



The President and Fellows of Harvard College

Where Was Constantine's Inner Rus'?

Author(s): OMELJAN PRITSAK

Source: *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, Vol. 7, Okeanos: Essays presented to Ihor Ševčenko on his Sixtieth Birthday by his Colleagues and Students (1983), pp. 555-567

Published by: [Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41036117>

Accessed: 19/10/2014 07:23

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute and The President and Fellows of Harvard College are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

Where Was Constantine's Inner Rus'?

OMELJAN PRITSAK

1.

Chapter 9 of the *De administrando Imperio* (ca. 948), in which the learned emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus (d. 959) dealt with the Rus' traders along the Dnieper-Black Sea trade route, contains the following passage:¹

Ὅτι τὰ ἀπὸ τῆς ἔξω Ῥωσίας μονόξυλα κατερχόμενα ἐν Κωνσταντινοπόλει εἰσὶ μὲν ἀπὸ τοῦ Νεμογαρδάς, ἐν ᾧ Σφενδοσθλάβος, ὁ υἱὸς Ἰγγωρ, τοῦ ἀρχοντος Ῥωσίας, ἐκαθέζετο, εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ ἀπὸ τὸ κάστρον τὴν Μιλινίσκαν καὶ ἀπὸ Τελιούτζαν καὶ Τζερνιγῶγαν καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ Βουσεγραδέ. Ταῦτα οὖν ἅπαντα διὰ τοῦ ποταμοῦ κατέρχονται Δανάπρεως, καὶ ἐπισυνάγονται εἰς τὸ κάστρον | τὸ Κιοάβα, τὸ ἐπονομαζόμενον Σαμβατάς. Οἱ δὲ Σκλάβοι, οἱ πακτιῶται αὐτῶν, οἱ Κριβηταιηνοὶ λεγόμενοι, καὶ οἱ Λενζανῆνοι καὶ αἱ λοιπαὶ | Σκλαβηνίαι εἰς τὰ ὄρη αὐτῶν κόπτουσι τὰ μονόξυλα ἐν τῷ τοῦ χειμῶνος καιρῷ, καὶ καταρτίσαντες αὐτά, τοῦ καιροῦ ἀνοιγομένου, ἠνίκα διαλυθῆ ὁ παγετός, εἰς τὰς πλησίον οὐσας λίμνας εἰσάγουσιν αὐτά. Καὶ ἐπειδὴ ἐκεῖναι εἰσβάλλουσιν εἰς τὸν ποταμὸν τὸν Δάναπριν, ἀπὸ τῶν ἐκεῖσε οὗτοι εἰς τὸν αὐτὸν ποταμὸν

The single-straked ships which come down from Outer Rus' (ἡ ἔξω Ῥωσία) to Constantinople are from Novgorod, where Svjatoslav, son of Igor', prince of Rus', has his seat, and others from the city of Smolensk, and from Ljubeč and Černihiv and from Vyšhorod. All these came down the river Dnieper, and are collected together at the city (castle) of Kiev, also called Sambatas. Their Slavic tributaries, the so-called Krivichians and the Lenzanins (= Poljanians)² and the rest of the Sklavinias (Slavic regions), cut the single-strakers on their mountains in winter time, and when they have fastened them together, as spring approaches and the ice melts, they bring them on to the neighboring lakes. And since these lakes debouch into the river Dnieper, they enter thence onto this same river, and come down to Kiev, and draw the ships along to be

¹ The text and translation, with minor emendations, is reproduced from *Constantine Porphyrogenitus: De Administrando Imperio*, Greek text edited by Gyula Moravcsik, English translation by Romily J. M. Jenkins (Budapest, 1949), pp. 56, 58 and 57, 59.

² I elaborated on this question in my article "LENZEN-IN-Konstantyna Porfiro-rodnoho," in *Symbolae in honorem Georgii Y. Shevelov* (Munich, 1971), pp. 351-59.

εἰσέρχονται καὶ ἀπέρχονται εἰς τὸν Κίοβα, καὶ σύρουσιν εἰς τὴν ἐξάρτισιν, καὶ ἀπεμπολοῦσιν αὐτὰ εἰς τοὺς Ῥῶς. Οἱ δὲ Ῥῶς σκαφίδια καὶ μόνα ταῦτα ἀγοράζοντες, τὰ παλαιὰ αὐτῶν μονόξυλα καταλύοντες, ἐξ αὐτῶν βάλλουσιν πέλλας καὶ σκαρμους εἰς αὐτὰ καὶ λοιπὰς | χρείας... ἐξοπλίζουσιν αὐτὰ. Καὶ Ἰουνίου μηνὸς διὰ τοῦ ποταμοῦ Δανάπρεως ἀποκινῶντες, κατέρχονται εἰς τὸ Βιτετζέβη, ὅπερ ἐστὶ πακτιωτικὸν κάστρον τῶν Ῥῶς, καὶ συναθροιζόμενοι ἐκεῖσε μέχρι δύο καὶ τριῶν ἡμερῶν, ἤνικα ἂν ἅπαντα ἀποσυναχθῶσι τὰ μονόξυλα, τότε ἀποκινοῦσιν, καὶ κατέρχονται διὰ τοῦ εἰρημένου Δανάπρεως ποταμοῦ.

