

N.	n'existe pas
G.	} <i>irar</i>
D.	
Ac.	
Ab.	<i>irariç</i>
I.	<i>irarov</i>
L.	n'existe pas

On emploie aussi la forme *megmegi* („réciproquement“, mot à mot — „l'un l'autre“), abl. *megmegiç*, instr. *megmegov*.

7. Pronoms déterminés

Dans la fonction attributive ils ne se déclinent pas: *amen* (chaque, tout), *bolor* (tous), *say* (tous), p. ex. *amen marthi* „de chaque homme“ (gén.), *say marthganç* „de tous les hommes“ (gén.). Employés séparément ils se déclinent suivant le type en *-i*, p. ex. *amen ban* (tout), gén. *amen bani*, *ame(n)kh(ə)* „tous, tout le monde“, gén. *ame(n)khi*, etc.

8. Pronoms indéfinis

Il y en eut beaucoup dans la langue classique (*imn*, *inç* — „quelque chose“, *omn*, *okh* „quelqu'un, quelque“, pl. *omankh*). Leur fonction est remplie à présent par l'article indéfini *mi* (du numéral „un“). En tant que formes séparées sont employées aujourd'hui: *ban* „quelque chose“ (gén. *bani*), *inç vor ban* „quelque chose“, *inç vor megə* „quelqu'un“ (gén. *inç vor megī*). Suivant le type en *-i* de déclinaison se déclinent aussi *uriš* (autre), *myus* (autre, second) employés séparément. En tant qu'attributs, ils ne se déclinent pas.

9. Pronoms négatifs

On les forme à partir des pronoms indéfinis, auxquels on ajoute la particule préfixée *heç* (cf. pers. mod. *hič*), p. ex. *heç ban* (rien), *heç megə* (personne, nul homme). On emploie aussi des formes empruntées à la langue littéraire: *voçinç* (rien), *voç vokh* (personne). Elles se déclinent toutes selon le type en *-i*. Comme complément déterminatif la particule *heç* est employée avec article indéfini *heç(mi)* ou le pronom négatif littéraire *voç(mi)*.

OMELJAN PRITSAK
(Harvard University)

AN ARABIC TEXT ON THE TRADE ROUTE OF THE CORPORATION OF AR-RŪS IN THE SECOND HALF OF THE NINTH CENTURY

1. The Arabic text describing the trade route followed by the merchants of the corporation of ar-Rūs has not survived in its original version. It has been preserved, however, in the works of two Arab geographers: the *Kitāb al-masālik wa'l-mamālik* of Ibn Khurdādhbeh (ca. 885 A. D.)¹ and the *Kitāb al-buldān* of Ibn al-Faḡih al-Hamadhānī (ca. 902 A. D.)².

2. The main part of Ibn Khurdādhbeh's work is devoted to a statistical description of cities and provinces of *dār al-Islām*, i.e., the caliphate and the lands of Islam, as well as some important non-Muslim countries of Europe and Asia, and including reports on some important post-roads and trade routes. Among these are included the routes of two groups of non-Muslim merchants: the Jewish corporation of the ar-Rādhāniya, and the corporation of the ar-Rūs, certainly both with roots in the traditions of international trade of the Roman Empire^{2a}.

2.1. The report on the trade route of the Jewish corporation is divided into two parts, the first dealing with their sea route, the second with their land route. Between these two parts there is an interpolation. This is the Arabic text on the trade route of the ar-Rūs.

¹ Concerning the date of composition of the work see below, n. 10. In the text of Ibn Khurdādhbeh I have followed the edition of M. J. de Goeje in *BGA*, vol. VI, Lugduni Batavorum, 1889, pp. 153—155.

² ed. M. J. de Goeje in *BGA*, vol. V, Lugduni Batavorum, 1885, pp. 270—271.

^{2a} Cf. note 9.

How is this interpolation to be explained?³

2.2. I am in agreement with S. D. Goitein that „the great international trade connected with the history of the Radanites has no connection with the socio-economic transformation of the Jewish people in Islamic times [as a result of „the ‘bourgeois revolution’ of the Muslim Empire in the eighth and ninth centuries“, *ibid.*, p. 105]. Rather it was a continuation of pre-Islamic Jewish trade⁴, which gained an unprecedented importance when the advent of Islam erected a temporary barrier between East and West. The Jews who combined political neutrality with long-standing international connections could, in the first centuries of Islam, cross the frontiers more easily than either Christians or Muslims. The headquarters of the Radanites obviously were in Christian Europe...“⁵.

It follows from this that the ar-Rādhāniya were active *before* the tenth century⁶. In Eastern Europe they operated between the 780's and 830's⁷.

2.3. From the Arabic text it is evident that the trade route of the ar-Rūs could have originated at the earliest in the 830's,

³ V. F. Minorsky (*Hudūd al-'Alam*, London 1937, 429) believed that the second part of the trade route followed by the merchants of the ar-Rādhāniya actually referred to the ar-Rūs. A convincing critique of this view was made by T. Lewicki (*Źródła arabskie do dziejów słowiańszczyzny*, t. I, Wrocław—Kraków 1956, 118—119). — B. N. Zakhoder (*Kaspiiskii svod svedenii o Vostochnoi Evrope*, t. II, Moscow 1967, 86) considered that the second half of the description of the trade route of the ar-Rādhāniya was a resumé of the two preceding parts (i.e., the first route of the ar-Rādhāniya and the route of the ar-Rūs). This view is similarly vulnerable to criticism.

