

Prism A, 17? Perhaps new sources will bring additional data to the question considered.

The present paper is a fragment of a more extensive study about Yamani's rebellion in Ashdod. As follows from a better acquaintance with the sources and from confronting them with the results of archaeological investigations, neither was Cyprus actively engaged in the rebellion nor was Yamani a native of Cyprus. All the misapprehensions accumulated in the literature of the subject are most probably the result of perfunctory and one-sided interpretations of Yamani's name.

On the other hand, however, Yamani's figure appears in the twilight of the history as an eminent individual coming from the lower social strata of Ashdod, raised to authority due to the support of the strong anti-Assyrian opposition⁵⁵. Of course the rebellion in Ashdod is an unimportant episode in the process of Assyrian empire expansion, which under the rule of Sargonids reached the height of its military power, but in the history of the Philistine town it is one of its most interesting and glorious pages.

⁵⁵ J. Kaplan's estimation of Yamani is — in the light of accessible sources — inconsiderate and unfair to this person. Cf. J. Kaplan, *The Stronghold...*, p. 149.

MARIA KOWALSKA

IBN FAḌLĀN'S ACCOUNT OF HIS JOURNEY TO THE STATE OF THE BULĠĀRS

To whom was Ibn Faḍlān's 'Account of the Journey' addressed¹? As is well-known, he was a member of the embassy, sent by caliph al-Muḥtadir to the ruler of the state of Bulġārs on the Volga in the years 921—922. Ibn Faḍlān's function was that of secretary. According to Canard², it might have been an official report prepared for the caliph's chancellery in Baghdād. However, there are no actual grounds for this hypothesis. The first argument against it is that Ibn Faḍlān's description does not include either any systematic account of the activities of the embassy or a recapitulation of the results of the mission. The last part of the account is not known, but, on the other hand, one can assume that it did not include any formal or official report either, since in those parts of the text which have been preserved descriptions of the official activities of the mission are woven into other descriptions and particulars which could have no basic significance for the caliph or his chancellery. Thus, first of all, Ibn Faḍlān relates objects and occurrences, as well as his personal impressions. He also tells about some interesting things which happened during the journey and impressed him deeply or excited his curiosity. However, he does not in the least emphasise any such details

¹ *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, vol. I—III. Leiden—London 1960—1971, vol. III. p. 759;

I. Ju. Kračkovskij, *Izbrannyje Sočinenija* (vol. IV, *Arabskaja geografičeskaja literatura*), Moskva 1957, pp. 184—185.

² M. Canard, *La relation du voyage d'Ibn Faḍlān chez les Bulgares de la Volga*, AIEO, (Alger) 1958, XVI. p. 48.

which might have been connected with the official character of the expedition. If his only purpose had been to fulfill his official duty, his account would most probably have included much less detailed descriptions and personal impressions; that is, he would simply not have given himself so much trouble. Undoubtedly, his intention was to share his experience with others, which, combined with his literary flair and talent, exceptional narrative power and gift for observation, as well as excellent 'film-like' memory, resulted in something which is less of an official report and more of an informal account of the journey, written almost in the form of a journalistic report. An additional argument against the above hypothesis (put forward even before Canard) is the fact that in the text there are mentions concerning also the reasons for which the embassy was sent — something that would not be required in an official report.

On the other hand, one is inclined to accept Kovalevskij's thesis that the account was meant for the readers in Baghdād, and strictly speaking, the court³.

Ibn Faḍlān frequently emphasises that on many occasions the envoys strove to secure the prestige of the caliph. It is in virtue of this that Kovalevskij (who also points out that Ibn Faḍlān made definite efforts to expose his own rôle in the mission) puts forward his thesis that Ibn Faḍlān must have also written another, official report. From this formal statement the official parts of his account of the journey might have come, that is those fragments which show Ibn Faḍlān's conscious purpose to emphasise the prestige of the sovereign. Such assumptions are not deprived of certain foundations, but, on the other hand, they are contradicted by the fact that the relation of the official activities of the embassy does not form any special separate part of the account, providing only a fragment of the text which is both natural and necessary for the whole composition. Moreover, since the account was written in Baghdād and meant to be read there, Ibn Faḍlān had to express his attitude towards the caliph in the proper way. Never did he go far enough, however, to justify an accusation of

