* p. 167; see ZAKHODER *Kaspiiskii svod svedenii o Vostochnoi Evrope* pp. 89–90) seems to be first to derive this peculiar (corrupted) Arabic form from the name, referring originally to the Northmen, of the type "nūrmāna" ("نورمانة") (cf. FRÄHN *Ibn-Fozzlan's und anderer Araber Berichte* pp. 71, 174). Strangely enough, Joseph Marquart developed this idea even without saying a word about D. A. Khvol'son's hypothesis (cf. VLADIMIR MINORSKII [MINORSKY] *Kuda iezdili drevnie rusy?*, in: *Fontes orientalis ad historiam populorum Europae Meridie-Orientalis atque Centralis pertinentes*. Moskva 1964, pp. 19–27, here p. 25.

¹⁵¹ BGA volume VIII: *Kitāb at-tanbīh wa'l-iṣhrāf auctore al-Masūdī*. Leiden 1894, p. ١٤١; SEIPPEL (ed.) *Rerum normannicarum fontes arabici* p. 18.

¹⁵² It is noteworthy that Joseph Marquart himself later rejected this explanation, a fact taken no account of by subsequent interpreters of the above misspellings, see PRITSAK *At the dawn of Christianity in Rus'* p. 88, fn. 6; STRUMIŃSKI *Linguistic Interrelations in Early Rus'* pp. 157–158.

¹⁵³ TAT'IANA M. KALININA *Arabskie uchenie o nashestvii normannov na Sevil'iu v 844 g.*, in: *Drevneishie gosudarstva Vostochnoi Evropy*. 1999 g., pp. 190–210, here p. 209.

¹⁵⁴ REINHART PIETER ANNE DOZY *Recherches sur l'histoire et la littérature de l'Espagne pendant le moyen age*. 3rd edition. Volume 2. Leiden 1881, p. 298.

called the Old Norsemen “al-urdumānījūn” (الأردمانيون),¹⁵⁵ a form which is explained by the loss of the initial *n* in *an-nurdumānījūn, similar to the loss of *l* in *al-lišbūna > “išbūna” (“Lisbon”).¹⁵⁶ According to Joseph Marquart, the Arabic form with the characteristic amalgamation of the *al*- article with the name and the absorption/loss of the initial consonant was first attested in the Spanish Latin “Chronicon Albeldense” under the year 850 and the year 866: “Eo tempore Lordomani [Nortmanos intellige] primi in Asturias venerunt”,¹⁵⁷ cf. also *Lorman* as represented in “Chronicon Lusitanum” under the year 1016: “Æra 1054. Octavo Idus Septembris venerunt *Lorman*es ad Castellum Vermudij, quod est in Provincia Bracharensi”.¹⁵⁸

4.3. The West Arabic Evidence

The Rus’ (الروس) could hardly have been well known among the Arabic geographers in the early Middle Ages. In this respect, Ibn al-‘Iḍārī’s attestation as cited above is most telling, since the Rus’ are not mentioned either in the works of al-Bakrī (1068), Abu’l-Fidā’ (1331), or an-Nuwajrī (14th century).¹⁵⁹ However, another Arabic (Egyptian) author, al-Ja‘qūbī (d. 897), described in his “Kitāb al-buldān” (“Liber regionum”, 891)¹⁶⁰ the attack of the Norsemen on the then Arabic city of Sevilla via the fluvial route (Guadalquivir) in 844: “The northern pagans [المجوس] who are called Rūs [يقال لهم الروس] entered it [Sevilla] in the year 229 [i.e., 843–844] and they took prisoners and ravaged and burned and murdered”.¹⁶¹ Yet, this passage is generally treated as a kind of misunderstanding (also to be found in al-Mas‘ūdī’s “Kitāb at-tanbīh wa’l-išrāf”,¹⁶² ca. 946,¹⁶³) because the

¹⁵⁵ SEIPPEL (ed.) *Rerum normannicarum fontes arabici* p. ٣١.

¹⁵⁶ ANDRII DANYLENKO [Review of] Bohdan Strumiński: *Linguistic Interrelations in Early Rus’: Northmen, Finns, and East Slavs (Ninth to Eleventh Centuries)*. Edmonton, Toronto 1996, in: *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 21 (1997) 1–2, pp. 197–200, here p. 199.

¹⁵⁷ *Chronicon Albeldense* (llamado tambien Emilianense) escrito en el año 883. Y continuando en el de 976, in: HENRIQUE FLOREZ [ENRIQUE FLÓREZ] *España sagrada, teatro geografico-histórico de la Iglesia de España*. 2nd edition. Volume 13: *De la Lusitania Antigua en comun, y de su Metrópoli Mérida en particular*. Madrid 1816, pp. 417–466, here pp. 453, 454.

¹⁵⁸ *Chronicon Lusitanum*, in: FLOREZ *España sagrada*. Volume 14. Madrid 1905, pp. 402–419, here p. 404; see MARQUART *Osteuropäische und ostasiatische Streifzüge* p. 349.

¹⁵⁹ BIRKELAND (ed.) *Nordens historie i middelalderen etter arabiske kilder* p. 119.

¹⁶⁰ BGA 2nd edition. Volume VII: *Kitāb al-a‘lāk an-nafīsa VII auctore Abū Alī Ahmed ibn Omar Ibn Rosteh et Kitāb al-boldān auctore Ahmed ibn abī Jakūb ibn Wādhīh al-Kātib al-Jakūbī*. Leiden 1892, p. ٣٥٤; SEIPPEL (ed.) *Rerum normannicarum fontes arabici* p. 10.

¹⁶¹ The English translation is based here on the corresponding passage in RAPOPORT Mohammedan writers on Slavs and Russians p. 82. As for a translation made recently by Bohdan Strumiński (STRUMIŃSKI *Linguistic Interrelations in Early Rus’* p. 85), it contains a mistake in the year of Hiġra. An exhaustive survey of this account in different Arabic sources, see in KALININA *Arabskie uchenyie o nashestvii normannov*.

¹⁶² See § 4.2.