⁴ [The problems connected with the activities of the ar-Rādhāniya I am treating elsewhere. Here I only want to emphasize that to treat them as some *deus ex machina* is not productive. The corporation of international traders of the ar-Rādhāniya belongs to the history of international trade of the Roman Empire and its successors, just as the Jewish merchant corporations of the Geniza documents belong to the international trade of the Islamic empire. — O. P.]

⁵ S. D. Goitein, *Jews and Arabs*, New York 1964, p. 107.

⁶ Goitein, *l. c.*

⁷ Evidence for this is presented in my monograph *The Origins of the Rus'*, now being prepared for publication.

since its existence was contingent on the fortress of Sarkel on the Don River, which was constructed only in 833.

The ar-Rūs had a partner on the Byzantine side in Chersones/Korsun' which at that very time (9th cf.) was entering a period of independent economic growth, typified in the minting of its own coinage⁸.

On the other hand we know that Ibn Khurdādhbeh incorporated these routes into his description not later than 885. It is possible, therefore, to date the trade route of the ar-Rūs between the 830's and 885.

2.4. From the foregoing it follows that the two trade routes, i.e., the route of the ar-Rādhāniya and the route of the ar-Rūs, are not from the same period, but that the former is earlier. In fact the corporation of the ar-Rūs⁹ replaced the corporation of the ar-Rādhāniya in Eastern Europe.

There is no evidence to assume that it was Ibn Khurdādhbeh who inserted the route of the ar-Rūs into the description of the routes of the ar-Rādhāniya. Ibn al-Faqīh (or better: his source), who utilized the same documents independently of Ibn Khurdādhbeh¹⁰,

⁸ V. V. Kropotkin, *Klady vizantiiskikh monet na territorii SSSR*, M. 1962, 11. As this sound monograph proves, significant trade relations between Byzantium and (Kievan) Rus' existed only in the tenth and eleventh centuries.

⁹ In this article I am only dealing with the Arabic text about the route of the merchant corporation of the ar-Rūs. Questions of their national identity lie outside the scope of my topic. It would be best to replace the word/name ar-Rūs with the sign X. In any case this was a corporation of traders who specialized in international trade and which, like the corporation of the ar-Rādhāniya, must have had its roots in the traditions of international trade in the Roman Empire. This position is necessary if we are to mitigate the harm created by various identifications, dictated by sentiments *ad maiorem nationis gloriam* which only impede scholarly progress.

¹⁰ Ibn al-Faqīh's text includes a number of data not found in the work of Ibn Khurdādhbeh, e.g., on the city of *al-Samkaré al-Yahūd* (all these passages are noted in the commentary to the text), so Ibn Khurdādhbeh could not have served as Ibn al-Faqīh's source. They both must have utilized a third source. M. J. de Goeje believed that there were two versions of Ibn Khurdādhbeh's work, one from A. H. 232/846—47 A. D., the other not earlier than A. H. 272/885—

found the routes of both corporations (ar-Rādhāniya and ar-Rūs) already in conjunction ¹¹.

2.5. I would explain this association of the routes of two different corporations in the following way. Sometime toward the end of the eighth century the state chancellery (*diwān ar-rasā'il* / *diwān al-inšā'*) received a text on the trade route followed by the corporation of the ar-Rādhāniya, describing separately their sea and land routes. In addition to China, India and Western Europe, the text also speaks of the ar-Rādhāniya's trade relations with Byzantium, Khazaria and Iran.

Subsequently, in the second half of the ninth century, caravans of another merchant corporation, the ar-Rūs, began to penetrate as far as Baghdad, where some official from the diwan (*wazīr* or *kātib*) gathered and recorded some information on their trade routes. Because the ar-Rūs traded mainly with Byzantium, Khazaria and Iran, much like the ar-Rādhāniya, the two corporations became closely associated in the mind of this official. In consequence he incorporated his report on the newcomers into the older report on the ar-Rādhāniya, and, following an old Eastern usage, entered it either in the margin of the older document or on a separate sheet inserted on a level between the two parts of the route description of the ar-Rādhāniya.

Later the copyists, state officials (*wazīr*'s) and scholars, who had access to the archives of the state chancellery, among them Ibn Khurdādhbeh as chief of the postal system, treated this interpolation as an integral part of one whole ¹².

86 A. D. P. G. Bulgakov, however, has recently proved that there existed only one version, identified with that which de Goeje considered to be the second, i.e. from ca. A. H. 272 'Kniga putei i gosudarstv' Ibn Khurdādhbeh (K izucheniiu i datirovke redaktsii)", „Palestinskii Sbornik", vol. 3, 1958, 127—131.

¹¹ However, Ibn al-Faqīh omitted the second part, the land route of the ar-Rādhāniya.

¹² In Ibn Khurdādhbeh's work there are a number of such cases where the text is interrupted by interpolations. Already de Goeje (*BGA*, vol. VII, p. XVII) called attention to this fact and proposed as a possible explanation of this „disorganization" the incorporation of marginal notes or insets into the texts by later copyists. Cf. also T. Lewicki, *Żródła*, p. 54.

3. In his chapter on „(the city of) Ray and (the mountain) Dunbāwand" Ibn al-Faqīh cites from various authors, including an excerpt from a pamphlet in honor of the city of Ray composed by one Muḥammad b. Ishāq. This pamphlet describes the trade routes of the ar-Rādhāniya (the sea route) and of the ar-Rūs as evidence for the greatness of Ray as a center of international trade ¹³.

3.1. The fact that Ibn al-Faqīh did not use the text of these routes directly but through the intermediary of Muḥammad b. Ishāq's pamphlet has been duly noted over sixty years ago by Josef Markwart ¹⁴. But neither Markwart himself nor other scholars (who overlooked his observation) recognized the implication of this important fact for the history of the Arabic text on the trade route of the ar-Rūs ¹⁵.