fitted out, and sell them to the Rus'. The Rus' buy these bottoms only, furnishing them with oars and rowlocks and other tackle from their old single-strakers, which they dismantle; and so they fit them out. And in the month of June they move off down the river Dnieper and come to Vytyčiv, which is a tributary castle of the Rus', and there they gather during two or three days; and when all the single-strakers are collected together, then they set out, and come down to the said Dnieper River.

This *locus classicus* is important because of the occurrence of ἡ ἔξω Ῥωσία 'the Outer Rus', a designation which is a *hapax* in Byzantine literature. Ever since T.S. Bayer made chapter 9 of *De administrando Imperio* known to scholars of Eastern Europe, in 1737-1744, a great many interpretations and emendations have been proposed,³ but the question of what was considered inner in contrast to outer Rus' has remained without a satisfactory answer. Most scholars, believing in the original primacy of Kiev in Rus' (a concept actually imposed by the clever chronicler of the first quarter of the twelfth century) maintained that Kiev was "the Inner Rus"; others proposed to exclude the embarrassing word *Rhōsija* from the text and to explain it as a later addition, taken from the title of chapter 9.

An unbiased analysis of the text, however, can yield only one valid conclusion: Constantine's text gives evidence of a very clear dichotomy of political structure along the Dnieper route around the 940s. Cities were under the direct control of Outer Rus'. Seven are mentioned by name: the five along the route were Novgorod, Smolensk, Ljubeč, Černihiv, and Vyšhorod/Vyšegrad; and the two central gathering points

³ See A. L. Pogodin, "'Vnešnja Rossija' Konstantina Bagrjanorodnogo," *Beličev Zbornik* (Belgrade, 1937), pp. 77-85; Alexandre Soloviev, "'H ἔξω Ῥωσία," *Byzantion* (Brussels), 13 (1938): 227-32; M. A. Šangin(†) and A. F. Višnjakova, "'Susčestvovala li 'vnešnja Rus'?", *Vizantijskij vremennik* (Moscow), 14 (1958): 97-102; Dimitri Obolensky in *Constantine Porphyrogenitus: De Administrando Imperio*, vol. 2: *Commentary*, ed. R. J. H. Jenkins (London, 1962), pp. 25-26.

in Rus' were Kiev, also called Sambatas, and Vytyčiv. On the other hand there appear the Slavic regions (αἱ Σκλαβήνιαι),⁴ tributary to Rus' and apparently located outside the Rus'-dominated cities. Only two such regions are mentioned by name in the quoted passage: that of the Krivichians, the most northern, and that of the Lenzanins/Polianians, the most southern. No "Inner" Rus', however, is mentioned in our text.

2.

Curiously enough, the term "Outer Rus'" reappears two centuries later—as a *hapax* in the Arabic (and Islamic) literature, in the *Kitāb Ruġġār* (1154) by 'Abū 'Abdallāh Muḥammad al-Idrīsī, who worked at the court of the Norman king Roger II (1105-1154) in Palermo (Sicily). The title of the sixth section of the sixth climate reads as follows:⁵

إن الذي تضمنه هذا الجزء السادس من
البحر البينطسي فهو طرف البحر بما عليه من
البلاد وتضمن أيضا قطعة من أرض القمانية
وببلاد الروسية الخارجة وبعض بلاد البلغارية
وبعض بلاد بسجرت وبلاد اللان وأرض
الخزر وبلادها وأنهاها.

This sixth section includes the Pontus (Black Sea), i.e., the outermost part of that sea, together with its countries. It contains [in this way] also a section of the country of Cumania (Polovcians) and the country of Outer Rus' (*ar-Rūsīya al-khāriġa*), part of the country of Bulgāriya and country of Bašġirt and country of Alānia and the land of Khazaria, as well as their towns and rivers.

The specific information on "Outer Rus'" which al-Idrīsī furnishes in this section is not original. He took it from a work of the tenth-century Arabic classical school of geography as represented by al-Iṣṭakhri and Ibn Ḥawqal. The former, author of the *Kitāb masālik al-mamālik*, wrote towards the end of the first half of the A.H. 400s/ca. A.D. 940-950, and the work of the latter dates from ca. A.D. 367/A.D. 977. It was typical for this geographical school to name three different kinds (not "tribes")

⁴ On the meaning of "Slavic regions," see O. Pritsak, "The Slavs and the Avars," in *Gli Slavi occidentali e meridionali nell'alto medioevo*, Centro Italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo, Trentesima Settimana di studio, Spoleto, 15-21 aprile 1982, vol. 2 (Spoleto, forthcoming).

