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I. DESCRIPTION OF THE MS.

The anonymous 1 geographical work called Ḥudūd al-'Ālam, i.e. "The Regions of the World", 2 was compiled in 372/982–3 and dedicated to the Amīr Abūl-Ḥārīth Muḥammad b. Ahmad, of the local Fārīghūnīd dynasty which ruled in Gūzgānān in what is now northern Afghanistān (see notes to § 1 and § 23, 46.). The unique manuscript was copied in 656/1258 by Abūl-Muʿayyad ʿAbd al-Qayyūm ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn ʿAlī al-Fārīsī (v.i., p. 166). The same half-erased name appears on the title-page: ṣāḥibuhu 3 kāṭibuhu al-ʿabd al-muḥtaḥ ilā rahmatiʿillāhī taʿālā Abūl-Mu ... ʿAbd al- ... ʿīm ibn ... yn ibn ʿAlī al-Fārīsī ....

The MS. consists of 39 folios measuring 28 × 18 cm., while the size of the written text (within ruled frame) is 20 × 13 cm. Each page has 23 extremely regular lines written in good and personal naskh-thulth script. The paper is of khānbālīq description.

On the whole the text is very well preserved. Ff. 28 and 29 are slightly damaged. The lower part of f. 39 (viz., half of the lines 17–23) has been torn, so that not only the text relating to the African countries but the colophon, too, has greatly suffered. The text begins on f. 1b. The title-page (f. 1a) is occupied by the title of the book, by some mediocre verses in the same hand, but having no relation to the text, and by some later entries of no interest. Marginal notes which are found on ff. 19b, 20a, 22b and 30a, have no great importance [cf. Appendix A].

The Ḥudūd al-ʿĀlam forms only one part of a bound volume of which all the folios are of the same size (28 × 18 cm.). It contains:


---

1 On the author cf. p. xii; he was a sunnī, cf. pp. 375, 392.
2 i.e., p. 30. The word Ḥudūd (properly 'boundaries') in our case evidently refers to the 'regions within definite boundaries' into which the world is divided in the Ḥ. -Ā., the author indicating with special care the frontiers of each one of these areas, i.e., p. 30. [As I use the word "region" mostly for nāḥiyat it would have been better, perhaps, to translate Ḥudūd al-ʿĀlam as "The limited areas of the World"]
3 Certainly in the sense of 'possessor' and not in that of 'author', as confirmed by the colophon of the Jāmīʿ al-ulūm, i.e., p. viii.

c. Ḥudūd al-‘Ālam (see above).

d. The well known encyclopedia ḫāmi‘ al-Ulūm (ff. 1–50)¹ by Fakhr al-dīn al-Rāzī (d. 606/1209) with the colophon: ṭawq̲a‘a al-firāq̲īn min taḥrīrīhī ya’um al-jum‘a lil-sādis wa-l-iṣhrīn min jumādā al-‘ūlā sana thamānī wa khamsin wa sitta-mī‘a ‘ala yadi. Aḥfī ḫakā Ḫallāh wa ahqaruhum Abūl-Mu‘ayyad ‘Abd al-Qayyūm b. al-Husayn(?) b. ‘Alī. Consequently this work, too, was copied by the scribe of the Ḥudūd al-‘Ālam on Friday, 26 Jumādā al-‘ūlā 658 (Thursday² 10 June 1259). He must have been an eager student to transcribe in his careful regular hand a series of important works for his personal library at the momentous epoch when the Mongol invaders were exterminating the Assassins, destroying the Baghdād Caliphate and remodelling the administration of Persia³.

2. DISCOVERY AND PUBLICATION OF THE Ḥ.-‘A.

The discovery and publication of the Ḥudūd al-‘Ālam have a long history not devoid of romance.

The Russian orientalist, Captain (later Major-General) A. G. Toumansky, was a great friend of the Bahā’īs whom he first met in Askhabad in 1890. He eagerly studied their religious literature⁴ and rendered some signal services to the thriving Bahā’ī colony established in the Russian Transcaspian province, for example at the time when the first temple of the new religion (mashriq al-adhkar) was being built in Askhabad.

Probably through Baron V. Rosen, who was his teacher, or through Barthold, who then was at the beginning of his scientific career, Toumansky heard of the interest of Ulugh-beg’s lost work Ulūs-i arba‘a and made a search for it through his Persian friends. The importance of Buhārā as a market for rare manuscripts was fully realized only after 1900 when special expeditions were sent there by the Russian Academy, yet even before that time it was natural to turn one’s attention towards that Muslim centre. Toumansky

1 Probably composed in 574/1178, cf. Rieu, Supplément, p. 102 (Or. 2972 contains 188 folios each side being of 17 lines).

2 Thursday evening is called in Persia shab-i jum‘a and considered as the beginning of Friday.

3 The data on the manuscript are partly borrowed from Toumansky’s article (v.i., p. ix, n. 2) and partly based on the notes personally taken in Paris in 1921.

4 See his edition of the Kitāb-i aqdas, SPh. 1899 (Mémoires de l’Académie des
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Availed himself of the occasional visits to Bukhārā of the learned Bahā’ī of Samarqand Mīrzā Abūl-Fadl Gulpāyagānī who soon after, in a letter in Persian dated 2 Rabī’ II, 1310 = 25 October 1892, reported as follows: “During my stay in Bukhārā all my efforts to find the Ulūs-i arba’a proved unsuccessful but I have found an ancient bound book which is very good and contains four treatises of which the first has geographical contents and formed a Preface to a Map (muqaddama-yi naqsha būda); the second, composed 943 years ago and copied 808 years ago, is also geographical and mentions the names of towns which now are absolutely unknown; the third treatise of Music, and is short; the fourth is the jāmi’ al-ulūm of Imām Fakhr-i Rāzī.” When, in 1893, Toumansky joined Mīrzā Abūl-Fadl in Bukhārā, his Persian friend made him a present of his find “on condition that it should be edited and not be lost for science”.

A journey to Persia and the vicissitudes of a military career made it impossible for Toumansky to publish the manuscript immediately but in an article which appeared in 1896 he explained the circumstances which led to the discovery of the Ḥ.-‘Ā., gave its description (date, colophon, dedication to the Farighānī ruler Abūl-Ḥārīth, complete table of contents &c.), and, as a sample of the text, published the Persian original and a Russian translation of the chapters on the “Christianized Slavs”, the Slavs, and the Rūs (ff. 37a–38a), with a short commentary.

Toumansky reserved the right of final publication of the MS., or more precisely, of the Hudūd al-Ālam, but in spite of some preparatory work done by him,1 was unfortunately unable to carry out his intention during his lifetime.


2 Zapiski Vost. Otd., x, 1896 (printed in 1897), pp. 121–37: The newly discovered Persian geographer of the 10th century and his reports on the Slavs and the Rus. In the same number of the Zapiski appeared the text of Barthold’s opening lecture at the St. Petersburg University, held on 8 April 1896.

3 So I was informed by Mme. Toumansky. In fact he published only the fragments on Samarqand (in the Russian
With the owner’s permission a photograph of the manuscript was taken in St. Petersburg in 1894, and Baron V. R. Rosen copied the whole of the text with his own hand. Both the photograph and the copy were left in the possession of the Musée Asiatique of the Russian Academy and Toumanskoy very liberally allowed other Russian scholars to make use of single passages having special interest to them. V. A. Zhukovsky was thus able to utilize the passage relative to Marv in his standard description of that province (see note to § 23, 37.). V. V. Barthold quoted extensively from the H.-‘A in his early Report on a Scientific Mission to Central Asia (1897), then in his famous Turkestan (1900), in his History of Irrigation in Turkestan (1914), and occasionally in many other of his books and articles. After Toumanskoy’s death he published the fragment on Tibet (see notes to § 11) and summarized the contents of the chapter on Gilân (see notes to § 32, 35.).

Nevertheless, in Western Europe very little was known about the H.-‘A, and J. Marquart who had access only to the quotations found in Toumanskoy’s article (ZVO, 1896), in Barthold’s Report, and in Westberg’s Beiträge (v.i. p. 427), several times expressed his regret that the MS. still remained unpublished.

On 13 December 1921 in a Russian paper edited in Paris I published an obituary notice of the head of the Bahá’í community ‘Abbás Efendi (d. in Haifa, 28 November 1921). In it I mentioned both E. G. Browne’s and A. G. Toumanskoy’s close connexion with the representatives of the faith preached by the Báb and the Bahá’-alláh. My article happened to be read in Constantinople by Madame Toumanskoy who hastened to communicate to me the sad news of her husband’s death (in Constantinople, 1 December 1920) asking me in the meantime for advice as to his MSS. which remained in her possession and with which, in view of the circumstances, she was obliged to part. The H.-‘A. was among them, and soon after the precious MS. was on my desk in Paris. Madame Toumanskoy fully realized the intense interest taken in Russia in the H.-‘A and the amount of work already done on it. I offered to communicate with the Leningrad Academy, and when a favourable answer came, through the late S. F. Oldenburg (d. 28. ii. 1934), she most generously agreed to repatriate the MS. to Russia, though more advantageous conditions could have been obtained elsewhere.

1 Cf. p. 169.
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Some time later we had the satisfaction of hearing that the publication of the Ḥ.-‘Ā. was being undertaken by V. V. Barthold. By March 1930 the plates reproducing the 78 pages of the original, as well as 32 pages of Preface and 11 pages of Index, were printed, but for some technical reasons the publication of the book met with delay. On 18 August 1931 Barthold wrote to me that the difficulties were being overcome, but this letter reached me in London an hour after I had read in The Times the two lines which came like a blow, announcing the death of the great historian on August 19.

Barthold had not the satisfaction of seeing in final form the work which had been a companion of all his scientific life. The now posthumous book appeared in the editions of the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R. under the title: Худъд ал-‘Āлем. Рукопис Туманскаго. С введением и указателем В. Бартольда. Ленинград 1930.

3. THE TRANSLATOR’S TASK

In the concluding words of his Preface (vi. p. 32) Barthold says that his chief reason for abandoning the idea of giving a complete translation of the manuscript was the “great number of geographical names, of which the reading remains unknown”. Probably for the same reason the text was not printed but photographically reproduced. As regards the Persian original, such a procedure can only meet with our full approval, for the risks of publishing such a complicated text from a single manuscript would be too great, and a printed text would never replace the paleographically very important original in doubtful places. As already mentioned the MS. is written in a script clear enough and yet in some places presenting considerable difficulties. Barthold (letter of 5. iii. 1930) was ready to admit with regard to the photographic reproduction of the MS. that “it would not be an edition in the proper sense, and orientalists who had no great experience in the reading of Muslim MSS. would feel disappointed”. In such circumstances, many people interested principally in the geographical contents of the book were likely to be hampered by the character of the script, while Barthold’s Preface, though extremely valuable, is far from exhausting the problems raised by the text.

I have decided therefore to take a resolute step in rendering this

1 Lately Sayyid Jalāl al-dīn Tehrānī has, more or less successfully, printed the text of the Ḥ.-‘Ā., together with that of Part III of the Tārīkh-i Jihān-gushā, as an annex (!) to his Calendary (gāh-nāmu) for the Persian year 1314 (= A.H. 1353-4 = A.D. 1935), Tehran 1352. The Ḥ.-Ā. occupies pages 1-114 and on pp. 115-49 Barthold’s Index is reproduced.
important tenth-century text more accessible to the public, by translating the whole of the Persian original and by supplementing it with a translation of Barthold’s Russian Preface and with my own detailed commentary.\(^1\) Lacunae and uncertainties are inevitable in such an enterprise, but only the sieve of translation is capable of separating what is clear from what remains doubtful. I only hope that my work will stimulate a further examination of the respective chapters by Turcologists, Indianists, Byzantologists, and other specialists.

The present book comprises the following parts:

1. A translation of V. V. Barthold’s Russian Preface.
3. My commentary on the text, disposed in the order of the chapters.
4. Appendices containing remarks on the marginal notes, the language of the H.-‘A., \&c., as well as a Glossary of the rare and less usual words and expressions.\(^2\)
5. A Romanized Index based on my translation and consequently differing in a number of transcriptions from Barthold’s Index (in Arabic characters). It also serves my Commentary.

My translation of the H.-‘A. (Part II) follows the Persian text strictly and literally. I do not even say “wood” when the original speaks of “trees”. In a unique manuscript of one of the earliest prose works of Persian literature,\(^3\) older than the Shāh-nāma, every word and turn of phrase is interesting and I have made a very liberal use of Romanized quotations with the double object of elucidating the difficult and doubtful readings and of affording a means of control.

---

\(^1\) P. Pelliot in his note on Barthold’s edition of the H.-‘A. in T'oung-Pao, 1931, No. 1, p. 133, write: “Puisque l’ouvrage est enfin accessible il faut espérer qu’uniraniste donnera en caractères typographiques une édition critique des sections concernant l’Asie Centrale et Orientale, et lui adjoindra une traduction annotée.”

\(^2\) [For some imperious material reasons only the Appendix on the marginal notes could be incorporated in the present volume. The rest will be published as an article in the Bull. of the School of Oriental Studies. Cf. however, even now Index E.]

Practically all the rarer words and expressions figure in my translation.

I have numbered all the chapters of the Ḥ.-ʾĀ. (§§ 1–61), and, within every single chapter, all the separate items which in the original appear in red ink (these latter numbers being followed by a dot: 1 2 3., &c.). This system of chapter and verse has proved of great convenience for quotations and cross-references.

4. THE COMMENTARY: EXPLANATION OF THE TEXT

The object of my Commentary (Part III) is twofold: (a) to explain the text by identifying the places and names mentioned in it, and (b) to ascertain the sources of the book.

My explanation of the less interesting chapters, such as the middle zone of Islām (§§ 27–31 and 33–4, cf. p. 223) is very brief and only checks the names, locates the places, and gives the immediate parallels. On the contrary, whenever the text contains traces of some new information I have done my utmost to elucidate the question in the light of all accessible data, using by preference the sources contemporary with, and older than the Ḥ.-ʾĀ. Of the slightly younger works I constantly quote Birūnī (inclusive of his Canon, Br. Mus. Or. 1997), Gardīzī (containing a number of invaluable parallels to the Ḥ.-ʾĀ.) and Mahmūd al-Kāshgharī. Having myself experienced great difficulties in finding the explanations of the names and facts relating to territories as different as China and Spain, India and the Volga Bulghārs, I could not help bearing in mind the interests of the readers who cannot be satisfied with mere references to doubtful passages in the sources and to little accessible works. Therefore at the beginning of the chapters (especially those on India, China, Tibet, the Turks, the Caucasus, and Eastern Europe) I have not only prefixed brief indications of authorities and literature, but summed up the present-day situation of the question, comprising tentative hypotheses and doubtful points, and have made my personal suggestions supplementing or modifying my predecessors’ views. Though my definite object has been to comment on the particular geographical work written in A.D. 982 and conspicuous for its well-balanced brevity, my commentary may eventually prove of more general utility as covering the whole field of the Orbis Terrarum Musulmanis notus and making

1 Le Strange’s excellent book The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate, 1905, describes only the countries between Asia Minor and Transoxiana; P. Schwarz’s amazingly full Iran im Mittelalter (in progress since 1896), covers only Persia. See my reviews of these books resp. in BSOS, vi/3, 1931, pp. 802–3, and Journ. As., July 1932, pp. 175–9. For the rest of the lands the information is very scattered. It is to be hoped that a translation of the BGA
a point of referring to the special sources and to recent investigations.¹
I have used notes and references very liberally in order to show respect
for my predecessors' opinions and to lay stress on the great fellowship
of the living and dead by whose efforts the fabric of our knowledge
has been reared.

In studying the H.-‘A. and in preparing the Commentary it has been
my particular endeavour not to lose sight of geographic realities.
I hope that my sketch maps illustrating the less known regions will
be found useful by all those who like myself had to toil through
the wonderful works of Barthold² and Marquart,³ unaccompanied by
such graphic aids. I take this occasion to say in pious gratitude what
I owe to these two great scholars who by their contributions (so
different in method, yet equally admirable as results) have shed light
on numberless points of Muslim historical geography.

5. THE COMMENTARY: THE SOURCES OF THE H.-‘A.

The second object of the commentary has been to ascertain the
sources of the H.-‘A. Our geographer was evidently but a "cabinet
scholar" and not a traveller. Only in the description of Gūzgānān
(§ 23, 47.), and maybe of Gilān (§ 32, 24.–5.), does the text reflect some
personal experience. For the rest, the information evidently depends
on other people's materials, which seem to have been of two classes,
viz. books,⁴ and any other information coming under the rubrics of
yādhkird-i ḥakīmān “memories of the sages” (f. 2a2),⁵ akhbār “informa-
tion [heard]” (cf. f. 13b3: ba-akhbār-hā ba-shanādim), or simply dhikr
“mention” (f. 12a2). There is no indication in the text as to which
particular details were derived from non-literary sources, unless we

—

¹ Comprising works in Russian, very insufficiently known in Western Europe.
[On the as yet unedited sources cf. p. 480.]
² Barthold's (15.xi.1869–19.viii.1930) bibliography comprises over 300 titles
of books and articles. See Ummiakov, V. V. Barthold, on the occasion of the
30th year of his professorship (in Russian) in Bulletin de l'Université de
l'Asie Centrale, 1926, No. 14, pp. 175–202; Milius Dostoyevsky, W. Barthold
zum Gedächtnis, in Die Welt des Islam, xii, Heft 3, 1931, pp. 89–135; Th.
³ See V. Minorsky, Essai de bibliogra-
phie de J. Marquart [Marquart] (9.vii.1864–4.ii.1930), in Journal Asis-
tique, October 1930, t. cxxvii, pp.
313–24 [where the obituary and bibli-
ographic notices by G. Messina, H. H.
Schaeder, &c. are quoted].
⁴ Kitāb-hā-yi pishtāgonān “books of the predeces-
sors”, folios 2a1 and 13b4; or sim-
ply "books", folios 4a19, 919 (con-
cerning the Kuchā river). Under 11b18
kitāb-hā va akhbār-hā are clearly dis-
tinguished.
⁵ I see that the reading yādhkird has
been accepted also in the text of the
H.-‘A. printed in Tehran, p. 4 (contrary
to Barthold, v.f., p. 31, note 1).
include in this category the above-mentioned details regarding Güzgânân and Gilân.

Abul-Faḍl Gulpaygânî (v.s., p. ix) made an interesting suggestion in taking the Ḥ.-Ā. for "a Preface to a Map". In several passages, in fact (folios 5b1, 8b10, 25b14, 33b16, 37a15), our author mentions a Map prepared by himself, which was certainly more than a simple illustration of the text. We know, for example, that on it were shown the stages between Rukhud and Multân (v.i., p. 121) of which there is no mention in the text. A close scrutiny of the text has convinced me that in numerous places the peculiar order of enumeration is a result of "reading off the Map", often without any regard for the natural divisions of territories, ranges of mountains, watersheds and roads. This discovery has facilitated the explanation of numerous passages in the text. It appears then that the Map was compiled before the text, and if so, we cannot help inferring that the author worked on the basis of some previous MAP which we must consider as one of the important sources for his compilation. In his Preface (v.i., p. 18, note 5) Barthold suggests that Balkhî's book may have been only an explanation of Abû Ja'far al-Khâzîn's maps. The latter (in a more or less modified form) may have been worked upon by our author as well.

The improvement due to him personally seems to be in the first place a clearer division of the chart into "limited areas" with rigorously indicated frontiers, as recapitulated in the description of each single country. Even the title of the Ḥudud al-Ālam indicates the importance which our author attached to this task. In the better known countries the problem presented no difficulty, though in the eastern region beginning with Khorâsân the bearings usually show some error, mostly as if the author took the north-east or east for the north (cf. notes to §§ 7, 4, 12 [p. 270], 17, 23, 24, 25, 48, &c.). This is a common mistake with Muslim geographers, cf. Išt., 253, quoted on p. 351, and may be partly due to the difference between the places where the sun rises and goes down in summer and in winter.

1 A striking example is offered by the themes of the Byzantine empire, v.i., p. 420, line 32.

2 V.i., pp. 239, 338, 376, 392 (§ 33, 11.), 394, 414 (especially § 38, 15.). On the contrary in some places the enumeration follows the roads, as quite clearly appears from a comparison with Gardini's parallels, v.i. p. 229, 260; cf. also pp. 251, 289, 293, 363, 380, 382, 391. [Cf. Index E: Map.]

3 By Ištâkhrî, at least in such regions as Fârs? Cf. I.H., 236 [V.i. p. 381, l. 16.]

4 Cf. Index E: bearings.

5 Reinaud, Géographie d'Abulfeda, i, (Introduction générale), pp. cxcii–iii: "Les Arabes, pour désigner le sud-est, disent quelquefois l'orient d'hiver, et pour indiquer le nord-est, l'orient d'été; de même, pour marquer le nord-ouest, ils se servent des mots occident d'été, et pour dire le sud-ouest d'occident d'hiver." Cf. the Qur'ân, lv, 16, where the "two Orient" and "two Occidens" are mentioned. [V.i. p. 285, l. 4: mâyhrî-î ʂâyîf.]
Perhaps also the confusion of the *qibla* with the south, natural in the Middle East but very misleading farther east, accounts for the irregularities in our text. In the less-known territories, the author would have been wiser not to have tried to be too precise and to have left due latitude to the imagination. He, however, wanted to force his data into map form and this is the reason of such blunders as his location of the *V.n.nd.r* and *Mirvāt* explained in the notes to §§ 46 and 53, as well as of his vagaries about the Pechenegs and Qipchaqs (§§ 20–1). He has fallen a victim to the desire for cartographic accuracy. Moreover, with the sole exception of the Pechenegs, he did not distinguish between the historical moves of the tribes and the different forms of their names. This is particularly felt in the north-western corner of the Black Sea (see notes to § 22, § 42, 16. and 18. and §§ 45, 46, 53).

Whatever the influence of the Map on the Text, the latter, as it stands, certainly forms a complete description of the world known to the Muslims in the 10th century A.D. In spite of the vague references to the "books", *akhbār*, &c., the number of the original sources at the disposal of our author cannot have been considerable. We must certainly make due allowance for the fact that earlier data were transcribed by later authors, and not necessarily imagine, for example, that our author had a direct knowledge of Aristotle and Ptolemy (in *Khuwārizmī's rifacimento*?), who are the only authorities quoted by name (resp. fol. 2a ult., 4a29, and 5a9). With this reservation, we may enumerate our author’s more obvious authorities as follows:

(a) **Ibn Khurdādhbih**, as appears from the paragraphs on China (§ 4, 9.), on Khūzistān (§ 30, 7. and 8.), on the Byzantine Empire (§ 42, as well as the points in §§ 3, 5, 6 mentioned on p. 419), on Nubia (§ 59), and the Südān (§ 60). Possibly the text of I.Kh. which was at our author’s disposal was more complete than that reproduced in *BGA*, vi. As the names of the kings of Nubia and the Südān are quoted after I.Kh., one may surmise that other curious details on Africa (cf. §§ 59, 60) also belong to the same author (v.i., p. 476, line 33). However, according to *Maq.*, 41, I.Kh.’s work was sometimes confused with that of Jayhānī, and as the reason of this confusion was that Jayhānī incorporated I.Kh.’s data, it is quite possible that echoes from I.Kh. penetrated into the *H.-‘Ā*. indirectly through Jayhānī.

---

1 In § 4, 33. Sardinia is located to the south of *Rūmīyā*. Has Sardinia been confused with Sicily?
2 Cf. also § 13, 1., § 15, 12.–13.
3 Cf. also § 8, 5. “the Greeks”.
The Translator’s Preface

(b) Some unknown work which was also utilized by I. Rusta, Bakrī, Gardizī, ‘Aufī, &c., and which is usually identified with Abū ‘Abdillāh Muḥammad b. Ṭāhir b. ʿAbdillāh Muḥammad b. Ahmad JAYHĀNĪ’s lost Kitāb al-mamālīk wa-l-masālik. The risk of exaggerating the importance of an unknown source is, of course, obvious and Barthold’s cautious remarks, v.i., p. 25, must be kept in mind. However, according to the additional passage in the Constantinople MS. of Maq., BGA, iii, 4, Jayhānī’s work was in seven volumes and this great bulk made it possible for later authors to select from the book different details. This may be the explanation of the fact that the peoples V.n.nd.r and Mirvāt figure only in the H.-‘Ā. and Gardizī. The rare reports quoted by name in I. Rusta (e.g. Abū ‘Abdillāh b. Isḥāq on India, v.i., pp. 235 and 241, and Hārūn b. Yahyā on the Byzantine Empire and the Balkans, v.i., pp. 320, 419, 468) may have been originally collected by Jayhānī. Through him may have been transmitted even the echoes of Khuwarizmi and Sulaymān-the-Merchant, found sporadically in our text. Some of Jayhānī’s written sources (Tamīm b. Bahr’s complete report?) may be responsible for the details about China which point to a time before the middle of the 9th century A.D. (v.i., pp. 26 and 227).

Jayhānī’s personal position gave him excellent opportunities for collecting independent intelligence. When during the minority of Naṣr b. ʿAbdul saw he became vāzir (in 301/913–14) “he wrote letters to all the countries of the world and he requested that the customs of every court and divān should be written down and brought to him, such (as existed in) the Byzantine empire, Turkistan, Hindustān, China, ’Irāq, Syria, Egypt, Zanj, Zābul, Kābul, Sind, and Arabia”. After having examined the reports he retained for observance in Bukhārā whatever he found suitable, see Gardizī-M. Nasīm, pp. 28–9.

1 Particularly with regard to Eastern Europe.

2 On Jayhānī see Marquart, Streifzüge, xxxi–xxxii and passim, Barthold, Turkestan, pp. 11–12, and Preface, v.i., p. 23, cf. also S. Janicsek, Al-Djaihānī’s lost ‘Kitāb al-Mamālik wa-l-Māsālik’. Is it to be found at Mashhad? in BSOS, v/1, 1926, pp. 14–25. [We now know that the rumour about the discovery of Jayhānī’s work in Mashhad was premature.]

3 According to the Fāhrīst, p. 154, Ibn al-Faqīh “borrowed (data) from the books of various authors and plundered (salakha) Jayhānī’s book.” However I.F.’s text as published in BGA, v, has been of almost no use for the explanation of the H.-‘Ā. Cf. infra, p. 182, on K.rkh (*Karch?), and p. 480.

4 Though some of his details seem to have been known to I.Kh., v.i., p. 27, note 2.

5 Cf. note to § 6, 16. as well as the Ptolemaic data in § 3, 6. and 8, § 4, 1–4, 18, 20–3, 26, § 9, 12, several of which are also found in I. Rusta who was perhaps the earliest among those who made use of Jayhānī’s book.

6 The relation of Sulaymān to I.Kh. is still obscure (v.i., p. 236 ult.). In T’oung-Pao, 1922, pp. 399–473, Pelliot cast doubt on the authenticity of Sulaymān’s travels.
Maq., pp. 3–4, says that Jayhānī "assembled foreigners, questioned them on the kingdoms, their revenues, the kind of roads leading to them, also on the height of the stars and the length of the shadows in their land, in order in this wise to facilitate the conquest of provinces, to know their revenues, &c. . . . He divided the world into seven climes\(^1\) and assigned a star to each. Now he speaks of stars and geometry, anon of matters which are of no use to the mass of people, now he describes Indian idols, now he relates the wonders of Sind, now he enumerates taxes and revenues. I myself have seen that he mentions also little-known stations and far-distant halting-places. He does not enumerate provinces, nor forces, he does not describe towns. . . . On the other hand, he speaks of the roads to east, west, north, and south, together with a description of the plains, mountains, valleys, hillocks, forests, and rivers found thereon. Consequently the book is long, yet he neglected most of the military roads, as well as the description of the chief towns."\(^2\) We may then attribute personally to Jayhānī many interesting items in our book on the Farther East\(^3\) and the Turkish tribes. The data on the Turks living round the Issik-kul (§ 12) reflect the complete disintegration of the former dominions of the Türkish, and even the latter’s successors the Khallukh seem to be under pressure from the south by the Yaghmā (future Qarā-khānids). In some details we may even recognize traces of Jayhānī’s interested curiosity to which Maq. alludes (cf. infra, p. 270). Some Arabic forms of names (§ 10, 45. and 46., § 15, 9., § 17, 1., § 42, 17.) may also be due to Jayhānī’s original text.

(c) /listsakhrī (<Balkhi) is without doubt the source most systematically utilized in the /list-‘ā/. The chapters on the countries between the Indus and the Mediterranean are practically a mere abridgement of Ist., sometimes with a verbatim translation of details, v.i., p. 21. For my commentary I first of all compared the text with /BGA/, i, and in cases of coincidence made no further references to parallel texts. As the names of places in Iranian and Caucasian regions have a distinctly iranicized form\(^4\) one would infer that Ist. was used in a Persian translation. Several points in Central Asia have parallels only in Ibn Ḥauqal (BGA, ii) and Maqṣī (BGA, iii). However, our author could not have utilized I.H., as otherwise we should find in the /list-‘ā/ traces of I.H.‘s original chapters, such as those on Africa and Spain (cf. §§ 40 and 41). Probably, therefore, the addi-

\(^1\) On this point our author totally disregards Jayhānī, for the only passing reference to a “clime” is found in our text in § 5, 2.


\(^3\) Cf. the reference to the “books” with regard to the Kuchchā river, § 6, 4.

\(^4\) Cf. Index E.
tional items on Transoxiana, &c. existed in the original Iṣṭ. and were preserved both by I.Ḥ and the Ḥ.-Ā. As regards Maq. even the earliest date in his book precludes the possibility of its use by our author. Consequently in cases of coincidence we have to suppose that Maq., too, BGA, 5a (Const. MS.), utilized some additional passages in Balkhī> Iṣṭ., which were also available in our author’s copy.

(d) More than problematic is the influence of Masʿūdī on our author. Apart from the dubious case of the two “Artush” rivers (§ 6, 41. and 42.), a conspicuous parallelism is found in the chapters on Shirvān (mountain Niyāl), Daghestan, and the northern Caucasus (§§ 35–6, 48–9), but our author adds several details not found elsewhere and we should rather assume that he utilizes a source of which Masʿūdī possessed only an abstract. Possibly the same source is responsible for the interesting details on Gilān.

(e) Very curious are a few original points on Arabia. One might suppose (v.i., p. 411) that some of them are due to an early knowledge of Hamdānī’s Fazīrat al-ʿarab but even Hamdānī does not seem to account for all of them. Do they, like some details on the African lands, belong to the more complete I.Kh., or to some unknown Book of Marvels?
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PART ONE

V. V. BARTHOLOD’S PREFACE

TRANSLATED FROM THE RUSSIAN
V. V. BARTHOLD'S PREFACE

The present edition is intended to discharge an obligation under P. 3 which Russian science has long lain; namely, that of rendering available to the specialists the important work dealing with Muslim geography which was discovered in 1882 in Bukhara through the initiative of the Russian orientalist, A. G. Toumansky (d. 1920).

I

The activity of the early Islamic scholars, who wrote almost exclusively in Arabic, is known to us not only by their original works that have reached us, by references to the books that have disappeared, and by quotations from them, but also through bibliographical surveys, of which the necessity was felt even then. Only five years after the date of the treatise preserved in the Toumansky MS., al-Nadim composed his Fihrist; from this work and from later bibliographical compilations European scholars have culled most of their information as to what works, known to be important and not yet to be found in European libraries, must still be sought for. Such quests, even if successful in bringing to light desired volumes, have sometimes brought disillusion as well, even in the cases when the book was linked with a great name.

The Persian Abul-Faḍl Gulpāyagānī, who had the luck to discover the present precious MS., was searching in Bukhārā, on behalf of Toumansky, for the historical treatise of Ulugh-bek. Judging by what is already known of the latter work, its discovery

1 On the discovery of the Toumansky MS. and its contents see Zapiski Vostochnogo Otdeleniya (ZVO), x, 121–37.
2 Now we know that the year 377 H. is given not only in the Leiden MS., as stated in Brockelmann, GAL, i, 147, but, for instance, in Yaqut's Irshād (vi, 408). It is known that the same date is several times given in the treatise itself (cf. ZVO, iv, 402); for the completion of parts i and ii even the day is given (Saturday, 1st of Sha'ban = 26.xi.987), though in isolated passages, apparently written by another person, later dates are given. Particularly characteristic are the words (p. 132) about the scholar Marzbānī, born in Jumādā II, 207 (II–III, 910): "And he is alive in these our times, in 377; and we beg of God for him health and continuation of life, from God's clemency and bounty; and he died in 378, may God have mercy on him." The last words belong, evidently, not to the author (otherwise he would have deleted the previous words) but to another person. [V.M.]
3 The work of the wazīr Maghrībī who continued al-Nadīm, see Irshād, vi, 467, has not reached us. On the wazīr Maghrībī see Brockelmann, i, 353; E. Zambaur, Manuel de généalogie et de chronologie pour l'histoire de l'Islam, Hanovre 1927, p. 15.
would have brought but little benefit to science. But while engaged in his search, Gulpāyagānī found a document quite unknown until then and mentioned in none of the bibliographical surveys, which has proved to be of the greatest scientific importance.

The MS. does not contain the author’s name, but the date of its composition is indicated: the author began his work in 372 H. (between 26.vi.982 and 14.vi.983) for Abul-Ḥarīrī Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad, prince of the province of Gūzgān or Gūzgānān (in Arabic ḫūqān, or ḫūqānān), which lies in the north-western part of the present-day Afghanistan. It is quite natural that the author allows more space (ff. 20b–21a) to this province than would have been expected from its comparative unimportance, even though at that time Gūzgān was experiencing, under the Fārīghūnī dynasty, a period of political and cultural prosperity.

On Gūzgān and the Fārīghūnīs Toumansky’s article gives only a fragment from Rashīd al-dīn’s *fāmt al-tawārīkh*, almost literally copied, as is the whole of the corresponding part of this work, from 

P 4 *ʿUtbi’s history in its Persian translation by Abul-Ṣharaf Jarbādhagānī.*
In a note added to Toumansky’s article I have mentioned a fact recorded by an author of the eleventh century—Gardīzī—that the amīr of Samanqand, Nūh ibn-Mansūr (A.D. 976–97), had accepted ties of relationship with the head of the Fārīghūnīs. This fact belongs to the beginning of the reign of Nūh (who ascended the throne at the age of thirteen). The prince of Gūzgān in the Gardīzī text, as in that of our author, bears the name of Abul-Ḥarīrī Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad (in *ʿUtbi: Aḥmad ibn-Muḥammad*).

Both our author and other geographers of the tenth century describe the Gūzgān of the Fārīghūnīs as much more extensive than it had hitherto been. Both at the time of the Muslim conquest and later, according to the geographers of the ninth century A.D., Fārīyāb (on the site of the town of Daulatābād, or that of the village of Khayarābād) was not reckoned as in Gūzgān, the western frontier of the latter, as attested by Ibn Khurḍādhbih’s itinerary, passing between

2 *ZVO*, x, 128 and sq.
4 Text of Gardīzī, according to the Cambridge MS., King’s College, 213, f. 104b: *va bā anīr Abul-[Itān ibn Fārīghūn khwester kard tā bud-ishān push-I ʿinda qavā i gusht.*
5 E.g. Balādhir, p. 406 below.
7 BGA, vi, 321.
Fāryāb and Shabūrqān¹ (or Shubūrqān;² in our author: Ushbūrqān or Ashbūrqān,³ now Shibarghān), at an equal distance (9 farsakhās) from both. According to Yaʿqūbī, Fāryāb was “the old town”; the second most important town at that time, and the residence of the Arab governor (ʿāmil) of Fāryāb, was the town of Yahūdān (in Ištakhrī and others: Yahūdiya; in our author: Jahūdhān, on the site of Maymana). But, on the other hand, the mountainous province Gurzivān, on the upper course of the river Āb-i Maymana, was considered a part of Gūzgān; there lived the local ruler (malik) of Gūzgān, whereas the Arab governors of Gūzgān resided in Anbār (according to our author: Anbār), on the site of the present town Sar-i-Pul. In Ištakhrī’s time (or that of his source, Balkhī) the situation had changed. It is not mentioned whether at that time Fāryāb was part of Gūzgān, but Yahūdiya was reckoned as belonging to it and as being even its principal town, while Anbār was the seat of the government (sultān); evidently at that time a distinction no longer existed between the Arab governor and the local ruler. As to our author, he names Jahūdhān as the residence of the “king of Gūzgān”, and Anbār as the capital of the province (qaṣaba, the same term is used by Bīrūnī,⁴ in whose work we also find the form Anbār).

Our author assigns to the rulers of Gūzgān the first place among the vassal princes (mulūk-i aṭrāf) of the Sāmānid kingdom, not only for their political importance, but also for their “love of science”. At that time the sway of the prince of Gūzgān reached to the north as far as the Amū-daryā and to the south was recognized by all the chiefs (mihtar) of the mountain provinces of Ghārchistān and Ghūr. A part of Ghārchistān was called “Ghārchistān of Gūzgān” and was administered directly by the prince of Gūzgān, whose frontier towns were those of Tālaqān, on the site of Qalʿa-Walī,⁵ and Rabāt-i Karvān on the upper Harīrūd.⁶ On the upper Murghāb Gūzgān had a common frontier with that of the prince of Bust (on the Hilmānd). It may be concluded therefrom that nearly the whole of the province of Ghūr owed allegiance to the prince of Bust. But in his description of Ghūr (f. 21b) the author calls the ruler of this province, the P 5 Ghūrshāh, vassal of the amīr of Gūzgān. To the latter tribute was

¹ Such vocalization in Ištakhrī, BGA, i, 270; in Marco Polo, Sapurgan, with several variants.
² Vocalization, BGA, vi, 321; vii, 287; distorted vocalization in Yaqūt, iii, 254 and 395, though Yaqūt had visited the place.
³ BGA, ii, 321 and 322: Ashbūrqān.
⁴ Thus in the work of A.-Z. Validov [Validi], Al-Birūnī ʿāthārī, now in the press, p. 18; in the Berlin MS. (on it see Ahlwardt, No. 5667), f. 123a, instead of qaṣaba stands qaẓṣar.
⁵ On its situation see ZVO, xiv, 931.
⁶ Similarly in Ištakhrī, BGA, i, 272; cf. ibid., 265 below. [V.i., p. 336.]
likewise paid by the nomad Arabs of the neighbouring steppes, who numbered 20,000, possessed herds of sheep and camels and were considered to be the richest of all the Arabs of Khorāsān.

The Farīghūnids called themselves descendants of the mythical Farīdūn,\(^1\) but apparently there exists no information as to whence this dynasty sprang, when and how it gained its power, and whether or not it was related to the pre-Islamic rulers of Gū zgān, the Gū zgān-khudāts.\(^2\) The name of the dynasty had some relation to a locality in the extreme north of the province; Maqdisī\(^3\) mentions a Rabāṭ Afrīghūn, one day’s march from Anē khoy and two from Karkī. According to Narshakhī,\(^4\) Aḥmad ibn-Farīghūn was already amīr of Gū zgān in the last years of the ninth century, at the time when the relations between the Šaffārid ‘Amr ibn-Laith and the Sāmānīd Ismā’īl ibn-Aḥmad were broken off. Since Īṣṭakhrī\(^5\) mentions an Abū Ḥārith ibn-Farīghūn, apparently the same Abū Ḥārith Muhammad ibn-Aḥmad who was a contemporary of our author, this ruler must have lived unusually long.\(^6\) It is probable that the name of this prince was not yet recorded in Balkhī’s original work, as it is mentioned not in the chapter on Khorāsān, but in that on Fārs, a chapter which, according to de Goeje,\(^7\) belongs without doubt to Īṣṭakhrī and not to Balkhī, though Īṣṭakhrī wrote it a long time before his work was brought out, not later than in 933, i.e. half a century before the appearance of the Ḥudūd al-‘alam. Īṣṭakhrī mentions also a secretary or minister (kāṭīb) of the amīr of Gū zgān, Ja’far ibn-Sahl ibn-Marzūbān, of the family of Marzūbān ibn-Zādiya, who was a native of Shīrāz. This Ja’far was still alive at the time when Ibn Hauqal composed his chapter on Khorāsān, i.e. at the end of the nine hundred and sixties;\(^8\) Ibn Hauqal\(^9\) was acquainted with him and speaks of

---

\(^1\) There is no foundation for reading Afrīghūn instead of Afrīdūn, as Touransky proposes, ZVO, x, 130.

\(^2\) J. Marquart (Markwart), Krūntaftr, p. 80.

\(^3\) Ed. Schefer, p. 85.

\(^4\) BGA, iii, 347s.

\(^5\) BGA, i, 148s.

\(^6\) The year of his death apparently is not mentioned anywhere. He was still alive in 999 at the time of the conquest of Khorāsān by Maḥmūd (‘Utbi-Manṣūr, i, 316); the account of the battle of Charkhīyān (4 January 1008; cf. my Turkestan, ii, 287) names, as the ruler of Gū zgān, his son and successor Abū-Naṣr (‘Utbi-Manṣūr, ii, 84), who died in 491 (1010–11). Contrary to Markov, Invent. Catal. of Muslim Coins of the Hermitage (in Russian), SPb. 1896, p. 178 and sq., and Zambaur, Manuel, p. 205, the Farīghūnids never possessed Balkh and did not strike coins. The names and dates given by Zambaur do not in the least correspond to reality and represent a step backwards in comparison with Sachau’s article to which Zambaur refers.

\(^7\) ZDMG, xxv, 50.

\(^8\) As the Sāmānīd amīr contemporary with himself Ibn Hauqal names Maḥṣūr ibn-Nūh (961–76), BGA, ii, 341s. In 358 (968–9) this author was on the Gū zgān (ibid., p. 282s), in the same year “for the last time” in Mosul, ibid., p. 146s, and apparently returned no more to the east.

\(^9\) Ibid., p. 208.
the rare unanimity with which the qualities of the Gūzgān minister were extolled by his contemporaries. About all other statesmen, alongside with favourable reports, unfavourable ones might be heard or read; but Ibn-Hauql never encountered any one who had an unfavourable opinion of Ja'far ibn-Sahl. Every one who visited Khorāsān during the previous fifty years was indebted to him for some kindness; those who could not visit him personally were not excepted, as they received letters and presents from him. On his lands he built ṛabāṭs and assigned revenues of his estates for their maintenance; in every ṛabāṭ and village he kept cows, to the number of one hundred or more, in order to provide milk for the refreshment of passing travellers. In no respect had he his equal in Khorāsān. It is very probable that Ja'far ibn-Sahl patronized Ibn-Hauql's work.

Whether the author of the Ḥudūd al-ʿalām made any travels himself does not appear from his work. He speaks only of borrowing information from books, though he names none of his Muslim sources. As Toumansky remarks, "nowhere does he name his sources, except for Ptolemy, and even him, probably, only as a rhetorical figure". This remark does not entirely correspond to the facts, for besides Ptolemy, Aristotle is named (f. 2a), and his "Meteorologica" (al-ʿĀthār al-ʿulwiya) cited. The same passage (about the ocean encircling the earth) is quoted by al-Kharaqī, an author of the beginning of the twelfth century. Ptolemy, as a matter of fact, is cited twice (4a and 5a), not in the chapters consecrated to separate provinces, but in the general part, vis. in the chapter on islands. There are mentioned thirteen islands and two mountains projecting into the Indian Ocean, and it is added that these two mountains are found in Ptolemy's books; but in Ptolemy's Geographica there is nothing on which this information could be founded. According to our author Ptolemy enumerated twenty-five islands in "the Western Ocean" (Ptolemy's δυτικὸς Ὀκεανός). These names are given and the majority are really borrowed from Ptolemy, beginning with the six "islands of the Blest" (ai τῶν Μακάρων νῆσων, Ptolemy, iv, 6, 34, in Arabic authors generally al-Khālidāt, in our author al-Khāliya, and in Battānī al-Khāliyāt). From Ptolemy was derived the information

1 ZVO, x, 132.
2 Text in Nallino, Al-Battānī sive Albatenii opus astronomicum, pars i, Mediolani, 1903, p. 175.
3 Battānī-Nallino, i, 17, note 2. This is not the only case of coincidence of Battānī's text with that of our author. According to Battānī, ibid., p. 18, note 5, and our author (f. 4b), near India and Ceylon there were fifty-nine islands; according to Ibn-Rusta, BGA, vii, 841, and Kharaqī, in agreement with the text of Ptolemy (vii, 4, 11-13), the islands were nineteen. In Nallino's opinion Battānī read 42, instead of 41, which stood in his list; this mistake was evidently made by the source common to Battānī and our author.
about the “isles of Britannia”, of which, according to our author and to Arab geographers,¹ there were twelve (this number is not in Ptolemy). Concerning Britannia, as well as the “Isles of the Blest” (Canary Islands), our author gives information which, apparently, does not exist in other sources: he says that in the “Isles of the Blest” there are “gold mines; once a year people from the Südän and from towns of Sūs al-‘Aqṣā make their way there and bring away gold from those mines; no one can live there on account of the intense heat”. Britannia is called (f. 37b) “the storehouse of goods from Byzantium (Rûm) and Spain (Andalus)”. Yet among the names of the twenty-five islands there are some that do not occur in Ptolemy: by mistake the author places Rhodes and Arvād in the Western Ocean; as to the legendary “Isle of Men” and “Isle of Women”, their mention at this place is, no doubt, due to the fact that the legend of the Amazons was in Islamic times localized in the Baltic sea,² perhaps owing to a linguistic misunderstanding. The references of the author, like those of many other Muslim geographers,³ are, evidently, not to the original text of Ptolemy, but to the readaptation of his work by the Arabs; but there is nothing “rhetorical” about these references.

II

The history of Arabian geographical science has been very insufficiently investigated.⁴ In the Encyclopaedia of Islam, which is not quite consistent in the choice of the catch-words (cf. Adab, al-Djabr, on the one hand, and on the other Astrology, Astronomy), where we might have expected to find an article on this subject, nothing is to be found either under Djahrahīya, or Geography. In Brockelmann’s Geschichte der Arabischen Literatur there are sections consecrated to geographical literature but, as has already been pointed out by its reviewer,⁵ the insufficiency of Brockelmann’s book⁶ is apparent, particularly as regards this topic. The learned critic, knowledge was transmitted by the Christian school to other Oriental Christians—Syrians and Arabs—and finally to the Muslims; that from the second half of the seventh century to the end of the eleventh century Arabic was the principal language of science and progress, and that in the twelfth century “the intellectual supremacy of the Muslims had already come to an end” (p. 18), which is hardly true. ⁶ [Seybold, Edrisiana, I., ZDMG, lxxiii, 596.]

¹ BGAL, vii. 8513, Ibn Rusta; Bâtâni-Nallino, i. 18.
² Kunin-Rosen, Izvestiya al-Bekri, etc., i. 80; Peschel-Ruge, Geschichte der Erdkunde, p. 50; Nalino, Al-‘Iwarzînî, p. 50.
³ Nallino, l.c., p. 52.
⁴ In the broadly planned Introduction to the History of Sciences (G. Sarton, Carnegie Institution of Washington, Publication No. 376, 1927; cf. a review by E. J. Holmyard in JRAS, 1929, 209 and sq.) much space is allotted to geographical science “from Hecataeus to Birûnî”. It is stated there that Greek
writing in 1908, was of opinion that the best survey of Arabian geographical literature was that of Reinaud, published in 1848. The work of Abū-Ja'far Muhammad ibn-Mūsā al-Khwārizmī, which in the first half of the ninth century laid the first foundations of Arabian geographical science, became accessible in a printed edition only in 1926. But as early as 1895 this work had been the subject of a classical study by C. A. Nallino, who later took up again numerous questions concerning Khuwarizmi and Arabian geographical science in general, in his extensive Latin work on the astronomer Bātānī (d. in A.D. 929).

It is a well-established fact that Arabian geography, like Arabian astronomy, was founded on Ptolemy. In the Middle Ages Ptolemy was studied only in the East, at first in the Christian East, later in the Muslim East, whereas in Western Europe until the fifteenth century he remained quite forgotten. From Ptolemy’s astronomical work was also borrowed the historical canon, that is, the chronology of reigns from the eighth century B.C. to the second century A.D., which was adopted by the Christian world jointly with the chronology of Eusebius (fourth century A.D.), in which history begins with Abraham and the kings contemporary with him and with his descendants. Some efforts, not always successful, were made in Muslim literature to localize ancient geographical traditions; thus Bīrūnī in his Canon (eleventh century) tried to identify the classical Ilion with the Syrian Tripoli. There is no literal rendering of Ptolemy’s text in Arabic; from the outset Muslim scholars treated this text much more independently than at a later date did the West-European scholars.

1 Géographie d’Aboulféda, t. i, Introduction générale à la géographie des orientaux.
4 C. A. Nallino, Al-Battānī sive Albatænii opus astronomicum, Public. del Reale Osservatorio di Brera in Milano, No. xl, parte i–iii. The third part (Arabic text) appeared in 1899, the first in 1903, the second in 1907.
6 See the text of Ptolemy’s Canon, e.g. C. Wachsmuth, Einleitung in das Studium der alten Geschichte, Leipzig, 1895, p. 305 sq. On Eusebius, ibid., p. 163 sq. According both to Eusebius and Bīrūnī, Chronologie, ed. Sachau, p. 85, the list of kings begins with Bel, father of Ninus.
7 Berlin MS. Abl. 5667, f. 34a:
Already in Muḥammad Khuwārizmī’s ʿSurat al-ard we find a new version of Ptolemy, partly corrected and completed, partly distorted. According to Nallino⁴ Khuwārizmī’s rifucimento is a work the like of which no European nation could have produced at the dawn of its scientific activity. Yet this early independence of Muslim scholars had its negative side as well. There was no firm and definite starting-point for scientific thought and no possibility of discriminating between facts borrowed from different sources; even in the tenth century, geographers did not know what was authentic in Ptolemy and what had been added by Muslim authors.¹

P 8 The exact date of M. Khuwārizmī’s work is unknown. The scanty biographical information about him has lately been summarized by E. Wiedemann.² The appellation al-Quṭrubbuli indicates that he was associated not only with Khorāsān, but also with the locality on the Tigris whither, perhaps, already his ancestors had migrated; the appellation al-Majūsī shows that his ancestors were not Christians but Zoroastrians; this may partly account for the fact that he was more influenced by Indian and Persian traditions than by Greek ones. Besides astronomical and mathematical treatises (it is well known that “algorithm” is a distorted form of al-Khuwārizmī’s name), he compiled an historical work, references to which are found in so early an historian as Ahmad ibn-Abī-Ṭāhir Ṭayfūr;³ in Ṭabarī the earliest reference to Khuwārizmī’s work deals with the death of the caliph Maḥdī (A.D. 785),⁴ while the last reference is made under 210 (A.D. 825–6).⁵ Khuwārizmī took part in the scientific activity which flourished in the reign of the caliph Ma’mūn (A.D. 813–33); his geographical work is surely connected with the map drawn up for Ma’mūn, which was regarded as a joint production;⁶ later, under the influence of the legend of the Septuaginta, &c., it was said that seventy scholars took part in this work.⁷ Consequently in Nallino’s⁸ opinion Khuwārizmī’s work undoubtedly was composed under Ma’mūn (A.D. 813–33). Meanwhile, Nallino determines tentatively the terminus post quem and the terminus ante quem. Among the towns of the third climate the insignificant village of Qiman⁹ in Upper Egypt is named, which could have become known in consequence of a victory of the Government troops over the rebels in 201 (A.D. 816–17);¹⁰ if so, Khuwārizmī wrote not earlier than 201 ⅓. As the latest

¹ Al-Ḥuwārizmī, p. 53.
² Enc. of Islam.
⁴ Ṭabarī, iii, 551 13.
⁵ Ibid., p. 1085 13.
⁶ BGA, viii, 3314.
⁷ Reinaud, Introd., p. xlv, note 2.
⁸ Nallino, Al-Ḥuwārizmī, p. 13.
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date, 210 (A.D. 826–7) is proposed, but no explicit reason for its adoption is advanced. In reality the work of Khuwarizmi in its present form cannot be placed in the reign of Ma'mun, as it mentions the new capital Surra-man-ra'a (Sāmarra),1 the construction of which began in 211 (A.D. 836)2 under the caliph Mu'tasim (A.D. 833–42). The terminus post quem must therefore be advanced by twenty years; as terminus ante quem could be taken the date of Khuwarizmi's death, if that date were known to us; the last time Khuwarizmi's name seems to be mentioned is on the occasion of the caliph Wāthiq's death in A.D. 847.3

In Khuwarizmi's treatise we meet along with geographical names of the Muslim period a great number of ancient names; later these names rapidly begin to disappear; Yaqūt in his dictionary says, with reference to geographical names occurring in pre-Muslim authors, that "owing to the length of time"4 they have mostly become unintelligible. It is interesting to note the efforts of Khuwarizmi to connect the ancient names with those of his time. Germany is called land of the Slavs; the two Sarmatias are respectively identified with the land of the Danube Bulgars and that of the Alans; both Scythias, respectively, with the land of the Turks in general and that of the Turks of the extreme east, the Toghuzghuz; Serika, with Sīnistān, i.e. China.5 The last example shows that for comparison with Greek terms Persian geographical names were utilized as well. For the exact title of Ptolemy's book Γεωγραφική Υφήγησις, "Geography" or in the Arabic version faghrafiya was substituted; this word was generally translated as "image of the earth" (ṣūrat al-ard),6 and here probably lies the explanation of the title of Khuwarizmi's book. The author of the Fihrist7 knew that Ptolemy's work consisted of eight books or sections (in Greek ββλίων, in Arabic maqāla). The first translation, an unsatisfactory one, was made for a younger contemporary of Khuwarizmi, Abū-Yūsuf Ya'qūb al-Kindī, tutor and familiar of Ahmad, son of the caliph Mu'tasim. The death of Kindī is given as 260 (A.D. 873–4).8 It is very probable9 that Kindī utilized this translation for his own geographical work, "Description of the inhabited part of the earth" (Rasm al-ma'mūr min al-ard), mentioned

---

1 In Mālik's edition, No. 301.
2 Ṭabarī, iii, 1180; BGA, viii, 357a.
3 Ṭabarī, iii, 1364a.
4 Li-tajāwul-l-zamān, Yaqūt, i, 7b.
6 e.g. Yaqūt, i, 7b, also H. Khalīfa, ii, 601. In Mas'ūdī, BGA, viii, 331a, the translation is qaf al-ard (the crossing of the earth).
7 Fihrist, p. 268; ZDMG, 1, 213.
8 Thus according to Nallino's Arabic work, 'Ilm al-falak, p. 115; Tj. de Boer, Enc. of Islam, ii, p. 1095, says only that he was still alive in 256 (A.D. 870).
9 Thus Brockelmann, i, 225.
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by Mas'ūdī. A pupil of Kindī, Ahmad ibn-Muhammad ibn-al-Ṭayyib sarakhsī (d. in A.D. 899), was also author of a geographical work; the title "Book of Routes and Kingdoms" (Kitāb al-masālik wa-l-mamālik), frequently occurring in Arabic geographical literature, is also often applied to this work. At the same time an improved translation of Ptolemy was made by Abul-Hasan Thābit ibn Qurra (A.D. 836–901), a native of pagan Harrān and a great admirer of his native pagan culture. By a similar disposition Nallino explains the tendency of Battānī, who also belonged to the pagan (Sabian) milieu of Harrān, to revert in some cases from Khувārizmī to Ptolemy, though it constituted a step backwards (un vero regresso).

From the geographical works of such mathematicians and astronomers as Khувārizmī, Kindī, Thābit ibn-Qurra, and Battānī the "Books of Routes and Kingdoms" greatly differed in that much more space was allotted in them to political and economical than to mathematical and physical geography. These works contained not only a list of provinces into which the world, and principally the Muslim world, as known to Arabic science, was divided, but also information on towns, commercial routes, articles of export from particular provinces and towns, &c. According to the Fihrist the author of the first work on "Routes and Kingdoms" was Abul-ʿAbbās Jaʿfar ibn-Ahmad al-Marwazi; his work remained unfinished; after his death in Ahwāz his books were taken to Baghdad and there sold in 274 (A.D. 887–8). These data might lead to the belief that the composition of Marwazi's work belongs approximately to the same time, and this renders doubtful Marwazi's priority. Another work of the same title was also written by a ninth-century geographer, Abul-Qāsim ʿUbaydullāh ibn-ʿAbdillāh ibn-Khurdādhbih. This work is likewise mentioned in the Fihrist, with no historical details except that the author was a familiar of the caliph Muʿtamid (A.D. 870–92). Ibn Khurdādhbih dedicated his work to some member of the Abbāsid dynasty, whom he addressed in the second person without giving his name. The question of the dates of Ibn Khurdādhbih's life and work is treated in detail in de Goeje's Preface to the edition of the text. According to de Goeje Ibn Khurdādhbih originally wrote his work in 232 (A.D. 846–7), i.e. in the reign of the caliph Wāthiq (A.D. 842–7), and rewrote it in 272 (A.D. 885–6), under the caliph Muʿtamid. If the first date is exact, the "Book of Routes and

1 BGA, viii, 2519.  
2 On the author Brockelmann, i, 210; Fihrist, p. 261.  
3 H. Khalifa, i, 509 (No. 11870).  
4 Al-Kuvārizmī, p. 24.  
5 Fihrist, 150; GMS, vi, 2, p. 400.  
6 Fihrist, 149.  
7 BGA, vi, p. xx.
Kingdoms” by Ibn Khurdâdbih appeared in its first version long before the work of Marwâzi, and the mistake of al-Nâdîm [P 10] must be explained by the fact that only the second version was known to him, as is shown by his words relating to the caliph Mu’tamid. De Goeje’s opinion was opposed by Marquart, who1 sought to prove that there was only one edition of Ibn Khurdâdbih’s work, terminated not earlier than 272. Marquart attributes a decisive importance to the fact that already in that version of Ibn Khurdâdbih’s work which de Goeje considers as the earlier one are mentioned the Toghuzghuz, as the Arabs usually called the Uyghurs, this information having been borrowed by Ibn Khurdâdbih from the traveller Tamîm ibn Bahr al-Mu’tawwî, who visited the Toghuzghuz in a region which the Uyghurs, according to Chinese sources, conquered only in A.D. 866. Yet in another passage2 Marquart himself quotes (though with a wrong interpretation) the text of Jâhiz, who died in 255 (A.D. 868–9), in which the Toghuzghuz are mentioned not as new-comers, but as old inhabitants of the same locality, in the neighbourhood of the country of the Kharlukhs (Qarluq). Evidently the word Toghuzghuz, as is only to be expected from its etymological origin (*toquz-oghuz “nine Oghuz”), did not always designate the Uyghurs; the Arabs apparently transferred to the Uyghurs the name of the previous inhabitants of the locality conquered by them.3 Therefore, in order to refute de Goeje’s opinion on the two versions, other proofs ought to be adduced. It is doubtful, for instance, whether Ibn Khurdâdbih could speak about the caliph Wâthiq in his lifetime without using the traditional formulae accepted in such cases; but this argument would have significance only in case the full and not the abbreviated version of Ibn Khurdâdbih had reached us.

Unlike the work of Marwâzi, forgotten at an early date, that of Ibn Khurdâdbih obtained a wide circulation and was utilized by many scholars, among whom was undoubtedly, though perhaps not at first hand, our author. The problem of what exactly was borrowed by later authors and from which of Ibn Khurdâdbih’s works it was borrowed, is somewhat obscured by the fact that the “Book of Routes and Kingdoms” has reached us, as de Goeje has proved,4 only in an abridged form. In quotations from Ibn Khurdâdbih by other authors a more complete text is sometimes found than in the two

2 Streifzüge, p. 91.
4 BGA, vi, p. xv and sq.
known MSS. of Ibn Khurdadhbih’s work; many statements of such authors as Ibn al-Faqqih, Ya‘qūbī, Ibn Rusta, and others are founded on Ibn Khurdadhbih. Besides the “Book of Routes and Kingdoms” Ibn Khurdadhbih wrote several other treatises, of which the nearest to the “Book of Routes and Kingdoms” as regards subject-matter was, judging by the title, the “Book of the Genealogies of the Persians and of their Colonies”, and it is possible that some of the references to Ibn Khurdadhbih belong to this latter work. Another question to be elucidated is whether some of the authors could have utilized directly the same sources as those from which Ibn Khurdadhbih’s data were derived.

Ibn Khurdadhbih says in his Preface that he translated Ptolemy’s Geography from a foreign language (it is not said whether from Greek or Syriac); this translation is not mentioned in Arabic literature. According to Nallino, the translation of Ptolemy’s Geography was made by Ibn Khurdadhbih for his own use and was not put into circulation. It is remarkable that even this author, who calls himself a translator of Ptolemy, attributes to Ptolemy the statement, which does not occur in the Greek original, namely, that in his times there were 4,200 towns altogether. In Ptolemy there is no such estimate of towns.

In spite of his study of Ptolemy, Ibn Khurdadhbih wrote his book on a totally different plan. The astronomical divisions are entirely put aside; the principal part is devoted to “itineraries”, i.e. the description of routes connecting provinces and towns, with an exact indication of distances. Mas‘ūdī, with some contempt, calls geography, as understood by Ibn Khurdadhbih, a science for couriers and letter-carriers (to a Russian these words may recall the well-known words of Mme Prostakov in Fonvizin’s comedy Nedorost). Actually, hardly any one will deny that the “Books of Routes and Kingdoms” form precisely the most precious part of Arabic geographical literature. Thanks to them we know the topography of the Muslim Near East of the ninth to tenth centuries much better than that of the ancient world. It is a matter of regret that among documents of ancient literature such compositions as Isidore of Charax’ Σταθμοὶ Παρθικοὶ, and to a certain extent the “peripli” of the Black Sea and the Indian Ocean, occupy such an isolated place, though Ptolemy would have probably classed them with “chorography”, which he opposes to scientific geography.

1 BGA, v. 2 BGA, vii. 3 BGA, vi, 39. 4 Al-Ḥuwārizmī p. 7. 5 BGA, vi, 54. 6 Prairies d’or, ii, 70 and sq.; BGA, vi, p. xii.
We have seen that a translation of Ptolemy had also been in the hands of a contemporary of Ibn Khurdaḏbiḥ, Kindī, who wrote a geographical treatise under a different title, indicating a closer relation to mathematical geography; but a pupil of Kindī, Aḥmad Sarakhsī, wrote, like Ibn Khurdaḏbiḥ, a book of routes and kingdoms. Sarakhsī, as his appellation denotes, was a native of Khorāsān, but his life and work, as far as it is known, were connected only with Baghdad, where he perished in 899, seemingly a victim to court intrigue.1 Another disciple of Kindī, who came to 'Irāq from the eastern provinces, Abū Zayd Aḥmad ibn Sahl al-Balkhī, returned to his birthplace, where he lived for many years (he died in 934) and where he wrote his geographical work, which had a great influence on later geographers, among whom was our author.

III

De Goeje devoted a detailed article2 to the question of the geographical work of Abū Zayd Balkhī and of its relation to those works of Iṣṭakhrī and Ibn-Ḥauqal which have reached us. In it he quotes biographical data on Balkhī found in the biographical dictionary of Ṣafadī, Al-Wāfi bil-wafāyāt.3 It is clear now that Ṣafadī borrowed this information from Yaqūt,4 who, in his turn, found it in the book on Abū Zayd, which was composed by Abū Sahl Aḥmad ibn-'Ubaydillāh ibn-Aḥmad, “client of the Commander of the Faithful”. As to Abū Sahl, he utilized an earlier biography of Balkhī, the author of which was Abū Muḥammad Ḥasan ibn-Muḥammad al-Wazīrī who personally knew Abū Zayd Balkhī and had studied under him.5

The most important addition to de Goeje’s data is Yaqūt’s testimony according to which Balkhī died (in Dhul-qa’dā 322/October 934) at the age of 87 or 88; he was therefore born about 235 (A.D. 849–50).6 His geographical work, composed, as may be gathered from de Goeje,7 in 308 or 309 (A.D. 920 or a little later), was therefore written by him in his late old age. His journey to ‘Irāq, mentioned by de Goeje (Yaqūt8 says that he went there on foot with a caravan of pilgrims), belongs to his early youth, as is confirmed by the fact

---

1 The version of the Fihrīst, p. 261, according to which the wazīr Qāsim fraudulently added the name of Sarakhsī to the list, confirmed by the caliph, of persons condemned to death, is in contradiction with that of a familiar of the caliph Muʿtaḍīd, Ibn Ḥamīdūn, recorded by Yaqūt, GMS, vi, r, p. 159, according to which the caliph deliberately sent Sarakhsī to his death as an heretic who had tried to lead astray the caliph himself.
2 ZDMG, xxv, 42–58.
3 Brockelmann, ii, 32.
4 GMS, vi, 1, pp. 141–52.
5 Ibid., pp. 143, 144, and 147.
6 Ibid., p. 141.
7 ZDMG, xxv, 49.
8 GMS, vi, 1, p. 145.
that he studied under Kindî, who died soon after 870 (see above). Balkhî spent eight years in ʾIrāq and while there visited the neighbouring countries. He acquired broad and many-sided knowledge and when, by way of Herat, he returned to his native Balkh, his learning won him great fame. The eight years spent in ʾIrāq do not cover, in all probability, the whole of the time of his travels; seeing that nothing is said about his life in Balkh before the accession to the throne of the Sāmānid Naṣr II (A.D. 914-43), one may conclude that he only returned to his birthplace in his old age. To the first years of the reign of Naṣr II belong, in all probability, Balkhî’s comments, quoted in the Fihrist, about his relations with the general Ḥusayn ibn-ʾAlî al-Marwazî (or Marwarrūdhi) and also with the wazīr Abū-ʾAbdillâh Muḥammad ibn-Aḥmad Jayhānî. Balkhî received from Ḥusayn and his brother Muḥammad ʾṢuʾlîk regular material assistance, but forfeited this subsidy in consequence of having composed a religious treatise, which later was highly appreciated in orthodox circles. Yâqūt quotes an opinion according to which Balkhî’s work was ranked with the most useful, from the Muslim point of view, that had ever been written. (Ḥusayn was an Ismāʾīlī heretic; Balkhî, too, in his youth held Shiʿīte views, which he later abandoned.) The wazīr Jayhānî used to send to Balkhî presents of female slaves, but later deprived him of this attention because of Balkhî’s treatise on sacrifices (al-Qarāḥin wa-l-Dhabāʾiḥ), which he disliked. The wazīr Jayhānî was suspected of dualism, and some peculiarities of his personal life were connected, in the minds of the people, with his religious opinions: he would not touch a man otherwise than through cloth or paper, and could not suffer the presence of cats.