3.2. An important point to be noted here is that Muḥammad b. Ishāq was by origin from the city of Hamadhān (the former capital of Media) which, like Ray, was one of the four centers of the province of Jibal, a rival of Iraq, which had the good fortune to become the political capital of the entire Abbasid empire (Baghdad/Samarra).

3.3. In Hamadhān Muḥammad b. Ishāq kept an open house for discussions on literary, scholarly and other similar topics ¹⁶. One such literary-scholarly debate (*munāẓara*) ¹⁷ revolved around the question whether Iraq (Baghdad) or Hamadhān deserved priority in glory and importance. Ibn al-Faqīh details minutely the course of the debate and cites all the learned quotations as well as old and new poems adduced by the two disputants — 'Abd al-Qāhir b. Hamza al-Wāsiṭī, who defended the primacy of Baghdad, and al-Ḥusain b. 'Alī Sarḥ ¹⁸, who extolled Hamadhān.

¹³ *BGA*, vol. V, p. 270—271.

¹⁴ *Osteuropäische und Ostasiatische Streifzüge*, Leipzig 1903, p. 203, n. 1; pp. 350—351. Ibn al-Faqīh cites the name of Muḥammad b. Ishāq twice: 227, 17 and 270, 7. Cf. also *Afterword*.

¹⁵ See below, note 18 to the Arabic text.

¹⁶ *BGA*, vol. V, p. 227.

¹⁷ Yāqūt ar-Rūmī, *Mu'jam al-buldān*, ed. F. Wüstenfeld, vol. IV, 984, 9.

¹⁸ *BGA*, vol. V, 227—237.

Unfortunately none of the other surviving sources provide any further details on these two or any other persons who participated in the discussion¹⁹.

The text of this long *munāẓara* gives the impression that Ibn al-Faḳīh was a first-hand observer of these events.

3.4. About Ibn al-Faḳīh himself we know actually very little. Our knowledge can be reduced to the following three facts:

1. he was by origin from Hamadhān;
2. his full name was: Abu Bakr Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Ishāq Ibn al-Faḳīh al-Hamadhānī;
3. he completed his work sometime ca. 289 A. H./902 A. D.²⁰

3.5. An analysis of his name — *kunya* and *laqab* — indicates that his father was some Muḥammad b. Ishāq who must have attained some distinction as a jurist (*faḳīh*) and therefore was given the name of his profession as a nickname (*laqab*): al-Faḳīh. From this *laqab* his son received in turn his nickname, formally a *kunya*: Ibn al-Faḳīh. As natives of Hamadhān both father and son also had the *nisba*: al-Hamadhānī.

3.6. When citing the above-mentioned literary discussion „Irāb versus Hamadhān“ Yāqūt (who also gives Ibn al-Faḳīh's full *kunya*)²¹ refers to the host, Muḥammad b. Ishāq, in the following manner: Muḥammad b. Ishāq al-Faḳīh²². It becomes quite evident from this that Muḥammad b. Ishāq al-Faḳīh (al-Hamadhānī) was the father of Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Ishāq Ibn al-Faḳīh (al-Hamadhānī).

3.7. To summarize, we know that:

1. Ibn al-Faḳīh took his information concerning the traders of ar-Rūs from a panegyric on Ray authored by his father;

¹⁹ This particular literary discussion is mentioned only by Yāqūt under the heading *Hamadhān* (ed. Wüstenfeld, vol. IV, 984—991).

²⁰ See Carl Brockelmann, *GAL*, S I, 405—406; — I. Yu. Kračkovskij, „Ist. arab. geografii“ (= *Sobr. sochineniia*, vol 4, M.-L. 1957, 156—159).

²¹ *Iršād*, ed. D. S. Margoliouth, vol. II, 53.

²² *Mu'jam al-buldān*, vol. IV, 984, 14.

²³ See note 14 to the Arabic text.

2. the differences between the text of the works of Ibn Khurdādhbeh and Ibn al-Faḳīh (in its final part) regarding the direction in which the merchandise of the ar-Rūs travels from the port of Gurgān (i.e., Abāskūn) are only illusory.

4. A panegyric in praise of the city of Ray (it must again be emphasized that Ray and Hamadhān were located in the province of Jibal, the rival of Iraq) was certainly not the place to explain that the merchandise of a foreign trade corporation (in this case the ar-Rūs) reached as far as Baghdad, the capital of Iraq. Rather the author felt it necessary to emphasize that this merchandise passed into Ray (which, in fact, it did, since the route from Abāskūn to Baghdad passed through both Ray and Hamadhān)²⁴.

Since, as we have seen, Ibn al-Faḳīh wrote his work sometime toward the end of the ninth century or the beginning of the tenth (ca. 902 A. D.), his father must have composed his pamphlet in the seventies or eighties of the ninth century. This was about the same time that Ibn Khurdādhbeh was writing his own work. There can be no doubt that they were contemporaries.

We do not know whether and which position Muḥammad b. Ishāq al-Faḳīh held in the provincial administration of Jibal, but as a *faḳīh* he could have had access, at least through an intermediary, to materials about the trade routes of foreign merchants which had been collected in the *Diwān al-inšā'*.

A possibility even comes to mind who could have helped him in this matter. We know that Ibn Khurdādhbeh, before moving to Baghdad/Samarra (at the latest ca. 870/878)²⁵, served as chief of the postal system and intelligence in the province of Jibal²⁶. We have also noted that the home of Muḥammad b. Ishāq in Hamadhān was a meeting place for the intellectual elite of Jibal. It would seem hardly possible that the intelligent and musically gifted civil servant and scholar, Ibn Khurdādhbeh, would not be numbered among the guests. As a high official he could have

²⁴ Cf., for example, map no. 1 in G. Le Strange, *The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate*, Cambridge, 1905.

