

de dissensions internes, ne pouvaient donner à toutes les affaires courantes le soin et la tutelle qui se devaient. De là les défaillances multiples et dans différents domaines qui autorisaient des appréciations aussi acerbes que celle que proféra en sa lettre Mehmed Pacha: „En Pologne, personne ne veut obéir à la loi“. On serait peut-être fondé à admettre que, dans l'occurrence, une orientation pro-turque aura amené des Polonais mêmes à traiter le contentieux d'une manière tendancieuse et partielle, à en forcer l'admission par-devant le tribunal frontalier, sans qu'il y eût à la chose un fondement juridique suffisant. Ce fut là cause des interjections d'appel et des contre-plaintes de Czarnocki faites auprès de différents cours judiciaires, de procès et de jugements réitérés.

Que les Turcs aient, dans cette affaire, fait preuve de réel acharnement ne doit pas étonner ni surprendre. En premier lieu, il a très bien s'agir d'une manifestation des soupçons que la Pologne, obéissant à une impulsion venant de Russie, faisait à l'égard de ressortissants turcs une politique de discrimination. Ensuite, il y eut tout le poids que la Turquie attribuait à son commerce extérieur. La Turquie donna attention, soutien, tutelle et protection, souvent bien au-delà de ses frontières, à tout marchand turc. Il suffira d'énumérer quelques interventions typiques des autorités turques: retour de biens, préservation et retour d'actifs laissés par des marchands décédés à l'étranger²⁷, application très stricte des tarifs douaniers²⁸, prix fixés aux marchandises importées, pour faire voir l'ampleur et l'universalité de la protection apportée aux affaires commerciales. Du fait qu'ils constituassent une des couches le plus actives de la société, les marchands turcs ont été une avant-garde en ce qui concerne les contacts internationaux. Aussi bien, quiconque voudrait faire le tableau complet des relations polono-turques à travers les siècles ne pourrait passer sous silence le trait si important de ces relations que fut le commerce entre ces deux pays. Malheureusement, ce point d'histoire capital attend toujours encore son historien.

Teresa Ciecierska-Chłapowa

SOME REMARKS CONCERNING 'EZĀNĀ'S INSCRIPTIONS AND THE BEJA TRIBES

The Beja tribes may be considered as one of the most important peoples on the borderland between Eastern Sudan and Erythrea. It is especially noteworthy that the southern Beja tribes constitute one

²⁷ V., T. Ciecierska-Chłapowa, *Episodes de tutelle ottomane au bénéfice des marchands turcs à l'étranger (XVIII^e siècle)*, dans „Folia Orientalia“, t. VII, pp. 314—320, Kraków 1966.

²⁸ *Ibid.*

of the main elements of the heterogenous federation known under the name of Beni 'Amer¹ whose second main component are Semitic Tigre. We do not know, it must be said, how old is this very interesting federation which is divided, at least in theory, by the frontier line which was drawn in a rather recent period. It is, however, well established that the Beja were in continuous contact with the Semitic peoples of Ethiopia since very remote times and that they played sometime quite an important part in the history of the Ethiopian state.

The oldest period of the relations between the Beja and between the Ethiopian state i. e. the period of the settlement of the Semites and of their expansion which consequently resulted in the foundation of their state, remains rather obscure and little can be said on this point. It may be pretended, however, that the Semitic immigrants from Arabia met the Beja among the other nomadic peoples that they had to encounter already in the first millenium B. C. The Ethiopian king who left the famous inscription from Adulis² mentioned the Beja in the list of the peoples he had „conquered“. We do not know what this pretended „conquest“ actually meant — it cannot be excluded that the Ethiopians merely won a battle with the Bejas but at any rate it is very possible that the latter were not really conquered and that their dependance from the Ethiopian state was rather nominal. Most probably only some tribes i. e. the southern ones were concerned. The more detailed and interesting information that came down to us is contained in the three essentially parallel inscriptions of the king 'Ēzānā from the 4th century A. C.

