

Urmane, Varjagi and other (Nordic) Peoples in the Cosmography of the Primary Chronicle*

Andrii DANYLENKO (New York)

1. Introduction

Contrary to the term *Varezi/Vajagi*, which is attested almost fifty times in the Laurentian redaction of the Rus'ian Primary Chronicle, the name *Urmane* appears in this codex only twice. It is first mentioned in the enumeration of Japhet's descendants: *Afetovo bo i to koleno Varezi Svei. Urmane [Gote] Rusь. Agneņe Galičane. Volъxva Rimlęne Nemci. Korlęzi Venъdici Fregovi i pročii*¹ 'For the following nations also are a part of the race of Japheth: the Varangians, the Swedes, the *Urmane* [Normans], the Gotlanders, the Rus', the English, the Galicians, the Gauls, the Romans, the *Nemci* [Germans], the Carolingians, the *Volъxva* [Venetians], the Franks, and others'.² For the second time this word is recorded beside the names of Nordic peoples under the year 6370/862 in the context of the invitation to the Varangians. Here is the corresponding mention in the Hypatian redaction of the Primary Chronicle: *Sice bo zvaxutъ. tѡi Varegy Rusь. jako se družii zovutse Sveje. družii že Urmani. Anъglęne. inei i Gote*³ 'For those Varangians were called Rus', just as others are called Swedes, [and] others *Urmane*, Englishmen, others Gotlanders'.⁴

* I would like to express my sincere thanks to Dr. Diana Gosselin Nakeeb (Pace University, New York City) who provided valuable suggestions for revision of an earlier version of this paper. Any opacity, which remains is, of course, my own.

¹ *Lavrent'jevskaja letopis'* (hereafter *LUR*), in: *Polnoe sobranie russkix letopisej*, vol. I: *Lavrent'evskaja letopis' i Suzdal'skaja letopis' po akademičeskomu spisku*, 2nd ed., Leningrad 1926, p. 4.

² S. H. Cross and O. P. Sherbowitz-Wetzor (eds. and transl.), *The Russian Primary Chronicle. Laurentian Text* (hereafter *LUR-E*), Cambridge, Mass. 1973, p. 52. While disproportionately modernized, the English translation of the passage by Samuel H. Cross and Olgerd P. Sherbowitz-Wetzor is, however, outdated and passes over consecutive historical layers as accumulated in the *Vorlage*. To give a few most telling examples, the word *Galičane* is translated as 'Spaniards' and *Volъxva* is ostensibly equated with the 'Italians'. Yet the word *Urmane* is translated, and rightly so, 'Normans'.

³ *Ipat'jevskaja letopis'* (hereafter *HYP*), in: *Polnoe sobranie russkix letopisej*, vol. 2 (Photomecanic reprint), Moskva 1962, p. 14.

⁴ Cf. *LUR*, p. 14. Leaving aside the obsolete word-form *Russes* instead of the collective name *Rus'*, Samuel H. Cross and Olgerd P. Sherbowitz-Wetzor's translation (*LUR-E*, p. 59) of the corresponding passage is on the whole acceptable:

To explain *Urmane*, which has long intrigued students by its unusual form, it would be expedient to determine the place of these people among other peoples in the ethnic nomenclature of the Primary Chronicle, which stresses a unique place of Old Rus' in the Christian world. This will lead us to a more comprehensive etymology than that offered by Bohdan STRUMIŃSKI,⁵ and provide an alternative basis for ascertaining the origin of the name *Urmane*, which contrasts both with non-Nordic and Nordic peoples, especially *Varêzi* and *Rusь*, who have long remained in the focus of the Varangian-Rus'ian controversy. I will argue that, despite its phonetic similarity to Latin designations of the type *Nortmanni*, the term *Urmane* is likely to have been borrowed from a non-European language. I will try to enhance that assumption by taking into consideration other ethnic designations, first and foremost *Varęzi*, which are paired elsewhere in Old Rus'ian records with another term, *Kolbjazi*. They are all mentioned not only in European but also in non-European sources, thereby demonstrating a kind of socio-cultural and linguistic continuum bridging the adjacent, Christian and non-Christian oecumenes. All this will further our understanding of the Old Rus'ian cosmography and its sources, thus shedding new light on the genesis of Old Rus'ian chronicle writing, on the whole.

2. Structure of the Cosmography

The cosmography of the Rus'ian Primary Chronicle, which deals in its introductory section with universal history, is premised mostly on the Biblical Table of Nations (Genesis, X) and certain post-Biblical historiographic works, e.g., on the Byzantine Chronicle of Georgius Hamartolus (and its continuation by Simeon the Logothete). The latter Chronicle is twice mentioned⁶ in the Laurentian redaction of the Primary Chronicle⁷ as a source of the annalist's inspiration.⁸ Yet a lack of precise information in the Greek and Biblical sources about the northern nations, including the Slavs and the Rus', prompted the Kievan annalist to design another vista of the lands situated to the north of Sarmatians and Scythians. It has been hypothesized that complementary sources may have been used,

⁴These particular Varangians were known as Russes [*Rus'*], just as some are called Swedes, and others Normans, English, and Gotlanders, for they were thus named'.

⁵ B. STRUMIŃSKI, *Linguistic Interrelations in Early Rus': Northmen, Finns, and East Slavs (Ninth to Eleventh Centuries)* (= *Collana di filologia e letteratura slave*, 2), Edmonton – Toronto 1996, 155-158.

⁶ V. M. Istrin (ed.), *Knigy vremennyja i obraznyja Georgija Mnixa. Xronika Georgia Amartola v drevnem slavjanorusskom perevode. Tekst, issledovanie i slovar'*, ed. vol. I, Petrograd 1920, pp. 58-59, vol. II, pp. 328-349.

⁷ LAUR, pp. 14, 17.

⁸ PH. KRUG, *Forschungen in der älteren Geschichte Russlands*, part 1, St.-Pétersbourg 1848, pp. 147-148.

in particular a Jewish chronicle, “*Sēfer Yōsippōn*”, written most likely in Southern Italy by Rabbenu Gershom in 953.⁹ While reflecting ethnic changes in Europe of that time, the Book of Joseph ben Guriōn [‘Luminary of the Diaspora’] (*Yōsippōn*) did not only follow the Biblical canon, but also expanded its narrative, especially in the presenting of nations. Of interest in this regard is the Rus’ who are mentioned by *Yōsippōn* twice. First, they appear together with Nordic peoples living on the coast of the Great (Varangian) Sea, and second, they are said to live not on the *Bira*, as was suggested by Joachim LELEWEL,¹⁰ but on the river of Kiev (כיוא), as found in MS Oxford, Bodleiana;¹¹ according to the Oriental tradition, this river flows to the *Gurgan* Sea.¹² The dual localization of the Rus’ as reflected in the Jewish chronicle testifies most likely to that author’s full cognizance of the military expeditions of the Rus’ in the South, particularly in the Caspian region, as well as the northern (Scandinavian) provenance of the Rus’. This supports the idea, first emphasized by David FLUSSER, that *Yōsippōn* was a secular person rather than a rabbi, thus being a writer and historian moving apparently in the margins of the traditionalist Jewish society.¹³

The Laurentian codex does refer to an eastern group of the Rus’ who traveled (traded) along the Volga down to the *Khvalis̄skoje* (Caspian) Sea.¹⁴ However, more detail is provided about the northern (Varangian) origin of the Rus’: they are placed among other Nordic peoples, i. e., *Varezi, Svei, Urmane, Gote, Rus̄, Agnēne, and Galičane*,¹⁵ a group which

⁹ N. GOLB and O. PRITSAK, *Khazarian Hebrew Documents of the Tenth Century*, Ithaca, London 1982, pp. 87-89; M. Lazar (ed.), *Sēfer Ben Guriōn [Yōsippōn]*, Lancaster, Cal. 2000, p. XI; V. JA. PETRUXIN, *Načalo etnokul’turnoj istorii Rusi IX-XI vekov*, Smolensk – Moskva 1995, p. 19f.

¹⁰ J. LELEWEL, *Géographie du moyen age*, vol. III, Bruxelles 1852, p. 13.

¹¹ GOLB and PRITSAK, *Khazarian Hebrew Documents of the Tenth Century*, pp. 12-13. In Avraham Asa’s Ladino translation (1753), this passage reads in the following way: אי אינגליסי מוראן סירקה לה מאר גראנדי. רוסי פוזאן סירקה ריאור די כיוא. קי קורי אה תירס סון לוס רוסיס; שכשני לה מאר רי גורגאן.

“Tirās son los Ruis; Sacsoni y Englesi moran cerca la mar grande. Ruis pozan cerca rio de Lieva, que corre a la mar de Gorgan” (Lazar, ed., *Sēfer Ben Guriōn*, p. 10). For a recent Russian translation of this passage, based on David Flusser’s critical edition of 1978, see PETRUXIN, *Načalo etnokul’turnoj istorii Rusi IX-XI vekov*, p. 38.

¹² The name *Gurgan* Sea is paralleled in the Arabic term *jarjān* (جرجان) ‘the Caspian’ as found, e. g., in al-Mas’ūdī’s work of 943/944: Ch. Barbier de Meynard, A. Pavet de Courteille, and Ch. Pellat (eds.), *Mas’ūdī. Les prairies d’or*, vol. I, Beyrouth 1966, pp. 274-275; LELEWEL, *Géographie du moyen age*, p. 13.

¹³ Lazar (ed.), *Sēfer Ben Guriōn*, p. IX.

¹⁴ LAUR, p. 3.

¹⁵ One should distinguish between *Galičane*, which is traceable back to the Middle Greek lexeme Γαλικία in reference to the country of Gaul in France, and the Latin word-form *Galicii* which denoted most likely a part of Spain: A. POGODIN, *Der Bericht der russischen Chronik über die Gründung des russischen Staates*, *Zeitschrift für osteuropäische Geschichte* 5 (neue Folge, 1) (1931) 203.

appears opposed to the rest of Japhet's descendents, i. e., *Vol̆xva*, *Riml̆ne*, *Nemci*, *Korl̆zi*, *Ven̆dici*, *Fregovi*. Remarkably, both of these groups are introduced with the help of generic terms, i. e., *Var̆zi* to refer to all Scandinavians, and *Vol̆xva*, designating all other nations.¹⁶

3. Defining non-Nordic peoples

The generic term for the non-Nordic group, *Vol̆xva*, has been again associated by Bohdan Strumiński with the Celto-Romanic people,¹⁷ based upon Celtic **volcos* > Germanic **walcha* > Slavic **volchъ* (> *valchъ* > *vlachъ*).¹⁸ Leaving aside the well-known evidence provided by Caesar, Livius, and Strabon, the Wallachians, successors to the Dacians and precursors of the present-day Romanians, were in the time of Byzantine rule living in the Danube area, and in Macedonia and Thessaly, then known as Great Wallachia.¹⁹ Niketas Choniates expressly stated that the Barbarians of the Haemus region, who used to be called Moesians, were later, especially in the Second Bulgarian Empire (1186-1396), exclusively called Wallachians (νυνὶ δὲ Βλάχοι κικλήσκονται).²⁰

Bohdan STRUMIŃSKI's assumption does not account for a more intricate synchronic interpretation of the name *Vol̆xva* by the Rus'ian annalist in the second decade of the 12th century. Since the term Wallachian was used in that time not only ethnically but as a collective name of nomadic tribes, it is tempting to infer that the Primary Chronicle²¹ could have associated some of them with the Franks, who, under Charlemagne (768-814), vanquished the Slavs residing in the Danube basin, and later were ousted, in their turn, by the Finno-Ugrian tribes. Here also begins a gradual semantic differentiation of this name in various Slavic dialects. Suffice it to mention that, while covering a wide ethnic range of peoples, from the Romanians to the Italians, this term also refers to specific social functions of people (shepherd, farmer, etc.) living mainly in the Balkans and Transcarpathia.²²

¹⁶ E. KUNIK, *Die Berufung der schwedischen Rotsen durch die Finnen und Slawen*, St.-Petersbourg 1844, pp. 2-3.

¹⁷ STRUMIŃSKI, *Linguistic Interrelations in Early Rus'*, p. 155.

¹⁸ M. VASMER, *Russisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, vol. I, Heidelberg 1953, p. 222; P. SKOK, *Etimologijski rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika*, ed. M. Deanović and L. Jonke, vol. III, Zagreb 1972, p. 606f.

¹⁹ G. OSTROGORSKY, *Geschichte des Byzantinischen Staates*, München 1952, pp. 321-322.

²⁰ J.-P. Migne (ed.), *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series graeca prior. Nicetae Choniatae opera omnia*, vol. I, Paris 1865, p. 720.

²¹ LAUR, pp. 11-12.

²² SKOK, *Etimologijski rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika*, vol. III, pp. 606-609; G. Labuda and Z. Stieber (eds.), *Słownik starożytności słowiańskich*, vol. VI, Wrocław 1977, p. 576. Thus, contrary to H. KUNSTMANN, *Woher die Russen ihren Namen*

3.1. *Nemci*

Leaving aside *Venēdici* ‘Venetians’²³ and *Fregovi* ‘Franks’ (cf. Middle Greek Φράγκος, Φράγγοι ‘Franks’),²⁴ the Laurentian codex does single

Haben, *Der Welt der Slaven* 31 (1986) 100-120, there is no commanding evidence for associating this term in East Slavic with the corresponding hydronym, *Volxovъ* (e. g., LAUR, p. 4) or *Volxov* (A. Nasonov (ed.), *Novgorodskaja pervaja letopis' staršego i mladšego izvodov* (hereafter *NOVG*), Moskva – Leningrad 1950, pp. 128, 160) which preserves the most archaic, non-pleophonic representation of the ancient *l*-diphthong as compared with ethnic designations of the type Old Rus'ian *vološьskyi* (LAUR, p. 4) or Modern Ukrainian *volos'kyi* ‘Italian’ with a pleophonic treatment of the underlying diphthong. The above hydronym was first explained by E. KUNIK, 13. *Anhang XIII*; 14. *Nachträge und Berichtigungen*; *Kunik's Aufsatz: Zur Literatur der Warangomachie (1859-März 1874. April 1874 bis Aug. 1875)*; 15. *Anhang IV*; 16. *Anhang V*; 17. *Chronologische Übersicht der Unternehmungen der Russen auf dem Kaspischen Meere*; 18. *Allgemeines Register*; 19. *Allgemeines Register zu den Kunik'schen Aufsätzen*, in: B. DORN, *Caspia. Über die Einfälle der alten Russen in Tabaristan (= Mémoires de l'Académie Impériale des sciences de St.-Petersbourg. VIII^e série, vol. XXIII/1), St.-Petersbourg 1875, pp. 243, 251, as a derivative from Finnish *Olhava*, although the absence of pleophony leads to another reconstruction, based upon the Baltic Finnic form **Ulhav* (STRUMIŃSKI, *Linguistic Interrelations in Early Rus'*, p. 256). The latter form is supported by some Middle Russian attestations like the 16th-century form *Влхонъ (Letopis' po Voskresenskomu spisku* (hereafter *RES*), in: *Polnoe sobranie russkix letopisej*, vol. 7, S.-Peterburg 1856, p. 261) with the usual Church Slavonic spelling of etymological *l*).*

²³ VASMER, *Russisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, vol. I, 1953, pp. 182, 222.