³ A. P. Kovalevskij, *Kniga Ahmeda Ibn Fadlana o jeho putie-šestvi na Volgu v 921—922 g.*, Charkov 1956, p. 48; cf. also H. Ritter, *Zum Text von Ibn Faḍlāns Reisebericht*, ZDMG, 98, 1942, p. 101.

flattery. And if on his journey he made numerous references to the authority of the caliph's power, which is clearly felt in the account, he did it chiefly for diplomatic reasons, that is in order to obtain maximum guarantee of safety during the passage of the embassy. Some commentators accused Ibn Faḍlān of boastfulness. But is such criticism not harmful? It is true that the author clearly emphasises his own importance, but one must also consider the circumstances of the expedition, that is all activities which were necessary to prevent it from ending in a failure.

Kovalevskij points out that Ibn Faḍlān keeps the envoy Sūsan ar-Rassī in the background, ascribes to the king of the Bulgārs some scornful remarks concerning other members of the embassy and stresses his own rôle as that of the real leader of the expedition, at the same time making all possible efforts to justify the failures of the mission or consciously putting the blame for them on the other members of the embassy. And the failures were serious. The Oğuz Turks did not adopt Islam, the Bulgārs remained faithful to the *ḥanafī* rites and rejected those of the Baghdād caliphs (i.e. *šāfi'*), the embassy failed to bring the four thousand dinars to the country of the Bulgārs. According to Kovalevskij, what he calls Ibn Faḍlān's boastfulness was a necessity for the author of the account. In Kovalevskij's opinion, this particular part of *Risāla* belongs to the official report, its purpose being the defence of Ibn Faḍlān who (according to Kovalevskij's hypothesis) was accused by one of the envoys of having caused the failure of the mission, and, in consequence, fell into the caliph's disfavour⁴. It seems, however, that Kovalevskij's hypothesis goes a little too far. Indeed, Ibn Faḍlān does not say much about other members of the mission and he points out several times that there were some controversies among them, while it was he who was in the right. The reason for this is that Ibn Faḍlān was not only the chronicler of the expedition, but also the recorder of his personal experiences. Thus he was not only the narrator but also the hero of his account of the journey. The author's personality is a considerable merit of the relation itself.

A characteristic feature of such accounts is that the narrator is put in the central position, taking over functions of other charac-

⁴ A. P. Kovalevskij, *Kniga Ahmeda Ibn Fadlana* p. 48.

ters of the epic world⁵, and first of all, that of the hero. The shortcoming of many such accounts (not only Arabic) is just that the author's personality is kept in the background. One can hardly talk about boastfulness here; the narrator stresses his own rôle, as it becomes for him a method necessary in order to achieve some authenticity. It is true that facts and objects represented in the work are seen through the mirror of the narrator's interpretation, but, on the other hand, his subjectivity strengthens the impression of their reality and brings them closer to the reader. A particular kind of subjectivity (which does not mean falsifying reality) is characteristic of all good narrators; in this case the subjective approach is the proof of Ibn Faḍlān's deep involvement, his ambition and narrative power.

At some most dramatic moments Ibn Faḍlān speaks quite openly about his feelings, which is a rare thing among medieval writers. He does it in a simple and natural way; for example, when relating the difficulties of passing through Central Asia (through the country of the Turks, after leaving Ġurġāniya, one of the capitals of Ḥwarizm) in the middle of fierce winter, he adds: 'In comparison to what we had been through, now we forgot all about what we had suffered while passing through Ḥwarizm. Those winter days seemed like summertime, now we were all close to destruction'⁶. When describing the unusual sunset which they observed in the country of the Bulgārs, he says: 'We became frightened by it and began to pray and the natives laughed at us, wondering at what we were doing'⁷. After the embassy were received in audience by the ruler of the Bulgārs, Ibn Faḍlān relates: 'And so I left him, frightened and tormented'⁸. Resorting to poetic comparisons, while describing the winter in Ḥwarizm, he says: 'We saw such a country that we thought that nothing else but the gates of Zamharir (the cold hell) had opened in front of us'⁹.

⁵ Z. Klátik, *Über die Poetik des Reisebeschreibung*, „Zagadnienia Rodzajów Literackich“ 11, 2 (21), 1969, p. 137.

⁶ A. P. Kovalevskij, *Kniga Ahmeda Ibn Fadlana*, p. 125.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 134.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 133.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 123.