¹⁶³ A similar, almost verbatim description is found in the history of the Arabs in Spain, authored by J. A. Conde (JOSE ANTONIO CONDE *Historia de la dominacion de los Arabes en España, sacada de varios manuscritos y memorias Arabigas*. Madrid 1874, p. 74), who, with regard to the original habitat of the “maġūs”, wrote: “[...] los Magioges [al-maġūs], gentes fieras habitadores de las últimas tierras Boreales”. A detailed account of this event is found in the history compiled in the 10th century by Ibn al-Qūṭīya (d. 977 in Cordoba) (see DOZY *Recherches sur l’histoire et la littérature de l’Espagne* pp. lxxviii–lxxxii, for the French translation, see pp. 259–264) and in al-Maqqarī’s “*Nafḥ at-ṭīb* [...]” (“*Aura odoramenti* [...]”), composed in the 16th century on the basis of the “*Kitāb al-*

Arabs of Spain (and northern Africa) would not call the Norsemen “Rus’”, a name, however, commonly used by the Arabs in the east.¹⁶⁴

However, it is obvious that the term “al-mağūs” appeared in Spain no later than in the 9th century. As a well-known ancient word among the population of Iran who were mostly adherents of Zoroastrianism, it should have lost its original meaning, “magician”, and become a vague term for infidels in general, as was the case with the Norsemen. Arabic writers of Spain might have borrowed this word from the Cordoba envoys¹⁶⁵ to the

muṭrib min aš‘ār ahl al-ma‘ārib” (“Liber gaudium afferens ex carminibus Occidentis”) composed by Ibn Dihja (1149–1235) (REINHART PIETER ANNE DOZY [et al.] [eds.]. *Analectes sur l’Histoire et la Littérature des Arabes d’Espagne*, par al-Makkari. Volume 1. Leiden 1855, pp. ۲۲۲–۲۲۳). The English translation of this passage was first undertaken by Pascual de Gayangos (PASCUAL DE GAYANGOS *The History of the Mohammedan Dynasties in Spain*; extracted from the *Nafhu-t-tib min Ghosni-l-Andalusi-r-Rattif wa Tārikh lisānu-d-dīn Ibnī-l-Khattīb*, by Ahmed ibn Mohammed Al-Makkari. Volume 2. London 1843, p. 116); a totally revised translation has been recently offered by Håkon Stang (STANG *The Naming of Russia* pp. 152–153). The identification of the “mağūs” with the Rus’ is not explicitly revealed in other accounts of this event (see DOZY *Recherches sur l’histoire et la littérature de l’Espagne* pp. 250–267), e.g., in al-Bakrī’s description of the Northern Africa (1068) (MAC GUCKIN DE SLANE [ed.] *Description de l’Afrique septentrionale*, par El-Bekri, in: *Journal asiatique ou recueil de mémoires d’extraits et de notices relatif à l’histoire, à la philosophie, aux langues et à la littérature des peuples orientaux*. Ve série 12 [1858] pp. 412–534; 13 [1858] pp. 97–194, 310–416, 467–519; 14 [1858] pp. 117–152, here 13 [1858] p. 169).

¹⁶⁴ EVARISTE LÉVI-PROVENÇAL *Histoire de l’Espagne musulmane*. Volume 1. Le Caire 1944, p. 152 ff. Joseph Marquart (MARQUART *Osteuropäische und ostasiatische Streifzüge* pp. 386 ff.) assumed that al-Ja‘qūbī could have heard of the raid by “al-mağūs” through the Mediterranean in 859, when some scattered groups of Vikings had penetrated as far as Alexandria (see DOZY *Recherches sur l’histoire et la littérature de l’Espagne* p. 264). This assumption, in turn, is patterned on the hypothesis of V. I. Lamanskii (VLADIMIR I. LAMANSKII *Istoricheskie zamechaniia k sochineniiu: “O slavianakh v Maloi Azii, v Afrike i v Ispanii”*, in: *Uchenye zapiski vtorogo otdeleniia Imperatorskoi Akademii nauk* 5 (1859) pp. 1–227, here p. 50). The latter student ascribed the words “who are called Rūs” to a later copyist who most likely transcribed the book in 1262 (GARKAVI *Skazaniia musul’manskikh pisatelei o slavianakh i russkikh* pp. 67–71; LEWICKI *Źródła arabskie do dziejów słowiańszczyzny* pp. 270–271). Of utmost interest here is the following expression: “but God knows best” (“والله اعلم”) as a cautious surmise expressed by al-Mas‘ūdī as to the ethnic origin of the attackers.

¹⁶⁵ Among them, according to al-Maqqarī (1591–1632), who in his turn derived most of his data from the work of Ibn Dihja (1149–1235) (see also fn. 163), was Jahjā Bakrī, known under the nickname “Yāzāl”, literally “gazelle” (d. 864), a successful diplomat and a renowned poet of Andalus (DOZY [et al.] [eds.]. *Analectes sur l’Histoire et la Littérature des Arabes d’Espagne* pp. liii–liv; GAYANGOS *The History of the Mohammedan Dynasties in Spain* p. 116). As a special emissary of the Umajjad Amīr ‘Abd ar-Rahmān II (822–852), Jahjā Bakrī undertook several important missions, in particular a journey to Constantinople. After the armistice between ‘Abd ar-Rahmān and the Norsemen, he traveled, in the company of Vikings, as far north as the Norse-dominated Dublin kingdom under Olaf the White. Yet, the corresponding account appears fictional (LÉVI-PROVENÇAL *Histoire de l’Espagne musulmane* p. 127). It is not, therefore, accidental that this “mağūs” land was metaphorically labeled by Jahjā Bakrī in his poem as “the farthest of God’s lands, where the wayfarer seldom penetrates” (“أقصى بلاد الله”) (DOZY [et al.] [eds.]. *Analectes sur l’Histoire et la Littérature des Arabes d’Espagne* p. ۶۳۶; SEIPPEL [ed.] *Rerum normannicarum fontes arabici* p. ۱۸; see STANG *The Naming of Russia* p. 157). A French translation of this passage was offered by Reinhart Dozy (DOZY *Recherches sur l’histoire et la littérature de l’Espagne* pp. 269–278). Harris Birkeland

Byzantines. The latter had much earlier inherited the word “μῆγος” from the ancient Greeks who, in the mid-1st millennium B.C., were active members of the ever-shifting pattern produced by the interactions between Asiatic, Iranian, Mesopotamian and other traditions and peoples.¹⁶⁶ Subsequently, the Byzantines might have identified the Scandinavians with the *magi* which lost direct connection with the title for the hereditary priests of (western) Iran. As for the Arabs, they tried to introduce the word “al-mağūs” in the context of an authentic traditional legend stating that the *mağūs* will come from the north (with the traditions of north- and central-Asiatic shamanism?)¹⁶⁷ and plunder Spain every 200 years.¹⁶⁸ This exegesis might have first appeared quite natural, especially if we recall the adoration of fire, comparable to Zoroastrianism, among the Rus’ as described by the Arabic geographers, for instance, by Ibn Faḍlān (ca. 922)¹⁶⁹ or al-Idrīsī (1099–1166) who mentions a “country of the infidels” (“أرض المجوس”) five times (!) in the fourth section of the seventh climate and one time in the third section of the sixth climate in his “Kitāb Ruḡār” (“Liber Rogerii”, ca. 1153).¹⁷⁰

Thus, early West Arabic sources knew not the term “Rūs”, commonly used in the Eastern Arabic world, but the name “mağūs” which tended to be subsequently ousted by the form “al-urmān” (“الأرمان”; “the Norsemen”) (cf. “al-urmānīja” [“الأرمانية”; “the country of the Norsemen”]) as found, for example, in the anonymous “Kitāb al-ḡa‘rāfīja” (“Liber

(BIRKELAND [ed.] Nordens historie i middelalderen etter arabiske kilder pp. 83–88, especially p. 87) seems to have premised his Norwegian text on Reinhart Dozy’s translation.