So far as is known, Balkhî was employed in the service of the State only during the short administration in Khorāsān of the eminent dihqān of Marv, Aḥmad ibn-Sahl (A.D. 918-19), who was held to be a descendant of the Persian kings. Aḥmad was at the head of the Sāmānid troops who quelled the revolt of Ḥusayn Marwarrūdhi, and took the latter prisoner. Subsequently, while in Nishāpūr, Aḥmad abandoned the cause of the Sāmānids and was obliged to retreat to Marv where he was defeated and taken prisoner, and later died in the prison of Bukhārā. Aḥmad ibn-Sahl came from a family

---

1 GMS, vi, 1, p. 147.
2 Fihrist, 138, quoted in Yaqūt, l.c., 141 and sq. In the Fihrist Abū-ʾAlî stands, by mistake, instead of Abū-ʾAbdillâh.
3 On him de Goeje, ZDMG, xxv, 54, note 1.
4 GMS, vi, 1, p. 149 below.
5 On this GMS, vi, 6, p. 293, according to Sallāmī’s History of the Rulers of Khorāsān, now lost. On this cf. my Turkestan, ii (Engl. ed., p. 10).
of zealous Iranian patriots; his brothers fell victims to the national fanaticism (ta'aşṣub) of the Arabs; there lived with Āḥmad in Marv a certain Sarv, to whom Firdausī refers when recounting the lays of Rustam. At that time Āбу Zayd tried to keep outside of the national disputes about the relative superiority of Arabs and Persians, as well as outside of the religious discussion of the relative merits of 'Alî and the other companions of the Prophet. Whatever his own national origin, and whatever his native language, he, as a scholar, spoke the literary Arabic, and in the same language, though with no great success, did the amīr Āḥmad ibn-Sahl3 try to communicate with him when he arrived in Balkh (there is no other information on Āḥmad ibn-Sahl's stay in Balkh). When Balkhī declined the office of wazîr offered him by Āḥmad ibn-Sahl, there was appointed to this position a friend and countryman of his, Abūl-Qāsim 'Abdullâh ibn-Āḥmad ibn-Maḥmûd Ka'bî, who also wrote treatises of a religious nature, though even farther removed from orthodoxy. In Sam'ānî he is called head of the Mu'tazilîtes.4 Balkhī took a post as secretary under Ka'bî with an allowance of 500 dînârs a month. Abūl-Qāsim was entitled to a sum of 1,000 dînârs, but he himself gave orders to the cashier to pay him 900, and to increase Balkhī's salary to 600, on the express understanding that Balkhī should receive his salary in good coin, while all questionable coins were to be put down to his own account.5 At that happy time Balkhī, thanks to the generosity both of the amīr and the wazîr, acquired some property in his native village of Shāmîstîyân, on the Gharbangî canal (one of the twelve canals irrigating the environs of Balkh), and this property was inherited by his descendants.

After the fall of Āḥmad ibn-Sahl, Balkhī, apparently, lived as a private person on his own lands. Without indication of date6 it is reported that a Sâmânid amīr (probably Naṣr) invited him to come to Bukhârâ, and that Balkhī declined the invitation, giving as his reason that he was frightened by the violence of the current and the width of the Amū-daryā. Other persons of high rank, with whom Balkhī kept up a correspondence, were the amīrs of Chaghânîyân (later viceroys of Khorâsân), Āбу-Bakr Muḥammad and his son Āбу-'Alî Āḥmad,7 but he seems not to have met them in person.

1 ZVO, xxii, 280.
2 GMS, vi, 1, p. 148. 3 Ibid., p. 150.
4 GMS, xx, p. 485. Ka'bî, who died in 319 (A.D. 931) also wrote historical works; cf. Turkestan, p. 11.
5 GMS, vi, 1, p. 147.
6 Only in Maqðisi, BGA, iii, 4. De Goeje, ZDMG, xxv, 55, refers to Maqðisi and Safadî, but the reference of Yaqût, GMS, vi, 1, p. 152, to Maqðisi shows that Safadî borrowed this information through Yaqût from the same Maqðisi.
7 GMS, vi, 1, p. 143.
The number of Balkhī’s compositions, according to his grandson, was sixty. The geographical treatise of Balkhī, which in all probability (reports are somewhat contradictory) bore the title *Ṣuwvar-al-aqālim* ("Images of Climes"), is not expressly mentioned among them. The contents of Iṣṭakhrī’s work, founded, as is known, on that of Balkhī, make one suppose that the title referred not to the division of the habitable world into seven climes from south to north, but to climes as geographical divisions, representing independent entities. Of such climes Iṣṭakhrī enumerates twenty, and the same number appeared in Balkhī. As a matter of fact in the list of Balkhī’s works there are mentioned some titles referring to geographical contents. Such are, for instance, the “Book of the Heavens and the Universe” and a “Commentary on Images” (*tafsir al-ṣuwvar*). It is possible that by the latter title is meant the geographical work of Balkhī which, according to Maqdisī, was only a very short commentary on Balkhī’s maps.

Already in those times the question of the authorship of the work, which now forms the first volume of the Bibliotheca Geographorum Arabicorum, was not quite clear. Maqdisī saw only three copies of this work, one—in Rayy, another—in Nishāpūr, and the third—in Bukhārā. In the first case, the authorship [of the maps? *yunsab ilā Abī Zayd bil-ashkal*]. V.M.] was attributed to Balkhī; in the second (in the MS. itself there was no author’s name), to Abū Bakr Muḥammad ibn-al-Marzubān al-Muḥawwāl al-Karkhī, who died in 309 (A.D. 921–2); in the third, to Abū-Ishaq Ibrahīm ibn-Muḥammad al-Fārisī al-Iṣṭakhrī, who was named in the MS. itself. Maqdisī considers the last to be the most probable, as he had seen several persons who had known Iṣṭakhrī and witnessed the composition of his work; one of these witnesses was Abū-Naṣr al-Ḥarbī, muḥtasib of the town of Bukhārā. The putative authorship of Karkhī is mentioned

---

2 *ZDMG*, xxv, 57.
4 Given by Yāqūt (GMS, vi, 1, p. 142 and sq.) more fully than in the printed edition of the *Fihrist*, p. 138.
5 [In an additional note Professor Barthold gives expression to the view that, in the printed editions, *Fihrist*, 13824, Yāqūt, GMS, vi, 1, p. 14217, a full stop may have wrongly cut into two the unique title *Kitāb tafsir ṣuwvar kitāb al-samā’ wal-‘alam li Abī Ja‘far al-Khāzīn* “Book of Interpretation of the Maps of Abū Ja‘far al-Khāzīn’s Book of the Heavens and the Universe”. He then proceeds: If this title refers to the geographical work of Balkhī, this could lead to the conclusion that to Balkhī belonged only the explanation of the maps, but not the maps themselves. The astronomer Abū-Ja‘far al-Khāzīn is often mentioned in Arabic literature, e.g. in Birūnī, see Sachau’s *Index* to his edition of the *Chronology.*]
6 *BGA*, iii, 5a.
7 On the library of the minister Ismā‘īl ibn-‘Abbād in that town see *ibid.*, p. 391.
again in the chapter on Sind; but in the references and quotations Maqdisi names only Balkhī and Ištakhrī. According to de Goeje all the quotations in which Balkhī is named correspond entirely to Ištakhrī's text. Nevertheless de Goeje thinks it possible that Maqdisi might have had in his hands, besides the text of Ištakhrī, that of Balkhī, but that Yāqūt, on the other hand, was in possession of a single book, and that quoting from this he referred principally to Ištakhrī, but sometimes to Balkhī as well, "as though following a definite system". This last guess is hardly supported by the facts: Yāqūt refers to Balkhī without mentioning Ištakhrī only once, with regard to the distance between Jedda and 'Aden; the corresponding words are of course to be found also in Ištakhrī. In all the other cases Ištakhrī alone is quoted, e.g. with regard to the distance between Ḥaḍramūt and 'Aden. Consistency, which de Goeje vainly seeks in Yāqūt, can be discovered only in Maqdisi: with regard to three out of the twenty climes mentioned, viz. the last three: Khorāsān, Sīstān, and Mā-warāʾ al-nahr, Balkhī is preferentially quoted; while in three others, Fārs, Kirmān, and Sind, preference is given to Ištakhrī.

In de Goeje's opinion the work of Ištakhrī represents a second and greatly enlarged edition of Balkhī's work, compiled between 318 and 321 (A.D. 930–3), i.e. in Balkhī's lifetime. In Russian works the date 340 (A.D. 951) is often attributed to Ištakhrī's work, but according to de Goeje this was the date of the MS. which was the basis of most of the copies circulating in the East; at that date the work, composed twenty years earlier, was published. De Goeje places Ištakhrī's meeting with Ibn Ḥauqal at the same date. The meeting is confirmed by IBN ḤAUQAL himself, who, with Ištakhrī's consent, undertook the revision of his work. Unfortunately, Ibn Ḥauqal does not say a word as to when and where this meeting took place, and only mentions that by that time he had already compiled a map of Ādharbayjān and Mesopotamia.

Ibn Ḥauqal intended to give at the end of his work a full synopsis

1 *Ibid.* p. 475; cf. the interpretation of the text, *ibid.* p. 51, in fine, as against ZDMG, xxv, 48. Grammatically, however, the previous interpretation seems more natural.
2 ZDMG, xxv, 47.
5 Yāqūt, ii, 417.
6 BGA, i, 27 above.
7 Yāqūt, ii, 285; Ištakhrī, 272.
8 ZDMG, xxv, 50.
9 Cf. e.g. Toumansky's article, ZVO, x, 127.
10 ZDMG, xxv, 51 and sq.

11 *Ibid.* p. 48 and 51 (below): in the one place: "vermutlich nicht später als 340"; in the other: "schwerlich früher", though the same date is meant.
12 Whether Ištakhrī in his time had received a similar consent from Balkhī, and whether he had met him at all, is not known.
13 BGA, ii, 236.
14 In the final edition of Ibn Ḥauqal's work, Ādharbayjān, as in Ištakhrī, is represented on the same map as Armenia and Arrān. [Cf. our § 35.]
of his travels, but never carried out his intention; the only definite date given is that of his departure as a young man from Baghdad (Thursday, Ramadān 7, 331, i.e. in May, A.D. 943); otherwise it is merely said that he visited certain towns in certain years. The year of the termination of his work is held to be 367 (A.D. 977–8). During such a lapse of time Ibn Ḥauqal could evidently visit the same towns several times; thus in 358 (A.D. 968–9) he was in Mosul for the last time. He wrote his work as a subject of the Fāṭimid caliph, and apparently spent in the West the years preceding the completion of his book, since in 361 (A.D. 971–2) he was in Sicily. This may account for the fact that his work did not acquire, in the Eastern parts of the Muslim world, the same fame as that of his predecessor. Only the work of Iṣṭakhrī was translated into Persian; the manuscript which Sir W. Ouseley took for a copy of the translation of Ibn Ḥauqal and edited as such was found to be an abridged version of Iṣṭakhrī’s book. The acquisition by the library of Shāhrukh in the fifteenth century of a copy of the Arabic original of Iṣṭakhrī gave an impulse to the composition in Persian of the geographical work of Ḥāfiz-i Abrū.

1 BGA, ii, 236b–c.

2 Ibid., 518. It is apparently not quite exact, as the day of the week does not correspond to the date. If instead of khalauna one reads baṣina, the date would be 1 June, 943, but such a supposition would be untenable. Ibn Ḥauqal adds that on the same day the Ḥamādānī Nāṣir al-daula left Baghdad, fleeing from the Turks. Nāṣir al-daula became chief amir of Baghdad (amīr al-umārā) on Shu‘bān 1, 330 (A.D. 21 iv. 942); the same date in Ibn-Miskawaih, Eclipse of the Abbasid Caliphate, ii, 28, and in Ibn al-Athīr, viii, 286. His rule came to an end as a result of the battle mentioned by Ibn Ḥauqal; it had lasted, according to Ibn-Miskawaih (Eclipse, ii, 41), 13 months and 3 days; according to Ibn al-Athīr, 13 months and 5 days, which brings us in any case to the first days of Ramadān 331; it is possible that Thursday, Ramadān 3, is meant (A.D. 11 May 943). In Zambaur (Manuel, p. 9) the day of Ramadān 7, 331, is given as the date of the passing of the power from Nāṣir al-Daula to the Turk Tuzūn; but, according to Ibn al-Athīr (vii, 208), Tuzūn received from the caliph the title of amīr al-

umārā only on Ramadān 25.

3 In de Goeje’s opinion, BGA, iv, p. v, this date results from the mention, BGA, ii, 2015, of the khutba, read “last year”, by the Ziyādīd ruler of Yemen, (Lane-Poole, The Muhammadan Dynasties, Russian transl., p. 72; Zambaur, p. 115), in the name of the Fāṭimid caliph. But de Goeje fails to say at this place (and apparently at any other) in what source he found the change of the khutba in Yemen in 366. In Ibn al-Athīr there is no information on the subject. Sir J. W. Redhouse in his Introduction to Khazraji’s History of Yemen (GMS, iii, 1, p. 11) says that when in 377 (A.D. 987) “the Hwaliyy ruler of Ṣan‘ī‘ took Zabīd, he suppressed the khutba in the name of the Fāṭimids. Reinaud (Géographie d’Aboufèdâ, Introd., p. lxxxi), without proofs, places the termination of Ibn Ḥauqal’s work in 366 (A.D. 976) [evidently after Uylenbroek, Specimen, p. 152].

4 BGA, ii, 146a; see above.

5 Ibid., 22b–c, 18.


7 Al-Muṣaffāriya (a volume dedicated to Baron Victor Rosen by his pupils), pp. 3, 13, and 18.
It is beyond doubt that our author had before him a copy of the work of Balkhi or of Istakhri. This is particularly evident in the chapters devoted to the western provinces; for instance, the words of our author (f. 34b) on Malatya correspond perfectly with Istakhri's text, p. 62:

The text of Istakhri is sometimes not very exactly rendered; our author calls Marida "the greatest town of Andalus" (36b), while Istakhri, p. 43, speaks of it as "(one) of the greatest towns of Andalus". A quotation from Istakhri, p. 68 and sq., not exactly understood, accounts for what our author says of Athens. South and west of Constantinople Istakhri distinguishes the Athenian and the Roman shores, but the words "Athens" (Athînâs) and "Rome" (Râmiya) remain to him names of towns; of Athens, as a town, it is said that there was "the residence of the wisdom of the Greeks" (yûnâni-yûn). According to our author (f. 37b), "the Athenian coast" included the entire sea-coast from the strait of Constantinople (Bosphorus) to Andalus (Spain); he knows "Athînâs" only as the name of a locality where in ancient times there stood a town Yûnâniyân, and, as he says, "all the wise men and philosophers rose from this region (nâhiyat) of Athînâs".

Historical facts are likewise now and then borrowed from Istakhri (or Balkhi). In the chapter on mountains (f. 7b), as in Istakhri's account of the Arabian peninsula, a mountain is mentioned, the summit of which occupied an area of 20 farsakhs in circumference, where there existed cultivated fields and running water, and, also as in Istakhri, it is said that the locality was conquered by the Qarmaţian Muḥammad ibn-al-Faḍl. According to our author this event took place "in ancient times", which is not very accurate, in that it refers to an event of circa 300 H.; but perhaps the words andar qâdim, used also two lines above with regard to the ancient capital of the Yemen kings, were repeated by a clerical error. Some passages in our author more nearly resemble Ibn Ha'uaiqal than Istakhri. In the chapter on 'Irāq (f. 31b) Qaṣr ibn-Hubayra is called the largest town between Baghâd and Kūfa; these words do not figure in BGA, i, 85, but they exist in BGA, ii, 166. Of course one cannot conclude from this

1 The Qarmaţian Muḥammad ibn-al-Faḍl, apparently, the brother of the Qarmaţian 'Adī ibn-al-Faḍl, who sacked Zabīd according to Lane-Poole, The Muḥammadan Dynasties, 1894, p. 90, shortly after 292/904, and according to Zambaur, Manuel, p. 115, in 303 H.
that our author utilized Ibn Ḥauqal’s original; in this case, as in many others, Nöldeke¹ is right in saying that Ibn Ḥauqal’s relation to ʿIṣṭakhrī cannot be determined by a simple comparison of the two texts of *BGA*, i and *BGA*, ii. The missing words of ʿIṣṭakhrī’s text, as published by de Goeje, are to be found in the abridged version (Gotha MS.) and in the Persian translation edited by Ouseley; consequently they were undoubtedly in ʿIṣṭakhrī.

The terms of our author’s description (26a) of three Muslim colonies on the lower reaches of the Sīr-daryā² corresponds almost literally to Ibn Ḥauqal’s text, p. 393. In *BGA*, i, these colonies are not mentioned; but it is sufficient to compare ʿIṣṭakhrī’s text in de Goeje’s edition, p. 333, with Yaḥqūt’s³ quotation from ʿIṣṭakhrī, to be convinced that the course of the Sīr-daryā was described in ʿIṣṭakhrī with much more detail than in the de Goeje edition.⁴

Did our author have before him Balkhī’s work in its primitive form, or in ʿIṣṭakhrī’s version? Some passages apparently show the influence of those chapters of *BGA*, i, which are principally attributed to ʿIṣṭakhrī, e.g. the chapters on Sind and especially the description of Manṣūra (f. 26a), cf. ʿIṣṭakhrī’s text, p. 173. But this passage may also have stood in Balkhī. The dependence on Balkhī-ʿIṣṭakhrī is still more noticeable in the chapters of the * Hudūd al-ʿalam* dealing with Khorāsān and Transoxiana which, in the original, belong undoubtedly to Balkhī: vide the passages on the Herat mosque and the number of people who spend their time there (f. 19b, cf. ʿIṣṭakhrī, p. 265); the description of Būshang (*ibid.*, cf. ʿIṣṭakhrī, p. 270); the account of the river Murghāb, which crosses the village Diza (f. 20a, cf. ʿIṣṭakhrī, p. 270); the account of the three Buttam (or Butmān) mountain chains (f. 23b, cf. ʿIṣṭakhrī, p. 333); the account of the outposts at Osh (f. 24a, cf. ʿIṣṭakhrī, p. 333); and the account of Khatlām or Khaylām as being the birthplace of the amīr Naṣr (*ibid.*, cf. ʿIṣṭakhrī, p. 334). In two instances, namely in the accounts of the market in Marsmanda (f. 23b, cf. Ibn Ḥauqal, p. 384a) and of sixty villages near Sokh (f. 24a, Ibn Ḥauqal, p. 396a), our author’s words can be compared only with the text of *BGA*, ii, because in *BGA*, i, the corresponding passages of the Balkhī–ʿIṣṭakhrī text have

¹ *ZDMG*, lxi, 433.
³ Yaḥqūt, ii, 404 and sq. The text in Yaḥqūt, as de Goeje points out in a footnote, *BGA*, ii, 393c, is clearly corrupt, especially 405, where instead of *fa yamtaṭdu ‘alā al-ʿatrāk al-Gharzīyya* one must read *fa yamtaṭdu ilā al-qaryāt al-hadīthā*.
⁴ De Goeje himself says that in *BGA*, i, he gives only the abridged text of the description of Transoxiana “während der eigentliche Text des Ḥṣṭakhrī bei Ibn Ḥauqal und in den Anmerkungen dazu zu finden ist”.

*V. V. Barthold’s Preface*
not come down to us. Apparently, among the passages of the Balkhī-
Iṣṭakhrī text, that have distinctly influenced our author, there is none
that from a chronological point of view could belong to Iṣṭakhrī
alone. Ḥallāj, who was executed in 309 (A.D. 922), is mentioned by
both our author (f. 28a) and Iṣṭakhrī (p. 148 and sq.), but he would
hardly have been named by Balkhī. Yet it is possible that our author
had another source in this case, as Ḥallāj is mentioned by Iṣṭakhrī
elsewhere than in the description of Ḥallāj’s native town al-Bayḍā.

Moreover, the question whether or not Balkhī’s version has been
preserved in Arabic MSS. along with that of Iṣṭakhrī would now
require a fresh consideration. De Goeje has proved very convincingly¹
that the MSS. that were at his disposal, inclusive of the Berlin MS.
(which Brockelmann² in spite of de Goeje still ascribes to Balkhī),
all contained Iṣṭakhrī’s version. But since then certain new MSS.
attributed to Balkhī have been discovered; viz. the MS. acquired in
Egypt by Ahmad Zāki bey³ and the “Balḥīkodex mit schönen
Karten”, acquired in Baghdād for the Hamburg library;⁴ the neces-
\[ ... \]

IV

A geographical work, under the same current title of “Book of
Routes and Kingdoms”, was written by the Sāmānid wazīr Abū
‘Abdīllāh Muḥammad ibn-Aḥmad Jayhānī, who is mentioned in
Balkhī’s biography. References to this work are often met with, but
the work itself seems to have completely disappeared. Among the
geographers of the tenth century who utilized it are Ibn Ḥauqāl⁶ and
Maqdisī. It can be seen from the latter’s⁷ comments that Ibn
Khurdādbbih’s work formed the basis of that of Jayhānī. Occasion-
ally the same MS., if it did not contain an indication of the author’s
name, was attributed by some to Ibn Khurdādbbih, and by others
to Jayhānī. But it can be gathered from Maqdisī that Jayhānī,

¹ ZDMG, xxv, 42-58. The final conclusion, p. 57, is that both MSS.,
taken as the basis of the edition, viz. the
Bologna one (on which see V. Rosen,
Remarques, &c., Rome, 1885, p. 94) and
the Berlin one (in printed editions
respectively A and B), transmit if not
entirely, at least in its greater part, the
work of Iṣṭakhrī.
² GAL, i, 229.
³ Ign. Kratchkovsky, Abū Ḥanifa ad-
⁴ C. Seybold in ZDMG, lxvii, 541.
⁵ In the summer of 1929 when the
present work had already gone to press
I had the opportunity of examining the
Hamburg MS. Like the Berlin MS.,
it proved to be the work of Iṣṭakhrī,
not of Balkhī. It also contains the
famous story of the author’s stay in
Samarkand (BGA, i, 318), which could
not belong to Balkhī, who, according to
the direct evidence of Maqdisī (BGA,
iii, 414), never crossed the Oxus.
⁶ BGA, ii, 236a, with an unfavourable
mention both of Jayhānī’s work and of
that of Ibn Khurdādbbih.
⁷ Cf. my Turkestan, p. 12 and sq.
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besides written sources, utilized oral information; he assembled foreigners and bade them speak of their native lands and of the roads leading thereto. Thus, according to Maqdisi, it was a 140 days' journey from Tūnkat to the principal town of China, "as Jayhānī was told by the ambassadors, and he mentioned this in his book and clearly expressed it in his statement".

Unfortunately this itinerary has not come down to us either through Maqdisi or any other author; I have not met with quotations from it. But one might suppose a priori that the great number of geographical names belonging to Central Asia and found in our author shows the latter's dependence on the itinerary given by Jayhānī. It is somewhat difficult to determine the extent of such a dependence, seeing that our author does not give any itineraries; but many of the geographical names of the Ḥudūd al-ʿālam are also quoted by an author of the eleventh century, Gardizi, who gives the distances between the towns and the itineraries, i.e. precisely the information missing in the Ḥudūd al-ʿālam. Gardizi states that he borrowed these data from Ibn Khurdādbeh, Jayhānī, and a third anonymous work under the title Tawāqūt al-dunyā. At one place Gardizi's expressions literally coincide with the quotation from Jayhānī found in Birūnī, though referring not to the route to China, but to that from Khotan to Tibet. According to Birūnī, Jayhānī said that "the Chinese in ancient times built a bridge from the summit of one mountain to the summit of another, on the way from Khotan into the province of the Tibetan Khāqān; whoever crosses this bridge enters the locality where the air impedes respiration and renders the tongue heavy; many of those who pass there die from this, but many recover as well. The Tibetans call it Mountain of Hell." The same passage (of course in Persian translation) is found almost verbatim in Gardizi, where the building of the bridge is attributed to the people of Khotan, which perhaps can be explained by a mistake of the copyist (instead of Į instead of Į). Evidently mountain sickness is

1 BGA, iii, 346 (345b).
2 South of Tashkent, on the river Āhanārūn (in Russian: Angren). But it is possible that instead of Tūnkat one should read Navīkat, the town of Navīkat or Navīkat being the starting-point of several routes to China, V. Barthold, Report, p. 114, note 1.
3 V. Barthold, Report, &c., pp. 78-126.
4 Ibid., p. 103 (text) and p. 126 (transl.). [Barthold translates Tawāqūt by "Insignificance", "Frailty", which is rather a strange name for a geographical treatise. It is more probable that the book bore the name *Rā` al-dunyā, "Habitable part of the World", as indicated by a variant, see M. Nāzım's ed. of Zayn al-akhbār, Berlin, 1928, p. 4. V.M.]
5 Ibid., p. 88 (text) and p. 112 (transl.).
6 Chronologie, ed. Sachau, 271.
7 Instead of byt, read Tbbt.
meant here, which even now hampers traffic along the high passes leading from Eastern Turkestan into India.¹

It is hard to say how far such a specific dependence of Gardīzī on Jayhānī confirms a similar dependence of the Ḥudūd al-ʿālam on Jayhānī, for in the passage on Tibet² there is less resemblance between the text of the Toumansky MS. and Gardīzī than in such other passages as those on the Toghuṣghuz and China. Gardīzī mentions none of the Tibetan towns, while the Ḥudūd al-ʿālam names a whole series of them and even attributes to Tibet several towns placed by Gardīzī on the way from Kāshghar to Khotan,³ though the town of Khotan itself (as in Gardīzī) is described in the chapter on China (f. 14a); moreover, Khotan is placed on the frontier between China and Tibet, and the title "Chief of Turks and Tibetans"⁴ is attributed to the Khotan ruler.

A passage at the beginning of the chapter on Tibet in the Toumansky MS. (on the involuntary gaiety felt by every one entering Tibet) is clearly borrowed from Ibn Khurdādbih.⁵ The data on the Tibetan towns are apparently derived from various sources; two names, Lhāsā and Kṛṣāṅg,⁶ designating, it seems, the same town, are given as names of two different towns. As in all compilations, such examples are fairly frequent in the Ḥudūd al-ʿālam, which not only refers to the Burṭās and the Barādhās as two distinct nations,⁷ but also, in the chapter on Khūzistān (f. 28b), separately mentions Rāmhur (?), i.e. Rāmhurmuz (as in Balkhī–Īṣṭakhri,⁸ place of the assassination of Mānī), and Rām-Urmuzd, a large and rich commercial town on the frontier between Fārs and Khūzistān, though it is evident that the latter is only a more correct and fuller Persian form of the first name. In the chapter on Khūzistān the name of another large town is given in the Persian pronunciation, Vandūshāvur, instead of in the Arabic, Junday-Sābūr; the spelling of the Toumansky MS. approximates very closely to the pronunciation Vandēw-Shāpūr proposed by Nöldeke.⁹ In the data borrowed from Balkhī–Īṣṭakhri the author sometimes substitutes a local Persian form for the literary

¹ Kornilov, Kāshgariya (in Russian), Tashkent, 1903, p. 349.
² Cf. Doklady Akademii Nauk, Series B, 1924, p. 73 and sq.
³ V. Barthold, Report, p. 94 (text) and p. 119 (transl.); Tārīkh-i Rashtī, mentioned there, figure in the Toumansky MS. among the towns which formerly belonged to China, and "now" belong to Tibet.
⁴ Cf. the title 'Aẓīm al-Khotan in a twelfth-century author, Turkestan, i, 203.
⁵ BGA, vi, 179a.
⁷ [But see p. 44, note.]
⁸ BGA, i, 93. [See my notes. V.M.]
⁹ Nöldeke, Geschichte der Perser und Araber, p. 42.
Arabic one; thus in the passage on Herat (f. 19b), evidently borrowed from Balkhī–Istakhri (p. 265), he writes Hari instead of Harāt.

The similarities of the *Hudud al-'alam* and Gardizi, and the dependence of both on a common source, are perhaps most obvious in the chapters on China and the Toghuzghuz. Many names of towns, and among them the Persian names Baghsūr and Sangalākh,1 occur in both authors as names of localities between Turfan and Khami and between Sha-chou and Su-chou. Gardizi gives itineraries which are not to be found in the *Hudud al-'alam*, but the sequence of names in both clearly shows that the itineraries were also known to the latter, who in accordance with the general plan of his composition enumerates the towns from east to west, while Gardizi does it in reversed order.2 There is no complete correspondence between the text of the anonymous and that of Gardizi; the former (f. 14a) mentions a “stone tower” (burj-i sangin), which seems to be the only trace of influence of Ptolemy’s geography in this locality (i, 12, 9, λῆθως πύργος, cf. Qudāma,3 burj al-hijāra); in Gardizi no such name occurs. On the other hand, the *Hudud al-'alam* contains no mention of Qamul or Khami, which is found in Gardizi.4 From this we may conclude that at this place Gardizi reflects a later stage of geographical knowledge; and it is possible that here our author depends on Ibn Khurdādbih, and Gardizi on Jayhānī. In any case our anonym’s information cannot be up to his own epoch, or even to that of Jayhānī. Particularly characteristic is the description of the town of Kan-chou (*Khānchū*, f. 13b and sq.; same in Gardizi): “Half of it is owned by the Chinese, half by the Tibetans; a perpetual war goes on between them; they are idol-worshippers; their government is on behalf of the Tibetan khāqān.” Such could have been the situation in the times of Ibn Khurdādbih, or in those of him whose work was his source, the traveller Tamīm ibn-Bahr al-Muṭṭawwī’ī;6 but during the whole of the tenth century Kan-chou was an Uyghur principality.7

In no greater degree does our anonym reflect the situation in India in the tenth century. The original source of Ibn Khurdādbih and

---

1 *Hudud al-'alam*, f. 13b and f. 14a; Gardizi in Barthold, *Report*, p. 92 (text) and p. 117 (transl.).
2 Cf. e.g. the itinerary in Gardizi, text p. 91, transl. p. 116, and the order in which the towns are enumerated in the *Hudud al-'alam*, f. 17a.
4 *Report*, p. 92 (text) and p. 117 (transl.). [But see note to § 12, 9.]
5 [Barthold translates: sulân, but in the tenth century this word meant more probably “government”. V.M.]
6 Yāqūt, i, 840, above; Barthold, *Report*, p. 34.
other early Arabian geographers was in this case provided by the work of the traveller Abū 'Abdillāh Muhammad ibn-Iṣḥāq, who lived two years in Khmer (Qimār), i.e. Cambodia; he it was who originated the passage (f. 14b) on the strict forbiddance of adultery in that country, as well as the story of the woman who ruled Orissa. The name Orissa occurs in two forms: Uรสfīn and Īrshfīn (in the story of the queen). The work of Balkhī-Īṣṭakhṛī was utilized for instance in the passage dealing with the Arab rulers of Multān and with the town Bābī (in Īṣṭakhṛī, Bāniya). According to Īṣṭakhṛī the khutba in Multān was read in the name of the caliph; according to Ibn Ḥauqal in the name of the 'Abbāsids whom Ibn Ḥauqal, writing in the kingdom of the Fāṭimids, did not recognize as caliphs; according to Maqdisī, in the name of a Fāṭimid. Our anonym (f. 15a) says that the khutba was read in the name of Mu‘izz (bar Mu‘izzī); but it is not clear whether we have to do here with a clerical error, the possibilities being Mu‘izz (the Fāṭimid caliph who ruled from 953 till 975), and “Mu‘izzī” which might designate the son and successor of Mu‘izz, the caliph ‘Azīz. The acceptance of either of these hypotheses [but see my translation and note, V.M.] would bring us to the conclusion that the anonym, perhaps from oral sources, knew of the Shi‘ite coup d'état in Multān which evidently took place after Ibn Ḥauqal and before Maqdisī. It is known that Multān remained in the hands of the heretics till its conquest by Maḥmūd the Ghaznavid in 1006; the epitomizer of Ibn Ḥauqal, who wrote in the twelfth century, gratuitously supposed, in order to explain Maḥmūd’s expedition, that Multān, after Ibn Ḥauqal, had again passed for a certain time into the hands of the Hindus.

In the chapters on Central Asia and China there are no indications of events that could have taken place a short time before the work was composed. It is possible that here, too, as in many other instances, the use of different sources made the author mention the same localities under different names. The town Panchul (Bnījūl), Wen-su of the Chinese sources, was situated probably on the site of the present-day Uch-Turfan, as confirmed by the Chinese source in which it was stated that this town bore the name of Yū-chou. Gardīzī

1 BGA, vii, 132.  
2 Ibid., and vi, 66 and sq.  
3 Together with Smndr, as in Ibn Khurdādbih, p. 64q, who gives Urnshīn. [But see my note, p. 243. V.M.]  
4 As in Ibn Rusta, p. 134b.  
5 BGA, i, 175.  
6 Ibid. ii, 2301.  
7 Ibid. iii, 485b.  
8 On this ‘Utbi-Manīnī, ii, 72; Elliot, History of India, ii, 441.  
9 E. Chavannes, Documents sur les T'ou-Kiue (Turcs) occidentaux, SPb. 1903, p. 9, placed Wen-su on the site of Aqsu, but later (in M. A. Stein's Ancient Khotan, p. 544) adopted the opinion that Wen-su was Uch-Turfan. [See my notes, pp. 294-7, V.M.]
uses the name Bnchul,¹ but not Ûj; Mahmūd Kāshgharī (eleventh century)² gives Ûj but not Bnchul, whereas our author (18a) names Bnchul and Ûj separately, with the additional remark, absent in other sources, that Bnchul “now” belongs to the Khirkhiz. This detail can hardly pertain to the times of the author, since it can only reflect the situation at the time of the Qirghiz empire, at the end of the ninth and the beginning of the tenth centuries,³ but could have been incorporated in the works both of Ibn Khurdādhbih and Jayhānī.

In the chapter on lakes are mentioned side by side (f. 3b) the lake of Tuz-kul, from which seven tribes of the Qarluq procured salt, 10 farsakhs long and 8 farsakhs wide, in the country of the Khallukh (Qarluq), and the lake of Issik-kul, lying between the possessions of the Chigil and the Toghuughuz, which was 30 farsakhs long and 20 farsakhs wide, and on the shore of which was situated the town of Barskhān. In spite of the different estimate of the size of the lakes,⁴ it is very probable that the first name Tuz-kul also designates Issik-kul.⁵ Nallino,⁶ on the strength of a quotation in Kharraqi, an author of the twelfth century, has shown that Issik-kul was mentioned by Jayhānī; the same quotation from Jayhānī, unnoticed by Nallino, exists in Yaqūt, II, 224, where some copyist substituted for the name of Issik-kul that of the port Abaskūn on the Caspian.

In the few cases where the author mentions events of his own times these events pertain to the history of the Muslim world. In the year 372, in which the author completed his work, there died the Būyid shāhānshāh Fanākhusrau (in our author Panākhusrau) who bore the title 'Aẖud al-daula (d. 8 Shawwāl 372 = 26 March 983);⁷ his massacre of the Balūches, an event mentioned by our author (f. 26b) and by Maqdisī after him,⁸ probably belongs to the end of his reign.⁹

¹ V. Barthold, Report, p. 91 (text) and p. 116 (transl.).
² Mahmūd al-Kāshgharī, Constantiniæ ed., i, 38; he several times (i, 335, 381; ii, 121) cites words from the dialect of its inhabitants.
⁴ Gardizi attributes to Issik-kul a still greater size, viz. of 7 days’ journey, see Barthold, Report, p. 89 (text), p. 114 (transl.).
⁸ BGA, iii, 489s.
⁹ Ibn Ḥauqal (BGA, ii, 221, ed.) speaks only of the victory which 'Aẖud al-daula, with the help of the Balūches, won over the Kūfch; one must suppose that the rupture with the Balūches occurred later. [It is doubtful that 'Aẖud al-daula assumed the title of shāhānshāh. As to the crushing defeat of the Balūches by 'Aẖud al-daula, it took place in 361/January 972, see Ibn Misakawaih, The Eclipse, ii, 299–301. V.M.]
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In the description of the town of Qum (f. 29a) it is said that the secretary (dābiḏ) Bul-Faḏl, the son of ‘Amīd, was a native of that place. The person here meant is the famous Buyid minister Abul-Faḏl ibn al-‘Amīd,¹ who died in Hamadān on the night of Thursday,² 6 Šafar 360 (8 December 970). Quite singular is the mention by our author (33a), in the chapter on Ādharbayjān, Armenia, and Arrān, of the large village of Mubārakī which was situated at the gates of Barda’a where “the camp of the Russians (Rūs) stood, at the time when they seized Barda’a”, and where they were afterwards besieged, an event which, as is known, happened in 332 (A.D. 943–4),³ forty years before the composition of the Ḥudūd al-ʿālam.

The mention of the Russian raid is perhaps corroborative of a fact which I have pointed out elsewhere,⁴ viz. that the Caspian provinces are described by our anonym with particular detail. Here he gives us a whole series of details which one would vainly look for elsewhere. The same remark applies in part to his description of the south-eastern shore of the Caspian; especially worthy of attention is the fact, apparently not mentioned in other sources, that two languages were spoken in Astarābd (f. 29b). However, it is evident that our author knows the eastern Caspian shore less than the western one, for in the description of the former several notable inaccuracies occur. In two places (f. 11a and f. 29b) the river Hirand is mentioned as rising in the mountains of Tūs, traversing the confines of Ustuvā and Jarmūḵān,⁵ flowing between the two parts of the town of Gurgān,⁶ then directing itself towards the town of Abaskūn, and finally emptying itself into the Khazar (Caspian) Sea. One sees that the upper course of the Atrak has been confounded with the lower course of the Gurgān, to form one river. (It is remarkable that the river Atrak, in spite of the fact that its waters irrigated the town of Dihistān and its environs,⁷ is not mentioned by the tenth-century geographers.) If, therefore, the anonym’s data upon the Caspian provinces were borrowed from one source, it is probable that this source was composed not in the eastern, but in the western part of the Caspian region.

With less geographical detail are described the provinces of modern

---

¹ Cf. his biography by Amēdroz (from Ibn-Miskawaih) in Der Islam, iii, 323 and sq.
³ Cf. Yakubovsky in Vizantiiskiy Vremennik, xxiv, 63–92; the Ḥudūd al-ʿālam quoted, ibid., p. 91.
⁴ Izw. Kavkaz. Instituta, vi, 63 and sq.
⁵ f. rm.ḵān, f. 11a and f. 19b, BGA, iii, 300 below and 320 Jrmūḵān; on its site, ibid., p. 352, where Jrm.ḵān is placed at three stages from Nasā.
⁶ Cf. BGA, ii, 273; iii, 358 and sq.
⁷ V. Barthold, The History of Irrigation in Turkestan, p. 32.
Afghanistān, more closely related to the author, but the fact is interesting that the Afghāns (Afghānān, f. 16a) are mentioned as a people; until now 'Uṭbī1 was considered the oldest author mentioning this ethnographical term (al-Afghāniya). Particularly little information is given on that part of Afghanistān where, at that time (since A.D. 977) ruled Sabuktagin, founder of the Ghaznavid dynasty, later so powerful.2 Apparently, the text here has been somewhat corrupted by the copyists. The name of the town of Ghazna occurs several times in its usual form “Ghaznīn”, but it is not impossible that to this same town may pertain the words about the rich commercial town Ghazaq, which at first belonged to India but later passed under the sway of Islām and formed the frontier between the possessions of the Muslims and those of the Infidels (f. 22a).

From the Preface translated by Toumansky3 Russian readers could form an idea of the author’s conception of his task. Not quite clear is the title chosen, Kitāb ḥudūd al-ʿālam min al-mashriq ilā al-maghrib, which in Toumansky’s translation is rendered “The Book of the Frontiers (or Limits) of the World from East to West”.4 The second variant of the translation (“the limits”) is apparently the more correct, though in Toumansky’s mind it was perhaps connected with the peculiarity of the work in which “for each province the frontiers are given first of all”. The word ḥudūd in Arabic geographical literature means not so much “frontiers”, in the sense of frontier-line, as “limits”, in the sense of the total extent of a territory. In Ibn Khurdādhbih’s words,5 Ptolemy abāna al-hudūd, which de Goeje translates “a donné une bonne description”.6 However, in the description of two provinces Khorāsān and Transoxiana, our author uses the word hudūd in some special and not very clear sense. Separately from the description of the provinces themselves are described their hudūd, and of the Sāmānids, the rulers of the whole country, it is said (f. 19a): “In the whole of Khorāsān are their lieutenants, while on the frontiers (andar ḥadd-hā) of Khorāsān there are kings, who are called margraves (mulāk-i ʿatraf).”7 If the author meant by this that in the chapter on Khorāsān would be described the provinces under the immediate rule of the Sāmānids, and that

---

1 Enc. of Islam, under Afghānān (M. L. Dames). Cf. also in 'Uṭbī the chapter on the Afghāns, 'Uṭbī-Manānī, ii, 300. [But cf. p. 349, n. 2.]
3 ZVO, x, 127.
5 BGA, vi, 39.
6 Ibid., p. 1.
7 [Barthold translates andar ḥadd-hā “within the limits”, but this expression means: “on the frontiers”; on the other
in that on the “limits [read: ‘marches’, V.M.] of Khorāsān” would be described the vassal principalities, then he did not adhere consistently to this distinction. Enough to say that the possessions of the amīr of Gūzgān, the most important of the vassal rulers, are included in Khorāsān proper (f. 20b), and not in “the limits [read: ‘marches’, V.M.] of Khorāsān”.

In spite of the relatively insignificant size of the Ḥudūd al-ʿālam, as compared with the works of the Arabic geographers of the tenth century, it was meant to contain all data “that became known until then” on the countries and kingdoms of the world, i.e. all that could be learnt from books or from the words of learned men.¹ Such a claim, expressed in the Preface, is repeated in the text in the passage where the author passes from the physico-geographical description of the inhabited world to that of separate kingdoms and towns, with the reservation that “all the particulars of the world may be known to none, save God” (f. 13b). In various other passages the same assurance is expressed as to the fullness of the information given. At the end of the chapter on freshwater lakes (f. 4a) it is said: “These are the lakes that are known and on which books give information; besides these, there are numerous small lakes, of which one is in the mountains of Gūzgān in Mānishān, near Bīstārāb;² its length is one farsakh, its width half a farsakh. There are similar lakes in the mountains of Tūs and in the mountains of Tabaristān; but these lakes are not known and are not ancient; or it happens [read: va yā vaqt buvadh, V.M.] that they dry up so that there remains no water in them; therefore we have not mentioned them.” The same reservation is further made where swamps (bāṭiḥa-hā) are described. The chapter on islands ends with the words (f. 5b): “There is no other reputed and inhabited island in the whole world, besides those that we have mentioned; we have represented (on the Map)³ all these seas, gulfs, and islands, as they are and at their respective places.” At the end of the chapter on deserts and sands (f. 13a) it is said: “In the limits of the Muslim world the large and known deserts and sands are those which we have mentioned; in the lands of the Infidels, except (those) of the Turks, they are also such as we have mentioned, and

¹ To the not very clear words of the Preface: andar gird-i hakimān [I read: yādkhird-i hakimān, “memories of the
sages”, V.M.] correspond on f. 13b the words: ba-akhbār-hā sharāndan.
² On the district Mānishān see also the description of Gūzgān, f. 20b, the town Bāt.rāb is not mentioned there.
³ Toumansky, ZVO, x, 128, had already noticed that the text mentions the Map which is absent in our copy.
God knows best of all and from Him is assistance.” In other words, the author admits the possibility of not having enumerated all the deserts and sands of the country of the Turks (where they are most numerous); but for the rest his list seems to him absolutely complete.

With the tendency towards completeness is connected a tendency towards numerical exactitude; the author tries to give the precise number of seas, salt and freshwater lakes, islands, countries into which the inhabited part of the world is divided, &c. As far as it is possible to judge by the Arabic geographical works that have come down to us, the author is largely independent in his geographical generalizations and terminology. The conception of the seven seas, as developed by our author (Eastern Ocean, Western Ocean, Indian Ocean, Mediterranean, Caspian, Black Sea, Aral Sea, f. 2b and sq.) does not apparently exist anywhere else. The author applies the term Green Sea (daryâ-yi akhdar or daryâ-yi sabz, in Arabic al-bahr al-akhdar) to the Eastern Ocean, and the term Great Sea (al-bahr al-a’sam) to the Indian Ocean, while in Muḥammad ibn-Mūsā al-Khwârizmî¹ both terms are applied to the Indian Ocean (the Great Sea—al-bahr al-habîr), and the Caspian Sea² is called Khuwârizmian.³ The Black Sea is called “Sea of the Georgians” (daryâ-yi Gurziyân), a term which does not seem to occur anywhere else. But even in our MS. the Georgians are not mentioned among the people living around the Black Sea; in another passage, that dealing with the description of Byzantium, the Black Sea bears the name of daryâ-yi Gurz (f. 37b) and the same form Gurz is given in certain Muslim sources as the name of the town of Kerch in Crimea; this has induced Westberg⁵ to suppose that our author gives the name “Sea of Kerch” to the Azov Sea; but in reality the Black Sea is meant here as it is mentioned in the neighbourhood of Thrace. Nor does the variant daryâ-yi Gurziyân support this supposition, though Westberg at another place endeavours to explain the name of Kerch by that of a people called Garsh⁶

¹ Ed. Māzik, p. 74. ² Ibid., p. 80.
³ Cf. Enc. of Islam, i, under Bahr al-Khazâr. As stated there, this early terminology of the Arab geographers may account for the Russian designation of the Caspian: Khvalinskoye, or Khvalinskoye morë.
⁴ [But see § 42, 15. V.M.]
⁶ “Die Gârschen”, ibid., p. 309, but the reference to the Russian translation by Patkanov, p. 29, is wrong, and I have in general failed to find such a passage in the [so-called] Geography of Moses of Khoren. [As a matter of fact Patkanov translated first the abridged version of the Armenian geography, ascribed to him by Anania Shirakats’i. The complete text, edited by A. Soukry, Venice, 1881, p. 25, transl. p. 35, mentions the Garsh, whom Marquart, Streifzüge, p. 171, identifies with the Kashak, or Circassians. Moreover, see p. 401, note 1, and p. 446, note 2. V.M.]
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who lived, according to the [so-called, V.M.] "Geography of Moses of Khoren", between the country of the Bulgars and the Black Sea.

Quite as original seems to be the author's conception of the division of the inhabited world into "parts of the world" and separate "countries". Like all Arab geographers, he accepts the division of the world into three parts, Asia, Europe, and Libya. Of course, the first place by extent belonged to Asia, and the term Āsiyat al-kubrā (f. 13a) entirely corresponds to Ptolemy's expression Ἡ μεγάλη 'Asia (beginning of books v and vii, also viii, 3). In the author's opinion Asia occupies two-thirds of the inhabited world, Europe one-quarter, and Libya one-twelfth. The belief that the area of Asia is twice as great as that of the other parts of the world put together occurs in other Arabic authors, notably in Bīrūnī, but in any other author we should vainly look for the opinion that Europe is three times as large as Africa. To the division of the world into parts, borrowed from the Greeks, the author lends as little importance as do the other Muslim geographers, and in the survey of separate provinces he does not approach the question whether they are situated in Asia or in another part of the world. Our author counts fifty-one countries (nāḥiyat) in all, of which five are situated south of the Equator, one (the Südān) is astride it and forty-five lie north of it. The number of the provinces is very near to that given by Khuwārizmī, viz. fifty-six, but the names of the provinces in Khuwārizmī are entirely different, and many of them are borrowed from Ptolemy, which is not the case with our author. The provinces situated to the south of the Equator are enumerated in the usual order from east to west; the first to be named is Zāba (but f. 2b and f. 39a, as well as in Arab geographers, Zābaj); further on come Zangistān (country of the Zanj or Negroes, actual Zanzibār), Ḩabasha (Abyssinia), the country of Buja (or Baja, a people of Hamitic descent, still existing, and divided into several branches), and Nubia. In the description of countries situated to the south of the Equator (f. 39a) the order is somewhat different: Zangistān, Zābaj, Ḩabasha, Buja, and Nubia. The author places the country of Zābaj, as he does also in the case of Zangistān, to the south of the Equator (f. 39a). The geographical term "Zābaj" is not very distinctly used by Arab geographers, who sometimes confuse the names Jāba (Java) and

1 Cf. quotation in Yaqūt, i, 63. It is remarkable that on the other hand Ibn Khurdādhbih, p. 155, entirely ignores Asia and divides the world into four parts: Europe, Libya, Ethiopia, and Scythia.


3 Cf. articles "'Abābde", "Bedja", and "Bishārīn" in Enc. of Islam.
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Zābabaj;¹ but in any case the term Zābabaj always refers to the Malay coast or archipelago.² The data of the Ḥudūd al-ʿālam on the islands of the Indian Ocean are borrowed from Ibn KhurdādBih. Besides the island of Jāba there is also mentioned "the continental Jāba" (Jāba-yi khushk, f. 6b), corresponding probably to "the kingdom of Jāba the Indian" of Ibn KhurdādBih.³ A certain influence of Balkhī is also felt in that our author, similarly to Iṣtakhīrī, p. 11, places the country of the Zanj opposite Fārs and Kīrmān, evidently on the assumption that the African coast extended much farther to the east than it does in reality.⁴ But in this part of his work the author seems to have utilized sources unknown to us. Thus in Abyssinia are mentioned the following towns: Rāsun, on the seashore, residence of the king; Savār, where the army is stationed; and Rin, the residence of the commander-in-chief. In other works we find entirely different names.⁵ The folio containing the description of the countries of Buja and Nubia has been considerably damaged.

The order of enumeration of the forty-five lands situated to the north of the Equator is somewhat different in the general enumeration (f. 13a) to the order followed in the description itself (see the table of contents, f. 1b).⁶ In the disposition of the chapters in the text the principle of movement from east to west is observed more scrupulously than in the general introduction (f. 13a), but without complete consistency. Thus India is described before Tibet, though in the text it is said that to the east of India are situated China and Tibet, and to the east of Tibet only China. After Tibet are described the countries of the Turkish peoples; after the Toghuṣglish (the western neighbours of the Tibetans) follow their western neighbours, the people Yaghmā;⁷ after them the author passes to the north and speaks of the Khirkhīz, who, in his opinion, lived in the east towards China and the Eastern Ocean;⁸ then again he passes to the south

¹ BGA, vi, 46, note 2; also Enc. of Islam, ii, under "Java". [See my note, p. 473. V.M.]
² According to Birūnī, India, ed. Sachau, p. 163 above, the islands Zābabaj are nearer to China than to India.
³ BGA, vi, 66: mamlakat Jābat al-Hindi [referring to the maritime Jāba. V.M.]
⁴ Our author places Zanj as well opposite Sīnd, and so does Iṣtakhīrī; at another place Iṣtakhīrī, p. 36, places Zanj opposite some parts of Hind. [This seems to be a misunderstanding, as Iṣtakhīrī, p. 36, refers to the Indian Ocean and not to the arḍ al-Zanj. V.M.]
⁵ [See my note, p. 474. V.M.]
⁶ [I omit here the enumeration, which will be found at its place in my translation. V.M.]
⁷ F. 17a, Yghmīyā, but 13a, 17b, and 18a correctly Yghmā. The chapter on this people mentions Kāshghar, though at the same time it is said that the town is situated on the frontier between the possessions of the Yaghmā, the Tibetans, the Khirkhīz, and the Chinese.
⁸ Iṣtakhīrī, p. 9 below, also speaks of the Ocean (al-bahr al-muḥit) as the frontier of the Khirkhīz.
and describes the Khallukh (Qarluq) whose province on the east adjoined Tibet 1 and the limits of the Yaghmā and the Toghuzghuz; then the Chigil, who had separated themselves [?v.i. § 16] from the Khallukh, whose country on the east [?] and south adjoined the limits of the Khallukh and whose western neighbours were the Tukhsi. 2 Again passing to the north the author speaks of the Kīmāk, living to the west of the Khirkhiz and to the north of the Irtish, and of the Ghūz. In the chapter on the Ghūz it is said that to the east and south of their province is situated the Ghūz desert 3 and the towns of Transoxiana; the Kīmāk are not mentioned in this connexion, but in their special chapter their peaceful relations as well as their wars 4 with the Ghūz are mentioned. After this come the Turkish Pecheneg, living to the west of the Ghūz, and the Khifjakh (Qipchaq), of whom it is said that they adjoin the Pecheneg on the south, and the northern desert on all the other sides. Elsewhere it is said that the Khifjakh separated from the Kīmāk, from which one might deduce that these latter had once been the eastern neighbours of the Khifjakh. After the Khifjakh is mentioned only one “Turkish” (according to the ideas of the Arab geographers!) people, the Magyars (Majghari). Nothing is said of the frontier between them and the Khifjakh, although it is mentioned that to their east were mountains, to their south lived a Christian people called Vanandar, and to their west and north lay the country of the Rūs. The text presents some resemblances to that of Ibn Rusta, 5 and likewise to that of Gardīzī 6 (e.g., the number of horsemen and the mention of the great extent of the Magyar country; Gardīzī estimates both its length and width as 100 farsakhs, while according to the Ḥudād al-ʿālam it was 150 farsakhs in length and 100 in breadth). All three texts are probably derived from the same source (perhaps the work of Ibn Khurdadhbih) which has been most fully utilized by Gardīzī.

After having spoken of the Magyars and their struggle with their neighbours, the author feels confident that he has finished with all

---

1 [See p. 256, note 2. V.M.]  
2 In the translation of the text of Gardīzī (Report, p. 125) and in the Sketch of the History of the Semirechye, p. 15, I wrote “Takhsi”; but in the MS. of Māhmūd of Kāshgār, judging by the printed edition (i, 28, 85, 342; ii, 243), everywhere stands Tukhsi. In the Ḥudād al-ʿālam: Tukhs, probably formed from Tukhshiyān, on a false analogy with Ghūzīyān < Ghūz. V.M.]  
3 The expression biyābān-i Ghūz corresponds to the expression mafāzat al-Ghūzīya, in Bakhsh-I Ṣtakhri (BGA, i, 217 and sq.).  
4 According to Ṣtakhri, p. 222, the frontier between the countries of the Kīmāk and the Ghūz was formed by the river Itil (Ithil), by which is probably meant the lower course of the Kama (cf. my article “Ghuz” in the Enc. of Islam).  
5 e.g. the mention of 20,000 Magyar horsemen, BGA, vii, 142.  
6 Barthold, Report, text, p. 98, transl. p. 121 and sq.
the Turks: “now I shall enumerate all the lands of Islam, and then the rest of the lands of the Infidels which are situated in the west.” However, we shall see that in spite of this intention, the author, after the description of the Muslim provinces, comes back to such peoples as lived even farther to the east than the Magyars.

VI

The description of the Muslim world forms, naturally, the greater part of the description of countries (17½ out of 26 folios), yet even this proportion shows that the Hudūd al-ʿālam allots to the non-Muslim world a greater space than do the Arab geographers. In the description of the Muslim countries the general order, from east to west, is again often disturbed by transitions from south to north. From Khorāsān and its frontier provinces [“marches”, V.M.], among which figure Sīstān and the provinces along the Hilmand, the author passes to the north, to Transoxiana and its frontier provinces. No special chapter is devoted to the desert Karaskūh [read: Kargas-kūh, V.M.], i.e. the “Khorasan desert” of Balkhī–Iṣṭakhri.¹ Then follows the description of the southern provinces: Sind, Kirmān, Fārs, Khūzistān. From Khūzistān again a transition is made to the north, to the Jībāl and Daylamān (plural of Daylam). The latter comprises all the provinces along the southern and south-eastern shore of the Caspian, including the province Kūmish (Qūmis of the Arab geographers), with Bistām, Damghan, and Simnān. Rayy, with Khwār and Qazvīn, is included in the Jībāl, and not, as in Balkhī–Iṣṭakhri,² in Daylam. Rayy is called “the residence of the king of the Jībāl” (f. 29a). Not until after this digression does a description of ʿIrāq, lying to the west of Khūzistān, follow; then again comes the description of northern provinces: Jazīra, Ādharbayjān, Armenia, and Arrān. As in Balkhī–Iṣṭakhri, the description of the last three provinces is united in a single chapter, in the following order: Armenia, Arrān, Ādharbayjān,³ though one would have expected to see Arrān before Armenia. The other provinces of the Muslim world are: Arabia, Syria, Egypt, Maghrib, and Spain (Andalus).

Khorāsān, Transoxiana, and their frontier provinces are described with more detail than the other parts of the Muslim world, because the author’s materials on them were the most detailed. But he shows no such partiality to the eastern provinces as would be detrimental to the western ones, and there are no eastern provinces or towns among those to which, in some respects, an exceptional place is ascribed in the whole of the Muslim world. Khorāsān is placed near

¹ BGA, i, 227. ² Ibid., p. 207. ³ Ibid., p. 180 [But v.i., p. 142].
the centre of the inhabited world (f. 19a) but 'Irāq near the centre of the world in general. 'Irāq was the most prosperous1 province of the Muslim world, Bağḥād the most prosperous town, and Wāsiṭ the most pleasant town in 'Irāq (f. 31a). The most pleasant countries in Islam were Ādhārbaŷjān, Armenia, and Arrān (f. 32b), a statement which was probably borrowed from the same source as that from which the data on the Caspian provinces in general were derived. The noblest town of the world is Mekka, the birth-place of the Prophet and the House of God. Mekka was built by Adam; its construction was completed by Abraham; from Adam's time God has loved this house (the Ka'ba, f. 33b). The first town built after the Flood was Ṣan‘ā in Yemen (f. 34a). The chief town of the province of 'Oman,2 Şoḥār (the name of this town has been for some reason replaced by the name of the province), is the storehouse for goods from all over the world; there is no other town where merchants are richer; all the merchandise from east, west, south, and north is brought to this town and from here re-exported. In Khūzistān prosperity3 is greater than in any of the neighbouring provinces (f. 28b). Egypt is the richest country of the Muslim world; Fustāṭ (Cairo) the richest town of the world (f. 35a–b). The Egyptian pyramids were built by Hermes even before the Flood. The length, width, and height of each of the two large pyramids equalled 400 arash (a comparison of this passage with the text of Ibn Khurdādhbih+ shows that the Persian arash corresponds to the Arabic dhirā'). Sometimes the author mentions an edifice as having an exceptional significance for the whole world, whereas in his source (Balkh–Iṣṭakhri) this remark is made only with regard to the Muslim world. In the passages on the Christian church in Edessa (Ruḥā, f. 32a), and on the large bridge over the Euphrates (f. 34b), the words

---

1 The Persian term ābādhān does not easily lend itself to translation; it points to a state of inhabitedness and prosperity, as contrasting with the state of desolation, though without reference to a large number of inhabitants; cf. f. 34b, on two towns of the Mesopotamian frontier zone: ābādhān wa kammarudum. [I translate ābādhān by the neutral term "prosperous". See on all these terms Index E. V.M.]

2 In the MS, everywhere wrongly 'Ommān instead of 'Oman.

3 In the text bisydr-mī'mat-tar. In the Ḥudūd al-ʿālam the terms mī'mat and khvāsta are often juxtaposed but not as synonyms. That mī'mat and khvāsta are not one and the same thing, may be seen from the fact that in a country there may be little mī'mat and much khvāsta (f. 16b) and contrariwise (f. 37a). Apparently the word mī'mat refers to the general level of prosperity and wealth, and khvāsta, to the separate sources of prosperity or income, as for instance cattle: cf. f. 16b above, on the inhabitants of a Tibetan province: "their khvāsta are sheep." [See Index E. V.M.]

4 BGA, vi, 159a. Therefrom, too, are borrowed the words about the inscription [but not the wording of it. V.M.]
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andar hama jihān correspond to ʻIṣṭakhrī's fil-Islām or fi bilād al-Islām.

Everywhere careful attention is paid to what goods are exported from a given place and what localities have a particular importance in trade. Such details will undoubtedly complete in many respects what we already know from Arabic geographical literature on the various branches of industry in the Muslim world. These data might form the subject of a special treatise but unfortunately the interesting terms will not always be found in dictionaries.²

Often occurs the expression “place of merchants” (jay-i bāzargānān [present-day pronunciation bāzurgān, V.M.] or jayagāh-i bāzargānān);³ thus are called whole provinces, e.g. Transoxiana (f. 22b), and separate towns; only in the chapters on Mesopotamia, Syria, Egypt, and Spain merchants are not mentioned, though with regard to Syria it is said that to it are brought all the goods imported from Maghrib, Egypt, Byzantium, and Spain (f. 34b). Single localities and towns are mentioned as gates (dar) into, or as store-places (bārgāh and bārkadha) of, some particular country. The situation of a town or of a locality on a given route is also mentioned, but only in the chapters on the eastern provinces; of the pilgrim routes to Mekka, the only one that merits the author’s attention is that of the Khorāsān pilgrims (f. 29a).⁴

Samarqand was a resort of merchants from all over the world (f. 23a), as were also Isfījāb (f. 24b where for the word jay is substituted the word ma’dān), and the port of Abaskūn (f. 29b) on the Caspian Sea at the mouth of the Gūrgān. The name of “Gates of Turkistān” is given to the whole of Transoxiana (f. 22b), to Khorāsān (f. 19a), and separately to Farghāna (f. 23b) and to the town of Gūrgānj (f. 25b) in Khuwārizm. The capital of Khuwārizm, Kāth (spelt: Kāsh) was “the gate to the Ghūz Turks (read: Turkān instead of Turkistān) and the store-place of the Turks, Turkistān, Transoxania, and the Khazars”. About the province of Isfījāb it is said that “whatever is produced in any place of Turkistān is brought here” (f. 24b); the town of Ṣabrān, or Ṣaurān, was “the place of the Ghūz merchants” (ibid.). The situation of Karmīna, Dābūsiya, and Rābinjan on the way (from Bukhārā) to Samarqand is specially mentioned (ff. 22b–23a). The small town Bāsānd⁵ in Chaghāniyān was “the

¹ p. 62 (the bridge) and p. 76 (the church).
² [See Index D.]
³ Or sometimes bāzargānān bīxyār, meaning that at a given place there are numerous merchants.
⁴ The Khorāsān pilgrims went via Baghdād; this may account for the mention of Ḍadisiya “on the way of the pilgrims” (f. 31b).
⁵ On it see my Turkestan, p. 76; English ed., p. 74.
place of paupers, though with abundant riches”; paupers were also the inhabitants of the town of Chaghāniyān (ibid.). Other “places of paupers” were the small town of Sakalkand or Iskalkand1 in the mountains of Hindūkūsh (f. 21b) and, as now, the Zarafshān mountains (f. 23b). The expressions “highway” (shāhrāh) and “highway of caravans” are used only with reference to the road from Marwarrūd to Balkh, through Faryāb and Shapūrqān (or Ushpūrqān, f. 21a).2 The store-house of Balkh was, however, the principal town of Gūzgān, Anbīr (or Anbār, ibid.), situated away from the above-mentioned road. The store-houses of India were Balkh (ibid.) and Lamghān, i.e. Laghmān (f. 16a); the gates to India were Bust on the Hilmand (f. 22a) and Parvān near the Hindūkūsh (f. 22b). To Andarāb near the Hindūkūsh was brought the silver from the mines of Panjhir and Jāriyāba and here drīhams were coined from it (f. 21b). On the frontier of Vakhān there was a village that was called “the gate of Tibet” where was a Muslim customs and guard-post (f. 23b). Several towns of Vakhān are enumerated, and as the last place in the limits of Transoxiana is named the large village Samarqandāq (“Little Samarqand”), where live Hindus, Tibetans, Vakhānians (Vakhī), and Muslims (ibid.); here, too, is described Bolor (Kāfīristān), a locality not mentioned by the Arab geographers. Sind was not a rich province, but there were many merchants in it and several of its towns carried on sea-trade (f. 26a).

From Khorāsān is mentioned the road to Rayy through Bahmanābād and Mazīnān and the road to Gurgān through Jājarm; Jājarm was the store-house of Gurgān (f. 19b). Several industrial and commercial towns are mentioned in the Caspian provinces; an interesting description is given of Fīrīm (or Firīm), principal town of the mountain province Qārin.3 In the detailed and precise description of the Caspian provinces is to be found a striking absurdity: the words of the Qur’ān (xviii, 78), concerning the ruler who seized every ship by force, are applied to the continental town of Ahar in Ādharbaijān ff. 32b–33a). The legend, as in Ištakhri,4 refers to the dynasty of the Julandids, but Ištakhri has in mind not the principal branch of the dynasty, which ruled in ‘Omān,5 but the “family of ‘Umāra”, P 28

1 The pronunciation in Yāqūt, i, 254, and iii, 108; cf. BGA, i, 275d.
2 Narshakhi, ed. Schefer, p. 115, uses the expression shāhrāh with regard to the Bukhārā–Samarqand road.
3 Cf. my Historico-geographical sketch of Iran, SPb. 1901, p. 155. [See the translation of f. 30a-b. V.M.]
4 BGA, i, 140.
which possessed the district on the coast of Fārs, on the Kirmān frontier. This district is also mentioned by our author (f. 27b) who calls it "a place of fishermen and a haunt of merchants". It is incomprehensible why the words on the Julandids and the Qor'ānic legend should have been transferred from one place to the other, to which they evidently can have no reference. Another evident and incomprehensible mistake occurs at the end of the chapter on Ṭrāq (f. 13b), where it is said that the construction of the small towns of Karkh and Dūr (in the text by mistake Dwn), near Sāmarrā was begun by Mu'tasim (833–42), and completed by Ma'mūn (A.D. 813–33).

Store-places were: in Kirmān, Hurmuz (f. 26b); in Fārs, Sīrāf, and Māhīrūbān (or Māhrūbān, f. 27b);¹ in Khūzistān, Sūs (f. 28b, here and in other passages—Shūsh). Consequently in Kirmān and Fārs such significance was attributed to sea-side towns, and in Khūzistān to a continental one. Yemen (f. 24a) is described in much greater detail than by Ištakhri: enough to say that the town of Zabīd, which according to our author occupied the second place after Ṣanʿā, is not mentioned at all² in Ištakhri.

The westernmost town ["land", V.M.] of the inhabited world was "Sūs-the-Distant" (Sūs al-aqṣā, f. 36b). Innumerable quantities of gold were found there; the people by their customs hardly resembled men; foreigners seldom penetrated there. The chief object of export from the Berber country were panthers (or leopards, palang); the Berbers hunted them and brought their pelts for sale into Muslim towns.

VII

From Spain the author again passes to the non-Muslim provinces, first of all to Byzantium, information on which is mostly borrowed from Ibn Khurdādbehīb. The following remark is curious (f. 37a): "In Rūm (Byzantium) there are ancient towns; formerly there were many towns, now there are few." A series of misunderstandings is explained partly by the careless rendering of the Arabic text, and partly by the fact that the author, as usual, did not discriminate between information borrowed from various sources. Ibn-Khurdādbehīb³ says that Thrace (Ṭrāqiyā) is situated "beyond Constanti-nople, on the side of the country of the Burjāns" (Danube Bulgars); in our author the name B.rqiya, i.e. Ṭrāqiyā, is given to the town⁴ of

¹ On this town see BGA, i, 29c; Yāqūt, iv, 699.
² According to Maqdisī, Zabīd was "the Baghdad of Yemen" and only by its size was inferior to Ṣanʿā, which was in a state of decadence, BGA, iii, 84 and 86. ³ BGA, vi, 109, above. ⁴ ["Land"? V.M.]
the Burjāns. To the north-west of Rūm the author places the Bulgars (Bulgārī), not noticing that they are identical with the Burjāns whom he has just named. As distinct from the Bulgars are named, but not described, “the Slavs who have accepted Christianity”, who paid tribute to the emperor of Byzantium. The country of Rūm extended to the Western Ocean, where on the south it bordered upon Spain. The Franks and the peoples living between the Franks and Spain, are described with less detail than by Ištakhri. Rome is included in the Frank country. As already explained, the information on Britain as a store-house of Rūm and Spain stands isolated. The deformation of Balkhī–Ištakhri’s report on the Greeks and Athens has been noted above, p. 21.

