Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society

The Name of the Third Kind of *Rus* and of their City

Omeljan Pritsak

THE NAME OF THE THIRD KIND OF *RUS* AND OF THEIR CITY

By Omeljan Pritsak

Дорогому Андрієві Ковалівському в подяку за його епохальні досліди над
Ібн Фадланом

IN THE WORKS OF the 10th-century Arabic classical geographers, as represented by
al-Iṣṭakhrī (*c.* 318–321/930–933) and Ibn Ḥawqal (*c.* 367/977), there appears a passage
which deals with three "kinds" (*ṣinf*) of *Rus*. At the mention of the first kind of Rus, only
the name of their city is given, while the name of the city of the second "kind"—apart from
that of the kind themselves—though mentioned by Ibn Ḥawqal, is not given by
al-Iṣṭakhrī.

As to the third kind of Rus, the name of the city as well as that of the kind is given in
both sources.

This passage has been studied since the time of Christian Martin Frähn, who as early
as 1823 was successful in identifying the name of the city of the first kind of *Rus* (كوياب
kwy'b') as Кыев- *Kyev-*, and that of the second kind (الصلاويـة *aṣ-Ṣl'wyyh*)[1] as Словѣ(н-)
Slově(n)-, the Slavonic tribe of the territory of the Vikings' Holmgard (Novgorod).[2]

As to the name of the city of the second tribe (صلا *ṣl'*), scholars agree that it does not
represent a real name, but is rather a form artificially constructed by an Arabic systematizer
(the source of Ibn Ḥawqal) who regarded وى *wy* in the name صلاوى *ṣl'wy* as a suffix,
apparently of the *nisba* type. There is no reason to reject this ingenious interpretation of
Frähn and his successors.

But it has not been found possible until now to identify the name of the third kind of
Rus, and that of their city, beyond doubt. Many scholars, both orientalists and historians
of Eastern Europe, have tried to solve this enigma, but instead of clarifying the situation
they have often made it more confused.

The last scholar to deal with the problem was the Czech Arabist Ivan Hrbek. In a very
detailed paper[3] he gathered all accessible source material and attacked the problems by
introducing the following criteria: (1) one should take into consideration not just Eastern
Europe, but all Slavonic territories of the first half of the 10th century; (2) the city of the
third kind of Rus, and the city itself, must be of the same importance as Kiev and Novgorod
were at the time; (3) the name of the city must correspond to the graphic and phonetic
values of the sources, i.e. *'rq'* or *'rf'*; (4) the name of the kind of Rus should be in agreement
with the spelling *'rt'nyy'* or *'rf'nyy'*, etc.; and (5) the realia should correspond with the date
of the sources.

---

[1] Or should we not do better to correct the source to الإصلاوينيه *aṣ-Ṣl'wynyyh*? Here I am using trans-
literation and not transcription of words written in Arabic script.

[2] *Ibn Foszlans und anderer Araber Berichte über die Russen älterer Zeit*, SPb. 1823, 143, 259.

[3] "Der dritte Stamm der *Rūs* nach arabischen Quellen", *Archiv Orientální*, 25, 1957, 628–652. After I had
completed this paper, my friend Dr. E. L. Keenan drew my attention to a recent Russian publication
Drevnerusskoe gosudarstvo (Moscow, 1965) where A. P. Novoseltsov discusses, among others, the
problem of the third kind of Rus: "Vostochnye istochniki o vostochnykh Slavyanakh i Rusi VI–IX vv.",
pp. 408–419. His approach, however, does not differ from that of his predecessors, and therefore his
tentative identification of the third kind with the region of Rostov-Beloozero is not convincing.