²⁵ It is a well-known fact that Ibn Khurdādhbeh was a personal friend of the caliph al-Mu'tamid; cf. T. Lewicki, *Żródła* I, 46—47.

²⁶ An-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, ed. G. Flügel, vol. I, p. 212.

procured for Muḥammad b. Ishāq documentary materials which interested him. This Ibn Khurdādhbeh could have done during his stay in Hamadhān, but even after his transfer to Baghdad/Samarra as well, since such friendly ties are usually maintained. It was possibly no coincidence that Ibn al-Faqīh was the only Arabic-speaking author who knew how to vocalize the Persian name of the geographer (Khurdādhbeh)²⁷.

5. The two contemporary writers (Muḥammad b. Ishāq and Ibn Khurdādhbeh) had already found the route of the ar-Rūs interpolated into the account of the trade routes of the ar-Rādhāniya. Each of them, however, utilized this common source in his own way, omitting whatever seemed insignificant for his purposes, and adding conjectures of his own. This fortunate circumstance makes possible a reconstruction of the original text on the trade route of the merchant corporation of ar-Rūs.

Our attempt to reconstruct this text is given below. It is not mechanistic; footnotes are provided to explain in each case why Ibn Khurdādhbeh or Muḥammad b. Ishāq dropped or substituted words or sentences.

Our reconstruction indicates that the original Arabic text was a description of the three divisions of the trade route followed by the ar-Rūs, two by river and sea, and one by land:

1. (river and sea route) from „the farthest reaches of *Ṣaqlabiya*“ to the Byzantine Crimea and back to „the *Ṣaqlabs*“;

2. (also river and sea route) along the Severskii Donets to Khazaria across the Don and Volga, and on to the Muslim (Iranian) ports on the Caspian Sea;

3. (land route, by camel caravan) from Gurgān (i.e., the port of Abāskūn on the south-eastern shore of the Caspian Sea) to Baghdad.

6. I am intentionally retaining the Arabic name *as-Ṣaqlab* (*aṣ-Ṣaqlāliba*) *ṣaqlabiya* untranslated, as I have also done with the name *ar-Rūs*. Unfortunately, many authors have developed the „patriotic“ habit of indiscriminately replacing the term *ṣaqlab* with the term „Slav, Slavic“. In many contexts this is undoubtedly

²⁷ Ibn al-Faqīh, *BGA*, vol. V, 203; cf. de Goeje's foreword to *BGA*, vol. VI (p. VII).

correct; but before deciding whether such a meaning of the term is possible, it is necessary to determine clear and precise criteria for a decision in each individual case. We cannot forget that the word *ṣaqlab*²⁸ is a term adopted by the Arabs from the Roman Mediterranean cultural sphere, i.e., from the bearers of Roman international trade (i.e. its later continuators, the Franks and Byzantines), with the established meaning of „fair-haired slave (often: eunuch)“. It is derived from the late Roman *sclavus* (in the West) / *σκλαβ-ος* (in the East), a term which originated sometime in the sixth century²⁹. It is probable that the above-mentioned merchants of ar-Rādhāniya first acquainted the Arab-Islamic world both with the term and the object to which it referred („fair-haired slaves“) ³⁰.

On Islamic soil the term *ṣaqlab* gained the additional meaning of „ruddy-faced, red-headed inhabitant of the northern lands“ ³¹. In addition to the true Slavs this collective term was also applied to the Scandinavians and Germans on the one hand, and to the Volga Bulgars, Turks, etc., on the other ³².

In the text under consideration here the term *ṣaqlab*, in its various grammatical forms, is attested five times.

6.1. The first appearance of the term is in an added comment explaining who were these new trading partners that now loomed over the horizon of the Abbasid empire: „and they are a kind type of *Ṣaqlabs*“. Within the Arab cultural sphere the term *Ṣaqlab*,

²⁸ The first /a/ in the word /*ṣaqlab*/ is epenthetic, since in accordance with Arabic morphology a cluster of two consonants in the word initial position is impossible; in this case the cluster is /sk/.

²⁹ Cf. F. Kluge — A. Götze, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*, 15, Berlin 1951, 728.

³⁰ It is probably not a coincidence that the Slavs designate the Jews by the late Roman (Romance) name *zhid-*; cf. M. Vasmer, *Russisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*, vol. I (Heidelberg, 1953), p. 423.

³¹ Cf. al-Kalbī (al-Qazwīnī), *Kosmographie*, ed. F. Wüstenfeld, vol. II, p. 413; — Yāqūt, *Mu'jam al-buldān*, ed. F. Wüstenfeld, vol. III, 405.

³² In the last few decades the meaning of the Arabic word *ṣaqlab* has provoked a heated polemic, due mainly to the resentments of scholars of Slavic origin. On this polemic see, for example, T. Lewicki, *Żródła*, vol. I, 6—9.

of course, is earlier than the name ar-Rūs. Because the ar-Rūs came from the north and corresponded to the anthropological criteria of the term *Šaqḷab* (red-haired and ruddy-faced — in comparison with the peoples of the Near East, of course!), the author of the report on their trade route added this explanatory note. For the reader this would immediately clarify who the subject of the report were, since the term *Šaqḷab* had long been known to the Arabic-speaking population. I consider the translation „and they are a type of Slavs“ to be entirely unwarranted in this instance.