Ibn Faḍlān's work is the first description in Arabic travel literature which has been preserved almost in its original form. The last part is missing and, moreover, as it is shown in Kovalevskij's investigation, in the Mašhad manuscript (which is not the autograph) some abridgements have been made by an unknown editor. On the other hand, however, this part of the text that is known to us, in every respect by far surpasses all writings by earlier authors which have been preserved. The latter were subjected to greater extent — and probably many a time — to some editing measures; moreover, in fact they are known only through long quotations or from partial summaries.

Kovalevskij, who was the first to analyze Ibn Faḍlān's account as a literary work, particularly strongly emphasised the great difference between Ibn Faḍlān and the writings of old Arabic geographers and historians whose knowledge was rather general and not very precise. Kovalevskij writes: 'We see things with the eyes of an eyewitness who — as we might suppose, without any side-thoughts or prejudices — gives us an account of everything that he sees, relates things in detail, tells us where he finds himself at a given moment, who is with him, who he talks to, etc. Sometimes it seems that the only thing he needs is a photographer's camera; if he only had it, he would be transformed into a modern tourist, who pays his attention to everything, becomes interested in everything and makes effort to record everything in his notebook'¹⁰.

The reason for these differences is found not only in the fact that Ibn Faḍlān wrote his account from autopsy and that his text reaches us directly and not through the mediation of a compiler. Before the Mašhad manuscript was discovered in 1923, Ibn Faḍlān was known chiefly through some extracts preserved in Yāḳūt's work. Comparing the two, one can easily see how much of the documentary and literary value of the original was lost due to the mediation of Yāḳūt, even though he was a compiler of relative responsibility and intelligence.

¹⁰ A. P. Kovalevskij, *Putiešestvije Ibn Fadlana na Volgu. Pierevod i komentarij pod riedakcijej I. Ju. Kračkovskogo*, Moskva—Leningrad 1939, p. 43.

One of our next purposes is to establish the originality of Ibn Faḍlān's text as a literary work (as different from the originality of the things which he related). Ibn Faḍlān's text is an example of documentary prose. Its basic parts¹¹ are: a short introduction, providing an explanation of the circumstances under which the mission was organized and sent, an account of the journey to the country of the Bulgārs, the first period of the stay of the embassy with the Bulgārs, the description of the country, some information about the Rūs, and finally, the information about the Hazars. The route and the progress of the journey determined the framework of the composition. The work is divided into three parts: 1. the incoming journey; 2. the sojourn in the country of destination; 3. the return journey (this part of the account has not been preserved but one can rightly assume that it must have been at least outlined in a schematic form). In the first part (i.e. the account of the incoming journey) Ibn Faḍlān does not strictly keep the form of the journal; therefore, the narrative progresses in the objective tense, that is Ibn Faḍlān relates consecutive stages of the journey without giving exact dates, but preserving the chronology of the most important occurrences. This provides one of the chief arguments for the statement that Ibn Faḍlān must have written his relation of the journey either after he had come back to his own country or else that he must have made some notes after each main stage of the journey, but without keeping any systematic current records¹². In the description of the incoming journey, the existence of some objective stages (i.e. passing through consecutive provinces or territories of various Turkish peoples) facilitated chronological recording and made it naturally possible to use time as a compositional device. In the part which provides the description of the country of the Bulgārs (except for the description of the first period of the embassy's sojourn there) time really ceases to exist. A definite compositional framework is lacking, which is characteristic of medieval Arabic writers: we are presented with a long series of relations and descriptions, dealing with various things and occurrences, only

¹¹ A. P. Kovalevskij, *Kniga Ahmeda Ibn Fadlana*, pp. 292—295.

¹² K. Czeglédy, *Zur Meschheder Handschrift von Ibn Fadlāns Reisebericht*, Acta Or. Hung., 1950—1951, p. 221.

rarely connected thematically through some more definite associations.