Hrbek rejects previous identifications of the third kind of Rus with Biarmia of the Vikings (*'b'rm'; D. Chwolson), Erza ('rth'nyy'/'rt'; Ch. M. Frähn), and of the name of the city with Perm' (B'rm'; J. T. Reinaud), Riazan' ('rth'; A. L. Mongait), Varton (an old name for the Kuban region, = 'rt'), etc., and proposes to leave Eastern Europe and look for a suitable identification among the Baltic Slavonic cities which did not participate in the Oriental trade. According to him, the city in question is the famous centre of trade Arkona (*'rq', i.e. *Arqa for *Arqo) on the Baltic island Rugia (German: Rügen), and the name of the tribe is thus to be identified with the Ruiana/Ruiani ('ry'nyy-/(A)ruyānī-), the inhabitants of the isle of Rugia.

But there are several objections, primarily of a methodological nature, to this identification. First, Hrbek failed to trace the source of the data found in Iṣṭakhrī and Ibn Ḥawqal and to establish the horizon or frame of reference of the original source. There has been a very productive discussion of the origins of the school of classical Arabic geographers, as a result of which we may regard as proven the fact that two men, one working in Balkh (al-Iṣṭakhrī) and the other in Bukhara (Jaihānī), while corresponding with each other, laid the foundation for the type of geographical work known as "Kitāb al-masālik wa'l-mamālik" or "Kitāb ṣurāt al-arḍ".[4] In such works, geographical information concerning Eastern Europe was taken from a collection of information which Boris Zakhoder calls very felicitously "The Central Asian–Khorasanian Codex" (*sredneaziatsko-khorasanskii svod*) or the "Caspian Codex" (*kaspiiskii svod*).

We know of the close relations of the Volga Bulgars with Khorasan, and of the great interest of the Samanid government in Bulgarian affairs. We know, for example, that Ibn Faḍlān was Jaihānī's guest in 309/921 in Bukhara.[5] It may be regarded as certain that the data in question were obtained from Bulgarian merchants in Balkh, by which are meant both Central Asian merchants who traded with the city of Bulghār, and merchants from the city of Bulghār in Central Asia.

Merchants from Bulghār visited places as far away as Kiev, but there is no proof that they ever went to Arkona, or even that they knew about the existence of that far-away place. Bulghār merchants were not interested in studying the ethnography of the Slavonic peoples. Nor was there any reason for them to undertake the dangerous and time-consuming, thousand-mile trip to Arkona in order to buy the sables, black martens, and tin (or lead) which were, as Hrbek admits, not products of Arkona, but probably available in their markets from other countries. The Bulgarian merchant had far more direct access to the merchandise in question.

Hrbek has, as I have mentioned, gathered all of the accessible source material but he has done so in a rather mechanical way, without distinguishing between data of primary importance and redundant readings.

In order to do so, it is necessary first of all to clarify the process of transmission of the corpus of classical Arab geographic knowledge. As we pointed out earlier, two versions of the report which interests us have come down to the present: the older, by Iṣṭakhrī

---

[4] Ignatii Yu. Krachkovskii, *Izbrannye sochineniya*, Vol. 4 (Moscow–Leningrad, 1957), 194–226; B. N. Zakhoder, *Kaspiiskii svod svedenii o vostochnoi Evrope* [Vol. 1]: *Gorgan i Povolzhe v IX–X vv.* (Moscow, 1962), 37–51.

[5] cf. V. Minorsky in *BSOAS*, XXXI, 1, 89.

(first redaction *c.* 318–321/930–933; second redaction 340/950),[6] and the younger by Ibn Ḥawqal (first version *c.* 356/967; the third version *c.* 367/977).[7]

Unfortunately, the manuscripts of Iṣṭakhrī's work are relatively late. The oldest, that of Gotha (C), is of 569/1173; the MSS of Bologna (A) and Berlin (B) are copies of a manuscript of 589/1193.[8]

A Persian translation of Iṣṭakhrī's work was made in the 5/6th century A.H.; the oldest known dated manuscript of this is that of 726/1326.[9]

Iṣṭakhrī's passage on the Rus was included by Yāqūt in his geographical encyclopedia of 621/1224.[10]

We see that all extant transmissions of the texts of Iṣṭakhrī are rather late, the oldest being the Gotha MS of 569/1173 (MS C).