²⁴ G. Moravcsik (ed.) and R. J. H. Jenkins (transl.), *Constantine Porphyrogenitus, De Administrando Imperio* (hereafter *DAI*), new rev. ed., Washington 1967, 13:116, 119; V. VASILEVSKIJ, *Trudy*, vol. I, S.-Peterburg 1908, p. 319. The form *Fregovi* might have been borrowed both by the South and East Slavs, although, in strict correspondence with their phonetic systems, hence Old Church Slavonic *fręgvъ* ‘francus’ (KUNIK, *Die Berufung der schwedischen Rodsen*, pp. 9-10; VASMER, *Russisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, vol. III, 1958, p. 219), which is attested in the late 12th c. (P. J. ŠAFAŘÍK, *Slovanské starožitnosti: Oddíl dějepisný*, vol. II, Praha 1863, pp. 732-733), and East Slavic *fręgvъ* (A. I. SOBOLEVSKIJ, *Die slavischen Benennungen deutscher Volksstämme*, *Archiv für slavische Philologie* 36 (1911) 310) next to *Frugia* ‘Francia’ (LAUR, p. 2) which is evidently patterned on the literary (Slavonic) tradition. Most remarkable in this regard is an Old Church Slavonic translation of the well-known expression, οἱ ἐκ γένους τῶν Φράγγων καθίστανται, in the Chronicle of Georgios Hamartolos (Istrin (ed.), *Knigy vremennyja i obraznyja Georgija Mnixa*, vol. I, p. 567). Vasilij Istrin (ibid. vol. II, p. 289) surmised, and rightly so, that, in translating it as ‘[stemming] from the Varangians’, the annalist demonstrated his East Slavic origin, since only a Rus'ian from Kiev could know that the campaign against Constantinople had been actually waged by the Varangians (Rhōs). Albeit a true connoisseur of the Byzantine military system, the annalist might have confused two equations Φράγγοι : Βάραγγοι and Ρῶς : Βάραγγοι, while ultimately associating Φράγγοι with Ρῶς, inasmuch as they were both treated as the Varangians in the service of Byzantium. All in all, this interpretation of the Franks does not have any bearing on the identification of these people in the Primary Chronicle. Although both interpretatively and phonetically somewhat vague, an interesting parallel is encountered in the work (943/944) of al-Mas'ūdī who regarded a certain *malik al-'afragh* (الأفرغ) as a second king of the Slavs (Barbier de Meynard, Pavet de Courteille, and Pellat (eds.), *Mas'ūdī. Les prairies d'or*, vol. III, 1967, p. 64; Ch. Pellat (ed.), *Mas'ūdī (mort en*

out those peoples who were incorporated by that time into the Holy Roman Empire, and they are these: *Rimlęne* ‘Romans’, *Nemci* ‘Germans’, and *Korlęzi* ‘Carolingians’. The first term, *Rimlęne*, is semantically quite lucid. The name *korlęzi* comes apparently from **korlęgi*, which is borrowed from a German Latin form in *-ingen*²⁵ and paralleled in Middle German ethnic names in *-ing(er)*:²⁶ [Lothar] *rex Karelīngorum/Karlingorum* as found in the Chronicle of Thietmar of Merseburg,²⁷ or [Outho *princeps*] *Karlingorum* in the “Chronicon Wirziburgense”.²⁸

Of greater interest is the form *nemci*, which has been folk-etymologically associated with the “mute people”, mostly with the Germans, or western peoples on the whole since the mid-11th c.²⁹ Some records, however, written in particular in Byzantium in the 11th to 12th c., demonstrate remarkable variations in the treatment of this ethnic term. To adduce most telling examples, the ethnic identity of Νεμίτζοι in the history of Michael Attaleiates, at the end of the 11th c., appears rather obscure, inasmuch as he explains this word as designating ancient Sarmatians.³⁰ In her “Alexiad”, Anna Comnena identifies the people Νεμίτζοι with the Barbarians, more specifically with those enslaved by the Westerners.³¹

Remarkably, Arabic and Persian evidence can help ascertain the time of the appearance of the Slavic name *nemci* with more precision. Thus,

345/956). *Les prairies d'or. Traduction française de Barbier de Maynard et Pavet de Courteille*, vol. II, Paris 1962-1965, p. 342). Waging wars with the Byzantines, Franks, and *al-bazkard* (البزکرد), i. e., the Langobards or the Hungarians (F. WESTBERG, *Beiträge zur Klärung orientalischer Quellen über Osteuropa*, Mémoires de l'Académie Impériale des sciences de St.-Petersbourg. VIII^e série, vol. XI/4, 5 (1899) 276), this prince could scarcely be identified either with a chieftain of the Croates or some nomads, as was postulated by LELEWEL, *Géographie du moyen age*, p. 50, or the prince of *al-firagh* (Prague), a reading which was proposed by J. MARQUART [MARKWART], *Osteuropäische und ostasiatische Streifzüge: ethnologische und historisch-topographische Studien zur Geschichte des 9. und 10. Jahrhundert (ca. 840-940)*, Leipzig 1903, pp. 100, 102. One deals here most likely with a ruler of the Varangians who is known to have recurrently attacked Constantinople (D. MIŠIN, *Sakaliba. Slavjane v islamskom mire*, Moskva 2002, p. 71).

²⁵ P. KRETSCHMER, *Austria und Neustria*, Glotta 26 (1938) 211.

²⁶ A. BACH, *Die deutschen Personennamen*, vol. I, 2nd ed., Heidelberg 1952, pp. 256-257.

²⁷ R. Holzmann (ed.), *Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptores Rerum Germanicarum. Nova Series*, vol. IX: *Thietmari Merseburgensis Episcopi Chronicon*, Berlin 1935, pp. 106, 107; see KRUG, *Forschungen in der älteren Geschichte Russlands*, pp. 154-156.

²⁸ G. H. Pertz (ed.), *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* (hereafter *MGH*), vol. II, Hannoverae 1839, p. 243.

²⁹ N. P. BARSOV, *Očerki russkoj istoričeskoj geografii. Geografija načal'noj (ĭstorovoj) letopisi*, 2nd ed., Waršava 1885, p. 13.

³⁰ 'I. Δ. ΠΟΛΈΜΗΣ (ed.), *Μιχαήλ Ατταλειάτης Ιστορία*, Αθήνα 1997, pp. 262, 263.

³¹ D. R. Reinsch and A. Kambylis (eds.), *Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae. Series Berlinensis*, vol. XL/1: *Annae Comnenae Alexias*, Berolini 2001, II, 9, 4:28-29.

the earliest known Arabic attestation of this term is found in al-Mas'ūdī's "Murūj al-dhahab wa-ma'ān al-jawhar" (Venae auri et fodinae gemmarum),³² written in the years 332-345 of Hijrah (= A. D. 943/944-956/957).³³ This attestation is consequently reiterated in his later work "Kitāb al-tanbīh wa-al-ishrāf" (Liber commonitionis et recognitionis, ca. 946)³⁴ in a passage about some peoples living on the river *d.n.b.h.* (دنبه), which has been recently identified by Dmitrij MIŠIN as the Danube (Old Church Slavic *Dunavъ*).³⁵ While speaking about Slavic peoples صقالبة (*baqālibah*), al-Mas'ūdī mentioned, after the Dulebians (دولابة), a certain *genus* (جنس) under the name *nāmjīn* (نامجين), whose prince is called *Gharānd* (غراند), that is, Conrad.³⁶ Interestingly enough, among other Slavic peoples, the author cited also *ṣāṣīn* (صاصين)³⁷ as compared with *saksan* (سكسن) in Ibrāhīm bin Ya'qūb al-Isrā'īlī's account of the 10th c.³⁸ Expanding on M. CHARMOY's explanation, Friedrich Westberg associated the people *ṣāṣīn* with the Old Saxons,³⁹ as is evidenced in the "Sēfer Yōsippōn",⁴⁰ meanwhile the *nāmjīn* were placed in southern Germany, somewhere in Alemania and Bavaria.⁴¹ Interestingly enough, among Nordic peoples

³² Barbier de Meynard, Pavet de Courteille, and Pellat (eds.), *Mas'ūdī. Les prairies d'or*, vol. III, 1967, p. 63.

³³ M. CHARMOY, *Relation de Mas'oudy et d'autres auteurs musulmans sur les anciens slaves* (= Mémoires de l'Académie Impériale des sciences de Saint-Pétersbourg. VI^e série. Sciences politiques, histoire et philologie, 2), St.-Pétersbourg 1834, p. 300.

³⁴ M. J. de Goeje (ed.), *Kitāb at-tanbīh wa'l-ishrāf auctore al-Masūdī*, vol. 8, Lugduni Batavorum 1894, pp. 8, 67.

³⁵ MIŠIN, *Sakaliba*, p. 73.

³⁶ Barbier de Meynard, Pavet de Courteille, and Pellat (eds.), *Mas'ūdī. Les prairies d'or*, vol. III, 1967, p. 63; PELLAT, *Mas'ūdī (mort en 345/956). Les prairies d'or*, vol. II, p. 341.

³⁷ Barbier de Meynard, Pavet de Courteille, and Pellat (eds.), *Mas'ūdī. Les prairies d'or*, vol. III, 1967, p. 63.

³⁸ A. P. van Leeuwen and A. Ferre (eds.), *Abū Bakrī. Kitāb al-masālik wa-l-mamālik d'Abu Ubayd al-Bakrī*, Qartaj 1991, p. 331.

³⁹ CHARMOY, *Relation de Mas'oudy*, pp. 384-385; see WESTBERG, *Beiträge zur Klärung orientalischer Quellen*, p. 275; idem, *Ibrāhīm's-ibn-Ja'kūb's Reisebericht über die Slawenlande aus dem Jahre 965*, Mémoires de l'Académie Impériale des sciences de St.-Pétersbourg. VIII^e série, vol. III (4) (1898) 131. The main difference in Charmoy's explanation was based on another reading of the corresponding lexeme, بامجين, i. e. *bāmjīn*, as found in the Codex of Ohsson. CHARMOY, *Relation de Mas'oudy*, pp. 308, 383, 392, identified the latter form with the Greek Βοημοί 'the Bohemians'. More obvious, however, is the Ladino form בייוריא (*Baioria*) as encountered in Chapter I of the Book of Joseph ben Guriōn: "[...] Baioria, los que moran cerca el río de Reinus" (Lazar, ed., *Sēfer Ben Guriōn*, pp. 10, 11).

⁴⁰ Lazar (ed.), *Sēfer Ben Guriōn*, p. 10.

⁴¹ The latter distribution was conspicuously outlined already in the 10th c. by Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus in his "De ceremoniis aulae byzantinae": "[...] εις τῶν ῥήγα Σαζωνίας [i. e., ad regem Saxoniae], εις τῶν ῥήγα Βαϊούρη [i. e., ad

Ibn Ya‘qūb mentioned also another German tribe, called *t.d.shkūn* (طدشكون),⁴² or *tudishkiyyun*.⁴³ Friedrich WESTBERG⁴⁴ proposed to read the underlying form as *tudishki*, thus deriving it from *Theudisci* (Italian *Tedeschi*), which was originally applied by the Jews to refer to the Germans.⁴⁵

Al-Mas‘ūdī, who is believed never to have visited Central or Eastern Europe, could have borrowed the whole of his account about the Germano-Slavic region from an Andalusian source. The latter appears based on the data provided by a Slavic informant who could easily distinguish between the Slavs and Germans. The Andalusians, however, might have routinely identified them as all belonging to *ṣaḡālibah* who lived to the north of their world.⁴⁶ Although not numerous and orthographically deviating, these attestations, which are also paralleled in the Khazarian Hebrew tradition,⁴⁷ may testify to both direct and indirect contacts between the East Slavs and the Arabs as early as in the beginning of the 10th c. To put it more precisely, granted for the palatalized velar in the suffix **-ik(u) > -ькь*, the East Slavs might have construed the idea of the “mute people”, covered by the word-form *nemci*, already by the time of the third palatalization in Slavic, i. e., in the late 8th – early 9th c.⁴⁸

4. Defining Nordic People

Returning to the Nordic group, the most controversial name is, to be sure, *rusь*, which has thus far been considered in terms of the Anti-Normannist – Normannist debate on the role of the Varagians in the formation of the Old Rus’ian state. For our study, it would suffice to accept the non-Slavic origin of the term *rusь*,⁴⁹ as can be corroborated with the help of philological material.⁵⁰

regem Baiuri seu Baioariae vel Bavariae] (ἔστιν δὲ αὕτη ἡ χώρα οἱ λεγόμενοι Νεμίτζιοι) [i. e., est ea regio, quam vulgo nobis dicti Nemetzii, id est Germani vel Alemanni, incolunt] (J. J. Reiske (ed.), *Constantini Porphyrogeniti Imperatoris De Ceremoniis Aulae Byzantinae libri duo* (= Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae, vol. 1: Constantinus Porphyrogenitus), vol. 1, Bonnae 1829, II: 48; V. THOMSEN, *The Relations Between Ancient Russia and Scandinavia, and the Origin of the Russian State*, Oxford – London 1877, p. 116 footnote 1).

⁴² Leeuwen and Ferre (eds.), *Abū Bakrī*, p. 336.

⁴³ A. A. El-Hajji (ed.), *The Geography of al-Andalus and Europe. From the Book “Al-masalik wal-mamalik”* (hereafter *AL-BAKRĪ*), Beirut 1387/1968, p. 181.

⁴⁴ WESTBERG, *Beiträge zur Klärung orientalischer Quellen*, p. 303.

⁴⁵ MARQUART, *Osteuropäische und ostasiatische Streifzüge*, pp. 509-510; MIŠIN, *Sakaliba*, p. 48.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 64-65.

⁴⁷ LELEWEL, *Géographie du moyen âge*, pp. 18, 49-50.

⁴⁸ G. Y. SHEVELOV, *A Prehistory of Slavic*, Heidelberg 1964, p. 350.

⁴⁹ K.-O. FALK, *Einige Bemerkungen zum Namen Rusi*, in: R. Zeitler (ed.), *Les pays du Nord et Byzance (Scandinavie et Byzance)*. Actes du colloque nordique et

Among other ethnic designations, most clear are the name *Göte*, which was quite reasonably associated with the Gotlanders,⁵¹ and *Svei* as patterned on German Latin forms like *Suevi* (1053) in *Annalista Saxo*, or *suavi* (1057), which appears in the “*Chronicon Wirziburgense*”;⁵² a curious collective East Slavic form, *sveja* (sg. f.),⁵³ as a continuation of *Svei*, is found in the Commission Transcript of the Chronicle of Novgorod (1016-1471): *pridoša* (pret. pl.) *Sveja* (sg. f.) *Murmane* (pl. m.) (1446) ‘the Murman *Svei* came’.⁵⁴ It seems that both the German Latin and Old Rus’ian forms might have stemmed quite independently from one foreign source, i. e., Old Swedish *Svéar*, *Svíar*.⁵⁵

Since Vilhelm THOMSEN⁵⁶ the form *agnēne/ambglēne* has been ubiquitously derived from the Middle Greek Ἰγγλινοὶ ‘Englishmen’, and not from Anglo-Saxon *engle*, *-an*.⁵⁷ Yet, in light of Ptolemy’s Ἀγγεῖλοι and Prokop’s Ἀγγίλοι, as well as of *Anglii*, which was first introduced by Tacitus in his “*Germania*”,⁵⁸ I am inclined to posit not Middle Greek as a source of borrowing but a much shorter way of interference, viz., not from Byzantium but from the adjacent parts of Western Europe. Regular

international de byzantinologie tenu à Upsal 20-22 avril 1979, Uppsala 1981, pp. 147-159; G. SCHRAMM, *Die Herkunft des Namens Rus’: Kritik des Forschungsstandes*, *Forschungen zur osteuropäischen Geschichte* 30 (1982) 7-49.