6.2. The text relates that the ar-Rūs merchants brought their goods „from the farthest reaches of *Šaqḷabiya*“. A very considerable part of this merchandise consisted of swords.

In ninth and tenth century Europe swords were manufactured only in two localities, both in Germany: *Ulfberht* (between Mainz and Bern) and *Ingelred* in Passau. Significantly, every fifth sword uncovered by archaeological excavations in Eastern Europe has the *Ulfberht* trademark³³.

At an early date, during the Carolingian period, these swords, especially those from the Rhineland, became known to the Rūs'. This is evidenced by the term *kharaliuzhnye* (= Carolingian)³⁴, attested in *The Igor Tale*, as an attribute for swords of especially high quality³⁵.

Archaeological evidence has shown that „nowhere in Europe have there been found so many swords from the ninth and tenth centuries as in Scandinavia, especially in Norway where they number about 2,500, making that country a virtual sword arsenal of the Middle Ages“³⁶.

³³ See Kirpichnikov, *Drevnerusskoe oruzhie*, part I, M.-L. 1966, 19.

³⁴ Tatjana Čiževska, *Glossary of the Igor's Tale* (The Hague, 1966), 369—370, s. v.

³⁵ On the Scandinavian term **karlungaland* see Esther M. Metzenthin, *Die Länder- und Völkernamen im altisländischen Schrifttum* (Bryn Mawr, 1941), 55a, s. v.

³⁶ Kirpichnikov, *loc. cit.* — The same meaning of „Carolingian swords“ for the swords of the ar-Rūs is also found in Ibn Fadlān (A. D. 922). He uses the term *ifranjiya*, „Frankish“ (Meshed Ms., 210a = ed. Kovaliv's'kyi, 1957, 141, and note 689 on p. 237—38), evidently from the Frankish origin of the Carolingian dynasty. —

The Arabic term *min aqsā šaqḷabiyah*, „from the farthest reaches of *Šaqḷabiya*“, i.e., from the northern lands, corresponds quite well to Scandinavia, especially Norway. Thus, in the ninth century the corporation of international traders of the ar-Rūs exported swords to the East from their Scandinavian depot and not directly from the Rhineland/Passau.

As can readily be seen, the translation of *min aqsā šaqḷabiyah* as „from the farthest reaches of Slavdom“ in this context is inadmissible.

6.3. From the Crimea the ar-Rūs „return to the *Šaqḷabs*“. Here, in all probability, the term *Šaqḷabs* does refer to the Slavs, the tributaries of the Rūs'. Concerning the practice of the Rūs' in gathering tribute from their subject Slavic population between their trading expeditions we know from the tenth century Byzantine emperor-scholar Constantine Porphyrogenitus and from the *PVL*. Important data from the ninth century, which for the most part tallies with that of the tenth century, is provided by the work of the Arab geographer Ibn Rūste.

6.4. The topography of ninth century treasure hoards³⁷ shows without any doubt that the route from the center of Rus' („the Rus'ian kaganate“) in the area of Yaroslav—Rostov to Khazaria passed along the Oka—Seim, then along the Severskii Donets, finally passing into the Don—Volga. Between Bolgar and Itil (Khamlikh/Khvalisy) the Volga was inaccessible to the traders of the ar-Rūs, since it was under the control of the Volga Bulgars and the Burtas who naturally did not give access there to any competitors.

Howeyer some Islamic authors (e.g., Ibn Rūste/Khvolson, p. 37; Gardizi/Barthold, p. 37) used their own attribute for the excellence of the swords of the ar-Rūs: *sulaimāniya*, „Solomon's“, i.e., „all-seeing“ (reference to the Qur'ān, XXXIV; 10—12; see A. P. Novosel'tsev, *Vostochnye istochniki o vostochnykh Slavianakh i Rusi VI—IX vv.*, *Drevnerusskoe gosudarstvo* etc., M. 1965, 404; — B. N. Zakhoder, *Kaspiiskii svod*, vol. II, 94). The swords of the ar-Rūs are also mentioned by *Hudūd al-'Ālam*/Minorsky 159 and the eleventh century author al-'Utbi/Seippel, 79.

³⁷ See V. L. Yanin, *Denezhno-vesovye sistemy russkogo srednevekov'ia, Domongol'skii period*, Moscow 1956, maps no. 5 on p. 86 and no. 17 on p. 107.

In this particular route the Severskii Donets was of major importance, which accounts for its appearance in Islamic sources of the ninth to twelfth centuries under two names:

- a. the river of aṣ-Ṣaqāliba
- b. the river of ar-Rūs.

We will attempt to explain briefly the origin of these names.

Among the goods of the ar-Rūs which became popular in Baghdad during the second half of the ninth century the texts of Ibn Khurdādhbeh and Ibn al-Faḳīh do not name one important commodity: slaves. From other Arab authors (e.g., Ibn Rūste³⁸ and Gardizī)³⁹ it appears clearly that the ar-Rūs did not actually bring this commodity into the caliphate, but took it only as far as Itil and Bolgar on the Volga. Thence the slaves were transported into Muslim lands by Khwarezmian traders who probably held a monopoly on the commodity.

The main route to Itil was, as we have seen, by way of the Severskii Donets and the Don—Volga. It is for this reason, according to our conjecture, that this riverway received the name „river of the Saqlabs“, i.e., the main highway by which were transported „fair-haired“ slaves from the „northern lands“ to Itil. Later this river received the additional name „river of the ar-Rūs“ from the name of the corporation which during the ninth and tenth centuries engaged in the slave trade with Khazaria.