The subsequent chapters, those concerning the Slavs and the Rūs (ff. 37b–38b), the text of which has been edited by Toumanskyy, give little that is new. The chapter on the Rūs forms a characteristic example of the indiscriminate amalgamation of data pertaining to different periods; one finds the report probably derived from Ibn Khurdādhbih about a single Russian khāqān, side by side with that about three independent Russian towns, taken probably from Ibn Fadlān. The fact that our author places the said three towns on the same river Rūs seems to result from an arbitrary combination by him of his sources. By the river Rūs in the present case is probably meant not the Volga in its upper course, above its junction with the Kama, as supposed by Toumanskyy, but the Don. The next people after the Rūs are “the Inner Bulgars”, in whom Marquart sees the Danube Bulgars, and Westberg the Black Bulgars who, according to the Russian Chronicle and to Constantine Porphyrogenetos, occupied the Don and the Azov Sea. It would be hardly expedient to attempt to analyse these hypotheses, founded as they are on the evidently insufficient and fragmentary information which has come down to us, especially in view of the fact that the author has blended together data belonging to different periods and in spite of the scarcity of his

1 This passage has been edited by Toumanskyy, ZVO, x, 132; translation and notes, 134. Under the influence of the record on an aqueduct coming, BGA, vii, 12619, “from the town called Bolghar” (the aqueduct near the village Belgrad) the Arabs imagined a river flowing from Bulgaria through Thrace and falling into the Bosphorus.  

2 BGA, i, 43.  

3 Ibid., p. 70.  

4 Solely to an unhappy conjecture of Toumanskyy is due a detail, not to be found in the text, viz. “that in one of their (Rūs) tribes there are Mirvats”, ZVO, x, 136, note 3. The word mrvat of the text (va andar ġūrūh az īšān mrvvat-as) is probably the translation of the Arabic ṭulaj (BGA, vii, 14614).  

5 ZVO, x, 137, note.  

6 BGA, ii, 27b.  

7 J. Marquart, Osteuropäische und osstaisische Streifzüge, Leipzig, 1903, p. 517.  

8 Journal of the Ministry of Public Instruction (JMNP), N.S., xiii, p. 387 and sq. (in Russian).
information, has tried, with illusory exactitude, to fix the geographical situation of the countries and towns which he enumerates. There are seemingly no contradictions in his system, but this system can hardly have ever corresponded to the actual facts.

The country of the Sarîr (i.e. that of the Avars), which on the west was bounded by Byzantium, was in the south conterminous with the Muslim possessions in the Caucasus, i.e. with Darband and southern Daghestan,¹ and not with Armenia, as our author takes it. To the north and west of the Sarîr lived the Alâns whose land adjoined Byzantium and not the Muslim possessions; to the north the Alân land extended to the Black (or Azov) Sea and to the possessions of the Khazarian Pechenegs. The latter, who were the northern neighbours of the Alâns, are the first people mentioned to the east, and not to the south, of the Black Sea; their eastern frontier was the "Khazar mountains", i.e. the mountains which, in the author's opinion, constituted the western frontier of the Khazar country; in his conception (f. 8a) the mountains stretched west of the Caspian Sea, between the possessions of the Sarîr and the Khazars, as far as the beginning of Alân territory, whence they followed a northern direction to the end of the Khazar country, then passed between the lands of the Khazarian Pechenegs, those of the Inner Bulgars and those of the Rûs (the text here is not quite correct), to the limits of the Slavs, then followed a northern direction passing through the middle of the Slav possessions and skirting the Slav town of Khurdâb² until they reached the end of the Slav country. To the west of the (probably the same) mountains, to the north of the Black Sea and to the north-west of the Khazarian Pechenegs lived the Mirvât (the Khazarian Pechenegs were for them partly eastern, partly southern neighbours); on the west, too, the Mirvât adjoined the Black Sea. To the north-west of the Mirvât and also to the north of the Black Sea, lived the Inner Bulgars whose land on the north reached the "Russian mountains". The westernmost country on the northern shore of the Black Sea was that of the Slavs, conterminous to the south with Byzantium. The eastern neighbours of the Slavs, besides the Inner Bulgars, were the Rûs; on the north and west, the Slav country marched with the 'Uninhabited Deserts of the north'. With the same deserts was conterminous on the north the Rûs country, which to the south extended down to the Danube, on which stood the capital of the Slavs, Khurdâb.³

¹ Cf. Enc. of Islam, Barthold, Da-ghestân.
² On this town, cf. the equally un-founded hypotheses of Marquart, Streif-züge, p. 471, and Westberg, JMNP, i.e., p. 12.
³ [Cf. § 6, 45. V.M.]
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On the other hand, on its north-east¹ the country of the Sarīr marched with that of the Khazars; the latter on their east had “a wall between the mountains and the sea, the sea and a part of the river Itil” (f. 38b). Among the Khazar lands are counted Ṭūlās and Lūghar, but their situation is not indicated; according to Ibn Rusta² thus were called the peoples living on one of the outskirts of the Khazar country, near the high mountains which stretch to Tiflis. Marquart³ endeavours to prove that Ibn Rusta’s Ṭūlās correspond to the Nandars (or Vanandars) of both the Toumansky MS. and Gardizī, and likewise that the Lūghar correspond to the Mirvāt, the name Lūghar itself being a distortion of Aughaz, or (with the article) al-Aughāz, by which are meant the Abkhāz.⁴ Meanwhile he (Marquart) thinks that in the source common to the Hudūd al-‘Ālam and Gardizī the information about these peoples had been confused, and that the Nandar, who according to their description correspond to the Alāns, received the name of Abkhāz.

الابربخز (through an intermediate form (إيكر) and مراد (طلاس) طللس). All this is, of course, more than questionable, and since the Ṭūlās and Lūghar are mentioned in the Toumansky MS. separately from the Mirvāt and the Nandar, these theories become still less likely.

North of the Khazars, and west of the Volga, lived the Barādhās, and west of the latter the Vanandar. East of the Volga lived the Burṭās,⁶ and north of the Burṭās and the Barādhās lived the Turkish Pechenegs, while north of the Vanandar were the Magyars. Gardizī adds⁵ that the Nandar (Vanandar) were separated from the Magyars by the Danube and that from their (northern?) bank the Magyars could see the Nandar. On the bank of the river stood a mountain and from its slope a water descended; beyond the mountain lived the Mirdāt (Mirvāt); between their province and that of the Nandar there was a distance of ten days’ journey. The neighbours of the Burṭās on the south-east were the Central-Asian Ghūz. Of the Bulgars it is only said that they lived on the Itil, with no explanation about their neighbours.

¹ The author speaks only of the north; to the west of the Khazar country were “mountains”.
² BGA, vii, 139a.
³ Streifswüge, pp. 31, 176, and 496.
⁴ Westberg, l.c., p. 388, was also inclined to consider the Mirvāt as Abkhāz.
⁵ V. Barthold, Report, p. 98 (text) and p. 122 (transl.). To the Danube (Dūnā) apparently refer the words of our author about the river, the name of which in our MS. can be read Rūtā or Rūṭhā, ZVO, x, 135, note 11. On the different names of the Danube in Arabic literature, cf. BGA, viii, 67, note 6.
⁶ [Instead of Burṭās (§ 51) read: Bulghār, as suggested by Barthold in an additional note. V.J., p. 459.]
Of the Pechenegs and other peoples considered as Turks, inclusive of the Magyars, information is given elsewhere, as we have seen. The northern outskirts of the Inhabited World begin in the east with the land of the Qirghiz (Khirkhis), whose neighbours on the west were the Kimak, who in their turn had as neighbours the Qipchaq (Khifjak, f. 18b). But meanwhile it is mentioned (f. 19a) that the Qipchaq country on all sides, with the exception of the south, where it adjoined the Pechenegs country, marched with the northern desert. Of the Pechenegs it is said that their neighbours to the east were the Ghuz; to the south, the Burfas and the Baradhas; to the west, the Magyars and the Rūs; to the north the Danube formed their frontier, provided that this river is identical with the river Rūtą, or Rūthā (f. 19a). From this summary it may be seen that, in addition to the erroneous location of the Pechenegs too far to the north (on the middle course of the Volga where they have never been), all the information on their old and new territories is jumbled together, notwithstanding the fact that their migration is mentioned in the text (f. 38a, chapter 47). The southern neighbours of the Magyars were the Vanandar, their western and northern neighbours, the Rūs; of the eastern side it is only said that a mountain was found there.

In spite of the uncertainty of these data, it does not seem superfluous, in view of the attention which this part of the Toumansky MS. has already attracted, to give a full translation of the corresponding chapters, from the place where Toumansky stopped (f. 38a), to the end of the section on the northern part of the inhabited world (f. 38b below), save for the information of the frontiers that has been separately treated above.

[We omit the translation of ff. 38a–38b which will be found at the proper place in the text. V. V. Barthold concludes his Preface as follows:]

P 32 The translation of this short fragment shows that the pronunciation of several names could not be established. A great number of geographical names of which the reading remains unknown is the principal reason that has made me renounce the attempt to give a full translation of the MS., and limit myself to the present Preface in which I do not touch upon the outward aspect of the MS., as these details have already been given by Toumansky [see my Preface, V.M.].

1 [Read: Bulghar. V.M.] 2 [Very doubtful. V.M.] 3 For a detailed survey and explanation of the data quoted by Barthold on pp. 42–4, see my notes to §§ 46, 53, &c. V.M.]
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[§ 1. Prefatory]

WITH bliss and happiness (bil-yumma wal-sa'āda)! Thanks (sipās) be to God, the Almighty (tuwa'ānā), Eternal (jā'īdīh), Creator of the World, Opener of difficulties (gushāyand-ī kār-hā), guiding his slaves and manifesting himself (khwāish-numā) through different sciences; and ample praises (durtūdī) upon Muḥammad and prophets all!

Owing to the glory, victory, and auspiciousness (nik-akhtārī) of the Prince Lord Malik the Just Abul-Ḥārīth Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥaṭiḥ the Commander of the Faithful, may God prolong his existence, and owing to the felicity of his days, we have begun this book about the properties of the Earth (andar ʿīfāt-i zamān) in the year 372 from the Prophet’s emigration, on him be God’s blessings. In it we have brought to light (paydāh kārdīn) the properties of the Earth and its disposition (nihādīh), and the amount of its cultivation and its lack of cultivation. We have also brought to light all the countries and kingdoms (spelt: pādshāh-hā) of the Earth, so far (ānch) as they have become known until now, and the state of each different people found in those lands, and the customs of their kings, as they exist in our times, and everything that comes forth from those lands.

We have brought to light every land (shahr) of the world of which we have found information in the books of (our) predecessors (pishtmānān) and in the memories (*yādkird?) of the sages, with particulars of that land as regards its greatness or smallness, its deficiency or abundance of amenities (ni'mat), wealth (khwāsta), and populations, and its cultivation or lack of the same; also, the disposition (nihādīh) of every land with regard to mountains, rivers, seas, and deserts, and all the products coming forth from it.

We have brought to light the disposition (nihādīh) of the seas all through the world, their broad and narrow (khurd va buzurg) places and the lagoons (murdāb), which are called gulfs (khalif), with each thing coming forth from that sea.

We have brought to light all the great islands with their cultivated and desolate places (ābdadhān va virān-ī vay) and the state of their people and all their products.

We have also brought to light all the principal (aša) mountains of the world and their manifold mines and the animals existing there.

We have also brought to light all the great rivers of the world, from where they rise till where they fall into the sea or are used for

1 V.i., p. 145, l. 29.  2 Construction: all the rivers that are great in the world.
agriculture (kisht[u]-barz), more especially those rivers which ships can navigate (gudhashstan); (and we have mentioned only the great rivers) because (az ʾān-k) of the small rivers the number is not known (paddhidh).

We have also brought to light all the deserts and sands which are notorious in the world, with their extension and breadth.

§ 2. Discourse on the disposition (nihādḥ) of the Earth with regard (az) to its cultivation or lack of cultivation

1. The Earth is round (gird) as a sphere (gūʾi) and the firmament enfolds it turning on two poles (falak muḥīt-ast bar vay gardān bar du quth), of which the one is the North Pole and the other the South Pole.

2. If on any sphere (har gūʾi ki bāshadḥ) you trace two large circles (dāyira) intersecting one another at right angles (zāwiya-yi qāʿima), those two circles will cut that sphere into four parts. The Earth is likewise divided into four parts by two circles, of which the one is called Horizon (dāʿirat al-ʿafāq) and the other Equator (khaṭṭ al-istiwā). As regards the Horizon, it starts from the eastern parts (nāḥiyat), passes by the limit of the inhabited lands (ābādḥānī) of the Earth, which (is) at the South Pole; then it passes by the western parts until it reaches again the East (bās mashriq rasadḥ). And this circle is the one which separates this visible (zāhīr) inhabited (ābādḥān) half of the Earth from the other hidden (pāshidḥa) half which is beneath us. The Equator is a circle which starts from the eastern limit (ḥadd) and follows the middle of the Earth by the line farthest distant [equidistant] from both poles until it reaches the West, and it goes on in the same way until it comes back to the East.

3. Within the northern quarter, the inhabited lands (ābādḥānī) lie in that half (of it) which adjoins the Equator. And there are also some inhabited lands in the southern quarter, in the half (of it) adjoining the Equator. The amount of the inhabited lands of the North is: 63 degrees of breadth by 180 degrees of length (darūznā), because (az ʾān-k) the largest (mihtarīn) circle traceable round the Earth (gird-i zamīn bar gardadh) is of 360 degrees. The measure of the inhabited lands lying in the southern parts (nāḥiyat) is somewhat over 17 degrees by 180 degrees. The measure of the area (masāḥa) of these two (har du) forms one-ninth of the whole of the Earth (nuh bahr-i hama-yi zamīn). All the cities of the world, the different kingdoms (spelt: pādshāy-hā), the seas, the mountains, and the rivers and (in general) all the places possessing animals (jānavar) and fishes are within this ninth part (nuh yak) of the Earth which we have mentioned.
§ 2–3

"The Regions of the World"

4. In the eastern region (nāhiyat) the farthest lying city is the
capital (qasaba) of China (Chinistān) called Khumdān on the shore
of the Green Sea (daryā-yi sabz). The Greeks (Rūmiyān) call this
sea the Eastern Ocean (uqiyānūs-i mashriqi) and the Arabs (tāsiyān)
the Green Sea (bahr al-akhdar). And so Aristotle says in the book
Āthār-i 'Ulūwī ("Meteorologica") that this sea surrounds the Earth like
the Horizon and ships cannot work in this sea | and nobody has
2 b crossed it (buridha) and it is unknown where it ends. And on the whole
stretch of the inhabited zone (har chand ki ābdhānī-st) the people
see that sea but cannot cross it in a ship, except for a very short
distance from the inhabited places.

On the other hand, the farthest of the lands (shahr-hā) of the
western parts (nāhiyat) is called Sus-the-Distant (and is situated) on
the shore of a sea called the Western Ocean. The latter's water
resembles that of the Eastern Ocean as regards the colour, taste, and
smell. Likewise on the whole stretch of the inhabited zone in the
West, both in the northern and southern direction (nāhiyat), the said
sea adjoins them, and the inhabitants can cross in ships only the
part of it lying close to the inhabited lands.

Consequently the people judging by analogy (qiyyās) said that the
two seas were one (ocean) which surrounds the Earth on the East and
West and passes by the two poles. And on account of this ocean
(daryā) no one knows anything about what there is in that other
(invisible) half (nīma).

5. As regards the Equator, it passes through the said half (in its)
largest extension (?)(in nīma-yi bīghtarin) across the Great Sea.
North of the Equator the inhabited lands stretch for 63 degrees;
farther on the animals cannot live in view of the intensity of the
cold that prevails there up to the North Pole.

As regards the region lying south of the Equator some parts of it
are (occupied by) the sea, and, moreover, great heat prevails there
(va dīgar sakht garmā-st) and the people of those regions are more
removed from the character of humanity (ṭab'-i mārdī). They are
Zangīs, Abyssinians, and the like. And farther on, down to the
South Pole, no one can live on account of the excess of heat. Assist-
tance (taufiq) is from God!

§ 3. Discourse on the disposition of the Seas and Gulfs2

1. The first is the Green Sea, which we have named the Eastern
Ocean. Its extension (hadd), so far as it is known, is from the extreme

1 V.s., p. 50. ll. 28–9? 2 Khalfī means both "gulf" and "strait".
limit (akhir) of cultivation (‘imarat) in the south down to the Equator, 
the island Wāqwāq, the lands of Wāqwāq, the country (nāhiyat) of 
Chīnīstān, and the confines of the lands (karāna-yi shahr-hā) of the 
Toghuuzghuz and Khirkhīz. This sea has no known gulfs (straits).

2. The other sea is the WESTERN OCEAN. Its extension, so far 
(an-k) as it is known, is from the extreme limit of the countries 
of the Sūdān, the Maghrib, and Sūs-the-Distant, up to the Rūmī Strait 
(khalij), up to the extreme limit of the countries of Rūm and 
Ṣaqlāb and up to the Tūlī (i.e. Thule) Island. This sea has a strait 
through which it joins the Rūmī Sea.

3. Another large sea is the one called the GREAT SEA (Bahṛ al-
A‘zām). Its eastern limit adjoins the sea (called) the Eastern Ocean, 
and about one-third (miqdār-i si-yahū) of the Equator stretches across 
this sea. Its northern limit starts from China (Chīn), skirts the 
countries of Hindūstān and Sīnd, and the boundaries (hudūd) of Kir-
mān, Fārs, Khūzistān and Šaymara [sic]. The southern limit of this 
sea begins at the Jabal al-Ṭā’in, skirts the country (nāhiyat) of 
Zābaj and reaches that of Zangīstān and Abyssinia. The western 
limit of this sea is a gulf which surrounds all the Arab country 
(gird-i hama-yi nāhiyat-i ‘Arab andar gardadh).

This sea has five gulfs: (a) One of them begins (bar dāradh) from 
the limits of Abyssinia and stretches westward; off (barābar) the 
Sūdān it is called the BARBARI GULF. (b) Another gulf (which) adjoins 
it, takes a northern direction ([ba] nāhiyat-i shamāl furūdāh āyadī) up 
to the confines (hudūd) of Egypt, growing narrow till (tā ānjā-kī) it 
becomes one mile (mil); it is called the ARABIAN GULF (khalij-i 
‘Arabi), or the GULF OF AYLA (spelt: Ḩala), or GULZUM. (c) The third 
gulf starts (bar giradh) from the frontiers of Fārs and stretches in a 
north-western direction until the distance between it and the Gulf 
of Ayla amounts to 16 stages (mansīl) on swift camels (bar jammāsa); 
it is called the GULF OF ‘IRAQ. All the Arab lands lie between these two 
gulfs, i.e. the Gulf of Ayla and that of ‘Irāq. (d) The fourth gulf is that 
of Fārs which starts from the limit (hadd) of Fārs, where it has a 
small breadth, and extends to the frontiers of Sīnd. (e) The fifth | 

3a gulf starts from the country of Hindūstān and becomes a gulf while 
taking a northern direction; it is called INDIAN GULF (khalij-i hindū’i).

Each portion of the Great Sea is called after the towns and countries 
(nāhiyat) which adjoin it, e.g. (chīnān-k) the sea of Fārs, the sea of Baṣrā, 
the sea of ‘Omān (spelt: ‘ommān), the sea of Zangīstān, the Indian Sea, 
and the like. And this sea is the mine of all precious things (gauhar) coming forth from the sea. Its length is 8,000 miles, and its breadth

1 Cf. § 7, 10.
2 Cf. p. 86, l. 25.
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varies in each place. In this sea, from the limit of Quiltum down to
the limit of Chinistān, ebb and flow take place twice during the period
of day and night. The flow (madd) is (when) the water swells and
rises higher (bartr), and the ebb (jazr) is (when) the water decreases
(bikāhadh) and falls lower. In no other sea do the ebb and flow exist,
except by the increase and decrease of water in the rivers.

4. Another (sea) is the Rūm Sea (daryā-ya Rūmiyān) in the western
parts. The form of that sea is conical (sīnaubar). Its western limit
adjoins the Western Ocean; on its northern coast lie the countries of
Spain (Andalus), the Franks (Ifranja), and the Byzantines (Rūmiyān);
on its eastern coast lie the towns of Armenia and some parts of Rūm;
on its southern limit are the towns of Syria, Egypt, Africa, and
Tangier. This sea has two straits, of which the one serves to connect
it with the Ocean, and the other, similar to a river, traverses the
middle of Rūm, skirts (kanāra) Constantinople and reaches the sea
of the Georgians (Gurziyān). And there is no sea round which
lie lands more prosperous (ābādhāntar). The length of this sea is
4,000 miles and its breadth is various. The greatest breadth of the
strait (khalij) of Constantinople is 4 miles, and the narrowest (bāriktarīn)
part of the western strait (khalij) is 10 farsakhs and from the
one shore the other is visible.

5. Another sea is the Sea of the Khazars. Its eastern side
(nāhiyat) is a desert adjoining the Ghūz and Khwarazm. Its northern
side (adjoins) the Ghūz and some of the Khazars. Its western side
adjoins the towns of the Khazars and of Ādharbādhaqān. Its southern
side adjoins the towns of Gilān, Daylamān, Tabaristan, and Gurgān.
This sea has no straits (khalij). Its length is 400 farsangs with a
breadth of 400 farsangs. It produces nothing but fish.

6. Another sea is that of the Georgians (Gurziyān) and it is called
Bontos (Black Sea). Its eastern limit is formed by the confines of the
Alāns (al-Lān); its northern limit is formed by the places
(occupied by) the Pechenegs (Bajanāk), the Khazars, the Mirvāts,
the Inner Bulghārs, and the Šaqlābs; its western limit is the country
(nāhiyat) of the Burjāns; on its southern limit lies the country of
Rūm. Its length is 1,300 miles with a breadth of 350 miles.

7. Another sea is that of Khwarazm which is situated at a distance
of 40 farsangs in the north-western direction from (the town of)
Khwarazm. All round it are the places of the Ghūz. The circuit
(gird-bar-gird) of the sea is 300 farsangs.

These are the seven seas. And outside (birūn as) these there are
numerous lakes (daryā-yak), sweet (fresh) and bitter (salt?).
The lakes which are salt (shūr) are eleven: the first is 8. MAEOTIS (Māwīṣ, “the Azov1 sea”) at the extreme limit of the Ṣaqlābbs towards the North. Its length is 100 farsangs with a breadth of 30 farsangs. From the Sea of the Georgians a strait (khālīf) joins it. And from this same sea a strait joins the Western Ocean.2 Round it (i.e., Maeotis) lie desolate places (wīrānī). 9. The second is the lake KABUDHĀN in Armenia. Its length is 50 farsangs with a breadth of 30 farsangs. In the middle of this lake is the village Kabūdhān and this lake is called after it. The lands round it are inhabited. In the lake on account of the saltiness (shūri) of its water there are no animals except worms. 10. The third is the DEAD SEA (daryā-yi murda) in Syria in which there is absolutely (albatī) no animal (life), on account of the bitterness of its water. Its length is three days’ journey and its breadth two days’ journey. 11. The fourth is the lake NAWYṬA (*Fārīṭa?) in Rūm. Its length is three days’ journey and its breadth two days’ journey. Round it lie inhabited lands (ābādhiyānī) and it has plenty of fish. 12. The fifth is the lake MYMĀṬY (Smāṭy?), also in Rūm. Its length is three days’ journey and its breadth one day’s journey. Round it are inhabited lands. It has plenty of fish and it is said that it has also water-horses. 13. The sixth is the lake YŪN in Pārs near Kāzrūn, 10 farsangs long and 8 farsangs broad. Round it lie inhabited lands and it has many useful products (manāfiʾ). 14. The seventh is the lake BĀSAFAHRĪ (*Bāṣaʃīya) in Pārs near Shīrāz, 8 farsangs long and 7 farsangs broad. Round it lie inhabited lands (but) it has little utility (kam-manfaʾat). 15. The eighth is the lake J.NKĀN in Pārs, 12 farsangs long and 10 farsangs broad. It has some useful products and round it are inhabited lands. 16. The ninth is the lake *BIJAGĀN [now: Bakhtīqān] in Pārs, 20 farsangs long, 15 farsangs broad. In it salt is formed (namak bandadh) and round it are the places inhabited by wild beasts; from it rises (bigushāyadh) a spring towards the limits (hudūd) of Dārāgird and it continues (hamī-ravadh) until it reaches the sea. 17. The tenth is *TURZ-KUL (spelt: Taus-kūk) in (the land) of the Khallukh. It is 10 farsangs long and 8 farsangs broad. In it salt is formed (and) from it comes salt for seven Khallukhian tribes (qabilat). 18. The eleventh is *ISSI-KUL (spelt: Ayskūk) between the Chigil and the Toghusghuz. It is 30 farsangs long and 20 farsangs broad. The town Barskhān is on its shore.

The number of the lakes with fresh water is not known. Some (bahrī) are called lakes (daryā) and some swamps (batīha). Among those called lakes seven are well-known. 19. The lake in Egypt called BUḤAYRA TINNĪS is joined to the sea of Rūm and the river Nile flows

1 Confused with the Baltic? V.1, p. 181.
2 Cf. § 4, 25.
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into it. This lake in summer is fresh, but in winter when (the water) of the Nile is low (rūdh-i Nil andaki buvadh) it grows salt. In the middle of this lake are two towns, the one Tinīs (spelt: Tinai) and the other Dimyāt. All the costly textiles (jāma) exported from Egypt come from these two towns. This lake is 15 farsangs long and 11 farsangs broad. 20. The lake of Tiberias (Ṭabariya) is in Syria. It is 12 farsangs long and 7 farsangs broad. 21. The lake of *Nicaea (spelt: T.ṇṭiya, <*Niqiya) in Rūm. Round it are inhabited lands. It is 8 farsangs long and 5 farsangs broad. 22. The lake Riyas [sic] in Rūm. Round it are inhabited lands. It is 5 farsangs long and 5 farsangs broad. 23. The lake Arzan (*Arzan) in Pārs, near Shīrāz. The fish of Shīrāz are from this lake. It is 10 farsangs long and 8 farsangs broad. 24. The lake Zarah in Sīstān. Round it are inhabited lands and villages, except on the side which adjoins the desert (ba biyābān bās dāradh). It is 30 farsangs long and 7 farsangs broad. It happens sometimes (gāh buvadh) that the water of this lake Zarah (grows) so much (chandān) that the rivers rising from it overflow into the province of Kirmān (ba Kirmān bigudharadh) and form an enormous lake. 25. The Daryāzha lying within the limits (andar ḫadd) of Surūshana (spelt: Subrūshna) is formed by four rivers rising from Buttamān (ki az Buttamān gushāyadh). It is situated amidst mountains. From it comes (bigushāyadh) the river watering Samarqand, Bukhārā, and Sughd. The lake is 4 farsangs by 4 farsangs.

So much (in) about those lakes (daryāyak-ḥā) which are known and which are mentioned in the information (akhbār) contained in the books [or: in the akhbār and books?].

And outside these (bīrūn az in), small lakes are numerous, such as the lakes, 26. one of which lies in the mountains of Gūzgān in Mānshān close to Bastarāb and is 1 farsang long and half a farsangs broad, and 27. such as there are in the mountains of Ṭūs and Ṭabaristān. But they are neither (well)-known nor ancient, and sometimes they dry up so that no water remains in them. Therefore (az bahr-i ān) we have not mentioned them.

As regards the waters called swamps they are numerous but the well-known ones (ānch maʿrūf ast) are nine: 28–30. three among them (lie in) the desolate lands of the south (si andar vay vīrān-yi jumūb-ast) beyond Nubia (Nūba) close to Jabal Al-Qamar, from which rise ten rivers. From each five of them one marsh is formed (batīha bandadh); then (āngah) from each of the (two) marshes rise three rivers, which (all) join in one place (ba yak jā gird āyadh) and from all the six of them one swamp (yaki batīha) is formed. Then from

this swamp rises the river Nile which passes between Nubia and the lands of Egypt until it empties itself (uftadh) into the lake Tinnis. 31.–32. The two other swamps are those of Basra, round which there are many inhabited lands, villages, and boroughs. 33. The (sixth) one is the marsh of Kūfā round which there are many inhabited lands, with many amenities (bā nī'mat-i bīyār). 34. The seventh is the swamp of Bukhārā which is called Āvāzā-yī Paykand and is situated in the desert. 35. The eighth is at the upper end (a'āli) of Chinistān, in the region (hudūd) of the town Khumdān. 36. The ninth is in the North of Chinistān.

All of these lakes and swamps have fresh water with much fish in it. Fishermen are active on them, whereas it (often) happens that the swamps other than these (juz in) dry up; therefore we have not mentioned them.

§ 4. Discourse on the Islands

Any land situated in the midst of a sea above the surface of the water, or any mountain standing in the midst of a sea, is called island.

A. In the Eastern Ocean there is a (well)-known island called 1. Silver-island (jasīrat al-fīḍḍa) on which there are many teak-trees (sāj) and ebony-trees (ābanūs), as well as silver mines. It possesses seven big rivers which come out of seven different places in the same island (ham az in jasīra) and empty themselves into that sea. On the island there is a great and well-known city, which is considered as belonging to Chinistān (az shumār-i Chinistān) and called the City of the Silver-island. It is prosperous (ābādhān) and has a numerous population (bisyār-mardum).

B. In the Great Sea there are thirteen known islands and 2. two inhabited mountains, of which the one stretches in a southern direction (az nāḥiyat-i junūbī āyadī) and protrudes into this sea; the other stretches (biravādī) in a northern direction and enters into this sea opposite the first one (barābar-i vay). These two mountains are mentioned in Ptolemy's books (in du kūh rā . . . madhkūr-ast [sic]). A part of each of these (two) mountains is on the land, and a part in the sea. 3. The first of the islands of this Great Sea is called gold-island (dhahabīyā); its periphery is of 300 farsangs and it possesses gold-mines and many cultivated lands (ābādhānī), and its inhabitants are called Wāqwāqian Zangi (Zangiyān-i Wāqwāqt). All are naked and (all are) man-eaters (mardum-khwār). Chinese merchants go there in great numbers, carrying iron and food, (which) they sell

1 Peninsulas are also considered islands, v.i. B 2.
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to the inhabitants for gold, using signs and without saying a word to each other. 4. Another island in this sea is called ṬABARNĀ (*Taprobane). Its periphery is 1,000 farsangs. Round it are fifty-nine large islands both cultivated and desolate. On it are found numerous towns and villages as well as many rivers and mountains. It possesses mines of corundum (yāqūt) of all colours. This island lies off the frontier (sarḥadd) separating Chīnīstān from Hindūstān, and in it there is a large city called MUVAS; it is situated on the extremity (karān) which lies towards Hindūstān (ba Hindūstān bāz dāradh). Whatever this island produces is carried to that city and therefrom to the cities of the world. 5. The third island RĀMĪ (al-Rāmī) lies in the region (hudūd) of Sarandīb, southward of it. There live black people, wild and naked. They are divers and this is the place of pearls (murwārtā). The island produces ambergris ('ambar), Brazil wood (dār-i parniyān), and the animal (called) rhinoceros (karg-i jānavar). They sell amber for (barābar) iron. The root of the trees of Brazil wood (bikh-i dār-i parniyān) which comes from this island is an antidote to all poisons (tiryāk-ast as hama sahr-hā). 6. The fourth island is Ș.RĪH (*Zābaj?), west[?] of Sarandīb. In it grow camphor trees, the people there are wild and snakes numerous. 7. The fifth is called JĀBA and SALĀHĪṬ (Sumatra). From it comes much ambergris, cubeb (kabāba), sandal-wood, spikenard (sunbul), and cloves (qaranful). 8. The sixth lies west of the said Jāba and is called BĀLŪS; between them there is a distance of 2 farsangs. The people there are black and man-eaters. From it come good camphor, coco-nuts (jauz-i hindi), bananas (mauz), and sugar-cane (nay-shakar). 9. The seventh, south of Bālūs, is called KALĀ, and it is the kingdom of the Indian Jāba. 2 Between Bālūs and Kala the distance is a two days' journey. In it (Kala) grow numerous bamboos (khayṣurān), and it possesses tin (arzīz) mines. 10. The eighth island, called BANKĀLŪS (*Lankabālūs), is situated west of Kala. Between them there is a distance of six days. Its people are naked; they mingle (andar āmitsand) with the merchants. Their commodity is iron. Their food is bananas, fish, and coco-nuts. This island is at a distance of 20 days from the town of *Malay. 11. The ninth island, situated near Sindān, is called HARANJ and produces much camphor. 12. The tenth island is LĀFT which possesses a flourishing (khurram) town, (also) called Lāft. On it there are fields

1 To distinguish it from the bird karg.

2 Could be alternatively translated: "The king of Jāba is an Indian" but our text is an exact rendering of I. Kh., 66: و هي مملكة جابه: تأويل.
(kisht-u-barz) and many amenities (ni'amat), and pleasant waters, and from all the world (people) go there for trade. This island is situated off Pars. 13. The eleventh is Nāra, lying on the Equator line, in the middle (bar miyāna) of the inhabited world. Its longitude (tūl) from East to West is 90 degrees. The astronomical tables and observations (zi'j va ra'ad), as well as the positions of planets (kawākib-i sayyāra) and fixed stars (thābitāt), were calculated in the ancient tables (zi'j) with regard to this island (badhin jazīra rāst kardand). This island is called "equinoctial" (istīwā al-layl wa 'l-nahār). 14. The twelfth island, called Wāl (*Uwāl), lies off Pars and possesses many pleasant villages. It is a port of call (jāy-i mansil) for ships. 15. The thirteenth, called Khārak, lies south of Basra at a distance of 50 farsangs. It possesses a large and prosperous town called Khārak. Near it excellent (murtafi') and costly pearls (murvārid) are found. 16. The other two islands are small and lie close to each other. They are called Socotra (ū rā Saqīṭrā [sic] khuvāand) and are situated near the country 'Omān. It is a place of little amenity (kam ni'amat) but has many inhabitants.

In that sea there are (other) numerous islands but they are desolate, unknown, and small. Therefore we have not mentioned them.

17. And in that sea1 off the Syrian desert (bādiya) lie the rocks 5a (kūh) called Fārān and Jūbāylāt. The sea | there is always billowy and agitated (bā mauj va āshufta).

C. In the Western Ocean there are twenty-five known islands of which the names are found in Ptolemy's book. Of them (as vay) six lying off the Land of the Sudān are called 18. Al-Jazā'ir Al-Khāliya and possess gold-mines. Once a year people from the region (nāhiyat) of the Sudān and the towns of Sus-the-Distant go to fetch gold from the mines but nobody can settle down there (kās muqīm natavānad shudan) on account of the intensity of heat. 19. The seventh island is Ghadīra (spelt: 'Adīra) which lies at the point where the sea of Rūm joins this Ocean; from it rises (bigushāyadh) a large spring of water. The mouth of the strait opens into the Rūm Sea (dahna-yi khaliy daryā-yi Rūm gardadh). The eighth and the ninth are two islands situated close to one another: the one is called 20. Rhodes (spelt: Rūdhas) and the other 21. Arwādh; they lie off the lands of Rūm. (The position of) the stars was observed by the Greeks (ra'ad-hā-yi Yūnāniyān) from (andar) these two islands. The tenth and the eleventh are two islands situated half a farsang from one another, off the last limits (ākhir-i hadd) of Rūm in the northern direction. They are called 22. Island of Men and 23. Island of Women. On the

1 i.e. in one of the gulfs belonging to it, v.s. § 3, 3 (b).
former the inhabitants are all men, and on the latter women. Each year for four nights they come together for the purpose of procreation (as bahr-i tavāhud rā), and when the boys reach the age of three years they send them to the Island of Men. On the Island of Men there are thirty-six big rivers which rise there and fall into the sea, while on the Island of Women there are three such rivers. Beyond these islands in the northern direction of the same sea (nāḥiyat-i shamāl-i ḫan daryā) there are twelve islands called 24. BRĪTANIYA, of which some are cultivated and some desolate. On them are found numerous mountains, rivers, villages, and different mines. The twenty-fourth is the island called 25. ṬUWAS (or Ṭnūs) and situated north of the islands of BRĪTANIYA. It is 100 farsangs long and from it comes a large water (āb-i busurg) which overflows the dry land (bar khushk ṭūsādī) and flows straight to the sea of Maotis (spelt: Maṛī) situated north of the Saqlāb, as we have mentioned.1 The twenty-fifth is the island 26. THŪLĪ (Thule). For some of the northern cities the longitude was fixed (girifta-and) from those islands [sic]. This is the island where the circle parallel (mawāsī spelt: mawāzī) to the Equator and passing through this island touches (gudharadh) the (extreme) limit of the inhabited lands (ābādhānī) of the world, in the northern direction.

The known islands of the Western Ocean are those which we have enumerated.

D. In the sea of Rūm there are six inhabited islands and two mountains. Of the latter the one is called 27. JABAL-ṬĀRIQ (Gibraltar). One of its extremities (ṣar) is in the land of Spain (Andalus) and the other, in the strait joining the sea of Rūm to the Ocean. In it there is a silver mine, and from it come the drugs (dārū) usual in that land, e.g., gentian (jiṃtiyānā) and the like. The other mountain is 28. JABAL AL-QILĀL near the Roman land (shahr-i Rūmiya?);2 west of it (andar maghrīb az vay) there is a mountain3 of which it is said that no one has been able to climb on to its summit on account of its height, and from it come game, timber, and fuel.

As regards the six islands, the one is called 29. CYPRUS (spelt: Qubras), of which the periphery is 350 miles (mil). It has mines of silver, copper, and plasma (dahānī). It lies off Qaysāriya, ‘Akka and Tyre (Ṣūr). The second island, lying north of Cyprus, is 30. QURNAS (spelt: Q/rs), of which the periphery is 350 miles. The third is called 31. YĀBIS (spelt: Bālus); its periphery is 300 miles. The fourth is 32. SICILY (spelt: Saqiyā), near the Roman country (Rūmiya); a high mountain encircles it. | In the days of old, Roman treasure used 5 b

1 Cf. § 3, 8. 2 Less probable: “town of Rome”, v.i. 32. 3 The Alps?
to be (kept) in that island on account of its strength (ustuvâri). Its length is 7 post stages (mansîl) and its breadth 5 stages. The fifth island is called 33. Sârdînîa (spelt: Surdânîya). It lies south of the Roman country (Rûmîya); its periphery is 300 miles. The sixth is 34. Cretê (spelt: Îqriâs), situated off Atrâbulus, (and) north of it. Its periphery is 300 miles.

These six islands are cultivated (âbâdhan) and have many amenities (ni'mat). They have many towns and districts (rustâ), a numerous population, many merchants, troops, and much wealth (khvâsta). These islands of the Rûm Sea are more cultivated than any islands of the world.

E. In the Armenian Sea lies one island with a village called 35. Kâbûdhân. It is a rich locality (jây) with many inhabitants.

F. In the Caspian Sea (daryâ-yi Khasarân) there are two islands. The one lies off the Khazarian Darband and is called 36. Jazîrat al-Bâb. It produces rîyan (madder, rûnâs) exported to all the world and used by the dyers. The other island is 37. Siyâh-kûh; a horde (gurûk) of Ghûz Turks who have settled there loot (dusât) on land and sea. There is another island on the sea, but one of its corners is joined to the land off Dihîstân; it is called 38. Dihîstânân-sur, and on it are found a few people (andakî mardum): hunters of falcons and pelicans (sayyâdân-i bâz va havâsil), and fishermen.

In the whole world there is no other extensive, reputed, and inhabited island, except those which we have mentioned here. We have represented on the Map (sûrat kârdim) the seas, the gulfs, and the islands as they are, and at their proper places. The might is in God!

§ 5. Discourse on the Mountains and Mines which exist in them

The nature (nihâdh) of the mountains is twofold. Some are real (aâlî) mountains, stretching from one region (nâhiyat) into another, growing now thin and now thick (siţabr), going, now straight and now curved, till the place where they finish (bi-buradîh); these are called ridges of mountains ('amûd-i kûh). The other (kind) are the ramifications (shâkh) of the mountains which branch off (bar giradîh) from the ridge of the mountain and also go on till the place where they end; they are called branches (shâkû), just as a tree has numerous branches. And it may happen that those branches also have branches. Such is the likeness (mithâl) of the mountains. The mountains of which the ridge passes through (andar miyân) countries and districts
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(rustā) have (usually) many branches, while those that stretch in the deserts and along the border of a sea, or of a river, have few branches. The ridges of the mountains are mostly joined to one another.

1. The first mountain in the eastern direction is the one which we have called AL-ṬA’IN FIL-BAHR ("Thrusting into the sea"). Half of it is on land and the other half in the sea.

2. The other mountain is SARANDĪB, of which the length is 100 farsangs and it is so high that in some places no one can climb (up it). From (the top of the) Sarandīb to (its) foot (dāman) is a distance of two days. The mountain possesses mines of corundum (yāqūt) of different colours. And in its river-beds (rūdh-kadha) diamonds are found. In the whole world there is no other place of diamonds. Its soil is of emery (sunbādha). In (Sarandīb) there are costly pearls (which are extracted from) the sea that is nearer to it. It produces plenty of spikenard (sunbul), cloves, cardamum (qāquila), nutmeg (jaus-i bava) and all kinds of spices (afvāh). It has numerous coco-nut trees, Brazil wood (dār-i parniyān), and bamboos. There are found in it musk-deer, civet-cats (hayvān-i zabūd) and rhinoceroses (karg). On it the trace of a human foot is found impressed upon a stone (nishān-i pāy-i mardum ba-sang furū shuda). It is said to be the trace of Adam’s foot, on him be peace! The people (mardumān) of Sarandīb are naked. This mountain lies in the first clime.

3. From the corner (gūsha) of this mountain starts (bar dāradh) (another) mountain adjoining it (which passes) between (miyān) the end (ākhir) of Hindūstān and the beginning of Chīnīstān. It is called MĀNĪSA. It follows (furūdh āyad) a northern direction until it reaches the place where Hindūstān ends and Tibet begins. It follows again a northern direction between Tibet and China (Chīn) up to the farthest limit of Rāng-rong (?) belonging to Tibet. Then (ān-gah) it turns (‘atf) westwards and goes between China and the country (nāhiyat) Nazvān belonging to Tibet in a north-western direction up to the farthest limit of Tibet; then between (miyān) Tūsmt and the confines (va miyān-i hūdūd) of China1 to the farthest limit (ākhir) of the desert situated at the extreme end (ākhir) of Chīnīstān; (then stretches) between (miyān) the towns of Transoxiana and the towns of Turkīstān up to the confines (hūdūd) of Tārāz and Shīljī, and there the ridge of the mountain disappears (ānjā in ‘amūd diburradh).

4. And at the end of Hindūstān and the beginning of Tibet a branch (of the Mānīsa range) shoots off (bar gīradh) eastwards into Chīnīstān (ba Chīnīstān andar) for a distance of 50 farsangs. And likewise from2 the place which is the end of Tibet numerous branches

---

1 Perhaps Khotan? See Notes.
2 Small erasure, but the text is complete.
shoot off east and westwards and spread out (va andar parāganadh). And at the confines of Transoxiana numerous branches shoot off, and from each of them too numerous branches spread out in every direction (hama nāhiyat) of Transoxiana. And in those branches mines of silver and gold are found, as well as much lead (surb) and iron and many drugs (dārū).

5. In the provinces (nawāb) of Chínistān there are eighteen mountains, small and big, separate (buridha) from each other. And in each locality there are some mountains scattered (parāganda) in every direction. In fourteen of these mountains gold-mines are found.

6. Then another mountain is at the farthest limit of the Toghuzghuz Turks where they adjoin China (Chīn). Its length is 4 farsangs and it is called Ṭafqān.

7. And also in the neighbourhood of Ṭafqān, in the Toghuzghuz country (nāhiyat), a mountain shoots off (bar giradh) in a western direction between (andar miyān) the Toghuzghuz, the Yaghmā, and various encampments (khargāh: “felt-huts”) until it joins the mountain Mānisā. In the neighbourhood of the river Khūlandghūn this mountain is called IGHRAJ-ART, and each part of this mountain (bar yakī az in kūh) has many names, because (zīrāk) every part of these mountains is called by the name of the region (nāhiyat), or by that of the town (yaān-i ān shahr) which is nearest to it.

8. Another mountain shoots off (bar giradh) from the beginning of the Toghuzghuz frontier (ḥadd) in the neighbourhood of the lake Issi-kūl (spelt: Iskāk). It continues till the end of the Tukhs (Tukh-siyān) and the beginning of the Khallukh frontier, then it bends (‘atf), and a branch separates¹ from it (bāz gardadh) into the land (nāhiyat) of a Khirkhīz tribe. This mountain is called TULAS and in it are found many sable-martens (samūr), grey squirrels (sanjāb), and musk-deer (āhū-yi mushk), while in that branch (‘atf) which stretches off (bāz kashadh?) towards the Khirkhīz country musk-deer (hayvān-i mushk), khutū-[horns], grey squirrels, and sable-martens are found.

9. Another mountain stretches from the district of Kūlī in Kanbāya (spelt: Kanbāta) belonging to Hindūstān. It follows an eastern direction till Šamūr², then takes (furūdh āyadh) a northern direction, passing between Dahum’s country (mamlakat-i D.h.m) and that of the raja of the Hindus (rāy az Hindwān) up to the limits (ḥudūd) of Hitāl (sic). Then this mountain splits into two branches (ba du shākh gardadh).

¹ Turn back? Cf. under 17. [See p. 286, n. 1].
² Indistinctly written: صُعْور، صُوْر؟
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9 a. One branch going northwards enters (furūḍh āyadh) the confines ( hudūḍ) of Ṭīthāl (?), and Nitāl (*Népál ?), and passes between (miyāna) the farthest limit of India and Tibet, going north of the confines ( hudūḍ) of Bolōr, Samarqandāq, Shākānān [sic], and Vakhān (spelt: Khān), and south of the desert; then, on the confines ( hudūḍ) of Zhashht (*Rāsh?) it takes (furūḍh āyadh) a north-western direction and passes through the confines of Buttāmān belonging to Transoxiana, until it reaches (bar āyadh) the confines of Sūrushna (spelt: Sarushana). This mountain has numberless (bisyār va bi- ādad) ramifications in the districts (as ħudūḍ) Shākānān, Vakhān, and Zhashht.

9 a a. From the interior (miyān) of Vakhān and Zhashht start many mountains (which) spread out (paṟaγanadh) inside the limits (andaɾ ħudūḍ) of Khuttālān, and mines of gold and silver are found there. Of the branches of Khuttālān, one branch separates (bar dārād) and becomes one with another (coming) from the district ( hudūḍ) of Buttāmān. From them separate numerous branches directing themselves (ustadh) into the district of Chaghāniyān, where they scatter. And where the said original ridge of the mountain (‘amūd-i ʿasher) comes near Buttāmān, (the chain) splits into two, but when (these two branches) come to the confines ( hudūḍ) of Sūrushāna (spelt: Shurūshna) they unite again. From the confines ( hudūḍ) of Buttāmān a branch shoots off (bar gīrād) which passes between the Buttāmān-of-Daryāzha and Chaghāniyān (andaɾ miyān-i Buttāmān-i Daryāzha va miyān-i Ch.) and skirts the confines (bar ħudūḍ) of Samargand and Sughd down to the confines of Bukhārā. And likewise, each of these branches has a few or many offshoots.

9 b. As regards the other branch, from the frontier (hadd) of Hībtāl [sic] it traverses (as miyān) Hindūstān, follows the confines hudūḍ) of Qinnaūj (Kanauj) and passes between the country of the continental (?) Jába (mamlakat-i Jába-yi khushk)1 and the kingdom of Lhrz 2 where it is called the mountain of Q.s.K (?), and so it runs north (andaɾ shāmol) of the confines of Qashmīr, Vayhind (spelt: Vbihnd), Dnūpūr, and Lamghān, and south of Bolōr, Shākānān, Vakhān, and Badhakhsān, passing south (bar junūb) of the districts (rustā-hā) of Khuttālān. Then it enters (ustadh) the limits ( hudūḍ) of Tūkhāristān, stretches between (miyān) Tāqaqān, Sakalkand, Khulm (and) Simingān, and south of Balkh, and enters the confines of Sān and Chāryak belonging to Gūzgān.

9 b a. Then it turns westwards (and) in a north-western direction penetrates into the country of Ghūr (passing) south of Aspūzār (Isfīzār),

1 Khushk, "dry land", cf. § 4, 25. 2 Small erasure, but the text is complete.
Herat (Harē), Būshang, and Nishāpūr. Then between Nishāpūr and Sabzavār (spelt: Sqrvār—*Safzavār*), it takes the direction of the road (following the latter) on its northern side (ba rāh furūdh āyadh az sūy-i shamāl) and again turning westwards passes north of Simnān and Rayy and enters (uftadh) the region (nāhiyat) of Daylamān, (stretching on) up to the end of the limits (hudūd) of Gilān.

9 bb. And when this mountain after having turned aside from the province of Balkh (az hudūd-i Balkh *att kunad*) (reaches) the frontier (andar hadd) of Madr belonging to Ṭukhārīstān, so many small and large branches spread out of it (bar dāradh) in those districts (navāḥī) that only God knows their number. And from each of its branches many (other) spurs shoot off which spread (parāganadh) in the region (andar hudūd) of Ṭukhārīstān, Andarāb, Panjhār, Jāriyāna (spelt: Khāriyāna), 1 Bāmiyān, Bust, Rukhadh, Zamīndāvar, and Ghaznīn, and (further) stretch (bikashadh) down to the limits (hudūd) of Sind. In those branches mines of gold and silver (are found). And when the (principal) ridge of this mountain reaches the districts of Ghūr, a branch shoots off from it and forms a circle (gird andar āyadh) like a finger-ring; then the branches unite (again) into one chain, and inside the ring a tribe . . . [2–3 words missing]. And from this ring of mountains a large branch shoots off, which together with those other branches takes an eastern [?] direction and spreads out in the limits (hudūd) of Bust and Ghaznīn. Likewise in the locality of Aspuzār this mountain possesses small offshoots which spread out (andar parāganadh) in the districts (rustā) of Aspuzār (Isbzār).

{Likewise in the region (nāhiyat) of Kūhīstān and Kūmish, and the limits (hudūd) of Daylamān this mountain has many ramifications.} 2

9 bc. On reaching the locality of Sān and Chahāryak belonging

7 a to Gūzgān, this ridge of mountains splits into two: | the one branch is that which we have described (padhīdh); 3 the other one goes north of it taking a western direction between Kundarm and Anbīr. It passes between Gurzīvān and Jahūdhān, between Bāshīn and Dīza, between *Marrūd* and Baghshūr and south of Sarakh. Then it takes a northern direction and goes to the limits (hudūd) of Tūs, Bāvard, and Nasā until it reaches the limits (hudūd) of Gurgān. Then comes a valley, three days long but narrow, which is called Dinār-Zārī. And the mountain, which (stretches?) on the other side of the valley, takes a direction through the limits of Sībarāyīn (*Siparāyīn > Isfarāyīn*) until it reaches the limits of Gurgān (az hudūd-i S. furūdh āyadh tā ba hudūd-i G. rasadh). Then it turns south-westwards going on (hamī ravadh) south of Āmol and the towns

1 Jārbāyā?  
2 This sentence ought to come under 9 na.  
3 See above, 9 na.
of Ṭabaristān down to the limits (ḥudūd) of the town Rayy. Then it joins the other chain (‘amūd) which we have described (ṣifat). The two chains united go up to the end of the province of Gilān, as we have explained. From the limits of Hindūstān where this mountain begins till the limits of Gilān where it ends this mountain is called "Belt of the Earth" (kamar-i zamīn), or in Arabic "Minṭaqat al-Arḍ".

10. Other mountains are in the province of Kirmān. They are separate (burīdha) from each other, (but jointly) are called the mountains of Kirmān. One of them called the Kūfīj Mountain is in the midst of the desert. It stretches from the sea to the limits (ḥudūd) of Jīruf and consists of seven mountains joined to one another. Each of them has a chief (har kūhī rā . . . mihtarī dāradh) and the representatives of the government (‘ūmil-i sultān) do not go (nashavadh) to those mountains, and those chiefs (ān mihtarān) every year collect and send in the amount of tribute-money (muqāṭa’a gīrd kunand). These seven mountains do not obey each other, and the people of these mountains are called Kūfijīyān. They have a special language. It is a place of great amenity (ni’mat) and great strength (ustuwār) and cannot be conquered by armies and war. Between Jīruf and this mountain there are hills (shākhak-hā-yi kūh) and the locality is called Bū GHĀNIM’S KŪHISTĀN. Another mountain is BāRĪJĀN. It runs along (darazā) from the frontier of Jīruf to the frontier of Barn, possesses mines of lead (surb), copper, and lodestone (sang-i maghnāṭīs), and has two villages: Kafṭār and Dīhak. Another mountain of Jīruf has a length of two days’ journey and possesses numerous mines. Another mountain called KūH-I SĪM ("Silver Mountain") consists of two small mountains joined together. It lies between Khatr (*Khabr?) and Jīruf and possesses silver-mines.

11. Another mountain in the province Pārs begins (bar gīradh) between Pasā and Dārāgīrd and stretches eastwards till the frontier (sarḥadd) of Kirmān. Then it takes a northern direction till (it reaches) the frontier of Tās (Unās?) and Raudhān (*Rōdhān). Then it turns westwards and runs on to the frontier between Pārs and Khūzistān. Then it takes a northern direction, passes (furūd kāyadh) between Bū-Dulaf’s Kara (i.e., Karaj) and Sīpāhān, and enters the lands of the Jībāl (ba shahr-hā-yi ʃ. furūd kāyadh) until it reaches the confines (ḥudūd) of Hamadān. Then it passes south of Hamadān, following a north-western direction until it reaches the confines of Marāgha, belonging to Ādharbādhagan, and then stops (biburradh). This mountain in the districts (kuwār) of the Jībāl | sends out so many offshoots that there remains no town but possesses near it a spur of this mountain.
Likewise in the province of Pars this mountain has many ramifications and (other) mountains lie there, both joined (to one another) and separate (burdha), so that in the neighbourhood of each city of Pars there is a mountain. This mountain has also ramifications near Sipahân, which spread out (paraganadh) in Khuzistan. Near Sipahân this mountain is called kūh-jîlû.

12. Another mountain lies in the northern parts (nāhiyat), between the frontier of the Kīmāk and the beginning of the Khirkhīz. It starts from the frontier of Kīmāk and stretches eastwards to the frontier of the Khirkhīz. Then it follows a northern direction till where the inhabited part (ābādhānî) of the world finishes in the north. In the northern region this mountain is called by the Kīmāk, K.NDâV.R-BĀGHI (*Kundavar, Kandâur-taghi).

13. Another small [?] mountain situated in the province (nāhiyat) of Adharbadhagan near Ardabil, is called Sablân (spelt: Sabilân?).

14. Another mountain lies in the districts of Armenia. It starts from Takrit in Irāq, where it is called kūh-îbârimmā, and so it goes between the frontiers (bar miyân-i hadd) of Armenia and Adharbâdthagān until it reaches the limits of Bardā'.

15. In the same region (nāhiyat) are two other mountains separate from each other. The higher one is called HāRITH (Ararat). It is impossible to climb up to its top on account of the difficulty of the road; it is constantly covered with snow, and cold (reigns) there. Numerous towns of Armenia (procure for themselves) game and fuel from that mountain. The other mountain, called Huwayrīth, is similar to Harith but smaller than it.

16. In the province of Jazīra there are two separate mountains. The one, called JUD, is the mountain on which Noah's ark (kashti) came aground (bištādī). The other, called the MOUNTAIN OF MÄRDĪN, is situated near Niṣībīn (spelt: Naṣibīn).

17. In the Arab country there are many small mountains; thirteen of them are called Thîāmā. One mountain is near Mecca and is called Ghazwān. Another called Shībām (spelt: Shiyyām) is near Šan'ā; on it sown and cultivated lands are found. This place is strong, and in the days of old the residence of the king (added: of the kings) of Yemen was on this mountain. Another mountain (there), having a periphery (chahar sū andar gird) of 20 farsangs, lies at the end of the mountains of Thîāmā. Its summit is flat (hamīn) and has villages (ābādhānī), agriculture (kisht), and running waters. In the days of old, Muhammad ibn Faḍil al-Qarmaṭī conquered it. Another hill (kūhak) called Râpwa stands near Madīna; the Mekkan whetstones (sang-i fasan) come from there. The other two hills (kūhak)
are near Fayd on the right hand of the road at a distance of two days; they are called the TWO MOUNTAINS OF TAYY (Jabalay Tayy).

18. In the province of Syria a mountain starts from the Syro-Egyptian frontier from the place which is called the TĪH OF THE SONS OF ISRAEL. Near, and joined to it, stands a high mountain called TŪR SĪNĀ. And so this mountain runs on straight through (andar) Syria in a north-eastern direction to the limits (ḥudūd) of Zughar (spelt: Zaʿr), and farther (hamchinān) to the limits of Damascus, Baʿlabakk, Ḫīms, passing north of these towns and north of Baghrās and crossing the river Jayḥūn between Armenia and Rūm. Then it takes a straight northern direction (and continues) between Armenia and Rūm to the beginning of the frontier of the Sarīr belonging to (as) Rūm. Then it turns eastwards passing between the Sarīr (spelt: Surīr) and Armenia and (between) Arrān and Qabq till (it reaches) the neighbourhood of the Khazar sea. Then it changes its direction and turns back (bar gardadāh) westwards, passing between the Sarīr and the Khazars and reaches the beginning of the frontier of the Alāns (al-Lān). Then it goes straight northwards as far as the end of the Khazars. Then it traverses the country of the Khazarian Pechenegs (miyān-i nāḥiyat-i Bachanāk-i Khazarī biburradāh) and separates the Inner Bulghars from the Rūs (miyān-i Bulghār-i dākhil [*va] Urūs [sic] biburradāh) as far as the limits of the Saqlāb. Then it takes a northern direction, traverses (andar miyān) the Saqlāb (country) and skirts that town of the Saqlāb which is called Khurdāb, after which it reaches the end of the Saqlāb and there stops (biburradāh).

From the Tūr Sīnā to Zughar (spelt: Zaʿur) they call this mountain MOUNTAIN OF THE KHĀRIJĪTES (shurāt, spelt: sh.rūh) and on it are many villages (ābādānī) and near it all the people are Khārijītes (khārijīyān). From *Zughar to the limits of Damascus they call it BALQĀ. From Damascus to Ḫīms, LUBNĀN; from Ḫīms to the limits of Baghrās, [the Mountain of the] BAHRĀ (spelt: Dahrā) and TANŪKH; from the limits (ḥudūd) of Baghrās to the beginning of the Sarīr frontier, LUKKĀM; from there, until having curved in the above-mentioned way (tā ān ʿatf-hā bikunadh) it reaches the beginning of the Alāns, it is called QABQ; after this, until finally (tā ākhīr hi) it disappears (mīnqāṭī”), each place is called after the town and the district which adjoins it, as is the case with the other mountains.

18 A. When it reaches the end of Syria and the beginning of Armenia a large branch separates from it and enters the region (nāḥiyat) of Rūm. It (also) has ramifications, and numerous gold-mines exist in it.

18 B. And from the beginning of the frontier of the Sarīr a branch starts which finally joins the Sea of the Georgians (Gursiyān).
18 c. And when it reaches the middle of the Sarîr a huge ('âsîm) branch shoots off from it and thus it runs on eastwards (âz sûy-i mashriq) between those two mountains until it reaches a fortress. The latter is a town on the summit of this mountain, of which the wall (hâra) is every day guarded in turn (ba-naubat) by (a detachment of) 1,000 men.¹ Mines of gold and lead are found there.

18 d. And when this mountain reaches the limits of the Alâns a very great (sâkht 'âsîm) branch separates (from it) which goes in a western direction as far as the Alân Gate and there, on the summit of this mountain, stands a town, which is the most flourishing of the Alân towns. There this branch ends.

19. Another small mountain stretches between the end of the Rûs frontier (hadd) and the beginning of the Kîmâk frontier; it runs on for a distance of five days.

20. In the country (andar hadd) of Rûm there is a mountain in the province called Rustâ-yi Awâs (Ephesus?) and therein is a large and frightful cavern (shikaft . . . bâ ḥaul) which is said to have been the place of the "Companions of the Cavern" (i.e., the Seven Sleepers).

21. Another mountain in Rûm, situated near the town (or land?) of Afrakhûn, stretches in length for a distance of six days.

22. Another mountain stands near the Georgian mountain (Kûh-i Gurz) and in it are mines of silver and copper.

23. In the province of Egypt there are two mountains: the one is situated on the eastern side of the river Nile (bar sûy-i mashriq az rûdîh-i Nil). From the frontier of Uswân and the beginning of the frontier of Nubia (Nîba) it runs straight north and enters Upper Egypt (Ṣa'id al-a'la'). It skirts the limits (liûdûd) of Bûsîr (spelt: Taṣîr) and Fûsâṭ, which is the capital (qašaba) of Egypt, until it reaches Ťau [al-Sharqi: "eastern bank"] (spelt: Khauf) and the place where the Jîfâr (spelt: Ťifâra) sands are situated, and there it ends. In that mountain mines of silver and gold are found and it is (called) Muqâtîm (spelt: Mu'âz'am).

24. The other mountain is on the western side of the river Nile. It also starts (bar gîradh) just (râst) from the beginning of the Nubian frontier and takes a northern direction until in the region (liûdûd) of Fayyûm it reaches Ibrîq (*Abwaṭ?).² Then a small branch shoots off (bâz kashadh) westwards and disappears. | In this mountain there are mines of garnets (bîjâdha), emeralds (sumurrud), and chrysolites (zabarjad). And on this mountain wild asses (khar-i waḥṣht) are found striped (mulamma') with black and yellow, but if you take

¹ This detail ought to come under 18 d., cf. § 48, 3.
² See note, p. 204-5.
them out of this climate (hawā) they die. This mountain is called MOUNTAIN OF THE OASES (kūh-i al-wāḥāt).

25. And in Rūm there is a small mountain beyond the gulf near Seleucia.

26. Another mountain is within the limits (andar ḥudūd) of Spain; it starts from (az ḥadd) Malaga (spelt: Māliqa) and in an eastern direction runs down to (tā bi ḥadd) Shantariya; then it turns northwards and enters (furūdh āyādh) the province of Lerida (Lārīda); then it bends westwards to the province of Toledo (Ṭulayṭila), and (the city of) Toledo is situated at the foot of this mountain; and there it ends.

27. Another mountain stands in the country of Spain on the frontier of Coria (bi ḥadd-i Qūriya) and Truxillo (Tirjāla). And from it come many drugs (dārī).

28. Another mountain stands in (andar ḥudūd) Western Rūm and is called BULGHARI. It is an inhabited mountain with many amenities (niʿmat).

All these mountains which we have enumerated are those situated in the northern quarter of the inhabited lands of the world. As regards Southern Inhabited Lands—so far as people can penetrate—they possess nine mountains.

29. The one, called JABAL AL-QAMAR, possesses mines of silver and gold, and the river Nile comes out of it. Its length is 500 farsangs.

30. The other eight mountains vary in longitude, latitude, and extension (tūl va ʿard va masāfāt); their places and dimensions are such as we have shown (paydhā) on the Map (ṣūrat). And assistance is from God!

§ 6. Discourse on the Rivers

Rivers are of two classes (darb). The first are natural and the others artificial (ṣināʿ). The latter are those of which the beds (rūdhkadha) have been dug out and the water brought (therein) for the benefit (ābādānī) of a town or for the agriculture (kisht-u-bars) of a district. Most of the artificial canals are small and ships cannot navigate them. There are towns with ten canals, or more or less, the water of which is used for drinking, for the fields (kisht-u-bars), and for the meadows (gīyā-khwar); the number of these canals cannot be fixed (na-māḥdūd) because at every moment it is subject to an increase or decrease.

1 Cf. infra, § 39, 10.
The natural rivers are those great waters which (are formed) by the melting of snow, or by the springs coming from the mountains or from the surface of the earth; (and) they make their way, while their beds become now broad (farâkh) and now narrow, and continually flow (hamî ravaðdî) until they reach a sea, or a marsh. Some of these natural rivers are not very large and are used (ba kûr shavudh) for the benefit (âbâdîhânl) of a town, or a district, such as the rivers of Balkh and of Marv, and it may happen that from a natural river numerous canals are derived (bar dârâdh) and utilized while the original stream (ân 'amûd-i rûdî) goes down to a sea, or marsh, as is the case of the Euphrates.

1. The first river in the eastern parts is the Khumdân River coming from the Sarandib mountain. After having flowed for a distance of twelve days it forms a swamp (îngah ba Según bândadh),1 of which the length and width alike are 5 farsangs. Then from that marsh too comes out such a large (chandân) river as to flow for a distance of seven days down to Khumdân. Some of it is used for cultivation, and the rest flows out into the Eastern Ocean.

2. Another river called Kîs au [sic] rises from the east of the mountain Mânisâ and reaches the place situated in the centre of Tibet (badh-ân jây ki ba-miyâna-yi hûdûd-i Tûbat). And it flows on, following that mountain (badh-in kûh), among mountains and cultivated lands, until it comes opposite the Tibeto-Indian frontier (tû barâbar-i hadd-i miyân-i Tûbat va Hindûstân râsadâh). Then it cuts through many mountains and traverses them down to the limits of Kujân and Bughshûr [sic]; then it passes between the Chinese provinces (nâhiyat) of Ir.sh and Khûr.sh and flows out into the Eastern Ocean. This river, after it has entered the limits of Bughshûr (B.ghsûz?), is called *Ghîyân (spelt: 'Inân).

3. Another river, called *Wajakh (îbâjâkh?), rises on the eastern side of the said mountain Mânisâ at the extreme limit (ákhir-i hadd) of the desert. It skirts (karân) the towns (districts?) of Thajâkh [sic], Barîha, and Kûskân, flows on through the province of Khotan, and while passing through the region of *Sha-chou (chûn az nâhiyat-i Sâjû andar gûdharad) forms a swamp. Thence it flows down to the limits of Kuchâ, then passes through (andar miyân) the province (nâhiyat) of Kûr.sh (?) and the province of F.raj.kli and empties itself into the Eastern Ocean. On the western bank of this river are the houses (nests?) of the birds 'akka (magpies?), and in springtime (ba vaqt-i bahârân) all the banks of the river are (strewn) with the little ones of these 'akka. The breadth of this river is

1 "A swamp is formed"(?).
half a farsang and this breadth can never be crossed (va hargis pahlā-ya in āb nabarand?). When the river reaches the limits of Kuchchā [sic] it is called the river of Kuchchā and as such is known in the books. And from the same neighbourhood (ham az ān nāzdikī), (but) nearer to Transoxiana, come out three rivers, of which the one is called S.Māy.nd-Ghūn, the second Kh.Rāy.nd (Khwāy.nd?)-Ghūn, and the third Khūl.nd (Khūk.nd?)-Ghūn. Between Gh.zā and K.lbānk all the three rivers flow into the river of Thajākh [sic].