⁵⁰ A. DANYLENKO, *The name RUS’. In search of a new dimension*, *Jahrbücher für Osteuropas Geschichte* (forthcoming in 2004).

⁵¹ KUNIK, *Die Berufung der schwedischen Rodsen*, p. 2.; *MGH*, vol. VI, 1844, p. 689.

⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 30.

⁵³ A. I. SOBOLEVSKIĬ, *Lekcii po istorii russkogo jazyka*, S.-Peterburg 1907, p. 218.

⁵⁴ *NOVG*, p. 426; R. Michell and F. Nevill (transl.), *The Chronicle of Novgorod (1016-1471)*, [s. l.] 1970, p. 203.

⁵⁵ VASMER, *Russisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, vol. II, 1955, p. 587.

⁵⁶ THOMSEN, *The Relations Between Ancient Russia and Scandinavia*, p. 110.

⁵⁷ VASMER, *Russisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, vol. III, 1958, p. 480.

⁵⁸ *Tacitus in five volumes*, vol. I, Cambridge, Mass. – London 1980, p. 196. The Venerable Bede (*Baedae opera historica with an English translation by J. E. King*, vol. I: *Ecclesiastical History of the English Nation*, Cambridge, Mass. – London 1979, pp. 69-74) stated in the early 8th c. in his “*Historia ecclesiastica*” that the *Angli(i)* dwelt in a land called Angeln (*Angulus*), somewhere between Flensburg and Schleswig. Although Ptolemy in his *Geography* located them between the Rhine and the Elbe (see A. ERDMANN, *Über die Heimat und den Namen der Angeln* (= *Skrifter utgifna af Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundet i Upsala*, 1), Upsala 1890, pp. 25-32, 71f, 101-118), the “*habitatores Angeli*” (ca. 754) (A. MELVINGER, *Les premières incursions des Vikings en Occident d’après les sources arabes*, Uppsala. 1955, pp. 88-89) are likely to have lived from the beginning on the coasts of the Baltic, probably in the southern part of the Jutish peninsula. This fact is well evidenced by English and Danish traditions (J. Hoops (ed.), *Realexikon der Germanischen Altertumskunde*, vol. I, Straßburg 1911-1913, p. 86), as well as supported by the author of the Jewish chronicle “*Sēfer Yōsippōn*” who claimed that *Englesi* (אינגליסי) used to live at the Great (Baltic?) Sea (Lazar, ed., *Sēfer Ben Guriōn*, p. 11; see LELEWEL, *Géographie du moyen age*, p. 13).

phonetic correspondences, in particular for the word-initial vowel,⁵⁹ confirm comparatively late borrowing of the German Latin *Angli(i)* into Old Rus'ian *anьglene*, with a metathesis word-initially in *agnene*. Chronologically, this borrowing scenario explains, why the Rus'ian chronicler did not mention the Danes (or their land), in his table of nations, since the corresponding passage was obviously composed at a time when England and Denmark, along with Norway and a part of Sweden, were incorporated into one realm under King Canute (Knud) the Great (1018-1035).⁶⁰

4.1. *Varezi/Varegy*

As early as 1877, Vilhelm THOMSEN⁶¹ assumed that the word *Varangian* or *Waring* (Swedish *väring*), derived from the Old Nordic *vár* (sg.), usually plural *várar* 'a pledge, troth', might have been applied to a new wave of the Northmen migrating during the Viking Age to Rus', along with a privileged group of the Scandinavians in Rus', *kylfingar*.⁶² Leaving aside some curious historiographic blueprints,⁶³ almost all major interpretations of the Old Nordic name *væringi* 'varangian' follow on the whole THOMSEN's line of reasoning.⁶⁴ The latter, in turn, was

⁵⁹ ERDMANN, *Über die Heimat und den Namen der Angeln*, pp. 117-118.

⁶⁰ POGODIN, *Der Bericht der russischen Chronik*, p. 207.

⁶¹ THOMSEN, *The Relations Between Ancient Russia and Scandinavia*, p. 111; idem, *Det Russiske riges grundlæggelse ved Nordbærne*, in: V. Thomsen, *Samlede afhandlinger*, vol. I, København 1919, p. 357.

⁶² F. MIKLOSICH, *Über die altrussischen Kolbjager*, *Archiv für slavische Philologie* 10 (1877) 2; G. SACKE, *Varjagъ und Kolbjagъ in der "Russkaja Pravda"*, *Zeitschrift für Slavische Philologie* 17 (1941) 284-291. It is noteworthy that both the name *varjagъ* (< *varjegъ*) and the form *kъlbjagъ* (< *kъlbeгъ*), which was first associated by P. A. MUNCH, *Det norske Folks Historie*, ser. I, vol. I, Christiania 1852, p. 487, with Old Nordic *kylfingar*, are found in parallel use in the earliest (short) copy of the "Lex Rossica" ("Russkaia Pravda"), issued by Jaroslav the Wise in Novgorod presumably before 1019. By that time, both the above names were deeply integrated into the Old Rus'ian language system. Suffice it to recall a pleophonic form *kolobegъ* (m. pl.), which is encountered in a private document written in the 12th c. on a birch bark (Chapter #222) (A. A. ZALIZNJAK, *Drevnenovgorodskij dialekt*, Moskva 1995, p. 367; cf. K. RABEK-ŠMIDT [RAHBK SCHMIDT], *Novoje o kolbjagax*, *Scando-Slavica* 17 (1971) 205-208). As for an unexpected preservation of *g* in *varjagъ* and *kъlbjagъ*, they may have been borrowed first in the Novgorod area, where the third palatalization was in general resisted (Shevelov, *A Prehistory of Slavic*, p. 350). Consequently, contrary to the East Slavic indigenous pleophonic group in *kolobegъ*, the word-final *g* in the above forms is not indicative at all; for cons, see G. SCHRAMM, *Altrußlands Anfang: historische Schlüsse aus Namen, Wörtern and Texten zum 9. und 10. Jahrhundert*, Freiburg im Breisgau 2002, p. 173.

⁶³ A. G. KUZ'MIN, *Ob etničeskoj prirode varjagov*, *Voprosy istorii* 11 (1974) 54-83.

⁶⁴ A. STENDER-PETERSEN, *Zur Bedeutungsgeschichte des Wortes vaeringi*, *Russ. var'ag*, *Acta Philologica Scandinavica. Tidsskrift for nordisk sprogforskning* 6 (1931-1932) 26-38; S. SÖDERLIND, *The realm of the Rus': a contribution to the prob-*

based on the extensive study by Ernst KUNIK⁶⁵ who was first to have brought together such, semantically and formally, similar forms as Old Nordic *væringi* (-ja, -jar)⁶⁶ and Langobardic *waregang* (ca. 643 and 851) alongside Italianised forms of the type *guaregang*, *garaging*,⁶⁷ Latinized Frankish German *wargeng* (ca. 803), *warganeus* (1069), and Old Anglo-Saxon *wær-genga* ‘the one who seeks protection, stranger’ which may primarily be applied to a person who enters ‘an agreement, pledge’.⁶⁸

As a consequence, the borrowing scenario of *varjag* and *kolbjag* from Old Swedish through the Slavic medium into the Middle Greek⁶⁹ is patterned on the legendary thesis about the “route from the Varangians to the Greeks”, thus revealing weak spots in the light of both relative chronology (see sections 4.1.1-4.1.1.1) and linguistic argumentation proper (see section 4.1.2). The most persuasive argument against this theory should be found, however, elsewhere, i. e., in Muslim sources (see section 4.1.3).

4.1.1. Relative chronology

Old Rus’ian accounts of *varjagi* dating back purportedly to the mid-9th c.⁷⁰ are wholly conjectural and could barely eclipse concurrent attestations of *væringjar* as found in the skaldic poetry, sagas, and some other

lem of the rise of the East-Slavic kingdom, in: S. P. Ureland and I. Clarkson (eds.), *Scandinavian Language Contacts*, Cambridge, New York 1984, pp. 133-170.

⁶⁵ KUNIK, *13. Anhang XIII*, pp. 249-250.

⁶⁶ See E. JONSSON, *Oldnordisk ordbog ved det kongelige nordiske oldskrift-selskab*, Kjöbenhavn 1863, p. 718.

⁶⁷ KUNIK, *13. Anhang XIII*, pp. 376-377, mentioned also an unusual word-form, *Guálani*, which is found under the year 1009 in the “Chronica monasterii Casinensis” composed by Leo Ostiensis in the second half of the 11th c. (*MGH*, vol. III, 1839, pp. 574-727). Apart from a sonant, *r*, as the corollary of dissimilation, an almost identical form, *Guárani*, is cited by Leo Ostiensis under the year 1041; the same form, *Guárani*, appears also in the contemporary “Regum Italiae et imperatorum catalogi” (*MGH*, vol. VII, 1844, p. 219). Both *Guálani* and *Guárani* were treated, and rightly so, by Ernst Kunik as derivatives from Middle Greek Βάρανγοι (cf. THOMSEN, *The Relations Between Ancient Russia and Scandinavia*, p. 116; MARQUART, *Osteuropäische und ostasiatische Streifzüge*, p. 345). What is remarkable in the first entry is that the form *Guálani* is used along with the names of other Scandinavian troops in the service of Byzantium who were sent to Apulia and Calabria: “Sed cum superbiam insolentiamque Grecorum qui non multo ante, a tempore scilicet primi Ottónis Apuliam sibi Calabriamque sociatis in auxilium suum Danis, Russis, et Guálanis vendicaverant [...]” (*MGH*, vol. III, 1839, p. 652).

⁶⁸ J. BOSWORTH, *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*, Oxford 1898, p. 1156; H. S. FALK and A. TORP, *Norwegisch-Dänisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, part 2, Heidelberg 1911, pp. 1403-1404.

⁶⁹ SCHRAMM, *Altruflands Anfang*, 2002, p. 175.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 173.

historical records about the Norse warriors in the service of Byzantium.⁷¹ According to the Primary Chronicle, the history of the Varangian Guard started around 980 when, allegedly upon request of the Byzantine Emperor, Prince Vladimir of Kiev dispatched a corps of 6,000 Varangians to Constantinople to defeat Bardas Phocas at the Battle of Chrysopolis.⁷² This chronology, albeit indirectly, is supported in Scandinavian sources. By way of illustration,⁷³ one can mention the Old Icelandic “Laxdæla saga”, which holds a certain Bolli Bollason to be the first Northman who spent in the service of the King of *Miklagarðr* (Constantinople) many years, before returning home ca. 1030.⁷⁴

Based on Old Rus’ian data, one can assume that the name of *væringjar* could have made its way into Old Rus’ian in the second half of the 10th c. This process was most likely facilitated by a supra-tribal use of the term *Rus’* which, by that time, might have already lost its original ethnic meaning, as evidenced in the entry under the year 839 in the “Annales Bertiani”.⁷⁵ It therefore stands to reason that a semantic extension of the term *væringjar* from the “oath-bound warrior” to its subsequent adaptation as a generic name in the Old Rus’ian vernacular was hardly indigenous. The above change was most likely brought about by the corresponding usage of the Middle Greek equivalent Βάρανγοι, which denoted the privileged imperial guard in Byzantium in the 10th to 11th c.⁷⁶

⁷¹ J. IHRE, *Glossarium Suiogothicum*, Upsalæ 1769, p. 1069; JONSSON, *Oldnordisk ordbog*, p. 718.

⁷² A. THULIN, *The Rus’ of Nestor’s Chronicle*, Mediaeval Scandinavia, vol. 13 (2000) 73-74.

⁷³ E. A. MEL’NIKOVA and V. Ia. PETRUXIN, *Skandinavij na Rusi i v Vizantii v X-XI vekax: k istorii nazvanija “varjag”*, Slavjanovedenie 2 (1994) 63-63.

⁷⁴ G. Cederschiöld, H. Gering, and E. Mogk (eds.), *Altnordische Saga-Bibliothek*, vol. 4: *Laxdæla Saga*, ed. K. Kålund, Halle 1896, 24: 3-6: “Hann var lítla hríð [Miklagarðr] zar, áðr hann kom sér í Væringjasetu; hófum vér ekki heyrt frásagnir, at neinn Norðmaðr hafi fyrr gengit á mála með Garðskonungi en Bolli Bollason”, that is, ‘He was there [in Constantinople] only a short time before he got himself into the Varangian Guard, and, from what we have heard, no Northman had ever gone to take war-pay from the Garth king before Bolli, Bolli’s son’ (M. Press (trans.), *The Laxdale Saga*, London; New York 1964, p. 255).

⁷⁵ *MGH*, vol. I, 1826, p. 434; J. SHEPARD, *The Rhos guests of Louis the Pious: whence and wherefore?* Early Medieval Europe 4/1 (1995) 41-60.

⁷⁶ According to “Haralds Saga harðráða”, before the arrival of Harald Sigurðarson harðráði (the King of Norway in 1046-1066) in Byzantium, there were in Constantinople many Northmen who were called Varangians by the Greeks: “Enn mikill fiolde var þar adr fyrir Nordmanna er þeir kalla Væringia” (*Flateyjarbok. En samling af norske konge-sagaer med indskudte mindre fortaellinger*, vol. 3: *Magnus Saga Hins Goda ok Haralds Harðrada*, Christiania 1868, p. 290). What is more substantial for our understanding of the status of *væringjar* both in Byzantium and Old Rus’ is that, after several years’ service in Constantinople, Harald harðráði found himself, in 1044 or thereabout, in Novgorod where his sweetheart Elizabeth (Ellisif), daughter of Jaroslav the Wise (1018-1054), lived

The earliest attestation of *væringjar* in its Middle Greek form, Βάραγγοι, first appears around 1034 in the work of the Byzantine historian Georgius Cedrenus.⁷⁷ A few examples are also found in seven imperial chrysobulls of the late 11th c., which, more often than not, contain a formula exempting monasteries from billeting foreign military contingents. Thus, the edict of 1060 issued by the Emperor Constantine X Ducas (1059-1067) comprises a limited list of foreigners: “λογαριακ(ῆς) εἰσπράξεως Βαράγγων, Ῥῦς ἢ Σαρακηνῶν, ἢ Φράγγων”, that is, Varangians-Rus’, Saracens, and Franks.⁷⁸ In 1073, to use Aleksander Kazhdan’s own words,⁷⁹ the “enigmatic” Κούλπιγγοι (*kolbjagi* of the “Lex Rossica”) is added. In the chrysobull issued in 1074 in the name of Michael Attaliota by the Emperor Michael VII Parapinaces (1071-1078) and later, in 1079, confirmed by his successor, Nicephorus III Botaneiates (1078-1081), the formula includes already “ἔτι τὲ Ῥῦς, Φαράγγ(ων), Κουλπίγγ(ων), Φράγγ(ων), Βουλγάρ(ων), Σαρακην(ῶν)”, i. e., Rus’, Varangians, Koulpingoi, Franks, Bulgarians, and Saracens.⁸⁰ In the chrysobull, issued in 1082 by the Emperor Alexius I Comnenus (1081-1118), the formula includes, in addition to Rus’, Varangians, Koulpingoi, also the names of English (ἡ Ἰγγλίνων), and Germans (ἡ Νεμιτζῶν).⁸¹ In 1086, another chrysobull of this Emperor cites a regular list of foreign

(KRUG, *Forschungen in der älteren Geschichte Russlands*, p. 230; A. STENDER-PETERSEN, *Varangica*, Aarhus 1953, p. 253; O. PRITSAK, *The Origin of Rus’*, vol. 1: *Old Scandinavian Sources other than the Sagas*, Cambridge 1981, pp. 287-290). Haralds harðráði and his Norwegian warriors’ loyalty and military qualities were highly esteemed by his patron, the Emperor Michael V. Harald harðráði, who appears in “Strategicon”, written by Kekaumenos in the second half of the 11th c., as “Ἀράλης Βασιλέως μὲν Βαραγγίας ἦν υἱός” (B. Wassiliewsky [V. G. Vasilevskij] and V. Jernstedt (eds.), *Cecaumeni Strategicon et incerti scriptoris de officiis regis libellus*, Amsterdam 1965, p. 97), i. e., ‘Arantes, a son of the King of Varangians’, was raised, after successful military campaigns, first to the rank of μαγγλαβίτης (Guardsmen), and later to the rank of σπαθαροκανδιδάτης, or an imperial officer with the right to carry a sword and wear a white robe (H.-G. Beck (ed. and trans.), *Vademecum des byzantinischen Aristokraten*, Graz – Wien – Köln 1956, pp. 140-141). It goes without saying that his brilliant career and the military qualities of his companions, *væringjar*, resulted in his new position with the Rus’ian Prince Jaroslav the Wise who appointed him leader of his Viking retinue.