⁵ Cited after Tadeusz Lewicki in *Al-Idrīsī. Opus Geographicum*, ed. A. Bombaci (†), U. Rizzitano et al., Istituto Universitario Orientale di Napoli, fasc. 8 (Naples and Rome, 1978), p. 914. My edition of the text and commentary will appear in the forthcoming volume 3 of my *Origin of Rus'*.

of Rūs, who were engaged in trade with the Muslim world: those of Kiev (*Kūyābā*), Novgorod (*aṣ-Ṣlāwiya*), and the still enigmatic *Artā*.⁶

The information on Rūs/Rus' provided by Constantine and al-Iṣṭakhri was actually contemporaneous. In the extant manuscripts of works by al-Iṣṭakhri-Ibn Ḥawqal, however, the word "outer" (*al-khāriġa*) does not occur together with Rūs. It is out of the question that al-Idrīsī (or his predecessors) could have had access to the secret handbook of Byzantine diplomacy written by Constantine Porphyrogenitus for the use of future emperors only. Hence the Arabic "Outer Rūs" must be based on an independent tradition from the mid-tenth century.

Without going into details at this time, it is important to note that in both the Byzantine and the Arabic traditions of the mid-tenth century "Outer Rus'" was a designation for Rus' international traders along two trade routes: the Novgorod-Kiev-Constantinople in the Byzantine tradition, and the Novgorod-Kiev-Bulġār (on the Volga) in the Islamic Arabic tradition.⁷

3.

Islamic geographical works of the mid-tenth century associate the oppositional terms "Inner" (*ad-dākhil*) and "Outer" (*al-khāriġ*) with two former steppe powers, the Bulġars and the Bašġirts (the future Hungarians).⁸

The "Inner" or "Great" Bulġars (a mixed Christian and Muslim population living near the Byzantine possessions) have been correctly identified by Friedrich Westberg⁹ with the Bosphorus "Great" or

⁶ See *Al-Idrīsī. Opus Geographicum*, fasc. 8 (1978), p. 917, and *Via regnorum. Descriptio ditionis moslemicae auctore Abu Ishāk al-Fārisi al-Iṣṭakhri*, ed. Michael Jan de Goeje, 2nd ed. (Leiden, 1927), pp. 225-26; *Opus Geographicum auctore Ibn Ḥawqal*, ed. Jan Henrik Kramers, vol. 2 (Leiden, 1939), p. 397. On *Artāniya*, see O. Pritsak, "The Name of the Third Kind of Rūs and of their City," *Studies in Medieval Eurasian History* (London), 1981, no. 12, pp. 2-9.

⁷ One should keep in mind that the Rūs were originally fluvial nomads ("nomads of the sea"). See O. Pritsak, *The Origin of Rus'*, vol. 1 (Cambridge, Mass., 1981), pp. 16, 21-22.

⁸ On Inner Bulgaria, see al-Iṣṭakhri, *Via regnorum*, ed. J. M. de Goeje, 2nd ed. (1927), pp. 7, 10; Ibn Ḥawqal, *Opus Geographicum*, ed. J. H. Kramers (1939), p. 288. On the Inner Bašġirts, see Ibn Ḥawqal, *Opus Geographicum*, ed. J. H. Kramers, vol. 2 (1939), p. 388. Al-Idrīsī also mentions the Outer Qumāniya (Polovcian Land); see the beginning of the description of section 6 of the seventh climate, *De geographia universali: Hortulus* (Rome, 1592), p. [324].

⁹ "Vnutrennye Bolgary," in "K analizu vostočnyx istočnikov o vostočnoj Evrope," *Žurnal Ministerstva narodnogo prosvěščenija* (St. Petersburg), 1908, no. 2, pp. 386-389.

“Black” Bulgars. The “Outer” Bulgars, living in “a small town having few dependencies and known only as the trading center of those [northern] countries,”¹⁰ were certainly the Volga-Bulgars.¹¹

The “Inner” Bašgirts were identical with the Hungarians prior to 898, i.e., with those still in Atelközü, since they are said to border with the Pečenegs and the Byzantine possessions in the Crimea.¹² At that time, as we are told, the “Outer” Bašgirts lived behind the Volga-Bulgars.

This association of the onomastic system of “Inner” versus “Outer” with the Bulgars and Hungarians, both originally steppe peoples, seems in fact to reflect the historical reality.¹³

4.

As far as I know, no one has undertaken to study the division of the Rus' realm into “Inner” and “Outer” territories. Two reasons for this can be posited. First, history and philology have been developed by sedentary peoples applying linear thinking. The system under discussion here, however, derived from the cyclical thinking of nomadic peoples; therefore it is outside the normal purview of the modern scholar. Since the nomads as they began to use script also began to apply linear thinking, their preserved monuments, too, are not always explicit about the existence of inner and outer spheres.