We are more fortunate in the case of transmissions of Ibn Ḥawqal. H. Ritter discovered a copy dated 479/1086 in Istanbul, which was quickly published by J. H. Kramers (1938–39).[11] In this manuscript, names, including foreign names, are copied very carefully and intelligently.

Since we possess this beautiful old MS, there is little need to give equal attention to the inexact spellings of the works of later compilers, such as al-Idrīsī, who used (in 1154) a copy of Iṣṭakhrī's work, or ad-Dimishqī (d. 1327), who utilized the work of al-Idrīsī.

Had Ibn Ḥawqal simply copied the work of his predecessor, it would be advisable to take the forms given in the older MS (that of 1086), leaving all the others aside. But we know that Ibn Ḥawqal had at his disposal Iṣṭakhrī's sources as well. Therefore, if we are faced with a situation in which it is impossible to reduce the forms of the MS of 1086 and those of the MSS of Iṣṭakhrī to a common denominator, we must consider the possibility that two or more versions of the information about the same place were available to the classical Arabic school of geography, versions which reflected the dialectal variety of the informants.

Islamic authors, including those who visited the city of Bulghār (Ibn Faḍlān, al-Gharnāṭī) tell us about those places in North-Eastern Europe which were the classical sable and marten territories *par excellence*. They were: روبسو[12] (*wysw'*) (Вѣсь *Věs*),[13] رو[14]

[6] I. Yu. Krachkovskii, *Izbrannye sochineniya*, Vol. 4, 197.

[7] J. H. Kramers, "La question Balḫī-Iṣṭaḫrī — Ibn Ḥawḳal et l'Atlas de l'Islam", *Acta Orientalia*, 10, 1, 1931, 16–17.

[8] *Abu Ishak al-Farisi al-Istakhri. Viae regnorum. Descriptio ditionis moslemicae*, ed. M. J. de Goeje (BGA, Vol. 1), second edition, Leiden, 1927, 225–6 (for abbreviations, see p. 2).

[9] See *Masālik va Mamālik by . . . Istakhrī. Anonymous Persian Translation from V/VI century A.H.*, ed. Iraj Afshar, Teheran, 1961, 15–22.

[10] *Jacut's geographisches Wörterbuch . . .*, ed. F. Wüstenfeld, Vol. 4, Leipzig, 18 . . , 318–9.

[11] *Opus geographicum auctore Ibn Ḥaukal . . .*, ed. J. H. Kramers (BGA, Vol. 2), second edition, Leiden, 1938–9, 397 (for abbreviations, see p. VIII).

[12] On *wysw'* see Ibn Faḍlān (921–2), MS. of Meshhed, ed. A. P. Kovalivsky, [1 ed.] *Putešestvie Ibn-Fadlana na Volgu*, Moscow–Leningrad, 1939, [2nd ed.] *Kniga Akhmeda Ibn-Fadlana o ego putešestvii na Volgu v 921–2 gg*, Kharkov, 1956, Phototyp. 206a, 207b, 208a; al-Bīrūnī, "Taḥdīd" (1025), tr. A. Zeki Validi, "Die Nordvölker bei Biruni", *ZDMG*, 90, 1, 1936, 50; al-Marvazī (1120), ed. V. Minorsky, *Sharaf al-Zamān Ṭāhir Marvazī on China, the Turks and India*, London, 1942, Arabic text pp. 44–5 (= § 3; Eng. trans. p. 34); al-Gharnāṭī (ca. 1131–1150), (*a*) "Tuḥfat al-albāb", ed. G. Ferrand, *Journal Asiatique*, 207, part 2, 1925, 118, 238; (*b*) "Mu'rib 'an ba'd 'ajā'ib al-Maghrib", ed. César E. Dubler, *Abū Ḥāmid el Granadino y su relacion de viaje por tierras eurasiáticas*, Madrid, 1953, Arabic text pp. 13 (§ 12), 14–15 (§ 14), 18–19 (§§ 17–18).