¹⁶⁶ PETER KINGSLEY *Greeks, Shamans and Magi*, in: *Studia Iranica* 23 (1994) pp. 187–198, here p. 195.

¹⁶⁷ IDEM *Ancient Philosophy, Mystery, and Magic. Empedocles and Pythagorean Tradition*. Oxford 1995, pp. 226–227.

¹⁶⁸ MARQUART *Osteuropäische und ostasiatische Streifzüge* p. 385.

¹⁶⁹ AHMED ZEKI VALIDI[-BONN] TOGAN (ed.) *Ibn Faḍlān’s Reisebericht*. Leipzig 1939, pp. ٢, ١٣٥–٣٩, 188–189, 236–237.

¹⁷⁰ “Les Russes brûlent leurs morts et ne les enterrent pas [...]” (JAUBERT [ed., transl.] *Géographie d’Edrisi* p. 402; for the Arabic text, see Al-Idrīsī *Opus Geographicum* p. 918). Having analyzed relevant place names on al-Idrīsī’s map, Richard Ekblom (RICHARD EKBLUM *Les noms de lieu baltiques chez Idrīsī*, in: *Mélanges de Philologie offerts à M. J. J. Mikkola. À l’occasion de son soixante cinquième anniversaire le 6 Juillet 1931*. Helsinki 1931, pp. 14–21) assumed that the country of al-mağūs was most likely situated both on the Latvian and Lithuanian territories, which by that time were retaining some archaic traditions, in particular the cult of Perkūnas. According to Tadeusz Lewicki (LEWICKI *Źródła arabskie do dziejów słowiańszczyzny* pp. 163–164), this country may be located somewhere in the Galician Rus’ (*Ruś halicka*), although the hypothesis of Oiva Johannes Tallgren-Tuulio and Aarne Michael Tallgren (OIVA JOHANNES TALLGREN-TUULIO, AARNE MICHAEL TALLGREN [eds.] *Idrīsī. La Finlande et les autres pays Baltiques orientaux [Géographie VII, 4]. Édition critique*. Helsingforsiae 1930, pp. 79–87) who identified “al-mağūs” with the Rus’inized Norsemen in the Novgorod area, appears more plausible. Overall, the identification of “al-mağūs” with the infidels as suggested by al-Idrīsī clearly testifies that the notion of “al-mağūs”, especially in reference to the Norsemen on the shore of the Baltic Sea, was most likely losing its primordial meaning. It comes then as no surprise that, as recounted by Ibn Dihja in the 13th century, “the *mağūs* abandoned the worship of fire and the [corresponding] religion, and returned to Christianity save for the inhabitants of some of their islands in the sea” (see SEIPPEL [ed.] *Rerum normannicarum fontes arabici* p. ١٥). A German translation, which contains a few vague places, may be found in Georg Jacob (JACOB [ed., transl.] *Arabische Berichte* p. 38); an updated Norwegian translation by Harris Birkeland (BIRKELAND [ed.] *Nordens historie i middelalderen etter arabiske kilder* p. 84) appears more reliable.

geographiae”, ca. 1150),¹⁷¹ and other similar West Arabic sources.¹⁷² The form “al-urmān” underwent most likely two divergent interferences, which might have happened almost concomitantly. At first, the latter form could have followed the pattern as realized in the Frankish name for the Norsemen, “Nortmanni”, “Nordmanni”,¹⁷³ “Normanni”, etc.¹⁷⁴ A while later, the Arabic form “al-urmān” should have led to parallel Spanish-Latin derivatives like “Lordomani”, “Lodormani”, “Lormani”, a process which is likely to have taken place upon the absorption of the article in “al-urmān” > “Lurmani”/“Lormani”¹⁷⁵ with a subsequent dissimilative interpretation of the word-initial sound in “Normanni” – “Lormani” or “Nortmanni” – “Lordomani”.¹⁷⁶

¹⁷¹ SEIPPEL (ed.) *Rerum normannicarum fontes arabici* p. ۳۹; HADJ-SADOK (ed.) *Kitāb al-dja‘rāfiyya* pp. 202, 232, 259, 269. Interestingly enough, the latter edition, which is based on the Parisian manuscript of 1410 (see DOLORS BRAMON *El mundo en el siglo XII. Estudio de la version castellana y del “Original” Árabe de una geografía universal: “El tratado de al-Zuhrī”*. Barcelona 1991, p. xiv), contains another reading, i.e., “أرمينية” (“Great *Armīnīja*”). The characteristics of this city/country appear rather contradictory. However, what is important in the corresponding passage (HADJ-SADOK [ed.] *Kitāb al-dja‘rāfiyya* p. 231) is that, although the inhabitants of this enigmatic country were used to travel southwards, their homeland was situated in the north.

¹⁷² The interplay between the term “mağūs” and the form “urmān” in the Western Arabic tradition can be most instructively illustrated by peculiar collocations of chronologically incongruent terms in some compounds or noun phrases. As for the compounds, not typical on the whole of the Arabic language system, one can mention a hapax in “*Kitāb at-tanbīh wa’l-išrāf*” (“*Liber commonitionis et recognitionis*”) composed by al-Mas‘ūdī in 946 (BGA volume VIII: *Kitāb at-tanbīh wa’l-išchrāf* auctore al-Masūdi p. ۱۸۱), “ارمانجس” (“*urmāngūs*”) denoting, as it becomes obvious from the text, “a kind [جنس] of Frankish people” (“الافرنجية”), cf. Byzantine “Φράγγου” and East Slavic “frjagove” (“Franks”) in the Laurentian recension of the Primary Chronicle (Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei [hereafter PSRL]. Volume 1: *Lavrentevskaia letopis’ i Suzdal’skaia letopis’ po akademicheskomu spisku*. 2e izdanie. Leningrad 1926, p. 2; see LEWICKI *Źródła arabskie do dziejów słowiańszczyzny* pp. 95–96, 120–121; SEIPPEL [ed.] *Rerum normannicarum fontes arabici* p. 7). Of interest also is a rather remarkable collocation, “al-mağūs al-urdumānijūn” (“المجوس الأردمانيون”) which is found in the account of Ibn al-‘Idārī (SEIPPEL [ed.] *Rerum normannicarum fontes arabici* p. ۳۱; BIRKELAND [ed.] *Nordens historie i middelalderen etter arabiske kilder* p. 111) of the invasion of the Danes (or Norwegians?) into Spain in 971 (DOZY *Recherches sur l’histoire et la littérature de l’Espagne* p. 298). This renowned geographer does not only identify “al-mağūs” with “al-urmān” but also places them somewhere in northern lands, presumably, in the Scandinavian Peninsula.