⁷⁷ I. Bekker (ed.), *Georgius Cedrenus [et] Ioannes Scylitzae ope*, vol. 2, Bonnae 1839, p. 508; see KUNIK, *13. Anhang XIII*, p. 250.

⁷⁸ P. LEMERLE, A. GUILLOU, and N. SVORONOS, *Actes de Lavra. Texte*, part 1: *Des origines à 1204*, Paris 1970, p. 198; see KUNIK, *13. Anhang XIII*, p. 378.

⁷⁹ A. KAZHDAN, *Latins and Franks in Byzantium: Perception and Reality from the Eleventh to the Twelfth Century*, in: A. E. Laiou and R. P. Mottahedeh (eds.), *The Crusades from the Perspective of Byzantium and the Muslim World*, Washington, D. C. 2001, p. 91.

⁸⁰ F. Miklosich and Io. Müller (eds.), *Acta et diplomata monasteriorum et ecclesiarum orientis*, vol. II, Vindobonae 1887, pp. 137, 143; LEMERLE, GUILLOU, and SVORONOS, *Actes de Lavra*, p. 218; MIKLOSICH, *Über die altrussischen Kolbjager*, p. 4.

⁸¹ LEMERLE, GUILLOU, and SVORONOS, *Actes de Lavra*, p. 243.

soldiers.⁸² A similar clichéd formula, albeit with a slightly different spelling, reappears in the chrysobull of 1088, with the supplement of two new groups – Alans (Ἀλανῶν) and Abasgians (Ἀβασγῶν),⁸³ most probably Georgian in general.⁸⁴

4.1.1.1. The tripartite nomenclature: Ῥῶς, Βάραγγοι, ἢ Κούλπυγοι

Most telling is a tripartite enumeration of Scandinavian mercenaries as reflected in the above-mentioned exemption formula, Ῥῶς, Βάραγγοι, ἢ Κούλπυγοι. However, a particular sequence of two designations, either Ῥῶς-Βάραγγοι or Βάραγγοι-Ῥῶς,⁸⁵ could hardly be identified as synonyma ethnica.⁸⁶ In 1875, Ernst KUNIK assumed that the name Βάραγγοι in the above semi-compound nominations was most likely applied not so much to the ethnic as to the military characteristics of the Old Nordic warriors in Byzantine service who were in the mid-11th c. more or less independent, while obtaining not only high titles but also territories.⁸⁷

Remarkable in this regard is another hypothesis of Ernst KUNIK⁸⁸ who, with a view to determining the place of *varjagi/varêzi* among other (Nordic) peoples in the Old Rus'ian cosmography, juxtaposed “Ῥῶς, Βάραγγοι, ἢ Κούλπυγοι” with another tripartite ethnic nomenclature, *Dani, Russi et Guálani*, which, as already mentioned, was offered in the 11th c. by Leo Ostiensis in his “Chronica monasterii Casinensis”.⁸⁹ The latter nomenclature agrees tangibly with another set of ethnic names as reflected in the “Lex Rossica”, that is, *Rusinъ* (article 2), *varęęъ* and *kolbęęъ* (article 10),⁹⁰ hence a tripartite equation of *Rhōs*, *Barrangoi*, *Koulpingoι* with *Russi*, *Guálani*, *Dani* and *Rusinъ*, *varęęъ*, *kolbęęъ*.⁹¹

⁸² Ibid., p. 258.

⁸³ K. E. Zachariä von Lingenthal (ed.), *Jus graeco-romanum*, parts III, Lipsae 1857, p. 373; MIKLOSICH, *Über die altrussischen Kolbjager*, p. 5.

⁸⁴ KAZHDAN, *Latins and Franks in Byzantium*, p. 91.

⁸⁵ Most indicative for this study is a similar East Slavic compound nomination which is found under the year 6452/944 in the Laurentian redaction of the Primary Chronicle, *Varęęi Rusъ* ‘Varangians-Rus’ (*LAUR*, p. 45.). Remarkably, later codices use the preposition *i* ‘and’ to represent them as separate peoples/tribes, i. e., *Varęęi i Rusъ* ‘Varangians and the Rus’ (*HYP*, p. 34).

⁸⁶ VASILEVSKIJ, *Trudy*, vol. I, p. 348f; D. OBOLENSKY, *The Byzantine sources on the Scandinavians in Eastern Europe*, in: *Varangian Problems* (= *Scando-Slavica*. Supplement. 1), Copenhagen 1970, p. 162.

⁸⁷ KUNIK, *13. Anhang XIII*, p. 372; KAZHDAN, *Latins and Franks in Byzantium*, p. 99.

⁸⁸ Ibid., p. 379.

⁸⁹ *MGH*, vol. III, 1839, p. 652.

⁹⁰ A. A. Zimin (ed.), *Pravda russkaja*, Moskva 1999, pp. 358-359.

⁹¹ Such an equation is likely to preclude any attempt to locate the most “enigmatic” people *kolbjagi* outside the Scandinavian ethnic area proper. While reiterating the etymology of B. BRIEM, *Kylfingar*. *Acta Philologica Scandinavica*. Tidsskrift for nordisk sprogforskning 4 (1929-1930) 45f, who, premised on the

For the purpose of this study, I will omit the term *Rhōs/Russi/ Rus'*,⁹² already used in the 11th c. as a supra-tribal name of the East Slavs.⁹³ There is also broad agreement that *Varjagi/Barrangoi/Guálani*, originally applied to Scandinavian mercenaries in the service of Byzantium, was subsequently reduced to designate Scandinavian, mostly Swedish oath-bound warriors in Old Rus'. One is left with the still “enigmatic” word-form *kolbjagi* (resp. *Koulpingo* and *Dani*), commonly etymologized as “members of the merchant guild”,⁹⁴ influential in the Old Novgorod area. While related to *Garðariki*, viz., ‘The Realm of Strongholds’, the corresponding place name *Kylfingaland* (< *kylfingar*)⁹⁵ is represented in Japhet’s progeny and in the Old Icelandic “Landafraedi” of Nikulás Bergsson (d. 1159).⁹⁶

4.1.2. Linguistic arguments

In order to trace the original distinction between *varjagi* and *kolbjagi*, which commonly appeared in tandem in the imperial chrysobulla and in the “Lex Rossica” in the 11th c., Gottfried Schramm posited the beginning of contacts between Old Northmen and Byzantines somewhere before 850. Apart from the entry under the year 839 in the “Annales Bertiani”, this student⁹⁷ paid special attention to the year 867 when the first Scandinavian merchants, presumably *kylfingar*, might have been identified by the patriarch of Constantinople Photius

Egils saga (1160-1200), associated *kylfingar* with the Vodians, STRUMIŃSKI, *Linguistic Interrelations in Early Rus'*, p. 234, added also another people, the Vepsians. According to him, then Vepsians along with the Vodians, might be identified with the *kylfingar*. This etymology, which was incidentally labeled by P. JOHANSEN, *Kylfingar*, in: *Kulturhistorisk leksikon for nordisk middelalder fra vikingetid til reformationstid*, vol. 9, ed. A. Karker, København 1964, p. 603, “fantastic”, fails to explain how the Vodians and Vepsians found their way to the “cohort of the Scandinavian peoples”, as enumerated in the above equation.

⁹² For a new interpretation of this term in a wider, both linguistic and cultural, context, see DANYLENKO, *The name RUS'*.

⁹³ SCHRAMM, *Altrußlands Anfang*, 2002, p. 156.

⁹⁴ MIKLOSICH, *Über die altrussischen Kolbjager*, pp. 2-3; STENDER-PETERSEN, *Zur Bedeutungsgeschichte des Wortes vaeringi*; SCHRAMM, *Altrußlands Anfang*, 2002, pp. 174-176.

⁹⁵ MUNCH, *Det norske Folks Historie*, p. 487 footnote 2.

⁹⁶ “[...] Kylfingaland, þat kollum ver Garða-riki” (K. Kålund (ed.), *Alfraedi islenzk. I. Cod. Mbr. Am. 194, 8vo*. København 1908, p. 8), that is, ‘Kylfingorum terra, a nobis appellata Gardarikia’. A similar passage appears in a later geographical work, “Heimslýsing” (ca. 1200), which along with the above “Landafraedi”, is heavily based on the “Etymologiae” of Isidorus Hispalensis (ca. 560-636): “[...] Kylfinga lande þat kollum ver Garða riki” (E. Jónsson and J. Finnur (eds.), *Hauksbók*, København 1892-1896, p. 165; JOHANSEN, *Kylfingar*, p. 603), that is, ‘Kylfingorum terra, quam vocamus Gardarikiam’.

⁹⁷ SCHRAMM, *Altrußlands Anfang*, 2002, p. 168-169, 246.

(d. 891) in his “Encyclica ad sedes orientales” as [τῆ̃ κολούμενον] ‘Pōς,⁹⁸ while *varjagi* arrived in Byzantium as ‘mercenaries’ by the end of the 10th c. All this purportedly testifies to the borrowing of the above two terms from Old Nordic via Slavic into Middle Greek. To follow Schramm’s line of reasoning, Βάραγγοι was most likely borrowed from East Slavic *varjagi* with a broad *a* [’ä] as a result of the denasalization of *ê* which, in its turn, came allegedly from the group *in* either in *varingjar* with the younger umlaut before a preserved *i* (cf. Swedish *kärling* ‘old woman’ next to *karl* ‘man’), or **varingjar* with the lack of the old *i*-umlaut.⁹⁹

The above synopsis, however, may easily slide off the rails if challenged from the point of view of historical phonetics. If the arrival of *kolbjagi* (< *kylfingar*) in Byzantium preceded the borrowing of *varjagi* (< *varingjar*) almost by a century, Gottfried Schramm’s argumentation¹⁰⁰ lacks any room for consideration of a similar rendition of the Early Old East Slavic *ę* in both lexemes. It would be interesting to cite here Τζερνιγῶγαν (ac.),¹⁰¹ which is one of the earliest known attestations of the denasalization of the East Slavic nasals in the “De administrando imperio” (948-952) of Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus. Since the denasalization of the nasal vowels in different East Slavic dialects could have occurred at different time,¹⁰² two forms in Constantine Porphyrogenitus appear most representative in this respect, i. e., Σφενδοσθλάβος and Λενζανῆνοι.¹⁰³ The first one, i. e., the name of the prince of Novgorod, **Svetoslavъ*, reproduces the sound *ę*, which could be pronounced as a nasal vowel either by speakers of the Old Novgorod (North Kriviči?) dialect, or by a Bulgaro-Macedonian interpreter.¹⁰⁴ Unfortunately, Islamic renditions of this name of the type of Arabic سويت “Sviit” or سوتيلك “Sviatblkъ”,¹⁰⁵ Persian سويت, سونت “Svent” or سويتاو “Sviatau”¹⁰⁶ are not informative in our case at all, since they refer to the Prince of Great

⁹⁸ V. Laourdas and L. Gerrit Westerink (eds), *Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana*, vol. 1: *Photii Patriarchae Constantinopolitani Epistulae et Amphilochia*, Leipzig 1983, p. 50.

⁹⁹ E. WESSÉN, *Svenska sprlkhistoria. 1. Ljudlära och ordböjningslära*, 2nd ed., Stockholm 1945, pp. 8-10; STRUMIŃSKI, *Linguistic Interrelations in Early Rus’*, pp. 36, 38.

¹⁰⁰ STRUMIŃSKI, *Linguistic Interrelations in Early Rus’*, p. 48.

¹⁰¹ *DAI*, 9:6.

¹⁰² ZALIZNJAK, *Drevnenovgorodskij dialekt*, pp. 34, 46.

¹⁰³ *DAI*, 9:4, 10.

¹⁰⁴ A. DANYLENKO, *The Names of the Dnieper rapids in Constantine Pophyrogenitus revisited*, *Die Welt der Slaven* 46 (2001) 53-54.

¹⁰⁵ D. A. XVOL’SON, *Izvestiia o khozarakh, burtasakh, bolgarakh, madiarakh, slavianakh i russakh Abu-Ali Akhmeda ben Omar Ibn-Dasta*, S.-Peterburg 1869, p. 139.

¹⁰⁶ J. de HAMMER, *Sur les origine russes. Extraits de manuscrits orientaux*, St.-Petersbourg 1827, pp. 48, 65, 71, 124, 130.

Moravia (870-894)¹⁰⁷ or some other non-East Slavic ruler(s).¹⁰⁸ The second appellative is the Poles' self-designation *ledeninъ* from **ledjane*, which might have been recorded from a speaker either from South (Galicia-Podolia) or North Ukrainian (Kiev-Polissia) dialectal group with the specific treatment of *ɛ* in unstressed syllables. George Y. Shevelov cites another lexeme, *Ζαμβατάς*, as a reliable example with a nasal not omitted.¹⁰⁹ To follow this argument, one should add the Arabic form *Zānbat* (زانبت) which is attested in the so-called "Anonymous account about the Nordic Peoples" compiled presumably in 889-890.¹¹⁰ Joseph MARQUART¹¹¹ identified the above place name with the Greek form *Ζαμβατάς*. Persuasive though this piece of evidence may appear, it would be reasonable to disregard this lexeme in view of vague etymologies advanced thus far (almost 30!); see the most recent interpretation which posits Swedish *sambåd* as an underlying form to designate a "gathering point for the levy".¹¹²

Although dating back to the same period when the above Byzantine examples were attested, the Middle Greek form *Βάραγγοι* shows a deviating transliteration pattern, especially if compared with the main bulk of Slavic toponyms adapted on Greek soil at that time and later. To adduce some most contrasting renditions of the nasal Slavic *ɛ* or its denasalized reflex, one can cite *Λενρίνη* along a secondary form *Λιανρίνη* from **Ľedina*, *Πιανρίνα* from **Pędina*, *Πενρίνα* from **Rędina* as recorded in Kantakuzenos and in a Charter of the 14th c.¹¹³ Most important in these examples is that one and the same phonemic correspondence is applied both to the nasal vowel and its eventual denasalized reflex, i. e., Slavic *ɛ/ä* : Greek *εν*.¹¹⁴

¹⁰⁷ MARQUART, *Osteuropäische und ostasiatische Streifzüge*, p. 470.