It was already Kračkovskij who said: 'One cannot ignore the fact that Ibn Faḍlān's 'Risāla' is also interesting from the literary point of view; due to its natural, unaffected flow of narration, its brisk and vivid language, with occasional glimpses of humour, though perhaps not always consciously introduced¹³'. Indeed, Ibn Faḍlān was able to see the comicality of some habits or situations. When talking about the Turks and their habit to pluck their beards and leave only the moustache, he relates that on one occasion he saw among them an old man who had plucked his beard, leaving some hair on his chin, and, as he was wearing a sheepskin coat, everybody who saw him from a distance must have taken him for a billygoat¹⁴. But a certain leader of Bulgār soldiers, who had deprived himself of his beard in a similar way, led everybody to suppose that he was an eunuch. Laughter is combined with disgust in Ibn Faḍlān's account of the Turkish habit to eat lice¹⁵. When telling about his having taught one of the Bulgārs who had embraced Islam of two suras of the Koran, he adds that the man's joy on becoming acquainted with those two suras was greater than if he had become the ruler of aṣ-Ṣakālība¹⁶. In this exaggeration of comparison there is even a slight touch of irony. Also with some humour Ibn Faḍlān tells about the liberty of morals among the Rūs people or about their habit to wash themselves in dirty water¹⁷. Kračkovskij was right to stress the natural and unaffected flow of Ibn Faḍlān's narrative — in relation to this, one should add that also the elements of humour are introduced in a most natural, simple and unaffected way. Moreover, Ibn Faḍlān proves extremely good at rendering the atmosphere, and especially the dramatic aspects, of numerous situations. One of the best descriptions of this kind is his account of the journey through the steppes of Middle Asia in sharp frost¹⁸, in which Ibn Faḍlān reports his short conversation with a fellow

¹³ I. Ju. Kračkovskij, *Arabskaja geografičeskaja literatura*, p. 185.

¹⁴ A. P. Kovalevskij, *Kniga Ahmeda Ibn Fadlana*, p. 128.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 130.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 138.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 142.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 125.

traveller, a Turk. The conversation provides an excellent characteristics of the mental state of the exhausted travellers. The episode in which Ibn Faḍlān relates his encounter with another Turk, a stranger, who alone stopped on its way a caravan of five thousand people, is also most suggestive. The fragment in which the Turkish leaders deliberate on what to do with the Moslem envoys — undoubtedly one of the most dangerous moments of the journey, as Ibn Faḍlān was facing a threat of death — is full of dramatic tension.

The way in which Ibn Faḍlān relates the failure of the mission to hand to the ruler of the Bulgārs the big sum of money sent to him by the caliph, requires a separate discussion. This failure caused that suspicion fell on the members of the embassy, and the envoys were threatened with some grave consequences. Ibn Faḍlān does not give a complete account of that fact, but, with a great narrative power, relates it in several consecutive stages, preserving the chronological order of all other happenings. What he thus achieves is a certain gradation of the tension, and by weaving into the main plot the records of some other happenings, he absorbs the reader's attention to an even greater extent. Already at the very beginning, that is when the embassy sets off from Ġurġāniya without the money, he warns his fellow travellers of possible consequences. As he tells about it after his coming back from the expedition, that is when he already knew how the whole affair ended and that it finally did not bring down any punishment on the envoys, he cannot be accused of boastfulness. On the other hand, he is aware of the fact that the episode was one of the most dramatic moments of the expedition, and especially interesting for the prospective reader. The plot is structured in the following way: 1. the announcement of the danger at the moment when the delegation leaves Ġurġāniya without the money; 2. the first warning: on the third day of their sojourn, after the official greetings, the delegation is received in audience by the king of the Bulgārs, in order to explain their failure to bring the money; 3. the strengthening of the tension: the Bulgār ruler demands that the money is handed in, threatening Ibn Faḍlān in person; 4. the ruler of the Bulgārs starts a dispute on religion, morals and politics, in order to prove to Ibn Faḍlān that

he is acting against the law. Aware of the provocation, Ibn Faḍlān accepts his part in the dispute and not only does he win it, but he also gains the ruler's respect and confidence; 5. some time later, after Ibn Faḍlān has realised that the state of the Bulgārs is rich enough to be able to afford building the stronghold (which was to be paid with the money offered by the caliph), he asks the sovereign about his real reasons for having asked financial help from the caliph. The ruler explains sophistically that the money which comes from the greatest Moslem leader would bring him blessing. This last part relieves the tension and provides the ending of the plot.

Ibn Faḍlān reports his dialogues with the ruler of the Bulgārs, and especially the long soliloquies of the latter. The Bulgār king made a great impression on him; for instance, the writer says that his appearance was full of self-respect and majesty, and his voice was stentorian.