4. From the Kisau river a big river separates which comes near this (?)] fortress of Tubbat-khāqān and to *ūsāng (ba nāzdik-i in qal’a-yi Tubbat-khāqān va ba-Kārsāng [sic] ayadh) and there it is used for the fields and meadows (kisht-ū-giyā-khwār).

5. Another river is called Ílā. It comes from the mountain Irghāj-ārt [sic], takes a northern direction, and falls into the lake Issi-kūl (spelt: Absīkūk) [?].

6. Another river is Jayhūn which rises from the region of Vakhān and follows the frontier (bar hadd) between the limits of Bolūr and those of Shāknān, (which is) of Vakhān,² down to the limits of Khuttalān, Tukhāristān, Balkh, Chaghāniyān, Khorāsān, and Transoxiana, (then) down to the limits of Khwārazm, (finally) to fall into the sea of Khwārazm.

7. Another river is called Kharnāb; it rises to the west of the mountain Qasak and flows into the Jayhūn between Badhakhshān and Pārghar. This Kharnāb is larger (mihtar) than the Jayhūn, but everybody gives the name of Jayhūn (to the latter) because (this) Jayhūn follows a longer course (az rahi dūrtar ravadh).

8. Another river flows behind (az ān sūy) Buttamān for a distance of 60 farsangs; it flows from the mountains which stretch from north to south (az nāhiyat-i shāmāl ba junūb dāradh), till it reaches Munk and Hulbuk; and having reached Pārghar it flows into the Jayhūn.

9. Another river called Vakhshāb rises from the Vakhsh mountains and near Vakhsh flows into the Jayhūn.

10. Another river rises from the limits of the Kumijīs (Kumijīyān), flows through their mountains, passes through (bar miyān) Nū-diz, and flows into the Jayhūn near Qavādiyān.

11. Another river is Chaghān-rūdh, which rises from Chaghāniyān and falls into the Jayhūn near Tarmid [sic].

These four rivers (8.–11.) flow from north to south.

12. Two other rivers, of which the larger is called Rūdh-i Darghām

1 So in view of § 2.4. Less probably: "cannot be dammed in".
(spelt: *D.z'am), come from the limits of Ṭukhāristān, unite into one river, and having passed between Valvālij and Khulm, fall into the Jayḥūn.

13. Another river rises from the mountains on the confines of Lamghān and Danpūr [sic] and passes south [north?] of *Ninhār (*bar ḥadd-i ḥudūd*) bigudharaaddressesū-i-junūb). It is called the River of Lamghān. It flows past the region (*bar ḥudūd*) of Multān (spelt: Mūliyān) and the towns *Rūr (spelt Dīvin), Sadūsān, Bulrī, Mansūra, and Manjābri, and near Kūlī empties itself into the Great Sea.

14. Another river called Sind-rūdh rises on the west of the mountain Qasak, which is also called the Mountain of Ice (Kūh-i yakḥ). The river flows southwards (*az sūy-i junūb*), enters the confines (*hudūd*) of Multān, and joins the river of Lamqān [sic] from the eastern side.

15. Another river (called) Hīvān, comes from the mountain Hīvān, passes between Jalavvat, Balavvat, and Bīrūza (spelt چر), enters the province of Multān, and falls into the river of Lamghān from the western [read: eastern] side.

After the junction of these three rivers the river is called Mīhrān.

It is said that from the summit of the Mountain of Ice, which is Qasak, a water springs up like a fountain (bar damadh chūn fawwāra) and also [that it?] separates into two in such wise (hamchinān) that one half flows northwards, and it is the river Kharnāb, and the other flows southwards, and it is the river Sind-rūdh, which afterwards becomes the Mīhrān.

16. Another river is the Lesser Mīhrān which rises in the Indian mountain (Kūh-i Hindwān) and, separating the frontiers (miyān-i ḥadd) of (the dominions of) Dahum and (those of) the Rāy, passes between (miyān) Hamānān and B.lhārī and between (miyān) Nu'nūn and Nu'nīn; it skirts (bar ḥudūd) Qandahār, reaches the limits of Kūlī, and flows into the Great Sea.

17. Another river is Ḫızgand which rises from behind the mountain of the Khallukh and skirts Ḫızgand, the town of Bāb, Akhsikat, Khūjand, and Banākāt, down to the limits of Chāch (spelt: Ἡαχ). Then it skirts S.tkand, Pārāb, and numerous boroughs down to the limit (*tā bi-ḥadd*) of Jand and Javāra (Khavāra?), and flows into (bāsic) the sea of Khwārazm.

18. Another river is Khursāb (spelt: Khirṣāb) which rises from the extreme limit (*ākir-i ḥadd*) of Buttamān on the northern side of the mountain, and near the town of Khursāb joins the river Ḫızgand.

19. Another river is Osh, which rises in the same mountain, passes between (*bar miyān*) Osh and Õrasht (Urast) and joins the Ḫızgand.
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20. Another river is QUBĀ which rises in the same mountain and joins the Üzgand near Qubā.

21. Another river is KHATLĀM [sic] which rises in the mountain Mānisā and at the point which is the frontier between the Khallukh and the Yaghmā skirts (bar) the town of Khatlām. Then it flows to the neighbourhood of Bāb and joins the Üzgand river.

22. Another river is PARAK which rises from behind the Khallukh mountain and takes a southern direction, flowing through the limits of Chāch. Between Banākat and the wall of Qalās it joins the Üzkand.

When all these rivers have united, their joint course is called the Chāch RIVER and the Arabs (Tāziyān) call it Sayḥūn.

23. Another river is that of BUKHĀRĀ. Four rivers rise in the mountain of Middle Buttamān. They flow for a distance of 6 farsangs; then all four form a swamp (battha) called Daryāzhā; out of the latter flows a river which skirts the confines (bar ḥudūd) of Surūshana, Samarqand, and Sughd, and cuts through (andar miyān) Bukhārā; some of it is utilized for cultivation (kisht-u-barz) in Bukhārā, while some falls into the Avāxa of Paykand. | 10a

24. Another river is that of BALKH which rises in the region (ḥudūd) of Bāmiyān, skirts (bar ḥudūd . . . bigudharadh) the confines of Madr and Ribāt-i Kirvān [sic], and reaches Balkh. All of its waters are used up for cultivation in Balkh.

25. Another river is HĪDHMAND which rises at the frontier (ḥadd) of Guzgānān. In the neighbourhood of Ghūr it flows past (bar) Durghush [sic], Til, and Bust and makes a sweep round the region of Sītān (az gird-i Sītān andar āyadh). Some of it is utilized for agriculture, and some flows into the lake Zarah.

26. Another river is that of MARV which rises at the limit of Gharchistān, on the frontier separating Guzgānān from Ghūr (az ḥadd-i miyān-i Guzgānān va Ghūr). It flows past (bar) Bashīn, cuts through the middle of the valley (miyān-i dara biburradh), and flowing past Marūdh, Diz-i Hīnaf [sic], Lōgar, B.r.kd.r (*Barakdiz?) and Girang, reaches Marv where it is used up in the fields.

27. Another river is that of HERAT (Harī < Harē) which rises at the limits (ḥudūd) of Ghūr and is used in the fields of Herat. Herat possesses also other considerable (busurg) rivers formed by torrents (sayl), but at times there remains no water in them. Therefore we have not mentioned them.

28. In the province (nāhiyat) of KIRMĀN there are no considerable rivers and no lakes, except the Great Sea and a small river capable of turning ten mills, coming from the limits of Jīruft and flowing fast;
most of it is used in the hot lands of Kirmān; the rest (of the rivers) flow into the Great Sea near Hormuz.

29. Another river is sakān in Pārs which rises in the mountains and the district (rustā) of Ṣuyagān; changing its direction it flows round the town Kavār (az gīrī Kavār andar gardaḍi) and between Najīrām and Sīrāf joins the Great Sea.

30. Another river is khuyadhān rising from the district (nāḥiyat) of Khuyadhān in Pārs. It passes east of Tavaj and joins the Great Sea between Ganāfa and Najīrām.

31. Another river is shādhagān which rises in the region (nāḥiyat) of Bāzranj in Pārs and flowing past the western corner of Tavaj joins the Great Sea.

32. Another river is sīrīn (Shīrīn?) which comes from the mountain Dhanbād (Dīnār?) in the district of Bāzranj. It passes between Vāyagān and Lārandān; on the confines (bar ḥudūd) of Arragān it passes through the town [ba-shahr read: *ba Rishahr “through Rishahr”] and joins the Great Sea between Sīnīz and Ganāfa.

These four rivers flow in a north to south direction.

33. Another river is kurr which rises from the limits of Azd (*Urd?) in the district (rustā) of Karvān belonging to (as) Pārs. It flows in an easterly direction until it has passed south of Ištākhr (hamt tā ba-Ištākhr bigudharadh) and joined the lake *Bijagān [now: Bakhtagān].

34. Another river is farvāb which flows from the district Farvāb, also in Pārs, in an easterly direction; having reached Ištākhr, it changes its direction and east of Ištākhr flows into the river Kurr, which is the healthiest (durusttarīn) and best water in Pārs.

35. Another river is Ṭāb, which rises in the Kūh-Jilū, situated on the confines (ba ḥudūd) of Sipāhān, follows the frontier between Khūzistān and Fārs (ba hadd-i miyān-i Khūzistān va Pārs) and falls into the Great Sea. The town Māhīrūbān stands in the sea between (two branches of) this river (andar miyān-i in ābast bāyn-i daryā).¹

36. The river sardān rises also in the Kūh-Jilū and falls into the river Ṭāb (ba rūdh-i Ṭāb andar uftadhi). The town Sardān (spelt: Sūrdān) is between these two rivers.

37. Another river is that of shūshtār in the province of Khūzistān. Its beginning is from the confines of the province of Jībāl (shahr-i 10b jībāl). It flows² through Shūshtar, Sūq al-Arba‘ā, Ahwāz, Jubbay, and Bāsiyān until it reaches Dahana-yi Shīr (“The Lion’s Mouth”) and Ḥīṣn Mahdī. Then it falls into the Great Sea.

¹ On the position of this town, cf. §29, 15. ² On the margin: al-jūz‘ al-thānī, “second section” (?).
38. Another river in Khūzistān is masruqān. It separates (bar dāradh) from the Shūshtar river and flows down to Ahwāz watering all the fields; the rest falls again into the river of Shūshtar (bāz rūdh-i Sh. uftadh) near Ahwāz. The town 'Askar-i Mukram (spelt: 'Askar va Makrum) is situated between these two rivers.

39. Another river also separates from the river of Shūshtar off (az hadd) Bāsiyān and irrigates the fields\(^1\) of Bāsiyān, Khān Murdūna [sic], and Dauraq up to the limits of Rām Ūrmizd.

40. Another river is that of Shūsh which rises in the neighbourhood of Karkha (az hadd-i Karkha bar-dāradh) from one of the spurs of the Jībāl mountains and it flows to irrigate the countryside (savād) of Shūshtar [?] and Shūsh. It passes between Shūsh and B. dhushāvur [?], but before reaching the limit of Başunay all of it is used up in the fields (tā . . . rasadh hama andar kisht-hā ba-kār shudha bāshadh).

41. Another river is the ras (?), flowing up in the North (andar hadd-i shamāl), in the country of the Ghūz. It is a large river of which (the waters) are black and bad-smelling (siyāh va ganda); it rises from the mountain which is on the frontier between the Kimāk and the Khirkhiz, traverses (andar miyān) the Ghūz country and falls into the Khazar sea.

42. Another river is the artush (Irtish ?) which rises in the same mountain. It is a large water, black yet drinkable and fresh (shirīn). It flows between the Ghūz and the Kimāk until it reaches the village Jūbin (*Chūbin) in the Kimāk country; then it empties itself into the river Ātil.

43. Another river is the Ātil [sic] which rises in the same mountain north of the Artush; it is a mighty and wide river flowing through the Kimāk country (andar miyāna-yi Kimākiyān) down to the village Jūbin (*Chūbin); then it flows westwards along the frontier between the Ghūz and the Kimāk until it has passed Bulghār (tā bar Bulghār bigudharadh); then it turns southwards, flowing between the Turkish Pechenegs and the Burtās,\(^2\) traverses the town of Ātil belonging to the Khazar (az hadd-i Khazarān), and flows into the Khazar sea.

44. Another river is that of the Rūs which rises from the interior of the Saqlāb country and flows on in an eastern direction until it arrives at the Rūs limits. Then it skirts the confines (bar hudūd) of Urtāb, Ş.lāb, and Kūyāfa, which are the towns of the Rūs, and the confines of Khifjākh. Then it changes its direction and flows southwards to the limits of the Pechenegs (ba hudūd Bachanāk) and empties itself into the river Ātil.

\(^1\) Read: kisht, instead of ḥašhīhā.  
\(^2\) V.i., p. 463.
45. Another river is the ṭūṭā (?) which rises from a mountain situated on the frontier (sarfāhād) between the Pechenegs, the Majgharāī, and the Rūṣ. Then it enters the Rūṣ limits (andar miyāna-yi ḥadd-i Rūṣ) and flows to the Ṣaqālāb. Then it reaches the town Khurdaib belonging to the Ṣaqālāb and is used in their fields and meadows.

46. Another river is the Tigris which rises in the mountains of Diyārbakr (Āmid; spelt: Imīdih), flows past (bar) Bula, Mauṣil, Takrit, and Sāmarra, cuts into two both Baghdād and Wāsiṭ (miyāna-yi B. biburradh), and finally reaches Madhār, Bula (*Ubulla), and the limits of Başra; then it empties itself into the Great Sea. Near Fath a river separates from the Tigris, which is called canal of Maqīl and flows to Başra. Another river too separates from the Tigris off Bula (ba bar-i Bula) and is called Bula-canal (nahr Bula). It flows straight westwards until in the limits (ḥudūd) of Başra it joins the Maqīl canal. Then it passes through (az) Başra, where it is called Dubays-canal. Finally it once more (bāz) joins the Tigris near ‘Abbādān. Between Wāsiṭ and Madhār a canal separates from the Tigris, and forms two swamps called Başra Swamps.

47. In the Armenian mountains rise two rivers called the two zābs (Zābayn, spelt: Zābir), the Lesser and Greater Zāb. Both flow in a south-western direction and empty themselves into the Tigris between the towns Ḥaditha and Sinn.

48. Of the other two rivers, the one called sās (Sābus ?) rises in the Armenian mountains and is utilized in the fields; when it reaches the town ‘Ukbara (spelt: ‘Akbara) nothing remains of it. The other river, rising in the same mountain and called Nahrawān, is utilized in the fields, and when it reaches Nahrawān none of it remains.

49. Another river is the Euphrates, which rises in the mountain ‘Ulayq (‘Āliq ?) and flows through the Rūm country, cutting the mountain Lukkām (az miyān . . . biburradh). It arrives at the limits (ḥudūd) of *Malatya (spelt: Malatīya) and thus (hamchīnīn), turning southwards, skirts Shumayshāt, Sanja, and Bālās (*Balus ?). Then it takes a north-easterly [read: south-westerly] direction until it has skirted Raqqa, Qarqisīya, Rahba, ‘Āna, Hit, and Anbār. Then again it changes its direction and flows towards the south-[east] (miyān-i jūnīh [*va mashrīq]), till it reaches the Kūfa swamp. After Anbār a canal called Nahr-‘Īsā separates from it, goes down to Baghdād (tā B.), and empties itself into the Tigris, and the people navigate (ba-kashtī ravanadh) this canal from the Euphrates to the Tigris. Lower down (az sir-i Nahr-‘Īsā), another canal larger than the Nahr-‘Īsā separates from the Euphrates (ham az in rūdh); it is called Nahr-Ṣarṣar and is utilized in the fields of the town Ṣarṣar. Still
lower down, a canal larger than the Nahr-Šarṣar, which is called Nahr al-Malik, separates (from it), and is utilized in the fields of the town of the Nahr al-Malik. Still lower down a canal starts in the region (ḫudūd) of Karbalā. It is called Nahr-Sūrā and flows until it too [i.e., like the Euphrates] empties itself into the Wāsiṣ swamp. The town Jāmiʿayn is between these two rivers, i.e., the chief stream (ʿamūd) of the Euphrates and the Sūrā canal.

50. Another river in the province (ḫudūd) of Khorāsān is called HIRAND. It rises from the mountain of Šūs and skirts the region of Ustuvā (spelt: Āsataevī) and Jarmagān. It cuts into two (the town of) Gurgān (miyāna-yi G. biburradh), flows to the town of Abaskūn, and empties itself into the Khazar sea.

51. Another river in the province Ṭabaristān is called TİZHIN-RŪDH. It rises in the Qārin mountain in the neighbourhood of Pirrīm, skirts Sārī, and (empties itself into the Khazar) sea.

52. Another river, called BĀVUL, rises in the Qārin mountain, skirts Māmaṭīr, and empties itself into the Khazar sea.

53. Another river, called HARHAZ, rises in the mountains of Rayy and Lārijān on the frontier (as ḥadd) of Ṭabaristān and flows down to the neighbourhood of Āmol, (where) most of its water is utilized in the fields while the rest empties itself into the Khazar sea.

54. Another river, called SAPĪD-RŪDḤ, rises in the mountain Ḥuwayrith in Armenia, flows westwards [read: eastwards], traverses (miyān) Gīlān, and empties itself into the Khazar sea.

55. Another river, called ARAS (spelt: Ārus), rises on the eastern side of the Armenian mountains, from a place adjoining the Rūm. Taking an eastern direction it flows on until, having skirted Vartān and followed the frontier between Ādhārbaḏahgān, Armenia, and Arrān, it joins the Khazar sea.

56. Another river called KURR rises in the province Arrān in the mountain lying between Arrān and the Sarīr. Taking an easterly1 direction it flows down to the limits of Shakī and Qabala (spelt: Qibla) and skirts Bardij (*Bardēj). Then it unites with the river Aras (spelt: Āris) and their waters flow between Mūqān and Bākū to join the Khazar sea.

57. Another river in the ‘Arab country2 is BAYHĀN (spelt: Miǰān) It rises from the farthest end (ākhīr-i ḥudūd) of the Tīhāma mountains, i.e., from the easternmost part of it (ānḥ ba mashriq nazdiktar-ast), skirts the town of the Wādī Bayḥān (spelt: Miǰān), Shabwa (spelt: Saywā), and the towns of Ḥaḍramūt, (then) traverses the Aḥqāf sands, and flows into the Great Sea.

1 So instead of: westerly.
2 So instead of: Arrān.
In the Syrian lands (ḥilād-i Shām) there are no large rivers.

58. Another river, called Nahr al-Karūm (*Kurūm*), rises in the province ('amād) of Buqallār (Buccellariote theme) in Central Rūm (az miyāna-yi Rūm), and flows into the Sea of the Georgians.

59. Another river rises in the theme of Paphlagonia (Iflākhūniya) in Rūm, skirts the town of Tanābri (*Kāngri*), and falls into the Sea of the Georgians.

60. Another river rises from the Opsikian theme (Ubsiq) of Rūm, skirts the town of B.ndaq.lus (?) and Dīdūn (B.ndūn, N.dydūn?), to flow into the *Niqiya* (spelt: Tanqiya) lake in Rūm.

61. Another river also rises here (ūdhar) and follows the frontier (bar miyān-i ḥadd) between the theme of Anatolicon (*Nathq* spelt: Batliq) and the Buccellariote theme (Buqallār). Then it turns southwards, flowing between Khāk (dū) and *Niqiya*, and empties itself into the *Niqiya* lake.

62. Another river is the NILE in Egypt. South [read: north?] of the Jabal al-Qamar rise ten great rivers.\(^1\) From each five (of them) a swamp is formed (batīha bandadh); then from each of the swamps come out three rivers. From all these six rivers a swamp is formed (yakī baṭīha bandadh) outside the limits of Nubia towards the south (birūn as ḥudūd-i Nūba andar jumbū). Then the river Nile comes out of these marshes and enters Nubia (ba miyān-i N.), flowing northwards until it has traversed (biburradh) all of the province of Nubia. Then it turns westwards down to the town of Sukar (spelt: Sakra), then it turns back (bāṣ gardadh) eastwards until it has skirted (bar ṯaraf) the Mountain of the Oases (Kūḥ-i al-Wāḥāt) and flowed past (bar) Uswān (Assuan). Then it flows straight northwards and crosses all the province of Egypt. It skirts Akhmūm, Fayyum, and Fustāt, and empties itself into the lake Tinnīs.

63. And from the sands which lie between the districts (nāṣwāhi) of Egypt and the Quzum Sea rises a great river which flows westwards and crosses Nubia in its breadth (miyān-i Nūba biburradh ba ṭawnā). At the place where the town of Kābīl is situated, which belongs to the Nubians and is their capital, it falls into the Nile. This river is called the RIVER OF THE RAML AL-MA'DAN.\(^2\)

64. From the Nile a large canal separates near Fustāt and is constantly utilized (ba kār hamī shavadh) in the fields until it reaches Alexandria; the remainder of the water flows again (bāṣ)\(^3\) into the lake Tinnīs.

65. In the lands (andar shahrhā) of Ifrīqiya, in Tanja, and down

\(^1\) Cf. § 3, 28.  
\(^2\) Cf. § 59, 63.  
\(^3\) Perhaps: ba . . . bāṣ “towards”, cf. p. 50, l. 20.
to the region (nāḥiyat) of Sūs-the-Distant there are no great and important (kull) rivers, except such as (magar chunānk) serve for drinking (khurḍ) and (the irrigation of) the fields.

Likewise we have not found any information in the books and reports (andrā kitāb-hā va akhḫār-hā) about any rivers in Sūdān.

66. Another river rises in the west of the country Rūm, from the mountain Bulghari, and follows (hamāt ravaḏ) an easterly direction until it reaches the place (jāy) of the Ṣaqlābians living in the Rūm country. After having traversed the country of the Burchān (ba nāḥiyat-i Burchān [sic] bigudharadh) it skirts the theme (bar 'amal) of Thrace (spelt: Burāqiyā), and in this (reach?) traverses the town Qustantinīya (andrā in [miyān?] miyān-i Q. bigudharadh), while the remainder (of the water) flows out into the strait. This river is called Bulghari.

67. The river Ṭagūs (↔ *Ṭāju) rising in the mountains of Spain near Toledo, flows round the town of Toledo (azgird-īshahr-i Ṭulayṭula andar ayadh), following a westerly direction, then turns eastwards, (then) again westwards. And it flows on till the limits of *Merida (spelt: Ḥārda) and Santarem (Ṣantarān). At the latter place it empties itself into the Western Ocean.

And in all this world there are no rivers on which ships can go 12a except those which we have mentioned. As regards the southern parts (nāḥiyat) we have found absolutely (al-batta) no mention of any big river there, except of the 68. BUJA [sic] RIVER of which it is said that it rises in a mountain situated in the south, traverses (miyān) the Buja, and falls into the sea near Abyssinia (Ḥabasha). God is omniscient and there is no might but in God!

§ 7. Discourse on the Deserts and Sands

Every land (ṣamīn) where there are sands (rīg), or salt marshes (ṣhīra), but no mountains, no running water, and no fields is called desert. Deserts are of various description: some extensive, and some small. And so are the numerous sands in those deserts: some extensive and some small. In the present chapter we shall mention, if God will it, each extensive desert, or sand, in the inhabited part (ābūdhānī) of the world.

1. In the southern part of the country Chinistān, between the mountain Ṭā’in fil-bahr and Khumdān there is a desert,1 of which a part protrudes into the sea like an island. East of this desert1 is the *Eastern2 Ocean, and south of it, the Great Sea; west of it, the

---
1 Plain?  
2 So instead of Western which stands in the original.
mountain al-Tā'īn fil-bahr; and north of it, the Khumdān river. In the soil of this desert there is much gold.

2. Another desert is situated north of China (*Chīn خَيْن*?). East of it lies the Eastern Ocean; south of it, the provinces (*navāḥi*) of China (خَيْن); west of it, the river of Kuchchā; and north of it, the Toghuzghuz and Khirkhūz.

3. In the country of Chānistān there are sands, three days’ journey (*mansīl*) wide, situated between two Chinese (خَيْن) towns Khathum and Vasārnīk. They stretch in length from the limit of the swamp of the Kuchā [sic] river up to the limit of that (*in*) desert which we have mentioned in the north of *China* خَيْن.1

4. Another desert is (that) east of which lie the limits of Tibet; south of it, the country of Hind (*bilād-i Hind*);2 west of it, the limits of Transoxiana; and north of it, the Khallukh country. It is a hard (*sqb*) desert, without water and grass.

5. Another desert [plain?] is in the country of Hind, on the shore of the Great Sea, stretching in length from the limit (*ḥadd*) of Sarandib up to the beginning of Dahum’s kingdom (*mamlakat*); yet this desert is intersected (*burīṭha*) and disposed in patches (*pāra pāra*).

In the provinces of Sind and Hind small deserts are numerous.

6. Another small and limited desert is the one east of which are situated the towns of Sind; south of it, the Great Sea; west of it, the Kūfīj mountains; and north of it, some parts of Sind and Kirmān.

7. Another desert (is the one) east of which lie the northern parts of the province of Sind down to the region (*hūdūd, basin*) of the river Mihrān, and of which the southern (part) skirts (*bar ḥūdūd . . . birāwēdhi*) Sind, Kirmān, and Pārs; west of it are the limits of Rayy, Qum, and Qāshān, and its north skirts (*bar . . . bigudharadhi*) Khorāsān with its Marches (*hūdūd*) and Sīstān. It is called the desert of KARGAS-KŪH, because west of it stands a small mountain called Kargas-kūh, after which the desert is called. In this desert hills are scattered everywhere. (The parts) of this desert are called after the provinces which happen to lie near them. In this desert lie the sands 12b which surround Sīstān (as gird bar āyadhi) | and are called the Sīstān sands.

8. Another desert is the one of which the east skirts the confines of Marv (*bar ḥūdūd Marv bigudharadhi*) down to the Jayḥūn. Its south marches with the regions of Bāvard, Nasā, Farāv, Dihistān, and with the Khazar sea up to the region of Ātil. West of it is the river Ātil; north of it, the river Jayḥūn, the Sea of Khwārazm, and

---

1 On the doubtful readings in 2. and 3. see notes to § 3, 5d.
2 Here in the sense of the upper part of the Indus basin.
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the Ghūz country, up to the Bulghar frontier. It is called the desert of Khwārazm and the Ghūz. In this desert there are sands which begin from the limits of Balkh, and stretch south of the Jayhūn and down to the sea of Khwārazm. Their breadth varies from 1 to 7 stages (manzils).

9. Another sand lies between the Kīmāk and the limits of Jand and Javāra. Its length is immense and its breadth is exiguous.

10. Another desert is the steppe (bādiya) of which the eastern side stretches from the limits of Hajar to those of Bahrayn and Bašra; (then) it marches with the region of Qādisiya and Kūfa (spelt: Kūh), up to the limits of the river Euphrates; south of it lies the whole of the Arab sea (daryā-yi 'Arab hama), the limits of the Ayla [read: *Barbari] Gulf, the Great Sea, the districts (nawāḥi) of Ḥaḍramūt and Yemen; its west marches with the regions of Jidda, Jār, Madyan, and *Ayla; its north, with the regions of Muʿān (spelt: Maghān), Salamiya, Tadmur and Khunāsira down to the river Euphrates. It is called the bedouin steppe (bādiya). Whatever part of this desert is adjacent to a town, or to an Arab tribe (hayy), it is called after those places. In this desert there are sands beginning from the sea-shore in the region of Bahrayn and varying in breadth from 2 to 4 stages (mansil), while its length is 20 stages. It is called the Ḥabīr sand, and its sand is red and used by the goldsmiths. All the pilgrims travelling by the 'Irāq route must cross this sand-plain (rīg).

11. Other sands lie on the sea-shore south of this [i.e. 10.] desert and surround (az gird bar āyadh) the towns of Ḥaḍramūt. They are called the aḥqāf-sands.

12. Other sands are those east of which are the Gulfs of Barbar and *Ayla; south of them, the desert of Buja; west of them, the countries of Nubia and Egypt; north of them, the Quẓūm Gulf. These sands are called sands of the mines (maʿdan) because in them there is much gold, and much gold is (actually) found there.

13. Another desert is that east of which lies the country of Abyssinia (Ḥabasha); south of it, the country of Buja; west of it, Nubia; north of it, the sands just described.

14. Other sands lie in the country of Egypt. Their eastern side stretches from Ḥaṣqalān to the Dead Sea (Buḥayrat al-mayīta); both south and west of them (junūb va mağihib-i vay har du) lies the province of Fustāṭ; their northern side stretches from the Tinnīs lake to Ḥaṣqalān. They are called the sands of Jīfār.

15. In the country of Maghrib (nāḥiyat-i M.), from Egypt, the Mountain of al-Wāḥāt, Barqa and Ṭarābulus down to the province of Sus-the-Distant, (the land) is mostly desert (bīshṭar-i hama biyābān-ast).
16. In the country of Maghrib there are extensive sands in the province Sijilmāsa, called ṭaml al-ma'dan. Much gold is found there.

17. The region lying south of the Equator is mostly desert (bīshṭar-i hama biyābān-ast). Their inhabited places (ābādhānti) are situated amidst (andar) the deserts, except a few which are up in the mountains.

18. Likewise there are mostly deserts in the northern region of those inhabited lands of the world which belong to the northern quarter and stretch from the frontier of China down to the country of the Khazars. The dwellings (jāy) of the Turks are mostly situated in (andar) deserts, except a few which lie among the mountains, running waters, trees, and fields.

The extensive and known deserts and sands existing in the Islamic lands are those which we have enumerated, and in the lands of Unbelief (nāhiyat-i kāfirī), except those of the Turks (juz as Turk), they are also as mentioned by us. God is omniscient and assistance is from God!

§ 8. Discourse on the Countries (of the World)

1. One country (nāhiyat) differs (judhā) from another in four respects (rūy). First, by the difference of water, air, soil, and temperature (gormā-va-sarmā). Secondly, by the difference of religion, law (sharī'at), and beliefs (kīsh). Thirdly, by the difference of words (lughāt) and languages. Fourthly, by the difference of kingdoms (padhshā'ī-hā). The frontiers of a country are separated from those of another country by three things: first, by mountains,1 great or small, stretching between them; secondly, by rivers, great or small, flowing between them; thirdly, by deserts, great or small, stretching between them (miyān-i du nāhiyat andar).

2. The Greeks (Rūmiya) have said that all the cultivated lands (ābādhānti) of the world form three parts. The one is that which, on the east, has the Eastern Ocean and the (farthest) limits of the Toghużghuz and Khirkiţ; on the south, the Great Sea up to the Qulzum; on the west, the countries of Syria and Rūm, up to the Straits of Constantinople; [and on the north], the Saqlāb country and the farthest limits (ākhir-i hudūd) of the cultivated lands of the world. This part (of the world) is called great Asia (Asiya al-kubrā). This part (of the world) constitutes two-thirds (du si-yak) of the cultivated lands (lying) in the northern parts.

3. The second part has on its east the beginning of the country of Egypt, from the Equator to the sea of Rūm; on its south, a desert

1 Singular in the text.
lying between the lands (bilād) of Maghrib and those of the Sudān; on its west, the Western Ocean; on its north, the Rūm Sea. This part of the world is called Libya (Lūbiya), and constitutes one-twelfth of all the cultivated lands of the world lying in the north.

4. The third part has on its east the Straits of Constantinople; on its south, the sea of Rūm; on its west, the Western Ocean; and on its north, the limit of the cultivated lands of the north. This part is called Europe (Urūfī, spelt: Aswīfī), and forms one-quarter of all the cultivated lands of the world.

5. As regards the cultivated lands lying to the south, the Greeks (Rūm) call them the “Inhabited lands of the South”.¹

6. The Inhabited Lands of the world (“oeumene”) consist of fifty-one countries, of which five lie south of the Equator, viz., Zāba [sic], Zangistān, Ḥabasha, Buja, and Nūba. One western country, the Sudān, partly belongs to the north and partly to the south, as the Equator traverses it. Forty-five countries lie in the northern side (sūy) of the Inhabited Quarter (chahār yak-i ābdāhān), viz., China, Tibet, Hindūstān, Sind, Khorāsān with its Marches (ḥudūd), Transoxiana with its Marches, Kirmān, Pārs, the desert of Kargas-kūh (spelt: Karas-kūh), Daylamān, Khūzistān, the province of Jībāl, 'Irāq, the lands of the Arabs (diyār-i 'Arab), Jazīrā, Ardharbādhagān, Syria, Egypt, Maghrib, Spain, Rūm, the Sarīr, the Alān, the Khazar, the Ṣaqāb, the Khazarian Pechenegs, the M.rvāt, the Inner Bulghār, the Rūs, the Majghari, the N.nd.r (*V.n.nd.r), the Turkish Pechenegs, the B.rādas [sic], the Burtās, the Khiṣjāq, the Ghūz, the Kīmāk, the Chigil, the Tuhks, the Khallukh, the Yaghmā, the Toghuzghuz, and the Khirkhz. Each of these countries is divided into provinces (aʿmāl), and in each of the latter there are numerous towns. In another section (fasl) we shall explain (padhīḥ kunīm) the size (miqādār) of each country and town, its nature and climate, the wonders and marvels coming from each town; all the kingdoms (pādhshāhī-hā) and towns of each country; their customs and manners and the religion of their inhabitants, so far as (badhān miqādār kī) we could find (these details) in the books of (our) predecessors (pishinagān) or hear reports about them (ba-akhbār-hā shanidām), for (zīrāk-kī) nobody can know all the particulars (ahvāl) about the world, except God, the Exalted. There is no power but in God!

§ 9. Discourse on the properties of the country of Chīnīstān

East of the country of Chīnīstān is the Eastern Ocean; south of it, the confines of Wāq-Wāq, the Sarandīb mountain, and the Great Sea;

¹ Persian ābdāhānī corresponds here to Greek ὀικουμενή and Arabic al-maʾmūra.
west of it, Hindūstān and Tibet; north of it, Tibet and the countries of the Toghuţghuz and Khirkhīz. This is a country with many amenities (nimat) and running waters. In it are found numerous gold-mines, mountains, deserts, lakes, and sands. Its king is called Faghfūr-i Chīn and is said to be a descendant of Farīdhūn. It is reported that the king (malik) of China has 360 districts (nāhiyat) and each day of the year the taxes of a district are brought to the Treasury. The inhabitants of this country (nāhiyat) are good craftsmen and make wonderful things. Embarking (andar nishasta) on the river *Ghiyān (spelt: 'Inān) they visit Tibet for trade. Most of them are Manichaeans (din-i Mānī), but their king is a Buddhist† (shamāni?). From this country comes much gold, silk (harīr va parand), Chinese khāskhīr (?), brocades (dība), china (ghaḍāra), cinnamon (dār-ṣīnī), khutū-horns from which knife-handles (dasta-hā-yi kār [read: kārd] kunand) are fabricated, and all sorts of wonderful objects (kār-hā-yi bādi'). There are elephants and rhinoceroses (karg) in China.

1. WĀQ-WĀQ, a province of China. In its soil gold-mines are found. (Even) their dogs have gold collars. Their chiefs wear extremely precious necklaces of rhinoceros horn (surā-i karg). The people are black and naked. (Wāq-Wāq) belongs to the hot zone and has no amenity (nimat). Its capital is M.qys, which is a small town (where) merchants of various classes (gūnāgūn) stay.

2. Besides Wāq-Wāq, China has nine large provinces (nāhiyat) on the coast of the Eastern Ocean: (a) Ir.sh; (b) Khūr.sh; (c) F.Rāj.Klī; (d) Thāy; (e) Kh.Sānī; (f) T.Nkūy; (g) Būnūghnī; (h) Qūrī; (i) Anfs.

All nine have various subdivisions (nāhiyat) which all differ (mukhālif) in religion (spelt: badhīn!), appearance, and habits, and in them (wāy) there are numerous towns, but the government (sulūn) of all these provinces is on behalf (az dast "from the hand") of the Faghfūr-i Chīn.

3. KHUMDĀN (Ch'ang-an-fu) is the capital of Chinistān. It is a great town and serves as residence to Faghfūr. It possesses numerous trees, habitations (ābdāhānī), and amenities (nimat), and is situated on the sea-coast.² Khumdān produces pearls. The inhabitants are round-faced and broad-nosed. They dress in brocade (dība) and silk and make their sleeves wide and skirts long.

4. BUGHSHŪR [sic], a large town belonging to China. In it reside numerous merchants from different cities and it is a very pleasant place (va jā'ī bisyār-nimāt-ast).

† "Shamanist" would be impossible here.

² Cf. § 2, 4, but a swamp is mentioned near Khumdān under § 3, 34.
§ 9

“The Regions of the World”

5. KUCHĀN, a small town in which reside Tibetan and Chinese merchants.

6. KHĀLB.K, a large town, prosperous (ābādhān) with numerous amenities (bā ni’mat-i bisyār) and governed from China.

7. KHĀMCHŪ (Kan-chou), half of which (nīma-yī ā) is owned by the Chinese and the other half (nīma’ī as ā) by the Tibetans. A perpetual war goes on between them. They are idolaters (Buddhists? but-parast), and their government is on behalf of the Khāqān of Tibet.

8. SAUKJŪ (Su-chou) is the frontier of Tibet. Its government is from China. In its mountains musk-deer and yaks (ghiszghāv) are found.

9. SAKHCHŪ is like Saukjū, but larger (miḥ). Its government’s seat is Saukjū.

10. KUCHĀ [sic] is situated on the frontier and belongs to China, but constantly (har vaqtī) the Toghuzghuz raid (tāsand) the inhabitants and loot them. The town possesses many amenities.

11. KŪGHM.R possesses many idol-temples. It is a pleasant place situated close to the mountains. In it there is a certain dead body (yakī murda) venerated by the inhabitants.

12. BURJ-I SANGĪN (“Stone-tower”), a large village in China, prosperous and very pleasant.

13. KHĀJŪ (Kua-chou), a large town and a residence of merchants. Its government is from China. The inhabitants profess the faith of Mānī.

14. SANGLĀKH (“Stony place”), a large village in the district (‘amal) of Sājū. The inhabitants are idolaters (Buddhists?).

15. SĀJŪ (Sha-chou) belongs to China and is situated (half-way) between the mountains and the desert. It is a prosperous place (ābādhān-st) and possesses many amenities and running waters. (The inhabitants) are harmless and profess the faith of Mānī.

16. K.SĀN, a town far from the road. It has few amenities (kam-nī’mat) and its governor (kārdār) comes from Tibet.

17. KĀDHĀKH lies in China, but the governor (kārdār) is on behalf of Tibet.

18. KHOTAN is situated between two rivers. In its limits (hudūd) live wild people who are man-eaters (mardumān-and vaḥshī mardum-khwāra). The commodities (khwāsta) of the inhabitants are mostly raw silk (gaz). The king of Khotan lives in great state (hay’at) and calls himself “Lord of the Turks and Tibetans” (’aṣīm al-Turk wa-Tubbat). He lives on the boundary of China and Tibet. This king of Khotan has eunuchs (khisiyān) in charge of all his districts. This

¹ So vocalized.
land (shahr) turns out 70,000 warriors. The jade stone (sang-i yashm) comes from the rivers of Khotan.

19. KH.ZA, village of Khotan, round which there are some sands.

20. ḤUTM (Khutm, Jutm?) is desolate; only a flourishing idol-temple is found there (andal vay yak but-khāna ābādhn bas).

21. SĀVINIK, a village, round (as gird) which there are sands.

22. BūRKHĪMŪ and NAVĪKATH(?), two towns of China on the sea-coast (bar karān-i daryā)1, prosperous, large, very pleasant, and having a warlike population (jang kunanda).

23. SARANDĪB lies in the south of China, on the boundary between Hindūstān and Chīnistan, on the sea-coast (bar kardn-i darya). It possesses numerous districts and running waters. In its rivers diamonds (almas) are found. From Sarandib come different kinds of corundum (yaqīt). Its king is independent (ba sar-i khwīsh).

24. 'AZR (Gh.zr?), a small town near Sarandib which serves as residence to the king of Sarandib.

§ 10. Discourse on the country of Hindūstān [sic] and its Towns

East of it are the countries of China and Tibet; south of it, the Great Sea; west of it, the river Mihrān; north of it, the country of Shakhnān belonging to Vakhān2 and some parts of Tibet. This country possesses many amenities, a numerous population, and many kings (pādshāy). Numerous towns lie in it. It has mountains, deserts, seas, and sands. Many perfumes (tīb-hā) come from it, musk, aloes-wood ('ūd), ambergris, camphor, various precious things (gauhar), pearls (murvārīd), corundum (yaqīt), diamonds, corals, and pearls (durr) as well as multifarious drugs (dārū), and wonderful textiles (jāma) of different kinds. In its plains and deserts various animals are found, such as elephants, rhinoceroses (karg), peacocks, k.rk.rī-[birds?], parrots (tītak), Indian cuckoos (shārak), and the like. This is the largest country in the northern oecumene. All through Hindūstān wine (nabīd) is held to be unlawful and adultery (sinā) to be licit. All the inhabitants are idolaters.

1. QĀMARŪN (Kāmarūpa, Assam), a kingdom in the eastern part of Hindūstān. Rhinoceroses and gold-mines are numerous there. From it come emery (sunbādha) and good fresh aloes ('ūd-i tār).

2. SANF (Champa?), large land (shahr) of the Qāmarūn kingdom. The Sanfī-aloes come from there.

1 Perhaps daryā means here only “the river”.
2 Probably “*Sh. and V.”. See note to § 2.
3. MANDAL, small land (shahr) of the Qāmarūn kingdom. From it come the Mandalī-aloes.

Both these lands (shahr) are on the coast.

4. FANṢŪR, a large town and a merchants' resort. From it comes much camphor. It is a maritime emporium (bārgah-i daryā). The king of Fanṣūr is called S.ṭūhā. He has a separate kingdom (mamlakati judhā). In the kingdom of Fanṣūr there are ten kings, all on behalf of (az dast) S.ṭūhā.

5. H.D.D.NJĪRA (?), a town with a market 1 farsang long. Its king is Saṭūhā.1 It is a flourishing and pleasant town.

6. QIMĀR (Khmer), a large country (shahr) and its kings are the most just among the kings of Hindūstān. And in all Hindūstān adultery is licit, except in Qimār, where it is forbidden. The presents (silat) given by the kings of Qimār consist of elephant-tusks (dandān-i pil) and the Qimārī-aloes.

7. N.MYĀS, HARKAND, ÜRSHĪN, S.M.ND.R, ANDRĀS—these five large towns (lands?) are situated on the sea-coast, and the royal power (pādshāhī) in them belongs to Dahum. Dahum does not consider any one (ḥīch-kas) superior to himself and is said to have an army of 300,000 men. In no place of Hindūstān are fresh aloes (‘ūd-i tar) found but in the (possessions) of the king of Qāmarūn and of Dahum (magar pādhshāyi [sic] Q. va D.).2 These countries produce in large quantities good cotton which (grows) on trees yielding their produce (bar dīhād) during many years. The product (māl) of this country is the white conch (sapīd muhra) which is blown like a trumpet (būq) and is called *shank (spelt: sanbak). In this country there are numerous elephants (pil).

8. TUŚŪL, a large country adjacent to China, from which it is separated by a mountain. The inhabitants are dark (asmār). Their garments are of cotton.

9. MŪSA, a country adjacent to China and Tuśūl. The people have strong fortresses and constructions. Much musk comes from there.

10. MĀNAK, a country adjacent to China and Mūsa.

These three (last-named) countries are at war with the Chinese (Chīniyān) but the latter come out stronger (bihtar āyand).

11. NŪBĪN (?) forms the frontier of Dahum's country (mamlakat). The provisions and corn (ghalla) of Sarandīb come from this town.

12. ÜR.SHHFĪN, a town with a district (nāḥiyat) protruding into the sea like an island. Its air is bad. That sea is called there the Sea of Gulfs (baḥr al-aghbāb). The royal power belongs to a woman who is called “rāyina”3 (pādshāhī az ōn-i xani buvadh rāyina khwānand).

---

1 So vocalized. 2 Evidently *pādshāh-i-yi Q. va D. 3 *rāniya?
Extremely large (‘āṣīm busurg) elephants are found there, such as in no other place of India. From it come large quantities of pepper (bilbil < *pilpil) and rotang (nayṣa).

13. MALAY, four towns (lands?) along the coast, all of which are called Malay. It is the kingdom (pādshāhī) of Ballah-rāy. From it comes much rotang (dār-i nayṣa) and pepper.

14. ŠĀMŪR (صمر), SINDĀN, SŪBĀRA (spelt: Sūyāra), KANBĀYA, four towns on the coast, in which live Muslims and Hindus (Hinduvān). In that locality (andar-ū?) is a Friday-mosque (mazgīt-i ādhīna) and an idol-temple. The people of these towns have long hair (mūy-i furū-hishta) and at all seasons wear only an izar (jissīydk-izar). The climate (of these parts) is hot. The government (pādshāhī) there belongs to Ballah-rāy. Near these (towns) there is a mountain on which grows much bamboo (khaizurān), rotang (nayṣa, spelt: na‘ra), pepper, and coco-nut. In Kanbāya shoes (na‘lān: “sandals”? ) are produced which are exported to all the countries of the world.

15. QĀMH.L (*Qāmiḥul), a pleasant town which is a part of Ballah-rāy’s kingdom.

16. BĀBĪ, a pleasant town of which the king is a Muslim. ‘Omar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz, who mutinied (khurūj) and seized Manṣūra, was from this town.

17. QĀNDAHĀR, a large town in which there are numerous idols of gold and silver. It is a place of hermits and Brahmans (zāhidān va brahmanān). It is a pleasant town to which appertains a special province (nāḥiyat-i khāṣṣa).

18. H.ŠĪNĀKRA (?šīnāgra?), a pleasant locality with numerous districts.

19. B.JŪNA, a populous village on the edge of the desert.

20. KÜNS.R, a small town with idol temples.

21. NŪNŪN, a town which is said to possess more than 300,000 idols, and there are numerous brothels (rū sipī-khāna) in it.

22. B.KSĀN, a populous village of which the inhabitants shave (bisuturand) their hair and beards. In it there are numerous idols of gold and copper (rūyīn).

23. H.MĀNĀN, a place of Indian hermits. (The inhabitants) are Brahmans who say that they are of the prophet Abraham’s tribe, God’s blessings be on him.

24. B.LHĀRĪ (Ballahārī?), a large and populous town and a residence of merchants from India, Khorāsān, and ’Īrāq. It produces much musk.

1 Cf. § 5, 9.
25. Bīnd (?), a populous town where stuff for Indian turbans (jāma-yī shāra) is produced. And in all these (places) the king is Ballah-rāy. Behind this king's (country) lies (that of) the king of Qinnauj.

26. F.MA (N.maj?), a small town where great quantities of precious things (gauhar) are brought (uf tadāh).

27. Khālīn (*fāln?i), a small but populous town producing great quantities of velvets and stuff for turbans (jāma-yī makhmal va shāra), as well as of drugs.

28. B.Rhāra, a large and pleasant town.

29. Qinnauj1, a large town and the seat of the raja (rāy) of Qinnauj who is a great king; most of the Indian kings obey him and this raja does not consider any one his superior. He is said to have 150,000 horse and 800 elephants (destined) to take the field on the day of battle (ki ba-rūz-i ḥarb bar-nishinand).2

30. Būrī, Qalrī, Narī (?), Rūr (spelt: Zūr), four towns belonging to Sind but lying on this (eastern!) side of the Mihrān river. This is a very pleasant locality. There stands a preacher's pulpit (minbar) and the Hindūstān merchandise (jīhāz) is brought (uf tadāh) to these little towns. Rūr possesses two strong walls (bar-ū du bāra muḥkam). This place is full of dampness and humidity (tar-u-nammāk).

31. B.sm.d (?), a small but very pleasant town in Hind (Panjāb ?).

32. Multān, large town in Hind. In it there is a very large idol, and from all Hindūstān people come on pilgrimage (ba-ḥajj) to visit this idol whose name is Multān [sic]. It is a strong place with a citadel (qundiz). Its governor (sultān) is a Quraishite from the descendants of Sām. He lives at a camp (lashkargāh) half a farsang (from Multān) and reads the khūṭba in the name of the “Western One” (bar maghribi).3

33. Jandrūz (*Chandrōr), a small town near Mūltān [sic].

34. Jāb.rs.rī (?), a populous and very pleasant village. In it great quantities of tamarind (khurmā-yī hindī) and cassia fistularis (khiyār-i shanbar) are found.

35. Bahrāyi was a large town but at present is desolate, and little (andak jā’t) of it is left.

36. Lahōr, a town with numerous districts. Its government (sultān) is on behalf of the chief (mīr) of Multān. In it there are markets and idol-temples. In it great numbers of jalgūza-trees,4

---

1 Such is the Arabic vocalization, once clearly indicated in our text too.
2 After this paragraph ought to come 38.
3 The Fātimid caliph is meant here.
4 According to Raverty: Pinus Gerardiana.
almond-trees, and coco-nuts are found. All the inhabitants are idolaters and there are no Muslims there.

37. Rāmiyān (Rāmeyān?), a town on a huge mound (tall). In it there are some Muslims called Sālhārī. The rest are all idolaters. Many Hindū slaves (barda) and numerous Indian commodities (jihās-i Hindūstān) are brought there (uftadh). The local government is on behalf of the amīr of Multān. At the town gate stands an idol-temple with a copper idol inlaid with gold (ba-zar kanda). They hold it in great reverence, and daily thirty women go round about this idol (zī san-and kī gird-i but āyand) with drums, tambourines (daf), and dances (pāy kūftan).

38. Jālhandar, a town situated on the summit of a mountain in the cold zone (sardār) and producing great quantities of velvets and stuffs (jāma), plain and figured (sādha va munaqqash). Between Rāmiyān and Jālhandar there is a distance of five days, and all this road is planted with trees (producing) myrobalan (halīta), terminalia belerica (balīta), embīlica officinalis (āmulā), and (other) drugs (dārī), exported to all the world. This town belongs to the dominions (hudūd) of the raja (rāy) of Qinnauj.

39. S.lābūr (S.lāpūr?), a large town with markets, merchants, and commodities (khvāsta). The government (pādshāhi) belongs to the raja of Qinnauj. The coins with which their trade is carried on are of various kinds, e.g., bārāda, nākhwār, shabāni, kabuhrā, kimāvān, and kūra, each of them having a different weight. S.lābūr has numerous idol-temples. Their sages (dānishmand) are Brahmans. Sugar, candy-sugar (panīdhi), honey, coco-nuts, cows, sheep, and camels abound there.

40. Brūn (?), a town like a fortified camp (ribāt). Four days in the year a lively (tīz) market is held there. The place lies near Qinnauj, within the dominions of the latter’s raja (va hudūd-i rāy-ast). It possesses 300 idol-temples and a water, of which it is said that whoever washes himself in it is free from any ill-luck (āfat). And whenever one of their chiefs (mīhtar) dies, all the inferiors (kihtar) living under his shadow kill themselves. The king of their town sits on a throne and wherever he travels (har jā kī ravadh) many men (bāsi mard) carry the throne on their shoulders to where (the king) wants. From this town to Tibet is a five days’ journey over difficult passes.

41. Haytāl, a country near Qinnauj, from which it is shut off by a huge mountain. The country is small but the people are warlike and good fighters (mubāris). The government at Haytāl (pādshāhi)

1 This paragraph ought to follow on 29.
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belongs to (one of the) margraves (mulūk-i aṭrāf) who is on hostile terms with the raja of Qinnauj.

42. Tythāl (?), a country adjacent to Haytāl. Between them stands a mountain of difficult access (ṣa'b) over which the inhabitants transport (bigudāranda-*bigudharānand) loads tied to their backs. It is a place with few amenities (kam-ni'mat).

43. Baytāl (Nepal?), a country adjacent to Taythāl. It is a place (visited by) the merchants from all over the world and much musk comes from there.

44. Tāfī (*Tāqī), a country with populous towns and ample amenities (ni'mat-i farākh). Its people are dark and white.

45. Salūqiyān (spelt: S.lāfsyān), a large country with many commodities. The people call their king najāya. They (?) take wives from the tribe of Ballah-rā (ishān zan as qabila-yi B. kunand). Much red sandal-wood comes from this country.

46. Al-Jurz (spelt: Lhrz), a country called after the name of its king. And this country is a place with justice and equity. It is reported that 100,000 men take the field (bar-nishtnad) together with (the king). And of all the three kings (mentioned) this one is the most valiant. From this | country come much aloes and sandal-wood. 16 a

47. Gardīz, a frontier town between Ghaznīn and Hindūstān, situated on the summit of a mound (tall) and possessing a strong fortress (hisār) with three walls. The inhabitants are Khārijites.

48. Saul, a pleasant village on a mountain. In it live Afgāns. And as you go thence to Husaynān the road passes between two mountains, and on the road one must cross seventy-two torrents (āb). The road is full of dangers and terrors.

49. Husaynān, a town in the hot zone lying by a steppe (bar șahrā). 50. *Nīnhār, a place of which the king makes show of Islam (mūsalmānī numāyadī), and has many wives, (namely) over thirty Muslim, Afgān, and Hindū (wives). The rest (va dīgār mardum) of the people are idolaters. In (Nīnhār) there are three large idols.

51. Hīvān, a town on a mountain. From this town flows downhill a water which is used in the fields.

52. Jalūt and Balūt, two towns (respectively) situated to the right and left of the road, on the tops of two mountains separated by a stream. In them (vay) there are idol-temples and they produce sugar-cane, cows, and sheep.

53. Bīrūza is a town within the limits (andar ḥudūd) of Mūltān

1 Cf. § 5, 9 b.  
2 Those of Tāqī, Salūqī, and Jurz?  
3 Spelt: Banīhār, cf. § 6, 13.  
4 Under § 6, 15: Jalavvat and Balavvat.
in Hindūstān. All the merchandise of Hindūstān (hama jihāz-hā-i Ḥ.) comes (uftadh) there and in it are idol-temples.

54. LAMGHĀN, a town situated on the middle course [? cf. p. 58, l. 4] of the river, on (its) bank (bar miyāna bar karān-i rūdḥ). It is the emporium (bārgāh) of Hindūstān and a residence of merchants and it possesses idol-temples.

55. DYNWR (supra: Dunpūr), a town situated opposite (barābar) Lamghān on the bank of a river. It is the residence of merchants from all Khorāsān. It has idol-temples. In both these towns reside Muslim merchants, and both are prosperous and pleasant.

56. VAYHIND, a large town. Its king Jaypāl is under the orders (of the raja) of Qinnauj. In it live a few Muslims, and the Hindūstān merchandise, such as musk, precious things (gauhar), and precious stuffs, mostly come to this country (jihāz-hā-yi Ḥ. bishtar badhin nāhiyat uftadh az mushk va gauhar va jāma-hā-yi bā-qimāt).

57. QASHMĪR, a large and pleasant land (shahr) with numerous merchants. Its king depends on the raja of Qinnauj (pādhshāh-i vay rāy-i Qinnauj-rā-st). It possesses many idol-temples to which the Hindus come on pilgrimage.

§ 11. Discourse on the Country of Tibet and its Towns. East of it are some parts of Chīnīstān; south of it, Hindūstān; west of it, some of the Marches (ḥudūd) of Transoxiana and some of the Khallukh country (ḥudūd); north of it, some parts of the Khallukh and Toghuzghuz. This country is cultivated and populous, but has few commodities (ābādhān va bīyār-mardum va kam-ḵwāstā). All the people are idolaters. Some of the country belongs to the hot zone and some to the cold one (sardāstr). Everything Indian is imported (uftadh) into Tibet and from Tibet re-exported to Muslim countries. There are gold-mines in Tibet, and from it come much musk, black foxes, grey squirrels (sanjāb), sable-martens (samūr), ermine (qāqum), and khutū-[horns]. It is a place of few amenities (kam-nil-mat). Its king is called Tubbat-khāqān and he has great numbers of troops and arms. One of the marvels of Tibet is that whoever visits it, without any reason, becomes (of) smiling (countenance) and merry heart until he leaves that country.

1. RĂNG-RONG, a province (nāhiyat) of Tibet adjacent to Hindūstān and Chīnīstān. In Tibet there is no province poorer (darvīshtar) than this. The people live in tents and their wealth (ḵwāstā) is sheep. The Tubbat-khāqān levies from them poll-taxes (sar-gasit) instead of land-taxes (kharāj). This country is a month’s journey long and as much across. It is reported that on (bar) its mountains there are gold-
mines, and in them (andar vay) nuggets (pāra‘ī) of gold are found in the form (mānand) of several sheep’s heads joined together (ba yak pāra). Whoever, having collected this gold, brings it home, death strikes that house until the gold is replaced in its (former) place.

2. THE BOLORIAN (B.lūrī) TIBET, a province of Tibet adjoining the confines (hudūd) of Bolor. The people are chiefly merchants and live in tents (khayma) and felt-huts (khargāh). The country is 15 days’ journey long and 15 days’ journey wide.

3. N.ZVĀN (?), a wealthy (tuvangar) country of Tibet with many commodities. In this country (shahr) there is a tribe (qabila) called Mayūl [sic] from which the kings of Tibet come. In (this province) two small villages are found of which the one is called N.zvān and the other Mayūl [sic]. It is a place of few amenities (kam-ni’mat) but has numerous commodities (khwāsta), such as gold, furs (māy), sheep, and (many other) commodities and implements (khwāsta va ālāt).

4. B.RKHMĀN, a town with numerous merchants.

5. LHĀSĀ, a small town (shahrak) with numerous idol temples (Buddhist temples?) and one Muslim mosque (masgūr). In it live a few Muslims.

6. ZAVA, a small village within the limits (hudūd) of Twsmt.

7. *AJĀYUL (? jā-?), a place with pastures, meadows (marghazār), and felt-huts of some Tibetans. When the Tubbat-khāqān dies and from the said tribe (i.e., the M.yūl tribe?) no one remains, the people elect a chief (mihtar) from among these *Ajāyul.

8. GREAT AND LITTLE J.RM.N.GĀN (Charmangān?), two towns on the edge of the desert. It is a place of few amenities and few commodities (andak khwāsta). The people (mardum) are hunters (sayyādī kurnand).

9. TWSMT (Tūsmat?), a land (shahr) formerly held by the Chinese and now by the Tibetans. In it there are troops (lashkar) belonging to the Tubbat-khāqān (āz ān-i T.-kh.).

10. BĀLS, 11. K.RYĀN (?), 12. V.J.KHYĀN (?), 13. B.RĪKAHA, 14. J.N.KH-KATH, 15. KUNKRĀ, 16. RĀYKŪTIYA, 17. B.RNIYA, 18. N.DRUF, 19. D.STUYA, 20. M.TH, small towns (lands?) which formerly belonged to China, but now are held by the Tibetans. In them the Toghuẓghuz (mardūmān-i Toghuẓghuzi) are numerous. They are places possessing commodities (khwāsta), amenities (ni’mat), and cultivation (ābādhānī). Between 15. Kunkrā and 16. Rāykūtiya huge fortress is situated to the right (of the road) on a high mountain, and the treasure (khazīna-hā) of the Tubbat-khāqān is placed there.

1 Cf. § 26, 19.
2 V. infra 9.
Hudūd al-ʿĀlam

21. G.H.ZA, the very beginning (nukhustin ḥadd) of Tibet from the Toghuzghuz side, near the river Kuchā.

22. BINĀ and *K.L.BĀN (?), two small towns belonging to Tibet with numerous troops, warriors, and arms (ba lashkar va mardumānt [sic] jangī va bā silāḥ).

23. K.RSĀNG (*Ŭsāng) belongs to Tibet. In it large idol-temples are found. The (locality?) is called Great Farkhār.

§ 12. Discourse on the Toghuzghuz Country and its Towns

East of it is the country of China; south of it, some parts of Tibet and the Khallukh; west of it, some parts of the Khirkhīz; north of it, also the Khirkhīz (who?) extend along all the Toghuzghuz country (andar hama ḥudūd-i ī ī biravādē). This country is the largest of the Turkish countries and originally (dar aṣl) the Toghuzghuz were the most numerous tribe (qaum). The kings of the whole of Turkistān in the days of old were from the Toghuzghuz. They are warlike people (mardumānt jangī) possessing great numbers of arms. In summer and winter (dimistān) they wander from place to place along the grazing grounds (giyā-khwān) in the climates which (happen to be) the best (khushtar buwadh). From their country | comes much musk, as well as black, red, and striped foxes, furs (mū) of the grey squirrel, sable-marten, ermine (qāqum), weasel (fanak ?), sabīja (?), khutū-horns, and yaks (ghishghāv). The country has few amenities, and their commodities are the things (ālāt) which we have enumerated, as well as sheep, cows, and horses. The country possesses innumerable streams. The wealthiest (of the Toghuzghuz?) are the Turks (Turkān). The Tatār too are a race (jinsi) of the Toghuzghuz.

1. JINĀNKATH (*Chinānkath, “Chinese town”), capital (qaṣaba) of the Toghuzghuz. It is a middle-sized (miyāna) town. It is the seat of the government and adjoins the limits (ḥudūd) of China. In summer great heat reigns in it but the winter there is very pleasant.

2. Near it is the mountain T.fqān, behind (az pas) which are five villages: KUZĀR.K, J.M.LKATH, PANJIKATH, BĀRLUGH, JĀMGHAR. The king of the Toghuzghuz in summer lives in this village of Panjikath. North of the Toghuzghuz is a steppe (ṣahrā) stretching between them and the Khirkhīz up to (tā) the country of the Kīmāk.

3. K.MSĪGHĪYA, a village between two mountains.

4. S.TKATH, a small district with three villages.

5. ARK (?), a small town near the river Khūland (Khūkand ?)-ghūn, possessing plenty of fruit, except grapes. To it belong seven villages, and Ark and its districts are said to turn out 20,000 men.
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6. **K. Rārkhūn** (*K.varkhūn?*), a village amid sands, possessing few amenities (*andak ni'mat*) but many people.

7. The villages of Bek-tekin consist of five villages belonging to the Soghdians. In them live Christians (*tarsīyān*), Zoroastrians (*gabrakān*), and heathens (*sāḥiyān*). The locality is in the cold zone and is surrounded by mountains.

8. **Kūm.s** (*Kūmis?*), a village on a mountain (*bar sar-i kūhī*). Its people are hunters.

9. **Kh.Mūd** (*Khūmul, Qumūl?*), a locality with meadows (*marghazār*) and grazing grounds (*gīyā-khwār*), with tents and felt-huts of the Toghuqghuz. The people own sheep (*khudavand-i guspand*).

10. **J. Mīkath**, a large village of which the chief is called Yabghū (*spelt: Baighū*). They [now?] settle (*nishānand*) there the subjects of Yabghū (*Baighū'iyyān*), (as) the Kimak (*Kimākyān*), Khallukh, and Yaghmā used constantly to plunder (*gharāt kardand*) this village.


12. **Māb.Nj J.Rābās (?)**, a stage at which a big river (*āb*) and plenty of grass (*gīyā*) are found.

13. **B.Lkh.Mkān (?)**, a stage where formerly lived the Toghuqghuz and which is now desolate.

14. **S.D.Nk (?)**, a stage at which it snows and rains constantly.

15. **Irgūzgūkath (?)**, a stage with pasture lands (*charā-gāh*) and springs.

16. **Igrāzgūkath (?)**, a stage which is never free from snow. Wild beasts (*dhadhagān*) and harts (*gavaznān*) are found there in profusion (*bār-and*), and from this mountain harts’ antlers (*surū'i gavazn*) are brought in great numbers.

§ 13. Discourse on the Country of the *Yaghmā* and its Towns

East of it is the Toghuqghuz country (*nāhiyat*); south[*?] of it, the river Khūland-ghūn which flows into the Kuchā river; west of it are the Khallukh borders (*hudūd*). In this country there is but little (*nīst magar andak*) agriculture, (yet) it produces many furs and in it much game is found.

Their wealth is in horses and sheep. The people are hardy (*sakht*), strong, and warlike (*jang-kūn*), and have plenty of arms. Their king

---

1 Here *Sāḥiyān* are probably the Buddhists, differently from § 34, 17.

2 *Topraqh-ārt* which in Turkish exactly means “earthen pass”.

3 Spelt: *Yaghmiyā*.
is from the family of the Toghuuzghuz kings. These Yaghmā (Yagh-
mā’iyān) have numerous tribes; some say that among them 1,700
known tribes are counted. Both the low and the nobles among
them venerate (namāz barand) their kings. The B.lāq (B.lāqiyān) are
also a clan (qaum) of the Yaghmā mixed with the Toghuuzghuz, and
in their region¹ there are a few villages (dih-hā-st andaki).

1. Kāshghar | belongs to Chīnistān but is situated on the frontier
between the Yaghmā, Tibet, the Khirkhīz, and China. The chiefs
of Kāshghar in the days of old were from the Khallukh, or from
the Yaghmā.

The mountain Ighraj-art traverses (andar miyān) the Yaghmā
country (nāhiyat-i Yaghmiyā [sic]).

2. *ARTŪJ (spelt: B.rtūj) was a populous village of the Yaghmā, but
snakes grew (so) numerous (ghalaba girift) (that) the people abandoned
the village.

3. KHIRM.KĪ (Khīrkī?i), a large village. (The people) are *Artū-
jians (spelt: Bartūjī). In the village are three kinds of Turks:
Yaghmā, Khallukh, and Toghuuzghuz.

§ 14. Discourse on the Khirkhīz Country

East of it is the country of China and the Eastern Ocean; south of
it, the Toghuuzghuz borders and some parts of the Khallukh; west of
it, (parts) of the Kīmāk country; [north of it, parts] of the Unin-
habited Lands of the North (vīrānī-yi shāmāl). In the [outlying] part
of their country (andar nāhiyat as vay) there is no population (hich
ābādhānī nīst), and that (region) is the Uninhabited Lands of the
North where people cannot live on account of the intensity of cold.
From this country are brought in great quantities musk, furs, 
khadang-wood, khalanj-wood, and knife-handles made of khutū
(dastayi-kār-i khutū, read: kārd-i khutū). Their king is called
Khirkhīz-khāqān. These people have the nature of wild beasts (tab’ī
dadhakān) and have rough faces (durust-šūrat) and scanty hair.
They are lawless (bidādhkār) and merciless, (but) good fighters
(mubāris) and warlike. They are at war and on hostile terms with all
the people living round them. Their wealth (khwāsta) consists of
Khirkhīz merchandise (jihāz-hā-yi Khirkhīz), sheep, cows, and horses.
They wander (mt-gardand) along rivers, grass, (good) climates, and
meadows (marghazār). They venerate (busurg dārand) the Fire and
burn the dead. They are owners (khudāvandān) of tents and felt-
huts, and are hunters and game-killers (nakchīr-zān).

¹ Andar-ū, perhaps, in the Yaghmā country in general.
§ 14-15

"The Regions of the World"

1. Fūrī (Qūrī?), name of a tribe which also belongs to the Khirkhīz but lives east of them and does not mix with the other groups of the Khirkhīz. They are man-eaters (marānum-khwār) and merciless. The other Khirkhīz do not know their language (zafān-i ʾishān dīgar Kh. nadānand) and they are like savages (va chūn waḥshīyand).