One of these inscriptions which were edited, not speaking about some older publications and translations, by Enno Littmann³, is in Greek and the other two are in Ge'ez — the first one written in South Arabic alphabet and the second one in Ethiopic characters. The fact that the inscriptions were recorded in three versions seems to point out that the events described in them were quite important in 'Ēzānā's reign⁴. On the other hand we should be inclined to expect the

¹ Cf. S. F. Nadel, *Notes on Beni Amer Society*, SNR, vol. 26, 1945, pp. 51—94; C. G. Seligman, Z. Brenda, *Note on the History and Present Condition of the Beni Amer*, SNR, vol. 13, 1930, pp. 83—97; A. Paul, *Notes on the Beni Amer*, SNR, vol. 31, 1950, pp. 223—45.

² E. O. Winstedt, *The Christian Topography of Cosmas Indicopleustes*, Cambridge, 1909, p. 74. Cf. J. Doresse, *L'empire du Prêtre Jean*, Paris, 1957, p. 117.

³ E. Littmann, *Sabäische, Griechische und Alt-Abessinische Inschriften*, Deutsche Aksum-Expedition (= DAE), vol. IV, Berlin, 1913, pp. 4—7, 8—17; a new translation by the same author in *Äthiopische Inschriften*, „Miscellanea Academica Berolinensia“, vol. II, part 2, Berlin, 1950, pp. 98—107.

⁴ C. Conti Rossini, *Storia d'Etiopia*, Bergamo, 1928, p. 132.

other equally or even more important events like the expedition against Noba to be recorded also in several versions. Of course we cannot pretend that such versions never existed but in any case it is difficult to give a really convincing explanation why it was just the expedition against the Bejas and the removal of six of their tribes that had to be commemorated in three versions.

In the royal title in which various peoples and territories are mentioned 'Ēzānā always names himself „king of the Beja“ and this means most probably that he exerted a nominal rule over this people. It is surprising that he names himself the king only of Aksum, Teyāmo, Kāsū and Beja in spite of the fact that he made a number of other African peoples subservient to him⁵. This may be tentatively explained in the following way — Beja were probably one of the most numerous peoples that were nominally subordinate to the Ethiopian state and their relations were somewhat closer while the less numerous peoples were not, in the principle, mentioned in the title. It must be also borne in mind that we do not know what exactly a meaning had the four names mentioned above. It is also to be remembered that the Beja are mentioned in 'Ēzānā's title already in the inscriptions which are prior to the three inscriptions commemorating the removal⁶. It is, therefore, evident that 'Ēzānā exerted at least nominal rule over the Bejas already before the removal and that he probably inherited it from his predecessors. As in both earlier inscriptions 'Ēzānā tells the history of the restoration of his rule over various neighbour peoples among which Beja are not mentioned, we should be able to conjecture that the Bejas were obedient to him in the early period of his rule⁷. This would be based, however, only on the argument ex silentio.

The concrete information on the relations between 'Ēzānā's state and between the Bejas is to be found only in these three parallel inscriptions which are the main topic of this article. Only one event is given a special attention there i. e. the removal. The other events are described very briefly and a fully convincing analysis of the whole is apparently not an easy task. Here is the summary of the content of these inscriptions:

1. When the Bejas started the war 'Ēzānā sent his brothers Še'azāna and Hadeḫāhā to fight them.
2. When his brothers came to the land of Beja, six „kings“ i. e. six Beja chieftains surrendered with their people.

⁵ Cf. I. M. Kobishchanov, *Aksum*, Moskva, 1966, p. 44; by the same author *Pravleniye Ezany, Problemy istorii Afriki*, Moskva, 1966, p. 260, 271. Cf. E. Littmann, DAE, vol. IV, p. 7.

⁶ E. Littmann, DAE, vol. IV, pp. 18—19, 24—25.

⁷ Cf. E. Littmann, *Miscellanea*, vol. II, part. 2, p. 108.

3. The Aksumites led out the Bejas with their women, children and cattle. The number of all the people was 4400. They had 3112 cows and 6224 sheep and other small animals.

4. Since the beginning of the journey the Bejas were supplied by the Aksumites with 22 000 wheat breads everyday, they were given meat in abundance and they received beer, wine and spring water⁸ for four months.

5. After their arrival to Aksum 'Ēzānā ordered to give them clothing and he decorated the Beja chieftains.

6. After that 'Ēzānā sent them to the country called in the Greek text Matlia and in both inscriptions in Ethiopic DAWALA-BYRN. He ordered also to give them food once again and he assigned to every chief 4190 cows — this makes a general number of cows 25 140.