Ibn Faḍlān uses dialogue very frequently, sometimes he even addresses his reader directly (i.e. in the second person), which adds in a particular way to the naturalness and directness of his suggestive narrative. He also frequently questions the natives, through the mediation of an interpreter. His chief interests are habits of strange peoples and their everyday life. Among these ethnographic interests, funeral rites occupy a special position. The explanation for this predilection is to be looked for in the fact that, being a divine and a lawyer, he was interested in other peoples' religions, and funeral rites belong to these religious ceremonies which can be relatively frequently and relatively easily observed. Participation in funeral ceremonies provided Ibn Faḍlān with an opportunity to obtain some indirect information concerning the whole system of religion. He must have been greatly impressed especially by long and complicated, solemn ceremonies of the peoples whom he met during his journey, differing in all respects from simple and inostensible Moslem rites. One of the longest parts of his account is his relation of a funeral in the country of the Rūs¹⁹. Ibn Faḍlān undertook a special journey

¹⁹ T. Lewicki, *Obrzędy pogrzebowe pogańskich Słowian w opisach podróżników i pisarzy arabskich głównie z IX—X w.*, „Archeologia”, 5. 1955, pp. 122—154; FO, 5, 1963, pp. 1—74.

to be able to see this ceremony. While his other relations of similar happenings are recordings of second-hand information (and hence less detailed, though still much better than those recorded by arm-chair geographers), the description of the funeral of a Rūs is exceptionally detailed and at the same time clear and suggestive. It is obvious that the ceremony must have greatly impressed the writer. Ibn Faḍlān remains objective, and even though he is a Moslem, he restrains from nearly all criticism and does not in the least show any enmity towards the culture of the Rūs which is entirely strange to him. His objectivity is best shown in his quotation of the opinion expressed by one of the Rūs, who criticises Moslem funeral rites and claims a definite priority for the customs of his own people. Thus Ibn Faḍlān not only relates what he saw himself, but, like a true reporter, he obtains and records opinions of representatives of other nations.

He also pays much attention to the beliefs of other peoples. Talking about phallic worship among the Baškirs, he does not express his own opinion but restricts himself to the relation of the facts and their justification which he had learned from one of the Baškirs, through the mediation of an interpreter. He is well aware of literary value of those facts and conveys the comicality of the situation, at the same time retaining the objectivity of a narrator. Even though he might be shocked or amused by such facts and habits of the strange peoples as living in dirt, eating lice or professing liberty of morals, his critical attitude does not prevent him from objectivity in his evaluation of those peoples or even his own coexistence with them. He is always interested in obtaining all kinds of information about exotic habits and ceremonies, but he is also an excellent diplomat, successful in coming into social contacts with people. He thinks highly about the hospitality, care of the poor, and especially honesty, justice and dependability of the Turkish peoples. Most of his relations and descriptions do not include the author's commentary, but Ibn Faḍlān is well aware of the fact that happenings and experiences that he relates speak in their own name, and he is able to convey them in such a way that they become most impressive. Thanks to this, the whole account has a ring of authenticity, invaluable in this kind of literature.

The question of dependence of Ibn Faḍlān on other writings of his time was already dealt with by Kovalevskij in his first edition of Ibn Faḍlān's work²⁰. Kovalevskij maintains that the account of Ibn Faḍlān's journey is not a direct record of a traveller's impressions²¹, separated from the whole of literary tradition. On the contrary, such an account could appear only as the result of some previous attempts, thanks to which a definite literary genre, a certain literary trend was created, which then had its followers and which produced, in the 14th century, the outstanding work: the accounts of travels of Ibn Baṭṭūṭa. In his second edition of Ibn Faḍlān's work²², Kovalevskij presents a comparison of certain similar motifs which appear both in Ibn Faḍlān and in Sallām Tarḡumān, Ibn Hurdādbēh, al-Ġāhiz, Buzurg ibn Šahriyār, Ibn al-Faḳih, tales of the Thousand and One Nights. But after a detailed analysis he comes to the conclusion that one cannot state with certainty that Ibn Faḍlān had borrowed from other writers such motifs as the big snake, the number of concubines in rulers' harems, a nation of giants, etc. Admiring Ibn Faḍlān's gift for detailed observation, Kovalevskij expresses the opinion that some kind of preparation for the author was provided by geographical literature of the time, and in particular, by other accounts of travels and journeys²³. One must agree with Kovalevskij's statement that Ibn Faḍlān knew what would be of most interest for his readers. Moreover, one should also add that, as a representative of the defined cultural environment, he must have shared at least some of these interests with his contemporaries. It seems, however, that Kovalevskij goes too far when he states that the account of Ibn Faḍlān's journey was dependent on contemporary geographical literature and especially on other accounts of travels.