2. This side of the Fūrī (az sīr-i vay) there is a town K.M.Jkath where the Khirkhīz-khāqān lives.

3. K.Saym, name of a clan (gaum) of the Khirkhīz who with their felt-huts have established themselves on the slopes of the mountains (babārāḵūh). They hunt for furs (mū), musk, khūṭū-[horns], and the like. They are a different tribe from the Khirkhīz. Their language (sukhan) is nearer to that of the Khallukh and they dress like the Kīmāk.

Except at the residence (nishast) of the khāqān, no class of the Khirkhīz has any villages or towns at all (al-batta).

§ 15. Discourse on the Khallukh Country and its Towns

East of it are some parts of Tibet and the borders of the Yaghmā and the Toghuẓguzh; south of it, some parts of the Yaghmā and the country (nāḥiyat) of Transoxiana; west of it, the borders of the Ghūz; north of it, the borders of the Tukhs, Chigil, and Toghuẓguzh. This is a prosperous (ābāḏān) country, the most pleasant of the Turkish lands. It possesses running waters and a moderate climate. From it come different furs (mūy-hū). The Khallukh are near to (civilized) people (marānumān-i and ba-mardum nazdīk), pleasant tempered (khūsh-khū) and sociable (amīzdanda). In the days of old, the kings of the Khallukh were called Jabghūy, and also Yābghū. The country possesses towns and villages. Some of the Khallukh are hunters, some agriculturists (kishāvarz [sic] kunand), and some herdsmen. Their wealth is in sheep, horses, and various furs. They are a warlike people, prone to forays (tāḵhtan paranda).

1. Kūlān, a small district adjacent to the Muslim world (ba musalmānī payvasta). In it agriculture (kisht-u-barz) is practised.

2. Mirkī, a village inhabited by the Khallukh and also visited by merchants. Between these two villages [seil., Kūlān and Mirkī] there are three Khallukh tribes | called: Bistān, Khaym, and B.rīš. 18a

3. Nūn-kat (*Navī-kat?) was a town near the mountain Ürūn-ʿĀrj (Ghārč), but now it is desolate and is a thieves’ haunt. It is a stage (on the road) and a few felt-huts of the Khallukh are found there.

4. Gh.Nksīr, a large village with numerous Khallukh tribes. It is a prosperous place.
5. **Tüzün-Bulagḥ**, a village with fields (*kisht-u-barz*), running waters, and amenities. It lies on the frontier between the Khallukh and the Yaghmā.

6. By Tüzün-'Ār.j (*Ghārch?*) is the lake **Tuz-kūl** (spelt: **Tūzkūl**), wherefrom seven tribes of the Khallukh procure for themselves salt.

7. **Kūkyāl** (*Kök-yal?*), **Atlālīgh** (*Otlālīgh?*), **Lūlīgh** (*Ulīgh?*) are three prosperous and pleasant villages, situated on the slope of a mountain (**babarākūl**); their princes (**diḫqān**) were Yabghū’s brothers.

8. **Kūkūyāl** (*Kūk-yāl*), **Atlālīgh**, **Lūlīgh** are three prosperous and pleasant villages, situated on the slope of a mountain (**babarākūl**); their princes (**diḫqān**) were Yabghū’s brothers.

9. **Kūmkān**, in which live a few Khallukh, called L.Bān. It is a large village where merchants from everywhere reside.

10. **Tūn.l** (*Tong?*) and **Tālkh.za**, two villages amidst the mountains, on the frontier between the Chigil and Khallukh, near the lake Issi-kūl (spelt: **Iskūl**). The inhabitants are warlike, courageous, and valiant.

11. **Barskān**, a town on the bank of the lake (**daryā**),1 prosperous and pleasant. Its prince (**diḫqān**) is a Khallukh, but the (inhabitants) are devoted to the Toghuzghuz (**hawā-yi T. khwāhand**).

12. **Jāmgħ.r**, a small borough in the Khallukh country, on the edge of the desert. In the days of old it belonged to the Khallukh, but now its government (**pādshāhī**) is on behalf of the king of the Toghuzghuz. In it live some 200 tribes of men (**dīvīst qabilā mardum**), and to it belongs a separate district.

13. **B.njûl** (*Bānjūk?*) lies in the country of the Khallukh, but formerly its king was (ruler) on behalf of the Toghuzghuz, and now it is occupied by the Khirkhīz.

14. **Aq.rāq.r** (?), a town (with) a numerous population, situated between a mountain and a river.

15. **Uj** lies on a mountain (**bar sar-i kūl**). There are some 200 men (**mard** in it.

These two (last-named places) are held by the Khallukh.

§ 16. Discourse on the Chigil Country

It is a country which [?] originally belongs to the Khallukh, but it2 is [still?] a country (with) a numerous population (**nāḥiyat-st bisyār-mardum**). East and south of it are the limits of the Tukhs; north of

---

1 Evidently referring to the Issi-kūl just mentioned under 10.
2 *Nāḥiyat-ast va aṣl-i it [?] as Khallukh-ast va lākin &c. [See Annex B.]
it, the Khirkhīz country. And whatever comes (uftad) from the Khallukh and Khirkhīz countries is also produced (khīzad) in (that of the) Chigil. The latter possess great riches. They own tents and felt-huts (but) possess few (andāk) pleasant towns and villages. Their wealth is in cows, sheep, and horses. Some of them worship the Sun and the stars. They are good-natured people, sociable and kind, and their king is one of themselves.

1. Sīkūl, a large town on the frontier between the Khallukh and the Chigil, close to the Muslim world (nazdīk ba musalmānt). It is a prosperous and pleasant place where merchants reside.

§ 17. Discourse on the Tukhs Country and its Towns
East of it are the Chigil limits; south of it, the Khallukh and their mountainous haunts (kūhistān-hā); west of it, a group of Khirkhīz; north of it, the Chigil. This country is much more pleasant (nāhiyatt-st bisyār-ni’mattar) than (that of the) Chigil. From it come musk and various furs (mūy). Their wealth is in horses, sheep, furs, tents, and felt-huts. In winter (dīmīstān!) and summer they wander along pasture-lands, grazing-grounds, and meadows (charāgāh-va-giyā-khwār-va-mar-ghazār).

1. Lāzīna (?) and F.Rākhiya (?), two clans (qaum) of Tukhs, each of which possesses a small country, and there are two villages 18b called after these two tribes.
2. Sūyāb, a large village from which 20,000 men come forth.
3. Bīglīgh ("home of the Beg’s men"), a large village, called in Soghdian S.m.knā. Its prince (dīhkān [sic]) is called Y.nālb.rr.kīn (*Yināl-beg-tegin). 3,000 men take the field with him (bā ā . . . bar nīshīnand).
4. Ürkath, situated between two villages of the Tukhs. Few people live in it but (the place) is pleasant and the inhabitants rich (twangār).

§ 18. Discourse on the Kimāk Country and its Towns
East of this country lives a race (jins) of Khirkhīz; south of it are the rivers Artush [sic] and Ātīl; west of it, some of the Khīfchakh and some of the Northern Uninhabited Lands (vīrānī-yī shamāl); its north lies in those northern parts where men cannot live. In this country there is only one town but many tribes (gabīla). Its people live in felt-huts and both in summer and winter wander along the grazing-grounds (gīyā-khwār), waters, and meadows (marghazār). Their commodities are sable-martens (samūr) and sheep. Their food in
summer is milk, and in winter preserved meat (gūšt-i qadid). Whenever there is peace between them and the Ghūz, they go in winter towards (ba-bar) the Ghūz. The king of the Kīmāk is called khāqān. He has eleven lieutenants (āmil) within the Kīmāk country, and the fiefs (a’māl) are given by heritage to the children of the lieutenants.

1. ANDAR AZ KHIFCHĀQ ("Cis-Khifchāqia"?), a country (nāhiyat) of the Kīmāk of which the inhabitants resemble the Ghūz in some of their customs.

2. Q.RQ.RKHAN, another district of the Kīmāk, of which the inhabitants have the customs of the Khirkhiz.

3. YGHSŪN YĀSŪ, another district of the Kīmāk, between the rivers Ātil and Irtish [sic], which has more pleasant people and more settled conditions (mardumānī bīshtar bā-nīmat va kārī sākhtatar dāradh).

4. NAMAKIYA, a town in Kīmāk which is the Khāqān’s residence during summer. Between this town and Tarāz (spelt: T.rār) there is a distance of eighty days for a horseman travelling at speed (bā-shitāb).

5. DIH-I CHŪB, a village on the bank of a river. In summer numerous people (gather) in it.

§ 19. Discourse on the Ghūz Country

East of this country is the Ghūz desert and the towns of Transoxiana; south of it, some parts of the same desert as well as the Khazar sea; west and north of it, the river Ātil. The Ghūz have arrogant faces (shūkh-rūy) and are quarrelsome (sītīsa-kār), malicious (badh-rag), and malevolent (ḥasūd). Both in summer and winter they wander along the pasture-lands and grazing-grounds (charāgāh-vagiyā-khwār). Their wealth is in horses, cows, sheep, arms, and game in small quantities. Among them merchants are very numerous. And whatever the Ghūz, or the merchants, possess of good or wonderful is the object of veneration by the Ghūz (va ham az Ghūz va ham az īshān har chīzī-rā ki nikū bwad va ’ajab bwad namāz barand). (The Ghūz) greatly esteem the physicians (tablābān) and, whenever they see them, venerate them (namāz barand), and these doctors ( pijishkān) have command over their lives (khūn) and property (khwāsta). The Ghūz have no towns, but the people owning felt-huts are very numerous. They possess arms and implements (silāh va ālāt) and are courageous and daring (shūkh) in war. They continually make inroads (ghazw) into the lands of Islam (nawāhi-yi

1 In Arabic the equivalent would be mā dūn Kh. [Perhaps “Inner Khifchāk”?].
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Islam), whatever place be on the way (ba har ja‘ī uftadh), and (then) strike (bar-kūband), plunder, and retreat as quickly as possible. Each of their tribes has a (separate) chief on account of their discords (nā-sāxandagī) with each other.

§ 20. Discourse on the Turkish Pechenegs

East of this country are the limits (ḥudūd) of the Ghūz; south of it, 19a those of the Burṭās and Barādhās; west of it, those of the Majgharī and the Rūs; north of it, (the river) Rūthā. This country in all respects resembles (that of) the Kīmāk and is at war with all its neighbours. The (Pechenegs) have no towns; their chief (mihtar) is one of themselves.

§ 21. Discourse on the Khifchākh Country

The southern frontier of the Khifchākh marches with the Pechenegs (Khifjākh rā hadd-i junūbash ba-Bajanāk dāradh), and all the rest marches with the Northern Uninhabited Lands where there is no living being. The Khifchākh are a clan (qaum) which, having separated from the Kīmāk, has settled down in these parts, but the Khifchākh are more wicked (badh-khutar) than the Kīmāk. Their king (malik) is (appointed) on behalf of the Kīmāk.

§ 22. Discourse on the Majgharī Country

East of it is a mountain; south of it,2 a tribe of Christians (tarsāyān) called V.n.n.d.r; west and north of (the Majgharī) are the districts (nawāhī) of the Rūs. This country has some 20,000 men who take the field with their king (bā malikashān bar-nishānad). The king of this country is called *Jula (א). This country is 150 farsangs in length by 100 farsangs in breadth. In winter they stay on the bank of a river which separates them from the Rūs. Their food is fish and they live on it (badhān xindagānī gudharānadh). They are very rich people but base3 (mardumānī bisyār-khwāsta- and va-sufla?). This country possesses many trees and running waters. The (people) are good-looking and awe-inspiring (bā-haybat). The Majgharī are at war with all the infidels living around them and are (usually) victorious (bihtar āyand).

And all these whom we have mentioned are the different categories of Turks (existing in the) world. Now we shall mention all the lands of Islam, and then the rest of the lands of the infidels (Kāfirān), lying in the western parts.

1 Bajanāk. 2 i.e., south of their country. 3 sufla is rather unexpected.
§ 23. Discourse on the Country of Khorāsān and its Towns

It is a country east of which is Hindistān [sic]; south of it, some of its (own) Marches (ḥudūd) and some parts of the desert of Kargas-kūh; west of it, the districts of Gurgān and the limits of the Ghūz; north of it, the river Jāyḥūn. This is a vast country with much wealth and abundant amenities (bā ... ni'matī farākh). It is situated near the centre of the Inhabited Lands of the world. In it gold-mines and silver-mines are found as well as precious things (gauhar) such as are (extracted) from mountains. This country produces horses and its people are warlike. It is the gate of Turkistān. It produces numerous textiles (jāma), gold, silver, turquoise, and drugs (dārū). It is a country with a salubrious (durust) climate and with men strongly built and healthy. The king1 of Khorāsān (padshāy-i Kh.) in the days of old was distinct from the king of Transoxiana but now they are one. The mīr of Khorāsān resides at Bukhārā (B. nishnādī); he is from the Sāmān family (āl-i Sāmān) and from Bāhrām Chūbīn’s descendants. These (princes) are called Maliks of the East and have lieutenants (‘ummāl) in all Khorāsān, while on the frontiers (ḥadd-hā) of Khorāsān there are kings (pādshāhān) called “margraves” (mulāk-i atrāf).

1. Nishāpūr is the largest and richest town in Khorāsān (busurg-tarin shahrī-st ... va bisyār-khwāstatar). It occupies an area of 1 farsang across and has many inhabitants. It is a resort of merchants and the seat of the army commanders (sipāh-sālārān). It has a citadel (ghandiz), a suburb (rabad), and a city (shahristān). Most of its water is from the springs and has been conducted (bi-āvārda-and) under the earth. It produces various textiles (jāma), silk, and cotton.

19b To it belongs a special province with thirteen | districts (rustā) and four territories (khān: “house”).

2. Sabzavār, a small borough (shahrak-st khurd) on the road to Rayy and the chief place of a district (qaṣaba-yi rustā‘īyāl).


4. Bahram-Ābād and Mazīnān, two small boroughs on the road to Rayy with numerous fields.

5. Azādhwār, a prosperous borough in the desert on the road to Gurgān.

6. Jājarm, a frontier borough on the road to Gurgān. It is the emporium of Gurgān, as well as that of Kūmis and Nishāpūr (bār-kadhā-y Gurgān-ast va in-i [sic] K. va N.).

7. Siparāyīn (spelt: Sabarāyīn), a prosperous and pleasant town.

1 Or: “kingdom”, *pādshāhī.
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8. JARMAGĀN, SIBĪNAKĀN, KHŪJĀN, RĀVĪNĪ, prosperous boroughs with many fields, situated amidst hills and plains. All these are within the limits of Nishāpūr.

9. NASĀ, a very pleasant town situated at the foot of the mountains, between the mountain and the desert. Its climate is bad (but) it has running waters.

10. BĀVARD is situated (midway) between the mountains and the desert. It is a place with much cultivation and has a salubrious climate and a warlike population.

11. TŪS, a district in which are situated the boroughs, such as ṬAVARĀN, NAUQĀN, BUZDĪGHŪR (spelt: Brūghūn), RĀYAGĀN, B. NVĀDHA, (which lie) amidst hills. In its mountains mines are found of turquoise, copper, lead, antimony (surma), and the like. (The district) produces stone kettles (dīk-i sānīn), whet-stones (sān-g-i fāsān), trousercords (shāhvār-band), and stockings. In Nauqān is found the blessed tomb (marqad) of 'Alī-ibn-Mūsā al-Riḍā and people go there on pilgrimage. There too is found the grave (gūr) of Hārūn al-Rashīd. (Nauqān) produces stone kettles.

12. MAYHĀNA, a borough in the district (hudūd) of Bāvard, situated in the desert.

13. TŪRSHĪZ, KUNDUR, B. NĀBĪD, KURI, boroughs belonging (az hudūd) to Kūḥistān and Nishāpūr,1 with numerous fields.

14. QA‘ĪN, chief town (qāšāba) of Kūḥistān, is surrounded by a moat (khandaq) and possesses a citadel (quhandīs) and a cathedral mosque (mazgīt-i īmā‘). The government palace (sarāy-i sultān) is in the citadel. This place belongs to the cold zone.

15. TĀBASAYN, a town lying in the hot zone, and in it palm-trees grow. The water is from underground canals (ḥāriz). The town lies on the desert.

16. KURI lies on the desert and produces cotton stuffs (karbās).

17. TĀBAS-I MASĪNĀN lies between the mountains and the desert and is a pleasant place.

18. KHŪR (spelt: Khuvār, *Khur ?) and KHUD,2 two towns on the edge of the desert. Their water is from underground canals. The wealth of the inhabitants is chiefly in cattle (chār-pāy).

19. BUΖHAGĀN, KHAYMAND, SANGĀN, SALŪMĪDH, ZŪZAN, are boroughs on the confines of Nishāpūr (az hudūd-i N.). These places have much cultivated land and produce cotton stuffs (karbās).

20. HERAT (Hari<*Hare), a large town with a very strong shahrīstān, a citadel, and a suburb. It has running waters. Its cathedral mosque

---

1 Nishāpūr added above the line.
2 Perhaps with a popular etymology: khur “eat” and khusp “sleep”.
is the most frequented in all Khorāsān (ābādhāntar-i masgīt-hā-st ba-mardum az hama-yi Kh.). The town lies at the foot of a mountain and is a very pleasant place. Many Arabs (Tāziyan) live there. It has a large river which comes from the frontier region between Ghūr and Gūzgānān and is utilized in the districts of Herat. It produces cotton stuffs, manna (shārkhisht), and grape-syrup (dushāb).  

21. Būshang is about half (the size of) Herat (chand nīma’ī az H.) and is surrounded by a moat and has a strong fortress (hiṣār). In it ‘ar’ar-trees (juniperus polycarpus?) are found and a plant (giyāhī) of which the juice (shīr) is an antidote (tirīyāk) against the venom of snakes and scorpions.  

22. Nūzhagān, a prosperous and very pleasant borough amidst the mountains.  

23. Fargird, a small borough; the inhabitants own cattle (khudā-vandān-i chahār-pāy-and).  

24. Baldghīs, a prosperous and very pleasant place with some 300 villages.  

25. Katūn (*Kālvūn), a borough of which the water is from wells and rain; good horses come from there.  

26. Khujistān, a mountainous district with many fields and warlike inhabitants.  

27. Kūh-i Sīm, a borough on the slope of a mountain (babarākūh) with a silver-mine; the latter has been abandoned on account of the lack of fuel (bi-hīsumī).  

28. Mālin belongs to Herat; from it come good Tā’īfī raisins (mavlīz).  

29. Asbuzār (*Aspuzār) has four towns: Kavāzhān (?), Araskan, Kūzd (?), Jarashān, all four within the distance of 6 farsangs; the locality is pleasant and the inhabitants are Khārijites, and warlike. In this district there are numerous and difficult mountains.  

30. Sarakhs, a town lying on the road amid a steppe (andar miyān-i biyābān). A dry river-bed (khushkrūdī) passes through the market; the water flows in it only at the time of floods (āb-khīz). It is a place with much cultivation, and its people are strongly built (qawī-tarkīb) and warlike. Camels are their wealth.  

31. Baun (Bavan?), a borough and the chief place of the rustā of Gānj. It is a very pleasant place with running waters. It produces grape-syrup (dushāb).  

32. Kīr, also a small borough like Baun.  

33. Baghshūr lies on the steppe (biyābān) and has water from wells.

1 On the margin of 19 b–20 a a note is found on Marv. See Appendix A.
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34. **Karūkh**, a borough with a prosperous district situated in the mountains. It produces fine raisins (*kishmish*).

35. **Shurmin**, a borough of Herat.

36. **Gharchistān**, a district of which the chief place is Bāshīn. The chief of this district is called *shār*. The place produces much grain, possesses numerous fields, and is prosperous. It is all mountains. The inhabitants are peaceful (*salmī*) and rather good (*nē bahd "not bad"*). They are herdsmen and agriculturists.

37. **Dīza**, a borough at the foot of a mountain. The Marv river passes through it. It is a pleasant place and abounds in fruit.

38. **Marūd** (Marv-rūd), a pleasant and prosperous town situated at the foot of a mountain. It abounds in fruit, and the river of Marv skirts it (*bar karān*).

39. **Dīz-i Aḥnaf** (spelt: Dar-i Ḥinf), a borough in the desert with many fields and running waters.

40. **Fūr Kūdar** (*Barakdīz*) is situated on the bank of the Marv river and has a strong citadel. Zoroastrians (*gabrakān*) called [Bih]-Afrīdhī live there.

41. **Gīrang**, a small town.

42. **Marv**, a large town. In the days of old the residence of the *mīr* of Khorāsān was there but now he lives in Bukhārā. It is a pleasant and flourishing place with a citadel built by Tahmūrāth; in it there are numerous castles (*kūshk*). It was the abode of the (Sasanian) kings (*khusravān*). In all Khorāsān there is no town [*better*] situated.\(^1\) Its market is good. Their land taxes are levied on the extent of irrigation (*bar ābast*). Marv produces good cotton, root of asafoetida (*ushturghāz*), *filāta*-sweets, vinegar, condiments (*ābkāma*), textiles of raw silk (*gazzīn*) and of *mulḥam* silk.

43. **Shing-i ’Abbādī**, a town with numerous districts, prosperous and pleasant.

44. **Dandānaqān**, a borough within a wall (*hišār*) which is some 20 b 500 paces long. It lies on the steppe. Outside it is a caravan station (*mansīl gāh*).

45. **Kushmanān** (*Kushmanān*), *muṣfarī*, Māshān, Sūsanaqān, *shābirinjī* (?), Zarq—these boroughs, small and big, belong to the province (*‘amal*) of Marv, and the agriculture of all these districts depends on irrigation from the Marv river.

46. **Gūzgānān**, a very prosperous and pleasant province. Justice, equity, and security reign there. On the east, this province marches with the limits of Balkh and Ṭukhāristān down to the limits of Bāmiyān; on the south, with the end of the confines of Ghūr and the

\(^1\) Something fallen out: *az nihādh [-i vay bih]*.
boundary (hadd) of Bust; on the west, with the limits of Garchistān and (its) chief place Bashīn, down to the limits of Marv; on the north, with the limits of the river Jayhūn. The sovereign (pādshāy) of this province is one of the margraves (muluk-i atrāf). In Khorāsān he is called “malik of Guzgānān”. He is a descendant of Afrīdhūn. All the chiefs within the limits of Gharchistān and Ghūr are under his orders (andar farmān). He is the greatest of all the margraves in authority, greatness (‘izz), rank, policy (siyāsat), liberality and love (dūstdārī) of knowledge. This country produces numerous horses, felts, saddle-bags (haqība),1 saddle-girths (tang-i asp), zilū, and palās. In it is found the khinj2 tree, the wood of which never becomes dry, and is so tender (narm) that one can make knots (girih afgandan) in it. In this kingdom (andar in pādshāy [sic]) there are numerous districts.

47. R.Būshārān (Rivshārān ?),3 a large and very pleasant district. (The inhabitants) are warlike. The district belongs to the Gharchistān of Guzgānān. Some of the waters of Marv rise from this district. There are gold-mines in it. The chiefs (mihtarān) of this district are among the chiefs of the Marches of Guzgānān (as mihhtarān-i atrāf-i G.) and they pay their annual tribute-money (muqāṭa’ā) to the malik of Guzgānān.

48. D.R.M-Shān (Dar-i M.shān ?) consists of two regions; the one is of Bust, and the other of Guzgānān.4 The latter (in) is adjacent (payvasta) to R.būshārān. The waters rising in this district join those of R.būshārān (spelt: Būshārān), and the river of Marv is formed by these waters. The chief of this district is called Darmashīshāh (Dar-i Mashī-shāh ?).

49. TAMRĀN, TAMĀZĀN, two districts situated in the mountains near the limits of Ribāt-i Karvān. Their chiefs are called (respectively) Tamrān-*waranda (فَرَندا) and Tamāzān-*waranda.

50. SĀRVĀN, a mountainous district. The inhabitants look arrogant (shūkh-rūy) and are warlike. They are professional thieves (dusd-pisha) and quarrelsome (sitīsa-kār), faithless (bi-oqsā), and blood-thirsty (khūn-khwāra); and clan animosity (ʿasābiyyat) constantly reigns among them.

51. MĀNSHĀN, a district adjacent to Dar-i Andara and lying in the mountains of Tamrān. Its chiefs were in olden times called B.rāz-bandā. Actually a deputy governor (kārdār) goes there from the capital (haḍrat) of the malik of Guzgānān.

1 Persic: khārjīn (?).
2 “white”.
3 Spelt in the text
4 Rūshārān Būshārān درمیان از دولت تا پهلوی یکی از بسته‌های روسیه بوده و دیکتر از کرکاتان روسیه راز ب."
All these districts are very agricultural and abound in amenities. Their chiefs are (appointed) on behalf of the malik of Gūzgānān and pay him annual tribute-money (muqāṭa’). The inhabitants are mostly simple-hearted (ṣādaḥa-dīl) and own great numbers of cattle, (namely) of cows and sheep. In this kingdom (pādshāḥī) small districts are very numerous. In it (i.e., Gūzgānān) grows a tree of which whips (tāsīyāna) are made. In its mountains are found mines of gold, silver, iron, lead, copper, antimony-stone (sang-i surma), and different kinds of vitriol (zāg-hā-yi gūnāgūn).

52. ṬĀLĀQĀN lies on the frontier of Gūzgānān and belongs to its king. It is a very pleasant town which produces much wine (nabīḍh) 21a and felt.

53. JAHŪDHĀN, a prosperous and pleasant town at the foot of a mountain. It is the residence of the malik of Gūzgānān who lives in the military camp (lashkargāh) at a distance of one farsang and a half from the town. This military camp is called DAR-I ANDĀRA and is a strong place at the foot of a mountain, (having) a more pleasant and salubrious (durust) climate than Jahūdhān and Pāryāb [sic].

54. PĀRYĀB (spelt: Bāryāb), a very pleasant town on the caravan high road.

55. NARYĀN, a borough between Jahūdhān and Pāryāb; its territory stretches for 2 farsangs (ḥadd-i ī du farsang-ast?).

56. GURZĪVĀN, a town situated on a mountain, very pleasant and with an agreeable climate. In the days of old the residence of the kings of Gūzgānān was there.

57. K.ND.RM, a pleasant borough producing good wine (nabīḍh) in great quantity.

58. ANBĪR (*Anbēr), capital (qasaba) of Gūzgānān and a good and prosperous town, the residence of merchants and the emporium of Balkh. It is very pleasant and is situated at the foot of a mountain. It produces the Gūzgān leather (pūst-i gūzgāmī) exported all over the world.

59. K.LĀR, a flourishing and prosperous borough with many trees and running waters. It abounds in amenities.

60. USHĪBŪQĀN, a town situated on a steppe (ṣahrā) on the high road. It abounds in amenities and has running waters.

61. ANTKHUDH, a borough in the steppe (biyābān). It is a place with much cultivation, but possesses few amenities (kam ni’mat).

62. SĀN, a town with a prosperous district producing many sheep.

63. RĪBĀT-I KARVĀN, a town on the frontier of Gūzgānān. In its mountains gold-mines are found.

1 V. supra under 46. 2 Note on the margin: Indkhū [sic].
64. **s.n.g-b.n** appertains to R.būshārān. Its **minbar** has been recently built (ba-nau nihātha-and).

65. **Aţīv**, a town at the end of the province ('aman) of Gūzgānān.

All the towns which we have enumerated belong to the kingdom of the Gūzgānān malik (az ān-i pādhshāy-i malik-i G.). In the steppes (biyābān) of this land (shahr) there are some 20,000 Arabs. They possess numerous sheep and camels, and their amīr is nominated from the capital (hadrat) of the malik of Gūzgānān, and to the latter they pay their tribute (sadaqāt). And these Arabs are richer (tuvangtar< *tuvangartar*) than all the (other) Arabs who are scattered throughout Khorāsān.

66. **Haush**, a large village, flourishing and prosperous, situated in the desert. It belongs to this sovereign (in pādhshāh, i.e., of Gūzgān) and the Arabs just mentioned mostly stay here in summer.

This province (nāhiyat) has many districts and large sub-divisions (rusūt-hā va nāhiyat-hā-yi busurg), but the towns with pulpits (minbar) are those which we have enumerated.

67. **Balkh**, a large and flourishing town which was formerly the residence of the Sasanian kings (spelt: Khisravān, [sic]). In it are found buildings of the Sasanian kings with paintings (naqsha) and wonderful works (kārkirā), (which) have fallen into ruins. (That place) is called Nau-bihār. (Balkh) is a resort of merchants and is very pleasant and prosperous. It is the emporium (bār-kādha) of Hindūstān. There is a large river in Balkh that comes from Bāmiyān and in the neighbourhood of Balkh is divided into twelve branches; it traverses the town and is altogether used for the agriculture of its districts. Balkh produces citrons and sour oranges (turunj-u-nārānji), sugar-cane (nay-shakar), and water-lilies (nīlūfar "lotus"). Balkh has a shahristān surrounded by a mighty wall. In its suburb there are numerous marshes.

68. **Khulm** lies between Balkh and Ṭukhāristān in a steppe (sāhrā) at the foot of a mountain. There is a river there and the land-taxes (kharāj) are levied on the extent of irrigation (bār-āb). It is a place with much cultivation.

**21b**

69. **Ṭukhāristān**, a pleasant province consisting mostly of mountains. In its steppes (sāhrā) live the Khallukh Turks. It produces horses, sheep, much grain, and various fruits.

70. **Simūngān**, a town lying in the mountains. There are in it mountains of white stone similar to marble (rukham) in which dwellings have been cut (kanda-ast), as well as halls (majlis), pavilions

---

1 Khallukh (§ 15) must be right here (not Khalaj, cf. § 24, 22).
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(kūshk),¹ idol-temples, and horse-stables, with all the implements (ālāt) appertaining to pavilions. On it² various figures are painted in the fashion of Indians (az kirdār-i H.).³ Simingān produces good wine (nabidh) and a great quantity of fruit.

71. SAKALKAND, a borough with much cultivation, lying in the mountains. It is a place of poor people (darvishān).

72. BAGHLĀN is like Sakalkand.

73. VALVALIJ, a flourishing town and the capital (qaṣaba) of Tukhāristān. It possesses numerous amenities and running waters. Its people are sociable (āmīzanda).

74. SIKĪMISHT, a district (nāhiyat) with much cultivation and much grain.

75. Behind this Sikīmisht there is a small kingdom (pādhshāhi), altogether hills (shikastagi-hā) and mountains, called YūN. Its prince (dīhqān), called Pākh, draws his strength from the amīr of Khuttalān. Yūn produces salt.

76. TĀYAQAṬ, a town on the frontier between Tukhāristān and Khuttalān. It is a place with much cultivation, lying at the foot of a mountain.

77. ANDARĀB, a borough amid mountains. It is a place with much cultivation, (producing) much grain. It possesses two rivers. Here dirhams are struck from the silver extracted from the mines of Panjhīr and Jāriyāna. Its king is called Shahr-salīr (*salār*).

78. BĀMIYĀN, a land on the frontier between Gūzgānān and the Marches (ḥudūd) of Khorāsān. It has much cultivation. Its king is called Shīr (*shēr*). A large river skirts it. In it there are two stone idols (but) of which the one is called Red Idol (surkh-but) and the other White Idol (*khing-but*).

79. PANJHĪR and JĀRIYĀNA (?), two towns where a silver mine is situated. A river passing between these two towns (lower down) enters the limits of Hindūstān.

80. MADR, MŪY, two small towns within the limits of Andarāb (andar miyān az ḥudūd-i Ā.).

§ 24. Discourse on the Region of Khorāsānian Marches⁴

East of this region (nāhiyat) lies Hindūstān; south of it, the deserts of Sind and Kirmān; west of it, the borders of Herat; north of it, the borders of Gharchistān, Gūzgānān, and Tukhāristān. Some parts of this region belong to the hot zone and some to the cold. From its mountains the Ghūr-slaves (barda-yi ghūrī) are brought (uftadh) to

¹ Kūshk, usually "castle".
² i.e., on the rock.
³ Or: "bearing likeness to Indians".
⁴ nāhiyat-i ḥudūd-i Khurāsān.
Khorāsān. It is a place with much cultivation. Indian articles (ālāt) are brought to this region.

1. Ghūr (Ghōr), a province amid mountains and rugged country (shikastagh-hā). It has a king called Ghūr-shāh. He draws his strength from the mir of Gūzgānān. In the days of old this province of Ghūr was pagan (kāfīr); actually most of the people are Muslims. To them belong numerous boroughs and villages. From this province come slaves, armour (zirih), coats of mail (jaushan), and good arms. The people are bad-tempered, unruly (nā-sāzanda), and ignorant. They are white and swarthy (asmār).

2. Sīstān, a province of which the chief place is called Zarang. The town has a fortress (jišār), with a moat round (pirāmīn) it, of which the water comes from (the fortress) itself (ābash ham az vay bar-āyādī). There are (several) canals inside the town and in its houses there is running water. The town has five gates, (while) the suburb is surrounded by a wall and has thirteen gates. The province belongs to the hot zone and it never snows there. (The inhabitants) possess wind-mills (āsiyā bar bādh sākhta). The province produces stuffs used as carpets (jāma-hā-yi farsh?) similar to those of Tabaristān (tabartā), zilū-rugs similar to those of Jahrum (jañrumī), dried dates and asafoetida (angusād).

3. Tāq, a borough with a strong fortress and a numerous population.

4. Gash [sic], a town with a prosperous and pleasant district. It has running waters and an agreeable climate, and is situated on the bank of the Hidhmand.

5. Nih, a prosperous borough with much cultivation. There are no flies (pasha) in it.

6. Farah, a town in the hot zone; in it dates and fruit are abundant.

7. Qarnī, a small town. The sons of Layth² who appropriated the royal power were from Qarnī.

8. Khuvāsh (Khwāsh), a town with running waters and underground canals. It is a pleasant place.

9. Bust, a large town with a solid wall, situated on the bank of the river Hidhmand and possessing many districts (ba næhiyati bisyār). It is the Gate of Hindūstān and a resort of merchants. Its inhabitants are warlike and courageous. It produces fruit, which is dried and exported to other places, cotton stuffs (karbās), and soap.

10. *Chālkān, a borough with running water; the majority of the inhabitants are weavers.

11. Sarvān, a borough with a small district called Alīn(?). It belongs to the hot zone. In it grow dates. It is a strong place.

¹ Or: "covers for carpets". ² i.e., the Ṣaffārīds.
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12. ZAMIN-DÁVAR, a prosperous district on the frontier between Ghür and Bust. To it belong two towns TIL and DURGHUSH which both are frontier forts (thaghr) against (bar rûy) Ghür. In Durghush grows much saffron. It\(^1\) is adjacent to the district Darmashān (*Varmashān*) of Bust.

13. BAGHNI, a town near Ghür in which live Muslims.

14. BISHLANG (Bashling?) belongs to Ghür and has much cultivation.

15. KHUẾN (Khwān) belongs to Ghür and has a population of some 3,000 people.

16. RUKHUD (Rukhkhudh), a very prosperous and pleasant district (nāhiyat), to which belongs a special district (ū rā nāhiyat-st judhā which forms a separate unit?). The chief place of Rukhudh is PANJVAY (spelt: Fījvān).

17. KUHAK and RUDHĀN are two pleasant boroughs with cultivation; salt (also) comes from them (vay).

18. BĀLIS, a district in the desert. It is a place with much cultivation but few amenities (kam-ni‘mat). In it towns are found, such as S.F.NJĀ‘T, KŪSHK, SĪVĪ, of which Kūshk is the residence of the amīr.

19. *GHAZNĪN (spelt: Ghazaq), a town situated on the slope of a mountain (babarākūh), extremely pleasant. It lies in Hindūstān and formerly belonged to it, but now is among the Muslim lands (andar Islām-ast). It lies on the frontier between the Muslims and the infidels. It is a resort of merchants, and possesses great wealth (khwāsta).

20. KĀBUL, a borough possessing a solid fortress known for its strength. Its inhabitants are Muslims and Indians, and there are idol-temples in it. The royal power (mulk) of the raja of Qinnaj (?) is not complete (tamām nagardadh) until he has made a pilgrimage to those idol-temples, and here too his royal standard is fastened (livā-yi mulkash bandand).

21. ISTĀKH and *SUKĀVAND, two small boroughs at the foot of the mountains. Sukāvand possesses a strong fortress and much cultivation.

22. In Ghaznīn and in the limits (hūdūd) of the boroughs which we have enumerated, live the *KHALAJ Turks who possess many sheep. They wander along climates (gardanda bar havā),\(^4\) grazing grounds and pasture-lands (marā‘ī). These *Khalaj Turks are also numerous in the provinces (hūdūd) of Balkh, Tūkhrāristān,\(^5\) Bust, and Gūzgānān.\(^6\)

\(^1\) It is more probable that Zamindāvar and not Durghush is meant here.

\(^2\) Here belongs \{\} in § 26, 20.

\(^3\) Read: Khalaj instead of Khalukh, v.i., p. 347.

\(^4\) Along places with favourable climate?

\(^5\) Cf. § 23, 69: Khallukh.

\(^6\) On the margin a note by Abul-Fadl Gulpāyagānī. See Appendix A.
§ 25. Discourse on the country Transoxiana and its Towns

East of this country are the borders of Tibet; south of it, Khorāsān and its Marches; west of it, the Ghūz and the borders of the Khallukh; north of it, also the borders of the Khallukh. This is a vast, prosperous, and very pleasant country. It is the Gate of Turkistān and a resort of merchants.

The inhabitants are warlike; they are active fighters for the faith (ghāzi pīsha), and (good) archers. Their creed is pure. This is the country where justice and equity reign. In its mountains there are very numerous mines of gold and silver, as well as all sorts of fusible substances (jauhar-hā-yi gudāsanda), such as are found in the mountains, and all sorts of drugs (dārū), such as are found in the mountains, e.g., vitriol, arsenic, sulphur, and ammoniac (naushādhor).

1. BUKHĀRĀ, a large town, the most prosperous of the towns in Transoxiana. Here is the residence of the King of the East (malik-i mashriq). The place is damp, produces plenty of fruit, and has running waters. Its people are archers and active fighters for the faith. It produces good woollen carpets as well as saltpetre (shūra), which are exported to (different) places. The territory (hūdūd) of Bukhārā is 12 farsangs by 12 farsangs, and a wall has been built round the whole of it, without any interruption (divārī . . . ba-yak pāra), and all the ribāts and villages are within this wall (az andarūn-i in divār).

2. M.GHĀN, KHUDĀD, ZANDANA (spelt: Dandūna), BŪMKATH (?), MADYĀMĪJKATH, KHARGHĀNKATH (spelt: ʃ.gh.nkath), boroughs with pulpits (minbar) within the area of Bukhārā; they are very prosperous places with much cultivation.
3. Firabr (Firabr), a borough on the bank of the Jayhun. The Lord of
the River (mīr-i rūdhi, “overseer of irrigation”) lives there. The
place is situated in the desert.

4. Paykand, a borough with a thousand ribāts. Its soil is good
durust). In it stands the tumular dome (gunbad-i īrkhāna-hā-st)
(over the dead ?) whom they carry there from Bukhārā (ki az Bukhārā
ānjā barand).

5. Sughd, a region. There is no place among the eastern regions
more flourishing than this. It has running waters, many trees,
and a good climate. The people are hospitable and sociable. It
abounds in amenities, is prosperous, and mild, pious people (narm-i
dīndār) are numerous there.

6. Tavāvis, a borough of Bukhārā on the frontier of Sughd. In
it annually for one day a market (bāzār) is held at which many people
assemble.

7. Karmīna, Dabūsī, | Rabinjan, boroughs in Sughd. They are prosperity and pleasant, and have running waters and trees.

8. Kushānī, the most prosperous town of Sughd.

9. Armān (read: Zarmān?) belongs to Kushānī.

10. Ishtīkhan, a flourishing, prosperous, and very pleasant place.

11. K.njkath (Ganjkath?), F.R.nkath, two towns lying between
the river and Ishtīkhan.

12. D.Rān (read: Vadhār?), a small, flourishing town belonging to
Samarqand.

13. Samarqand, a large, prosperous, and very pleasant town. It
is the resort of merchants from all over the world. It has a city
(shahristān), a citadel, and a suburb. On the roof of their market
a stream of water flows in a leaden (conduit) (yakā jīy-i āb rāvān ast
az arzīz). In Samarqand stands the monastery of the Manichaeans
(khānagāh-i Mānaviyān) who are called nighūshāk (“auditores”).
Samarqand produces paper which is exported all over the world,
and hemp cords (rishta-yi qinnab). The Bukhārā river flows near the
gate of Samarqand.

14. Varaghsar, B.njkath, two boroughs of Samarqand, lying on
the Bukhārā river. In this Varaghsar stands (the weir) distributing
the waters (gismatgāh-i āb).

15. Kish, a borough belonging to the hot zone. Much rain falls
in it. It possesses a city, a citadel, and a suburb. Two rivers flowing
past (bar) the town gate are used in the fields. In its mountains
mines of drugs are found. It produces good mules, manna (taran-
gābin), and red salt, which are exported everywhere.

1 Or: domes? [Impossible to refer to the later gūr-khāns]
16. **Nauqat-i Quraysh** (Nūqad Quraysh), a very agricultural borough.

17. **Nakhshab**, a very pleasant, prosperous town with cultivation. A river traverses the town.

18. **Sūbakh**, a town belonging to Nakhshab.


20. **Bazda**, a borough sparsely populated (*kam-mardum*), but with much cultivation. It has a dry river-bed in which during some parts of the year water runs, but most of their water is from wells and water-wheels (*dūlāb*, “noria”).


22. **Tirmidh**, a flourishing town situated on the bank of the Jayhūn. Its citadel is on the bank of the river. This town is the emporium (*bārgah*) of Khuttalān and Chaghāniyān. It produces good soap (*sābūn*), green mattings, and fans (*bādh-bisan*).

23. **Hāshumkirt** [sic], a borough with numerous sheep and cattle (*chahār-paś*).

24. **Charmangān**, borough with cultivation and running waters.

25. **Chaghāniyān**, a desolate region. It is a large tract with extensive cultivation (*bisyār kisht-u-barz*), but it has lazy peasants (*barsīgarānī kānlī*) and is a place of poor people (*darvīshān*); (yet) it possesses many amenities. The people are warlike and courageous. The district has an agreeable climate, good (*durust*) soil, and waters good for digestion (*gavdranda*). It produces a small number of horses, woollen cloths, *palās*-rugs, and much saffron. The king of this district is one of the margraves (*mulūk-i aṭrāf*) and is called amīr of Chaghāniyān.

26. **Darzangī** (spelt: *Dārzangī*), a borough surrounded by a moat and belonging to Chaghāniyān. It produces puttees (*pāy-tāba*), different sorts of tapestry-woven carpets (*gilāmāna*), and woollen carpets.

27. **Chaghāniyān**, a large town situated on the slope of a mountain. It is the capital of this region and possesses running waters, an agreeable climate, and a poor population (*mardumānī darvīsh*).

28. **Bāsand**, a borough with numerous population, situated on the road of Bukhārā and Samarqand. It is a strong place; the inhabitants are warlike.

29. **Zīnvar**, a borough with much cultivation, but sparsely populated.

30. **Nauzhān** (*Būrāb*?), a borough with a very strong fortress.

31. **Jās** (?), a borough near the river Nīhām, possessing a nice climate and plenty of [amenities].

32. **Hamvārān**, a borough near the river Kasavān, with sparse population.
33. SHUMÄN, a strong town on the slope of a mountain; round it a wall is built, and its citadel is situated on the summit of a mountain, with a large spring inside. This place produces much saffron.

34. AFRIDHAN, a town with sparse population, situated amid mountains.

35. VAYSHAGIRT (*Vëshagirt), a strong town situated between the mountains and the steppe, on the frontier between Chaghâniyân and Khuttalân. Wind blows there constantly, and there lies the tomb (turbat) of Shaqiq Balkhi, God's mercy upon him. This place produces much saffron.

36. SURUSHANA, a large prosperous region with a town and numerous districts (rustâ). Much wine (nabidh) comes from it, and from its mountains comes iron.

37. ZAMÂN, a town of Surūshana lying on the road of Khujand and Farghâna. It has a strong fortress and much cultivation.

38. CHARQân (*Kharqâna*), a prosperous borough also belonging to Surūshna.

39. DIZAK, a borough with a stream. Near it is the place MARSAMANDA where annually for one day a market is held, and it is said that at that market business (bâxurgâni) is transacted for upwards of 100,000 dinars.

40. BUNJIKATH (spelt: Navînjkath), is the chief place of Surūshna and the residence of its amir. It has a numerous population and is very prosperous and pleasant. It has running waters.

41. FAGHKATH, GHAZAQ, SABBÂT, KURKATH, boroughs of Surūshana, with much cultivation and very populous.

42. BUTTAMÂN, a region lying amidst mountains and broken country (*kûh-hâ va shikastagi-hâ*), and belonging to Surūshna. It has three tracts (zones, *hadd*): Inner, Middle, and Outer Buttamân. This is a region with much cultivation but with a poor population (*darvishân*). It has many villages and districts (rustâ) and in its mountains numerous mines of ammoniac (*naushâdhur*) are found.

43. BARGHAR, a district of Middle Buttamân. In it lies the Daryâzha (lake) which collects the waters of the Middle Buttamân, and whence rises the Bukhârâ river.

44. KHUJAND, a town, and the chief place of that region. It possesses much cultivation, and chivalrous people (*bâ-muruvvat*) live in it. It produces pomegranates.

45. FARGHÂNA, a prosperous, large, and very pleasant region. It has many mountains, plains, running waters, and towns. It is the Gate of Turkistân. Great numbers of Turkish slaves are brought (*uftadh*)

1 On the margin: *Frghl.*
here. In its mountains there are numerous mines of gold, silver, copper, lead (surb), ammoniac, quicksilver (simāb), combustible schists (chirāgh-sang?), bezoar stone (sang-i pāy-zahr), lodestone (sang-i maghnātīs), and numerous drugs. It produces tabarkhūn (red colour?), and plants useful in the preparation of wonderful ('ajab) medicines. The kings of Farghāna belonged formerly to (the class of) margraves and were called dihqān.

46. Chadghal, a district of Farghāna lying amidst mountains and broken country and possessing many boroughs and villages. It produces horses and a great number of sheep, and has mines as well.

47. Akhsīkath, the capital of Farghāna and the residence of the amīr and (his) lieutenants ('ummāl). It is a large town situated on the bank of the river Khashart (Jaxartes), at the foot of a mountain. In its mountains there are numerous mines of gold and silver. Its inhabitants are wine-drinkers (nabīd-khwārā).

48. Vāthkath forms the frontier between Khujand and Farghāna and is a borough with much cultivation.

49. Shaḥ (??), a borough producing quicksilver.

50. Tamākhus, Nāmkākhus [sic], two boroughs situated on the slope of a mountain.

51. Sōkh lies in the mountains on the frontier between Buttamān and Farghāna and has sixty villages.

52. Avāl lies on the slope of a mountain (babarākūhist) and possesses villages.

53. Baghaskān (?) belongs to Avāl.

54. Khuvākand, Rishtān, Zandarāmīsh, densely populated (anbūk) boroughs with much cultivation.

55. Qubā, a large town, the most flourishing in the district of Farghāna.

56. Ōsh, a prosperous and very pleasant place with a warlike population. It is situated on the slope of a mountain, on which watchers (pāshbān) and scouts (dīdabān) are posted, to observe the infidel Turks (kāfir-i Turk rā nigāh dārand).

57. 'Urāshīt, Khursāb, two boroughs with running waters, spaciousness (gushādhāgi), many amenities, and a good climate.

58. Üzgānd, a town on the frontier between Farghāna and the Turks. Two rivers pass its outskirts (karāna), of which the one called t.BAKH.R(*Yābāghū) comes from Tibet and the other, Barskhān, comes from the Khallukh country.

59. Khatlām, a borough which is the birth-place (maulūd) of Naṣr ibn Aḥmad, the [Sāmānid] amīr of Khurāsān.

1 Vide infra under 63. "Jadghal", now Chatqal.
60. KASHUKATH, PĀB, two prosperous boroughs, with much cultivation.
   All these are the towns of Farghana.

61. BUSHT, K.L.SKĀN, YŪKAND, KUKATH, KHUSHKĀB (?), boroughs situated near to each other, with much cultivation but with poor people.

62. SH.LĀT, a frontier post (thaghūr) situated towards the Turks.

63. ILĀQ, a large province stretching between (andar miyān) the mountains and the steppe. It has a numerous population, and is cultivated and prosperous, (but) the people have little wealth (khwāsta). Its towns and districts (rustā) are numerous. The people profess mostly the creed of those “in white raiment” (sapīd jāmagān). The people are warlike and arrogant-looking (shūkh-rū). In its mountains are mines of gold and silver. Its frontiers march with Farghana, Jadghal [sic], Chāch, and the river Khashart. The chiefs of this province are called Dihqān-i Ilāq. Formerly the dihqāns in this province were counted among the margraves (dihqān in nāḥiyat rā az mulāk-i ʿatrāf būdandī).

64. NŪKATH [sic], the chief place of Ilāq, has a city, a citadel, and a suburb. Its river is called Ilāq, and Nūkath is situated on its bank.

65. KUHSAYM (*Kūh-iSIM) is a borough on the slope of the mountain, in which there is a silver-mine.

66. DHAKHKATH, a borough which produces dārū-yi mush (“mouse-poison”=arsenic?).

67. YAHŪDHLIQ, ABARLIQ (?), ITLUKH (?), ALKH.JĀS (Alkh.njās ?), boroughs on the frontier of Farghana and Ilāq.

68. SĀMĪ S.BRAK, a flourishing and populous borough.

69. HAN, KHĀS,1 boroughs with much cultivation but sparsely populated.

70. GH.ZJAND, a flourishing and prosperous borough.

71. TUKATH, a borough with great wealth.

72. K.L.SHJ.K, KH.MB.RK, ARDALĀNKATH, S.T.BGH.VĀ, | حئاح, are 24b boroughs situated near one another, populous, with much cultivation and running waters. Ardalānkath is the chief place of these boroughs.

73. K.RĀL, GH.ZK, KHIWĀL, VARDHŪL, K.BRIYA, B.GHŪRĀNK (?), small boroughs, very agricultural, producing horses, and lying close to one another.

74. ARD, BAGHŪYKATH, F.RNKATH, small boroughs, prosperous, pleasant, and lying close to one another.

75. JABGHŪKATH, a small borough which formerly was the military camp of Chāch.

1 Barthold’s Index: Khābs.
76. SH.KAKAB, two flourishing and prosperous towns of Ilaq.

77. TUNKAT-I B.KHARNA, a chief place with several districts situated between Ilaq, Jadghal, and Chach. It has running waters and is a resort of merchants.

78. YALAPAN, a borough from which the bank of the river Parak is farsang distant. There stands a dirham-mint (saray-i diram zadan).

79. CHACH (spelt: Chaj), a large and prosperous district. The inhabitants are active fighters for the faith, warlike (jang-kun), and wealthy (tuwanger). (The locality) is very pleasant. It produces great quantities of khalanj-wood, and of bows and arrows made of khadang-wood. Its kings formerly belonged to the class of margraves (muluk-i vay... az muluk-i atraf budand).

80. BINKATH (spelt: Bikath), capital of Chach (spelt: jaj). This large town, prosperous and flourishing, is the seat of the government.

81. NÜJAKATH, a borough from which come the boatmen (kashtibadan) working on the rivers Parak and Khashart.

82. K.RJAKATH (?), TARKUS, KHATUNKATH, two [sic] small but prosperous boroughs which are the store-places (bargah) of Sughd and Samarqand, as well as of Farghana and Ilaq (va än-i F. va I. ast).

83. BANÄKATH, a flourishing and prosperous borough on the bank of the river Khashart. (Harakek, Harakes, SH.TÜRKATH, S.BKATH (Biskath?), K.K.RAL), boroughs of Chach producing the chächi-bows. The locality is flourishing, very pleasant, and prosperous.

84. ISBİJAB, a region on the frontier between the Muslims and the Infidels. It is an extensive and pleasant locality on the frontier of Turkistân, and whatever is produced in any place of Turkistân is brought here. It possesses many towns, provinces, and districts, and produces felt and sheep. The chief place is called Isbijab. It is a large and very pleasant town and is the seat of the government. It possesses great wealth and merchants from all over the world abound in it (ma'dan-i bāzurgānān).

85. SÂNİKATH, a flourishing, pleasant, and wealthy (tuwanger) town.

86. ŞAK, a flourishing and very pleasant town.

87. SUTKAND, a pleasant locality on the bank of a river. The people are warlike. It is the abode of trucial Turks (jāy-i Turkān-i āshī). From their tribes many have turned Muslims.

88. FÄRÄB, a pleasant district of which the chief place is called Kadir. The people are warlike and courageous. It is a resort of merchants.

1 Barthold's Index: Tarkūsh.
§§ 25-6

"The Regions of the World"

89. Between Isbijāb and the bank of the river is the grazing-ground (giyā-khwār) of all Isbijāb and of some parts of Chāch, Pārāb, and Kunjdih. On it a thousand felt-tents are seen of the trucial Turks who have turned Muslims.

90. ȘABRĀN (spelt: Șahrān), a very pleasant town and the resort of Ghūz merchants.

91. DHARNŪKH (?), a borough on the bank of a river, prosperous but sparsely populated.

92. SŪNĀKH, a very pleasant borough of Pārāb (spelt: Bārāb), producing bows which are exported to different places.

93. SHILJĪ, ȚARĀZ (spelt: T. rār), FARŪNKATH, MIRKĪ, NAVIKATH, boroughs where both Muslims and Turks live. (This locality) is a residence of merchants, and the Gate of the Khallukh (dar-i Khallukh). In Afrūnkat [sic], Mirkī, and Navikath the Turks are numerous.

§ 26. Discourse on the Region of Transoxianan Marches and its Towns

The Marches (hudūd) of Transoxiana are scattered districts, some lying to the east of Transoxiana, and some to the west of it.

East of the Eastern Marches of Transoxiana are the borders of Tibet and Hindūstān; south of them, the (Marches) of Khorāsān; west of them, the borders of Chaghāniyān; and north of them, the borders of Surūshana which belong to Transoxiana.

1. KHUTTALĀN (spelt: Khutulān), a region lying amidst high mountains, extensive, prosperous, cultivated, populous, and abounding in amenities. Its king is one of the margraves. The inhabitants are warlike. In its limits towards Tibet some wild people live in the deserts. Mines of silver and gold are found in its mountains. Great numbers of good horses come from Khuttalān (az in).

2. HULMUK (Hulbuk) is the chief place of Khuttalān and the seat of the king. It is situated on the slope of the mountain and has many men and many districts (rustā).

3. NUCHĀRĀ, a strong town situated between two rivers: Kharnāb and Jayhūn. Its district extends to the confines of Badhakhshān and is called Rustā Bik. (Nuchārā) is a town on one side of which is the Jayhūn and on the other a mountain. It is a very pleasant locality, and the emporium of Khuttalān.

4. PARGHAR (spelt: Bārghar), a prosperous town, with much cultivation, and very populous.

1 nāhiyat-i hudūd-i Mā wara' al-nahr.  2 *Vakhshāb? See Notes.
5. BĀRSĀRAGH, MUNK, T.MLIYĀT (Selāt), small boroughs, very pleasant and prosperous, with a warlike population.

6. VAKHSH, a prosperous region lying on the bank (karāna) of Vakhshāb.

7. HALĀVARD, the chief place of Vakhsh. It is an agricultural town with many districts (rustā). The inhabitants are warlike archers.

8. LİVKAND (*Lēvkand) belongs to Vakhsh, and from it come the vakhshī-sheep.

9. ZHĀSHT (Rāshī?), a district lying amid mountains and broken country (andar kūh-hā va shikastā-hā), between Buttāmān and Khuttalān, with many divisions (rustā) and fields. The chiefs of this district are called Dihqān-i Zāsh [sic].

10. Within the limits of Khuttalān and Chaghāniyān there is a tribe (gurūh) called KUMĪJĪYĀN. They are courageous and warlike and professional thieves. Their wealth is in sheep and slaves. They possess numerous villages and districts but have no towns. Those of them who are within the limits of Chaghāniyān are found in the district SAYLĀKĀN (*Selākān) situated between Shūmān and Bishgird (*Vēshgīrd?). And those of them who live within the limits of Khuttalān are found between *Tamliyāt (spelt: Namliyāt) and Munk. They live among mountains and dales (dasht) which have running waters and are pleasant places. Each tribe lives under the orders of the amīr of its district (andar firμān-i amīr-i nāhiyat-i khwīsh-and), and the amirs of Khuttalān and Chaghāniyān, when they have need, solicit their help (va amīrān-i Khuttalān va Chaghāniyān-rā chūn bāyad az ishān yārī khwāhānd).¹

11. THE K.NJĪNA TURKS, a tribe of few men living in the mountains between Khuttalān and Chaghāniyān and established in a valley (darra). This place is very strong. The people are professional thieves and looters of caravans (karvān-shikan) and look arrogant (shūkh-rūy). In their predatory expeditions they behave gallantly (andar ān duzdī javānmard-pīsha). They go for looting to a distance of 40 and 50 farsangs from the periphery (?gardān) of their district. They show attachment (payroastagī numāyand) to the amīr of Khuttalān and that of Chaghāniyān.

12. DAR-I TUBBAT, a village where a gate stands on a mountain. There live Muslims who levy the toll (bāz) and keep watch on the road. And when you come out of this gate (you) are in the limits of Vakhān.

13. R.KHT.I.B (?), a village of Vakhān where the vakhī infidels (gabrakān, Zoroastrians?) live.

14. SIKĀSHIM (Ishkāshim), a town and the chief place of the region of Vakhān (gaśaba-yi nāhiyat-i ù (?) Vakhān-ast). Its inhabitants are infidels (gabrakān, Zoroastrians?) and Muslims, and the malik of Vakhān (spelt: Rakhān) lives there. From it come covers for saddle-cloths (rūy-i namad-zīn), and the vakhī arrows.

15. KHMĀDĒH, a place where the idol-temples of the Vakhīs are (andar [ù] but-khāna-hā-ya Vakhīyān-ast). A few Tibetans are found in it. On its left side is a fortress occupied by the Tibetans.

16. SNGLNJ (Sanglich ?), lies at the foot of a mountain. The mine of the Badakhshī garnets (bijādha) and of rubies (la'ī) lies in that mountain. Near the mine is a hot spring in a pool (ab-i garm va isticādha), such that on account of its heat it is impossible to put the hand into it. From that mine to Tibet there is a distance of one day and a half.

17. Beyond (Snglnj) is a region called RūSTĀ *B.I.J.M (M.īj.m ?) (va az ānjā bigudhari nāhiyatī āyadh ù-rā rūstā [mā ?] khwānand).

18. SAMARQANDĀQ, a large village in which live Indians, Tibetans, and Vakhīs, as well as Muslims. It is the frontier and the farthest point (ākhīr-i ḥudūd) of Transoxiana.

19. BOLOR (Bulūr)1 is a vast country (nāhiyatī-št 'azīm) with a king who declares that he is the Son of the Sun (mā farzand-i āftāb-īm). And he does not rise from his sleep until the Sun has risen, saying that a son must not rise before his father. He is called Bulūrin-shāh. In this country there is no salt but that imported from Kashmir [sic].

20. ANDRĀS (?), a town in which live Tibetans and Indians. From it to Kashmir is a journey of two days (tāwza rāh < *du rūza rāh?)

{The houses which are (seen) on the Map (ṣūrat) between Rukhudh and Multān are all villages and stations of caravans. (They lie) in the desert, and are places devoid of amenity and poor in grass (tang 'alaf).}2

21. KHWĀRAZM. West of Transoxiana are the limits of Khwārazm.

22. KĀTH (spelt: Kāzh), the capital of Khwārazm and the Gate of the Ghūz Turkistān (T-.ī Ghūz). It is the emporium of the Turks, Turkistān, Transoxiana, and the Khazar. It is a resort of merchants. Its king, who is one of the margraves (az mulāk-i atrāf), is called Khwārazmshāh. The people are active fighters for the faith and are warlike. The town abounds in wealth (khwāsta). It produces covers for cushions (rūy-i mukhaddā), quilted garments (qashāgand), cotton stuffs (karbās), felt, snow (barf), and rukhībīn.3

23. KHUSHMĪTHAN, a borough with merchants and much wealth.

1 Cf. § 11, 2. 2 The paragraph between { } evidently belongs to § 24, 16. 3 Sort of cheese?
24. **Nūzhābān**, a town with a wall, iron gates (spelt: *daryāhā-yi āhanī*?), running waters, and many inhabitants.

25. **Gurgānī**, a borough which formerly belonged to the Khwārazmshāh, but now its government (*pādshāhi-yi sūru*) is separate and its king (*pādshāh*) is called mīr of Gurgānī. The town abounds in wealth, and is the Gate of Turkistān and resort of merchants. The town consists of two towns: the inner one and the outer one. Its people are known for their fighting qualities and archery.

26. **Kūrdar,** a borough with cultivation, very populous. Great numbers of lambskins (*pūst-i barā*) come from there.

26a 27. **Kūrdar,** a borough with cultivation, very populous. | Great numbers of lambskins (*pūst-i barā*) come from there.

28. **Khīva** (spelt: *Khīv*), a small borough with a wall, belonging to Gurgānī.


§ 27. Discourse on the Country of Sind and its Towns

East of this country is the river Mihrān; south of it, the Great Sea; west of it, the province of Kirmān; north of it is a desert adjacent to the Marches (*hudūd*) of Khorāsān. This country belongs to the hot zone and has many deserts (*biyābān*), and few mountains. The people are swarthy with slim bodies, (good) runners (*dāvanda*). They are all Muslims. The region has few amenities (*kam-nī mat*), but numerous merchants (are found in it). The country produces skins (*pūst*), leather (*charm*), red *abānk* (?),1 shoes (*na'lāīn*), dates (*khurmā*), and sugar-candy (*pānidh*).

1. **Mansūra**, a great (*ašim*) town, situated like an island in the middle of the river Mihrān. It is very pleasant and prosperous and is a resort of merchants. The inhabitants are Muslims and their king is a Quraishite.

2. **Manjābri, Sadūsān**, two prosperous towns of the country of Sind, situated on the bank of the river Mihrān.

3. **Bīrūn**2 (spelt: *wūruz*), **Masvāhī**, two towns in the limits of Sind. (The inhabitants) are the people carrying on the sea-trade (*marūdā-mānih-and kī bāsurgānī-yi daryā kunand*). These places have few amenities.

1 the word *abānk* unknown. 2 Or: *Nīrūn?*
4. Daybul, a town of Sind on the coast of the Great Sea. It is the abode (jayyāh) of the merchants. Products (alat-hā) of Hindūstān and the sea are brought there in large quantities.

5. F.Nīkī (*Q.nī.tī?), *Aramābil, two towns of Mukrán (as hudūd-i M.) which possess many riches and are situated close to the sea on the edge of the desert.

6. Tīz is the first town of Sind (as hudūd-i S.), situated on the coast of the Great Sea. It is not an interesting place (kam sayr?).

7. Kīz, Kūshk-i Qand, BiH (4), Bind (3), Dizak (spelt: Drk), AsKF—all these towns belong to Mukrán. Most of the sugar-candy exported everywhere (andar jihān) comes from these boroughs. The king of Mukrán lives in Kīj.

8. Rāsk, the chief place of the district of Jurūj. It is prosperous and very populous, and is a place possessing many merchants.

9. Mushkī (spelt: HuShkī), a borough in the steppe (biyābān).

10. Panjbūr (spelt: Banjpur), the largest of the towns of Sind on this side of the river Mihrān.

11. Pulpara (spelt: BuHlbara), a town belonging to the district of Jurūj. It has few amenities (kam-nilmat).

12. M.Hālī (?), Qusdār (spelt: Qusdhan), KījKānān, Shūra, towns of the region of Tūrān. It is a pleasant locality with much cattle. In it live many Muslims and heathens (gabrakan, Zoroastrians?). The seat of the king of Tūrān is in KījKānān.

13. Abl (?), a town of the Būd-hā (6d) region, prosperous and extremely pleasant; its inhabitants are Muslims.

14. Qandābil, a large town, prosperous, pleasant, and situated on the plain. It produces great quantities of dates.

§ 28. Discourse on the Province of Kirmān and its Towns

East of the province of Kirmān are the limits of Sind; south of it, the Great Sea; west of it, the province of Pārs; north of it, the desert of Sistān. Whatever parts of this province lie towards the sea, they are in the hot zone, their people are swarthy; there reside merchants and there are deserts; the local products are cumin (ṣīra), dates, indigo, 26b sugar-cane, and sugar-candy; the food of the inhabitants is millet-bread. And whatever places are remote from the sea (and) near to the desert of Sistān, they belong to the cold zone, are prosperous and very pleasant, and the bodies (of the inhabitants) are healthy (tan-hā

1 To the reading: one would prefer: "hot zone".

2 Ṯaḥayṭisht, Kermān, Bāsi, Drayast Jāmehy Kermān Ast
§ 28

durust); here (too) lie numerous mountains with mines of gold, silver, copper, lead, and lodestone (maghnāṭīs).

1. SīRGĀN, the capital of Kirman and the seat of the king (pādh-shāh). It is a large town and a resort of merchants. Their water comes from underground canals, and in the small districts (rustā) the water is from wells. The trees are few and the constructions are vaulted (va binā-hā-shān isaja).

2. BÁFT and KHIR (?), two prosperous and pleasant boroughs.

3. JĪRUFT, a town occupying an area of half a farsang by half a farsang. It is a very prosperous and pleasant place. They have a rapid (tīz) river which flows with a roar (bāng kunān); its water is so abundant that it turns sixty mills, and in its canals auriferous sand (khāk-i zar) is found.

4. MĪZHĀN, a borough situated on the slope of a mountain. The fruit, fuel, and snow of Jīruft come from this town.

5. MUGHŪN (?), VULĀSHGIRD, KŪMĪN, BAHRŪGĀN, MANŪGĀN, large and small boroughs. From them come indigo, cumin (zirīra, read: zīra), and sugar-cane, and here sugar-candy is produced. The inhabitants’ food is sorghum (gāvārs, v.i., p. 147) and they have plenty of dates. They have a custom that the owners never pick up the dates that have fallen from the tree, and those dates belong to the poor (darvīshān).

6. BALŪJ, a people established in the steppe (sahrā) between these towns and the Kūfij mountains. They are professional way-layers, herdsmen, intrepid (nā-bāk) and bloodthirsty. They were [formerly] very numerous but [the Buyid] *Panā-Khusrau has destroyed them by various stratagems (hilat).

7. KŪFIJ, mountaineers (kūhiyān) living on the Kūh-i Kūfij. They are divided into seven tribes of which each has a chief. The Kūfij too are professional looters, herdsmen and agriculturists. East of the Kūh-i Kūfij down to Mukran is a desert. Between Jīruft and Manūgān is a mountainous country, very prosperous and pleasant, called KŪHISTĀN-I ABŪ GHĀNĪM. West of this mountainous tract is a district (rustā) RÜDBĀR, altogether woods, trees, and meadows (marghzār).