The foregoing shows that the name „the river of aṣ-Ṣaqāliba“⁴⁰ is not connected with the population inhabiting its basin. Rather the name originated from the river's role as a major highway in the slave trade. It may be added that archaeological data show that in the ninth and tenth centuries there could not have been any Slavs in the basins of the Severskii Donets and the Don.

³⁸ BGA, vol. VII, 145.

³⁹ ed. Barthold, p. 100.

⁴⁰ The term *nahr aṣ-Ṣaqāliba*, „the river of the Saqlabs“, is attested in Islamic historical literature in the account of the victorious campaign by Marwān b. Muḥammad against the Khazars in 737, e.g., in the *Kitāb al-futūḥ* of Ibn A'tham al-Kūfī (d. ca. 314 A. H./926 A. D. = Z. V. Togan, *Ibn Faḍlān*, 296, 16). In the tenth century, when the author was composing his work, this term was also used for the river Donets-Don.

Consequently it is again unacceptable in this instance to translate the Arabic term *nahr aṣ-Ṣaqāliba* as „the river of the Slavs“.

6.5. In our text the term *Ṣaqḷab* is attested for the last time in reference to the eunuchs who served as translators for the representatives of the ar-Rūs in Baghdad. In our opinion it is impossible to establish which language these eunuchs and the ar-Rūs used to communicate. It could have been a Scandinavian tongue or German or Slavic. But taking into consideration the certainly heterogeneous membership of the corporation of the ar-Rūs and the wide scope of their activities, we cannot exclude the possibility that this language was some Turkic or Finnic („Chudian“) tongue. For this reason it is again advisable to leave the term „Ṣaqḷab“ untranslated.

THE ARABIC TEXT ON THE TRADE ROUTE
OF THE CORPORATION OF AR-RŪS
(ATTEMPT AT A RECONSTRUCTION)

مسلك تجار الرؤس* وهم جنس من الصقالبة.²

[1] *فانهم³ يحملون جلود الخنز وجلود الثعالب* السود والسيوف من
أقصى صقلية.

*فيجيئون⁵ الى البحر الرومي، فيعشرهم صاحب الروم.

¹ In both works (IKH and IF₂: IKH = Ibn Khurdādhbeh; IF₂ = Ibn Faḳīh) our text is an interpolation and consequently begins with the formula *فأما*, „and as to...“

² IF₂, who in places abbreviates the text, has omitted: *الروس وهم* „the ar-Rūs, they are a type of“, retaining only that which to him seemed essential, that is: *Ṣaqḷabs*. This is the origin of the „parallel“ text about the trade route of „Slavic“ merchants.

³ according to IKH; IF₂ has omitted *إنهم*.

⁴ according to IKH; IF₂ has omitted the attribute for foxes (السود „black“) and a very important article of trade exported by the ar-Rūs: the German swords from the Rhineland.

⁵ according to IF₂; the phrase is omitted in IKH.

*ثمَّ يَحْمِثُونَ فِي الْبَحْرِ إِلَى سَمَكْرِشَ الْيَهُودِ، ثُمَّ يَتَحَوَّلُونَ إِلَى الصَّقَالِبَةِ.⁶

[2] *وَإِنْ شَاءُوا سَارُوا⁷ فِي تَيْنٍ⁸ يُقَالُ لَهُ نَهْرُ⁹ الصَّقَالِبَةِ حَتَّى

يَحْمِثُونَ إِلَى خَلِيجِ الْخَزَرِ¹¹ فَيَعِشُرُهُمْ صَاحِبُ الْخَزَرِ¹² غَمَرُوا بِخَمَلِيخِ

⁶ according to IF₂; the entire sentence is omitted in IKH.

⁷ according to IKH. IF₂ uses a different phraseology: ثُمَّ (the editor, M. de Goeje, considering that this word „sensum non dat“, corrected it to آوُ „or“). يَأْخُذُونَ.

⁸ according to IKH; in IF₂ it is omitted. The name of the river in the text of IKH is corrupt: لس D/س/ A. Circumstances indicate that only the Severskii Donets can be considered. It is attested in the sources under the form of تَيْن. See also note 10 to the Translation.

⁹ According to IF₂; it is omitted in IKH. In IF₂ the whole phrase has been preserved, but accidentally appears in the wrong place (see note 10).

¹⁰ according to IKH; IF₂ has here mistakenly بحر „sea“. Because of his stylization of the original he placed before بحر the preposition من „from“. This is evident from the following sentence in IF₂: فِي هَذَا النَّهْرِ „in that river which they call the river of the Saqlabs“. This sentence, as de Goeje noted, was misplaced and became an explanation for the term الْبَحْرُ الْخَرَّاسَانِي „Khorasanian (= Caspian) Sea“. That the fault for this lies with IF₂ and not with the original text is evident from the use in this sentence of the term „Khorasanian Sea“ to indicate the Caspian (see note 14).

¹¹ according to IF₂; IKH has omitted this sentence.

¹² Thus in IF₂; because of a mistaken inversion of the sentence (see n. 13) IKH speaks here of the lord (governor) of Khamlikh.

مَدِينَةِ الْخَزَرِ¹³. ثُمَّ يَصِيرُونَ إِلَى بَحْرِ جُرْجَانِ¹⁴ فَيُخْرِجُونَ فِي آيٍ سَوَاحِلَهُ أَحْبُوا¹⁵ فَبَاعُوا جَمِيعَ مَا مَعَهُمْ¹⁶.

[3] *وَزَبْمَا حَمَلُوا تِجَارَاتِهِمْ مِنْ جُرْجَانٍ عَلَى الْإِبِلِ إِلَى بَغْدَادِ¹⁷. وَيَتَرْجَمُ عَنْهُمْ الْخُدَمُ الصَّقَالِبَةُ. وَيَدْعُونَ أَنَّهُمْ نَصَارَى فَيُؤْذُونَ الْجَزْيَةَ¹⁸.