My examination of the division of the Rus' territories begins with the “Kitāb Dedem Qorqud,” a collection of Turkmen-Oghuz Turkic epic stories. The Aq Qoyunlu redaction (probably dating from the first half of the fifteenth century) has come down to us in two often differing manuscripts: one (the Vatican) from ca. A.H. 956/A.D. 1549-1550, and the other (the Dresden) from ca. A.H. 993/A.D. 1585.¹⁴

One can hardly expect an epic about a single hero to provide details about the structure of society and the geography of a people's habitat.¹⁵

¹⁰ Al-Iṣṭakhrī, *Via regnorum*, ed. de Goeje (1927), p. 10.

¹¹ See Josef Markwart, *Osteuropäische und ostasiatische Streifzüge* (Leipzig, 1903), p. 518.

¹² On the “Atelközü” Hungarians, see O. Pritsak, “From the Sābirs to the Hungarians,” in *Hungaro-Turcica: Studies in honour of Julius Németh* (Budapest, 1976), pp. 21, 30.

¹³ For some reason the same Arabic works refer to an “Inner” and “Outer” Armenia; the former included the district of Dvin (Dabīl), Nakhičawān, Karin (Qalīqalā), while the latter comprised the regions around Lake Van. For details, see M. Canard, “Armīniya,” in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, new ed., vol. 1 (Leiden, 1960), p. 642.

¹⁴ See Ettore Rossi, *Il “Kitāb-i Dede Qorqud”* (Città del Vaticano, 1952), pp. 8-14.

¹⁵ See Jan de Vries, *Heroic Song and Heroic Legend*, trans. B. J. Timmer (London, 1963), especially pp. 194-269.

The “Dedem Qorqud” does tell us, however, that there were two kinds of Oghuz (*Oγuz*)—the Inner, or *İç Oγuz*, and the Outer, or *Taş Oγuz*. Each had its own leadership,¹⁶ but the Inner Oghuz were higher in rank.

In addition, the “Story of Qan Turali, son of Qangli Qoğa” gives us information about the extent of the two groups’ territories. We are told that in the quest for a suitable maiden, the super-hero Turali

<i>İç Oyuza girdi, qiz bulimadi.</i>	went [first] into the Inner Oghuz [territory] but could find no maiden.
<i>Ṭolandi Taş Oyuza girdi, bulimadi.</i>	He wandered on and went into the Outer Oghuz [territory], but could find no maiden.
<i>Ṭolandi Ṭirabuzana geldi.¹⁷</i>	He wandered on and came to Trebizond.

There he finally found a maiden to this liking. Ṭirabuzan was the Greek empire of Trebizond under the dynasty of the Grand Comneni (1204-1461). These peoples were the sedentary counterpart to the nomadic Oghuzes. The Outer Oghuzes lived on the Trebizond frontier, while the Inner Oghuzes were situated in the eastern part of their empire.¹⁸

4 bis.

The Old Turkic runic inscriptions contain the same two oppositional terms: *iç*¹⁹ ‘inner’ and *taş* ‘outer’.

Also mentioned are *iç il* ‘the Inner realm’ and *iç yär* ‘the Inner land’.²⁰ The inner realm is specified as that of the Türgiś (-766): *bän öltəm, Türgäs äl äcäntä bäg bän* ‘I died; I am the chief (commander; bäg) in the

¹⁶ On the Inner and Outer Oghuzes, see Joachim Hein, *Das Buch des Dede Korkut* (Zurich, 1958), pp. 337-39, and R. Dankoff, “‘Inner’ and ‘Outer’ Oğuz in Dede Korkut,” *Turkish Studies Association Bulletin* 6, no. 2 (1982): 21-25.

¹⁷ *Dede Korkut Kitabı*, ed. Muharrem Ergin, vol. 1 (Ankara, 1958), p. 185.

¹⁸ Whereas Ergin is sceptical about the possibility of locating the two groups of Oghuzes (*Dede Korkut Kitabı*, 1: 51), Fahreddin Çelik concludes that the Inner (*İç*) Oghuzes lived in the zone from Alaşgert to Erivan, whereas the habitat of the Outer (*Taş*) Oghuzes was situated to the east of Gökçe Deniz and Gençe (Gjandža). See F. Çelik, “Dede Korkut kitabındaki coğrafi isimler,” *Ülkü* (Ankara), 17, no. 101 (1941): 449-56.