¹⁷³ MGH volume 3 pp. 277, 331; cf. FLAT. Nordomanni as attested in the “manuscript B” of the “*Annales de Saint-Bertin*” from the Saint-Omer Library (DEHAISNES [ed.] *Les Annales de Saint-Bertin* p. 59).

¹⁷⁴ THULIN “The Third Tribe” of the Rus pp. 136–137.

¹⁷⁵ SEIPPEL (ed.) *Rerum normannicarum fontes arabici* p. 7; BIRKELAND (ed.) *Nordens historie i middelalderen etter arabiske kilder* p. 152, fn. 18; STRUMIŃSKI *Linguistic Interrelations in Early Rus* pp. 157–158.

¹⁷⁶ There is an interesting hapax, “murmān” (“مرمان”), which is used in Ibn Ja‘qūb (SEIPPEL [ed.] *Rerum normannicarum fontes arabici* p. ۸۲; EL-HAJJI [ed.] *Abū ‘Ubayd Al-Bakrī* p. ۱۰۸; WESTBERG *Ibrāhīm’s-ibn-Ja‘kūb’s Reisebericht* p. 39; JACOB [ed., transl.] *Arabische Berichte* p. 11) in reference to the Norsemen. The conjecture “germān” as proposed by Michael Jan de Goeje (GOEJE *Een belangrijk arabisch bericht* p. 193; see BIRKELAND [ed.] *Nordens historie i middelalderen etter arabiske kilder* p. 143, fn. 10; cf. WESTBERG *Ibrāhīm’s-ibn-Ja‘kūb’s Reisebericht* p. 158), thus referring to the Germans appears perfunctory at its core and, remarkably, has remained so far unknown to most contemporary Muslim scholars; see the preface of, to use the author’s own transliteration, Abdurrahman Ali El-Hajji to his edition of Al-Bakrī’s “*Geography of al-Andalus and Europe*” (EL-

4.4. The East Arabic Evidence

Returning to the term “rūs” as used in the Eastern Arabic world, one should keep in mind the difference between two Rus’ s. On the one hand, there was the Volga Rus’ Kaganate¹⁷⁷ identified by the Arabic writers of the “second Oriental tradition” (according to Pavlo Smirnov) in the 8th to 10th centuries, e. g., by Ibn Rusteh in his “Kitāb al-a‘lāq an-nafīsa” (“Liber ornamentorum pretiosorum”, ca. 903–913),¹⁷⁸ as an isle – الجزيرة (al-ġazīra “isle” = “peninsula”)¹⁷⁹, which was inhabited by multiethnic tribal groupings, in particular Scandinavians, Iranians and others.¹⁸⁰ On the other hand, the appearance of the Outer Rus’, as evidenced first in Constantine Porphyrogenitus and much later in works pertaining to the “third Oriental tradition”, can be tentatively associated with the rise of the Kievan Rus’ which might have been instigated in the 9th century by the penetration of the Volga Rus’ into the central part of the Dnieper basin.¹⁸¹ Although only the Outer Rus’ was recorded in Old Rus’ian and Byzantine chronicles, there are some archaeological

HAJJI [ed.] Abū ‘Ubayd Al-Bakrī pp. ٢٦–٢٨). There is, in fact, reason to assume that the Arabic form “murmān” might have been borrowed in ESL. Murmane (“Norwegians”) as used most naturally in oral speech, cf. “Murmanъ”, a part of the Arctic Ocean (from which the name of Murmansk on the Kola Peninsula comes (MAX VASMER Russisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch. Volume II. Heidelberg 1955, p. 176). The colloquial form “Murmane” could have evolved (by distant *n-m* > *m-m* assimilation) from the learned form “Nurmane” modeled in its turn to Latin “Normanni”. Yet all this could hardly take place in the 15th century, as was posited by Bohdan Strumiński (STRUMIŃSKI Linguistic Interrelations in Early Rus’ p. 157) with regard to “murmane” in the First Novgorodian Chronicle of the mid-15th century (under the year 1240, 1241, or 1412) (ARSENI N. NASONOV [ed.] Novgorodskaia pervaiia letopis’ starshego i mladshhego izvodov. Moskva, Leningrad 1950, pp. 77, 291, 403; cf. “the Murman People” in ROBERT MICHELL, NEVILL FORBES [transl.] The Chronicle of Novgorod 1016–1471. [n. p.] 1970, pp. 84, 181). The corresponding transformation is likely to have happened much earlier before the emendation of “murmane” (< “nurmane”) to “urmane” as found in the Primary Chronicle (written in 1113–1116) (PSRL volume 1: Lavrentevskaia letopis’ pp. 2, 7; cf. the emendation “nurmany” as adduced in 1926 by Karskij in his edition of the Primary Chronicle). One has therefore to distinguish between two learned forms, which penetrated into the vernacular of Old Rus’ian, “murmane” (< “nurmane”) patterned on Lat. Normanni, and “urmane” which came to be attested/emended later under the influence of the counterpart WArab. al-urmān.

¹⁷⁷ Cf. GOLDEN The question of the Rus’ Qaghanate.

¹⁷⁸ BGA Volume VII: Kitāb al-a‘lāq an-nafīsa VII auctore Abū Alī Ahmed ibn Omar Ibn et Kitāb al-boldān auctore Ahmed ibn abī Jakūb ibn Wādhīh al-Kātib al-Jakūbī p. ١٤٥.

¹⁷⁹ See also § 2.2.1.

¹⁸⁰ GARKAVI Skazaniia musul’manskikh pisatelei o slavianakh i russkikh p. 262; MARQUART Ost-europäische und ostasiatische Streifzüge p. 200; SMIRNOV Volz’kyi shliakh i starodavni rusy pp. 80, 120 ff.

¹⁸¹ See also fn. 32. KONOVALOVA Les Rūs sur les voies de commerce de l’Europe orientale pp. 400–403, 404–405. In this respect, of utmost interest are chronicled accounts about a long military contest between, on the one hand, the Poliane, who were later, along with some other tribes, to be wholly identified with the Kyivan [Kievan] Rus’, and, on the other hand, the Derevliane and Ulichī. Their struggle may be treated as a conflict between the “Rus’ian outsiders” from the Volga Kaganate and the autochthonous Slavs. Under the pressure of the Rus’, the bulk of the Ulichī tribe might have moved northwestwards (VSEVOLOD HANTSOV Dialektolohichna klasyfikatsiia ukrains’kykh hovoriv. Kyiv 1924, pp. 135 ff.). If this is true, the dialects of Podillia (Podolia) and Halych (Galicia) are basically Ulichian in their origin and, therefore, appear “more Ukrainian” as compared to the tribal basis of the Kyiv-Polissia dialects, see GEORGE Y. SHEVELOV A Historical Phonology of the Ukrainian Language. Heidelberg 1979, p. 208.