Finally 'Ēzānā mentions the sacrifice he offered to the Gods, there is also a formula condemning everybody that would dare to destroy the inscriptions⁹ etc. etc. The Greek text is naturally shorter in this part and it slightly differs from the two Ethiopic inscriptions in some minor details.

The events described above were rather unanimously interpreted by the historians as a great victory of 'Ēzānā's army which resulted in the forcible deportation of the Beja captives under a convoy to a new territory¹⁰. 'Ēzānā's magnanimity and munificence was praised and the propaganda character of the inscriptions stressed — these had, accordingly with the same opinion, to render 'Ēzānā's name famous¹¹. This interpretation does not, however, explain everything and it does not answer some very important questions. In the following these questions will be formulated and an attempt will be made to propose new answers and solutions. It must be said at the very beginning that the new interpretation will be quite tentative and because of the scarcity of the existing sources quite an important part of it will be based on arguments ex silentio. The author hopes that the hypothesis proposed here will be considered by other specialists who are better prepared to deal with such problems.

We do not know the immediate cause of the war activities or of the „mutiny“ of the Bejas. In both Ethiopic texts it is mentioned that the Bejas started the war but the verb which is used there may mean also „to rebel“¹². The „rebellion“ or „the revolt“ of the Bejas is men-

⁸ The spring water is mentioned only in the Greek inscription.

⁹ Cf. I. M. Kobishchanov, *Pravleniye*, p. 264—265.

¹⁰ C. Conti Rossini, *op. cit.*, p. 133; A. E. W. Budge, *A History of Ethiopia, Nubia and Abyssinia*, vol. I, London, 1928, p. 244; J. Dorette, *op. cit.*, p. 145.

¹¹ Cf. I. M. Kobishchanov, *Aksum*, p. 47; *Pravleniye*, 264.

¹² A. Dillmann, *Lexicon Linguae Aethiopicae*, Lipsiae 1865, p. 1329.

tioned also in the Greek text¹³. The „rebellion“ was probably organized in order to abolish the supremacy of the Aksumitic state but it cannot be excluded that the Bejas merely launched a pillage attack. The reasons why 'Ēzānā did not personally take part in the expedition against the Bejas are unknown and we cannot explain why the army was led by his two brothers¹⁴. It is possible that this expedition was not so important or difficult as the other ones and 'Ēzānā did not wish to participate in it. The reason might be even else but this problem does not seem to be relevant indeed.

The inscriptions tell us quite expressively that the Bejas surrendered but at the same time there is no mention of a battle or fighting at all. It seems to be highly probable that there was no fighting indeed. If there had been a battle, 'Ēzānā would have probably made a boast of the number of enemies killed — such details are reported very accurately in the inscriptions commemorating the campaigns against other peoples which had a character of the punitive expeditions. Perhaps the encounter was not quite successful for the Aksumites? This seems to be rather less probable because there are other arguments in support of the hypothesis that there was almost no fighting. It would be, perhaps, more safe to speak about showing the obedience by the Bejas¹⁵ rather than about their surrender. If there had been fighting and if the Bejas had to surrender, then they would have been captives but there are some details which indicate that they were not captives or at least that their capitulation was not unconditional. Before all it is rather improbable that the Aksumites were strong enough to deport 4400 men¹⁶ with about 10000 of cattle only by force. As it was rightly pointed out by Kobishchanov in his brilliant studies, there were probably no more than 1500 men fit for carrying the arms among the Bejas¹⁷. May be there was only 1000 of warriors but even in such a case they would be able to resist and to constitute a real danger. Accordingly with Kobishchanov's hypothesis 'Ēzānā's army had no more than a few thousands of men and then, consequently, the number of all the Aksumites oscillated between ten and fifteen thousands¹⁸. This

¹³ Cf. E. Littmann, DAE, vol. IV, p. 4, line 7.

¹⁴ Cf. the discussion of the position of the royal brothers by Kobishchanov, *Aksum*, p. 216; *Pravleniye*, p. 263.

¹⁵ Cf. A. Dillmann, *op. cit.*, pp. 1178—1179.

¹⁶ I agree with Kobishchanov that this number is only approximate — cf. I. M. Kobishchanov, *Obshchestvenniye otnosheniya v Aksumskom carstve*, „Afrikanskiy Etnograficheskiy Sbornik“, vol. V, Moskva—Leningrad, 1963, p. 135.