¹⁰⁸ CHARMOY, *Relation de Mas'oudy*, p. 395.

¹⁰⁹ SHEVELOV, *A Prehistory of Slavic*, p. 138.

¹¹⁰ MIŠIN, *Sakaliba*, p. 51.

¹¹¹ MARQUART, *Osteuropäische und ostasiatische Streifzüge*, pp. XXXIV, 189.

¹¹² E. MELIN, "Sambatás" and city names in Ch. IX of Constantine Porphyrogenitus' "De administrando imperio", *Die Welt der Slaven* 48 (2003) 187.

¹¹³ M. VASMER, *Die Slaven in Griechenland* (= *Abhandlungen der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Jahrgang 1941. Phil.-hist. Klasse, 12), Berlin 1941, p. 275.

¹¹⁴ This correspondence is considerably simplified, inasmuch as no attention whatever has been paid to the peculiarities of the pronunciation of vowels either in stressed or unstressed syllables. Even if we took all this into account, we should only obtain a more complex table, with the final conclusion not changed. On the other hand, it is worth mentioning another Slavic sound, i. e., the back jer, which is treated by SCHRAMM, *Altrußlands Anfang*, 2002, p. 168, as irrelevant for the etymology of the word *kolbjagi* with *o* from *ъ* in the strong position. By the time of the alleged borrowing of this lexeme, the jer could scarcely have yielded *o*, since the jers in both *CъSC-* and *CъSC-* sequences followed the general development of East Slavic strong jers which changed into full-fledged *o* and

Vis-à-vis the above linguistic arguments, one is strongly tempted to refute the derivation of the form Βάραγγοι directly from the East Slavic *varjagi*. The palliative explanation, based on the historical data as discussed above, is that both the Greek form Βάραγγοι and the East Slavic *varjagi* are independent corollaries of the adaptation of the underlying Old Nordic form by speakers of two different linguistic systems. Yet the above parallel adaptation does not disregard a possible linguistic interplay between these terms, especially if one recalls that both of them were directly attested in the 11th c. It stands therefore to adhere to Gunnar Jacobsson¹¹⁵ who claimed that the form in *-ang-* should be regarded as primary, whereas the form *væring-* as a subsequent reshaping of the form like **varang-*, a process which was triggered by the suffix *-ing*. Imaginary as this view may appear, the form **varang-* is the only one which can explain consistency in the Byzantine rendition of the Old Nordic name **varang-/væring-*, since the borrowing from the East Slavic *varjagi*, which is also paralleled in a rare and quite representative *Varigi*,¹¹⁶ seems much less probable due to difficulties in elucidating some deviating transliterations of the Slavic nasal reflexes in Middle Greek texts.

4.1.3. The Arabic *Warank* (وارنك).

Of utmost importance for substantiating the above hypothesis are the corresponding attestations of the Varangians which appear in Muslim sources relatively late for the Islamic descriptive school of geography, that is, only in the first half of the 11th c. It is generally accepted,¹¹⁷ although ostensibly beyond the Islamic geographical context,¹¹⁸ that Bīrūni (973-1048) is the earliest known author mentioning in his

e respectively by the mid-12th c. for Old Ukrainian and Old Novgorodian dialects (SHEVELOV, *A Prehistory of Slavic*, pp. 482-483; ZALIZNJAK, *Drevnenovgorodskij dialekt*, pp. 52-53). In other words, had the Greeks really borrowed this word directly from the East Slavs, the corresponding rendition would not necessarily be a form like Κούλπιγγοι. While emphasizing possible dialectal and phonemic differences in the rendition of jers in Middle Greek dialects, VASMER, *Die Slaven in Griechenland*, pp. 280-281, cited some interesting examples reflecting both jers and their reflexes, e. g., Μυρόκοβον : **Mir̥kovo* along Κουβέλτσι : **K̥b̥yl(̥)ci*, with the *̥* changed already into *o*, as well as such old renditions as Τσερκούβιανα : **C̥rk̥v̥jane* and Τσερκοβίστα : **C̥rk̥v̥išče*. This said, the chronology of the borrowing of *kolbjagi* as suggested by Gottfried Schramm warrants obviously a thorough revision.

¹¹⁵ G. JAKOBSSON, *La forme originelle du nom des varègues*, *Scando-Slavica* 1 (1954) 36-43.

¹¹⁶ LAUR, p. 8.

¹¹⁷ Ch. M. FRÄHN, *Ibn-Fozlan's und anderer Araber Berichte über die Russen älterer Zeit*, St. Petersburg 1823, p. 177f; LELEWEL, *Géographie du moyen age*, p. 15; KUNIK, *13. Anhang XIII*, p. 250; STRUMIŃSKI, *Linguistic Interrelations in Early Rus'*, p. 231.

¹¹⁸ THULIN, *The Rus' of Nestor's Chronicle*, p. 74.

“Kitāb al-taffhīm” (Liber de elementis astronomicae artis, ca. 1030) “the Varangian Sea” (*baḥr warank*, بحر ورنك), and the people living on its coast.¹¹⁹ Vladimir MINORSKY¹²⁰ was obviously beforehand in stating that Bīrūnī must have found this information in a certain literary source written before him. This idea, however, was much earlier expressed by Joseph MARKWART¹²¹ who assumed that not only Bīrūnī, but also another Persian author, Muḍammad al-‘Aufī, an author of a collection of anecdotes (1228), derived their data from the same source of information. The latter could have allegedly been a legendary (extinct) geographical work of Abū-‘Abdillāh Muḍammad ibn-Aḍmad Jayhānī, a wazīr in the court of the Sāmānid Naṣr II (914-943).¹²² Yet, this hypothesis seems less convincing, inasmuch as Jayhānī, in his turn, is likely to have based his descriptive work on the renowned geography of Ibn Khurdādhbeh (9th c.), who was born to a Persian family as well. Otherwise, it is difficult to explain why similar attestations are, in fact, found only in few works written by Bīrūnī’s successors. Thus, in the seventh climate of his “Athār al-bilād wa-akhbār al-‘ibād” (Monumenta regionum et notitiae virorum), al-Qazwīnī (1203/1204-1283) placed *baḥr warank* in “the farthest North”.¹²³ Another author, al-Dimashqī (1256-1327), called the people *warank* “the most true *ṣaqālibah*” (وهم [ورنك] صقلب الصقالبة).¹²⁴ According to him, these people were the inhabitants of the Rus’, up to its farthest limits, i. e., up to the Ladoga, after which one would encounter the “sea of the *warank* and *ṣaqālibah*” (بحر ورنك و الصقالبة).¹²⁵

It is noteworthy that another renowned geographer, Abū al-Fidā’ (1273-1331), derived his account about the Varangian sea and its people from Bīrūnī’s work.¹²⁶ He cited also liberally from the “Memoir

¹¹⁹ F. Wüstenfeld (ed.), *Jacut’s geographisches Wörterbuch* (hereafter *JACUT*), vol. I. Leipzig 1866, pp. 20, 34.

¹²⁰ V. Minorsky (ed. and transl.), *Hudūd al-‘Ālam. ‘The Regions of the World’. A Persian Geography. 372 A. H. – 982 A. D.* (hereafter *Hudūd al-‘Ālam*), London 1937, p. 422.

¹²¹ J. MARKWART [MARQUART], *Ein arabischer Bericht über die arktischen (uralischen) Länder aus dem 10. Jahrhundert*, Ungarische Jahrbücher 24 (1924) 302, 303.

¹²² V. V. BARTHOLD [BARTOLD], *Preface*, in: *Hudūd al-‘Ālam*, pp. 3-44.

¹²³ AL-QAZWĪNĪ, *Athār al-bilād wa-akhbār al-‘ibād*, Bairūt 1984, p. 617; G. JAKOB, *Arabische Berichte von Gesandten an germanische Fürstenhöfe aus dem 9. und 10. Jahrhundert*, Berlin – Leipzig 1927, p. 23; H. BIRKELAND, *Nordens historie i middelalderen etter arabiske kilder* (= Skrifter utgitt av Det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo II. Hist.-Filos. Klasse, 2), Oslo 1954, p. 103.

¹²⁴ A. F. 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, p. 133, see also pp. 22, 23, 146; A. ZEKI VALIDI-BONN [TOGAN], *Die Norvölker bei Bīrūnī*, Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft 90 (1936) 48; CHARMOY, *Relation de Mas’oudy*, pp. 354, 375.

¹²⁵ MIŠIN, *Sakaliba*, p. 98.

¹²⁶ J. T. Reinaud and Mac Guckin de Slane (eds.), *Géographie d’Aboulféda*, vol.

[Tadhkirah] on Astronomy”, completed in 1261 by a noted Persian astronomer and mathematician, Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī (1201-1274). Premised mostly on Bīrūnī’s tradition, the latter posited the longitude and latitude of the “Sea of *Warank* in the northern region” as “well-established”.¹²⁷ The Varangian sea and people are also mentioned by Sharīf al-Jurjānī (1339-1413),¹²⁸ a Persian philosophy and theologian, who wrote one of the fourteen most popular commentaries on Naṣīr al-Dīn’s “Tadhkirah”.¹²⁹

Comparatively late Muslim attestations of *baōr warank* and people living on its coast, can rationalize the idea of the Ptolemaic Maeotis (the Azov sea), which appears as a connecting link between the Black and the Baltic seas, spheres of the interests of Old Scandinavians as reflected in an anonymous Persian geography “Ḥudūd al-Ālam” of 982.¹³⁰ In fact, like a gulf of Pontos (بنطس), which is, according to al-Mas‘ūdī,¹³¹ the Rūs Sea (بحر الروس), since no one else navigates it, the real Maeotis, treated by al-Mas‘ūdī also as the Rus’ian sea,¹³² was associated by the Muslims primarily with the Northmen called sometimes *Warank*. It is no wonder therefore that on a Syriac map compiled towards 1150 the Azov sea bears the name of the *Warank* Sea.¹³³

The *Warank* people belonged originally to the farthest North, thus sporadically appearing in some Muslim records alongside Balto-Fennic peoples. Bīrūnī mentioned the people of *Warank* in the seventh climate next to the *Īsū* (*Wīsū* in Ibn Fadhlān’s account)¹³⁴ and *Jūrah*, i. e., *بيورة* و

[I]: *Texte Arabe*, Paris 1840, p. 35; J. T. Reinaud (transl.), vol. II: *Traduction*, 1848, p. 42. It should be noted that some codices of Abū al-Fidā’s Geography contain a slightly different spelling of the *Warank* name, i. e., *وزنك* (*Wazank*) in place of commonly attested *ورنك*. FRÄHN, *Ibn-Foszlān’s und anderer Araber Berichte*, pp. 179-181, concluded quite reasonably that a later scribe, by a mere negligence, could have mistakenly taken a *rā’* (ر) for a *zāy* (ز) which in the Kufi script are almost identical.

¹²⁷ F. J. Ragep (ed.), *Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī’s Memoir on Astronomy (al-Tadhkira fī ‘ilm al-hay’a)*, New York 1993, vol. I, pp. 248-249, vol. II, p. 466.

¹²⁸ CHARMOY, *Relation de Mas‘oudy*, p. 356.

¹²⁹ FRÄHN, *Ibn-Foszlān’s und anderer Araber Berichte*, pp. 185-186; Ragep (ed.), *Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī’s Memoir on Astronomy*, pp. 58-64.

¹³⁰ *Ḥudūd al-Ālam*, p. 181f.

¹³¹ Barbier de Meynard, Pavet de Courteille, and Pellat (eds.), *Mas‘ūdī. Les prairies d’or*, vol. I, 1966, pp. 364-365; vol. II, 1966, p. 15.

¹³² *Ibid.*, pp. 24-25; cf. CHARMOY, *Relation de Mas‘oudy*, p. 325.

¹³³ *Ḥudūd al-Ālam*, pp. 181-182.

¹³⁴ A. Zeki Validi[-Bonn] Togan (ed.), *Ibn Fadhlān’s Reisebericht* (= *Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 24/3), Leipzig 1939, p. 26. FRÄHN, *Ibn-Foszlān’s und anderer Araber Berichte*, p. 218f, was first to derive the *Īsū/Wīsū* from the Old Rus’ian name of the Baltic Finnic people of *Ves̆*. An alternative interpretation, based chiefly on the depiction of these people’s habitat in Ibn Fadhlān’s account, was proposed *en passant* by WESTBERG, *Beiträge zur Klärung orientalischer Quellen*, pp. 222-223, who identified the *Īsū/Wīsū* with the Samoyeds (Nenets). This the-

ايسو و ورتك.¹³⁵ Although with some orthographic deviations, the same ethnic grouping is cited by al-Dimashqī and al-Qazwīnī, who both placed the people *Jūrah* in the vicinity of the Sea of the Darkness (الظلمات بحر).¹³⁶

This said, one could scarcely endorse the view of A. ZEKI VALIDI-BONN [TOGAN] who claimed that, in accordance with Bīrūnī's tradition, the *Warank*, as one of the people *ṣaqālibah*,¹³⁷ should be looked for in the Scandinavian Peninsula, i. e., in the territory of modern Norway, while the Rus' could have come from Sweden. Leaving aside the name of the Rus', used in fact as a generic ethnonym, this assumption seems to be outdated and in conflict with the equation of Kunik as discussed in section 4.1.1.1. If the equation holds true, one could not but legitimately presume that Denmark was most likely the point of the colonizing (trading) exodus of *Kolbjagi/Koulpingoī* 'Dani', while both the *Rus'/Rhōs* 'Russi' and *Varjagi/Barrangoī* originated from the Old Swedish territories,¹³⁸ which is obviously supported by the vocalic pattern in the Arabic (and Persian) *Warank*. This equation,¹³⁹ however, disregards another North

ory has been recently reiterated, although without any reference to the latter author, by STRUMIŃSKI, *Linguistic Interrelations in Early Rus'*, pp. 261-265, who advanced another reading of this word, i. e., *Wīswā* which might reflect the Zyrian name **Visva* of the Dvina delta. Although early Islamic geographical accounts prove to be largely vague and confused, this interpretation may be taken for granted, especially if one recalls the corresponding entry under the year 1095 in the Primary Chronicle (LAUR, p. 85), according to which *Jugra* along with *Samojad̄* dwelled in "the northern lands". The latter passage is conspicuously paralleled in the Arabic works based on Bīrūnī's *Vorlage*. In this regard, one should also mention that the names of *Isū* and *Jūrah*, although without the third ethnonym, *Warank*, are also found in the Iranian text of al-'Aufī (MARKWART, *Ein arabischer Bericht*, p. 274) who closely followed his predecessors.

¹³⁵ JACUT, vol. I, p. 34; Zeki Validi-Bonn [Togan], *Die Norvölker bei Bīrūnī*, pp. 39, 60.