8. HURMŪZ, within half a farsang of the Great Sea. This very hot place is the emporium of Kirman.

9. SHAHRUVĀ, a borough on the sea-coast where fishermen (šay-yādān) live.

10. SŪRĪQĀN, MAZRŪQĀN, KASBĀN, RAVĪN, KHABRŪQĀN are towns with many wells, the water of which is used for drinking and agriculture. The towns abound in amenities and have a moderate climate.
11. KAHUN, KHUSHNABADH, two small towns on the road to Pars.

12. KAPTAH, DIAK, two boroughs on the mountain Barjiyan, and whatever comes (uptadhi) from the mountain Barjiyan is brought (uptadhi) to these towns.

13. DIHY GAZ (spelt: KUR), DARZIN (spelt: Darjin), two boroughs between Bam and Jiruft, prosperous and very pleasant. From it (Darzin?) comes cinnamon (darzini).

14. KHWAISH and RIQAN, two boroughs situated in the desert between Sind and Kirmān.

15. SHAMAT, KUGHUN, KHAYNA, SARVISTAN, DARZIN, towns between Sirgan and Bam. They belong to the cold zone, have a good climate, and are prosperous and very pleasant. They have running waters and a numerous population.

16. BAM, a town with a healthy climate (havā-yi tan-durust). In its shahristān stands a strong fortress. It is larger than Jiruft and possesses three cathedral mosques (masgīt-i jāmi’): one belongs to the Khārijites, another to the Muslims, and the third is in the fortress. From it come cotton stuffs (karbās), turbans (’āma), Bam-turbans (or kerchiefs, dastār-i bami), and dates.

17. NARGISH, a flourishing town, prosperous and pleasant, where the merchants reside.

18. BAHRA (Pahra), situated at the end of the country (shahr) of Kirmān and on the edge of the desert. Through it (the travellers) go to Sistān.

19. SIBIH, a town in the desert, between Nahla (Pahra) and Sistān. It belongs to Kirmān (az ‘aman-i K.).

20. FIRDĪR (?), MAHAN, KHAS, very pleasant towns with a salubrious (durust) climate. Some of them are situated in the mountains and some in the steppe (biyābān).

21. BARDASIR, JANZARUDH, two boroughs on the road to Herat and Kūhīstān, very favoured by nature (bā ni’mat-i bisyar), but with a sparse population.

22. KUTMIDHAN, KRDAGAN, ANAR are (āyand, read: -and) very pleasant boroughs on the road from Pars to Rūdhān.

23. Between Sirgan and Bardasir lies a mountainous tract (kūhīstān), very prosperous and pleasant; there lie 260 villages, prosperous, pleasant, and populous.

In the whole province of Kirmān no large river is found, such as could be navigable (chinānk kasthi bitavānad raftan). In its mountains there are long-living (darāz-zindagān) and healthy people.

¹ At both places probably the same town. ² Spelt: Chatrudh.
§ 29. Discourse on the Province of Pārs and its Towns

East of this province is the province of Kirmān; south of it, the Great Sea; west of it, the river Ţāb which separates Pārs from Khūzistān, and some borders (ḥudūd) of Sipāhān (Isfahān); north of it, the desert of Pārs, (which is a part) of (that of) Kargas-kūh. (Pārs) possesses many cities and a numerous population. It is a prosperous and wealthy (tavangar) province with manifold resources (niʿmat-hā-yi gūnāgūn). It is a resort of merchants and has mountains and rivers. It was the seat of the Sasanian kings (khusrawān). The inhabitants are eloquent (sukhan-dān) and clever. In its mountains there are gold-mines. It produces manifold textiles (jāma) of linen (katān), wool, and cotton, and also rose-water, violet-water, palm-blossom water (āb-i tal'), carpets, rugs (bisāt va farsh), zīlā-rugs, and gilim (tapestry woven carpets), of precious quality. Whatever parts of Pārs lie nearer to the sea they belong to the hot zone; and whatever parts are nearer to the desert they belong to the cold zone. In Pārs there are mountains and gold-mines. In it the fire-temples of the *Zoroastrians (g.rān, read: *gabrān?) are situated [and the latter] respect [the vestiges] of the people of yore1 and visit them on pilgrimage. Most of the towns of Pārs have mountains in their neighbourhood.

1. SHĪRĀZ, the capital of Pārs, is a large and flourishing town with many riches and many inhabitants. It is the seat of the government (dār al-mulk). This town was built in the Islamic epoch (in shahr-rā ba rūzgār-i Islām karda-and). There stands in it an ancient and very strong citadel, called Shah-mōbadh’s Fortress. In it (i.e., Shīrāz?) two venerated fire-temples are found. In it a kind of sweet basil (isbargham) is found called sūsan (spelt: sūs) -i nargis, of which the leaves (petals?) are like those of a lily (sūsan), and the middle (miyāna) like the narcissus.

2. IṢṬAḴHR, a large and ancient town, which had been the seat 27b of the Sasanian kings. | In it ancient buildings, images (naqsh), and figures (sūrat) are found. Iṣṭāḵhr has many districts (nawāḥi), and (some) wonderful buildings called Solomon’s Mosque (mazgīt-i Sulaymān). In it grows an apple, of which one half is sour, and the other sweet. In its mountain iron mines are found, and in its region, silver mines.

3. DIZ-I PISAR-I ‘UMĀRA, “The castle of ‘Umāra’s son”, a borough with a fortress, situated on the coast of the Great Sea. It is a place of fishermen, and a travelling stage (mansil) of merchants.

1 Something fallen out: اندیق وی آتش کنده، کونه،، [و آثار] قدمی‌مرزا بزرگ دارد.
4. Sīrāf, a large town in the hot zone. It has a salubrious (durust) climate, and is the merchants’ haunt and the emporium of Pārs.

5. JAM, KURĀN, KHURMUK (حیرمک), boroughs within the limits (hudūd) of Sīrāf, very prosperous and populous.

6. Gūr, a flourishing town which was built by Ardashīr Bābakān and served him as a residence. Round it is a solid wall. From it comes the jūrī rose-water exported everywhere. It produces palm-blossom water (ab-i tal’) and santoline (qaisūm)-water which are exported everywhere and are not to be found anywhere else. Gūr possesses a powerful (sakh) spring of water.

7. Bajīragān, *Jīra (جر), Bānū, Mihrā, boroughs of Gūr, very pleasant and prosperous, with running waters.

8. Najīram, a town on the sea-shore which is a resort of merchants.

9. Ša’āda, Bahlavān (?), two flourishing boroughs, prosperous and situated close to the sea.

10. Ganāwa (گانوا [sic]), a large and flourishing town which is a resort of merchants and possesses much wealth. From it come manifold textiles (jāma). In the sea of Ganāfa (گانفا [sic]) there is a pearl bank (ma’dān-i murvāridh). Bū Sa’īd Daqqāq, who carried on propaganda (da’vat kard) and took Bahrayn, was from this place. Sulaymān ibn al-Hasan al-Qarmātī was the son of Ibn Bū Sa’īd.

11. Tavazi, a town situated between two rivers. Its inhabitants are numerous and rich (tuvangar). All the tavazi textiles come from it.

12. Kāzrūn lies near the lake Yūn. It is a large and prosperous town with much wealth. In it there are two venerated fire-temples.

13. Sinīz, a town on the sea-shore, very pleasant and with a salubrious (durust) climate. All the sinīzi textiles come from there.


15. Māhī-rūbān, a town standing like an island amidst waters. It is a flourishing place and the emporium of the whole of Pārs.

16. Arragan (Arragān, Arrajān), a large and flourishing town with much wealth, abounding in amenities and enjoying a good climate. In its district (rustā) there is a well of water of which no one in the world knows the depth (ki zarfī-yi ān ba-hama jihān natavānand dānist); from it comes a water to turn one mill (miqdār-i yak āsiyāb) and spreads over the soil. This town produces good grape-syrup (dushāb).

17. B.ZR.K, Bīsūk, Vāyagān, Lārandān, boroughs of Arragan, abounding in amenities and enjoying a pleasant climate.
18. **Naubandagan**, a flourishing town, very pleasant and having much wealth (*khwāsta*).

19. [**Bishāvūr**], a wealthy (*tuvangar*) town with a wall round it, built by Shāpūr Khusrav. There are two fire-temples in it to which people go on pilgrimage. Near it stands a mountain on which the figures of every king, mōbadh, and marzbān previous to Shāpūr (*pīsh az vāy*) are represented (*nigāṣta*) and at the same place their adventures written down (*nivishta-ast*). In its neighbourhood (*hudūd*) there is a mountain from which smoke comes up continually and every bird that happens to fly over this smoke (*bālā-yī ān dūdhiparadh*) is burned and falls down.

20. **Vāyagān**, *Kimarīj*, two boroughs of Bishāvūr, flourishing and prosperous.


22. [**Gūyum**?], a borough where the weir distributing the water of Shirāz stands (*bakhsh-gāḥ-i ūb-i Shirāz az ānjā-st*).

23. **Barsarkān** (?), *Kuvaristān* (*Kauristān*?), two prosperous and pleasant boroughs of (az) Shirāz.

24. [**Baypā**], a prosperous borough. Ḥallāj who laid claim to divinity (*da'vā-yī khudhā'i kārd*) was from here.

25. **Hazār, Zarqān, KHIR**, boroughs . . . [flourishing], prosperous, and pleasant.

26. **Pasa**. a large and flourishing town with a citadel and a suburb. It is a resort of merchants and has much wealth (*khvāsta*).

27. **Tamistān, Bustugān, Azbarā, Darakān, Mazīrākān** (*Murayzigān*?), *Sanān*, prosperous boroughs between Pasā and [Dāragird].

28. **Dāragird**, a flourishing and prosperous town, with much wealth (*khvāsta*) but with a bad climate. It produces *mūmiyā'ī* (bitumen) which is not found anywhere else in the world. In its region (*nawāhī*) are mountains of salt of white, black, red, yellow, and every other colour, of which good tables (*khwān-hā*) are made [ . . . which are exported?].

29. **Ram, Rūstā Rustām** (?), *Furj* (spelt: *F.rkh*), Tārum, boroughs between Dāragird and the limits of Kirmān. These are places with much cultivation, abounding in amenities.

30. **Kārzīn** belongs to Pasā and has a strong citadel.

31. **Kariyān**, a borough of Dāragird within ( . . . *ndr?*) an inaccessible (*sa'b*) and strong fortress (*hīṣār*). A venerated fire-temple is found in it.

32. **Samīrān, Iraj, Rūfta, Madhavan** (spelt: *Madhāran*), Gūyum, boroughs of Dāragird, prosperous and pleasant.

---

1 Supplied from 20.  
2 Fol. 28 slightly damaged.  
3 Cf. § 36, 15.
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33. JAHRUM, a flourishing town producing zilū-rugs and good prayer-carpets.

34. KIZH, a town with a strong fortress (hišār) in it.

35. KHĪR, KURDIYĀN, two prosperous boroughs having much cultivation and belonging to Pasā.

36. ĪJ, ISTAHBANAT, KHIYAR, MASHKANAT, boroughs situated on the slope of a mountain, sparsely populated, but having much cultivation, and much favoured by nature.

37. ABĀDHA, BARDANGĀN, JĀHUK, boroughs between Istakhr and Kirman. They are caravan-stages, much favoured by nature.

38. KAMĪN, SARVAB, M.ZIRAKAN (?), SHAHR-I BABAK (spelt: Fānak), KHURRA, KĪS, all these boroughs lie in the mountains of the cold zone. The locality has a salubrious climate and is very pleasant. In Khurra there is a fire-temple, held in great veneration and attracting pilgrims. It was founded by Dārā.

39. BAJJA (spelt: -bt.), KILĪDH (spelt: Kilīnd), SHAMAGĀN, SURMA, ARJĪNĀN, boroughs lying amidst the mountains of the cold zone. The locality is prosperous, cultivated, very pleasant, and populous.

40. BARQŪH (Abarqūth), an extremely pleasant town; in its neighbourhood there are large mounds of ashes.

41. [NĀYĪN], a prosperous and pleasant town. In its mountains there are silver-mines.

42. SARDAN, a town situated between two rivers. It is a . . . prosperous and flourishing place, and in its mountains a mine of copper (ma’dan-i rūdh) is found.

43. ABRAJ, K.SBĀ, MĀYIN, prosperous boroughs between Pārs and Ispāhān.

44. RUDHĀN, DARKĀN, two towns on the frontier between Pārs and Kirmān. They are caravan-stages and belong to the cold zone.

45. ANĀR, BAHRA, KATHA, MAYBUDH, NĀYĪN, boroughs of the cold zone, much favoured by nature and lying on the frontier between Pārs and the desert.

§ 30. Discourse on the Province of Khūzistān and its Towns

East of this province lies Pārs and the borders of Sipāhān; south of it, the sea and some of the 'Irāq frontier (hadā); west of it, some of the borders (hudūd) of 'Irāq, and of the countryside (sawād) of Baghdād and Wāṣīt; north of it, | the lands (shahr-hā) of the province of Jibāl. This province is more prosperous than any province adjoining it. Great rivers and running waters are found in it. (Its) countryside

1 Cf. supra 27.

2 Cf. infra, 45.
(sawād-hā) is flourishing and (its) mountains full of utility. From it come: sugar, manifold textiles, curtains (parda-hā), sūzangird-textiles), trouser-cords (shakwārband), fragrant citrons (turanj-i shammāma), and dates. The people of this province are gain-loving¹ and avaricious.

1. DIZ-I MAHDĪ (spelt: Dar-i M.), a flourishing and prosperous town situated on the river between 'Iraq and Khūzistān.

2. BĀSIYĀN (spelt: Bāsabān ?), KHĀN MARDŪNA, DAURAQ, boroughs situated on the bank of the river, prosperous, flourishing, wealthy (tuvangar), and very pleasant.

3. DAYRĀ, a borough near the mountains, very pleasant.

4. ASAK [sic], a large village situated on the slope of a mountain, on the summit of which a fire is constantly shining, day and night. In the days of yore the battle with the Azraqī [Khārijites] (spelt: Raqiyān) took place there.

5. JUBBAY ( jadxr Jubbā, jubbe?), a borough on the bank of the Shūshtar river, flourishing and very pleasant. The well-known Abū 'Ali Jubbā'ī was from this town.

6. SŪQ AL-ARBA'Ā, a town situated on the bank of the river, very pleasant and prosperous.

7. AHWĀZ, an extremely flourishing town. There is no town in Khūzistān more flourishing than this. It abounds in amenities and has a good situation. The people are yellow-faced. It is said that whoever establishes himself in Ahwāz becomes wanting in brains, and every aroma that is carried there (hama ḣibī [spelt: ḥyy] ki ānjā bari) loses its scent on account of the climate. In its mountains there are vipers (mār-i shīkanj, spelt: shtknj).

8. UZAM (?), a small borough, very pleasant.

9. RĀMḤUR ([sic], Rāmḥiz ?), a borough lying on the bank of a river. Mānī was killed there (az ānjā).

10. 'ASKAR-I MUKRAM, a town with extensive countryside (sawād), flourishing, prosperous, and very pleasant. All the red and white sugar (shakar) and refined sugar (qand) of the world comes from there.

11. MAṢRUQĀN, a flourishing and pleasant borough. In it extremely good fresh dates are found.

12. RĀM URDMIZD, a large town, flourishing, prosperous, and very pleasant. It is a resort of merchants and is situated between Pārs and Khūzistān.

13. BĀZĀR-I SAMBĪL, a pleasant borough.

14. IDHA [read: Tustar], a town with a very flourishing countryside

¹ The sense is clear but the word is incomplete ... بسیبزور. After r two dots are seen under the line.
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(sa'wād), prosperous, very pleasant, and possessing much wealth. It lies on the bank of a river. It produces great quantities of brocades (dībā). There also the brocade of the cover for the Mecca (sanctuary) (parda-yi Makka) is made.

15. v. NDUSHĀVUR, a prosperous and very pleasant town. The tomb of Ya'qūb (ibn) Layth is situated there.

16. SHUSH, a wealthy town, which is a resort of merchants and the emporium of Khūzistān. It produces textiles and turbans of precious silk stuff (jāma va 'amāma-yi khaz), and fragrant citrons (turunj-i dastanbūy). The coffin (tābūt) of the prophet Daniel was discovered here.

17. MANUB (Mānūf, read: Mattūth), BIRDŪN, two agricultural boroughs . . ., prosperous and very pleasant.

18. BAŞUNNAY (Ba-Şunnā, Ba-Şunnē), a flourishing wealthy town. It produces good curtains (parda), exported everywhere.

19. TĪB, a flourishing and prosperous town producing very good trouser-cords, just like the Armenian.

20. SHAHR-I QURQŪB, a small and prosperous town. It produces sūzangird textiles.

§ 31. Discourse on the Jībāl Province and its Towns

East of this province are some borders of Pārs, of the desert of Kargas-kūh, and of Khorāsān; south of it, the borders of Khūzistān; west of it, some parts of 'Irāq and of Ādharbādhağān; north of it, the mountains of Daylāmān. This province has much cultivation and is prosperous. It is the place of clerks and litterati (dablran va adlban). It is very pleasant and produces cotton stuffs (karbās), textiles of (silk?) . . . , 1 and saffron.

1. SĪPĀHĀN, a great town consisting of two parts: the one is called Jahūdān and the other Shahristān. In both there are minbars. Between them there is a distance of *half a farsang [read nīm "half" instead of nūh "nine"]. It is a flourishing town, much favoured by nature. . . . in Jībāl. It has a river called Zarīn-rūd which is utilized in its fields. It produces . . . silk textiles of different kinds, such as ḥulla ("cloaks"?), "tabby" ('attābī, coarse watered silk), and "siglaton" (siglātān).

2. KHĀN LANJĀN, a flourishing and very pleasant borough . . .

3. JĪYGĀN, a flourishing but sparsely inhabited borough.

4. BĀRV (read: Burī?) , it was a flourishing borough with much cultivation, but now lies in ruins.

1 The end of the lines on f. 29 a and the beginning of the lines on f. 29 b are torn (1-2 words per line wanting).
5. [KARAJ?] is large but most of it lies in ruins. There stood the army camp of Abū Dulaf of Karaj (spelt: Karkhi).

6. BURŪGIRD, a flourishing and pleasant borough . . . , producing saffron and good fruit.

7. RĀMIN, a sparsely populated borough with much cultivation, situated on the slope of a mountain.

8. [KARAJ-I RUDHRĀVAR?], a large town, prosperous, pleasant, and very populous. It is a resort of merchants. It produces much saffron and cheese (?) . . . , exported everywhere.

9. RUDHRĀVAR, a borough, thickly populated (anbūh), and lying on the slope of a mountain.

10. NIHĀVAND, a town . . . with two cathedral mosques in it (andar vay). It is a very pleasant place. It produces saffron and fruit which owing to (their) excellency . . .

11. LIŚHTAR, a borough with a good climate and many fields. From it hazel-nuts (bunduq) are exported.

12. SHĀBURKHĀST (spelt: Sārjāst), a place . . .

13. ASĀBĀD (Asadābād?), KIRMĀNSHĀHĀN, MARJ, boroughs on the road of the pilgrims (hujjāf), densely populated (anbūh), prosperous, . . . and pleasant.

14. ŞAYMARA, SĪRVĀN, two prosperous and flourishing boroughs, producing dates.

15. DĪNĀVAR, SHAHRA-ZHŪR, [SUHRAVA]RD, densely populated towns, much favoured by nature, and having a sociable (āmīsanda) population.

16. ZANGĀN, a town much favoured by nature. The people . . .

17. AUHAR, a borough situated on the slope of a mountain (ba-bar-i kūh, [sic]), and possessing numerous waters (?) and fields. The inhabitants are slow (āhasta).

18. QAŻVĪN . . . , round it there is a wall. It possesses a rill (jūy-i āb) which flows through the cathedral mosque and which is only sufficient for drinking purposes (chandān-ast kī bikhurand), and the people . . . Good fruit is found there.

19. TĀLAQĀN, a borough of Rayy, lying close to Daylam.

20. KHUVĀR (Khwār), a borough of Rayy, prosperous . . .

21. RAYY, a great town, prosperous, having many riches, inhabitants, and merchants. It is the seat of the king of Jībāl (pādhshāh-i ḫ). . . . The water is from underground canals. It produces cotton stuffs (karbās), cloaks (burd), cotton, china (gḥadāra), oil (raughan), and wine (nabīd). From its districts come good woollen ūylasān (scarfs worn on the head). Muḥammad Zakariyyā the Doctor (bijishk) is (buried) there. The tombs (turbat) of Muḥammad ibn
al-Ḥasan the Lawyer (al-faqīḥ), Kisāʾī the Reader (al-muqrī), and Fazārī the Astronomer are also there.

22. Sāva, Āva, būsānana (Būsana?), Rūdha, boroughs densely populated, prosperous, very pleasant, flourishing, and enjoying an equable climate. (They are) on the road of the pilgrims of Khorāsān.

23. Qum, a large town, (now) lying in ruins, with many fields. The inhabitants are Shiʿites, and Bul-Fadl Ḥamīd the Minister 29b (dabīr) was from there. From it comes saffron.

24. Kashān, a very pleasant town. [Among its inhabitants?] are numerous Arabs. From it come many clerks and litterati. In it scorpions (kasdum) abound.

§ 32. Discourse on Daylamān and its Towns

This is an extensive region possessing many different dialects and types (?), which is called the Daylamite country (nāhiyat bišyār-ast bā zabān-hā va ʿṣrāt-hā-yi mukhtalif ki ba-nāhiyat-i Dayālim bāz khwānand).

East of this province is Khorāsān; south of it, the Jībāl lands; west of it, the limits of Ādharbādhaqān; north of it, the Khazar sea.

This province has running waters and numerous rivers, is prosperous, [. . . and is a resort] of merchants. The inhabitants are warlike and fight with shields and javelins (ṣūpin). They are pleasant . . . . This province produces silk textiles (jāma-yi abrishum), of one colour or of (several) colours (yak-rang va bā rang) e.g., mubram, harīr, and the like, as well as great quantities of linen cloths and of wooden [utensils].

1. Gurgān, a town with a large province and flourishing countryside (sawād), very well cultivated and abounding in amenities. It forms the frontier between Daylamān and Khorāsān. The people have regular features (durust-sūrat), are warlike, cleanly clad, chivalrous (bā muruvvat), and hospitable. The town consists of two halves: Shahrīstān and Bakrābād. The river Hirand coming from Tūs passes between these two quarters. Gurgān is the seat of the king of Tabaristān [read: King of Gurgān].1 It produces black silk textiles, viqāya (long veils), brocade (dībā), and raw silk textiles (qazīn).

2. Dihistān, a district possessing a ribāṭ with a minbar. It is very well cultivated place with extensive countryside (sawādī bišyār). This is a frontier post (thaghr) against (bar rūy) the Ghūz. The tomb of ʿAlī b. Sukkārī (Ṣagāt?) lies there.

3. Farāv, a ribāṭ, situated on the frontier between Khorāsān and Dihistān, on the edge of the desert. It is a frontier post against the

1 Cf. under 13. Āmol.
Ghūz. Within the ribāt there is a spring of water sufficient for drinking purposes (chandānk khurd rā ba-kār shavadh). The inhabitants have no fields, and bring grain from Nasā and Dihistān.

4. Astarābādh, a town at the foot of a mountain, pleasant and flourishing. It has running waters, and an equable climate. The people speak two languages: the one is the kwirā (?), of Astarābādh, and the other is the Persian of Gurgān. From it come many silk textiles, such as mubram and sa'fūrī of different kinds.

5. Ābaskun, a prosperous town on the sea-coast and a haunt of merchants from the whole world trading on the Khazar sea. From it come shagreen, woollen cloth (kimukhta [va] pashmin ?), and various fish.

6. Tabaristān is a large (division) of this country of Daylamān. Its frontier (hadd) is from Chālūs to Tamīsīsha. It is a prosperous (district . . .), with great wealth and numerous merchants. Their food is mostly rice-bread and fish. The roofs of their houses are of red tiles (ṣufāl) on account of the frequency of rain both in summer and in winter.

7. Tamīsha, a small borough round which there is a wall. It is a very pleasant place, lying (miḥāda-ast) between the mountains and the sea. It possesses a strong fortress. In (all parts of) the town mosquitoes are plentiful, except in the cathedral mosque where they do not enter.

8. Limrāsk, a flourishing borough at the foot of the mountains.

30a Within a distance of 1 farsang from it | there is a salt-mine (namaki-stān) which supplies salt to Gurgān and Tabaristān.

9. Sārī, a prosperous and pleasant town with many inhabitants and merchants. It produces silk tissues (jāma-yi ḥarīr va parniyān), khāvkhir (?), as well as saffron-water (mā [sic] sa'farān), sandal-wood water (mā şandal), and perfumed water (mā khaliq), which are exported everywhere.

10. Māmaṭīr, a borough with running waters. It produces thick mats (hasīrī sītabl) of very good quality, which they use (ba-kār dārānd) in summer.

11. Turjī, a prosperous borough, the most ancient in Tabaristān.

12. Mīlā, a small borough producing much sugar-cane.

13. Āmol, a great town and the capital of Tabaristān. The city (shahrīstān) has a moat but no walls. Round the city lies the suburb. (Āmol) is the seat of the kings of Tabaristān (mulūk-i T.), and a haunt of merchants. It possesses great wealth, and in it live numerous scholars in every science. It has very numerous running waters. It produces linen-cloth, kerchiefs of linen-and-cotton (dastār-i khīsh),
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The tabari-rugs (farsh), tabari-mats, and box-wood (chūb-i shimshād) which is found nowhere else. It also produces citrons (turunj) and sour oranges (nāraṇj), white Kūmīsh-gilīms\(^1\) with gold thread (zar-bāft), various kerchiefs shot with gold thread (dāstārcha-yi zarbāft), shagreen (kūmukhta), and wooden implements (ālat-hā-yi chūbī), like ladles (kafcha), combs, handles for the plough (šāna-yi niyām?), scales (tarāsū-khāna), bowls, platters (tabaq), deep plates (tayfūrī), and the like.

14. ALHUM, a borough on the sea-coast which is a haunt of seamen and merchants.

15. NATIL, CHĀLŪS [sic], RŪDḤĀN, KALĀR, boroughs lying among mountains and broken country. (These towns form) a district of Ṭabaristān, but the kingdom is separate and the king is called Ustundār. Its limits stretch from Rayy down to the sea. Kalār and Chālūs are on the frontier between Daylamān proper (khūsā) and Ṭabaristān. This Chālūs is on the sea-coast, while Kalār is in the mountains. From Rūdḥān comes the red woollen cloth, from which rain-cloaks (bārāni) are made, which are exported everywhere, as well as blue gilīms which they use in Ṭabaristān itself (kū ham der Ṭ. ba-kūr dārān).

16. KŪMĪSH, a province between Rayy and Khorāsān on the pilgrims’ road. It lies amidst mountains and is a prosperous and pleasant province, with warlike people. It produces k.nūs (?)-textiles, and fruit, of which there is no like in the world; they are exported to Gurgān and Ṭabaristān.

17. DAMGHĀN, a town having little water, and situated at the foot of the mountain. Its inhabitants are warlike. It produces dessert napkins with fine borders (dāstār-hā-yi sharāb bā ‘alam-hā-yi nikū).

18. BĪṢṬĀM, a town at the foot of a mountain. It adjoins the limits of Gurgān and is a pleasant place.

19. SIMNĀN, a flourishing and prosperous borough producing better fruit than any other place.

20. VĪMA, SHALANBA, two towns in the territory (huḍūd) of the mountain Dunbāvand (spelt: Dnyāvand). Both in summer and winter it is very cold there. From this mountain iron is extracted (uftadḥ).

21. KŪH-I QĀRIN, a district in which there are more than ten thousand villages. Its king is called Sipahbadh-i Shahriyār-kūh. This district is prosperous and most of its people are Zoroastrians (gabra-kān). From the (beginning of) Muslim times (rūzgār) the kings of this district have been from the descendants (farzandān) of Bāv.

22. PIRRĪM is the chief place of this district, while the seat of the

\(^1\) Indistinct: gilīm-i safīd-i Kūmīsh, or gilīm-i safīd-gūsh?
sipahbadhs is at the military camp (lashkargāh) situated half a farsang from the town. In (Pirrīm ?) live Muslims, mostly strangers, [namely], artisans (pishavār) and merchants, because (ṣārik) the inhabitants of this district are exclusively soldiers (lashkar) and husbandmen. Every fifteen days a market day is held there, and from all the region men, girls, and young men come there dressed up (ārāsta),¹ frolic (mīsāh kunand), organize games (hāst kunand), play on string instruments (rūdh zanand), and make friends (dūstī girand). The custom of this province is such that each man who loves (dūst dāradh) a girl, beguiles her (bīfrībadh), carries her away, and for three days does with her as he likes (bīdāradh har chān ki khwāhand). Then he sends some one to the father (ba bar-i pidhar) of the girl that he should give the girl in marriage. In the districts of Kūh-i Qārin there are springs of water to which several times in the year most of the people of the district repair, dressed up,¹ with wine (nabīdh), music, songs, and dances (pāy kūftan). There they pray God for their needs (ḥāfat-hā khwāhand), considering this as a sort of worship (ta‘abbud); they pray for rain when they need it² and the rain comes (down).

23. Sāmār (? Shāhmār), a small borough of the same province (nāhīyat), producing much iron, antimony, and lead (surb).

24. Daylamān, the district of the Daylam proper (Daylam-i khūsā) who come from it. It is situated between Ṭabaristān, the Jībāl, Gīlān, and the Khazar sea. These people are of two classes (gurūh): one class lives on the sea-coast and the other amidst mountains and broken country. A (third) class lives between these two. Those who live on the sea-coast occupy ten small districts: LˈTRA, bārpuvā, LANGĀ, M.RO, CHĀLKRUDH, GURGRUDH (?), DĪNARRUDH, JUDĀHANJĀN, BĀLĀN, RUDNAR, HAUSAM. Behind the mountains three big districts correspond to these ten districts: VASTĀN, SHĪR, P.ZHM. Each of these districts has numerous sub-divisions and villages. All these lie within an area of 20 farsangs by 20 farsangs. This district of Daylam is prosperous and rich. Its people are all soldiers (lashkari) or agriculturists. Their women, too, till the soil (barzigari kunand). They have no towns with minbars; their towns are Kalār and Chālūs.

25. Gīlān, a separate district between Daylamān, the Jībāl, Ādharbādthagān, and the Khazar sea. This district lies in the open land (bar ʿahrā nihādha), between the sea and the mountains of the Jībāl. Gīlān has many running waters; one of them is a great river

¹ Read: orta instead of the incomprehensible ʿarāsta. The expression ʿarāsta is indeed found a few lines higher up. A marginal note is found here on a source in Dāmghān. See Appendix A.
² Cf. p. 120, n. 1.
called Sapidh-rūdh, which crosses Gilān and flows out into the Khazar sea. There are two classes (gurūḥ) of these Gil-s (Gilān): one class lives between the sea and the river, and is called: "those-of-this-side-of-the-river" (in-sūy-i-rūdhī), and the other between the river and the mountains, and is called: "those-of-that-side-of-the-river". The first occupies seven large districts: Lāpjān, Myāljān (?), Kushkajān (?), Barfjān, Dākhil, Tijān, Chīma. That of the other side of the river occupies eleven large districts: Nanak, Kūtum, Sarāvān, Paylamān-shahr, Rasht, Tūlīm, Dūlāb, Kuhān-rūdh, Astarāb, Khān-balī (?), and each of these has very numerous villages. This province of Gilān is prosperous, favoured by nature, and wealthy (tuvangar). All the agricultural work is done by the women. The men have no other business but warfare, and on all the frontier (hadd) of Gilān and Daylamān, once or twice a day in each village, there is a fight with another village, and there are days when many people are killed through (that) clan animosity ('āsābiyat).

And the animosity and fighting persist until [the men] have left those places on military service (ba-lashkar kardan), or have died, or have grown old. And when they grow old they become censors of public manners (muhtasib) and are called law-abiding muhtasibs (muhtasib-i ma‘rūfgar), and if in any district (andar hama nāhiyat) of Gilān one man calls another names or drinks wine (nabīd), or commits other offences, they give him forty or eighty strokes of the stick (chihil chūb bizanand). The (Gil-s) possess boroughs with minbars, such as Gīlābādh, Shāl, Dūlāb, Paylamān-shahr (?), which are small places with markets, but the merchants are strangers. Take them all round the (inhabitants) are law-abiding people (va dīgar hama ma‘rūfgar-and). The food in all this province is litr (?), rice, and fish. From Gilān come brooms, mats, prayer-carpet, and māha-fish (māhi-yi māha ?), which are exported everywhere.

§ 33. Discourse on the Country of 'Irāq and its Towns

East of this country lie some confines (hudūd) of Khūzistān and of the Jībāl; south of it, some parts of the 'Irāq Gulf (khalij-i 'Irāq) and of the steppe (bādiya) of Baṣra; west of it, the deserts of Baṣra and Kūfa; north of it, some parts of the Jazīra and of Ādhārbād-hagān. This country is situated near to the centre of the world, and is the most prosperous (ābahdāntarīn) country in Islam. It has running waters and a flourishing countryside (sawād). It is a haunt of merchants, and a place of great riches, many people, and numerous

1 Perhaps "territory"? colloquial sense: "anyhow, at all

2 Dīgar seems to stand here in the events", &c.
scholars. It is the seat of the great kings (pādhsahān-i buzurg).\(^1\)
It belongs to the hot zone, and from it come dates which are exported
everywhere (lā ba-hama jihān bi-barand), as well as various textiles
(jāma), and most of the implements (bishtār-i ālāt) becoming kings
(muluk rā shāyadah).

1. **Baghdād**, a great town, which is the capital (qaṣaba) of 'Irāq
and the seat of the caliphs.\(^2\) It is the most prosperous town in (andar
miyān) the world, and a place of scholars and of great riches. Manṣūr
built it (karda-ast) in the times of Islām. The river Tigris flows
through it (andar miyān ba-vay; biguzaradī); on it there is a bridge
(pullī-st [sic]) made of boats. Baghdād produces cotton stuffs, silk
textiles (jāma-yi pamba va abrishum), crystals turned on a lathe
(abgīna-yi makhrūt), glaze-ware (ālāt-hā-yi mad-hūn), as well as
[various] oils (unguents?), potions (? sharāb), and electuaries (ma'jūn),
exported everywhere.

2. **Mādā'īn**, a borough lying east of the Tigris. It was the seat of
the Sasanian kings of yore (ān khusrawān). There stands an edifice
called Ayyān-i Kīsrā, of which it is said that there is no higher
portico (ayvān) in the world. It had been a large and very prosperous
town, but its prosperity has been transferred to Baghdād.

3. **Nu'māniya** lies west of the Tigris, and Ḍayr ʿAqūl east of it.
These two towns are prosperous.

4. **Jabbul** (spelt: Ḥbl) is not a populous borough (kam-ābādhānī). Most
of its inhabitants are Kurds.

5. **Jarjarāyā** (spelt: ʿifrāy), east of the Tigris, Fam al-Ṣilh, east
of the Tigris, Sābus (spelt: Šābas), west of the Tigris—these are
prosperous and pleasant boroughs.

6. **Wāṣīt**, a large town consisting of two parts. The Tigris flows
through it (ba-miyān-i vay hāmī ravadh), and upon it there is a bridge.
In each of the two parts (of the town) there is a minbar built by Ḥajjāj
ibn Yūsuf. The town has an equable (durust) climate and is the most
pleasant town in 'Irāq. From it come gīlims, trouser-cords, and dyed
wool (pashm-hā-yi rangīn).

7. **ʿAbdāṣī, Nīm-Rūdīh**, two populous boroughs. In them (andar
vay) dates are found in great quantities.

8. **Mafṭāh**, a populous borough east of the Tigris; the canal
Maʿqil starts from there (az vay bar-giradh).

9. **Ubulla**, a strong town | surrounded by water, and lying west
of the Tigris. From it come thebull kerchiefs and turbans (dastār va
ʿamāna-yi bullī).

10. **Baṣra**, a great town possessing twelve wards; each one of

\(^1\) Evidently the Būyids.

\(^2\) So much only about the caliphs!
these is of the size of a town (chand shahri) and they are separated (gusista) from each other. Basra is said to possess 124,000 canals. It was founded by 'Omar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb, God be pleased with him. Basra is the only country of tithes (‘ushri) in 'Irāq. The 'Alawi Burqa'i rose from there. There lie the tombs of Tālḥa, Anas ibn Mālik, Shaykh Ḥasan Baṣrī, and the Son of Sirīn. It produces good shoes (na'layn) and aprons (futa)' as well as linen-and-cotton stuffs of high quality (jāma-hā-yi katān-va-khāsh-i murtafi').

11. BAYĀN, a borough to the east of the Tigris, prosperous and flourishing.

12. SALMĀNĀN, a borough to the east of the Tigris, prosperous and flourishing.

13. 'ABBĀDĀN, a flourishing and prosperous borough on the sea-coast. All the "'Abbādān mats" and "Sāmānī mats" come from there, and therefrom comes the salt for Başra and Wāṣīt.

14. MĀDARĀYĀ, a prosperous and flourishing town, with much cultivation.

15. USKĀF BANĪ JUNAYD, a place on the fields of which the remainder of the Nahrawān canal is used up.

16. NAHRĀWĀN, a town with some prosperity (bā ābādhānī andak). In it some palm-trees (khurmā andak) are found, as well as some places built by the Sasanian kings (khusravān).

17. JALULĀ, KHĀNIQĪN, two flourishing boroughs. Through Khāniqīn flows a large river.

18. QAṢR-I SHIRĪN, a large village with a stone wall. In it there is a portico coated with marble stones (yaḵ āyvān az sang-i marmar gustarda). 1

19. HULWĀN, a very pleasant town, traversed by a river. It produces figs which are dried and exported everywhere.

20. KŪTHAY-RABBĀ, a town in the neighbourhood of which there are mounds of ashes, and they are said to be (the remnants) of the fire which Nimrūd had kindled in order to burn the prophet Abraham, on him be God's blessings and protection.

21. BĀBIL, the most ancient borough in 'Irāq, which was the seat of the kings of the Canaanites (Kan'āniyān [sic]).

22. ŠARŠAR, a prosperous and very pleasant borough through which flows the river Šaršar.

23. NAHR AL-MALIK, a prosperous and pleasant borough.

24. QAṢR IBN HUBAYRA, the largest (mihtarīn, bihtarīn?) town between Baghdad and Kūfa, prosperous, pleasant, and populous (bisyār-mardum).

1 Cf. § 38, 23.
25. JAMI‘AYN, a borough situated between the principal course of the Euphrates (‘amat va Furāt, read: ‚amād-i F.) and the canal Surā. From all sides the access to it is only by water.

26. KUFA, a borough on the bank of the Euphrates, founded by Sa‘d ibn Abī Waqqās, and there lies the sepulchre (rauda) of the Prince of the Faithful 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib, may God exalt his face.

27. HIRA (spelt: Ḷira), a borough on the edge of the steppe, possessing a better climate than Kūfa.

28. QADISIYA, a borough on the pilgrims’ road, on the edge of the steppe.

29. BARADĀN, ‘UKBARA, two boroughs to the north of Baghdād and to the east of the Tigris. It is a prosperous locality.

30. SĀMARA [sic], a town situated to the east of the Tigris, while its countryside and fields are to the west of the Tigris.

31. KARKH, DUR (spelt: Dūn), two boroughs founded by Mu‘taṣīm and finished by Ma‘mūn [sic], prosperous and pleasant.

32. TAKRĪT, a town lying on the frontier between the Jazīra and ‘Irāq, prosperous, flourishing, and populous.

§ 34. Discourse on the Jazīra Province and its Towns
This province on its four sides is surrounded by the waters of two rivers, the Tigris and the Euphrates, and on this account it is called the Jazīra (“island”). This is | a province prosperous, pleasant, very populous, with an equable climate and running waters. It has mountains, numerous towns, flourishing countryside, gardens and orchards known for their flourishing state (khurramī). In it there are many people belonging to the Rabī‘a tribe, and many Khārijites.

1. MAUSIIL, a large town, with an equable climate and with some amenity (ni‘mat-i andak).

2. BALAD, a town on the bank of the Tigris, having some running waters besides (ba-juz as) the Tigris.

3. BAR-QA‘ID, ADRAMA (read: Adhrama), two flourishing and populous boroughs.

4. NIṢIḤBIN, the most flourishing town in Jazīra. It is a prosperous and pleasant place. In it monasteries (dayr) are found belonging to the Christians (tarsā‘ān [sic]). In it deadly scorpions (hazdum) are found. In it a strong fortress stands, inside which snakes are numerous. From it comes glass-stone (sang-i ābgīna) of good quality.

5. DĀRĀ, a borough at the foot of a mountain with numerous running waters.

6. KAFARTŪTHĀ, a flourishing and prosperous town with running waters.

7. RA’S AL-‘AYN, a flourishing town with many springs which form five rivers; the latter unite (ba-yak jāy) and, under the name of Khābūr, flow into the Euphrates.

8. DIYĀR-RABI’Ā (spelt: Diyār Ra’nay), a very pleasant land (shahr).

9. RAQQA, RĀFIQA (spelt: Ra’īqa), two large and flourishing towns joined with one another and situated on the bank of the Euphrates. The battle of Ṣiffin took place in their neighbourhood (andar ḥadd-i ʿā) on the other side of the river.

10. QARQĪSĪYĀ, a flourishing and pleasant borough; all its countryside is always green.

11. RAHBA, a flourishing town with abundant water and trees.

12. DĀLIYA (spelt: Wāliya), a small town, densely populated (anbūh) and pleasant.

13. ‘ĀNA, a flourishing borough situated amidst the waters of the Euphrates.

14. HĪR, a prosperous and pleasant town within a solid wall. ʿAbd-allāh ibn al-Mubārk’s tomb (turbat) is there.

15. ANBĀR, a flourishing, prosperous, pleasant town with a numerous population. The seat of the Prince of the Faithful Abūl ṬAbbās was there.

All these towns, from Raqqa to Anbār, are situated on the bank of the Euphrates.

16. BĀLIS (spelt: Tālis), JISR-MANBIJ (spelt: Ǧisr ʿEnaj), SUMAYSĀT (spelt: Shumaishāt), boroughs situated on the bank of the Euphrates and adjacent to Syria.²

17. ḤARRĀN, a town with little water (ābashān andak). In it live numerous Ǧabians (Ǧabiyyān).

18. SARŪJ, a prosperous borough.

19. RUHĀ (spelt: Rahā), a flourishing town. Most of its inhabitants are Christians. In it stands a church (kanīsa); in the whole world there is none larger, better attended (ābādhāntar), and more wonderful. To it belongs a flourishing countryside, and in it live numerous monks (ruhbānān).

20. JAZĪRA IBN ‘OMAR, a flourishing borough, with trees and running waters, situated on the bank of the Tigris.

21. ḤADĪTHA, a town with very good orchards.

22. SīNN, a borough on the bank of the Tigris, very pleasant and lying close to the mountains.

¹ Cf. under Syria, § 38, 27. ² Cf. under Syria, § 38, 16. and 3.
§ 35. Discourse on the Provinces of Ādharbādhagān, Armīniya, and Arrān, and their Towns

These three provinces are adjacent to each other. Their country-sides enter into each other (ba yak-dīgar andar shudha). East of this region (nāhiyat) are the borders of Gilān; south of it, the borders of 'Irāq and the Jazīra; west of it, the borders of Rūm and the Sarīr [sic]; north of it, the borders of the Sarīr] and the Khazars (spelt: Ghasarān).

These places are the most pleasant (bisyār-nī'mattarin) among the Islamic lands. The region is very prosperous and pleasant, with running waters and good fruit. It is the abode (jaygāh) of merchants, fighters for the faith (ghāsiyān), and strangers coming from all parts. It produces crimson (qirmiz), woollen stuffs, madder (? rūdīna), cotton, fish, honey, and wax. There (too) Greek, Armenian, Pecheneg, Khazar, and Slav (saqlābi) slaves are brought.

1. ARDAVĪL, the capital (qasāba) of Ādharbādhagān, and a great town within a wall. It was a strong (sakht) and very pleasant town, but now is less so (aknun kamar-ast). It is the seat of the kings of Ādharbādhagān. It produces striped stuffs (? jāma-yi burd), and stuffs of various colours (jāma-yi rangān).

2. ASNA (Æ Ushnah > Ushnū), SARĀV, MIYĀNA, KHŪNA, JĀBRUQĀN, small but pleasant, prosperous and populous boroughs.

3. TABRĪZ, a small borough, pleasant and prosperous, within a wall constructed by 'Alā ibn Aḥmad.

4. MARĀGHĀ, a large town, flourishing and pleasant, with running waters and flourishing gardens. It had a strong wall, but the son of Bū Sāj destroyed it.

5. BARZAND, a flourishing and prosperous town with running waters and many fields. It produces qatīfā-textiles.

6. MŪQĀN, a town with a district (nāhiyat) lying on the sea-shore. In the district of Mūqān there are two other boroughs also called Mūqān. From (Mūqān) come: madder (rūdīna), grain for food (dāngū-hā-yi khurdanī), sacks (juwāl), and palās-rugs in great numbers.

7. VARTĀN, a very prosperous town from which come zīlū and prayer-carpets.

All these towns which we have enumerated belong to Ādharbādhagān.

[§ 36. Armīniya and Arrān]

8. DUVIN (Down), a great town and the capital of Armenia, encircled by a wall. In it live numerous Christians. It is a very

1 Arab. tīhak.  2 Stuffs with long pile; actually bath-towels are called qatīfā.
pleasant town with great riches, men, and merchants. To it belongs a vast countryside (sawāḍ-i bisyār) stretching down to the limits of the Jazīra and even (khud) adjoining Rūm. It produces worms from which the crimson-dye is made, and good trouser-cords.

9. Dākharraqān (spelt: Dākhartāb), a flourishing borough, with running waters, near the lake Kabūdhān.

10. Urmiya (spelt: Armana), a large town, very prosperous and very pleasant.

11. Salamās (now: Salmās), a flourishing and populous borough producing good trouser-cords.

12. Khoy, Bargrī, Arjī, Akhlā, Nakchuvān, Bīdlīs (spelt: Budlais)—these are all boroughs, small or large, flourishing, pleasant, populous, having riches and merchants. They produce large quantities of zillū-carpetts (? zillū-hā-yi qālī), trouser-cords, and wood (?).

13. Malāgrim, a frontier post (thaghr) against the people of Rūm (Rūmiyān). The people are warlike and the place pleasant.

14. Qālīqala (usually Qaλīqala, Erzerum), a town inside which there is a strong fortress where there are always fighters for the faith, by turn from each place. Merchants too are numerous in it.

15. Mayyāpāriqān (spelt: Miyaqariqān), a town inside [sic] a fortress (hiṣār), on the frontier between Armenia, the Jazīra, (and) Rūm.

16. Marand, a small borough, prosperous, pleasant, and populous. It produces various woollen stuffs.

17. Mīmadh, a well-known (shuhra) district, prosperous, very pleasant, and populous.

18. Ahar, the chief place of Mīmadh, belonging to the kingdom of the son of Rawwād, who is one of the family of Julandā bul K.ıkı, the 33 a one who "omnes naves vi capiebat" [Qur'ān, xviii, 78].

19. sNgān (Sungān?), a town with a large district, belonging to the kingdom of Sunbāt.

All these boroughs which we have enumerated belong to Armenia.

20. Qabān, a flourishing town, producing much cotton of good quality.

21. Barda, a large town, very pleasant. It is the capital of Arrān and the seat of the king of that province. To it belongs a countryside, flourishing, with many fields and much fruit, densely populated. In it grow numerous mulberry-trees of which the fruit belongs to everybody (tūdh-i sabīl). The town produces much silk, good mules, madder (rūnās), chestnuts (shāh-balāt), and caraway (karāviya).

1. Perhaps: "good (khūb) trouser-cords", instead of chūb "wood".

2. Cf. Iṣṭakhrī, p. 140. [See my note. V. M.]
22. BAYLAQĀN, a very pleasant borough, producing striped textiles (burd-hā) in great numbers, horse-rugs (jul), veils (burqa’), and nāṭif-sweets.

23. BĀZHGAH (“Toll-house”), a borough on the bank of the river Aras (Araxes), producing fish.

24. GANJA, SHAMKÛR, two towns with extensive fields, prosperous, pleasant, and producing woollen stuffs of all kinds.

25. KHUNĀN, a district on the banks of the river Kur, forming the frontier between Armenia and Arrān.

26. VARDŪQĪYA (Barduj), a small and sparsely populated town in Khunan.

27. QALʿA, a great fortress and a minbar on the frontier between Armenia and Arrān.

28. TIFLĪS, a large town, flourishing, strong, prosperous, and very pleasant, within a double wall. It is a frontier post (thāghr) against the infidels (bar rūy-i hāfīrān). The river Kur passes through it (andar miyān-i vay). Tiflis possesses a spring of water, extremely hot; above it hot baths (garmāba) have been built which are always hot without any fire (to heat them).

29. SHAKKI, a district of Armenia, prosperous and pleasant. Its length is some 70 farsangs. The inhabitants are Muslims and infidels (hāfīrān).

30. MUBĀRAKĪ, a large village at the gate of Barda’. There the camp of the Russians (Rūsiyān) stood when they came and seized (bisītadānd) Barda’. This Mubārakī is at the head of the frontier (avval-i ḥadd) of Shakkī.

31. SŪQ AL-JABAL, a town of Shakkī, close to Barda’.

32. SUNBĀṬMĀN (?), a town at the farther end of Shakkī (ākhir-i ḥadd-i Sh.), with a strong fortress (ḥisār). These two (last-named) towns are prosperous.

33. ŞANĀR, a region 20 farsangs long and situated between Shakkī and Tiflis. The inhabitants are all infidels.

34. QABALA, a town between Shakkī, Barda’, and Shirvān, prosperous and pleasant. From it come many beaver-furs (qunduz).

35. BARDĪJ (?), a small town, prosperous and pleasant.

36. SHIRVĀN (شیران), KHURSĀN, LĪZĀN (Layzān?), three provinces under one king. He is called Shirvān-shāh, Khursān-shāh, and Līzān-shāh. He lives at the army camp (ba lashkārgāhī, spelt: lashkarshāh) at a farsang’s distance from Shamākhī. In the region (ḥudūd) of Kurdivān he possesses a mountain with a high summit, which is broad and smooth (pahn va hāmūn). Its area (chahār-sū) is 4 farsangs by 4 farsangs. It is accessible only from one side by a made road
which is very difficult. Within that area there are four villages. All
the treasures and wealth of that king are kept there and all his clients
(maulāyān), men and women, are there. They both sow and eat
(their produce) there (ānjā kārand va ānjā khurand). This fortress
is called Niyāl-Qal’ā, and near it there is another very strong fortress
at a distance of 1 farsang; (the king’s) prison is there.

37. Khursān, a district (lying between?) Darband and Shīrvān,
adjacent to the mountain Qabk (Caucasus). It produces woollen
stuffs, and all the different kinds of māhfūrī which are found in
the world are from the said three districts.

38. Kūrdīvān, a prosperous and pleasant borough.

39. Shāvārān, the capital of Shīrvān [sic], is situated near the sea
and is a very pleasant (spot). From it touch-stones (sang-i miḥakk)
are exported everywhere.

40. Darband-i Khazarān, a town on the sea-coast. Between the
town and the sea a huge chain has been stretched so that no ship
can enter there without permission (dastūrī). This chain is solidly
attached to the walls made of stone and lead (arzīz). The town
produces linen-cloths and saffron. Slaves (bandagān) are brought
there of every kind of infidel living close to it.

41. Bākū, a borough lying on the sea-coast near the mountains.
All naphtha used in the Daylamān country comes from there.

§ 37. Discourse on the Arab Country and its Towns

East of this country is the 'Omān Sea, which is a part of the Great
Sea; south of it, the Abyssinian Sea, also a part of the Great Sea;
west of it, the Qulzum Sea, also a part of the Great Sea; north of it,
the steppe (badīya) of Kūfā and Syria. This is a vast country
belonging to the hot zone. In it there are mountains separated one
from another, as we have explained (padādh) in our notice (yādhkird)
on mountains. And in all this country there is (only) one river, which
comes out of the mountains of Tihāma and skirts the region of
Khulān (spelt: Jaulān) and the province of Ḥadramūt, to empty
itself into the Great Sea. Nor is this river large either. In this
country there are numerous districts. Most of the country is a
desert. Here is the original home (jāy-i ašli) of the Arabs, and all
those who have gone to other places are originally from here. Most
of them live in the desert, except those (magar ānh) who live in the
towns of this country. This country produces dates of different
kinds, skins (ādīm), Mekkan sand (rig-i mahkī), whet-stones, pilgrim
shoes (na'lain-i mash'ar), and parti-coloured (mulamma') shoes. In
it live various strange animals.
The districts of this region are as follows: YEMEN, HIJÄZ, TIHĀMA, YAMĀMA, NIZWAIN (*Bahrayn?*)—where the tents are found of the tribes, such as Tamīm (Tānimīyān), Muḍār (spelt: Mīṣrīyān), Asad, Jassān (?), Kalb, Fazāra (Fazārīyān), and the like. We have marked (padīdh) them all on the Map that they should be clearer (paydhātar).

1. MEKKA, a large town, prosperous (ābādhān), populous, and situated at the foot of the mountains. All round it (girdāgird) are mountains. This is the most honourable (sharīftarīn) town in the world because there was born our Prophet, on Him (added: and on His family) be God’s blessings and protection, and because it is the House of God, may He be exalted. The length of the mosque of the House of God is 370 cubits (arash = Arab. dhirā?) and its width 315 cubits. The House of Mekka (i.e., the Ka‘ba itself) is 24½ by 23½ cubits. The height (samk) of the Ka‘ba is 27 cubits and the circuit around the stone (va as gird-i sang tawāf) is 50 cubits; while the length [of the tawāf, i.e., circumambulation?] is 150 cubits. Mekka was built (binā?) by Adam, on him be God’s peace, and finished by Abraham, on him be God’s peace. And since the times of Adam, God has made this house sacred (‘azīz karda-ast).

2. MADĪNA, an agreeable (khush) town, with a numerous population. The sepulchre (rauda) of the Prophet, on Him and His family be God’s blessings, as well as of many of his companions are there. From the districts of Madīna come whet-stones which are exported everywhere.

3. TA‘IF, a small borough lying at the foot of the mountains. It produces skins (adīm).

4. NAJRĀN is a prosperous borough in which lives the tribe Hamdān. From it come brigands (duzd) who rifle the region of Yemen (ba-hudūd-i Yaman rāh burand).

5. JURASH, a flourishing and populous borough of Yemen.

6. ŠA‘DA, a prosperous and populous town. Merchants from Basra are found in it. In the days of old it was the seat of the kings of Yemen. It produces great quantities of skins (adīm) and the yemeni-shoes for pilgrims (na‘lāin-i yamāni-yi mash‘ar).

7. ŠAMDĀN (Hamdān?), a district in Yemen, between Ša‘da and Šan‘ā. It possesses three boroughs in which live the sons of Himyar (farzandān-i Himyar) who have fields, pasture grounds (marā‘ī), and vines (raz).

8. ŠAN‘Ā, the capital of Yemen. It is a flourishing and prosperous town. Whatever (goods) come from the majority of the districts of Yemen are also produced in this town. It is the most pleasant place in all Yemen. In all the Arab country there is no larger and more

---

1 may be a misspelling for بحرین. u.i. 26.
2 Read: *Ḥijr. See note.
flourishing town than this. On account of the perfectly moderate climate of this land (shahr), wheat and other crops (kisht) yield harvests twice a year, and barley (even) three or four times. (The town) has a stone wall, and it is said that the first building which was built after the Flood was this.

9. DHIMAR (spelt: Dimār), a populous town with markets belonging to the district (‘amal) of Şan‘ā. It is a very pleasant place. Their current money (bāzurgani) is something (chisi) similar to the qanda-hārī-coins; eight of (their coins) weigh a dirham.

10. SHIBAM (spelt: Sīyām), a mountain above a fortress in which a market and a numerous population are found.

11. ZABĪD, a town of Yemen. With the exception of Şan‘ā there is no larger town in Yemen than Zabīd. At a distance of three days from there is the frontier of Abyssinia. Their current money is silver and gold, but their 12 dirhams weigh only 1 dirham’s weight (yak dirham-sang sanjadh).

12. MANKATH, a small borough with stone walls. Huge mountains surround it and its districts (rustā), and in whatever direction one travels in it, it is necessary to cross mountains (va az har sūy ki dar vay ravi kūh bibāyadh buridan). The frontier of this place marches with that of Ḥaḍramūt.

13. ŞUHAYB (spelt: Şahīb), a flourishing and prosperous borough. All these places are in Yemen. Among the latter’s mountains and plains there is a place of monkeys (kapiyān). All the baboons (ham-dūnagān) are from there.

14. ‘ADEN, a borough on the sea-coast. Many pearls come from it. It is adjacent to the limits (hudūd) of Abyssinia.

15. ḤAḌRAMŪT, a flourishing and prosperous province possessing (several) towns. They have a custom that to any stranger who enters their town and makes a public prayer (namāz) in their mosque, they bring food thrice a day and pay him great attention (navākht), unless he opposes them in religious matters (mukhālafati kunadh ba-madhhhab bā ishān).


17. ‘ATHTHAR, a prosperous and pleasant village.

18. MAHJARA (spelt: Mahjār), a large town within a wall and a moat. The (inhabitants’) clothes consist of izār and chādhur.

19. SIRRAYN (spelt: Sarir), a flourishing and prosperous town. The inhabitants sow sorghum and barley. Their current money is silver washed over with quicksilver (musabbag). They all wear izār and ridā. (This place?) belongs to the province (‘amal) of Yemen.

1 Cf. 153, note 2. 2 gāvars, v.s., p. 124.
20. JIDDA (spelt: ǧudda), a town belonging to Mekka and situated on the sea-coast, prosperous and flourishing.

21. SABA' (spelt: Sabā), 'UQĀB (?), WĀDĪ *BAYHĀN (? spelt: فَيْحَان), pleasant and populous boroughs.

22. SHIHR, a town on the sea-coast. It produces good camels, and from here frankincense (lubbān) is exported everywhere.

23. 'OMAN (spelt: 'Ommān), a large town on the sea-coast. Merchants are numerous in it. It is the emporium (bārkadha) of the whole world. There is no town in the world where the merchants are wealthier (tuvangartar) than here, and all the commodities (jihās) of East, West, South, and North | are brought to this town and from there carried to different places.

24. SHARJA, two prosperous and flourishing boroughs.

25. HAJAR, a very populous town on the sea-coast.

26. BAHRAYN, a very populous region with towns, villages, and prosperous places.

27. FAYD, a flourishing and prosperous borough.

28. JABALA, a fortress with a mīnbar in it.

29. FUR' (spelt: F.rgh), a small borough.

30. TABŪK, WĀDĪ AL-QURĀ, TAYMĀ' (spelt: Fymā), very prosperous boroughs situated in the desert.

31. JĀR, a borough on the sea-coast which is the emporium of Madīna.

32. MADYAN (spelt: Mīdyan), a flourishing town on the sea-coast. There lies the well from which Moses, on him be peace, drew water for the sheep of Shu'ayb, on him be peace [Qor'ān, xxviii, 24].

§ 38. Discourse on the Country of Syria and its Towns

East of this country is the Syrian steppe (bādiya) belonging to the Arab country, and the limits of Jazīra ( hudūd-i Jazīra); south of it, the Sea of Quzum; west of it, the limits of Egypt and some parts of the Rūm sea; north of it, the limits of Rūm. This country is flourishing, prosperous, with many people, great riches, and numerous towns. Whatever is produced in Maghrib, Egypt, Byzantium (Rūm), and Spain (Andalus) is brought there.

THE FORTIFIED LINE (thaghr-hā) OF JAZĪRA. These are the boroughs (forming) the military frontier (thaghr) against the Byzantines (Rūmiyān), and belonging to Syria, though called after Jazīra:

1. SUMAISĀT, a flourishing borough lying on the bank of the river (Euphrates).¹

¹ Cf. under Jazīra, § 34, 16.
2. SANJA, a flourishing borough near which there is a bridge; in the whole world there is no better and more marvellous bridge.
3. MANBIJ, a strong borough in the desert.¹
4. MANŞÜR, QÛRUS, two prosperous but sparsely populated boroughs.
5. MALÂTYA (spelt: Malatîya), the largest frontier post (thaghr) on this side of the mountain Lukkâm. Its fruit is all given free (mubâh) and has no owners.
6. MAR'ASH, ḤADATH (spelt: Ḥadath), two flourishing and prosperous boroughs, small, but having many fields and running waters.
7. HÂRÛNî, a borough built by Hârûn al-Rashîd and lying on a mountain.
8. BAYÂS (Payas), a flourishing and very pleasant borough in which dates abound.
9. KANÎS, a small borough at the foot of the mountain.
10. KAFARBAYYÂ (spelt: Kamarînâ), MAŞÎSA, two flourishing and prosperous boroughs divided by the river Jayhûn. If one mounts (chûn . . . bar râvi) on the bridge spanning that river the sea is visible, though the distance between them is 4 farsangs (va miyânashân chahâr farsang-ast). (Their) population is numerous.
11. 'AYN-ZARBA, a town with fruit and well cultivated fields (kisht-hâ-yi ārâsta).
12. ADHANA, a town with a flourishing market, situated on the bank of the river Sayhûn.
13. TARŞUS, a large, prosperous, and pleasant town within a double stone wall. The inhabitants are warlike and courageous.
14. AULÂS (Eleusa), the last town of Islâm on the coast of the Rûm Sea. In it are two places which the Byzantines (Rûmiyân) venerate and to which they go on pilgrimage. These are all the frontier posts called Thughûr-al-Jazîra.
15. ISKANDARŪNA, ŞuHBA, LÂDHIQIYA, ANŢARŢUS, AṬRÂBULUS, BAYRÛT, SAYDÂ (Sidon), SÛR (Tyre), 'AKKA, QAYSÂRIYA, YÂFÂ (spelt: yâ'), ¹ 'ASQALÂN, towns of Syria on the coast of the Rûm Sea, inhabited by Muslims. They are very pleasant towns, with extensive fields and great riches.
16. BÂLIS, a town of Syria situated on the bank of the Euphrates.
17. KHUNÂŞIRA, TADMUR, SALAMIYA, MUʿÂN (spelt: Maghân, now: Maʿān), boroughs | on the edge of the Syrian steppe. The people of Salamiya are all Hâshimites, and those of Muʿān, Omayyads.
18. AYLA (spelt: lâ), a borough on the coast of the Quzum Sea, on the frontier between the steppe of Egypt and Syria.

¹ Cf. under Jazîra, § 34, 16. ² Sic.
19. ALEPPO, a large town, flourishing, prosperous, populous, and having great riches. It has a wall on which a horseman can make a tour round the town.

20. BAGHRAS, a town amidst the mountains. In it stands a palace built by Zubayda, who gave it numerous endowments (waqf), in order that anybody reaching that town should be put up and entertained (mihmānī) in the said building.

21. MA'ARRA MAŞRİN, a flourishing borough with rain-water.

22. QINNĂR, a flourishing and prosperous town.

23. HYMŞ (spelt: Ḥimş), a large, flourishing, and populous town, with all the roads paved with stones (ba-sang gustarda). The inhabitants are cleanly clad, chivalrous (bā muruvvat), and handsome (nikūrū), Snakes and scorpions abound in it.

24. KAFRING (spelt: Bqr-Tāb), SHAYZAR, ḤAMĂT, prosperous, pleasant, and very flourishing towns.

25. BA'ALBAKK, a very pleasant town lying on the slope of the mountain (bar bar-i kāh).

26. DAMASCUS, a prosperous and flourishing town, possessing many fields, a nice countryside (sawādi khush), and running waters. (It lies) close to the mountains. This is the most flourishing town in the Arab lands (dar 'Arab). It produces yellow citrons (turānį) [or yellow rice, birinį].

27. RAQQĀ, a flourishing borough with few inhabitants.

28. RUWĀT (spelt: Ruwāb), a borough lying close to the mountains. It is the chief place of the Jibāl (Kūhistān) district.

29. ADHRUḤ (spelt: Adhrūkh), a flourishing and pleasant borough, inhabited by the Khārijites.

30. URDUNN, a very flourishing, prosperous, and pleasant region.

31. TABARIYA, the chief place of Urdunn. The town is flourishing, prosperous, and pleasant, and has running waters.

32. PALESTINE (Filastīn), a province with many fields and fruits, great riches, and many inhabitants.

33. RAMLA (spelt: Zamla), the capital of Palestine. The locality is pleasant and the town large.

34. GHAZZA (spelt: 'Arra), a borough on the frontier between Syria and Egypt.

35. BETHLEHEM (Bayt al-laḩm), a borough where the Prophet Jesus, on Him be God's blessings and protection, was born (maulūd).

36. MAŞĪĐ IBRĀḤĪM, a borough on the frontier between Egypt and Syria. The sepulchre (raūda) of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, on them be God's blessings, is there.

1 Cf. in Jazīra, § 34, 9.  
2 Iṣṭ., 58: al-shurāt.
37. NĀBULUS, RĪHĀ (Jericho, spelt: Rikhā), two small boroughs, little favoured by nature (kam-ni'mat).
38. JERUSALEM (Bayt al-mugaddas), a town lying on the slope of the mountain. It has no running water. In it stands a mosque which is visited by Muslims coming from everywhere.

These are all the towns of Palestine.

39. THE HOME OF LOT'S PEOPLE (jāy-i qaum-i Lūṭ), a desolate district, sparsely populated, and without amenity.
40. ZUGHAR (spelt: Z'ṛ), a town of the Home (dīyār) of Lot’s people. A little prosperity is still left there.
41. Within the limits of this (!) mountain of BALQĀ there are many villages and small districts (rustā), and it is inhabited by the Khārijites (va andar vay hama mardumān-i khawārij-and).

§ 39. Discourse on the Country of Egypt and its Towns
East of this country are some borders of Syria and some parts of the Egyptian desert; south of it, the borders of Nubia; west of it, some parts of Maghrib and of the desert called Wāhāt (oases); north of it, the Sea of Rūm. This is the wealthiest (tuwanqartarin) country of Islām and in it lie numerous towns, all prosperous, flourishing, wealthy, and extremely favoured by nature in many respects (bā ni'mat-hā-yi bisyār-i gīnāgūn). It produces textiles (jāma), handkerchiefs (dastār), and robes (ridā) of various kinds, than which there are none more precious in the whole world—such as Egyptian woollen goods and textiles, and handkerchiefs made of dabiqī [and ?] khasz.1 And in this country | good asses are found of great price (kharān-i 35b nīk uftadh bā-qimāt).

1. FUSṬĀT (spelt: Fasṭāt), the capital of Egypt. It is the wealthiest city in the world, extremely prosperous and very pleasant. It lies to the east of the river Nile. The tomb of Shāfī‘ī, God’s mercy on him, is there.

2. DHAMĪRA, DANQARĀ (Dabqū?i, two towns to the east of the Nile, prosperous and pleasant, producing excellent (murtafi‘) and precious linen-cloths.

3. FARAMĀ, a town on the shore of the lake Tinnis, amidst the sands of Jifār. The tomb of Galen (fātinūs) is there.

4. TINNIS, DIMYAT, two towns situated on two islands in the lake of Tinnis. The inhabitants have no fields. They produce woollen and linen stuffs of very high price.