¹³ In IKH this sentence was mistakenly transposed, replacing the omitted sentence mentioned in note 11. This is evidently due to the close resemblance of the names: خَلِيجُ الْخَزَرِ „the Khazarian (river) arm“ and خَمَلِيخُ مَدِينَةِ الْخَزَرِ „Khamlikh, a Khazarian city“. It should not be forgotten that the name of the city of خَمَلِيخُ Khamlikh is often „corrected“ in manuscripts (e.g., MS. B of IKH), i.e., it is mistakenly replaced by the word „arm, strait“: خَلِيجُ (xlyj).

¹⁴ Instead of بَحْرِ جُرْجَانِ (IKH). „mare Hyrcanium“ the text of IF₂ has الْبَحْرُ الْخَرَّاسَانِي „Khorasanian Sea“. This last name, very rare in Arabic geographical literature (it is used only by Mas'ūdī, BGA, vol. VIII, 60), is typical of IF₂. He uses it as equivalent with other terms for the Caspian Sea: بَحْرُ الْخَزَرِ „Khazarian Sea“: الْبَحْرُ الْخَرَّاسَانِي (BGA, V, 324₁₄).

¹⁵ according to IKH; in IF₂ this sentence is omitted. It is followed in IKH by a citation of the width of the sea: وَقَطْرَ هَذَا الْبَحْرِ جَسْمَانَةُ فَرَسَخٍ „and the width of this sea has 500 farsangs“ (cf. *Hudūd al-'Ālam*, Eng. translation by V. Minorsky, 53, 3.5): „its [Caspian Sea] length is 400 farsangs with a breadth of 400 farsangs“. This is probably an explanatory insert of the learned scholar, IKH.

¹⁶ according to IF₂; IKH has omitted this sentence.

¹⁷ according to IKH. IF₂ confused this sentence with the preceding one, giving rise to a „joint“ text: فَرَبْمَا خَرَجُوا بِجُرْجَانٍ فَبَاعُوا جَمِيعَ مَا مَعَهُمْ „sometimes they go to Gurgān (= Abāskūn) and sell (there) everything that they have“.

¹⁸ according to IKH; omitted in IF₂. — The following sentence in IF₂ فِي قَعِّ جَمِيعِ ذَلِكَ إِلَى الرَّيِّ „and all this reaches (the city of) Ray“ has no relationship to our text. It is taken from a panegyric in honor of Rey, whose author, Muḥammad b. Ishāq, included data on foreign

TRANSLATION OF THE RECONSTRUCTED ARABIC TEXT
ABOUT THE TRADE ROUTE OF THE CORPORATION OF THE AR-RŪS

The [trade] route of the merchants [of the corporation of] ar-Rūs, and they are a kind type¹ of *Ṣaqlabs*².

[1] They bring skins of beavers, skins of black foxes, and swords³ from the farthest reaches of *Ṣaqlabiyah*.

They travel [by boats] to the sea of Rum (= Byzantium, i.e., the Black Sea) [to the city of Chersones/Korsun'] and the lord (= governor) of Rum (= Byzantium) takes [there] from them a tenth⁴.

Then they go by sea [on boats] to [the city of] Samkarč-the = Jewish (Tamartarkha, the later Tmutorokan')⁵, [there they sell their merchandise and] then they return to the *Ṣaqlabs*⁶.

[2] If they want, they [take another route; that is, they] go by [the river Siverskii] Donets (= *Tīn*)⁷, which is called „the river of aṣ-Ṣaqliba“ (= the river of the *Ṣaqlabs*)⁸, until they reach

merchants whose merchandise passed into Ray (see n. 4). Because scholars have not noticed the position of the account about the „Slavic“ merchants in the structure of the text of IF₂, there has developed a conviction that (to quote B. Zakhoder); „the essential difference of Ibn al-Faḡīh's text from the text of Ibn Khurdādhbeh is in the description of the direction in which the merchandise of the Rus' merchants travels from Gurgān. In the words of Ibn al-Faḡīh they are directed not to Baghdad [as in Ibn Khurdādhbeh], but to Ray...“ (II, 88).

¹ The word *jins* has the following meanings: „sort, variety, species, class, genus; category; sex (male, female); gender (*gram.*), race nation“, see Wehr-Cowan (1966, 141).

² See 6.1.

³ See 6.2.

⁴ The topography of treasure hoards shows us the route by which the ar-Rūs, who at that time (second half of the ninth century) did not yet rule in Kiev, undertook their trade journeys to the Crimea: Oka — Seim — Vorskla — Dnieper (see map no. 17 on p. 102 in B. L. Yanin, *Denezhno-vesovye sistemy*, Moscow, 1956).

⁵ On this name and its identification with (Tmutorokan') see the exhaustive note no. 19 on p. 106—107 in P. Kokovtsev's *Evr. Khaz. Perepiska*. See also *op. cit.*, p. 118, n. 4.

⁶ Evidently the ar-Rūs returned via the Azov Sea — Don — Donets. Cf. 5.14.

⁷ See 6.4. On the form *tyn* see my work „The Ethnographic Composition of Khazaria“ (in preparation).

⁸ See 6.4.

the Khazarian [river] arm [i.e., to the Don, to the place where stood the Sarkel fortress]⁹; [there] the Khazarian lord (= governor) takes from them a tenth, and they [sailing down the Volga] cross Khamlikh [the mercantile part of Itil, the Old Rus'ian *Khvalisy*]¹⁰, the Khazarian city.