¹³⁶ MEHREN, *Cosmographie de Chems-ed-Din Abou Abdallah Mohammed Ed-Dimichqui*, p. 22; AL-QAZWĪNĪ, *Athār al-bilād wa-akhbār al-ibād*, p. 620; see CHARMOY, *Relation de Mas'oudy*, p. 356.

¹³⁷ Zeki Validi-Bonn [Togan], *Die Norvölker bei Bīrūnī*, p. 48. For the latest, and thus far most comprehensive study of the historical treatment of this term in Muslim records, see MIŠIN, *Sakaliba*, especially pp. 7-100, where the author reconstructed a development from the meaning 'Slav(s)' via reference to the inhabitation of the northern or north-eastern Europe to the meaning 'slave' or 'eunuch'.

¹³⁸ A. A. ŠAXMATOV, *Drevnejšie sud'by russkogo plemeni*, Petrograd 1919, pp. 48-49.

¹³⁹ Most arresting in this respect is Christian Frähn's attempt (FRÄHN, *Ibn-Fozlan's und anderer Araber Berichte*, pp. 199-200) at deciphering vague ethnic names as encountered in al-Dimashqī, i. e., سوار ورتك و بوره (MEHREN, *Cosmographie de Chems-ed-Din Abou Abdallah Mohammed Ed-Dimichqui*, p. 22). By mere emendation, which looks convincing as for the Arabic orthography, he posited سواز, i. e., *Sues*, *Swes*, or even سواد, i. e., *Sued*, *Swed*, instead of سوار, and proposed to read سوار as نوره, i. e., *Nure* or *Nore*, to denote the Norway. Altogether, this emen-

Germanic people who are commonly identified with the Norwegians, cf. Old Swedish *nordhmann* ‘Norwegian’ > *norrman*¹⁴⁰ which seems to be parallel to *Urmane* in the Primary Chronicle. The question arises as to what may have motivated the development of a unique sound form of the lexeme *Urmane* if compared with other ethnonyms demonstrating more or less regular correspondences in the source and borrowing language. Altogether, the form *Urmane* is indicative from different points of view. Nor is this surprising, since it apparently reflects the complex relationship of the East Slavs with their neighbors.

4.2. *Urmane*: Historical and linguistic underpinnings

As follows from the invitation to the Varangians, the ethnonym *urmane* refers to some kind of North or Northwest Germanic group from which Varangians were recruited. The provenance of this word remains, however, obscure,¹⁴¹ even much obfuscated by the identification of *Rusʹ* with the Baltic Sea Varangians which was first suggested in an episode, apparently inserted much later in the text of the Primary Chronicle.¹⁴² The ethnonym *urmane* is commonly connected with the form *murmanъ*, referring to a part of the coast of the Arctic Ocean, from which arose both the name of *Murmansk* on the Kola Peninsula and the northern *Murmansk* Germans who together with the *svei* feuded with the North Slavs.¹⁴³ Characteristically, a similar form, *murmane*, with the word-initial sonant *m*, is encountered several times in the Chronicle of Novgorod (1016-1471), e. g., *murmaně* ‘the Murman people’ (1241, 1412),¹⁴⁴ as well as in the First Chronicle of the Hagia Sophia Cathedral in Novgorod of the late 15th c., e. g., *murmani*.¹⁴⁵ Yet, remarkably, the Ostroz’kyj (Xlebnikov) codex of the South Rus’ chronicle, which was copied in the 1570s by one of the teachers in the Ostrih [Russian *Ostrog*] Academy, reveals the more conservative orthography with the letter *n* in superscription, i. e., *nurmane*.¹⁴⁶ I may venture to assume that, contrary to

dation brings about a part of the Scandinavian nomenclature as found in the Primary Chronicle *Vareži. Svei. Urmane* (LAUR, p. 4).

¹⁴⁰ E. WESSÉN, *Schwedische Sprachgeschichte*, vol. 1: *Laut- und Flexionslehre*, Berlin 1970, p. 76.

¹⁴¹ STRUMIŃSKI, *Linguistic Interrelations in Early Rus’*, p. 155.

¹⁴² A. A. ŠAXMATOV, *Skazanie o prizvanii Varjagov*, *Izvestija Otdelenija ruskogo jazyka i slovesnosti* 9/4 (1904) 285.

¹⁴³ VASMER, *Russisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, vol. II, 1955, p. 188; vol. III, 1958, p. 176.

¹⁴⁴ NOVG, pp. 7, 291, 403.

¹⁴⁵ *Sofijskaja pervaja letopis’ staršego izvoda* (hereafter *SOPH*), in: *Polnoe sobranie russkix letopisej*, vol. 6, part 1, Moskva 2000, p. 305.

¹⁴⁶ *The Old Rus’ Kievan and Galician-Volhynian Chronicles: The Ostroz’kyj (Xlebnikov) and Čertvertyns’kyj (Pogodin) Codices*, Cambridge, Mass. 1990, p. 7.

North Rus'ian forms which all share an *m* word-initially, southern forms appear more archaic in retaining the non-assimilated *n* in the same position.¹⁴⁷

It should be noted that in the above dichotomy, there is no place for a seemingly identical sound form, which is common in a broad, predominantly East Slavic area of use. To adduce a few examples, one can cite here Russian place names of the type *Urman*, *Urmanets*, *Urmanova*, *Urmančina*, and the like¹⁴⁸ which are paralleled in South Slavic toponyms, e. g., *Orman* (Macedonia), *Ormanjevin*a (Hercegovina), and *Romà-nija* in reference to a valley not far from Sarajevo.¹⁴⁹ A student deals here with an ostensibly phonetic coincidence brought about by the Turkic interference, which is known to have been long operative in vast (South) Slavic territories. It is not surprising therefore to discern a derivative base with the general meaning 'forest' in Crimean Turkish, Bashkir *urman*, Turkish, Kazakh *orman*, Kyrgyz *ormon* and other Turkic forms.¹⁵⁰ Similar forms are traceable not only in South Slavic, e. g., Bulgarian *orman*, and Russian *Urman* and the like¹⁵¹ but also in West Ukrainian. The latter has retained a unique village name *Urman'* first recorded in 1385, albeit the settlement itself might have been founded in the 11th c.¹⁵²

In 1996, Bohdan STRUMIŃSKI advanced a new etymology of "authentic" Old Rus'ian *Urmane*. According to this theory,¹⁵³ the examples from East Slavic chronicles provide evidence that the form *Urmane* was, long

¹⁴⁷ B. GRÖBER and L. MÜLLER, *Volständiges Wörterverzeichnis zur Nestorchronik*, part 4. München 1986, p. 871.

¹⁴⁸ M. VASMER, *Russisches geographisches Namenbuch*, ed. H. Bräuer, vol. IX: *Tarabaeva – Xjanniki*, Wiebaden 1979, pp. IX, 307; F. G. GARIPOVA, *Issledovanija po gidronimii Tatarstana*. Moskva 1991, p. 288.

¹⁴⁹ SKOK, *Etimologijski rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika*, vol. II, 1972, p. 566.

¹⁵⁰ W. RADLOFF, *Versuch eines Wörterbuches der Türk-Dialekte*, vol. 1, St. Petersburg 1893, pp. 1078, 1673; H. EREN, *Türk Dilinin Etimolojik Sözlüğü*. Ankara 1999, p. 309.

¹⁵¹ K. LOKOTSCH, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der europäischen (germanischen, romanischen und slavischen) Wörter orientalischen Ursprungs*, Heidelberg 1927, p. 128.

¹⁵² B. Chlebowski (ed.), *Słownik geograficzny królestwa polskiego*, vol. XII, Warszawa 1892, p. 818. In our case, no less deceptive may appear another place name, which is encountered in al-Idrīsī's "Kitāb rujār" (Liber Rogerii, ca 1153). While enumerating in the fifth section of the sixth climate Rus'ian cities and towns, this Arabic geographer mentioned the city *ارمن* (*armān*) (E. Cerulli, et al. (eds.), *Al-Idrīsī. Opus Geographicum*, part 8, Neapoli – Romae, p. 912). The latter can be identified not with the enigmatic *Armen* in P.-A. JAUBERT, *Géographie d'Édrisi traduite de l'arabe en français*, vols. 1-2, Paris 1840, p. 397, but rather with the Old Ukrainian city *Romen* first attested under the year 1096 in *LAUR*, p. 250, Modern Ukrainian *Romen*, although this city might have been founded already in the 9th c. (B. A. RYBAKOV, *Russkie zemli po karte Idrisi 1154 goda*, in: *Kratkie soobščenija Instituta istorii material'noj kul'tury* 43 (1952) 33).

¹⁵³ STRUMIŃSKI, *Linguistic Interrelations in Early Rus'*, pp. 155-158.

before the 15th c., changed by the “learned Novgorodians” to *Nurmane* in an effort to bring the name closer to Latin *Normanni*. Only later, the form *Nurmane* turned into *Murmane*, ‘Norwegians’. Bohdan Strumiński maintained also that the origin of *Urmane*, which is allegedly more ancient in comparison to both *Nurmane* and *Murmane*, should be sought elsewhere than in Latin or German, i. e., in Arabic geographical and historical literature. To corroborate this assumption, this student cited¹⁵⁴ but one, although remarkable, collocation, *al-majūs al-urdumāniyūn* (المجوس الأردمانيون) as found in the entry under the year 360 of Hijrah (= A. D. 971) in the “Kitāb al-bayān al-mughrib” of Ibn al-‘Idhārī.¹⁵⁵ According to Bohdan STRUMIŃSKI, the form *al-urdumāniyūn* may be explained by the loss of the initial *n* in **an-nurdumāniyūn*, similar to the loss of *l* in **al-lishbūnah > ishbūnah* ‘Lisbon’.¹⁵⁶

¹⁵⁴ Ibid., p. 157.

¹⁵⁵ *Ibn ‘Idhārī al-marrakūsh, Kitāb al-bayān al-mughrib*, part 2: *ta’arikh al-andalus*, ed. G. S. Colin and É. Lévi-Provençal, Bairūt 1967, p. 241; R. DOZY, *Recherches sur l’histoire et la littérature de l’Espagne pendant le moyen âge*, vol. 2, 3rd ed., Leyde 1881, p. 338. It is noteworthy that, contrary to all the preceding entries, e. g., under the year 230 of Hijrah (= A. D. 844), with a common designation of Scandinavian warriors, *al-majūs* (المجوس) (e. g., *Ibn ‘Idhārī al-marrakūsh, Kitāb al-bayān al-mughrib*, part 2, pp. 87, 225), the former entry contains a compound form to refer, presumably, to those Scandinavian troops who were half pagan and half Christian (MELVINGER, *Les premières incursions des Vikings*, pp. 65, 67). It is no surprise that in the following passages Ibn al-‘Idhārī makes use of only الأردمانيون (*al-urdumāniyūn*), as if alluding at the rapid christianization of these Scandinavians. As I have already noted elsewhere (DANYLENKO, *The name RUS*), the form الأردمانيون can be connected with an enigmatic form اللوذعانة (**al-lūdh‘āna*), which is encountered in al-Mas‘ūdī’s work of 943/944 (Barbier de Meynard, Pavet de Courteille, and Pellat (eds.), *Mas‘ūdī. Les prairies d’or*, vol. II, 1966, p. 18). MARQUART, *Osteuropäische und ostasiatische Streifzüge*, pp. 342, 348-349, took this form to be a corrupted rendition of the Spanish Latin counterpart *Lordoman-* < *Nordoman-*, and cited another characteristic misspelling from al-Mas‘ūdī’s work of 946, الكونكانه (**al-kūdhkāna*) (see de Goeje, *Kitāb at-tanbīh wa’l-ischrāf*, p. 141), which, together with *al-lūdh‘āna*, might allegedly stand for the original form like **al-lurdumāna/*al-lordomāna*. For this study, however, more interesting is another emendation first offered by XVOL’SON, *Izvestija o khozarakh, burtasakh, bolgarakh, madjarakh, slavjanakh i russakh*, p. 167, who derived the above Arabic form(s) from the name, referring originally to the Northmen, of the type **nūrmāna* (نورمانة) (cf. FRÄHN, *Ibn-Fozlan’s und anderer Araber Berichte*, pp. 71, 174). According to T. M. KALININA, *Arabskie uęenyje o našestvii normannov na Sevil’ju v 844 g.*, in: G. V. Glazyrina (ed.), *Drevnejšie gosudarstva Vostočnoj Evropy 1999 g. Vostočnaja i Severnaja Evropa v srednevekov’je.*, Moskva 2001, pp. 190-210, 206, the form *al-lūdh‘āna/al-kūdhkāna* may be a rendition of either *al-urdumāniyūn* or even **al-urmana* which is phonetically “similar to Russian *urmane*”. Although both Xvol’son’s **nūrmāna* and Kalinina’s **al-urmana* are highly conjectural, it is tempting to perceive one of them as the first and unique attestation of the Northmen by the Arabs (cf. S. GEDEONOV, *Varjagi i Rus’. Istoričeskoe issledovanie*, parts 1-2, S.-Peterburg 1867, p. LXXXV footnote 229), leaving aside the form مرمان (*murmān*) found in a text extent from the mid-10th c. (see section 4.2.3).

¹⁵⁶ See A. DANYLENKO, Review of: B. Strumiński, *Linguistic Interrelations in Early Rus’: Northmen, Finns, and East Slavs (Ninth to Eleventh Centuries)*, Harvard Ukrainian Studies 21 (1997), p. 199.

Indeed, the latter change looks quite plausible. Suffice it to mention a similar form, أشبونة, which is found in the “Kitāb al-‘ibar” (Liber exemplorum) written by Ibn Khaldūn in the second part of the 14th c. Yet, what is remarkable in this case is a discrepancy in the vocalic pattern, especially in the initial vowel, which may be reconstructed for this form. In the Beirut edition of 1956-1961, a *kasrah* is placed above the *hamza* supported by an *alif*, i. e., *ašbūnah*,¹⁵⁷ while Harris Birkeland bases his reading on a *maddah*, i. e., *Ushbūna(h)*.¹⁵⁸ Both readings, however, should be treated as secondary, although premised on regular introflexional patterns.

In view of the above sound changes, Old Rus’ian *Urmane* is likely to be paralleled in the form الأرمآن (*al-urmān*) ‘Northmen’ attested, for example, in the “Kitāb al-ja‘rāfiya” (Liber geographiae),¹⁵⁹ which was written by Abu Bakr al-Zuhrī in Granada ca. 1150.¹⁶⁰ Despite the fact that the form *al-urmān* appears several years later in comparison with the corresponding passage in the Primary Chronicle (1113-1136), Bohdan STRUMIŃSKI argued that Old Rus’ian *Urmane*, which gave rise to *Nurmane* and subsequently *Murmane*, was of West Arabic provenance.¹⁶¹

4.2.1. The country of *al-Urmān* in the “Kitāb al-ja‘rāfiya”

Regardless of the readings offered both by Alexander SEIPPEL¹⁶² more than one hundred years ago and, most recently, by V. BEJLIS¹⁶³

¹⁵⁷ Ibn Khaldūn, *Ta’arīkh al-‘ulāmah*, part 1, vol. 4. Bairūt 1958, p. 281.

¹⁵⁸ BIRKELAND, *Nordens historie i middelalderen etter arabiske kilder*, p. 126.