5. ISKANDARIYA (Alexandria), a town, of the two sides of which the one is adjacent to the Sea of Rūm and the other to the lake of
Tinnīs. In it stands a lighthouse (mināra) which is said to be 200 cubits (arash) high. It is situated in the midst of the water (andar miyān-i āb), upon a rock, and when the wind blows it moves (bijunbadh) so that one cannot see it.

6. HARAMAYN (Pyramids), two structures on the summit of a mountain near Fustāṭ; their mortar (milāt) is of a substance (jauhar) on which nothing has effect. Each of them is 400 cubits long by 400 cubits broad and 400 cubits high. Inside (them) rooms have been made (khāna-hā). (Each) has a narrow door. Hermes built these buildings before the Flood, as he knew that the Flood would take place (khwāhad būd), and he built them in order that the water might not do him harm (ziyān, spelt: zabān). He has written on them in Arabic: "We have built this by a (supernatural) power; if some one wants to know how we have built it, let him destroy it." And on these two pyramids much science has been engraved (kanda-ast) of medicine, astronomy, geometry, and philosophy.

7. FAYYŪM, a borough to the west of the Nile. It has other running waters, too, besides the Nile.

8. Būṣīr (spelt: Tūṣīr), a town lying to the east of the Nile. The magicians (musha'bidhān) who were with Pharaoh and who worked sorceries (fūdā't), were from there. In the river Nile crocodiles abound everywhere; they snatch men and quadrupeds from the banks of the river, but when they reach this town [the situation becomes different]. (Here) a talisman has been put up (karda-and) that they should be impotent and do no harm (ziyān natawānadh kardan), and it may happen that children catch a crocodile in the water and sit upon it and guide it (hamī-gardānand) and it cannot do any harm. And wherever the crocodiles are upstream and downstream of this town they are harm-doers.

9. ASHMŪNAYN (spelt: Ash'ūnayn), AKHMĪM, BULAINĀ, three towns on the bank of the Nile, to the west of it. They are prosperous, flourishing, and very pleasant. In (this locality) grow numerous ebony trees.

10. SUWĀN (Assuan), the last town of Egypt and a frontier post (thaghr) against the Nubians. It is situated west of the Nile and is a town with great riches (māl). The people are warlike. In the mountains which are near Suwān and belong to al-Wāhāt (oases region), mines of emeralds and chrysolites (sumurruj wa zabarjad) are found, and in all the world they are found nowhere else. In the mountains of al-Wāhāt there are wild sheep. Beyond Suwān, in the frontier region between Egypt and Nubia, there are great numbers

1 The text in Arabic and in Persian. In Persian: “say (to him): Destroy this.”
§ 40. Discourse on the Country of Maghrib and its Towns

East of this country is the country of Egypt; south of it, a desert of which the farther end adjoins the country of the Südān (ba-nāhiyat-i S. bāz dāradh); west of it, the Western Ocean; north of it, the Sea of Rūm. In this country deserts are many and mountains very few. The inhabitants are black and swartly. The country has many regions, towns, and districts (rustā). In their desert live numberless Berbers. This place (belongs to) the hot zone. Gold is found there in large quantities. In the sands of this region are gold-mines. Their transactions (bāzurgānī) are mostly in gold (ba-zarr).³

1. AṬRĀBULUS, the first town of Ifríqiya. It is a large and prosperous town lying on the shore of the Rūm Sea. It is populous and is the resort of the Byzantine and Spanish merchants. Whatever the Rūm sea produces comes there.

2. MAHDĪYA, a large town on the coast of the Rūm Sea and adjacent to the limits of Qayruwān. It is a pleasant place. Merchants from (different) lands (as jāyhā) are numerous in it.

3. BARQĀ, a large town to which belongs a province adjoining Egypt. It is a place with great wealth and with (many) merchants. In it numerous troops are always stationed.

4. QAYRUWĀN, a great town. In Maghrib there is no town larger, more prosperous, and richer than this. It is the capital of Maghrib.

5. ZAWĪLA, a great town on the edge of the desert of Südān. In its neighbourhood and in its district live many Berbers. In the deserts (biyābān-hā) of Maghrib these Berbers are what the Arabs are in (their) steppe (bādīya). They own cattle (khudāvandān-i chahār-pāy) and much gold (zar), but the Arabs are wealthier (tuwangartar) in cattle, and the Berbers in gold.

6. TŪNIS (spelt: Tūnas), a town of Maghrib on the sea-coast. This is the first town opposite Spain (Andalus).

7. FARŠĀNA (Qalshāna?), a flourishing town, very pleasant. The people are sociable (āmīzanda) and possess great wealth. The town lies near Qayruwān.

8. SATĪF (spelt: Sāṣīf), a large town, with many inhabitants and much gold (zar), but little favoured by nature.

9. TABARQA, a town on the coast of the Rūm Sea. Near it, in the

¹ Cf. § 5, 23. ² Present-day pronunciation. ³ Or: “their current money is gold.”
sea, lie extremely numerous coral-banks; in the world there is no other place (like it). There are large and deadly scorpions (in Ṭabarqa).

10. TANAS, a large town on the sea-coast, prosperous, pleasant, and having many inhabitants and great wealth.

11. JAZĪRA BANI ZAGHANNĀ (spelt: Raʾnā), a town surrounded on its three sides (si karān) by the sea. In its region (ḥawāli) live many Berbers.

12. NĀKŪR, a town like Tanas.

13. TĀHART, a great town with a special district (nāḥiyatī judhā) belonging to the province (ʿamal) of Ifriqiya. It possesses great wealth.

14. SĪJILMĀSA (spelt: Slhmāsa), a town situated on the edge of the desert of Sūdān amid sands which are auriferous. This town is separated (gusista) from all the districts; it is little favoured by nature (kam-ni mat) but has much gold.

15. BUṢAYRA (?), a town on the sea-coast opposite Gibraltar (Jabal Tāriq). It is a very prosperous place.

16. AZAYLA (spelt: Usīla), a large town within an extremely solid wall. It is the very last (bāzpas-tarīn) town (of Africa) from which (travellers) go to Spain.

17. FĀṢ, a great town which is the capital of Tangiers (Tanja), and the seat of the kings. It is a place of great wealth.

36b 18. SŪS AL-AQSĀ, a land (shahr) situated on the coast of the Western Ocean which is the last land of the oecumene (ābahdhānī-yi ʿālam) towards the west. It is a great land and its people have extraordinary (bi-andāsa) quantities of gold. The people are somewhat far (dūrtar) from the characteristics of humanity (ṭabʿ-ʿi mardī). Strangers rarely happen to visit it (kamtar uftadh). (The articles) mostly coming from the country of the Berbers are panther-skins (palang). The Berbers hunt (panthers) and bring their skins (pūst) to Muslim towns.

§ 41. Discourse on the Country of Spain (Andalus) and its Towns

East of this country are the borders of Rūm; south of it, the straits of the Rūm Sea; west of it, the Western Ocean; north of it, also the borders of Rūm. This country is prosperous and flourishing, and possesses many mountains, running waters, and great riches. In it mines of every kind (maʿdan-i hama-yi jauhar-hā) are found: gold, copper, lead (arzīz), and the like. Their houses are of stone. The people are white-skinned and blue-eyed.

1. CORDOBA (spelt: Qrṭna), the capital of Spain, prosperous,
populous, with great amenities and riches. By the nearest road there is a three days' journey from it to the sea. Cordoba lies near a mountain and is the seat of the government. The kingdom belongs to the Omayyads (pādishāh-i [sic] vay Amavīyān-rā-st). The houses (of the town) are of stone.

2. TOLEDO (Tūlayṭūla), a town on a mountain (bar kūh), situated on the slope of the mountain and (the bank of a) river (bar bar-i kūh va rūdh), and the river Tagus (Ṭājḥ, read: Ṭājū) encircles it.

3. TUDELA (Tuṭayla, spelt: B.ṭila), a town situated near the mountains. In it an extraordinary (bi andāza) number of sable-martens (samūr) is found; (their skins) are exported to different places (ba-jdy-hā).

4. LERIDA (Lārida), SARAGOSSA (Sarqūs, usually: Saraqūsta), SHANTARIYA, REGIO (bī-ṣīrī), JAEN (Jayyān, spelt: Khyān), MORÓN (Maurūr, spelt: Maurūd), CARMONA (Qarmūnā), NIEBLA (Labla), GHĀFIQ, towns of Spain possessing great amenities, and (frequented by) merchants from Rūm, Maghrib, and Egypt. These towns possess great wealth and have a moderate climate.

5. BEJA (Bāja) is an old, wealthy town in Spain.

6. CORIA (Qariya), a small town. In it people are few but there is much wealth.

7. MÉRIDA (Mārida), the largest town in Spain. It has a fortress, a wall, and a moat, all strong.

8. TRUJILLO (Turjāla), GUADALAJARA (Wādī al-Ḥijāra), two towns belonging to the cold zone of Spain. This is the oldest place (jā) in this region (nāhiyat).

9. TORTOSA (Turtusha), a prosperous town on the coast of the Rūm Sea, adjacent to the limits of gh.l.j.sk.s (the people of Jacā?) and İFRANJA (Franks), which are two provinces of Rūm.

10. VALENCIA (Balansiya), MURCIA (Mursiya), PECHINA (Bajjāna), pleasant towns in the maritime zone (bar karāna) of the straits (khalij) of the Rūm Sea.

11. MÁLAGA (Mālaqa), a town on the coast (karān) of the Rūm Sea. From it come very great numbers of lizard-skins (pūst-i sūsmār) used for the hilts of swords (qabda-yi shamshīr).

12. ALGECIRAS (Jazīra), a borough on the coast of the straits. At the beginning of the Islamization (musalmān) Spain was conquered from this town (az in shahr bigushādhand).

13. MEDINA SIDONIA (Sadīna), SEVILLA (Iṣbīliya), OCSONABA (Ukhshunaba), boroughs in the maritime region (bar karān) of the

1 The phrase is awkward: *va [lab-i] rūdh?
Western Ocean. They are places with few amenities and sparsely populated.

14. SANTAREM (Shantarîn?), the farthest town of Spain in the maritime zone of the Ocean. From it comes extremely good ambergris ('anbar-i ashhab) in great quantities.

Within the limits of Maghrib [sic] there is no other place.

§ 42. Discourse on the Country of Rûm, its Provinces and Towns

East of this country lie Armenia, the Sarîr, and the Alân (al-Lân); south of it, some parts of Syria, of the Rûm Sea, and of Spain; west of it, the Western Ocean; north of it, some Uninhabited Lands 37a (virâni) of the North, some parts of the countries of the Șaqlîb and Burjâ(n) (ba’dî hudûd-i Șaglîb va ba’dî nâhiyat-i Barjâ-st [sic]), and some parts of the Khazar Sea (daryâ-yi Khaszarîn). This country is extremely vast; it abounds in amenities beyond description (bî andâxa), and is extremely prosperous. It has many towns, villages, and great provinces, all with extensive fields, running waters, wealth, and troops. In it small lakes (daryâyak-hâ), mountains, and very numerous fortresses (hişâr) and castles (gal’â) are found. It produces in great quantities brocades (jâma-yi dîbâ), sundus-textiles (of silk), maysânî-(textiles?), carpets (tanfasa), stockings, and valuable trousercords.

The provinces of Rûm are fourteen; three lie behind (ax pas) the straits of Constantinople on their western side; and eleven provinces lie east of the straits.

Those that lie westwards are as follows:

1. The first is ȚâBLÂN in which Constantinople is situated. The latter is the seat of the kings of Rûm and a place of great wealth.

2. The other is MACEDONIA (Maqadûniya). Alexander of Rûm was a native of it. It lies by the Rûm Sea.

3. The third is Thrace (Thrâqiya, spelt: Brâqiya) which lies by the Georgian Sea (daryâ-yi Gurî).

As regards the other eleven provinces which lie eastwards of the straits of Constantinople, they bear the following names: 4. THRACE-SION (spelt: Brqâsî); 5. OPSIKION (spelt: Abisîq); 6. OPTIMATON (spelt: Aftmâ); 7. SELEUCIA (Salûqiya); 8. ANATOLICON (Nâlîq); 9. BUCELLARION (spelt: Bqlâr); 10. PAPHLAGONIA (Aflakhûniya); 11. CAPPADOCIA (Qabâdhâq, spelt: Fyâdq); 12. CHARSIANON (Kharshana?); 13. ARMENIACON (Arminiyyâq); 14. CHALDIA (Khâldiya).

Each of these provinces (themes) is vast and has numerous towns,
villages, castles, fortresses, mountains, running waters, and amenities. In each of these provinces lives a commander-in-chief (sipāhsallār) on behalf of the king of Rūm (az ān-i malik al-Rūm), with numerous troops numbering from 3,000 men to 6,000 horse [sic] and (destined) to guard the province (mar nigāh dāshtan-i nāḥiyat rā).

In the days of old cities were numerous in Rūm (andar Rūm shahr-i qadim andar bīsyr būd, read: andar qadim?), but now they have become few. Most of the districts (rustā-hā) are prosperous and pleasant, and have (each) an extremely strong fortress (bā hišārī sahkt bīsyr ustuvār), on account of the frequency of the raids (tākhtan) which the fighters for the faith (ghāsiyān) direct upon them. To each village appertains a castle (qal’a) where in time of flight [they may take shelter].

And these provinces, with large villages, and whatever there is (in them) of towns, are such as we have represented them and shown on the Map (ṣūrat).

15. GURZ (Georgia ?) is also a province of Rūm; most of its (population) live on small islands. By (?) the sea of Gurz they have a land (shahr) called Gurz which lies in Rūm on the coast of the said sea. All the customs (akhlāq) of these people resemble exactly and in every respect (rāst ba-hama rūy) those of the people of Rūm (Rūmiyān).

16. BURJĀN, a province with a district (shahr) called Thrace (spelt: B.rqiya); it is a flourishing place, much favoured by nature but having little wealth (khurrām va bīsyr-ni’mat va kam-khwāstā). Taking it altogether it is steppe and cultivated lands (va ḍīgar hama șahrā-st va kišt-u-bars). It is a prosperous place and has running waters. It is a part of Rūm and (its people) pay land-taxes (kharāj) to the king of Rūm.

17. CHRISTIANIZED SLAVS (al-Ṣaqqāliga al-mutanaṣṣira), a province of Rūm, in which live the Slavs who have become Christians (Ṣaqqāliyi tarsā gashtā). They pay land-taxes (kharāj) to the king of Rūm. They are wealthy (tuvangar) people and their country is pleasant and safe.

18. BULGARĪ, is the name of a people living on the mountain Bulgharī (qaumī-st bar kūh-i Bulgharī nishinand) to the north-west of Rūm. They are infidels (kāfir). They too are Rūmī, but are

---

1 Ki andar gurkhātan . . . Something omitted by the scribe: *ba-ānjā panāhand.
2 The text is awkward: the words “villages” and “towns” ought to come in inverted order.
perpetually at war with the other Rūmīs. These Bulgharī are moun-
taineers, possessing fields and great numbers of cattle.

This country of Rūm stretches westwards (ba maghrib bikashad) down to the Western Ocean, and its southern side (ṣūy) marches 37b with Spain. Towards the north it marches with the Uninhabited Lands of the North, and includes some (pāra-i) deserts. In all the other places of Rūm there are no deserts; on the contrary (illā) cultivated lands (ābdhānī) are everywhere.

19. IFRANJA, a province of Rūm adjoining the Rūm Sea.
20. RūMIYa (Rome), a town on the coast of this sea, belonging to Ifranja. In the days of old the seat of the kings of Rūm was in this Rūmiya.
21. *B.SKŪN.S (Vascones, Basques), *GH.IJ.SK.S (the people of Jacá?), are two provinces between Ifranja and Spain. The (people) are Christians.
22. BRITANNIA (Barīṭniya), the last land (shahr) of Rūm on the coast of the Ocean. It is an emporium (bārgāh) of Rūm and Spain.

From the limit of the straits (of Constantinople) down to Spain whatever is on the shore of the Sea of Rūm is called "the coast of Athens" (sāhil-i Athīnās).
23. YUNĀN (Greece) was in the days of old a town of this Athens and all the sages and philosophers arose (khāsta) from this region of Athens (nāḥiyat-i A.).

§ 43. Discourse on the Slav Country (Ṣaqlāb).
East of this country are the Inner Bulghārs (Bulghār-i andarūnī) and some of the Rūs; south of it, some parts of the Gurz sea and some parts of Rūm; west and north of it everywhere are the deserts of the Uninhabited Lands of the North. This is a vast country with extremely numerous trees growing close together (payvasta). The people live among the trees and sow (kisht) nothing except millet (arzan). They have no grapes but possess plenty of honey from which they prepare wine and the like. Their vessels (casks) for wine (khumb-i nabidh) are made of wood, and there are people (mard buvadāh kī) who annually prepare a hundred of such vessels of wine. They possess herds of swine (ramma-hā-yi khūg) which are just like (ham chinānk) herds of sheep. They burn the dead. When a man dies, his wife, if she loves him, kills herself. They all wear shirts and shoes over the ankles (pirāhan va mūxa tā ba ka’b). All of them are fire-worshippers. They possess string instruments (ālāt-hā-yi rūdū) unknown in the Islamic

1 Shahrī būd as in Athīnās. Perhaps: *Shahr būd "was the country (belonging) to this (town) of Athens."
countries (andar musalmānt), on which they play. Their arms are shields, javelins (zūpīn), and lances. The Şaqlāb king is called S.mūt-swyt (or Bsmūt-swyt, سموت سویت خرانت). The food of their kings is milk. They spend the winter in huts and underground dwellings (kāz-hā va sīr-zamin-hā). They possess numerous castles and fortresses. They dress mostly in linen stuffs. They think it their religious duty (vājīb andar dīn) to serve the king. They possess two towns.

1. VĀBNĪT is the first town on the east of the Şaqlāb and some (of its inhabitants) resemble the Rūs.

2. KHURDĀB, a large town and the seat of the king.

§ 44. Discourse on the Rūs Country and its Towns

East of this country are the mountains of the Pechenegs; south of it, the river Rūtā (رَوَت) ; west of it, the Şaqlābs; north of it, the Uninhabited Lands of the North. This is a vast country, and the inhabitants are evil-tempered (badh ṭab' ), intractable (badh-rag va nā-sāsanda), arrogant-looking (šūkh-rūy), quarrelsome (sittsa-kār), and warlike (harb-kun). They war with all the infidels (kāfir) who live round them, and come out victorious (bihtar āyand). The king is called Rūs-khāqān. It is a country extremely favoured by nature with regard to all the necessaries (of life). One group (gurūh) of them practise chivalry (muruvvat). They hold the physicians in respect (ṭabībān rā buzurg dārānd). They annually pay the tithe on their booty and commercial profits (ghanmtat va bāzsurgānī) to the government (sultān). Among them lives a group of Slavs who serve them. Out of 100 cubits (gas) of cotton fabric (karpās), more or less, they sew trousers which they put on (andar pūshand), tucking them up above the knee (bar sar-i zānū gird karda dārānd). They wear woollen bonnets (ba sar bar nihādha dārānd) with tails let down behind their necks (dam as pās-i qafā furū hishtā). They bury the dead with all their belongings (bā har chi bā khwīshtan dārād), clothes, and 38a ornaments (pīrāyā). They (also) place in the grave, with the dead, food and drinks (ta'ām va sharāb).

1. KUYYABA (? Kūbāba, &c.) is the town [land?] of the Rūs lying nearest to the Islamic lands. It is a pleasant place and is the seat of the king. It produces various furs (mūy) and valuable swords.

2. Ş'LĀBA (? صلاب), a pleasant town from which, whenever peace reigns, they go for trade (bā bāzsurgānī āyand) to the districts of Bulghār.

3. URTĀB (? ارتاب), a town where strangers are killed whenever they visit it. It produces very valuable blades and swords which can be bent in two (tū rā du tāb tawān kardan), but as soon as the hand is removed they return to their former state.
§ 45. Discourse on the Country of the Inner Bulghārs

East of it (live) the Mirvāt [so spelt]; south of it, is the Gurz Sea; west of it, the Ṣaqlābs; north of it, the Rūs mountain. It is a country without towns. The people are courageous, warlike, and terror-inspiring (bā ḥaybat). Their nature resembles that of the Turks living near the Khazar country. The Inner Bulghārs are at war with all the Rūs, but carry on commerce (bāṣurgānī kūnand) with all those who live around them (az gird-i vay). They possess sheep, arms, and implements of war (ālāt-i ḥarb).

§ 46. Discourse on the Country of Mirvāt

East of it are some mountains, and some of the Khazarian Pechenegs (Bachanākh-i Khazar); south of it, some of the Khazarian Pechenegs and the Gurz Sea; west of it, some parts of the latter (baʿdī daryā- yi Gurz), and the Inner Bulghārs; north of it, some of the latter and the V.n.n.d.r mountains. They are Christians and speak two languages: Arabic (tāzī!) and Rūmī (Byzantine Greek?). They dress like the Arabs. They are on friendly terms (yārī kūnand) with the Turks and the Rūm. They own tents and felt-huts (khudāvandān-i qubba va khargāh).

§ 47. Discourse on the Country of the Khazarian Pechenegs

East of it is the mountain of the Khazars; south of it, are the Alāns; west of it, is the Gurz Sea; north of it, are the Mirvāt. These people were formerly a group of the Pecheneg Turks (Türkān-i Bachanākt); they came here, took the country by conquest (ba ghalaba in nāḥiyat bisitadand), and settled down in it. They own felt-huts and tents (khargāh va qubba), cattle, and sheep. They wander within the same territory on the grazing grounds situated in the Khazar mountains. The Khazar slaves brought (uftadḥ) to the Islamic lands (musalmānī) are mostly from here.

These three (last) named countries are little favoured by nature (kam-nī maṭ).

§ 48. Discourse on the Country of the Alāns (al-Lān) and its Towns

East and south of it is the Sarīr; west of it, Rūm; north of it, the Gurz Sea and the Khazarian Pechenegs. All this country is broken and mountainous (andar shikastagī- hā va kūh-hā) and is favoured by

1 Bulghār-i andarīnī.

2 Cf. p. 159, l. 37.
nature. Their king is a Christian. They possess 1,000 large villages. Among them there are both Christians and idol-worshippers (but-parast). Some of the people are mountaineers and some plain-dwellers.

1. KASAK, a land (shahr) of the Alān on the coast of the Gurz Sea. It is a pleasant place and there are merchants in it.
2. KHAYLAN (?), the town where the king's army is stationed.
3. DAR-I ALĀN ("the Alān gate"), a town situated like a fort on the summit of a mountain. Every day 1,000 men by turn mount guard on its wall.¹

§ 49. Discourse on the Sarīr Country and its Towns

East and south of it are the borders of Armenia; west of it, the Rūm limits; north of it, the Alān country. This is an extremely pleasant country consisting of mountains and plains. It is reported that in its mountains live flies, each as big as a partridge (chand kabkū). Every now and then (har chand gāhī) this king sends to the place where the flies dwell large quantities of carrion of slaughtered or dead cattle and of game (shikāri-hā) to be thrown there for their nourishment, for if they grow hungry, they come and devour every man (mardum) and animal whom they may meet.

1. THE KING'S CASTLE (Qal'a-yi malik) is an extremely huge (sākht 'ażīm) castle on the summit of a mountain. The seat (nīshast) of the King is in that fort, and he is said to possess an extremely grand throne (takhtī sākht 'ażīm) of red gold.
2. KHANDAN (Khaydān ?) is the town serving as a residence (nīshast) for the generals (sipāh-sālārān) of that king.
3. R.BKH.S (R.nj.s?), M.SQ.T, two very prosperous towns.

From both these countries (nāhiyat)² numerous slaves are brought to the Islamic countries.

§ 50. Discourse on the Country of the Khazars³

East of it is a wall stretching between the mountains and the sea, and for the rest (dīgar) the sea and some parts of the river Ātil [sic]; south of it, the Sarīr; west of it, mountains; north of it, the B.rādhas and N.nd.r (*V.n.nd.r). This is a very pleasant and prosperous country with great riches. From it come cows, sheep, and innumerable slaves.

1. Ātil, a town divided by the river Ātil. It is the capital of the Khazars and the seat of the king, who is called Tarkhān Khāqān and

---
¹ Cf. § 5, 18 c. ² i.e., the Alān and the Sarīr. ³ Nāhiyat-i Khazarān.
is one of the descendants of Ansā (?). He lives with all his troops in the western half of the town which possesses a wall. In the other half live Muslims and idol-worshippers. This king has in this town seven governors (ḥākim) belonging to seven different creeds. At any hour (ba har sā'ātī) when a more important litigation arises (chūn dāvari busurgtar uftadh), they ask the king for instructions (dastūrī), or inform him of the decision (taken) on that litigation.

2. SAMANDAR, a town on the sea-coast. It is a pleasant place, with markets and merchants.

3. *KHAMLĪKH (حملخ), *BALANJAR (بランجار), BAYḌĀ, SĀVGHAR (?), KH.TL.GH, L.KN, SWR, MS.T (M.sq.t?), towns of the Khazars, all with strong walls. The well-being (ni'mat) and wealth of the king (mlk, *malik or *mulk?) of the Khazars are mostly from the maritime customs (bāz-i daryā).

4. TŪLĀS, LUGH.R (?), two regions of (az) the Khazar (country). The people are warlike and have great numbers of arms.

§ 51. Discourse on the Country of Burtās [read: Bulghār!]
East and south of it are the Ghūz; west of it, the river Ātil; north of it, the Pecheneg country. The people are Muslims and have a particular (khāṣṣa) language. The king is called Mus (?). They own tents and felt-tents and are divided into three hordes (gurūḥ) : *BARCHULA (spelt: B.hawla), ISHKIL (Ashgil? &c.), and B.LKĀR. They are all at war with each other but if an enemy appears they become reconciled (yār).

§ 52. Discourse on the Country of B.rādhās
East of it is the river Ātil; south of it, the Khazars; west of it, the V.n.nd.r [sic]; north of it, the Turkish Pechenegs (Bachanāk-i Turk). They are a people professing the creed of the Ghūz. They own felt-huts, and burn their dead. They obey the Khazars (andar ḫa'at-i Khazariyān). Their wealth is in weasel-furs (pūst-i dala). They have two kings who keep separate from each other (nayānīzand).

§ 53. Discourse on the Country of V.n.nd.r
East of it are the B.rādhās; south of it, the Khazars; west of it, mountains; north of it, the Majghari. They are cowards (badh-dīl), weak, poor (darvīsh), and possess few goods (khwāsta).

1 Immediately after this must follow wrongly placed between §§ 53 and 54.

the paragraph on the Bulghār towns,
§ 53–6

"The Regions of the World"

All these countries which we have enumerated are all countries, both of Islamic and Infidel dominions (Musalmān va Kāfīrī), situated in the northern part of the oecumene (nāhiyat-i shimal az ābādhānī-yi jihān).

1. BULGHĀR, a town to which belongs a small province (nāhiyat) on the bank of the river Ātil. The inhabitants are all Muslims. From (Bulghār) some 20,000 horsemen (mard-i savār) come out who fight against any number (bā har chand ki buvad) of infidel troops and have the upper hand. The place is extremely (sakht va biasār) pleasant.

2. Suvār, a town near Bulghār. In it live fighters for the faith similar to (the people of) Bulghār.}

§ 54. Discourse on Southern Countries

As regards southern countries, all their inhabitants are black (amīn nāhiyat-hā-ya junūb-rā mardum-ash siyāy-and) on account of the heat of their climate. Most of them (go) naked. In all their lands (zamin) and provinces (nawāḥī) gold is found. They are people distant from the standards of humanity (az i’tiddl-i mardi dūr).

§ 55. Discourse on the Country of Zangistān and its Towns

It is the largest (mihtarīn) country in the south. Some of its eastern regions adjoin Zābaj; its north adjoins the Great Sea; some of its western parts adjoin Abyssinia; on its south are mountains. Their soil is (full of) gold-mines. The country is situated opposite Pārs, Kirmān, and Sind. The people are full-faced (tamām-sūrāt), with large bones, and curly hair (jā’d-mū). Their nature is that of wild animals (dadhagān va bahā’im). They are extremely black. Enmity reigns between them and the Abyssinians and Zābaj.

1. M.ljān (M.ljān ?), a town of the Zang on the sea-coast (bar karāna-yi daryā). It is the haunt of the merchants visiting those parts.

2. Sūfālā, the seat of the Zang king.

3. Ḥwfl ( חוויל), the town which in this country is by far the richest in goods (bisār-khwāstatarīn).

§ 56. Discourse on the Country of Zābaj and its Towns

West and partly south of it is the country of Zangistān; north of it, the sea; for the rest (it is contiguous with) the Southern

1 The passage in { } belongs to § 51. a part) of the Southern Uninhabited

2 Or: "and altogether (this country is Lands".
Uninhabited Lands (va digar hama byābān-i junūb-ast). This country and its inhabitants are all like the Zang, but they are somewhat (lakhti) nearer to humanity (mardumī). Their king is called M.nh.b (?). They constantly war with Zangistān. In the mountains of Zābaj grow camphor-trees, and snakes are found which are said to swallow at a gulp (ba yak bār) men, buffaloes, and elephants. A few Muslims and (some) merchants are found in it.

2. M.Lh.Mān (?), the king’s residence. (But) these Zābaj possess on the sea a great island and in summer their king resides there.

§ 57. Discourse on the Country of Abyssinia and its Towns
East of it live some Zang; south and west of it is a desert; north of it lie the sea and some parts of the Barbarī Gulf. (The inhabitants of) this (country) have faces of the average size (bā i’tidāl-i šūrat). The people are black and lazy, but with high aspirations (bā himmat-i buzurg-and), and obedient (farmān bardār) to their king. The merchants of ʿOmān, Ḥijāz, and Baḥrayn come here.

1. Rāsun (*Faramī), a town on the sea-coast and the king’s residence.
2. S.Wār, the town where the army of the Abyssinian king is stationed.
3. Ryn (*Zayla‘), the town where the commander-in-chief resides with (his) army. In this province gold is abundant.

§ 58. Discourse on the Country of Buja
East, south, and west of it is the desert . . . and north of it is that desert which lies between Abyssinia, Buja, Nubia, and the sea. He does not mix with his people except by necessity. And in their soil . . . huge, and the residence of the king of Buja is there. . . .

[§ 59. Discourse on the Country of Nubia]
. . . is the south; and north of it is the country . . . sociable and moderate . . . called Kābilī and they . . . | a place of Ramīl al-Maʿdān is 20 farsangs.

Ṭarī (Ṭahī?), a small province lying in the desert between the limits of Nubia and the Sudān; in it lie two remote [?] monasteries belonging to the Christians (ḍu ẓaumaʾa-st b’d [*baʾid?]) as ān-i tarsāyān. It is reported that in them (andar vay) live 12,000 monks

1 Contrary to the Sudanese, cf. § 60.
2 The edge of the fol. 39 is torn and the remaining words of the lines 20–3 make no complete sense.
3 Cf. § 6, 63.
4 Cf. Appendix B.
5 Neither huʾd nor baʾd nor bi-ʾadd make any good sense.
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(mard-i rāhīb), and whenever one of them disappears (kam shavadh) from Nubia, one of the Christians of Upper Egypt (Ṣaʿīd) goes there.

§ 60. Discourse on Südān and its Towns

Its east and south are contiguous with the Southern Uninhabited Lands (ba biyābān-i junūb bās dārādī); west of it is the Western Ocean; north of it is the desert separating the Sudanese (ṭshān) from Maghrib. This is an extremely vast country and (its area) is said to be 700 farsangs by 700 farsangs. It is the country from which eunuchs (khādīmān) mostly come. Their soil is entirely auriferous (hama maʿdān-i zar). Their king is the best man from among these negroes and they call the king Rāʾi b. Rāʾi (?); and he pretends during each three days to drink only three cups of wine (va chinān numāyadī ki man ba-har si rūz si qadah nābūdī khuram, va bas). From Südān to Egypt is a camel ride of 80 days. On that road there is only one place with water and grass, that is all (va digar hich nist). The people are cowards (badh-dil), and covetous in business. The upper part of their body is short, and the lower part long. They are slender (bārik-tan), thick-lipped (sītabr-lab), long-fingered, and large-faced (busurg-šūrat). Most of them go about naked. Egyptian merchants carry there salt, glass (ābgīna), and lead (arzīz), and sell them for the same weight in gold (ba hamsang-i zar). A group of them wanders in this region of theirs, camping at the places where they find more gold ore (rag-i zar). In the southern parts there is no more populous (bisyār-mardumtar) country than this. The merchants steal their children and bring them (with them). Then they castrate (ḫuṣṭ) them, import them into Egypt, and sell them. Among themselves there are people who steal each other’s children and sell them to the merchants when the latter arrive.

1. Ḥ.RĀN, a large town and the residence of the kings. In it men and women go dressed, but children remain naked until they have got beards (ṛish bar-ārand). They are the most sociable people in this country.

2. KH.FĀN, RYN, two boroughs near the frontier of Maghrib, and (their inhabitants) possess much gold (va in mardumānī bisyār-zar-ānd).

3. M.QYS (?), a large town and the residence of the commander-in-chief of that king.

4. LĀBA, a country (shahr) in the neighbourhood (nasdihtar) of the limits of Nubia. The people are thieves (dūzd), poor (darvīsh), naked, and the most despicable (madhmūm) of all this country.

ملك راعي راعي خواند 1 *malik [rā] rāʾi bin (?) rāʾi? khwānd?
§ 61. Epilogue\(^1\) of the book

The inhabited (\(ābādḥān\)) countries of the world are those [which we have enumerated] . . . in the Islamic and Infidel countries . . . in eastern, western, northern, and southern regions. After having looked up in all the books . . . we have included (\(bāz  āvārdīm\)) in this book, but we have rejected its (their ?) superfluities (\(hashwiyat ?\)). As regards the inhabited part of the world . . . which (has been the subject of) astronomical observations (\(raṣad\)) . . . and it was not very much. Therefore each town [which Ptolemy ??] . . . and other astronomers who were after him . . .

[Colophon] . . . the poor ʿAbd al-Qayyūm ibn al-Ḥusain ibn ʿAlī al-Fārisī . . . in the year 656, and praises be to God, Lord of the Worlds.

\(^1\) Andar khatmat (?)
PART III

COMMENTARY ON THE TRANSLATION OF THE ḤUDŪD AL-ʿĀLAM

By V. Minorsky
### Dates of the Principal Authorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Information</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Khurdādbih</td>
<td>first draft</td>
<td>232/846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>second</td>
<td>272/885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulaymān</td>
<td>written down</td>
<td>237/851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>completed by Abū Zayd</td>
<td>304/916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ya’qūbī, Geography</td>
<td></td>
<td>278/891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>became vazīr</td>
<td>302/914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Faqīḥ</td>
<td>[used Jayhānī]</td>
<td>circa (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>290/903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Rusta</td>
<td></td>
<td>circa or after</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>300/912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balkhī</td>
<td>wrote</td>
<td>308/920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>317/929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battānī</td>
<td>died</td>
<td>316/928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qudāma, Kitāb al-kharāj</td>
<td></td>
<td>318-21/930-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iṣṭakhrī, Kitāb al-masālik</td>
<td>written</td>
<td>circa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>340/951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>published</td>
<td>circa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>332/943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mas‘ūdī, Murūj al-dhahab</td>
<td></td>
<td>345/956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>al-Tanbīḥ</td>
<td>334/945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>397/977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamdānī</td>
<td>died</td>
<td>372/982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>375/985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Hauqal</td>
<td></td>
<td>387/997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥudūd al-‘Ālam</td>
<td>begun</td>
<td>circa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>421/1030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maqdīsī, Aḥsan al-taqāsim</td>
<td>text</td>
<td>circa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>additions</td>
<td>421/1030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birūnī, Chronology</td>
<td></td>
<td>442/1050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>India</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardīzī, Zayn al-akhbār</td>
<td></td>
<td>487/1094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>466/1074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[or] 470/1077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>548/1154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakrī</td>
<td>died</td>
<td>633/1236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāshgharī, Dīwān-l-al-Turk</td>
<td></td>
<td>610-85/1214-86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idrīsī, Nuzhat al-mushtāq</td>
<td></td>
<td>721/1321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Auﬁ, Jawāmi’ al-ḥikāyāt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Saʿīd</td>
<td>lived</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abul-Fidā, Taqwīm al-buldān</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ABBREVIATIONS

The following list of abbreviations comprises only the main works quoted throughout the commentary. Some of the books specially consulted for particular subjects will be referred to under the respective chapters, though even such indications must certainly not be taken for an exhaustive "bibliography" of the given subject. A tentative list of authorities on eastern Europe is prefixed to § 43.


Bakrī—al-Bakrī in Baron Rosen, Izvestiya al-Bakrī, &c., SPb., 1878 [the quotation from Ibrāhīm b. Ya’qūb reprinted as annex to F. Westberg, Kommentariy na zapisku Ibrakhina, SPb., 1903]. See notes §§ 40, 43–53.

Barthold, Christentum—Barthold, Zur Geschichte des Christentums in Mittel-Asien, Leipzig, 1901 [Russian original in ZVO, viii (1893), 1–39].


Barthold, Irrigation—Barthold, K istorii orosheniya Turkestana, SPb., 1914 ("History of Irrigation in Turkestan").

Barthold, Obzor—Barthold, Istoriko-geograficheskii obzor Irana, SPb., 1903 [Persian translation by Sardāvvar, Tehrān, 1308/1930].

Barthold, Preface—Barthold’s Preface to the Ḫudūd al-ʿĀlam, v.s., pp. 1–44.


Barthold, Semirechye—Barthold, Ocherk istorii Semirechye, in Pam’atnaya knizhka oblastnogo statisticheskago Komiteta Semirech. oblasti na 1898, tome ii, Verny, 1898.

Barthold, Turkestan—Barthold, Turkestan down to the Mongol Invasion, GMS, 1928 [Russian original: Turkestan v epokhu Mongolskago nashestviya, SPb., 1900, consists of 2 volumes: I (selection of illustrative texts in Oriental languages) and II (Russian text); English edition gives the translation only of II with cross-references to the pages of the original].

Barthold, Vorlesungen—Barthold, 12 Vorlesungen über die Geschichte der Türken Mittelasiens [original in Turkish], deutsche Bearbeitung von Th. Menzel, published in Die Welt des Islams (1932–5) and separately 1935.

Battānī—Al-Battānī sive Albatenii Opus Astronomicum, ed. C. A. Nallino, in Pubblicazioni del real osservatorio di Brera in Milano, N. xL, Pars I (versio capitum), 1903; Pars II (versio tabularum), 1907; Pars III (textus arāb.), 1899.

Abbreviations

BGA—Bibliotheca geographorum arabicorum, ed. de Goeje.
Chavannes, Documents—E. Chavannes, Documents sur les T\'ou-Kiue (Turcs) occidentaux, SPb., 1903 (published as vol. vi of Sbornik trudov Orkhnoskoy expeditsii).
Elliot-Dowson—Elliot-Dowson, The History of India as told by its own Historians, i–viii, 1867–77.
GMS—Gibb Memorial Series.
H.—\'AHudud al-\'Alam.
Hsiian-Tsang, Life (Beal)—The Life of Hiouen-Tsang, by S. Beal, London, 1911.
Hsiian-Tsang, Si-yu-ki (Beal)—Buddhist Records of the Western World tr. by S. Beal, London, 1884.
I.H.—Ibn Hauqal, BGA, ii.
I.Kh.—Ibn Khurdadhbih, BGA, v.
Abbreviations

Išt.—Ištahhrī, BGA, i.
Kāshghārī-Brockelmann—Brockelmann, Mitteltürkischer Wortschatz, Budapest, 1928.
Maq.—Maqdisī [or Muqaddasi], BGA, iii.
Marquart, Streifzüge—Marquart, Osteuropäische und Ostasiatische Streifzüge, Leipzig, 1903.
Mas‘ūdī, Murūj—Mas‘ūdī, Murūj al-dahhab, ed. by Barbier de Meynard and Pavet de Courteille, Paris, 1861.
Mas‘ūdī, Tanbih—Mas‘ūdī, Tanbih, BGA, viii.
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Qudāma—Qudāma, BGA, vi.
Ramsay, Asia Minor—W. M. Ramsay, The Historical Geography of Asia Minor, Royal Geogr. Society, Supplementary Papers, iv, 1890.
Reinaud, Relation des voyages. See Sulaymān.
Sprenger, Postrouten—Sprenger, *Die Post- und Reiserouten des Orients*, in Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, iii/3, 1864 (with 'maps utilizing, among other sources, Bīrūnī's Canon).
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*Note.* My use of brackets may appear not strictly consistent. In principle, and especially in the translation of the *H.-Ā.*, simple brackets ( ) are used for additions more or less understood in the text, whereas in square brackets [ ] are given additional explanations not directly belonging to the text. In the notes, square brackets are used for the passages and corrections added after the basic text was printed.
§ 1. Prefatory

The brevity and simplicity of the style of this Preface are very characteristic. In the whole of the book only one quotation from the Qorʾān is to be found (§ 36, 18.) and only one short phrase in Arabic (§ 39, 6.); apart from the author's patron no other king's name (the caliph's not excepted) is accompanied by any of the usual bombastic epithets.

The Farīghūnids

1. The Author's Patron. Our book is dedicated to Abul-Ḥarīth Muḥammad b. Ṭabīb, ruler of Gūgān (cf. §23, 26.). The author goes no further in his patron's genealogy and even omits to mention anywhere the name of Farīghūn, usually considered as the eponym of the dynasty to which Abul-Ḥarīth belonged.


3. The Name Farīghūn. The eponym's name is clearly associated with the lore of the Oxus basin. Naṣīr-i Khusrāw in his Dīvān, Tehran, 1307, pp. 329a, 3551a, and 4742a thrice mentions a Farīghūn (* Farīghūn) referring to some tyrant who may be identical with the king of Khwārazm Afrīgh quoted in Birūnī, Chronology, p. 35 (transl. 41). This ruler was supposed to have reigned nine generations before the Prophet Muḥammad (cf. note to § 26, 21.) and "his name was considered a bad omen like that of Yazdagird the Wicked with the Persians". This would suit perfectly the use of the name in N. Khusrāw. The correct form of the name seems to be Afrīgh (* Afrīgh, or Ifrīgh) which is only a parallel form of
Farīgh, while the final -ūn is probably only a suffix, of which the sense will become clearer when we learn more about the former Iranian language of Khwārazm. In spite of Birūnī and Naṣīr-i-Khusrau’s characterization of Farīgh/Farīghtūn, the name Afrīghūn was popular in Transoxiana: a traditionalist who lived about 438/1046-7 bore the name of مخلوف بن محمد العريفي السفي. As another example of a name, repulsive in tradition but used in Eastern Iran, may be mentioned Zāhak, or Zuhāk (Iran. azdahāk), in Arabic garb: the kings of Ghur considered themselves descendants of the famous tyrant, see Ṭabaqāt-i Naṣīrī, Raverty’s transl., p. 302, and ضحاك was the name of the historian Gardīzī’s father, more probably called so in view of local associations than in imitation of the purely Arabic ضحک, though the latter was known among the Khārijītes, § 10, 47]

4. THE MA’MŪNIDS WRONGLY CALLED FARĪGHŪNIDS. It is noteworthy that Ghaflārī, in his Jāhān-ārā, written about 972/1564-5 (Br. Mus., Or. 141, f. 86a) under salātūn-ī ʿAlī Farīghūn a shulq qab ha Khwārazmshāh būden speaks of the short-lived Khwārazmshām dynasty founded by the amīr Abūl-ʿAbbās Maʿmūn b. Muhammad, who in A.D. 996 usurped the power of the ancient Khwārazmshāhs (descendants of Afrīgh). Ghaflārī’s blunder passed into Browne’s Lit. Hist. of Persia, ii. 230, 237, but was denounced by Muḥammad khan Qazvīnī in his edition of the Chahār maqāla, p. 243. The relationship of the Ma’mūnids, enemies of the descendants of Afrīgh, and the Farīghūnids of Gūzgānān is not warranted by any facts, and only the striking likeness of the names Afrīgh and Farīghūn (v.s.) must have partly accounted for Ghaflārī’s mistake.

5. AFRĪDHŪN, AS THE ANCESTROR OF THE FARĪGHŪNIDS. The only indication found in our source concerning the origins of the Farīghūnids is that they were descended from Afrīdhūn, § 23, 46. Toumanksk has already made a suggestion for the emendation of افرین افرین into Afrīghūn, and in favour of this hypothesis one could perhaps cite § 9, where the name of the emperor of China’s ancestor is spelt Farīdhūn, not Afrīdhūn. However, the fact is that Afrīdhūn is clearly written in our text, and as a matter of fact numerous Turanian kings—the emperor of China making no exception—could claim as their eponym Farīdhūn’s son Tūr (see I. Kh., 16, cf. Minorsky, Tūrān in EI.), and Gūzgān lay right on the frontier between Irān and Tūrān. A more specious consideration would be that if the Farīghūnids (v.s.) were to be connected with the Khwārazmshī Afrīgh, they would probably have proclaimed as their ancestor the Kayānid Siyāvush (cf. Birūnī, l.c.) rather than the Pishdādian Farīdhūn. However, in the popular opinion the

---

1 Ṣhrīf, figures in Sachau’s Zur Gesch. v. Khwārizm, 1873. The form افرین, with the initial long ā, admitted into Sachau’s edition of the Chronology, was most probably given preference in order to suit the editor’s personal hypothesis on the etymology of the name [“Shedder of water”?], cf. Sachau in ZDMG, 1874, xxviii, 448-52.


3 See the History of Samarqand, Bib. Nat., ms. arabe 6284, f. 18b [I owe the reference to the kindness of Muhammad khan Qazvīnī].
Kayānids were certainly connected with the Pishdadians; cf. Christensen, *Les Kayānides*, Copenhagen, 1932, p. 70.

6. THE ORIGINS OF THE FARĪGHĪNIDS. As Barthold has noticed, *v.s.*, p. 6, we know nothing on the connexion of our Farīghīnids (4th/10th cent.) with the earlier rulers of Gūzgān whom I. Kh., p. 40, calls Gūzgān-khudāh and on whom Tabarī, ii, 1206, 1569, 1609–11, 1694, gives some details under the years 90, 119, and 120 A.H. Had such a connexion existed, the 10th–11th-cent. writers would hardly have failed to notice it. But our chief source Utbi, very favourably disposed to the Farīghtinids, writes only, ii, 101–2: “The province of Gūzgān belonged to the Farīghtin family in the days of the Sāmānids (qād kānat wīlāyat al-jūzjān lī-āli Farīghūn ayyāmā Šāmān) and they (i.e. the Farīghūnids) inherited it from father to son (kābir ‘an kābir) and bequeathed it from the first to the last (of them).” This text does not suggest the idea that our family had been known previously to the rise of the Sāmānids (3rd/9th cent.).

THE CHART OF THE FARĪGHĪNIDS. The number of the ruling members of the family was certainly very limited. Utbi, ii, 101–5, mentions by name only two Farīghūnids, Abū-Ḥārith and Abū Naṣr, whereas Gardizi, p. 48, gives the genealogy of the former as Abū-Ḥārith Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Farīghūn.

The genealogical tree of the family may be reconstructed as follows:

```
  a. Farīghūn  
     b. Aḥmad  
       c. Abū-Ḥārith Muḥammad  
          e. Abū Naṣr  
          d. Farīghūn  
            daughter,  
            wife of Nūḥ b.  
            Manṣūr  
            daughter,  
            wife of  
            Sultan  
            Maḥmūd  
            f. Ḥasan  
                daughter,  
                wife of Abū Aḥmad  
                Muḥammad, son of  
                Sultan Maḥmūd  
```

The name of *a. Farīghūn* is known to us only from the patronymic of his son (*v.i.*) whom Narshakhī and Gardizi call Aḥmad b. Farīghūn, and the *Qābūs-nāmā*: Aḥmad-i Farīghūn. It is probable that in this case Farīghūn was a definite person, though in later times, and with regard to other persons, the appellation “ibn Farīghūn” could be used in the general sense of “Farīghūnid” and did not necessarily mean “son of a definite Farīghūn”. In view of Utbi, ii, 101, this Farīghūn may have lived under the earlier Sāmānids in the 3rd/9th cent. and the Rabāt Afrīghūn, *v.s.*, p. 6, may have been associated with his activities.

b. The amīr Aḥmad b. Farīghūn is mentioned for the first time towards
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287/900 as a prince of some importance. During the struggle of the Šāmānid Ismā’īl with the Šaffārid ‘Amr b. Layth, he was unwilling to help Ismā’īl, and was treated by ‘Amr on terms of equality not only with the ruler of Balkh but even with Ismā’īl, see Narshākhī, p. 85; cf. Barthold, *Turkestan*, p. 224 [differently in *T.-Sīstān*, p. 251]. In a story of the Qābūsnāma, ch. xxv, p. 90, Āḥmad-i Farighūn appears as the owner of a large herd of mares (who foaled to him 1,000 blue-eyed colts in one day).

c. ABUL-HĀRĪTH MUḤAMMAD B. ĀḤMAD is the name transmitted to us in the Ḥudūd al-ʿĀlam and Gardīzī. However, ‘Utbi, i, 166 (Persian translation p. 114 incomplete) and ii, 101 (Persian translation pp. 305–6) speaks of Abul-Hārīth Āḥmad [sic] b. Muḥammad who was father of Abū Naṣr Āḥmad b. Muḥammad [sic]. And the latter form: Abū Naṣr Āḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Farighūnī, also occurs *l.c.* ii, 84. There is therefore no doubt that Marquart and Barthold are right in accepting the name of Abul-Hārīth as Muḥammad b. Āḥmad and of his son as Abū Naṣr Āḥmad b. Muḥammad, whereas Muḥammad Nāzīm is wrong in interpolating an “Abul-Hārīth Āḥmad” between our *c.* Abul-Hārīth Muḥammad and *d.* Abū Naṣr Āḥmad, for such a person is non-existent. ‘Utbi’s confusion may be accounted for by the fact that two names follow each other closely in his text i, 166–7: the above-mentioned “Abul-Hārīth Āḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Farighūnī” and Abul-Muẓaffar Muḥammad b. Āḥmad. Their names were so similar that the Persian translator wrongly added to the latter the qualification “al-Farighūnī” which is an evident mistake (*v.l.*). In any case the confusion must have existed in the early manuscripts of ‘Utbi’s work, for the same quid pro quo is found in Ibn al-ʻAthīr, ix, 69 and 159, who followed ‘Utbi.

Abul-Hārīth Muḥammad b. Āḥmad’s reign marks the heyday of the Farīghūnīd power. The earliest mention of Abul-Hārīth “b. Farighūn” (*v.s.* is found in *Iṣṭ.,* 142, whose work, or its revision, dates probably from 340/951; cf. Barthold, Preface, pp. 6 and 19. Some time after 365/976 Abul-Hārīth gave his daughter to the youthful Šāmānid Nūḥ b. Maḥṣūr, Gardīzī, 48. In 372/982–4 the Ḥudūd al-ʿĀlam was dedicated to him. After 380/990, ‘Utbi, i, 165–6, he was requested by Nūḥ b. Maḥṣūr to march against the rebellious amir Fāʾiq, but was defeated by the latter; cf. Ibn al-ʻAthīr under 383 H. In 383/993 Nūḥ on his way to Khorāsān arrived at Gūzgān and was joined by Abul-Hārīth al-Farīghūnī, ‘Utbi, i, 184; cf. Barthold, *Turkestan*, 261. In 385/995 during the struggle of Sabūktāğin with Fāʾiq, the former sent for Abul-Hārīth al-Farīghūnī, ‘Utbi, i, 209, Gardīzī, 56; cf. Barthold, *ibid.* 262. Probably about that time of rapprochement with Sabūktāğin Abul-Hārīth gave his daughter to Maḥmūd b. Sabūktāğin and took a daughter of Sabūktāğin’s for his son Abū Naṣr, ‘Utbi, ii, 101. When Sabūktāğin died (387/997) Abul-Hārīth first mediated between Maḥmūd and his brother Ismā’īl, ‘Utbi, i, 275, and then communicated with Maḥmūd when the latter marched on Ghazna, *ibid.* i, 277. Finally, about 389/999, Maḥmūd entrusted the captive Ismā’īl to Abul-Hārīth’s care, *ibid.* i, 316; cf. Barthold, *ibid.* 271. This is the last mention of Abul-Hārīth.
d. In 394 or 395 (A.D. 1004–5) 'Utbi, i, 343, mentions some FARĪGHŪN b. MUḤAMMAD who with 40 generals (qā‘id) was dispatched by MAHMŪD from Balkh against the last ŠĀMĀNĪD MUNTAŞĪR. The latter at that time was roaming in the region of Andkhudh (v.i., §23, 61.) and Pul-i Zāghūl (near Marwarrūd), and it is likely, therefore, that this Farīghūn belonged to the Farīghūnid family and was sent as a person acquainted with the territory of Gūzgānān. We can only suppose that he was a son of Abū-Ḥārīth Muḥammad, but we have no means by which to ascertain whether his appearance towards 1004–5 indicates some sort of interregnum between Abū-Ḥārīth and Abū Naṣr.

e. ABU NAṢR AḤMAD b. MUḤAMMAD is mentioned for the first time as “wālī of Gūzgānān” in 398/January 1008 when in the battle near the bridge of Charkhiyān in which the Qara-Khānids were defeated, he, together with Mahmūd’s brother, was in command of the centre of Mahmūd’s army, ‘Utbi, ii, 84; cf. Gardīzī, 69 and Barthold, Turkestān, 273. In 399/1009 he accompanied Mahmūd when the latter entered the fortress of Bihm Nagar in India, ‘Utbi, ii, 95. He died in 401/1010–1, ibid. ii, 102, and Ibn al-Athīr sub 401 H.

f. Bayhaqī, p. 125, describing under 401 the times when the Ghaznavid princes Maṣ‘ūd and Muḥammad, both 14 years old, were living in Zamīndāvar while their father Mahmūd was warring in Ghur, mentions as their companion “ḤASAN, son of amīr Farīghūn, amīr of Gūzgānān”. We know that exactly in 401 A.H. the last known Farīghūnid ruler died, and we may imagine that Hasan was the youthful candidate to the throne of Gūzgānān kept, during his minority, with his Ghaznavid cousins. Whose son was this Hasan? If we keep literally to Bayhaqī’s text: حسن ... فرخزادم احمدرک حسن’s father may have been d. Farīghūn b. Muḥammad. But probably “amīr Farīghūn” stands here only for “Farīghūnid ruler”, in which case Hasan may have been the son of the last Farīghūnid amīr Abū Naṣr Aḥmad. On the other hand, we know that Sultan Mahmūd having married his son Abū Aḥmad Muḥammad to a daughter of the amīr Abū Naṣr al-Farīghūnī gave him Gūzgān as a fīef (‘aqada lahu ‘ala a’aml al-fūṣāl) and appointed Abū Muḥammad [b.] Ḥasan b. Mihrān to act as his adviser. The young prince inaugurated in Gūzgān a new era (wa barasa ilayhā burūz al-sayf min yad al-sāqīl), and displayed much solicitude for the population’s welfare, ‘Utbi, ii, 230. Muḥammad’s marriage with the Farīghūnid princess is also confirmed in the Lubāb al-albāb, i, 25 and 294. According to Gardīzī, p. 74, the transformation of Gūzgān into a Ghaznavid fīef took place in 406/1017–18 and Naṣīr-i Khusrau in his Dīvān, ed. Tehrān, 1307, refers to the event in the following verse, p. 818:

کباست آنها فرینیان شاه شتار
ز دست خویش بدنده کرکان‌زا

“Where is he [i.e. Mahmūd] for fear of whom
the Farīghūnids let slip Gūzgān from their hands?”
We have enumerated all the known members of the Farīghūn family, and it remains to us only to mention the prince of Chaghānīyān (v. i., § 25, 27.) Abul-Muzaffar Muḥammad b. Ahmad, who has been wrongly supposed to be a Farīghūnūd; cf. Barthold, Târkestan, p. 254, and more decisively Sa‘īd Nafisi, o.c., p. 258. The appellation "Farīghūnūd" has been only by mistake appended to the name of this Abul-Muẓaffar in the Persian translation of ‘Utbi, p. 114, and is absent in the Arabic original, i, 167. This Abul-Muẓaffar was dispossessed by his relative Tāhir b. Faḍl, but evidently was reinstated after the latter’s death. ‘Utbi, i, 165, mentions these events some time after 380/990, but according to the Lubāb al-albāb, pp. 27–9, Tāhir died in 377/987; cf. Muḥammad khān Qazvīnī’s notes in the Chahār-maqāla, pp. 163–6.

On the possessions of the Farīghūnūds see § 23, 46.–66. and Barthold’s Preface, pp. 5–6.

Writers patronized by the Farīghūnūds. Among the men of letters patronized by the Farīghūnūds ‘Utbi, ii, 102–5, names Abul-Faḍl Ahmād b. Ḥusain Bādi‘ al-zamān Hamadhānī (the poem quoted will be found in the latter’s Diwān, Cairo, 1321, p. 33) and the poet Abul-Fath Bustī. Mūnejjīm-bāshi adds to their number Khuwārizmī, “author of the Mafāṭīḥ al-‘utbīn”.

Finally our Ḥudūd al-‘Ālam is a tangible proof of Abul Ḥarīth Muḥammad’s literary and scientific tastes.

§ 2. Cosmographic

1. Entirely as in I.R., 8, 12, who quotes Ahmād b. Muḥammad b. Kathīr al-Farḡānī, author of the Kītāb fil-ḥarakāt al-samawiyya, who was still alive in A.D. 861; see Sarton, Introduction, i, 567.

2. According to I. Kh., 5, the invisible (al-dīn ‘affleh “antipodal”) part of the world is devoid of inhabitants.

1 The connexion of the author of the Mafāṭīḥ with the Farīghūnūds is probable, as he dedicated his book to the wazīr of the Sāmānīd Nūḥ b. Maṃṣūr [976–97] who was son-in-law of the Farīghūnūd Abul-Ḥarīth Muḥammad. However, the name of the author of the Mafāṭīḥ was Ābū ‘Abdillāḥ Muḥammad b. Aḥmād b. Yūsuf. Mūnejjīm-bāshi by an evident slip calls him Ābū Bakr, which is the kānyā of a different Khuwārizmī, namely of Muḥammad b. ʿAbbās, author of the Diwān Rasīl, who died in 383/993 in Nishāpūr; cf. Ibn Khallīkān, Paris, 1842, i, 736 [transl. iii, 108].

2 E. G. Browne, A Lit. Hist. of Persia, i, 453, mentions among the Farīghūnūds clients the poets Daqīqī and Maṃjiḵ, though he does not quote his authority [Eṭḥē?]. No such statement is found in ‘Auffī, Daulatshāh, or the Majma’ al-fuṣūḥā. According to ‘Auffī’s Lubāb al-albāb, ii, 12–14, Maṃjiḵ was the panegyrist of the amīr of Chaghānīyān [v. i., § 25, 25.] Abul-Muẓaffar Ṭāhir b. al- Faḍl b. Muḥammad b. al-Muẓaffar, and Daqīqī, ibid., ii, 11, that of the amīrs of Chaghānīyān [particularly of Abū Sa‘īd Muḥammad Muẓaffar Muḥṭār] and of the Sāmānīd Maṃṣūr (b. Nūḥ b.) Naṣr b. Aḥmad. Fārūkhī in his famous qasīda dedicated to Abul-Muẓaffar Chaghānī says: tā ṭarāṣandāy (sic) maddi-hi tu Daqīqī dar gudhasht, s-ṭafārin-i tu dilārgānda chinnān k-az dāna nār, see Chahār-maqāla, p. 165. The explanation of the error may be the fact that the said amīr Abul-Muẓaffar Muḥammad had been wrongly taken for a Farīghūnūd, v. i., line 3.
Cosmographic

3. The inhabited part of the earth is supposed to occupy the whole width of the visible part of it, *i.e.* $180^\circ$, while in latitude it occupies $63^\circ$ in the northern part of it and $17^\circ$ in its southern part. $180 \times (63+17) = 14,400$, while the whole area of the earth (both visible and invisible) $= 360 \times 360 = 129,600$. Of the latter number $1/9$ is exactly $14,400$. I. Kh., 4, says that the earth is inhabited as far as $24^\circ$ beyond the Equator, *i.e.* southern lat. $24^\circ$. Prof. C. A. Nallino kindly writes to me (Rome, 5. xi. 1932): "Je pense que les chiffres $63^\circ$ et $17^\circ$ sont tout simplement l'application de l'idée que l'oioumu'ην (ربع السور) est la quatrième partie de la surface [scil. visible V.M.] du globe terrestre; $63^\circ$ étant la limite boréale des habitations humaines, et $90^\circ$ la largeur de l'habitable (sur $180^\circ$ de longueur), on a fait $90-63 = 17$.

5. See § 4, 13, on the island Nâra (*Bāra) lying on the Equator.

§ 3. The Seas and the Gulfs

The word *khaliṣ* stands in the text both for "gulf" and "strait", and *batīha* both for the real "swamp" and for "lake". Our author uses his own names for the Eastern Seas; cf. Barthold's *Preface*, p. 32.

1. The Eastern Ocean (cf. § 2, 4.) corresponds more or less to Khūwārizmī's, p. 32, "Sea of Darkness" *al-bahr al-muẓālim*, and to *al-bahr al-akhd̄ar* of Ibn Rusta and Mas'ūdī; cf. Māzik, *Parageographische Elemente*, p. 188. The lands bordering upon the Eastern Ocean are enumerated from the extreme south (more to the east than the Zanj, *v.i.*, 3.) towards China and the Khirkhīz, who on the east of China are supposed to reach the maritime region (§ 14).

2. The Western Ocean is the Atlantic. On its islands see § 4, 17 c.

3. The Great Sea, *i.e.* the Indian Ocean, with its dependencies and the waters adjoining eastern Africa and Arabia, corresponds to the seas which Khūwārizmī, p. 74, calls *bahr al-Qulzum, al-bahr al-akhd̄ar, bahr al-Sind, bahr al-Hind, bahr al-Šīn*, and *bahr al-Baṣra*. On the African coast, which is supposed to stretch eastwards parallel to the Equator (see notes to § 55), the Great Sea reaches only up to Zanj.

Of the five gulfs of the Great Sea, (a) is the Gulf of 'Aden, on the southern coast of which Barbarā is situated; cf. *al-khaṭl̄ī al-Barbarā* in Mas'ūdī, *Mūrūj*, i, 231-3, and Yāqūt, i, 100 and 966-7. In § 7, 10, the "Gulf of Ayla", mentioned to the south of Arabia, between the Arab [*i.e.* Red] Sea and the Great Sea, is an evident slip for the "Barbarī Gulf". Under § 57 some parts of the Barbarī Gulf are placed north of Abyssinia, and as in § 32 the name Barbarī is given to the gulf off the Sudan one would imagine that our author, or his source, was somehow influenced by the existence on the Nile of the town of Barbar ("the key of the Sudan"), which he took for the source of the term *Barbarī*. Under § 7, 12 the confusion of Barbar and Barbarā is still more clear, for the waters east of the Arabian desert (which latter lies between Egypt and the Red Sea) can perhaps be associated with Barbar, but not with Barbarā! (b) the Arab Gulf
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§ 3

(under § 7, 10.; the Arab Sea) represents the Red Sea jointly with the Gulfs of Suez and 'Aqaba (Ayla<Roman Aelana). Under § 7, 10., the latter is placed on the west [read: north-west] of Arabia, while the Arab Sea is mentioned south [read: south-west] of Arabia; (c) the Persian Gulf is strangely given the name of the Gulf of 'Iraq. The distance between Kuwait and 'Aqaba is circa 1,400 km. and could hardly be travelled over in 16 days even on mehāris; (d) is the Gulf of 'Oman with the Arabian Sea, and (e) perhaps that of Bengal.¹

4. It is unexpected to meet Armenia on the eastern coast of the Mediterranean in the tenth century, but here the term hadd may have the more vague sense of coastal region (cf. under Spain, § 41).

5. Here the author says that the Caspian has no gulfs (or straits?).² On the supposed communication between the Caspian and the Black Sea see note to § 6, 44. On the term daryā-yi Khasarān as applied to the Black Sea see § 49, 17.

6. The Aral Sea, on which see Barthold, Nachrichten über den Aral-See, in Quellen und Forschungen zur Erd- und Kulturkunde, Leipzig, 1910 (Russian original, Tashkent, 1903).

[A curious caption is found in Biruni’s Canon with regard to Balkhān (north of the present-day Krasnovodsk, on the eastern coast of the Caspian sea): “Balkhān is a deserted place (khirba), on account of the Jayhūn having deflected from its course [and having flowed] towards the Arvāniyān (?) sea and the town of Jurjān [read: *furjāniya = Gurgānj, § 26, 25].” Biruni’s style is uncouth but the meaning is more likely that given in our translation than that “the [former] course of the Jayhūn was towards the *Arvāniyān sea”. I do not see any explanation of this name as applied to the Caspian, but with regard to the Aral sea the term may be explained by the name of a certain division of the Kimāk or Qifchaq. In a letter dated 578/1182 the Khwārazm-shāh records the submission of Alp-Qara ایران (or, with all the Qifchaq tribe, adding that he sent to him his son Firān<Pl. Pīrān (cf. infra p. 295, note 2) with a number of Yūghūr-sādagān (v.i. § 18, 3). Biruni’s term ایران آرپاریص, عرپاریص, Usānīyān (?) seems to be a derivation of the family name of these chiefs who apparently ruled in the north of the Aral sea, cf. Barthold, Turkestan, 340 and 343, and the accompanying texts, p. 79 (the quotation from Fakhr al-dīn Marvarrūdī refers to p. 47 of Sir D. Ross’s edition).] [See Appendix B.]

8. مارط stands undoubtedly for *Maeotis as the Greeks called the Azov

¹ On the bahr al-agḥāb see under India, § 10, 12. ² But see p. 391.
Sea, but the position of our is fantastic. Though its junction with the Black Sea, and even the dimensions, are rightly indicated, it is placed north of the Sāqālib and said to communicate with the Western Ocean. This latter detail is confirmed in § 4, 25.-26., with a further indication that some "water" (Baltic Sea?) coming from Tūwas (*Ṭāliya = Thule) in the extreme north flows into the Maeotis. This idea of the Maeotis being a connecting link between the Baltic and the Black Sea may reflect the rumours of the usual road of the Normans who utilized Russian lakes and rivers and dragged their boats over the short stretches of dry land intervening between the different basins [Map xii]. Our Maeotis may stand for the northern Russian lakes (Ilmen, Ladoga) near which the Norman Rus (§ 44) had their settlements. A further confusion may have arisen out of the fact that several expanses of water were associated with the Normans and that the latter were designated by two different names, Rūs and Varang.