grounds¹⁸² to assume the possibility that both Rus' were known not only to the ancient East Slavs¹⁸³ and the Byzantines but also to the Arabs, who were inclined to mark down their venue as far as in the South-Eastern Ladoga area, or even further northwards.¹⁸⁴

4.5. The Arabic Stemma

In view of the two phonological patterns as attested both in the Middle Greek and Latin German texts, it is tempting to suggest the existence of two similar designations for the Rus' in Middle Arabic, which is known to possess both short [ū] and long [ū̄], the latter being rendered by the letter “و” “wāw” (*mater lectionis*). Harris Birkeland¹⁸⁵ was first to take heed of a passage in the Geographical Dictionary of Jāqūt (d. 1229) who cited two forms of one and the same designation for the Rus', i.e., “rūs” (“روس”) with the long ū̄ and “rūs” with the short ū: “ويقال لهم رس بغير واو”, literally, “and they are [also] called rus without wāw”.¹⁸⁶ Unfortunately, save Jāqūt's evidence dating from the first quarter of the

¹⁸² JOHAN CALLMER From West to East. The Penetration of Scandinavians into Eastern Europe ca. 500–900, in: *Les centres proto-urbains russes* pp. 72–94, here pp. 73–86.

¹⁸³ This assumption is corroborated by Nestor's account which, while traditionally distinguishing between Japheth's, Ham's, and Shem's descendents, enumerates, among other of Japheth's descendents, two kinds (tribes, peoples) of the Varangians: “The Varangians dwell on the shore of that same sea [Varangian sea], and extend to the eastward as far as the portion of Shem. They likewise lived to the west beside this sea as far as the land of the English and the French” (PSRL volume 1: *Lavrentevskaia letopis'* p. 2; for the English translation, see SAMUEL H. CROSS, OLGERD P. SHERBOWITZ-WETZOR [eds., transl.] *The Russian Primary Chronicle. Laurentian Text.* Cambridge, MA 1973, p. 4). In other words, the Scandinavian Varangians dwelled not only on the shore of the Baltic Sea, but also “sēmo”, that is “over here”, where the chronicler himself lived, as far as the frontiers of the steppe powers, the (Volga-)Bulghārs and Khazars.

¹⁸⁴ AHMED ZEKI VALIDI[-BONN] TOGAN Die Nordvölker bei Bīrūnī, in: *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 90 (1936) 15, pp. 38–51.

¹⁸⁵ BIRKELAND (ed.) *Nordens historie i middelalderen etter arabiske kilder* p. 82; see SÖDERLIND *The realm of the Rus'* p. 157.

¹⁸⁶ WÜSTENFELD (ed.) *Jacut's geographisches Wörterbuch* p. ٨٣٤. The form with the short ū (رس) as cited by Jāqūt should not be confused with two groups of homographs, conveying either geographical or religious (fabulous) meanings. To take the latter group as an instance, its conceptual sphere is immediately represented by the name “aṣḥāb ar-rass” (“اصحاب الرس”), which, as has been outlined (see § 2.4), occurs twice in the Qur'ān. As concerns the so-called geographical homonyms, one can mention here Jāqūt's “valley ar-Rass” (“الرس وادي اندريجان”) (see § 2.4) and “the river ar-Rass” (“نهر الرس”), i.e., the Araxes (modern Aras), which flows into the Kura river (الكر) in the southeastern Caucasus (WÜSTENFELD [ed.] *Jacut's geographisches Wörterbuch* pp. ٧٧٩, ٧٨٠; see also al-Mas'ūdī's account in BGA volume VIII: *Kitāb at-tanbīh wa'l-ischrāf* auctore al-Mas'ūdī. p. ٦٢). In this respect, arresting attention is al-Idrīsī's “Opus geographicum” which reveals two spellings, both with and without the definite article, cf. “نهر الرس” (Al-Idrīsī. *Opus geographicum*. Part 4. Neapoli, Romae 1974, p. 422) next to “نهر رس” (Al-Idrīsī. *Opus geographicum*. Part 7. Neapoli, Romae 1977, p. 830). In the *Cosmography of ad-Dimašqī* (1256–1327) one encounters both types of the homonyms, e.g., “the river ar-Rass” (“نهر الرس”), that is, the Araxes (KONRAD MILLER *Arabische Welt und Länderkarten des 9.–13. Jahrhunderts in arabischer Transkription und Übertragung in neuzeitliche Kartenskizzen*. Volume 4: Asia, part 2: Nord- und Ostasien. Stuttgart 1929, p. 57, see maps 37, 38; IDEM *Mappae Arabicae*. Ed. by Heinz Gaube. Part 1. Wiesbaden 1986, pp. 135, 136, 137, 138, 141), and the legendary tribal name, “ar-rass” (“الرس”) (MEHREN [ed.] *Cosmographie de Chems-ed-Din Abou Abdallah Mohammed Ed-Dimichqui* pp. ١٠٦, ٢٥٠; FRÄHN *Ibn-Foszlan's und anderer Araber Berichte* p. 38). It is noteworthy that as early as 1827, while identifying the “Rha” (cf. “Pā” in the *Geography of Ptolomey*), i.e., the Volga (cf. GOTTFRIED SCHRAMM *Nord-*

13th century, this peculiar form is not attested in Arabic geographical literature elsewhere. However, apart from some linguistic arguments accounting for a possible quick loss of the form with the short *ũ*,¹⁸⁷ the distribution, as represented by Jāqūt, appears trustworthy.

There is therefore solid ground for reducing all the known attestations of this name predominantly in the Eastern Arabic sources to the following stemma: 1) “روس” [rūs] as opposed to the less attested 2) “رس” [rūs].

5. Synthesizing the Stemmas

5.1. Borrowing from East Slavs?

Bohdan Strumiński¹⁸⁸ assumed that had the Greeks borrowed the term “Rus” directly from the East Slavs, we would expect *ῥούς in Greek. A notable Normanist, this author contended that the Greeks must have borrowed the term through the medium of the language of the Alans, inasmuch as in this language OIr. *au* (= Sl. *ou*) changed to *ō*, hence the Byzantine form “Ρῶς”. Yet, had the Greeks really borrowed the term “Rus” directly from the East Slavs, the corresponding Greek rendition would not necessarily be a form like *ῥούς-. It is useful to recall here that the Slavic *u* tended to be represented in northern Middle Greek renditions with the help of *ω* [o], cf. Στρώμνη (Parnassis) vs. Sl. *Strumens, Στρωμίνιονη (Akarnanien) vs. Sl. *Strumenjane,¹⁸⁹ cf. etymologically parallel “ῥεῦμα” with *eu*-grade. It is certainly not coincidental that Max Vasmer, while emphasizing that Old Finnic renditions of Sl. *u* contained *ō*, hence *uo*, identified the Byzantine spelling οἱ Ρῶς with ESl. Русь.