¹⁷ I. M. Kobishchanov, „*Armii*“ carya 'Ēzāny (*Perezhivki voennoy demokrati v drevnem Aksume*), „Vestnik Drevney Istorii“, vol. 79, 1962, p. 96.

¹⁸ I. M. Kobishchanov, „*Armii*“, p. 96.

is, however, based on the assumption that the Bejas were captives and that they were led under a convoy which had, hypothetically, to consist of at least 700 men¹⁹. Even this might be, perhaps, not necessarily enough to keep 4400 Bejas under control. At the same time it must be remembered that in the expedition against Noba the Aksumites killed 602 men and 156 women and children and thus they encountered, not speaking about those who escaped, with 1387 men²⁰. During the expedition against 'Afan²¹ 503 men and 202 women were killed and this makes the total number of 705. I agree with Kobishchanov that the number of the victims of these victorious wars could exceed the number of the invaders²². Of course it is clear that we do not know the number of 'Ēzānā's warriors and that this number changed from time to time even quite considerably. In view of all of it I am rather inclined to doubt whether it was possible to deport the Beja by force. Of course it cannot be excluded that the Aksumites had the Bejas hostages in their hands but even such an assumption does not solve all the problems. It is quite evident that the Bejas were not captives and that they were treated in quite another manner than all the other people who were exterminated, enslaved or forced to pay a tribute. The Bejas not only did not pay any tribute but they themselves were abundantly supplied with food in spite of the fact that they had some cattle with them. They were given 22 000 wheat breads daily and this makes 5 breads for a man²³ — this had to be a decent ration and we know that they received also meat, beer, wine and water²⁴. Even if a substantial part of this supply came from some subordinate people inhabiting the territories through which the „convoy“ advanced, it is difficult to admit that the Bejas would have been treated so well if they were merely captives. In Aksum they were given clothing, their chieftains were decorated²⁵ and in a nice country to which they were directed they received food once again and they obtained 25 140 cows. To sum up we may say that Bejas did not change their homeland only on compulsion²⁶. Consequently we should be inclined to suppose that there was no victory of Aksum but a compromise was reached and there was an agreement profitable for both sides. The Bejas received food composed also of agricultural articles that

¹⁹ I. M. Kobishchanov, „*Armii*“, p. 96.

²⁰ E. Littmann, DAE, vol. IV, pp. 110—111.

²¹ E. Littmann, DAE, vol. IV, p. 29.

²² I. M. Kobishchanov, „*Armii*“, p. 96.

²³ I. M. Kobishchanov, *Aksum*, p. 121.

²⁴ Cf. I. M. Kobishchanov, *Otnosheniya*, p. 142; *Aksum*, p. 173.

²⁵ On the decoration cf. E. Littmann, *Miscellanea*, p. 106.

²⁶ It is noteworthy that the whole tribes i.e. the men with their families were removed. Cf. A. Dillmann, p. 1340—1341.

were not produced probably by themselves and moreover they received a big number of cows which they had formerly twice less than other cattle and they also obtained a territory which was most probably better than that which they had occupied previously²⁷. What received the Aksumites? 'Ēzānā mentions only his big expenses and these cannot be explained only as a manifestation of his munificence. Although all the statistical data in 'Ēzānā's inscriptions are given very scrupulously and this may be considered as a proof of the efficiency of his administration²⁸, nevertheless it cannot be excluded that the data concerning the supply offered to the Bejas were so accurately given because the quality and the number of it²⁹ had been determined by the possible agreement treaty. I do not agree with the opinion that 'Ēzānā wanted merely to demonstrate his power and generosity by giving a list of the supply³⁰ — this may serve as an explanation why it was mentioned in the inscriptions at all but it does not explain why such a considerable expense had been made. It seems to be beyond any doubt that 'Ēzānā — the king of Aksum had some quite defined political and economical purposes and advantages in view but these were not mentioned at all since nothing was said about any condition or obligations on the part of the Bejas. We may even hypothetically say that 'Ēzānā did not mention such conditions or obligations because he wanted to exalt himself announcing his great victory without mentioning that the Bejas were merely his partners in the negotiations. On the other hand we should rather expect him to speak about what he gained from the Bejas and not to tell us how much they costed him. In any case 'Ēzānā's munificence and generosity cannot be taken as a sole explanation.