[13] On *Věs* see *Povest' vremennykh let*, ed. D. S. Likhachov, Vol. I, Moscow–Leningrad, 1950, 10, 13, 18.

[14] Al-Gharnāṭī, "Mu'rib", ed. Dubler, 13 (§ 12).

('rw) (Арян- *Aryan-*),[15] and يورا[16] (*ywr'*) (Югра *Yugra*).[17] These places were also visited by Vikings, called in Eastern Europe *Rus'*, who were very eager to establish themselves there. The sagas of the Vikings call these rich and desirable territories "Biarmia".[18] The "Caspian (or Khorasanian) Codex" makes a clear distinction between these "Rus" and the Slavs, as do the other contemporary Islamic sources.

The next problem which should be considered is a palaeographic one. Are the name of the third kind of Rus and that of their cities really two different names, which go back to two different etymons, or have we rather here the same situation as it was with the second kind of Rus (i.e. name of the "kind" صلاوي *şl'wyy-* > name of the city صلا *şl'*)?[19]

The name of the third city occurs in the text three times: the first time it is used with the preposition بـ *bi-*. It is strange that the later copies of Iṣṭakhrī, A and B, or, more precisely, their common protograph of 1193, where the "longer" forms (ending in *-q'* or *-f'*) occur, do not write one and the same name in the same way. The following spellings are used:

	with preposition	without preposition	
MS A (Bologna)	بابارقا	ابارفا	ارفا
MS B (Berlin)	بابارقا	ابارقا	ارقا

The oldest manuscript of Iṣṭakhrī, MS C (Gotha), as well as that of Chester Beatty (ChB),[20] the Persian translation of Iṣṭakhrī,[21] and Ibn Ḥawqal do not have the "longer" forms at all; the name of the city is spelled in these copies consistently in all cases:

(a) Iṣṭakhrī: MS C	باربا	اربا	اربا
ChB	بارتا	ارتا	ارتا
(b) Persian Iṣṭakhrī; MS *m*		ارتا	ارتا
MS E			ارتا
MS Melgunoff		ازتا	ارتا
(c) Ibn Ḥawqal	بارثا	ارثا	ارثا

As to the "longer" form, there is no doubt that با in such sequences as ابارقا, بابارقا is due to dittography under the influence of the first occurrence of the name, where it is written with بـ. Thus بابارقا is nothing but a false spelling for بارقا, and ابارقا for ارقا.

[15] On **Ar-* see *Ar'skaya zemlya*, in *Moskovskii letopisnyi svod kontsa XV veka*, ed. M. N. Tikhomirov = *Polnoe Sobranie Russkikh Letopisei* [= *PSRL*], Vol. 25, Moscow–Leningrad, 1949, s.a. 1379 [= p. 201]; further data can be found in *PSRL*, Vol. 29, Moscow, 1965, Index, s.v. (p. 371); (*Aryane*), in different annals starting with the year 1489, e.g. *PSRL*, Vol. 27, Moscow–Leningrad, 1962, 288–9. For further data on Аряне, Арьская земля, Арскій городокъ, Арское поле, Арскія городскія ворота [in Kasan] see A. S. Adrianov, *Ukazatel' k pervym os'mi tomam PSRL: Otděl vtoroi. Ukazatel' geografícheskii* (SPb. 1907), s.v. (pp. 4–5). Cf. also Ivan Hrbek, "Arabico–Slavica", *Archiv Orientální*, 23, 1955, 116–119.