Then they enter [by ships] the sea of Gurgan (Mare Hyrcanium, i.e., the Caspian Sea) and disembark (there) on the shore, where they want (i.e., they sail to whichever Islamic port on the Caspian they wish at the time) and sell [there] all that they have.

[3] Sometimes [they] carry their goods on camels from Gurgan [i.e., Abāskūn, which was the port of that province]¹¹ to Baghdad, [where] *Ṣaqlab*¹² eunuchs serve as their interpreters. They [the ar-Rus merchants] identify themselves as Christians¹³ and [therefore] they pay duty according to a special lower tariff [for the adherents of the revealed religions]¹⁴.

AFTERWORD

The Arabic text about the traderoute of the corporation of the ar-Rūs holds a very important place in the system of sources for the history of Eastern Europe in the ninth century. But associated with it is also my own personal story.

⁹ The Arabic *خليج* has the meaning „bay, gulf; canal“ (Wehr—Cowan, 253). The term „Khazarian *khalij*“ was used evidently for the Don from its mouth to the Donets, including the portage which linked the Don with the Volga.

¹⁰ On this identification see my work „The Ethnographic Composition of Khazaria“.

¹¹ Cf. le Strange, p. 379.

¹² See 6.5.

¹³ The merchants of the corporation of the ar-Rūs, who may have included pagans at that time, wanted to have the prestige which accrued in the Islamic world to the adherents of the revealed religions (*ahl al-kitāb*), primarily Christians. They (e.g., Christians, Jews, Zoroastrians) had their self-rule, forming a separate „national organization“ (*umma*), but they had to pay a repressive tax (*al-jizyah*).

¹⁴ The term *al-jizyah* also had the additional meaning: custom duty according to the tariff set for merchants who belonged to the *ahl-al-kitāb*. It constituted only one-twentieth of the value of the goods, i.e., it was half as great as in Chersones and Sarkel (see T. Lewicki, *Źródła*, 138, which provides a bibliography on the subject).

I first became acquainted with this text in a Ukrainian translation in „Vyjimky z zherel do istoriji Ukraïny-Rusy“ („Excerpts from sources for the history of Ukraine-Rus“) of Mykhailo Hrushevsky (Lviv, 1895, 19—20), while still a student in the gymnasium sometime around 1934, the year of the great historian's death. It was this particular text which served as one of the chief stimuli which turned me (then a fifteen year old boy) to the study of Oriental languages (especially Arabic), the key to the Islamic sources to the history of Ukraine and Eastern Europe.

I started to realize this plan in the academic year 1936/37 when I entered the humanities division of the Lvov University. At that time the chair of Arabic was already defunct for some six years (vacant since the death of Zygmunt Smogorzewski). Instruction in the Arabic language, however, continued. Elementary grammar was taught by a former Azerbaidzhani minister and lecturer in three Islamic languages, Muhammad Sadyk Bej Agabekzadeh (d. 1944) on the basis of his compilation from well-known Russian university textbooks. His teaching consisted solely in guiding the students through paradigms of Arabic nouns and verbs. He was afraid to touch an Arabic text.

The Lvov University had in addition another lecturer in the Arabic language, who concentrated mainly on Arabic historical and geographical texts. This was the (then) senior assistant at the chair of history of the Ancient History, Dr. Tadeusz Lewicki, now the world-renowned Polish Arabist.

My older university colleague and close friend Teofil Kostruba (*1907—d. 1944; died as a member of the Basilian Order) was on friendly terms with Dr. T. Lewicki, and thanks to his mediation I gathered the courage to enroll in the following academic year (1937—1938) in his reading course of Arabic texts. Knowing from Fr. Kostruba about my interest in the text of Ibn Khur-dādhbeh, Dr. Lewicki chose „my text“ for our first common undertaking. Thus the first extended Arabic text which I saw in my life in the Arabic original (more than thirty-one years ago) was this same text about the trade route of the ar-Rūs.

I must admit frankly that at the time I was yet in no condition to handle that type of text replete with various problems. But since that time I often returned to it, although engaged in other

subjects and scholarly disciplines, I never had the opportunity to devote myself to it more closely.

Even then (1937—1938) I made my first „discovery“: I explained (independently of J. Markwart) that Ibn al-Faqīh was acquainted with „my text“ through an intermediary work of some Muḥammad b. Ishāq. The identity of this enigmatic author often kept me awake nights. I remember well my disappointment when in the summer of 1939 (shortly before the outbreak of World War II) Prof. T. Kowalski informed me, through L. Lewicki, that the newly discovered manuscript of the work by Ibn al-Faqīh (the Meshhed MS) contained nothing which could aid in the solution of the problem of Muḥammad b. Ishāq.

Only on the 24-th and 25-th of January 1969, when in connection with the completion of two of my monographs on the Igor Tale and the history of Eastern Europe of the 8—13th centuries I decided to try myself to reconstruct the Arabic text about the trade route of the ar-Rūs, my eyes were opened.

When I decided to put my conclusions on paper, I could not free myself from reminiscences of Lvov, and therefore I dedicate this work to my first teacher in Arabic literature, a tireless researcher in Arabic sources relating to the history of the Slav, and my friend, Prof. Tadeusz Lewicki.

P. S. Having completed this work I turned to other subjects, and according to my custom placed it in my archives, making no attempts to have it published. But on My 30, 1969, I received an honorary invitation to take part in a Festschrift in honor of T. Lewicki. I, of course, could not have hoped for a better opportunity to contribute my mite of gratitude to my dear teacher and life-long friend. Neither the turbulent passions of the 1930 s nor later events and situations have been able to disrupt our friendship.