We do not know much about these accounts, as in most cases they have not been preserved, but what we do have is enough to state that most probably they could not be considered equal to Ibn Faḍlān's work. Other travellers were not able to say much about their experiences because, unlike Ibn Faḍlān, they lacked

²⁰ A. P. Kovalevskij, *Putiešestvije Ibn Fadlana*.

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 44.

²² A. P. Kovalevskij, *Kniga Ahmeda Ibn Fadlana*, p. 50 ff.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 49.

the mastery of words and the inner resources which necessarily condition the contents and value of a relation²⁴, irrespective of the exotism of strange countries and the unusualness of adventures. Geographical literature, apart from mere descriptions of travels, that is works of geographers, could not have served as a model for Ibn Faḍlān. In their literary and documentary aspects, they were well beyond the level represented by authentic travel accounts, as their purposes were different, and as their authors drew to a large extent from those authentic sources. Unfortunately, arm-chair geographers and common compilers most often deprived the accounts which they used of many valuable features, and especially of their authenticity, so important for the creation of a true picture in the mind of the reader. Thus, to what extent is one justified in speaking about Ibn Faḍlān's dependence on other writings of his time? Moreover, what explanation can be provided for the fact that in such respects as the faithfulness, dynamism, objectivity and authenticity of relation he was equalled only by a few of his followers? Ibn Faḍlān's achievement was due to his gift for observation, his obvious sensitivity and ability to convey information, that is, to his inborn reporter's gift.

It is due to this gift that the account of the journey, written by Ibn Faḍlān, is the greatest achievement of Arabic medieval literature, equalled only by the work of Ibn Baṭṭūṭa.

²⁴ Z. Klátik, *Über die Poetik der Reisebeschreibung*, p. 152.

FRANCISZEK KMIETOWICZ

ARTĀNIYA-ARTĀ

Dans „Kitāb al-masālik al-mamālik“, oeuvre d'un géographe et voyageur arabe Abū Iṣḥāq al-Fārisī al-Iṣṭahṛī, écrit selon toute probabilité vers, à peu près 318—321 AH = 930—933 AD (c'est à-dire du vivant encore de son maître et professeur Abū Zayd al-Balḥī dans les travaux duquel il a abondamment puisé), mais répandue à l'Orient dans la version établie seulement aux environs de 340 AH = 951 AD¹, nous lisons:

„Il y a trois tribus² *ar-Rūs*. La tribu qui se trouve le plus près de *Bulḡār* et dont le roi habite une ville appelée *Kūyāba* et qui est plus grande que *Bulḡār*. La tribu le plus éloignée est appelée *as-S.lāwiya* et la [troisième] tribu que l'on appelle *al-Artāniya* et dont le roi réside à *Artā*³. Des gens avec des marchandises pénètrent à *Kūyāba*. En ce qui concerne *Artā*, il n'est pas mentionné

¹ I. Y. Kračkovskiy, *Arabskaya geografičeskaya literatura*, Izbrannye Sočineniya, v. IV, Moskva—Leningrad 1957, p. 197.

² Ar. صنف (*ṣinf*), pl. اصناف (*aṣnāf*); désignant plus souvent: „le genre, la classe, la catégorie, la corporation“. C'est l'origine dont on parle parfois dans la littérature des trois „genres“ ou „centres“ d'*ar-Rūs*. E. W. Lane, *Arabic-English Lexicon*, London 1867, v. II, p. 1735, ajoute la signification suivante: „And صنة signifie also a portion of a tribe (قبيلة)“; quant à R. Dozy, *Supplément aux dictionnaires arabes*, v. I, 2^e éd., Leiden—Paris 1927, p. 849, il donne seulement celles-ci: „famille, tribu, nation“, et dans notre cas c'est celles-ci qu'on doit appliquer.

³ Ar. ارتانية—ارتا. Il existe plusieurs versions de ces deux noms (voir I. Hrbek, *Der dritte Stamm der Rūs nach arabischen Quellen*, Archiv Orientalní, v. 25, 1957, p. 630); vu la prépondérance des leçons susdites (12 fois sur 26) nous allons les appliquer ici conséquemment.