[16] On *ywr'* see al-Bīrūnī, "Taḥdīd" (in *ZDMG*, 90, 1, 50); al-Marvazī, ed. Minorsky, Arabic text pp. 44–5 (يورح, *ywrh*; Eng. trans. 34 and Minorsky's commentary, pp. 112–116); al-Gharnāṭī, "Tuḥfat", ed. Ferrand, 238–9; "Mu'rib", ed. Dubler, 14–16 (§ 14–15), 18–21 (§ 17–19).

[17] On Югра/Угра (*y*ugra) see *Povest' vremennykh let*, ed. Likhachov, Vol. 1, 10 (угра) and 167 (югра, s.a. 1096), 197 (югра, s.a. 1114) and *Novgorodskaya pervaya letopis'*, ed. A. N. Nasonov, Moscow–Leningrad, 1950, 38, 40, 41, 97, 99 (югра).

[18] On "Biarmia" see M. A. Tallgren, "Biarmia", in *Eurasia Septentrionalis Antiqua*, Vol. 6, Helsinki, 1930, 100–120.

[19] See I. Hrbek, *Archiv Orientální*, 25, 629.

[20] ibid., 648–9.

[21] ed. Iraj Afshar, Teheran, 1961, 182.

In the same way ق *q* of MSS A and B of Iṣṭakhrī cannot be considered as going back to the original.

We have seen that Ibn Ḥawqal (MS of A.D. 1086) as well as the oldest MS of Iṣṭakhrī (C) and the Persian translators of Iṣṭakhrī's work have not ة/ف but ف or, in the case of MS C of Iṣṭakhrī, ن. In the same way, in Yāqūt's Encyclopedia (he copied Iṣṭakhrī) there is no trace of ة/ف:

MS b (Berlin)	باربا	اربا	اربا
MS c (Paris)	بادیا	ادیا	ادیا

The only possible conclusion is that ة/ف goes back to a ث (*th*), where the two lower diacritical dots were written so close to the character ﺭ that they were read by the copyist as a ف (*f*), and the ة was later misconstrued as a ق (*q*).

As to the letter at the end of the first syllable, it must be a ﺭ (*r*); the lone occurrence of ز (*z*) in Melgunov MS, as well as د (*d*) in the Paris (= c) MS of Yāqūt, are easily explained as common copyist's errors.

Let us now examine the forms of the name of the third kind of Rus:

(a) Iṣṭakhrī: MS C	الاوثانه		
MSS A and B	الارنانه		
MS ChB	الافنانیه		
(b) Persian Iṣṭakhrī: MS *m* (of 1326)	ارثانی		
MS *t*	اوثانی		
(c) Ibn Ḥawqal:	الارثانیة		
(d) "Ḥudūd al-ʿĀlam":	ارتاب	(phototyp. edition by W. Barthold, Leningrad, 1930, p. 38a)	
(e) Yāqūt: MS *b*	الارباویه		
MS *c*	الادیاویه		

Forms with ﺭ (*r*) at the end of the first syllable prevail here in the same way as in the name of the city. But here we have to deal with another type of copyist's error: namely, the substitution of ﻭ (*w*) for ﺭ (*r*) and—as the second stage—the replacement of this "secondary" ﻭ by ف (*f*). Neither type can be attributed to the original, and therefore both must be eliminated.

If we take away the Arabic collective suffix ـیـ (*-iyya-*), the final consonant character as represented in the MSS of Iṣṭakhrī and Ibn Ḥawqal is ن (*n*); ب (*b*) in "Ḥudūd al-ʿĀlam" is certainly a mistake for ن, as is the ﻭ in the MSS of Yāqūt.

We now come to the consonant of the second syllable of the name. As all old MSS have both in the name of the kind and that of the city ث (*th*), this is a form which should be taken seriously, in view of the fact that it was this spelling which was the basis of the erroneous forms with ف (*f*) and ق (*q*).