Another interpretation of the whole story consists in the assumption that a part of the Bejas was forcibly removed in order to

²⁷ It is explicitly stated that they were directed to „a nice country“.

²⁸ Cf. I. M. Kobishchanov, *Otnosheniya*, p. 135.

²⁹ I do not think that the „convoy“ travelled 4 months — cf. I. M. Kobishchanov, *Zolotonosnaya strana Sasu*, „Palestinskiy Sbornik“, vol. 11 (74), 1964, p. 95; A. E. W. Budge, *op. cit.*, p. 244. This would be a far too long distance. The provision was sufficient for 4 months but this does not imply a 4 months travel even if the Bejas travelled with their cattle very slowly. Many historians pretended that the Bejas were directed to Begameder since this name can be translated as „The Beja land“. This etymology is not quite certain and there are no traces of the Bejas on that territory. Cf. E. Littmann, *Miscellanea*, p. 108; I. M. Kobishchanov, *Pravleniye*, p. 264; *Aksum*, p. 46. I am rather inclined to agree with the etymology proposed by G. W. B. Huntingford, *Ethiopian place-names*, „African Language Studies“, vol. III, p. 185—186.

³⁰ C. I. M. Kobishchanov, *Otnosheniya*, p. 142.

weaken the rest and to render the defense of the northern frontier of Aksumite state easier³¹. If this had been the case, the Aksumites would have rather tried, provided that they were strong enough, to apply the same method that had been used with 'Afan or with Noba i. e. pacification. If they wanted only to disperse the enemy and to keep him more easily under control, they would not have settled six tribes which were most probably related or united in some way, on the same area as this would make the control quite a difficult task even if there were perhaps peoples obedient to 'Ēzānā around. It must be also stressed that we do not know the total number of all the Bejas and we do not know if these 4400 which were removed really constituted a considerable part of this people. Thus this second interpretation may be also considered only as a partial explanation. The possibility of a „conquest“ and of keeping the nomads under a close control is rather doubtful at all. An exhaustive explanation of the motives and purposes of 'Ēzānā's policy against the Bejas is impossible because of the lack of the responsible sources but it seems to be rather safe to assume that among the other reasons it was also the necessity of coexistence with the dangerous nomads from the north. By the removal of six Beja tribes he probably gained, to some extent, the reduction of tension in the northern borderland — the hypothesis mentioned above cannot be refuted in its entirety. Perhaps also another hypothesis merits attention — we may suppose that 'Ēzānā wanted to colonize some uninhabited territories or that he wanted to use the Bejas to defend his state against some other enemies. It must be said here that we cannot consider the supply of 25 140 cows to be only a provision for the sustenance of the Bejas — they had some amount of cattle which would have been probably sufficient, if necessary, to feed them. We do not know the origin of the cattle offered to the Bejas and we do not know how much cattle the Aksumites actually possessed. We know, however, that the expedition against 'Afan won 31 000 cows³² and the expedition against Noba took 10 500 cows and 51 500 sheep³³ as a booty. It is interesting that 'Ēzānā offered to the Bejas only cows and that the latter had originally much less cattle in comparison with Noba or 'Afan. This might be due to the war or to some plague but it might be also possible that the economics of the Bejas were quite substantially changed and improved by the Aksumites. We should expect some mention of a tribute or of a rent but, as it has been already said, we do not know about any condition or obligation on the part of the Bejas. In spite of it a hypo-

³¹ G. Conti Rossini, *op. cit.*, p. 135; A. E. W. Budge, *op. cit.*, p. 244, A. Paul, *A History of the Beja Tribes of the Sudan*, Cambridge, 1954, p. 46.

³² E. Littmann, DAE, vol. IV, p. 29.

³³ E. Littmann, DAE, vol. IV, p. 34.

thesis that 'Ēzānā supplied them with the cattle in order to make them their shepherds or „vassals“ who would perform functions similar to those of the vassals in the social structure of Beni 'Amer, Tigre, Bilin and some other peoples, is not quite improbable. It is noteworthy that there is a tradition among Beni 'Amer that the cattle was granted to the „vassals“ by the „seniors“³⁴. Of course we have no ground to associate this tradition, which may be, on the other hand, just an ideological fiction, with the events described in the records of Ancient Aksum but it is certain that it was during 'Ēzānā's reign that the Bejas came into a close contact or even mixed with the Semites and this stimulate much later the development of the characteristic social structure³⁵. As it was already said by A. Paul, the neighbourhood with the Aksumitic state had to have some influence on the southern Beja tribes³⁶.