¹⁵⁹ M. Hadj-Sadok (ed.), *Kitāb al-dja‘rāfiyya. Mappemonde du calife al-Ma’mūn reproduite par Fazārī (III^e/IX^e s.) réédite et commentée par Zuhrī (VI^e/XII^e s.)* (= Bulletin d’Études Orientales, XXI), Damas 1968, pp. 76, 98, 191, etc.

¹⁶⁰ C. BROCKELMANN, *Geschichte der arabischen Literatur*, vol. 1, Weimar 1898, p. 476.

¹⁶¹ STRUMIŃSKI, *Linguistic Interrelations in Early Rus’*, p. 158. It should be noted that early West Arabic sources knew not the term *Rūs*, commonly used in the Eastern Arabic world, but the name *majūs* (MELVINGER, *Les premières incursions des Vikings*, pp. 43, 113-115). The interplay between the term *majūs* and the form *urmān* in the Western Arabic tradition can be most instructively illustrated by a peculiar hapax legomenon ارمآنjus (*urmānjus*) ‘a kind (جنس) of Frankish people’ (الأفرنجية) in a work written by al-Mas’ūdī in 946 (de Goeje, *Kitāb at-tanbīh wa’l-‘išchrāf*, p. 181; cf. A. SEIPPEL, *Rerum Normannicarum fontes Arabici*, Osloae 1896-1928, p. 7).

¹⁶² Ibid.

¹⁶³ V. M. BEJLIS, *Ètnonim al-arman v arabskom geografičeskom sočinenii XII v. Kitāb al-d a’rafija i urmane “Povesti vremennyx ket”*, in: *Vostočnaja Evropa v drevnosti i srednevekov’je. Problemy istočnikovedenija. Čtenija pamjati členu-korrespondenta AN SSSR Vladimira Terent’jeviča Pašuto*, Moskva, 18-20 aprelja 1990 g. Tezisy dokladov, Moskva 1990, p. 7.

along with Dolores BRAMON,¹⁶⁴ the vocalic pattern of the name الأرمان appears obviously much the same as Old Rus'ian *Urmane*, while differing from another form الأرمن (*al-arman*) which commonly refers to the Armenians living in the country of Armenia.¹⁶⁵ However, in view of some specific data provided by al-Zuhrī about the country *al-urmān/al-armān*, complete identification is not possible in this case, although the location of this country can be easily delimited with the help of information apropos of the adjacent countries enumerated in the “Kitāb al-ja‘rāfiya”:

و بلاد جليقية تجاور أرض غليسية
 في المغرب كما تجاور أرض الأرمان
 في المشرق
 و بلاد غليسية آخر بلاد قشتالة
 في الشمال و سيأتى ذكرها إن شاء الله.
 و بلاد الروم كلها من أرض قسطنطينية
 في المشرق إلى بلاد برشلونة
 في المغرب هي بلاد خصيبة [...] ،
 كثيرة الزرع و الضرع و الفواكه و الكروم ،
 إلا ما كان منها و اغلا في الشمال كبلاد
 ارمينية و الرمانية و جليقية و غليسية ،
 فالزرع في هذه البلاد قليل ،
 و الكرم معدوم عندهم غيره
 من الفواكه و الالبان و القطنى¹⁶⁶

The country of *Jillīqiyah* borders the country of *Ghalīsiyah* in the West and the land of *al-Urmān* in the East. And the land of Galicia is the furthestmost edge of the country of *Qashtālah* [Castilia?] in the North, and about them shall we speak if Allah wishes it. The country of *al-Rūm*, from the land of *Qusṭantīniyah* [Constantinople] in the East to the country of *Barshilūna* [Barcelona], is rich in wheat, and cattle, and fruits, and grapes, thereby omitting northern countries such as the country of *Armīniyah*, and the country of *ar-Rumāniyah*, and the land of *Jillīqiyah*, and the country of *Ghalīsiyah*. There is a lack of wheat and grapes in these countries, but there are many a fruits and much milk and vegetables.¹⁶⁷

Inasmuch as the country of *Jillīqiyah* borders the country of Galicia in the West and the land of *al-Urmān* in the East, it is tempting to identify the country of *Jillīqiyah* with some territories in modern France. Yet the information extracted from the “Kitāb al-ja‘rāfiya” is too scarce to

¹⁶⁴ D. BRAMON, *El mundo en el siglo XII. Estudio de la versión castellana y del “Original” Árabe de una geografía universal: “El tratado de al-Zuhrī”*, Barcelona 1991, p. 138.

¹⁶⁵ *Ibn Khaldūn, Ta‘arīkh al-‘ulāmāh*, vol. I, 2nd ed., 1967, p. 4. For an English translation of the corresponding passage, see F. Rosenthal (ed. and transl.), *Ibn Khaldūn. The Muqaddimah. An Introduction to History* (= Bolingen Series, 43), vol I, Princeton, N. J. 1967, p. 154.

¹⁶⁶ HADJ-SADOK, *Kitāb al-dja‘rāfiyya*, p. 228; SEIPPEL, *Rerum Normannicarum fontes Arabici*, p. 40.

¹⁶⁷ The translation from Arabic here and hereafter is mine (A. D.).

assert in a definite manner that the country of *al-Urmān* was located in Normandy or some other part of France.¹⁶⁸ Moreover, the fact that the country of *al-Rumāniyah* (بلاد الرمانية), populated among others by the people of *al-Urmān*, was time and again assailed by the Arabs from Seville and other Muslim-Spanish lands is not compelling in our case.

To start with, al-Zuhri could have had in mind those Normans who conquered southern Italy in the second half of the 11th c. Strikingly enough, he argued as well that the country of *al-Urmān*, which was labeled elsewhere the Great *Armīniyah* (أرمينية الكبرى), belonged to the country of *al-Rūm* (Byzantium).¹⁶⁹ The latter claim appears too flimsy, especially vis-à-vis the morphological overlapping of the name *al-Armīniyat al-ṣuġra* ‘the Little Armenia’ (أرمينية الصغرى) to refer to Armenia, with the name *al-Armīniyat al-kubra* (الأرمينية الكبرى) ‘the Great *Armīniyah*’¹⁷⁰, or *al-Urmāniyat al-kubra* ‘the Great *Urmāniyah*’ (الأرمانية الكبرى). The name *al-Urmāniyat al-kubra*, which is cited by Aleksander SEIPPEL from the Codex Parisiis of the early 15th c.,¹⁷¹ denotes “the coldest country in the whole of the world”, stretching “far into the depths of the north”. Moreover, the situation gets even murkier once we recall here the name *al-Rumāniya* (الرمانية),¹⁷² which is likely to refer to southern Italy.¹⁷³

4.2.1.1. The opposition of “great/little” in the Byzantine tradition

Of utmost interest in this regard is a similar overlapping of the ethnonyms in Middle Russian records. One can cite from the Chronicle of the Resurrection Monastery in Moscow (16th c.) the learned form *Nurmani* as opposed to *Armane*¹⁷⁴ which brings to memory Modern Russian *Armjane* ‘Armenians’. Remarkably, deviating orthographic forms of this kind were already commonplace in Old Rus’ian chronicles. This is why, taken out of context, these forms could easily refer to both the Northmen and Armenians: *Armane*, *Nurmane*, *Urmari*, *Urmani*, *Ur̄mjani*, *Ur̄mani*,¹⁷⁵ and *Urmjane*.¹⁷⁶

¹⁶⁸ BEJLIS, *Ētnonim al-arman*, p. 9.

¹⁶⁹ HADJ-SADOK, *Kitāb al-dja’rāfiyya*, pp. 231, 202, 232, 269.

¹⁷⁰ Ibid., p. 231.

¹⁷¹ SEIPPEL, *Rerum Normannicarum fontes Arabici*, p. 39; BRAMON, *El mundo en el siglo XII.*, p. XIV.

¹⁷² HADJ-SADOK, *Kitāb al-dja’rāfiyya*, p. 228.

¹⁷³ STRUMIŃSKI, *Linguistic Interrelations in Early Rus’*, p. 158.

¹⁷⁴ RES, p. 261, 268.

¹⁷⁵ GRÖBER and MÜLLER, *Volständiges Wörterverzeichnis zur Nestorchronik*, p. 871.

¹⁷⁶ BARSOV, *Očerki russkoj istoričeskoj geografii*, p. 13.

There seems to be solid evidence that the above overlapping was triggered much earlier by the opposition of “great/little” as cultivated in the Byzantine tradition. With regard to the East Slavs and Rus’, and all the more, albeit indirectly, to the corresponding place names in the “Kitāb al-ja‘rāfiya”, of utmost importance is a parallel notion of Μεγάλη Ῥωσία, which was first attested in two Byzantine sources extant from the 12th c. As early as 1143, in his *Notitia*, Neilos Doxopater let the Norman king Roger II (1105-1154) in Palermo (Sicily) know that the metropolitan of the *Great Rosia* (τῆν μεγάλην Ῥωσίαν, that is, *in magna Russia*) was nominated by the Patriarch of Constantinople.¹⁷⁷ Another “Notitia episcopatum”, issued in the time of Manuel Comnenus (ca. 1170), enumerated 11 bishoprics of the metropolis of the *Great Rosia*, which are the following: *Belgorod*, *Novgorod*, *Černigov* [Ukrainian *Černihiv*], *Polock*, *Vladimir*, *Perejaslavl’*, *Suzdal’*, *Rostov*, *Kanev* [Ukrainian *Kaniv*] (τὸ Κάνεβε – sic), *Smolensk*, *Galič* [Ukrainian *Halyč*].¹⁷⁸ While referring to the whole of Rus’, the Byzantine notion of the “Great Rosia” as opposed to the “Little Rosia”,¹⁷⁹ reflected most likely the geographical egocentrism which is applied in the toponymy.¹⁸⁰ The latter egocentrism is discern-

¹⁷⁷ Nili Doxapatrīi notitia thronorum patriarchalium, in: J.-P. Migne (ed.), *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series Graeca*, vol. 132: *Theophani Archiepiscopi Tauro-meni in Sicilia cognomento Ceramei. Homiliae in evangelia dominicalia et festa totius anni*, Turnholt (Belgium) 1864, pp. 1105, 1106.

¹⁷⁸ H. GELZER, *Ungedruckte und ungenügend veröffentlichte Texte der Notitiae episcopatum*, *Abhandlungen der philosophisch-philologischen Classe der königlich bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 21 (1901) 585, 588.

¹⁷⁹ For a Byzantine metropolis of Mavrokastron or *New Rosia* (Μαυρόκαστρον ἦτοι Νέαζ Ῥωσία), which was founded on the western shores of the Black Sea in the 11th c. and soon after abandoned in about A. D. 1060-1064, see E. HONIGMANN, *Studies in Slavic Church History*, *Byzantion* 17 (1944-1945) 128-182, 158-162. The notion of the “New Rosia” should be treated here not so much in geographic as in chronological terms.

¹⁸⁰ There seems to be another, perpendicular axis of the geographical egocentrism which is traceable both in the Byzantine and Arabic geographic and historical literature. One should recall here a hapax legomenon from chapter 9 of Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus’ treatise “De Administrando Imperio”, ἡ ἔξω Ῥωσία ‘the Outer Russia [Rus’]’ comprising the territories of Kiev proper with adjacent Vyšegrad and Vytičev (*DAI*, 9:3-7). Providing no term to denote “the Inner Rus’”, the relevant passage testifies to a clear dichotomy of political structure along the Dnieper route in the 10th c. The validity of this hypothesis is challenged in view of a similar term in the geographical work of al-Idrīsī (see SEIPPEL, *Rerum Normannicarum fontes Arabici*, pp. 29-30). In the sixth section of the sixth climate, he mentions the country of “the Outer Rus’”, الروسية الخارجة (CERULLI, *Al-Idrīsī*, p. 914), a term which he might have borrowed from the secret handbook of Byzantine diplomacy written by Constantine VII Pophyrogenitus (O. PRITSAK, *Where Was Constantine’s Inner Rus’?* *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 7 (1983) 558). Geographically, he contrasts this kind of the Rus’ with another one in the title of the fourth section of the sixth climate, بلاد الروسية القصوى (CERULLI, *Al-Idrīsī*, p. 892) ‘the farthest Rus’’, 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

able in the opposition *Armenija malaja i velikaja* as attested in the Old Church Slavonic translation, available in a copy of the 14th c., of Georgios Hamartolos's Chronicle,¹⁸¹ cf. Middle Greek Ἀρμενία μικρά τε καὶ μεγάλη;¹⁸² the same egocentrism is well retained in Old Rus'ian *Arv[sic]inbja Malaja i Velikaja* 'the Great and Little Armenia'¹⁸³ which is most likely patterned on the above Byzantine (Church Slavonic) model.

4.2.2. The country of the Great *Armīniyah* in the "Kitāb al-ja'rāfiya"

In fact, the characteristics of the inhabitants of the country/city of the Great *Armīniyah*, as presented in the "Kitāb al-ja'rāfiya", appear rather contradictory. Suffice it to mention that, although the natives of this enigmatic country used to travel south- and eastwards, e. g., to the Sea of Khazars (the Caspian Sea), their homeland was situated in the north. It comes therefore as no surprise that in this country there were few crops, although lots of cattle, much milk and many big "apples *al-armanī*" (التفاح الارمنى) which were exported to Iraq, Syria and as far as to Egypt.¹⁸⁴

It is tempting to take *al-urmān* for the Northmen, in particular those who bordered the Slavs in the north. One can also assume that they belonged to those Normans who might have settled in southern France, since from that place and starting in the mid-11th c. they would attack the Muslim-Spanish lands.¹⁸⁵ However, the author of the "Kitāb al-ja'rāfiya" challenged this probability and stated that the Great *Armīniyah* was inhabited (apart from *al-armān*?) by certain communities (طوائف) of the people of *al-Rūm* (Byzantines). Remarkably, these communities stemmed from the Khazars, although the people of *al-Rūm* had ascendance over other peoples and professed Christianity.¹⁸⁶

one is those who live in the vicinity of the country of Hungary (أنكرية) and Macedonia (مقدونية)" (ibid., p. 920). It stands to endorse Irina Konovalova's idea (I. G. KONOVALOVA, *Vostočnaja Evropa v sočinenii al-Idrisi*, Moskva 1999, p. 152) that, contrary to O. PRITSAK, *Where Was Constantine's Inner Rus?* p. 557f, the opposition "far/near" reflects here the geographical egocentrism, which is likely to depend on a particular vantage point.

¹⁸¹ Istrin (ed.), *Knigy vremennyja i obraznyja Georgija Mnixa*, vol. I, p. 59.

¹⁸² F. Miklosich (ed.), *Chronica Nestoris: textum russico-slovenicum, versionem latinam, glossarium*, vol. I, Vindobonae 1860, p. 183.

¹⁸³ LAUR, p. 3.

¹⁸⁴ HADJ-SADOK, *Kitāb al-dja'rāfiyya*, p. 231.

¹⁸⁵ DOZY, *Recherches sur l'histoire et la littérature de l'Espagne*, pp. 332-371.

¹⁸⁶ HADJ-SADOK, *Kitāb al-dja'rāfiyya*, p. 231; SEIPPEL, *Rerum Normannicarum fontes Arabici*, p. 39.