The basic shape of the character ﺙ, ﺙ, is shared with four other consonants; they are distinguished by diacritical marks only: ن (*n*), ت (*t*), ب (*b*), ی (*y*). Anyone who has worked with Arabic manuscripts knows how easily a copyist can make mistakes in the placing of the diacritical dots in unfamiliar words, especially foreign place or personal names. The explanation of the forms with ف and ق is therefore very simple. It is typical, in one graphic style, that, instead of putting the three dots, the copyist would put a dot over a short

dash (⸗) (or use a kind of circumflex, ^), but often the wide double dot is indistinguishable from the smaller one. In the same way the ث written with two connected dots is often indistinguishable from the ﺏ.

But how are we to explain the variants which arise from the placement of the dots *below* the character, i.e. forms having ﻳ or ﺑ? In our opinion, ﻳ (*y*) must be considered the basic form of these variants, the ﺑ (*b*) having arisen from the misreading of the double "wide" dot. The basis for this conclusion, as we shall see, is in an analysis of the texts, which leads us to differentiate two "Bulgarian" traditions in the transcription of the names of the kinds and cities of Rus; one tradition used ث and the other ﻳ. Thus the name which unmistakably represents Kiev is transmitted in two otherwise identical variants:

(a) MS C (I repeat, the oldest known MS of Iṣṭakhrī's work) and Yāqūt, who copied Iṣṭakhrī, have the name written with a ث (*th*) كوثابه;

(b) Ibn Ḥawqal spells it with a ﻳ (*y*) كويابه.

Now we can see that in fact it was not Ibn Ḥawqal or Iṣṭakhrī who abstracted the name of the city from that of the third kind of Rus, but that they found the form already abstracted in their "Khorasan" (or "Khorasanian") source.

Iṣṭakhrī used: (a) the full form of the third "kind" of Rus as written with a ث and (b) the abstracted form written with a ﻳ:

(a) MS C الارثانيه (the original apparently had *الارثانيه);

(b) MS C اربا > *اريا.

MSS of Yāqūt have اربا and اديا; both forms go back to *اريا. Ibn Ḥawqal or his source apparently standardized the two forms, giving preference to the ث variant: ارثا and الارثانيه.

But how may we explain the coexistence of two traditions, the ث tradition and that of the ﻳ? The language of the Volga Bulgars belonged to the Hunno-Bulgarian branch of the Altaic group. The only living representative of the branch is the Chuvash language, which has two main dialects: Viryal and Anatri.

One of the distinctive features of the Bulgarian group is that there was no consonantal phoneme /y/ in initial position. When borrowing words with the sequence: /n, r, l/ at the end of the first syllable—/y/ at the beginning of the second syllable, Chuvash substitutes for that sequence /nDŽ/ (Viryal) or /nDŽ/ (Anatri), e.g.: Russ. /Marya/ "Mary" > /MarDŽa/ ~ /MarDŽa/.

Or a historical example: the Arabic word دنيا /dunyā/ representing "the transitory world" was borrowed by the Bulgars together with Islam sometime in the 9th century; the present-day Chuvash form is /těnče/, i.e. (tĭnDŽe) or (tĭnDźe).

The Bulgarian pronunciation of /nč/ < /ny/ was certainly not very different from the Chuvash; to represent that sound, the Arabic writers used their ث (*th*).

Let us now conclude our analysis: the name of the third city of the Rus was abstracted from the name of the third kind of Rus. The "Khorasan" school of geography had at its disposal two forms of the latter: one variant written with a ث, ارثان *rth'n*, which reflected the Bulgarian pronunciation of the name Ар-ян- Ar-yan (*arDŽan), and another variant,

written with a ز, which was obtained either from a Central Asian (e.g. Khorasanian) or Turkic merchant from the multinational city of Bulghār: اريان *'ry'n* (Aryan).