To summarize we may say that 'Ēzānā solved the problem of the Bejas by peaceful methods — by a suitable treatment he calmed the Beja chieftains and he removed six tribes thus wading off the danger and gaining some more or less effective supremacy over them. The extant sources do not permit us to go beyond the hypothesis — they have a propaganda character and they give a partial and tendentious report of the facts.

Andrzej Zaborski

DIRHEMS DE TRÉSORS POLONAIS DE HAUT MOYEN ÂGE INÉDITS

Au cours des quelques dernières années, toute une série de dirhems provenant surtout de trouvailles isolées, mais aussi de trésors de moindre volume découverts soit par hasard, soit dans le cadre de fouilles systématiques, ont été dirigés vers notre Centre d'Etudes Numismatiques¹ afin d'y faire l'objet d'étude scientifique. Si même la découverte de certains d'entre eux ait été à différentes reprises mentionnée dans la littérature du sujet, ce n'est qu'aujourd'hui que nous publions une description minutieuse desdits dirhems.

³⁴ Cf. W. Munzinger, *Ostafrikanische Studien*, Schaffhausen, 1864, p. 264.

³⁵ Cf. A. Zaborski, *Notes on the Medieval History of the Beja Tribes*, „Folia Orientalia“, vol. VII, 1965, p. 302.

³⁶ A. Paul, *History*, p. 48.

¹ Institut d'Histoire de la Culture Matérielle, Académie Polonaise des Sciences.

Quelque peu simplifié cette fois, le système par nous suivi est celui qui a été adopté lors de l'élaboration de nos catalogues antérieurs². Il y a lieu de signaler que plusieurs pièces n'ont pu être mises à l'étude que sur la seule de base de photos conservées³, à la suite de quoi bon nombre d'inscriptions qui auraient sans doute été suffisamment déchiffrables sur les pièces originales se sont malheureusement avérées illisibles. Notre description apporte, en premier lieu les renseignements requis sur la trouvaille prise en bloc, puis, la description de la ou des pièces, enfin, toutes remarques utiles au sujet des différentes pièces.

KAMIEN POMORSKI⁴

Date de la découverte: ?

Circonstances: ?

Genre de trouvaille: trouvaille isolée.

Composition: 1 dirhem, 2 pièces d'Europe Occidentale⁵.

Description

Dynastie: Samanides.

Souverain: Nūh ibn Naṣr (331—343 = 942—954).

Lieu de frappe: Samarkand.

An: 334 = 945/46.

² Cf. nos publications: M. Czapkiewicz, F. Kmietowicz, *Skarb monet arabskich z Drohiczyzna n. Bugiem* (Le trésor de monnaies arabes de Drohiczyzna-sur-Bug), Kraków 1960; M. Czapkiewicz, A. Gupieniec, A. Kmietowicz, W. Kubiak, *Skarb monet arabskich z Klukowicze, pow. Siemiatycze* (Le trésor de monnaies arabes de Klukowicze, district de Siemiatycze), Kraków 1964, et autres.

³ Il ne s'agit en l'occurrence que de photos d'images de monnaies.

⁴ Une deuxième trouvaille faite en la même localité. Cf. T. et R. Kiersnowscy, *Wczesnośredniowieczne skarby srebrne z Pomorza* (Trésors d'argent de haut Moyen Age en Poméranie), Warszawa—Wrocław 1959, p. 53, n° 63, où note est prise d'un trésor de composition différente. Les pièces de monnaie ici décrites (1 dirhem et 2 monnaies d'Europe Occidentale — cf. renvoi 5) se trouvent, au Museum de Poméranie Occidentale à Szczecin.

⁵ Il s'agit de contrefaçons de sous de Dorestad (de Charlemagne): un bractéat pesant 0,82 g et un demi-bractéat du poids de 0,53 g. Cf. K. Stronczyński, *Dawne monety polskie* (Anciennes monnaies polonaises), p. 11 et suiv.