Nonetheless, given that Greek was not sensitive to the length of Slavic vowels, the second Byzantine form with *u* (ου) can represent a case of rendering Sl. *u* of various origins, including non-etymological or even borrowed *u*, cf. Λουκάβιτσα (Elis) from Sl. *Lukovica: “lukъ” (“leek”) (< Gmc. *lauka-*), Στρούζα (Arcada) from Sl. *Struzja¹⁹⁰ next to Gr.

pontische Ströme. Namenphilologische Zugänge zur Frühzeit des europäischen Ostens. Göttingen 1973, p. 118, fn. 307.), with the “Ros”/“Ras” (STANG The Naming of Russia pp. 72–73), Joseph de Hammer (HAMMER Sur les origines russes pp. 50–51) assumed that “ašhāb ar-rass”/the “Ros” were the people living on the Volga, that is, the Rus’ who are traditionally situated between the Khazars and the Slavs. Later Friedrich Knauer (FRIEDRICH KNAUER Der russische Nationalname und die indogermanische Urheimat, in: Indogermanische Forschungen 31 (1912/1913) pp. 67–88) expanded on this idea, although without saying a word about Hammer’s hypothesis. He observed, among other things, that the name “Rus” (< *ros) originated from the ancient name for the Volga river, thus denoting the “Volga people”. All this is likely to support B. N. Zakhoder’s assumption about “الرس” (cf. MINORSKY [ed.] Ḥudūd al-‘Ālam p. 75) as a case of later compilation (ZAKHODER Kaspiskii svod svedenii o Vostochnoi Evrope pp. 105–106).

¹⁸⁷ In rendering an East Slavic form like “Русь” with the final *jer* [ĭ] the Arabic form “rūs” (رُس) fits seemingly well phonetically. Yet, while a palatalized final consonant in “Русь” [rūs’ĭ] is not relevant to the Arabic phonetics, the East Slavic form may appear nevertheless anomalous since it obviously contradicts a derivatively typical triconsonantal root, hence a more natural, from the point of view of the Arabic morphophonetics, basic (derivative) form like “rūs” (روس).

¹⁸⁸ STRUMIŃSKI Linguistic Interrelations in Early Rus’ pp. 82–83.

¹⁸⁹ MAX VASMER Die Slaven in Griechenland. Berlin 1941, p. 239 ff.

¹⁹⁰ GEORGE Y. SHEVELOV A Prehistory of Slavic p. 278; see also ANDRII DANYLENKO The Names of the Dnieper Rapids in Constantine Porphyrogenitus revisited. An Attempt at Linguistic Attribution, in: Die Welt der Slaven 46 (2001) 1, pp. 43–62, here 44–45, 49.

στρεύγω (“to be exhausted, worn out, weary oneself”).¹⁹¹ Moreover, Gr. *u* (ου) could correspond to the etymological Slavic *o*, although largely in unstressed positions, e. g., Μουτσόρα (Trikkula) from Sl. *Močara and the like.¹⁹²

Overall, there seem to be substantive grounds for assuming that the form “ῥούσιος” could have most likely arisen at the time of, or soon after the monophthongization of *u*-diphthongs in East Slavic. Thus, phonetically, “ῥούσιος” may actually represent the corresponding Rus’ian name with *u* < *ū*₂, which in turn evolved from an *ou*-diphthong. Meanwhile, one cannot dismiss the possibility that the above Byzantine spelling could have been influenced by some orthographic patterns already generalized by the second half of the 10th century in Middle Greek. It is, then, instructive to posit that both “Ῥῶς” [rūs] and “ῥούσιος” [rūs] represent consecutive stages in the phonetic development of Slavic *u*-diphthongs, in particular with *ou*-grade, which monophthongized into an *ū*-type sound. In absolute chronology, the monophthongization in Slavic might have taken place in the 6th or 7th century, although, theoretically, the process could have come to an end a bit later, depending on a specific dialectal area.¹⁹³ Based on this chronology, it is therefore conceivable that not only the Byzantine but also Western-European (Latin German) rendition of both the *ū*- and *u*-grade forms fell behind as compared to the corresponding Slavic changes. This fact can provide additional support to the northern origin of the term “Rus’”, which might have spread from the Baltic people to the Outer Rus’, then on to the Germans, Greeks, and subsequently to the Arabs.

If this assumption is true,¹⁹⁴ one can hardly adhere then to Omeljan Pritsak’s hypothesis¹⁹⁵ about the Rhenish provenance of the Arabic counterpart “ar-rūs” (“الروس”) which was allegedly borrowed as early as the mid-9th century and subsequently used by Ibn Ḥurdādhbeh. This hypothesis, however, demands further consideration, and may account for other data, in particular those excerpted from the writings of Ibn Mūsā al-Ḥuwārīz-mī.¹⁹⁶ All these data should be analyzed structurally,¹⁹⁷ thus exposing historical pattern of

¹⁹¹ LIDDELL, SCOTT A Greek-English Lexicon p. 1654.

¹⁹² VASMER Die Slaven in Griechenland pp. 240, 234.

¹⁹³ See SHEVELOV A Prehistory of Slavic p. 238.

¹⁹⁴ KNUT-OLOF FALK Kilka uwag o nazwie *Rus’*, in: Lingua Poznaniensis 12/13 (1968) pp. 9–19, here pp. 16–19; IDEM Einige Bemerkungen zum Namen Rus’, in: Les pays du Nord et Byzance (Scandinavie et Byzance), pp. 147–159, here 153–155.

¹⁹⁵ PRITSAK The origin of the name *Rus’* p. 57.

¹⁹⁶ See § 4.1.

¹⁹⁷ An overly atomistic approach can result in precarious etymologies which are prone to lose subsequently their vitality. Of interest in this respect is the Red-Blond-People hypothesis of Stefan Söderlind (SÖDERLIND The realm of the Rus’ pp. 156–157), according to whom “Русь” is etymologically connected with Goth. **rauþs* (“red”), and belongs to the Proto-Indo-European stem **roudh-* or **reudh-* (“red”) as represented by the Russian adjective “rusyj” (“light brown”) or Lith. *raūdas* (“red” of horses) (see JAN OTREBSKI Noch einmal über Русь, in: Die Welt der Slaven 11 (1966) 1–2, pp. 220–223, here pp. 221–222; POKORNY Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch pp. 872–873). Without any reference to his predecessor, Håkon Stang (STANG The Naming of Russia p. 297) has recently outlined an almost identical theory. According to him, the Gothic word might have resulted in the 5th to 7th centuries in **rōtsi*. At first glance, the Red-Blond hypothesis appears plausible, especially in light of a similar Arabic derivative form as encountered, for instance, in al-Mas’ūdī’s “Kitāb at-tanbīh wa’l-išrāf” (“Liber communitiois et recognitionis”, 946), where “rūsya” (“روسيا”) means “the red”: “معنى ذلك الحمر” (BGA volume VIII: Kitāb at-tanbīh wa’l-išrāf auctore al-Mas’ūdī p. ١٣١). Yet due to active contacts between the Greeks and Arabs one is

relations among the attested forms in the Byzantine, Latin German, and Arabic sources, all approached in their connection to the East Slavic underlying form. This is why, taken from the developmental perspective, the term “Rus” as encountered in the above groups of records attests most obviously to its borrowing from the East Slavs. Historical doublets in Middle Greek, Latin/Old High German, and Arabic to render the corresponding East Slavic name should be treated as adaptation of consecutive reflexes of an *u*-diphthong in the underlying form, i.e., (*ou* >) *ū* and, finally, *u*.