¹⁹ Only in the third Talas inscription (lines 1-2) does there appear a *hapax* in the Runic Turkic *oś*, with the meaning of *iş* ‘inner’: *tašina ošina uliti bardəm. Bäg çor oyal* “I went off [campaigning] to both the Outer and Inner territories; [I am] Bäg Çör Oyal.” Sergej Efimovič Malov, *Pamjatniki drevnetjurkskoj pis'mennosti Mongolii i Kirgizii* (hereafter *Pamjatniki*) (Moscow and Leningrad, 1959), p. 61. Sir Gerard Clauson, who did not know about the Talas inscription, regarded Kāšgarī's (ca. 1070) *oś* = Arab *qalb* ‘the heart, center of a tree trunk,’ as a *hapax*; see his *Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth-Century Turkish* (Oxford, 1972), p. 255.

²⁰ The Abakan inscription in S. E. Malov, *Enisejskaja pis'mennost' Tjurkov* (hereafter *EPT*) (Moscow and Leningrad, 1952), p. 94, no. 48, line 4.

Türgiř Inner realm'. The deceased, Äzgänä, was an *icrägi* 'official in the Inner realm' of Qam Qan.²¹ One inscription (Kara Jus) refers to an *iç sü bař* 'commander of the Inner army'.²² In the empire of Bilgä Qayan ca. 731, Säbäg, who had the title *Kül irkin*, was the leader of the *iç buyruq* 'the retinue of the Inner [territory]'.²³ According to the Kemčik-Džirgak inscription, in order to earn a "heroic name" (*är at*) Yula ('torch'), a man had to perform seven deeds in the "Outer" (*tařru*, 'frontier') territory.²⁴

A warrior called Kümül Ögä became, at the age of 40, the leader of his *bodän* ("political tribal unit") with the title *äl tutuq*. In this capacity he fought foes in the "Outer" frontier territory (*tař*) and was victorious.²⁵

4 ter.

According to the Chinese encyclopaedia *Wên hsien t'ung-k'ao*, written by Ma Tuan-lin (ca. 1250-1325), both the empire of the Türküt (T'u-chüe; 552-744) and that of the Uighurs (744-840) had six 外宰相六 *wai-tsai-siang*, or foreign ministers (i.e., officials acting in the Outer territory), and three 內宰相三 *nei-tsai-siang*, or inner ministers (i.e., officials acting in the Inner territory).²⁶

In his *De ceremoniis*, Constantine Porphyrogenitus ranks the Danube

²¹ Inscription Tuba III in Malov, *EPT*, p. 67, no. 37, lines 1-3. The older form of *icrägi* was *icräki*, with the non-assimilated *-k-*. It appears in the Orkhon inscriptions with reference to the *bodän* 'politically organized tribe' (*icräki bodän*; Kül Tigin Inscription I S 2) and to a particular office: *tabyaç qayanəñ icräki bädäzçi* 'the court decorator of the Chinese emperor' (IS 12). The Orkhon inscriptions are quoted after the Finnish Atlas *Inscriptions de l'Orkhon, recueillies par l'expédition finlandaise 1890* (Helsingfors, 1892). Two Uighur official documents dating from the reign of the third Uighur kagan, Il Itmiş (795-780), have *icräki* as a title. It also designated high officials in modern Chinese Turkestan: the second in command of the city of Činänčkanö (Qočo) was *Isik Ingi İcräki Vanömäx Toñar xän*, while the king (*khwatāw*) of Ark (Agni) was called *İcräki İtmış Žim Tāy-ši Uyyur Tapmař*; see the "Mahnāmag" of 762, in Friedrich Wilhelm Karl Müller, *Ein Doppelblatt aus einem manichäischen Hymnenbuch (Mahnāmag)* (Berlin, 1913), p. 10, lines 58-60, and p. 10, lines 89-91. The institution of *icräki orunčilar* is referred to in an inscription on a wooden pole from 767 (the third pole of Qočo); see F. W. K. Müller, *Zwei Pfahlinschriften aus den Turfanfunden* (Berlin, 1915), p. 23, l. 24. See also *icräki* in the Jenissei inscriptions; Malov, *EPT*, p. 20, no. 4, and p. 29, no. 11, line 1. On the corresponding title in Danube Bulgarian, see fn. 27.

²² Kara-Jus inscription, in Malov, *EPT*, p. 68, no. 39, line 2.

²³ The Bilgä Qayan inscription (II S 14). On the institution of *buyruq*, see Pritsak, *Origin of Rus'*, vol. 1, pp. 14, 74-75.

²⁴ Malov, *EPT*, p. 73, no. 41, lines 2-3.

²⁵ Kežilig-Xobu inscription, in Malov, *EPT*, p. 81, no. 45, lines 1-4.

²⁶ See the 1901 edition, chapter 34, fol. 8v^o.

Bulgarian ruling institutions, and puts in fifth place of ἔσω καὶ ἔσω βολιάδες, i.e., the *boljars* of the Outer and Inner territories.²⁷

5.