The "Turkic" form of the name اريان *'ry'n* = *Aryān* can be identified without any difficulty with the form cited in the Old Russian chronicles, *Aryan*. This name in the form ارو *'rw* (= *Ar-*) is also attested in the Islamic sources; al-Gharnāṭī (who visited Bulghār in 1131–1150) uses it in the following context:

"The city of Bulghār had suzerainty over certain territories which pay tribute. Between them and Bulghār lies a journey of one month. One [of these vassal territories] is called ايسو *'ysu* (= ويسو *wysw* = Вѣсь *Vĕś* of the Old Russian chronicles) and the other, ارو *'rw* (= *ar-*). There one hunts sable, marten, and squirrel. In the summer the day lasts 22 hours. Very fine sable furs are exported from [this territory]."[22]

Both names, *Ār(ū)* and *Īsū*, were found in the Arabic source of the so-called answer of the Kaghan Joseph of Khazaria to Hasdai b. Shaprut of Cordova (longer version, in Hebrew); the compiler misunderstood these two names and regarded them as one name:

בולגר סואר אריסו ערמס   *bwlgr, sw'r, 'r ysw, crmys*, etc.[23]

The form *'rysw* is nothing but *'r* and *'ysw* (= *Īsū* < **Wīsū* = Вѣсь).

Certainly that was the situation in the 12th century; in the 10th century the Viking Rus were the masters of the territory of the so-called Aryan-/[ArDŹan], and the merchants of Bulghār were very much interested in keeping the monopoly of trade with them. Therefore it was necessary for them to spread rumours about the Aryan-Rus to the effect that they were very savage and would kill strangers who might make forays into their territory.

In any case, the existence of a political organization in the Viatka (and Cheptsa) region in the 9–10th century and its relations to the Volga–Bulgarian state are well documented by buried treasures with Islamic coins (dirhams).[24]

During the later period of the Volga Bulgarian state (12–14 c.), the Khanate of Kazan' (15–16 c.) and the first period of Muscovite rule in the Volga region (latter half of the 16th century) there are constantly mentioned Ar(yan) princes and their cities Arsk on the Kama and Karin on the Viatka.[25] It is not possible to say definitely what was the nationality of the Arsk princes. However, it would not be surprising if the old political name *Ar-* (used by the Vikings at the beginning of the 10th century) had been used from the 14th to the 16th centuries by Tatar princes.

It is significant that the Arabic classical school of geography used the word *ṣinf* "kind, class" for different Rus (Viking) organizations operating in Eastern Europe, and not a word like *jins* "tribe, clan".

It is also remarkable that the Volga Bulgars when distinguishing different groups of Rus Vikings either used the name of their main city (e.g. Kiev), or called them after their leading native vassal tribe, in Novgorod الصلاوى *aṣ-Ṣlāwī-* (= Slovĕn-), a Slavic tribe, and in the Viatka region اريان *Aryān-* (= Arians), (apparently) a Finnic tribe.

[22] "Mu'rib", ed. Dubler, 13 (§ 12). cf. nn. 12, 13, 15.
[23] ed. P. K. Kokovtsov, *Evreisko-khazarskaya perepiska v X veke*, Leningrad, 1932, 31, l. 12.
[24] See V. L. Yanin, *Denezhno-vesovye sistemy russkogo srednevekov'ya. Domongol'skii period*, Moscow, 1956, maps on pp. 86 and 102.
[25] See n. 15, and *Ocherki istorii SSSR. Period feodalizma IX–XV vv.*, Vol. 2, Moscow, 1953, 436–7.

Historians who use the data of the Khorasan school of Arab geography should remember that to the Volga Bulgars the most important places were the trade centres, not the political centres.

Al-Balkhī (d. 934) wrote in *c.* 308/920–921; Jaihānī became vizier in 302/914 and wrote not earlier than 310/922. We can therefore assume that the information contained in the "Caspian collection" came from *c.* 910–915.

Of great importance for scholars of the history of Eastern Europe is the fact that by that time—according to the data of the above-mentioned school of geography—Novgorod and Kiev were still two separate Viking organizations and had not yet united in one Kievan state.

But now it is time for us to stop and ask historians and archaeologists of Eastern Europe to take the floor.