5.2. Irradiation From the North or From the South?

The basic East Slavic form, however, could hardly be indigenous. This thesis has been most consistently defended by the Normanists, especially by the disciples of the so-called “Lund Theory” which derives ESL. Русь from BFin. *rōtsi. A classical etymology of the latter word form was first adduced in 1877 by Vilhelm Thomsen,¹⁹⁸ who derived the BFin. *rōtsi from ONord. *rōþsmenn or *rōþskarlar (“rowers, seafarers”). This etymology underwent substantial revision by Sven Arnold Ekbo¹⁹⁹ who offered instead a plausible form *rōdR with the abstract meaning “rowing/naval expedition” which, as was pointed out by Bohdan Strumiński,²⁰⁰ belonged to the realm of fiction. In strictly geographical terms, the “Lund Theory” marks the spread of the alleged *rōdR from north to south, or, more precisely, to southeast: i.e., from the Western Finns via Rus’ and Byzantium to the Arab world: *rōtsi – “Русь” – “Ρωσ” – “ar-rūs”.²⁰¹

The opposite direction is discernable in a theory propounded by O. N. Trubachev.²⁰² While postulating for the “Rus” an underlying form like OIAr. *ruksa-/ru(s)sa- or OIr. *ruks-, he claims that southern (Rus’ian) reflexes of these forms were quite pervasive, by the 6th to 7th centuries, not only in the Pontus region, that is, on the northern coast of the Black Sea and on the sea of Azov, but also among the Slavs living on the Don and Dnieper. Among such reflexes, one can cite *russi as a result of consonantal assimilation in contrast to a more archaic form retaining a word-final “affricate”: *ruksi or *rutsi.²⁰³ In the face of serious counter-arguments, outlined by Gottfried Schramm,²⁰⁴ the Trubachev

more inclined to accept not the alleged Gothic “Red-Blond center”, but the interplay between various factors, first and foremost the influence of the medieval form “ῥόυσιος” (“reddish”) (LIDDELL, SCOTT A Greek-English Lexicon p. 1575; see BIRKELAND [ed.] Nordens historie i middelalderen etter arabiske kilder pp. 40, 142, fn. 157).

¹⁹⁸ THOMSEN Det Russiske riges grundlæggelse ved Nordboerne p. 346.

¹⁹⁹ SVEN ARNOLD EKBO Om ortsnamnet Roden och därmed sammanhängande problem. En översikt från nordisk synpunkt, in: Arkiv för Nordisk Filologi 70 (1958) pp. 187–199; IDEM Die Etymologie des finnischen *Ruotsi* ‘Schweden’, in: JBfGÖE 34 (1986) 3, pp. 354–356.

²⁰⁰ STRUMIŃSKI Linguistic Interrelations in Early Rus’ p. 78; cf. FALK Einige Bemerkungen zum Namen Rusī p. 148.

²⁰¹ FALK Kilka uwag o nazwie *Rus* p. 19.

²⁰² TRUBACHEV Lingvističeskaia periferiia drevneishego slavianstva pp. 13–29; see IDEM *Indo-arica v Severnom Prichernomor’e. Rekonstruktsiia reliktoiv iazyka. Ètimologičeskii slovar’*. Moskva 1999.

²⁰³ TRUBACHEV Lingvističeskaia periferiia drevneishego slavianstva pp. 266, 246.

²⁰⁴ Based on the relative chronology of palatalizational processes in Old Rus’ian, Gottfried Schramm (SCHRAMM Die Herkunft des Namens Rus’ p. 32; IDEM *Altrußlands Anfang* pp. 89–90, 102–103) treated quite reasonably O. N. Trubachev’s (TRUBACHEV *Lingvističeskaia periferiia drevneishego slavianstva* p. 225) enigmatic “vernacular and dialectal simplification *ks* > *s(s)*” as purely hypothetical. Indeed, the very existence of a southern form with the cluster *ts*, like *Rutsь, in

theory could hardly compete with the Normanistic thesis of the spreading of a single underlying form, and it fails to account for the historical doublets in Middle Greek, Latin/Old High German and Arabic.

Eliminating the above etymologies, one is left with the following hypothesis: ESL. Rusь is likely to have originated from the Baltic Finnic form *rōtsi, denoting outsiders.²⁰⁵ The Suomi form was introduced by the Finns to refer to those East Slavic tribes (e. g., the Poliane and Slověne) which were tribute takers in the region. Later, as a social nomen, this form was applied to the Norsemen, and even to the West Slavs from the Baltic coast, who together with the East Slavs assumed the role of retinue members.²⁰⁶ A designation similar to *rōtsi is lacking in both East and West Scandinavian. Had such a designation existed in Old Scandinavian, a loan form in Slavic would have been modeled to a plural pattern of the type “Varjazi” (“varangians”), “Svei”/“Svoje” (“Swedes”) or “Ourmane” (“Northmen”; “Swedes”), “Гьѣ”/“Gotě” (“Gotlanders”), “Анъглє”/“Aglє” (“Englishmen”) as attested in abundance in the Primary Chronicle of Rus'.²⁰⁷

The most illuminating argument is morphological (derivational). In the process of borrowing, a semantic-morphological shift from the Baltic Finnic singular to the Old East Slavic feminine collective occurred, based on the model of names of other social and ethnic groups, such as “Chiudь” for the ancestors of the Estonians, “Vєсь”/“Vсь” (< “Vьсь”, Finn. vepsäläinen [“Vepsian”]) for the ancestors of the Vepsians, all attested next to “Rusь” in both the Laurentian and Hypatian Chronicles, cf. also “Permь” (“Permians”) (Finn. permalainen [“Permian”]), “Iамь” (“Iемь”) (“Tavastians”) (Finn. hämäläinen [“Tavastian”]).²⁰⁸ The corresponding derivational pattern in *-jь* seems to be common in

the 6th to 7th centuries proves to be untenable inasmuch as the above consonantal group in the reflex *Rutsi was inadmissible in Slavic until the disintegration of Common Slavic (ANDRÉ VAILLANT *Grammaire comparée des langues slaves*. Volume 1. Paris 1950, pp. 84–85). On the whole, the final consonant in the underlying form appears a true stumbling block in some deviating etymologies. To adduce an explicit example, one can mention the latest attempt of Lothar Dralle (LOTHAR DRALLE *Artanija – Ruś – Varjagi*, in: *JBfGOE* 33 (1985) 1, pp. 1–22, here p. 18 ff.) to derive the term “Rus” from the name of the ancient inhabitation of the isle Rügen, i.e., “Rugini” (730), cf. also “Runi”, “Ruani”, “Rugiani”, “Rujani”, “Rojani”, and finally “Rani”. Contrary to Lothar Dralle, his predecessors were more cautious in connecting these forms with the name of the Rus’ (see LUBOR NIEDERLE *Slovanské starožitnosti*. Series 1. Volume 3: *Původ a počátky slovanů západních*. Praha 1919, p. 147–149).