From antiquity through the medieval epoch, every nomadic empire in the Eurasian steppe had nomadic and sedentary (urban) components. The nomadic component itself was clearly divisible into an Inner and an Outer territory. As a case in point, let us examine the second empire of the Türküt (T'u-chüe; 681-744), for their history can be studied not only on the basis of foreign sources (Chinese, Persian, Byzantine, Syriac, Armenian, etc.) but also in contemporary native documents, especially imperial runic inscriptions. The restitution of the second T'u-chüe Turkic Empire in A.D. 681 is referred to both in the grave inscriptions of the two sons of the "Reichsgründer" (Il-täriš) from A.D. 731-732 and in the *Apologia pro vita sua* of his (and his sons') chief minister, Tonyuquq/Ton Yuquq (ca. 716).

Kül Tigin's inscription gives the following account :²⁸

qaḡam il-täräs qaḡanəy ögəm	Tängri, seizing from the height [of the sky],
il-bilgä qatunəy täñri töpəsində	raised my father Il-Täriš to the [position of]
tutəp yügärü kötürmäs ärəñç.	emperor (<i>qaḡan</i>) and my mother Il-Bilgä to the [position of] empress (<i>qatun</i>).
qaḡam qaḡan yiti yägərmi	My father, the emperor, went off [to the Outer territory] with seventeen
ärän tašəqməs.	men.
tašra yorəyur tiyən kü äsədəp,	Having heard the tidings that he was marching off to the Outer territory (<i>tašra</i>), the townspeople
balıqdaqi, tayıqməs, taydaqi inməs.	went up [to him] and the highlanders came down [to him].

²⁷ J. J. Reiske, ed., in *Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae*, vol. 12 (Bonn, 1829), p. 681. The corresponding form in Proto-Bulgarian was ιτζιργου / ητζιργου / ητζουργου / чръго. See Veselin Beševliev, *Die Protobulgarischen Inschriften* (Berlin, 1963), index, p. 341, 342, s.v.; idem, *Pärvobälgarite. Bit i kultura* (Sofia, 1981), pp. 51-52; idem, "What was the title ητζιργου (ητζουργου) βολιας in the Protobulgarian Inscriptions?," *Byzantinoslavica* (Prague), 16 (1955): 120-24; cf. also Vasil N. Zlatarski, "Koi sa bili vüvresnite i vürsnite boljari," in *Sbornik v čest na S. S. Bobčev* (Sofia, 1921), pp. 45-51; and Ivan Dujčev, "Les boljars dits intérieurs et extérieurs de la Bulgarie médiévale," *Acta Orientalia Hungaricae* (hereafter *AOH*) (Budapest), 3 (1953): 167-78. The Proto-Bulgarian *ičürgü* ~ *ičürgü* goes back to **icärigü* 'what is inside, interior, inner'; see Karl Heinrich Menges, "Altaic Elements in the Proto-Bulgarian Inscription," *Byzantion* 21 (1951): 96-97.

²⁸ The Kül Tigin inscription (E 11-12 = Bilgä Qaḡan inscription II E 10-11).

Ton Yuquq's inscription explains exactly what the term *tašra* 'the Outer territory' referred to:²⁹

Čoγay quzin² qara quməγ

oləruṛ ärtəməz

We were established [at that time] in the shady slope (refuge) of the Čoγay [mountains] and in the Qara Qum [town].

In Chinese the Čoγay mountain range is called Yin-shan (both the Turkic word *čoγay* and the Chinese *yin* mean "shade"); it is situated north of the bend of the Huang-ho (Yellow River).³⁰ In Turkic Qara Qum means "Black Sand"; in Chinese it is also known as "Black Sand City" — *Hei-sha ch'eng*, the southern (= Outer) residence of the T'u-chüe.³¹ In fact, the annals (*pen-ki*) of the history of the T'ang dynasty note, under the year 682, that the Ku-tu-lu (Il-täriš), having established himself in Hei-sha-ch'eng, started raiding the Chinese limes to the north of Ping chou.³² The outer territory of the Turks, the region from which the Turks conducted relations with China, both peaceful and military, comprised present-day Ordos and the lands north of the bend of the Huang-ho. The Inner territory was in Mongolia, especially the valleys of the rivers Orkhon (with the Ötükän Mt.) and Selenga. "There," says the Kül Tigin inscription of 732, "all politically organized tribes (*bodän*) of the Inner territory (*ičräki*) obey me [i.e., the emperor]."³³

The Turks regarded the Ötükän forest as the place "from which the empire should be governed" (*il tutsəq yir*).³⁴ Dynastic sanctuaries with special edifices and inscriptions were located there, and it was the place where the annual rites and official ceremonies of the Tängri religion were conducted.³⁵ The Inner territory was regarded as the patrimony of the dynasty; therefore it was given to the "youngest son" of the emperor; along with the characteristic title "prince of the [dynastic] heart" — in Turkic *Kül Tigin* and in Mongolian *Odčigin* [*<* Turkic *Od tigin*].³⁶

²⁹ The Ton Yuquq inscription is quoted after the new edition by Gustaf John Ramstedt-Pentti Aalto, *Materialien zu den alttürkischen Inschriften der Mongolei* (Helsinki, 1958), p. 32, line 7.