4.2.3. Ibn Ya‘qūb’s *murmān*

In view of the opacity of the information related to the people of *al-urmān*, it would be useful to consider another hapax legomenon, *مرمان* (*murmān*), in reference to the Northmen. The above word-form is encountered in the well-known tenth-century account of the Jewish traveler, Ibrāhīm bin Ya‘qūb,¹⁸⁷ about the Central European countries, and especially about the Slavs, as cited in the “Al-masālik wa-al-mamālik” (Liber viarum et regnorum, ca. 1068) of al-Bakrī:

و ملوكهم الآن اربعة :
 ملك البلغارين و بويصلاو ملك فراغة
 و بويمة و كراكو ، و مشقه ملك الجوف ،
 و ناقون في آخر المغرب.
 و جاور بلد ناقون في المغرب
 سكسون و بعض مرمان [...] ¹⁸⁸

And there are nowadays four kings [of the Slavs]. They are the King of the *Bulghār*, and *Bwīṣlāw* [Boleslav], the King of *Frāghah* [Prague], Bohemia and *Krākū* [Cracow], and *Miṣquh* [Mieshko I], the King of the North tribe, and *Nāqūn* [Naccon, Duke of the Obodrites]¹⁸⁹ in the far West. And *Nāqūn*’s land borders *Saksūn* [Saxony] and some *murmāns* in the West ¹⁹⁰

Granted that the conjecture *germān* as proposed by Michael DE GOEJE¹⁹¹ proves perfunctory at its core, one can treat the above form

¹⁸⁷ WESTBERG, *Ibrāhīm’s-ibn-Ja‘kūb’s Reisebericht über die Slawenlande*, p. 139; JAKOB, *Arabische Berichte*, p. 11. This account is commonly dated back to the year 965 (see M. J. de GOEJE, *Een belangrijk arabisch bericht over de slawische volken omstreeks 965 n. Ch.*, Verslagen en mededeelingen der koninklijke Akademie van wetenschappen. Afdeling letterkunde. 2. Reeks 9 (1880) 187-216; MIŠIN, *Sakaliba*, pp. 36-37, 47), although the German scholarly tradition defines the time of this account at about the year 973 (J. WIGGER, *Bericht des Ibrahim ibn Jakob über die Slawen aus dem Jahre 973*, *Jahrbücher des Vereins für metlenburgische Geschichte und Alterthumstunde* 24 (1880), pp. 5-20; JAKOB, *Arabische Berichte*, p. 3). Yet, the evidence of the relationship between the Tsar Peter of Bulgaria (927-969) and the German Emperor Otto I (936-973), as discussed by V. ZLATARSKI, *Izvestieto na Ibraxim-ibn-Jakuba za Bŭlgarite ot 965 godina*, in: V. Zlatarski, *Izbrani proizvedenija*, vol. 2, Sofia 1984, pp. 73-76; see also M. CANARD, *Ibrāhīm ibn Ya‘qūb et sa relation de voyage en Europe*, in: *Études d’orientalisme dédiées à la mémoire de Évariste Lévi-Provençal*, vol. II, Paris, p. 507) leads one to opt for the first, earlier date of Ibn Ya‘qūb’s narrative, inasmuch as the Bulgarians could barely have sent an embassy to Otto I in 973 (*Al-Bakrī*, pp. 267-268).

¹⁸⁸ Leeuwen and A. Ferre (eds.), *Abu Bakrī*, pp. 330-331; *Al-Bakrī*, 158.

¹⁸⁹ MARQUART, *Osteuropäische und ostasiatische Streifzüge*, pp. 311, 327; A. Bauer and R. Rau (eds.), *Quellen zur Geschichte der sächsischen Kaiserzeit. Widukinds Sachsengeschichte. Adalberts Fortsetzung der Chronik Reginos. Liudprands Werke*, Darmstadt 1971, p. 158.

¹⁹⁰ S. RAPOPORT, *On the early Slavs. The narrative of Ibrahim-ibn-Yakub*, *The Slavonic (and East European) Review* 8/22 (1929) 331-342.

¹⁹¹ DE GOEJE, *Een belangrijk arabisch bericht over de slawische volken*, p. 193; BIRKELAND, *Nordens historie i middelalderen etter arabiske kilder*, p. 143 footnote 10; cf. WESTBERG, *Ibrāhīm’s-ibn-Ja‘kūb’s Reisebericht über die Slawenlande*, p. 158.

مرمان (*murmān*) not as a corrupted rendition of نرمان (*nurmān*)¹⁹² but rather as the first Arabic attestation of East Slavic *murmane* ‘Northmen’.

The Old Rus’ian lexeme *murmane* belonged most likely to the vernacular, owing its appearance to the distant assimilation of the sonorants $n-m > m-m$ within a more ancient ethnonym *nurmane*. The latter is likely to have been modeled on a Frankish Latin form like *Normanni*, excluding, however, *Nordomanni*, which is attested in the “manuscript B” of the “Annales Bertiniani” from the Saint-Omer Library,¹⁹³ and *Nortmanni*, *Nordmanni* as used by Liudprand in his “Anapodosis”.¹⁹⁴ Speaking in terms of the absolute chronology, the above assimilation might have taken place long before the attestation of *Urmane* in the Primary Chronicle written in the very beginning of the 12th c. Characteristically, Efim KARSKIJ, in his edition of the Laurentian redaction of the Primary Chronicle, emended in the name index the form *Urmane/Urmani* to a “more learned” lexeme, i. e., *Nurmany*,¹⁹⁵ thus completing a kind of philological and historical circle.

4.2.4. Old Rus’ian *Urmane*: a borrowing scenario

There seem to be solid grounds for distinguishing between two learned forms, which penetrated into the vernacular of Old Rus’ian. The first name, *nurmane*, was patterned on the Frankish Latin counterpart *Normanni*, although historically (by distant $n-m > m-m$ assimilation) it changed into *murmane*. Not surprisingly, the resulting form *murmane*, with the initial- and medial-radical sonorants assimilated, prevails in the late chronicle versions, e. g., in the First Chronicle of the Hagia Sophia Cathedral in Novgorod of the late 15th c.: cf. *Murmani*, *Murmany* next to *Nurmani*,¹⁹⁶ or *Nurmany*¹⁹⁷ which are preserved in the enumeration of Japhet’s descendants. As for the second, contending learned form, *Urmane*, to refer to Scandinavians, it could have penetrated into the Old Rus’ian vernacular due to both direct and indirect contacts of the Rus’ with the Muslim Mediterranean countries, including Spain.

It should be noted, however, that the alleged process of borrowing was rather complicated. The written records extant from the Mediterranean region, influenced by both the Muslim and Christian cul-

¹⁹² MIŠIN, *Sakaliba*, p. 38.

¹⁹³ Ch. Dehaisnes (ed.), *Les Annales de Saint-Bertin et de Saint-Vaast*, Paris 1871, p. 59.

¹⁹⁴ *MGH*, vol. III, 1839, pp. 277, 331.

¹⁹⁵ *LAUR*, pp. 562, 564.

¹⁹⁶ *SOPH*, pp. 395, 534, 2.

¹⁹⁷ *Letopisnyj sbornik, imenujemyj Tverskoju letopis’ju*, in: *Polnoe sobranie russkix letopisej*, vol. 15, S.-Peterburg 1863, p. 18.

tural traditions, prove that the emergence of Arabic *al-urmān/al-armān* was most likely provoked by an assimilation of the *al* article to the next initial-radical *n* with the subsequent loss of the latter sonorant.¹⁹⁸ The absorption and loss of the sonorant *n* is likely to have taken place in a twofold way. First, in case of a loan word like Latin *Nordomanni/Nortmanni/Nordmanni*, the above process tends to be identified with a change like **al-nurdumān* > **an-nurdumān* > *al-urdumān*¹⁹⁹ found in the account of Ibn al-‘Idhārī of the invasion of the Danes into Spain in 971.²⁰⁰ Second, the loss of the initial-radical *n* could also have occurred within a Frankish Latin form like *Normanni* as a result of the corresponding developments **al-nurmān* > **an-nurmān* > *al-urmān*.²⁰¹ In their turn, both the Arabic forms, *al-urdumān*²⁰² and *al-urmān*, might have brought about the emergence of such Spanish Latin derivatives as *Lordomani* as attested under the year 850 and the year 866 in the “Chronicon Albeldense”,²⁰³ and *Lormanés* which is found under the year 1016 in the “Chronicon Lusitanum”.²⁰⁴ The latter sound change(s) dating back no later than the

¹⁹⁸ SEIPPEL, *Rerum Normannicarum fontes Arabici*, p. 7.

¹⁹⁹ We are disregarding here forms like *الاردمليس* (*al-urdumlīs*) or *الاردمليش* (*al-urdumlīsh*) as attested in al-Maqqarī (1591-1632) (see W. M. Wright and L. M. Krehl (eds.), *Analectes sur l'histoire et la littérature des Arabes d'Espagne, par al-Makkari*, vol. 1, Leyde 1855, p. 749) who cites in this case a passage from one of his predecessors, a Muslim-Spanish author Ibn Ḥayyān (987-1076). DOZY, *Recherches sur l'histoire et la littérature de l'Espagne*, pp. 337-338, suggested with good reason one read these forms as *Alordomani* which means ‘an army of the Northmen’. One deals in both cases with a corrupted rendition of the phrase *جيش الوردمانين* (*jaish al-urdumāniyīn*) or *جيش الوردمانيين* (*jaish al-urdumāniyīn*) as encountered in Ibn Bassām who in his turn based himself on the evidence provided by Ibn Ḥayyān.

²⁰⁰ DOZY, *Recherches sur l'histoire et la littérature de l'Espagne*, p. 298.

²⁰¹ The latter pluralis fractus pattern is paralleled in another Arabic form, *al-almān* (اللمان), which is attested in the “Prolegomena” to the World History of Ibn Khaldūn, *Ta’arīkh al-‘ulāmah*, vol. I, 2nd ed., 1967, p. 127. Although fitting well with an underlying Latin form *Alemanī* referring to one of the German tribes (French *Alemagne*), the word-initial *al-* was later conceived of as a duplicate, superfluous article (**al-al-mān*), hence the loss of the second *-a-* in *al-limān*. It comes as no surprise, therefore, that, in the World History of Ibn Khaldūn (ibid. pp. 126, 133) the younger form *al-limān* is prevailing, e. g., *امم / بلاد اللمانيين* ‘the country/people of *al-limān*’.

²⁰² A secondary, reverse assimilation of the alveolars is traceable in a unique designation, *al-rūdhmānūn* (الروذمانون), which is attested in the account of al-‘imyārī of the conquest of Barbastro by Northmen in 1064 (MELVINGER, *Les premières incursions des Vikings*, pp. 69-70). Although deviating in its sound form, this word, however, is a derivative from the *al-urdumān*, which in its turn is the result of a series of sound developments as discussed in this section.

²⁰³ *Chronicon Albeldense (Llamada tambien Emilianense)*, in: E. Florez, *España sagrada, teatro geografico histórico de la iglesia de España*, vol. XIII: De la Lusitania antigua en comun, y de su Metrópoli Mérida en particular, Madrid 1816, p. 453.

²⁰⁴ *Chronicon Lusitanum*, in: ibid., vol. XIV: De las Iglesia de Abila, etc., 2nd ed., 1905, p. 404.

mid-9th c., is most conspicuously retained in a Spanish place name, *Lordemanos*, referring to a small village which is located in the Province of León, near the border with the Province of Zamora.²⁰⁵ Mariano Campo has recently argued that this name was most likely introduced by the Varangians themselves who were making their way through this region during the third wave of their incursions in Spain in 968-972.²⁰⁶ Yet, the emergence of the above village name can also go back to the years of the second wave of incursions occurring in the mid-9th c. Moreover, one may legitimately presume that the village of *Lordemanos* was founded by some Scandinavians who involuntarily settled down in Spain, in particular after their defeat at Tablada in 844.²⁰⁷

As it becomes obvious from the chronicles, both the Arabic and Spanish Latin forms were used to denote the “South Normans”, i. e., those Northmen who lived on the northern borderline of the Mediterranean region. A student needs, therefore, to explain why the East Slavic chroniclers made use of the leaned form *Urmane* to denote not the South Normans but some kind of North Germanic (Scandinavian) people, which is mentioned in the Primary Chronicle in the context of the invitation to the Varangians.

5. Concluding remarks

As has been already contended, contrary to the loan terms *Varjagi*, *Kolbjagi*, and *Rusʹ*, all denoting some kinds of Varangians, the original East Slavic lexeme, in reference to the Northmen, was an ethnonym like *Nurmane*, which was most likely borrowed from the Frankish Latin counterpart *Normanni*, and later changed into *Murmane*. It is remarkable that the latter form is attested to in the account of the Jewish traveler, Ibn Jaʿqūb, in 965, i. e., almost a century earlier than the form *Urmane* came forth in the literature of Rusʹ (1113-1116). This chronology is extremely noteworthy. First, it gives proof of an early occurrence of the “original loan form” *Nurmane* found in the East Slavic chronicles. Second, while speaking of the invitation to the Varangians, the annalist seems to have been compelled to give up a commonplace (stylistically unmarked) form, *Murmane*, and resort, instead, to an unusual (stylistically marked) form, *Urmane*, to refer to some kind of Scandinavian people from which *Varjagi* were recruited to rule over the (northern) East Slavic territories. What is

²⁰⁵ P. MADDOZ, *Diccionario geográfico-estadístico-histórico de España y sus posesiones de ultramar*, vol. X, Madrid 1847, pp. 379-380.

²⁰⁶ M. G. Campo (ed.), *Al-Ghazali y la embajada hispano-musulmana a los vikingos en el siglo IX*, Madrid 2002, pp. 24, 14-15.

²⁰⁷ É. LÉVI-PROVENÇAL, *Histoire de l'Espagne musulmane*, vol. 1: *De la conquête à la chute du califat de Cordoue (710-1031 J.C.)*, Caire 1944, pp. 157-158.

left unclear in this hypothesis is how the ethnonym *Urmane* was, in fact, borrowed – either via West European records or directly from Arabic sources? Given a scarcity of the attestations of this name in West European Latin records, it is tempting to endorse the second scenario, although one should not disregard the influence of the oral tradition in using the corresponding ethnonym by the Scandinavians themselves in their contacts with the Arabs.

While accepting the second scenario, the Old Rus'ian cosmography, which appears derived from the Biblical and Byzantine post-Biblical narratives, as well as from some medieval West European historiographic works, reveals rather unexpected complimentary sources. Since both Jewish and Arabic data were somehow introduced into the Old Rus'ian table of nations, it is quite reasonable to infer that the compiler(s) of the first redaction of the Primary Chronicle could have resorted to some authentic Jewish and Islamic sources, both in the written or oral form. Moreover, one can legitimately presume that the *Vorlage* of the Primary Chronicle was really compiled (revised) not by a monk(s), but by a secular Kiev annalist, who may be compared with the diplomat Petr Borislavich, a nobleman (*bojarin*), mentioned later, under the years 1152 to 1169 in Old Rus'ian Chronicles.²⁰⁸ To adduce an immediate parallel, such a possibility was realized by the author of “*Sēfer Yōsippōn*”, who was a secular person rather than a rabbi.

34 ²⁰⁸ B. A. RYBAKOV, *Petr Borislavič: Poisk avtora “Slova o polku Igoreve”*, Moskva 1972, pp. 160-173.