²⁰⁵ G. F. KOVALEV *O proiskhozhdenii étnonima “Rus”*, in: *Studia Slavica Finlandensia* 111 (1986) pp. 68–90, here pp. 79–80.

²⁰⁶ “Rousь [...] отъ рода Vęřęzheska soushche” (“οἱ ἐκ γένους τῶν Φράγγων καθίστανται”) (VASILII M. ISTRIN *Khronika Georgiia Amartola v drevnem slavianorusskom perevode*. *Tekst, issledovanie i slovar’*. Volume 1. Petrograd 1920, p. 567; volume 2. Petrograd 1922, p. 289).

²⁰⁷ PSRL volume 1: *Lavrentevskaia letopis’* pp. 2, 7; PSRL volume 2: *Ipatevskaja letopis’*. 2e izdanie. S.-Peterburg 1908, p. 4.

²⁰⁸ THOMSEN *Det Russiske riges grundlæggelse ved Nordbørne* p. 346. Regular correspondences of this type fit well into the Thomsen-Shakhmatov formula, most explicitly put forward by A. Shakhmatov (ALEKSEI A. SHAKHMATOV *Skazanie o prizvanii Variagov*, in: *Izvestiia Otdeleniia russkogo iazyka i slovesnosti* 9 [1904] 4, pp. 284–365, here pp. 339–340) in his famous study about the so-called invitation of the Varangians: “The form *Rusь*, as Thomsen pointed out, relates to *Ruotsi* [*rōtsi*] in very much the same vein as Old Russian [Old Rus’ian] *Sum’* [...] correlates with Finnish *Suomi*”. A similar equation is emphasized in NIEDERLE *Slovanské starožitnosti*. Series 1. Volume 4: *Původ a počátky slovanů východních*. Praha 1924, p. 111.

East Slavic ethno- and toponymics,²⁰⁹ and there it proves also to be extremely productive when adopting the ethnic names of Finno-Ugric tribes, as well as the names of peoples borrowed from Finno-Ugric languages, where the suffix *-i* after a palatalized consonant (= East Slavic *-ь* after a palatalized consonant) is a common morphological characteristic: “Vodь”, “Sumь”, “Samoiadь”, “Libь” and the like²¹⁰ alongside “Žmudь” (“Lithuanians”), Skifь (“Scythians”), and “Sury” (“Syrians”), all demonstrating presumably “some association” in the language of the Primary Chronicle between the feminine singular ending and an earlier stage of social organisation.²¹¹ In the oldest layer of such ethnic names, the term “Rus” seems to be the only one to refer to a Slavic people, a fact which, taken together with the pertinent historiographic and archaeological data, speaks for the Baltic coast as a center of irradiation of the BFin. *rōtsi. The latter transformed into the East Slavic form “Rūsь”, and later into “Rusь”, which both, in subsequent waves, spread over the trade routes leading to the Caspian and Black seas before reaching possessions of both the Byzantine Empire and the Abbasid caliphate.

6. Concluding Remarks

The origin of the name “Rus” as discussed in the framework of what was aptly dubbed by Arist Kunik “barangomachia”,²¹² has obviously resisted comprehensive explanation so far. The variety of solutions suggested by different scholars testifies to an impasse in the etymologizing of this term, a procedure which is chiefly reduced to a multiple choice decipherment. To draw a parallel with linguistic methods proper, the situation with the interpretation of the term “Rus” is reminiscent of the Neogrammarian approach as cultivated in the late 19th – early 20th centuries. Premised mostly on sound changes triggered by analogous reasons, the Neogrammarian trend was compelled, nevertheless, to give place to the structural standpoint which discarded the atomistic approach by paying more attention to the relationships between language entities.

It becomes obvious, then, that most of the attempts at solving the long-standing Normanic controversy remained, to use linguistic terminology, Neogrammarian at their core. This warrants a new, structural interpretation of seemingly well-known stemmas for the “Rus” name as found in the Byzantine, Latin German, and Arabic records. As has been already mentioned, it would be useful in this case to give up searching for an etymology of the underlying form(s). As a matter of fact, even the boldest etymologies are apt to appear reiterative, and hardly any new idea can be advanced for further scholarly

²⁰⁹ In this respect, of interest is another form, “Донь” (“Denmark”), which occurs in the First Novgorodian Chronicle under the year 1131, 1134, and later as a parallel form to “доньская земля” (NASONOV [ed.] *Novgorodskaja pervaja letopis'* pp. 23, 207, 445; MICHELL, FORBES [transl.] *The Chronicle of Novgorod 1016–1471* p. 13; ALEKSANDR I. SOBOLEVSKII *Die slavischen Benennungen deutscher Volksstämme*, in: *Archiv für slavische Philologie* 32 [1911] pp. 309–310, here p. 309). Incidentally, both Gottfried Schramm (SCHRAMM *Die Herkunft des Namens Rus'* p. 38; IDEM *Altrußlands Anfang* p. 93) and his critic, Håkon Stang (STANG *The Naming of Russia* p. 280, fn. 7), mistook the form “Донь” for an ethnonym.

²¹⁰ LAMANSKII *Istoricheskie zamechaniia* pp. 39–40, see PSRL volume 1: *Lavrentevskaia letopis'* pp. 5, 7–7v; tom 2: *Ipatevskaja letopis'* p. 4.

²¹¹ PAUL BUSHKOVITCH *Rus' in the ethnic nomenclature of the Povest' vremenykh let*, in: *Cahier du monde Russe et Soviétique* 13 (1971) 3, pp. 296–306, here p. 304.

²¹² ARIST A. KUNICK [KUNIK] *Zur Literatur der Warangomahia (1859 – März 1874)*, in: DORN Caspia. Über die Einfälle der alten Russen in Tabaristan, pp. 279–284; MOSHIN *Variago-russkii vopros* pp. 109–115.

consideration without breaking through the limits of the so-called “barangomachia”. While discussing cross-linguistically diachronic connections between consecutive attestations of the term “Rus”, structural methods can prove highly effective in this case.