³⁰ Károly Czeglédy, "Čoγay-Quzi, Qara-Qum, Kök-Öng," in *AOH* 15 (1962): 55-69.

³¹ On *Qara Qum* = *Hei-sha-ch'eng*, see Czeglédy in *AOH* 15 (1962): 57.

³² *Chiu T'ang-shu* (Po-na ed., 1931), ch. 5, p. 8ff.

³³ Orkhon inscription I S 2.

³⁴ Orkhon inscription I S 4.

³⁵ See Annemarie von Gabain, "Steppe und Stadt im Leben der ältesten Türken," *Der Islam* (Berlin), 29 (1949): 30-42.

³⁶ Władysław Kotwicz, "La signification du titre *Kül-tägin*," and "Contribution à l'histoire de l'Asie Centrale, II," in *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* (Cracow), 15 (1949): 185-88. Cf. also Nikolaus Poppe, *Vergleichende Grammatik der altaischen Sprachen*, vol. 1 (Wiesbaden, 1960), p. 49.

The Outer territory was of vital importance to every nomadic *Pax*, since it was there that contacts were made with the sedentary states, their civilization, culture, and, especially, economy. This contact-area must also be the focal point for the historian, since it was from here that the non-historical nomadic polities of the steppe — or, for that matter, of the river — began gradually to enter the stream of history.

It was for good reason, then, that the Byzantines and the Arabs encountered and wrote about *only Outer Rus'*.

6.

Where was Inner Rus' located? In my *Origin of Rus'* I have shown that the Volga Rūs kaganate, created by a branch of the Khazar kaganate in the A.D. 830s,³⁷ comprised the territories within the bend of the middle Volga (ca. 150 km. in length and 110 km. in width), bounded by the Kotorosl' River, Lake Rostov, and the Sara River on the east, and Lake Kleščino with the Nerl' River (tributary of the Volga) on the south.³⁸ During the first period of Kievan Rus' (tenth to eleventh century) the area included the cities of Jaroslavl', Rostov, and Sarskoe gorodišče. The Islamic descriptive school of geography, as represented by Ibn Rūste (ca. A.H. 300/A.D. 912), Muṭahhar b. Ṭāhir al-Maqdisī (ca. A.H. 355/A.D. 966), Gardīzī (ca. A.H. 442/A.D. 1050), and al-Marwazī (A.H. 514/A.D. ca. 1120) call the territory of the Rūs qayan (*khāqān*) an isle, or, better yet, a peninsula (*al-ġazīra*),³⁹ since it was almost completely surrounded by rivers and lakes. The extent of the Rūs *ġazīra* ("isle" = "peninsula") given by the Islamic authors — "three days in either direction" — seems to correspond closely to reality, namely, ca. 150 km. × 110 km. This territory must be identified as Inner Rus'.

Outer Rus' originally (ca. 830-930) comprised the trade routes leading to the Azov and Caspian seas (known in Old Norse as Ellipaltar)⁴⁰

³⁷ Pritsak, *Origin of Rus'*, 1: 26-28, 182, 583.

³⁸ See the map "Rostovo-Suzdal'skaja zemlja," in Arsenij Nikolaevič Nasonov, "*Russkaja zemlja*" i obrazovanie territorii drevnerusskogo gosudarstva (Moscow, 1951), facing p. 184. Also note the map appearing here, p. 567.

³⁹ There is a very good French analogy for "isle" as a designation for a patrimony bounded by rivers: the Île-de-France, during the Carolingian period (although use was made of the name *Francia*), was restricted to the territory bounded by the rivers Aisne, Oise, and Seine. It is possible that this parallel in usage goes back to the Frankish origin of *Ruti* > *Rūs*, on which see Pritsak, *Origin of Rus'*, 1: 25. Concerning the Île-de-France, see Pierre Bernus, *Histoire de l'Île-de-France* (Paris, 1934), and Armand Leyritz, *L'Île-de-France, sa géographie, son histoire* (Paris, 1948).

⁴⁰ On Ellipaltar, see Pritsak, *Origin of Rus'*, 1: 171-72, 180, 508.

—that is, the limes of the Khazar Empire and the frontiers of Byzantium's Crimean territories. Sometime in the 930s, the Rus' kagan (< *qaγan*) Igor' took control over a new "Outer Rus'"—the emerging Dnieper trade route including the city of Kiev.⁴¹

Great-Rostov based Inner Rus' continued to be the patrimony of the Rus' dynasty, and, in accordance with the steppe system, was given to members of the dynasty selected to serve as the "youngest son." Rostov was the first seat of Jaroslav (later "the Wise," d. 1054). When he was given Novgorod, Jaroslav's place in Rostov was taken by the new "youngest son"—Boris, who was later canonized.⁴²

According to Jaroslav's will, Rostov (with Perejaslav) went to his youngest son, Vsevolod (d. 1093),⁴³ who, as the "keeper of the dynastic hearth," also took charge of Jaroslav's burial.⁴⁴ Monomax (d. 1125) first gave Rostov to his younger son Izjaslav. After Izjaslav was killed, on 6 September 1096,⁴⁵ Rostov fell to Monomax's official "youngest son," the boy Jurij (d. 1157), then under the tutelage of his elder brother, Mstislav Monomaxovič of Novgorod. In a letter to Oleg Svjatoslavič of Černihiv in 1091, Monomax described the situation with the Rostov patrimony thus: да то ти съдѣть сынъ твой хрестъный с малым братомъ своимъ, хлѣбъ ѣдучи дѣдень;⁴⁶ "Let your godson [Mstislav Monomaxovič] sit with his little brother [Jurij Monomaxovič] eating his ancestral [lit. "grandfather's] bread." In this connection, it is also possible to solve a puzzle about Monomax's "collected works." These have come down to us only in the Laurentian Codex of 1377.⁴⁷ We may well ask why Monomax's "Poučen'e," for instance, was not available to the compiler of the Hypatian Chronicle of ca. 1425? As shown by Mixail Dmitrievič Priselkov⁴⁸ and Dmitrij Sergeevič Lixačev,⁴⁹ the Laurentian

⁴¹ On this, see my statements in Norman Golb and O. Pritsak, *Khazarian Hebrew Documents of the Tenth Century* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1982), pp. 60-64, 67-69.

⁴² *Povesť vremennyx let* (hereafter *PVL*), ed. D.S. Lixačev, vol. 1 (Moscow and Leningrad, 1950), p. 83.

⁴³ See *Novgorodskaja pervaja letopis'*, ed. A. N. Nasonov (Moscow and Leningrad, 1950), p. 160.

⁴⁴ *PVL*, ed. Lixačev, 1: 108-109.

⁴⁵ *PVL*, ed. Lixačev, 1: 168.

⁴⁶ *PVL*, ed. Lixačev, 1: 165.

⁴⁷ *Polnoe sobranie russkix letopisej*, vol. 1: *Lavrent'evskaja letopis'*, 2nd ed., by Evfimij Fedorovič Karskij (Leningrad, 1926), cols. 240-56.

⁴⁸ *Istorija russkogo letopisanija XI-XV vv.* (Leningrad, 1940), pp. 87-96 (about the Rostov editions incorporated into the Laurentian collection); pp. 51-52 (about the Hypatian collection).

⁴⁹ *Russkie letopisi i ix kul'turno-istoričeskoe značenie* (Moscow and Leningrad, 1947),

Codex reproduces, in the final analysis, the Rostov tradition of Rus' chronicle writing of the thirteenth century, that is, the chronicle of Konstantin Vsevolodovič of Rostov (1206), that of his son Vasil'ko of Rostov (d. 1258), and the edition of 1263 by Vasil'ko's widow, Maria Mixajlovna (of Černihiv). Private dynastic documents such as the works of Monomax remained in safekeeping in Rostov, the patrimony and residence of the "youngest son." It is understandable that only the chronicler at the court of the prince of Rostov would have access to such private texts and finally include them in his compilation. Since the Hypatian Chronicle reflects chronicle writing under the patronage of the *oldest* branch of Monomax's kin (*Volodimerovo plemja*), one cannot expect it to contain any of the private papers (e.g., Monomax's "Poučen'e" or his letter to Oleg) of the previous head of the dynasty.

* * *

We can now answer the question put forward in the title of this essay. In keeping with the general structure of the steppe empires, the kaganate of Rus' consisted of two territories, an Outer and an Inner Rus'. In the 940s Outer Rus' was the Dnieper trade route. At that time Inner Rus' was the (Great-) Rostov land, home of the original Volga Rūs Kaganate of the ninth to tenth century and later the patrimony of the dynasty, passed on to the "youngest son" of the clan's senior member.⁵⁰

Since foreign affairs were conducted by the peoples of Outer Rus' along the *limes* of the respective sedentary state, not only the whereabouts, but also the existence of Inner Rus' remained unknown to both Constantine Porphyrogenitus and his contemporaries, the Arabic geographers, apart from the name itself.

Harvard University

pp. 283-85 (on the activity of Vasil'ko Konstantinovič) and pp. 282-85 (on Marija Mixajlovna's part in editing the chronicle).

⁵⁰ It is very regrettable that Russian scholars, strongly affected by Kiev's real and illusory past glory, spend much time and energy in a vain effort to appropriate Kiev's history for Russian history while neglecting the medieval history of actual Russian lands. The territories of the former Rūs Kaganate and of Inner Rus' deserve much more attention than these scholars have been willing to give them.



“Inner Rūs”