The sense of our passage (§ 4, 25.-26.) about some "water" connecting the Western Ocean with the Maeotis becomes much clearer in the light of the description of the Baltic Sea in Bīrūnī's cosmographical work al-Taḥfīḥ, where it is said that al-Bahr al-Muḥīt (= our Western Ocean), beyond Tangier and Andalus (Spain), "stretches northwards along the land of the Ṣaqāliba, and from it a large gulf separates north of the Ṣaqāliba which stretches up to the neighbourhood of the Muslim Bulghars' land. This (gulf) is known under the name of Bahr Warank (given it) after the name of the people living on its coast. Then it curves in beyond this people towards the east, and between its coast and the furthest limits of the Turkish lands lie lands and mountains, unknown, barren, and untrodden." Cf. Wiedemann in Sitzungsber. d. physik.-mediz. Societät zu Erlangen, Band 44 (1912), p. 4, and Abul-Fīdā, text, p. 35, transl., p. 42, where it is stated that the said Bahr-Warank is found only in Bīrūnī's works and in Naṣīr al-dīn (Ṭūsī)'s Taḥkīra. The real Maeotis, i.e. the Azov Sea, was named by the Muslims equally after the Normans. Masūḍī, Mūrījī, ii, 15, says that "in the upper reaches of the Khazar river [i.e. the Volga] there is an outflow (fit a’dī nahr al-khazar masab) which joins a gulf of the Pontos, which is the Rūs Sea, for no one except them [i.e. the Rūs] navigates it, and they are established on some of its coasts". Most probably the passage refers to the Azov Sea, and this is confirmed by the later Idrīṣī, who makes the Nahr al-Rūṣiyah, as he calls the Tanais (Don), flow into the Bahr al-

---

1. Our dimensions correspond to those given by I.R., 86: 'length from west to east 300 miles, width 100 miles' (1 farsakh = 3 ml, cf. Maq., 66). Cf. also Masūḍī, i, 261 and Bakrī, ed. Rosen, p. 25 (Bakrī literally follows I.R.).

2. On a similar idea of the Maeotis stretching towards the North Pole cf. Masūḍī, Tanbīḥ, p. 66. I.R., p. 85, makes the Tanais (Don) come out of the Maeotis.

3. And even for the Baltic sea itself!

4. Ed. R. Wright, p. 121 [the translation made from the Persian is slightly different from ours].

5. Cf. I.H., 276, quoted in the note to § 6, 44.

6. Could the latter detail refer to the still mysterious Russian principality of Tmutarakan (Const. Porphyry, ch. 42, Tawārak) on the Taman peninsula?
Rusiya, i.e. the Azov Sea. Still more curious is the fact that on a Syriac map compiled towards A.D. 1150 and described by Dr. A. Mingana in the Manchester Guardian of 19 May 1933, the Azov Sea bears the name of the Warang Sea! This is then a very probable way in which the connexion or identity of names could lead to the confusion of the facts referring respectively to the Baltic and the Azov Seas.

The real Ptolemaic Maeotis does not play any role in our text and even the Rús river which might be taken for the Don (but see note to § 6, 44.) is said to flow into the Volga. Consequently the real Azov Sea is merged into the Black Sea, and I am inclined to think that the alternative name of the Pontos: daryā-yi Gurziyān (or Gurz) was passed on to the latter precisely from the real Azov Sea which our author omitted to describe. As the Gurz, i.e. Georgians, see note to § 42, 14., cannot possibly have given their name to the Black Sea, I admit the possibility of the name standing in this case for the original 

Graphically such a substitution is quite imaginable, if for instance, the final ḫ was written somewhat above the line and the top bar of ḫ happened to be drawn near the initial ḫ.

Consequently the imaginary Maeotis corresponds probably to some northern Russian lake while the name Gurz applied to the Black Sea is in reality that of the courageous navigators, the Warang = Rús, for whose special association with the Azov Sea we possess several indications in Muslim sources. This confusion was rendered possible by the fact that our compiler merged the Azov Sea into the Black Sea.

[Additional note. The alternative explanation of the strange term would be to connect it with كَرْج as I.R., 143, calls the Byzantine port where the Magyars (living on the northern coast of the Black Sea) used to take their Slav prisoners for sale. كَرْج K.rkh can be easily restored as * K.rj of which كَرْج would be a tentative iranization. Instead of كَرْج I. Faqih, 281, mentions سَكْرَج S.mh.rsh. The Khazar king's letter (version B) ed. Kokovtsov, p. 31, mentions on the western frontier of the Khazar kingdom Sh.rhîl Ṣarqâl, يُ الیملاس S.mk.rts and يٰل� K.rts, of which the two latter evidently retranscribe the names quoted by I. Faqih and I.R. For our purpose it is enough to say that our author, who among his sources undoubtedly had the text utilized by I.R., may have derived his Iranian كَرْج from كَرْج as K.rj (cf. Hebrew K.rts < K.rj). As K.rj is most probably Kerch [the alternation in Arabic of sh/j is in favour of the original ð], this explanation, already suggested by Westberg, v.s., p. 32, still merits our consideration. However the following explanation now appears to me as being the simplest. In I.Kh. (cf. § 42, 17.), undoubtedly utilized by our author, the Black Sea (on the authority

\[1\] Cf. Map II.

\[2\] According to Mas’üdl, Murîj, ii, 272, Tanbih, 67, Pontos and Maeotis are one sea, cf. Marquart, Streifzüge, 161.

\[3\] S.mh.rsh may be either the same name as K.rj with the initial element sam- (some adjective in a local language), or the name of some neighbouring place only slightly differing from the original K.rj.
The Seas and the Gulfs

§ 3

of Muslim al-Jarmi) is called بحيرة البرج Khazar and جزر is constantly confused in Arabic. As in § 3, 5., the Khazar sea is the Caspian sea, I.Kh.'s aberrant term could all the easier be read بحر البرج and as our author everywhere substitutes Iranian جزر for Arabic جزر, the Black Sea could under this name (Gurz > Gursiyân) become associated with the Georgians.]

9. The fact that the Lake of Urmia is placed in Armenia explains some peculiarities of the order followed in § 36, see note to § 36, 9.

11. فردان must be a corruption of Perta, which I. Kh., 113, mentions on the road from Cilicia to Amorion. Perta lay immediately south of the great salt lake now called Tuz-chölü, lying north-east of Qoniya.

12. It is tempting to compare كاس with كاس which in I.Kh.'s itinerary, p. 113, immediately follows Fārita (Perta). This place evidently lay by a lake, for I. Kh. speaks of "bank of ?". Both names are certainly corrupted, but it is not impossible that they stand for Savitra, of which it is only known that it lay in the waterless Lycaonian desert not far from Archelais. W. M. Ramsay, Asia Minor, p. 340 and Map, places Savitra south-west of Perta. The respective positions of Perta and Savitra are not very certain; the latter lay perhaps farther north, and in that case could have given its name to the (salt?) lake which lies immediately south-west of the Tuz-chölü and which is now called Murād-gölü. The difficulty in the way of such an identification is that at present the dimensions of this lake are too small (2 × 2 km.), but it may have shrunk since. Cuinet, La Turquie d'Asie, has nothing on this lake.

13. This name (cf. also under § 29, 13.) is very differently spelt. Išt., 100, and I.H., 193, give Bur, Leer, Bum, Bwōd, Tuz, Muz, but actually the lake is called Fāmr, which confirms the reading Mūr in the older Fārs-nāma, ed. Le Strange, GMS, 154.

14. Išt., 122, Bāsfahīya, I.H., 123, Bāshafīya, &c., is the Lake of Tasht now forming the northern part of the Lake Bakhtagān (Bichagān), see Schwarz, Iran, 11, Le Strange, The Lands, 276. Išt., 122, prizes its utility.

15. Išt., 122, also gives Jankān (*janagān), while the older Fārs-nāma, 153, has Māhāliya, nowadays turkicized into Mahāriu.

16. *Bijagān, cf. also § 6, 33., is now called Bakhtagān but Hasan Fasā'i on his detailed map of Fārs (note to § 29) gives the alternative Bichagān. The river of Dārgār (Rūd-i Shūr flowing into the Persian Gulf, north of the island Qishm) rises from a source situated some 35 K.M. south-east of the lake. It was considered as a reappearance on the surface of the Kur; cf. Išt., 121: "the Kurr is said to possess a spring (manba') in some of the districts of Dārgār and to outflow into the sea". Chardin, ed. Langlé, viii, 235, 499, who crossed the Rūd-i Shūr on his way from Lār to Bandar-i 'Abbāsī, took it for a continuation of the Band-i-mīr river (i.e. of the Kur). Tomasechek, Neach, p. 44, calls it Ab-i Kurr (without quoting his authority) and identifies it with the Coros mentioned by P. Mela and Kόpioς found in Ptolemy, vi, cap. 8; cf. Schwarz, Iran, p. 8.
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17. 18. Barthold’s hypothesis of the identity of the Issik-kul and Tuz-kul, v.s., p. 28, does not seem very happy. The areas of the two lakes, as well as their location, are different. The Issik-kul stretched between the Chigil and Tug-tashghuz and the Ili is wrongly supposed to flow into it. The Tuz-kul lay within the limits of the Khallukh. It is true that the latter occupied the southern (or south-western) bank of the Issik-kul, cf. § 15, 10. and 11., but according to the order of enumeration Tuz-kul must have lain to the west of the Issik-kul near the homonymous places Tuzun-Bulaq and Tuzun-’Arj, § 15, 5.-6., of which the former is mentioned on the frontier of the Yaghnas, i.e. on the south-western border of the Khallukh. Finally, though Gardizî calls the Issik-kul šühr “salt”, it is only slightly brackish and an abundant supply of salt from it is highly improbable.

A. Z. Validi kindly draws my attention to the Boro-dabasun lake situated to the east of the Issik-kul, between the headwaters of the Tekes and Kegen (the two southern tributaries of the Ili); Boro-dabasun lies at an altitude of 6,400 feet and is intensely salt; it produces yearly 40,000 poods of salt “used by the Qirghiz and the Russian settlements round the Issik-kul; some of it is exported to China”, cf. Prince Masalsky, Turkestanskiy kray, SPb., 1913, p. 48, and Molchanov, The Lakes of Central Asia (in Russian), Tashkent, 1929, p. 49. The suggestion is interesting, but a close consideration of our text makes it very difficult to include the region of Boro-dabasun within the limits of the Khallukh (already at Barskhân, § 15, 11., the Khallukh influence was weak). Therefore I am personally more inclined to identify the Tuz-kul with the Shür-kul “Salt lake” situated at an altitude of 5,000 feet on the southern slope of the T’ien-shan some 140 Km. to the north-east of Kâshghar, and south of the Taushqan which was within the sphere of the Khallukh influence; cf. § 15, 13.-15. According to Huntington (in R. Pumpelly, Explorations in Turkestan, Washington, 1905, p. 208) the Shür-kul “is a sheet of salt rather than of water... The salt is collected by the people and is carried as far as Kâshghar; it is used just as it occurs, without cleansing.” Dr. Huntington’s exploration has shown that the level of the lake stood formerly 350 feet above the present level, which fact would account for the size of the Tuz-kul as indicated in the Hudūd al-ʿĀlam.

19. Only the eastern branch of the Nile flows out to the Tinnis lake.

21. On the rivers supposed to reach the Lake of Nicaea see § 6, 60. and 61. I. Kh., 106, gives a different measurement, viz., 12 × 7 farsakhs.

22. Riyaś is a great puzzle but the starting-point for its identification must be the recognition that our author’s source for Asia Minor is I.Kh. The latter, 101, on an alternative road from Cilicia to Amorion, quotes رأس بحيرة الباسيليون i.e. the locality “at the head of the lake of Basilion”. In I. Kh.’s passage the word رأس could have been misspelt into رسي in which case our author having interpreted it as “Riyas, lake of Basiliyün” may have retained the name and dropped the explanation. Le Strange, The Lands, p. 135, identifies the lake Basiliyün with that of the Forty Martyrs, i.e. the Ak-šehir-gölü, which (at present) measures some 5 × 1 km. As above under 11.
these dimensions are much under our author's estimate, but we must in
general mistrust the seeming exactitude of his statistics the origin of which
is obscure [cf. the lakes of Fārs, the width of which is constantly indicated
though it is not found in 1st.].

23. 1st., 122, buḥayrat bi-Dasht-Ārzan, situated west of Shīrāz, on the
road to Kāzrūn.

24. The usual pronunciation of Zarah is Zirīh, but this name has, of
course, nothing to do with the popular etymology "(glowing like a) cuirass",
&c. The name is explained by Old Persian drayah, Avestic zrayah, "sea,
lake". Probably of the same origin are the names of a lake in Kurdistan
Zarbār, and perhaps of some islands on the Caspian composed with -zīra
(Qum-zīra, Būyūk-zīra, with a Turkish beginning, but Khara-zīra "Ass
[Dorn: Pig?] Island" purely Iranian, cf. Dorn, Caspia, 82).

24. Daryāsha is evidently a local (Soghdian?) form for Persian daryācha.
Cf. § 5, 9 a, § 6, 23.

25. Bastārāb must be identical with Astarāb, the western headwater of
the river of Sar-i pul and Shibarghan. The initial b of the name is not clear,
but v.s. 23.

27. The Lake of Ħūs lies in the mountain separating Ħūs from Nīshāpūr.
Bīrūnī, Chronology, p. 264, calls the lake Sabzarūd and gives various ex-
planations of its situation on a height. In the Nuzhat al-qulūb, GMS, p.
241, it is called Buḥayra-yi chashma-yi sabz and identified with the legendary
lake from which came out the horse that killed Yezeqīl the Sinner.
According to the Shāh-nāma, ed. Mohl, v, 519–23, the event took place
near the Lake Shāhīd and the source Sau; cf. Minorsky, Ħūs in EI.1 Follow-
ing Sir P. Sykes, A sixth journey, in GY, Jan. 1911, p. 3, the Chashma
Sabz lies under the Lūk Shīrbīd peak (between Nīshāpūr and Ħūs) and
occupies an area of 400 × 100 yards, though formerly it had been much
larger.

28. Cf. § 6, 62.

34. This "swamp" is the Qara-kul "Black Lake" in the neighbourhood
of which the Samarqand river (Zarafshān) disappears. Its other names,
following Narshakhi, were Sāmian [sām- according to Marquart, Wehrst,
29, means "black"] and Bārgīn-i farākh; see Barthold, Turkestan, 117, and
Barthold, Irrigation, 124. In our text the word 
āl is evidently a common
name "lake, swamp". The same word still survives in Avoza-Karti-
Damzin (?), a fishery in the Krasnovodsk district on the Caspian Sea, see
Geyer, Turkestan, Tashkent, 1909, p. 165.2 The form ḏwāsā is metrically
attested in the Shāh-nāma, ed. Mohl, vi, 630, 651, 654. In Firdausī, 507,
Āvāza is the castle which Bahram Chūbīn takes after a siege during his
campaign against the "Turkish" king Shāba and his son Parmūda.

1 Marquart, Wehrst, p. 7, thinks that ḏwāsā in Firdausī is an error for ḏwāsā *Sind,
as the lower course of the Herāt river was probably called after a village which
existed in the neighbourhood of Nasā and Abīvard (§ 23, 9., 10. and 30.), see
Yaqūt, iii, 167.

2 The maps show an Avāza on the
western side of the spit covering from
the west the bay of Krasnovodsk.
Instead of Āvāzā Thaʾālibī, p. 655, mentions the castle of Paykand (cf. § 25, 4), but their identity is clear from the mention in both sources of Siyāvush's girdle deposited there by Arjāsp. On Paykand see Barthold, *Turkestan*, 118-19. In his *Wehrot*, pp. 138-65, Marquart has a long dissertation on Āvāzā and Paykand. Cf. also his *Catalogue*, 34-6, where the equation is established of Dizh-i Nāvāzak = Dizh-i rōyīn = Paykand, and Firdausi's āvāza is regarded as a corruption of nāvāzak "the boatman", but the latter argument is not convincing.

35. Perhaps the Lob-nor considered as a connecting-link between the Tarim and the Huang-ho.

36. Too vague for identification (Baikal?).

§ 4. The Islands

In spite of the clear definition of what an island is, the author mentions in this chapter peninsulas as well, following the Arabic use of the word *jazīra*.

A. THE EASTERN OCEAN

1. The Silver-island. Pomponius Mela, iii, 70, and Pliny, *Natur. Hist.*, vi, 80, mention in the neighbourhood of India two islands Chryṣē and Argyrē but describe them too vaguely for location, see Coedes, p. xiii. As the source of the early Muslim geographers is Ptolemy, it is much more probable that the *jazīrat al-fīdda* (Khuwārizmī) represents Ptolemy's 'Iafašī (vii, 29). However, the situation is complicated by the fact that Ptolemy mentions in the Transgangetic India (vii, 2, 17) two countries bearing respectively the names of 'Arpūrī (vii, 2, 29). However, the situation is complicated by the fact that Ptolemy mentions in the Transgangetic India (vii, 2, 17) two countries bearing respectively the names of 'Arpūrī (vii, 2, 29). However, the situation is complicated by the fact that Ptolemy mentions in the Transgangetic India (vii, 2, 17) two countries bearing respectively the names of 'Arpūrī and *Xiphos* (cf. Coedes, Index). In Khuwārizmī's arrangement of Ptolemy, *jazīrat al-fīdda* came somehow to connote two different entities: (a) an island, and (b) a peninsula protruding into the sea from a larger peninsula which vaguely corresponds to Indo-China. Mžik, who in his article *Parageographische Elemente*, has traced a map after Khuwārizmī's data, shows the island to the west of the large peninsula through which flows the river Suwās (not in Ptolemy); to the east, beyond the river protrudes the small peninsula. Only the latter could be considered as belonging to the Eastern Ocean and our author's "seven rivers" may somehow reflect Khuwārizmī's record on the Suwās with its three estuaries. On the other hand, the town of the Silver-island may refer to Ptolemy's capital of the Yabadiu: 'Arpūrī.

B. THE INDIAN OCEAN AND NEIGHBOURING SEAS

2. The two peninsulas "mentioned in Ptolemy's books" seem to be the Southern Cape (τὸ Νότιον ἄκρον) and the Cape of Satyrs (τὸ Σατύρην ἄκρον), between which, in the country of the Sinai (< dynasty of *Ch'īn*), stretches the gulf ᴴθρησκόν, see Ptolemy, vii, 3, and Marcianus of Heraclea (5th cent.) § 45, cf. Coedes, o.c., p. 121. In this case our author, in order to be consistent, ought to have mentioned the two peninsulas under the Eastern Ocean (v.s. a.).
§ 4  

The Islands

For the better understanding of 3. and 5.-8. it must be had in view that Muslim authors do not clearly discriminate between Sumatra and Java, and speak of Sumatra under several names relating to different parts of this great island.

3. This Gold-island (= Sumatra) corresponds to bilād al-Wāqwaq in I.Kh., 69, as confirmed by the appellation of its inhabitants “Wāqwaqian Zangīs”. For a second time the same place is mentioned in § 9, r., as a dependency of China under the name of Wāq-Wāq. Cf. also §§ 55, 3. and 56.

4. Žabar is Ṭabārdan, cf. 1. Rusta, 94, who evaluates its periphery at 3,000 miles and mentions 19 islands lying around it [Ptolemy, v, 4, 11] and the corundum found in it. Khuwarizmi, p. 4, places طربوسى in the Sarandib island”. Our author distinguishes Žabar from Sarandib; see § 9, 23., cf. Ferrand, Relations, p. 205, note 2. The name of the town Muvas is a puzzle unless it stands for موس. Less probable would be the supposition that Muvas somehow represents the name of the Suwās river, v.s., note 101. [On the position v.s., p. 235, n.1.]

5. ṭām < ṭām is Sumatra (v.i., 7), Ferrand, Relations, p. 25. This paragraph closely follows I.Kh., 64–5. On the products, cf. also Sulaymān, p. 9.

6. In spite of its location west of Sarandib stands evidently for جاج for the details (camphor-trees, snakes) correspond to those quoted under § 56.

7. Žāba and Shalāḥīṭ are treated as a single island (Sumatra; cf. above, 5). I.Kh., 66, uses the singular for جاج جاجة Shalāḥīṭ; cf. [Ibrāhim b. Waṣīf-shāh] L’Abrégé des Merveilles, tr. by Carra de Vaux, 1898, p. 58: “the island of Žāba contains the town of Shalāḥīṭ”. I.Kh., 66, does not mention ambergris and cuben among the products of Shalāḥīṭ, but they are mentioned in I. Rusta, 138.

8. Bālūṣ is the port lying on the south-western coast of Sumatra. Ferrand, Relations, p. 21, note 5, and Ferrand, Wak-Wak in EI. “The said Žāba” refers to the preceding 7. I.Kh., 66, places Kala at 2 days’ distance from Bālūṣ (this sentence in our text comes under 9) and from the latter counts 2 farsakhs to Žāba, Shalāḥīṭ, and Harlaj.

9. Our author exactly follows I.Kh., 66. Kala (I. Kh. gives Kila) according to de Goeje is probably Keda (Kra) in the Malay peninsula. Instead of “south of Bālūṣ” Kala ought to be located north (north-east) of it. Sulaymān says that after *Lanjabalus the ships call at Kalāḥ-bār, which is (a part) of the Žābaj. The name of tin in Arabic al-riṣāṣ al-qal’ī, or simply qal’ī (<kalī), is a derivative from Kala. The “Indian (or Brahmanic?) Žāba” (I. Kh., 66), in contradistinction from the other Žāba (I. Kh.,

1 Sulaymān rightly explains Persian -bār as “a country, or coast”.
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67), whom our author calls “Continental Jába”, see § 5, 9, b and § 10, 45; cf. Barthold’s Preface, p. 34, note 3.

10. Bankálus stands for I.Kh.’s, 66, Al.n.k.batālūs “the Nicobar islands”. Ferrand, Relations, p. 26, takes as the right form *Lankabatūlūs. Our author exactly translates I.Kh.’s: امربالون الجديدة وتجارون التجارة. I.Kh. counts 10–15 days from Al.n.k.batālūs to Sarandib, and, moreover, mentions the distances Malay–B.līm, 2 days, B.līm–*Bāpattan, 2 days, and B.līm–Sarandib, 1 day. It is possible that our author, or his source, added all these distances together indiscriminately and obtained the result of 20 (= 15 + 2 + 2 + 1) days for the distance between Bankálus and Malay.

11. One would perhaps expect, e.g., note to 7., that H.r.nj(مرح) following the group of islands situated east of India stands for H.r.ļ (Idrīšī: مرح) which I.Kh., 66, associates with Sumatra. I.R., 138, says that “Harraj was only the name of the king’s military representative (qā’id)”, while the island itself (in which camphor was discovered in 220/835) was called T.warān. However, our author clearly places H.r.nj in proximity to Sindān (§ 10, 14.) and lets 12. Lāfft (in the Persian Gulf) follow it in the enumeration. One must perhaps look for the explanation of our مرح in Sulaymān’s (p. 5) name for the sea off the south-western coast of India: مرح. In, and round, this H.r.ļ Sea Sulayman mentions 1,900 islands (dībūt < ssk. dvīpa “island”) corresponding to the Laccadives, &c. Our H.r.nj island may refer to the latter. The name مرح in our author stands for something entirely different, namely for Harikel = Bengal; see note to § 10, 7. Provisionally, we must have in view three different localities with names equally beginning with مرح: (1) the sea near the Laccadives, (2) Bengal, and (3) some part of Sumatra.

12. Lāfft, e.g., under 14.

13. The name بُلِّنِش, Biruṇi, India, 157: بُلِّنِش, meaning in Persian “moenia et munimentum castri vel urbis”, Vullers, 8, 170. This legendary island stands the 60° of longitude and latitude has given rise to much discussion and confusion. A mention of the Equinoctial, or Equatorial, Island is found in I.R., 83: Jazīrat istiwa al-layl wal-nahār, who adds that the Indian Ocean, of which the area between Abyssinia and the furthest end of India is 8,000 × 2,700 miles, extends beyond this island

1 According to the Chinese annals of the Sung dynasty (960–1279) the kings of San-fō-ts’ī, i.e. the Srivijaya kings of Palembang in Sumatra, had the title of chan-pei. The latter (still unexplained) according to Ferrand’s hypothesis must be the equivalent (in Chinese pronunciation) of the Arabic Jába. The annals of the Ming dynasty (1368–1644) suggest that the name of the kingdom of Jambi (north-west of Palembang) is derived from the same chan-pei. See Ferrand, Črivedjaya, 16–17, 166.

2 It is possible that Sulaymān’s H.r.ļnd as the name for the sea near the Laccadives requires emendation.

3 One of the possible sources of confusion could also be the Indian view on the existence of an island called Malaya-dvīpa on which lies the town of Lānīkā inaccessible to men, while Lānīkā is also the name of Ceylon; cf. Kärlf, Die Kosmographie der Inden, Leipzig, 1920, p. 111.
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for 1,900 miles. Biruni is the principal authority on Bāra. In his al-Qānūn al-Maš’ūdī he says:

"On...

Abū O.C., 5 cf. 4.189 f.

quote my parent; which note in ch. on first has India found Kangdiz, castle country "Yamakoti however between 7. the fault localities "According al-Mas̲ūdī" *Bara... the... J. 97r. 97r.

The island Lank known in the books as the ‘Cupola of the Earth’... 100° 50’ 0° 0’

"Bāra [sine punctis] mentioned by Fazārī and Ya’qūb b. Tāriq... 190° 50’ 0° 0’

"Jamakūt situated at the extreme eastern limit; Persians call it Jamāgird... 190° 0’ 0° 0’

"According to the Indians there is no habitation beyond these two (sic)."

Opposite Lank, Bāra, and Jamakūt, there is a note stating that these localities are “as if unknown (k-al-majhūlat)”. The text of Or. 1997 is faulty and an additional numeration suggests the following order in which the localities should follow: ... 4. Lank; 5. Sūra island; 6. Jamakūt; 7. Bāra.

In the Taqfīm, p. 140, § 239, Biruni says: “A central point of longitude between East and West of the habitable world is called the Cupola of the Earth. Sometimes it is described as lacking latitude because it is on the equator. We do not know whether this is an expression of opinion of the Persians, or others, at least the Greek books do not mention it. The Hindūs however say that it is a high place named Laṅkā, the home of devils.”

Finally in his India, p. 157, transl. i, 303, Biruni more explicitly says: “Yamakoṭi (यमकोटी) is, according to Ya’qūb [b. Tāriq] and al-Fazārī, the country where is the city Tāra [read: Bāra]! within the sea. I have not found the slightest trace of this name in Indian literature. As kōṭi means castle and *Yama (म) is the Angel of Death, the word reminds me of Kangdiz, which, according to the Persians, had been built by Kaykā’ūs, or Jam, in the most remote east, behind the sea. ... Abū Ma’shar of Balkh has based his geographical canon on Kangdiz, as the 0° of longitude, or first meridian.” Reinaud, o.c., cxxxi, cxxxi, &c., who first commented on this passage, showed how this Yamakoṭi (= Jamshidgird)

(1) has got confused with the “Cupola of the Earth” (قبة الارض) which in India was identified with the site of the town of Ujjain, 'Oẓrāy, az-Zamīn misread in European medieval sources as “medius locus terrae dictus Arin”; cf. note to § 10, 18;

(2) brought into connexion with the Lank (Laṅkā Island, Ceylon) through which the first meridian was also supposed to pass; cf. Biruni, India, ch. xxx: “On Laṅkā, or Cupola of the Earth”.

However, the irregular character of the Indian first meridian was apparent; therefore “on abandonna l’ancienne base du méridien de Laṅka

1 Prof. H. von Mžik very kindly drew my attention to this passage which I now quote from the Br. Mus. MS. Or. 1997, f. 97r.

2 Both these astronomers were contemporaries of the caliph Manṣūr [A.D. 754–75], see Suter, Die Mathem. und Astron. d. Araber, 1900, p. 4, and Sarton, o.c., i, 530.
et on reporta la Coupole d'Arin à l'ouest. Mais ici on se partagea encore: quelques personnes (al-Battānī, Mas'ūdī) . . . paraissaient avoir mis Arin au milieu de la mer, dans une île imaginaire, entre l'Afrique et la presqu'île de l'Inde; pour les personnes qui . . . prolongeaient le continent africain du côté de l'est la coupole d'Arin se trouva dans une petite île située sur la côte de l'Afrique, dans le Zanguebar", Reinaud, o.c., p. ccxliv and the maps of al-Battānī and Mas'ūdī, ibid., ad p. ccxxxii.

Our author places the island at long. 90° and mentions it after H.r.nij and along with the islands of the Persian Gulf, consequently somewhere west, or north-west of India. Some light on current views as to its situation is thrown by Idrīsī, transl. Jaubert, i, 171: "Sūbāra [cf. § 10, 14.] . . . est voisine de l'île de Bāra, laquelle est petite et où croissent quelques cocotiers et le costus."

12. 14. and 15. lie in the Persian Gulf. 12. Lāft is mentioned in Išt., 107, where it is said that the island was also called Jazīra hāni Kāwān (or Barkāwān). This last name is mentioned only in Sulaymān, p. 16, and in I. Kh., p. 62, according to whom it was inhabited by the Ḥādīs sectorians. It corresponds to the large island Qishm, on the northern promontory of which there is a village called Lāft; see Tomashchek, Nearch, p. 48. Our author seems to be the first to speak of the commercial activity of Lāft.

14. 15. Uwāl is one of the Bahrayn islands, Yāqūt, i, 395. The pearl-fisheries of 15. Khārak, are mentioned in Išt., 32.


17. Išt., 13, 30, 31, 33, places Tārān between the gulfs of Suez and 'Aqaba (bayn al-Qulzum wa Ayla) and Jubaylāt near Tārān. The locality is famous for its winds and a whirlpool, and is reputed to be the place of Pharaoh's death [Exodus, 14, 29]. Maq., xi, spells جلا. Yaqut, iii, 834, places the islands near Hijāz.

C. THE WESTERN OCEAN


19. Ghadīra, i.e. Cadiz, see Qudāma, 231, and I.R. 85; Khuwārizmī, 15 [= Nallino, p. 48], has *قادر. The Greek name is Πάσειπα, Ptolemy, i, 3, Punic Gadder ("wall"). See Seybold, Cadiz, in EI.

20. 21. should really appear under D.

20. Rhodes is mentioned in Khuwārizmī, p. 115, and I. Rusta, 98. In fact Ptolemy (Book I) attributes much importance to the parallel of Rhodes (lat. 36°), cf. below 26. In a.d. 130 Hipparchus observed in Rhodes the obliquity of ecliptics. Cf. also Ptolemy, v, 2.

21. Arwādī, small island off Tārūṣ in Syria, now Ruwād. The name cannot be directly derived from Ptolemy's, *Αρωδὸς (Geog., v, 14). It is not found in any other ancient Muslim sources, except Ṭabarī, ii, 163.
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22. 23. Khuwārizmī, 89 [= Nallino, 50] mentions the islands ἀμαρως (?) and ἀμαρως of which the first is inhabited by the men and the second by the women. Nallino suggests the emendation of ἀμαρως into ἀμαρως *Amazons. The myth of the Amazons found a favourable ground in the confusion of Kwen-en, a Finnish tribe north of the Bothnic Gulf, with Kwen “woman” in Germanic languages. Cf. Idrīsī, ii, 433, Idrīsī-Tallgren, 34, 77, 140: ἀμαρως. Tallgren says that the island Nargen (off Reval = Tallinn) is called in Finnish Naissare “The island of the Woman, or the Women”. A story of the Town of Women (madinat al-nisā), situated west of the Rūs, is reported in Ibrāhīm b. Yaʿqūb [circ. A.D. 965], quoted in al-Bakrī, p. 37, but here the details are entirely different: the women bear children from their slaves and kill the latter. An Island of Women situated west of Fu-lin (Roman Empire) is mentioned in Hsüan-Tsang, Si-yu-Ki (Julien), ii, 180 (under Po-la-sse).

24. The form پِنْطِه (as in Qudāma, 231), hails evidently from a source different from that of پَنْطِه quoted in § 42, 21. (as in I. Rusta, 85).


26. Ptolemy, Geography, Book I, attributes much importance to the parallel of Thule (according to him lat. 73°); cf. also 20. above. Our author draws the Northern Polar circle (“the limit of the inhabited lands”) through Thule. Kiepert, Lehrbuch d. Alten Geographie, 1878, p. 533, identifies Thule with the Shetland Islands. On Maecotis, cf. § 3, 7.

D. THE MEDITERRANEAN

This list of islands in the Mediterranean does not exactly correspond to any of the lists known. To it must be added the islands 20. and 21.

28. The mountain jabal al-qilal (a promontory?) is mentioned in Iṣṭ, 71, and I.H., 136, as a very strong place seized by a party of Muslims and held by them against the Ifranja. According to Iṣṭ. the length of the mountain is 2 day-marches, but I.H. reduces it to only 2 miles. I.H. adds that, like Mallorca, Jabal al-qilal is a dependency of Spain [probably on account of the origin of the invaders, as Prof. C. A. Nallino (letter of 5. xi. 1932) kindly suggests to me]. Yāqūt, i, 392, speaking of the Alanka-burda (Lombards) says that their country is vast and is situated half-way (bayn) between Constantinople and Spain: “it begins from a side of the Mediterranean (bahr al-khaliḥ), cf. Yāqūt, ii, 465) opposite the Jabal al-qilal and stretches opposite the Maghrīb coast until it reaches the lands of Calabria (Qalawriya)”. These data seem to refer to the greatest extension of the Lombard kingdom and at all events to the times before the latter was crushed by Charlemagne in A.D. 776, but we do not know whether the J. al-qilal was known under that name in the eighth century, or whether Yāqūt has combined two different sources. The mountain is taken clearly as the western (north-western) limit of the Lombard kingdom which grosso modo extended over the whole of Italy, with the exception of Venice, Ravenna,
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Rome, Pentapolis, Naples, and the southernmost parts of Calabria and Apulia. Juynboll, the editor of the Marāṣid al-Iṣṭila‘ [an abridgement of Ya’qūt’s Mu‘jam al-buldān], i, 185, thought first that the “island” was to be sought near the Gulf of Genoa “secundum mappam, aliquam insulam cogites, in sinu Genuensi propriorem”. But in the meantime he published, v, 25–8, a remarkable letter by Reinaud in which the French orientalist suggested the identification of Jabal al-qilal with Fraxinetum, which the Arabs occupied towards A.D. 889 and kept till about 972. This Fraxinetum was further identified by Reinaud with La garde Frainet in the Forêt des Maures, which is situated on the French Riviera, in the mountainous region south of Draguignan, between Fréjus and Toulon, and more exactly north of the St. Tropez Gulf. On the Arab invasion of Provence see Reinaud, Invasions des Sarrasins en France, Paris, 1836, pp. 155–225, Amari, Bibli. Arabo-Sicula, 1880, p. 2, Poupardin, Le Royaume de Provence sous les Carolingiens, Paris, 1901, pp. 243–73. Reinaud’s identification is still the accepted one. The details of the H.-À. regarding the silver mine and the high mountain to the west of the Jabal al-qilal are not found elsewhere. The high mountain could be identified with the Massif des Maures which stretches north and south-west of the Fraxinetum. The mention by our author of the “Roman land”, or the “town of Rome” in the neighbourhood of the Jabal al-qilal may be related to the old text on the Lombard reproduced in Ya’qūt.1

29. Iṣṭ and I.H. give no dimensions of Cyprus. In I. Rusta, 85, its periphery is evaluated at 300 miles, but Qudāma and al-Battāni (quoted by de Goeje, ibid., 85 f) reckon its circuit as being 350 miles, as in our author.

30. فز stands certainly for قرني, Kūrpos, i.e. Corsica, Ptolemy, iii, 2. This usually mis-spelt name is found in I. Rusta, 85 (with a periphery of 200 miles), as well as in Qudāma and al-Battāni (quoted ibid., 85 d). The position of Corsica is confused by our author with that of Crete.

31. يابس correspondes to يابس (var. يابس) in Qudāma, 231, which is Yābis "Εβυβοσ, now Ibiza, one of the Balearic islands. [Not to be confused with جبلة خالصة, خالصة, خالصة, خالصة, خالصة, Xalasa, which I.H., 136, places between Sicily and Crete.]

32. Iṣṭ, 70, and I.H., 136, place Sicily very close to the Ifranja (Franks) and give similar dimensions of 7 marḥalas in length (and 4 in width), while I. Rusta, 85, following his system, gives its periphery as being of 500 miles.

33. Sardinia is mentioned in I. Kh., 109 (there lives the patrician governor of all the islands), in Qudāma, 231 (under a different form سرداية) and in I. Rusta, 85, who also estimates the length of its periphery as 300 miles. Our author evidently confuses Sardinia with Sicily for he places Sardinia south of Rūmiya, whereas the Imperial treasure is mentioned in Sicily.

34. Crete (usually Iqritish, I. Kh., 112, Iṣṭ, 70) has the same periphery in I. Rusta, 75 (where the name has the form Iqriṭiwa). The position of this island is confused with that of Cyprus.

e. The name 35. Kabūdhnā “the blue one” belongs certainly to the lake itself called in Strabo, xi, 13, 2, Ἀλυσων τὴν Στρατον, read: *Καπαθραν, Old

1 [The best identification for the high mountain would be the Alps. Then J.-Q. could be taken for the island of Elba, cf. Juynboll’s suggestion.]
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Persian kapauta, cf. Marquart, Brānšahr, 143. [The word is now attested in kāsakā hyya kapauta “lapis lazuli” in Darius’s “charte de fondation” ed. by V. Scheil.] There are several islands in the north-eastern part of the sea but the existence of considerable villages on them is open to doubt, unless the peninsula Shāhī, Ţabarī, iii, 1171, Shāhī, is understood here. See Minorsky, Marāgha, Marand, Tabrīz, and Urmīya, in EI.

f. The island Jazīrat al-Bāb according to the description is the “Madder island” Jazīra-yi Ruʿynās which is mentioned in Khāqānī’s well-known ode referring to a Russian raid in Shīrūn towards A.D. 1175. Cf. also Dimashqī, ed. Mehren, 147, and Nushat al-qulūb, GMS, 239. There are no islands in the immediate neighbourhood of Darband. Khanikoff, in Mélanges Asiatiques, iii, 131, identifies the Madder Island with the Sarā Island off Lankūrān, while Westberg, Jour. Min. Naur. Prosv., 1908, xiv, 7, thinks that the peninsula of Apsheron (Abshārān), on which Bākū stands, is meant here.

37. Siyāh-kūh, on the north-eastern coast of the Caspian, is now known under the Turkish name Manghīshlaq, on which see Barthold in EI. Īṣṭ., 219, says that the Turks “recently” seized Siyāh-kūh.

38. The MS. vocalizes Dīhistānān-sur [in which -sur is hardly connected with the name of the local prince نصر ‘Chūr]. It is tempting to read the name as *D.-sar, in which case it would mean “the promontory of D.”, cf. Miyānasar, the headland protecting the Gulf of Astarābād. The promontory must correspond to that of the Bay of Hasan-quli by the estuary of the Atrak, near the district of Dīhistān, “the country of the ancient people Ḍadā, Dahae”; cf. Hoffmann, Auszüge aus syrischen Akten, Leipzig, 1880, 277–81, and Minorsky, Meskhad-i Mestoriañ in EI. On the other hand, Dīhistānān-sur (or -sur) very probably is the place where Firdausī, ed. Vullers, i, 115, places the Dīzh-i Alānān, cf. Marquart, Komarene, 109, Minorsky, Tūrān, in EI. On the falcons caught on the islands lying opposite the Jurjān coast, see Mas‘ūdī, Mūrj, i, 423.

§ 5. The Mountains

This chapter is particularly important as reflecting the author’s conception of the surface of the Earth, see Map 1.

1. The Arabic name of al-Ta‘īn fil-bāhr most probably means only “protruding into the sea”; cf. Birūnī, Canon, 3rd climate: al-Mahdīya ʿalā anfin tā‘īn fil-bāhr. If eventually tā‘īn be taken in the sense of “striking” it may refer to some legend of the Alexandrian (?) lore. So Dimashqī (A.D. 1325), Cosmographie, SPb., 1866, p. 170, speaking of the Sea of Darkness (bāhr al-zulamāt) at the extreme limit of the inhabited world says: “on the coast towards the north, there are three stone statues cut in the rock and looking formidable. With their hands stretched towards the sea they show by their threatening air that there is no passage beyond there”. Cf. Māzik, Parageographische Elemente, who similarly explains Khuwarizmi’s al-Qal‘ at al-mudi‘a by a story found in the Abrégé des Merveilles, tr. by Carra de Vaux, p. 46. As the easternmost mountain of the world Ibn Sa‘īd (13th cent.)
names *jabal al-sahāb* "Mountain of the clouds", see Ferrand, *Relations*, p. 334. The additional details found in § 7, 1, though very vague, lend more reality to *al-Tā’in fil-bahr* and seem to refer to the locality between Shan-tung and Corea.

2. Sarandib = Ceylon is regarded as belonging to China, § 9, 23. Khuwārizmī, 40, calls the mountain of Ceylon (Adam’s peak) Ruhūn [Ssk. *rōhāqa* "ascent" and, as a proper name, "Adam’s Peak"]. The mention of the first cline, while as a rule our text does not mention the climes, is curious and points perhaps to Jayhānī. On the products of Ceylon cf. also § 9, 23. and Qazwīnī’s list, ‘Ajā‘īb al-majhūlaqāt, 112.

3. It is difficult to see how the Mānisā’s range is connected with a “corner” of Ceylon but under § 6, 1, it is again called the Sarandib mountain. Possibly Ceylon is here confused with Sumatra. The sections of the range are as follows:

a. Between the imaginary “corner” of Ceylon and the boundary of Hindūstān with China. This first part of the Mānisā must represent the longitudinal chains of the Malay peninsula.

b. Eastern frontier of Tibet towards China (the ranges running west of Ssū-chuan?). Rāng-Rong (?), on which see § 11, 1, must accordingly be looked for in the south-east of Tibet.

c. The stretch of the Mānisā where from the south-to-north direction it bends to the north-west, shutting off China from the Tibetan N.zvān (cf. § 11, 3), seems to correspond to the Nan-shan mountains separating Kan-su from the Koko-nor and Tsaidam.

d. The part of the range dividing Tūsmat (*Tusmat*) from China “up to the end of the desert (forming) the extremity of China” must be the Altīn-tagh and K’un-lun separating northern Tibet from the Taklamakan desert. Possibly instead of “between Tūsmat and China” (spelt جیح) we must read “between Tūsam and Khotan” (جیح). ² On a similar confusion in writing of جیح with جین see Barthold’s *Preface*, p. 25. On Tūsmat see § 11, 9. On Khotan § 9, 18.

e. Some connecting words must have fallen out in the description of the final portion of the Mānisā which is represented as stretching in the north into Turkestan towards Tarāz and Shiljī (on the latter see § 25, 93, and Ist., 283). This stretch must correspond to the westernmost ʿI(_:n-shan and, farther north, to the ranges forming the eastern barrier of the Jaxartes basin, for under § 6, 21, the sources of the Khatlām river (i.e. the Narin) are placed on the Mānisā. The mention of Tarāz and Shiljī seems to indicate for the last portion of the Mānisā the Alexandrovsky range forming the watershed between the Jaxartes and the rivers Chū, Talās, &c., which finally disappear in the sands. On the other hand, the real continuation of the ʿI(_:n-shan,

¹ This is the vocalization indicated in the text. The origin of the name remains obscure. In Tibetan Dr. Unkrig suggests *smad gnīṣ sa*, pronounced maṇiṣa with the approximate meaning of “the region of two depressions”, or “the range separating two depressions”.

² The name of China usually appears in our text as Chīnīstān.
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resp. its central and eastern parts, is only mentioned as “joined” to the Mánisâ (cf. infra, 7. Ighráj-art and 6. Tafqân).

Consequently the Mánisâ range is composed of the mountains skirting Tibet on the east, then looping round the southern and western part of Chinese Turkestan and finally forming, towards the north, the eastern barrier of the Jaxartes basin.

4. These are the ramifications of the Mánisâ, such as the mountains separating the basins of the Yang-tze and Huang-ho in China, the mountains of the Central Plateau of Tibet and the off-shoots of the Alexandrovsky range.

5. This statement presupposes the existence in our author’s source of some detailed list of the mountains of China.

6. Túrfân is perhaps a mis-spelling for تُرْفٍان Turfân. The mountains must be the eastern T’ien-shan (Boghdo)—separating Turfân (in the south) from Dzungaria (in the north). The capital of the Toghuzghuz Chinânj-kath (Khara-Khocho) stood near it, § 12, 1. The length of 4 farsakhs may refer only to the central peak.

7. This range is certainly the central T’ien-shan stretching north of Kuchâ, Aq-su, &c. The reading of the name Igrâj-art, in Turkish “the col of Igrâj”, is not certain but as under § 6, 5. it is vocalized Irghâj (with metathesis) the form Ighráj has been adopted. The mountain (and the pass) of Ighráj-art, situated “in the neighbourhood” of the river Khûland-ghûn (§ 6, 3.) is either the Muz-art, or the lower1 and more western Bedel-pass. More likely the Ighráj-art is the Muz-art, if we judge by the description under § 12, 17. (cf. note to § 6, 3.) and by the fact that the Ili river is said to rise from it (§ 6, 5.). The stage of Ighráj-art (§ 12, 17.) lay on the Toghuzghuz territory, but the mountain of Ighráj-art traversed the Yaghma territory (§ 13, 1.) as well. It is difficult to say whether ارگاح (under § 6, 5.; أرگاح توزان عارج) is responsible for the second part of توزان عارج (§ 15, 6.) which probably lay south of the Western T’ien-shan, see note to § 3, 17. Cf. also § 15, 3.

8. This range seems to run to the north-west of the Toghuzghuz territory, north of the Issik-kul, and consequently corresponds to the Küngey-Ala-tau from the western extremity of which2 a branch shoots off northwards, i.e. at a right angle. This branch separates the basins of the Ili and Chu, and on it are situated such passes as Kastek (7780 f.) &c.3 This “Ili-Chu range” seems to be the branch mentioned at the end of 8. as “stretching off towards the Khirkhiz country”. Several other passages in our book (see notes to § 14) also point to the presence of the Khirkhiz in the region north of Kastek, but though the meaning of the text is clear, the accuracy of the author’s statement cannot yet be controlled by any other contemporary evidence. The name Tûls (*Tûlás?) given in the text to the range is known

1 Alt. 14,600 feet.

2 More exactly, of the “Trans-Ili Alatau” which is a parallel range running to the north of the Küngey Ala-tau.

3 Farther north the height rapidly decreases and here the range is crossed now by the “Turksib” railway. See Maps v and vi.
to us only at an entirely different place. According to the *Zafar-nāma*, i, 495, in 792/1390 Timūr sent from Tashkent an expedition against the khān Qamar al-dīn. The troops marched north of the Issik-kul and crossed the rivers Ili and Qara-tal. On reaching the Irtish they learned that Qamar al-dīn had already crossed this latter river and taken the direction of Tūlas “in the woods of which sable-martens (*samūr*) and ermine (*qāqūm*) are found”. These details point certainly to the wooded Altai mountains and it is curious that the fauna mentioned by our author in his Tūlas resembles that of its namesake of the *Zafar-nāma*. If now we revert to Gardizi, who certainly utilized much the same sources as our author, we shall find a locality Mān.b.klū, abounding in “sable-martens, grey squirrels and musk-deer”, on the road leading (in a northerly direction) from the Toghuughuz territory to that of the Khirkhīz. The distances in Gardizi are vague (see note to § 14), but the Mān.b.klū mountain seems to stand at four days’ distance south (or south-west) of the Kūkūn (*Kūkmān*) mentioned also in the Orkhon inscriptions and identified with the mountains of the Upper Yenisei, cf. Barthold, *Report*, p. 110. In this case Mān.b.klū (with its peculiar fauna) must also refer to the Altai region. As the expansion of the Khirkhīz (§ 14) took place westwards it would be natural to find a tribe of theirs in the Altai. [So too I understand *qurba* Khirkhīz in 191 281.]

To sum up: geographically our author’s description of the range running north of the Issik-kul and its northern offshoot is correct, but he may have transferred to it some characteristics borrowed from a different source and belonging to some range lying farther to the east (Tūlas = Altai?). For an explanation see p. 286, n. 1.

9. In this important paragraph on the “Belt of the Earth” an attempt is made to link up the Central Indian hills with the highest ranges forming the north-eastern border of India; these again are linked up with the mountains north and south of the Oxus and finally with the Elburz. See the map “Orographical features” in *Imp. Gazetteer of India*, vol. xxvi, plate 4, and S. G. Burrard and H. H. Hayden, *A Sketch of the Geography and Geology of the Himalaya Mountains and Tibet*, revised edition, Delhi, 1933.

The Central Indian range is represented as starting from the western coast of India, stretching eastwards and then splitting into two so that its outer ramification (9 A) comprises the Himalaya, Karakorum, Pamir, and the ranges north of the Oxus, while its inner ramification (9 B) comprises the part of the Himalaya immediately north of Kashmir which is then connected with the Hindukush, &c.

The paragraph on the Central Indian hills must be examined in the light of the description of the Lesser Mihrān (§ 6, 16.) which in its lower course is said to flow through the limits of Kūlī. This Kūlī of Kanbāya must be clearly distinguished from the Kūlī estuary of the Indus (§ 6, 13.). It is difficult to decide whether the starting-point of the hills is taken south or north of the Narbadā, but the presumption is for the south, as the hills descend here much nearer to the coast and possess a peak of 5,261 ft. (Saler, south of the Tapti) which is the prominent landmark of the whole of Central
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India. Şamūr, or Şawur (indistinctly written), can hardly have anything to do with the coastal Şamūr mentioned in § 10, 14. Geographically it would be tempting to identify our Şamūr (ṣ = ⲓ?) with Chandor (Chandor hills west of Ajānta), after which the line of the hills takes in fact a north-eastern direction. Following our text, the range splits into two in, or beyond Hitāl (?). The latter (§ 10, 41.) is certainly a Transgangetic and Sub-Himalayan locality but our author, totally silent on the existence of the Ganges, does not explain how the hills coming from the west cross this great river. In spite of his opinion, the hills split off west of the Ganges. When their line south of the Narbadā and Tapti reaches the sources of the Narbadā, it bifurcates: the eastern branch follows the previous direction and forms the watershed between the Ganges and the rivers flowing more to the south towards the Bay of Bengal, while the other branch bends round the right bank of the Narbadā, following first a western direction (Vindhya range) and then a northern one (Aravalli range). This is presumably the situation which our source originally had in view.

9 A. The “northward” line (in reality stretching eastwards) was then supposed to join the Himalaya and skirt Tīthāl and Nīṭāl, cf. § 10, 41.-3.¹ Here comes a curious detail: the range is continued not by the mountains lying immediately north (i.e. north of the Sutlej gorge) but by the ranges lying farther east and forming the real watershed between the Trans-Himalayan part of the Indus basin and the plateau of Tibet. The further continuation of the range is formed by the Pamir mountains (Alay?) and the northern watershed of the Oxus (on Buttamān see Barthold, Turkestan, 82).

9 A a are the ramifications of 9 A, filling the extremely mountainous country north of the Upper Oxus; Khuttalān is the region lying between the Panj and the Vakhsh (§ 6, 8.-9.) while Buttamān stretches between the Vakhsh and Samarqand (§ 6, 10.-11). The two branches of Khuttalān seem to correspond to the Trans-Alay and Alay ranges stretching respectively south and north of the upper Vakhsh (cf. note to § 6, 18.). The range between the Daryāzha and Chaghāniyān is that of Ḥišār, which forms the southern watershed of the Zarafshān in the basin of which both Samarqand and Būkhārā are situated.

9 B. corresponds to the Vindhya–Aravalli range forming the southern barrier of the Ganges basin (which was under the sway of the king of Qinnauj of the Gurjara dynasty, cf. § 10, 46.). On the impossibility of its branching off from Hitāl (Hītal) v.s. 9 A. The continuation of the Aravalli range is the watershed of the Ganges and the Indus, and consequently the dominions of the “continental Jāba” (cf. § 10, 45.)² must be looked for in the basin of the Indus, and probably south of Kashmir. The further extension of 9 B must comprise the northern part of the Great Himalaya (i.e. the range west of the upper course of the Indus, towering over Kashmir), the

¹ Our text, v.s., line 5, presupposes the splitting off of the main range in Hitāl and the latter is not mentioned again under 9 A.

² Bordering on the possessions of ʿal-Jurz (§ 10, 46.), evidently identical with the king of Qinnauj.
watershed between the sources of the Indus and the Oxus and the Hindukush. The latter is then linked up with the ranges of northern Persia, but the Elburz range is not continued beyond Gilân. The Q.s.k (*Qasak?) mountain belonging to 9b is not mentioned in any other known source. No particular precision is expected from its location in, or near the kingdom of Lhrz (Jurz, § 10, 46.), of which, according to § 10, 57., Kashmir was a dependency. This mountain *grosso modo* stands for the watershed between the sources of the Indus and the Oxus (or more particularly the Khurnáb, see note to § 6, 14.). The name *Qasak* is curious. Ptolemy, vi, 15, mentions a locality called *Kuola xópa* in the Scythia-outside-the-Imaos, *i.e.* east of the range separating the Pamir plateau from Késhgharia. In § 6, 14. the Qasak "is also called *Küh-i yakh* (*i.e.* Mountain of Ice)", which looks like a Persian translation of the native term. The Turkish equivalent of this would be *Muz-tagh*, which is a common term in the region: Muz-tagh-ata, west of Yarkand, Muz-tagh, south of Khotan, to say nothing of the Muz-art, north-west of Kuchá. The nearest identification would be with the Muz-tagh-ata but the latter lies too much to the north for our purpose (on 9a, not on 9b) and the decisive indication as to the situation of Qasak is the story quoted under § 6, 14.

9ba. Here we are in the region which our author knows very closely, though his description of it is involved. He rightly considers the locality of Sán-va-Cháryak (now Sangchárák), lying on the Āb-i Safí from Sar-i Pul, as the point near which the main chain splits off. He first describes the range of Siyāh-kōh following the Herat-river on the south [but commits an error in saying that Aspúzar (Ispízar) lies north of it]; he further connects it with the mountains of southern Khorásán and follows them up to the region of Níshápúr and Sabzavār between which towns the line of the hills passes to the north of the great Khorásán road. [More correctly, this passage takes place between Mashhad and Níshápúr.] See Map viii.

9bb. Here our author describes the central part of the knot of the Hindúkush and Kōh-i Bábā mountains with their southward ramifications towards the headwaters of the Kábul river and the Hilmand. The valley near Ghur resembling a finger-ring must be Dasht-i Návur (some 50 km. west of Ghazní) which has no outlet. [Návur (nor) in Mongolian means "lake".]

9bc describes the northern branch of the mountains (Band-i Turkistán) starting from near Sán-va-Cháryak. On the localities mentioned see notes to § 23, 53. &c. In the west the Band-i Turkistán is linked with the outer

---

1 In reality the Hindúkush continues the Kara-korum range, which according to our author belongs to 9a and not 9b.

2 The language to which the name [as well as -gōhā, *v.s.*; 3] belongs remains mysterious. One might recall at this occasion the still puzzling Scythian name of the Caucasian mountains quoted by Pliny, *Natur. hist.*, 6, 50, "Croucasis, nive candidus", cf. Marquart, *Woher stammt der Name Kaukasus?*, in *Caucasia*, fasc. 6, 1. Teil, 1930, p. 31. For the second element of the name cf. also the Greek forms *Kaukaos, Kaukaos*.

3 In this description *miyán* does not seem to mean that the range separates the points mentioned but simply that it stretches along them. Cf. p. 63, line 37.
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(northern) range of Khorāsān separating the latter from the Atak (‘the skirt of the mountains’, i.e. the Transcaspian province, now Turkmenistān).

The author skips the valley of the upper Atrak [which he confuses with the Gurgān, § 6, 50.] and passes on to the range stretching south of the Atrak. On the south-western face of this latter range is situated the gorge from which rises the Gurgān river and which was known under the name of Dīnār-zārī. Ist. 217, gives the following itinerary from Jurjān to Khorāsān: from Jurjān to Dīnār-zārī one marches; thence to Amītāلا (Armut ‘Ali?) ditto; thence to Ajugh (? ) ditto; thence to Sibdāst ditto; thence to Isfarā’in ditto. In the Tārikh-i Bayhāqi (Morley), p. 255, Dīnār-zārī is described as a gorge (sar-darra) on the way from Nishāpur to Gurgān; Zahir al-din, Tārikh-i Ṭabaristān (ed. Dorn), p. 19, describes Dīnār-chārī as the eastern frontier of Ṭabaristān. Nowadays the gorge is called Dahāni-yi Gurgān.

The “mountain on the other side of the valley” is that stretching along the left bank of the Gurgān river and separating Gurgān (in the north) from Isfarāyin (in the south). Farther to the west it is continued by the Mazandarān mountains. The author still distinguishes the two ranges: his 9b is the range of Mazandarān as seen from the south (from Simnān, Rayy, &c.) while his 9c overlooking Āmol is the northern face of the same orographic system. According to his notion the two branches meet in the region of Rayy. Between the two ranges must then lie the Mazandarān highlands. Such a view can be explained by the intricate character of the Mazandarān mountains sloping down towards the Caspian in several gradients. See A. F. Stahl’s map of the Caspian mountains (Petermann’s Mitteilungen, 1927, Heft 7–8), utilized also in the annex to Rabino’s Mazandarān.

I have not found elsewhere the mention of the Arabic term Mintaqat al-Ard in the sense in which our author uses it. But a similar conception is found in I.H. who, pp. 109–11, gives an account of the mountain stretching along “the spine of the earth” (jabal alā ẓahr al-ard) which “begins in the East in China, (where) it comes out from the Ocean, and (directs itself) to Vakhkhañ. It traverses Tibet, in its western parts and not its centre, and the eastern parts of the Kharlukh land, until it penetrates into Farghāna which is within the Islamic limits. The ridge (sadr) of the mountain stretches over Farghāna towards the mountain of Buttam situated south of Ushrūsana. . . . Then it directs itself towards Samarqand Skirting it also on the south, goes towards . . . Kishsh and Naṣaf and the region of Zamm. Then it crosses the Jayhūn and . . . goes westwards to Jūzjan . . . and over Tālaqān to Marw ar-rūdā and Ṭūs . . . leaving Nisabūr to the east [cf. supra 9b a]. Then it stretches to Rayy . . . while the mountains of Jurjān, Ṭabaristān, Gilān and Daylam branch off from it. Then it joins the

1 Napier, The northern frontier of Khorāsān, G7, 1876, shows on his map “Dasht-i Armūt-Ali” between the northern source of the Gurgān and the pass of Simnāghān.

2 The idea may be of Zoroastrian origin. Cf. Bundahishn, tr. by E. W. West, Oxford, 1880, ch. xii, where the Alburz is represented as stretching “around this earth and connected with the sky” whereas the other mountains, 244 in number, “have grown out of Alburz.”
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mountains of Ādharbāyjān.” It stretches on the right of the road from Rayy to Ḥulwān, then turns north towards Takrit and Amid sending off its branches into Armenia and towards the Caucasus (al-Qabq). Then it continues towards Mar‘ash where it joins the range coming from Syria. Through the latter the principal range is united to the North African mountains which stretch on to the Atlantic.

If the general idea of I.Ḥ. and of our author is practically the same, they differ considerably in details. The H.‘Ā. gives much more exact information on Tibet, India, the region of the Hindūkush and the Caucasus. On the other hand, our author is silent on the supposed African extension of the Syrian mountains.

1o. The Kūfij mountains, according to our author, occupied an extensive area between Jiruf and the sea, cf. Iṣṭ., 164. They correspond *grosso modo* to the ranges which separate the closed basin of Jaz-Moriyān from the sea, such as Kūh-i Bashākirt (6,800 feet), Kuhrān (7,095 feet), &c. On the Kūfij cf. § 28, 7. The Bārijān (Iṣṭ., 167, Bāriz) separates Jiruf from Bam. The highlands of Abū Ghānim, according to Iṣṭ., 164, lay north of the Kūfij, and according to our § 28, 7. they must be the mountains to the south of Khānū (Kūh-i Dasht-gird?). The silver mountain west of Jiruf towards Khabr is probably the Siyāh Kūh. See 1:2,000,000 Map of Persia.

11. South-east of the Naftlake in Fārs there is a knot of mountains where several chains running north-west to south-east unite. Our author arbitrarily makes the mountain shutting off Fāsā from Dārāb the starting-point of a range which, after a sweep to the east towards Kirmān, turns in the opposite direction of south-east to north-west. This range is then brought into connexion with that forming the western border of Isfahān, with that of Northern Luristān, with the Alvand and further with the ranges of Persian Kurdistān and Ādharbāyjān. The evidence for the locality of Rūdḥān (on the road from Kirmān to Yazd) has been examined by Le Strange, *o.c.*, 286, where Rūdḥān is placed near Gulnābād. Tās (?) in our text corresponds to Unās which is identified with Bahrāmābād, but the reading of the names عناس and تاس, &c., is not certain, cf. Iṣṭ., 102 d. Abū Dulaf’s Karaj lay on the road from Isfahān to Hamadān near the present-day Sulṭānābād, cf. § 31, 5. The Sahand mountain (between Marāgha and Tabrīz) is evidently considered as the northern end of the range.

The author’s idea was to describe the inner chain of the western mountains of Persia, as opposed to the outer range stretching between the Persian Gulf and the Ararat. The idea is not inaccurate, but some misunderstandings in details were natural. Even Iṣṭ., 97, had to give up the task of describing in detail the mountains of his native Fārs “because there are few towns in Fārs where there is not a mountain, or whence one cannot see some mountain”. Our author has translated the first part of this statement word for word. The Kūh-Gilū (*Gélūya*) mountains are usually reckoned to Fārs. The present day Kūh-Gilū is reduced to the territory between Bāšt and Behbehān, cf. Minorsky, *Luristān*, in EI.
Commentary

12. The mountain stretching between the Kimak (cf. § 18) and Khirkhiz (cf. § 14) looks like the Altai near which the Irtish (§ 6, 42.) rises. The Altai is further supposed to be linked up with the hills standing west of the Irtish, among which the K.n.dāv.r mountain must be sought. Barthold reads this name Kāndīr (?) and Marquart Komanen, 92, 205: Kānd-ūr (?) and Kundāvar (with a reference to Persian kundāvar “army-leader, hero”). I now feel inclined to identify K.n.dāv.r with the mountain described by Biruni, Chronology, ed. Sachau, 264 (transl. 255): “similar to this little lake (i.e. Sabzarūd, v.s. § 3, 27.) is a sweet-water well in the district of the Kimak in a mountain called مکر as large as a great shield. The surface of its water is always on a level with its margin. Frequently a whole army drinks out of this well and still it does not decrease as much as the breadth of a finger. Close to this well there are the traces of the foot, two hands with the fingers, and two knees of a man who had been worshipping here; also the traces of the foot of a child and of the hooves of an ass. The Ghuzzī Turks worship those traces when they see them.”

Marquart’s restoration, Komanen, 101, of Mnkr as *mīn kūl “thousand lakes” is inadequate from the point of view of Biruni’s description. One can assume that in Gardizi K.n.d.āw.r the alif is only a tribute to the Persian popular etymology *kundāvar [most suspect with regard to such a remote Turkish territory as ours]. Then كندور would look very much like مکر. But even supposing that the two names are identical it is not easy to decide which form must be given preference. For Mnkr we have the parallel of a Qipchaq clan مکر which quoted in al-Warrāq (d. A.D. 1318), Marquart ibid. 157, and the name of a Kurdish tribe Mangur which is very probably of Turkish or Mongol origin, see Minorsky Sa’udj-bulak in EI. The form K.n.ūr (*)k.ūr) has in its favour the parallel of a Turkish title on which v.i., note to § 22, and also some resemblance to the present name Kāngūr mentioned in the note to § 18.

As regards the location of the mountain we must consider the possibility of the road to the Kimak (§ 18) having in the course of time changed its direction. If K.n.dāv.r was found on the original route of which the starting point was near Tarāz (Talas), Marquart’s identification of it with the Ulu-tau is still the best. This mountain has a peak of 631 metres = 2,070 feet and forms the watershed between the Sarl-su and Tars-āqan, the latter being one of the feeders of the Ishim. If, on the other hand, the route started from the lower course of the Jaxartes (Gardizi, 83) it would be necessary to look for the K.n.dāv.r between the sources of the more northern Turghai and the western loop of the Ishim, though the heights in this locality are insignificant. Finally if Gardizi’s route was imagined to run northwards (towards some other, or some later, part of the Kimak territory) the K.n.dāvar could be identified with the Mugojar mountains (see note to § 18). [On the name v.i., p. 308, note 1.]

13. The Savałān, which stands 16,800 feet, can be called small only in the sense that it does not belong to a long chain.

14. See Herzfeld, Bārimma, in EI. The name Bārimma was applied to
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The present-day Ḥamrin where the Tigris cuts the latter south of the estuary of the Lesser Zāb and north of Takrit. The Ḥamrin is a long range of reddish hills following on the west the border range of the Persian plateau. Ist., 75, vaguely says that “in the east” it stretches to the limits of Kīrmān; and that “it is (also) the mountain of Māsabadhān”. From this it is evident that the Bārīmā was confused with the southern part of the western outer range of Persia (on the inner range see above 11.). Our author is entirely wrong when he takes the “Bārimā” for the starting-point of the northern part of the same outer range of Persia (i.e. the present “frontier range” between Persia on the one hand and ʿIrāq and Turkey on the other). In the north the connexion of the Ararat with the Qara-bāgh (highlands west of Barda’ā) is imaginary.

16. The Jūdī stands in Bohtān, north of the Tigris and north-east of Jazīra-ibn-ʿOmar. On its association with Noah’s ἀρχαὶ ἄρτιον see Streck, Dūdī, in EI and Markwart, Südarmenien, pp. 349, 352. The town of Mārdīn is situated on a cliff at an altitude of 1,190 metres and its fortress lies 100 metres higher above it. The range of the Mārdīn mountains was called in antiquity Masius, or ᾿Ωθάλης. See Minorsky, Mārdīn, in EI.

17. Tīhāma is the low coastal region along the Red Sea overlooked by a long range of mountains. Ghawwān is the mountain on which ῾Ωθαὶ is situated, Ist., 19. The Shibām mountain is situated at 2 days distance towards the south-west of Ṣanāʿa, see Grohmann, Shibām I, in EI. The mountain “at the end of Tīhāma” is Mudhaikhira, see Ist., 24, where both its length of 20 fars. and its conquest by Muḥammad b. Fadl are mentioned; cf. I. Kh., 106, v.s. 21. The two mountains of the ῾Ωτy territory, in Central Arabia, have nothing to do with Tīhāma. Their names are ῾Αγα and ῾Σαλμ, see Yaqūt, ii, 20 (Jabalān), i, 122 and iii, 120.

18. This composite range of mountains consists of the Sinai and the Syrian mountains, of the Armenian Taurus, of the Lesser Caucasus (Alagez < Armenian Aragats, &c.) and of the Eastern Caucasus. The term “Qaboq” covers the principalities of Daghestan. From the Sinai to the Caspian our author's range runs approximately south-west to north-east, but in the neighbourhood of the Caspian it changes its direction sharply running now from SE. to NW., and follows the eastern (outer) line of the Daghestan mountains, grosso modo from Darband to the Dariah pass. But then instead of continuing straight to the Black Sea, the range, in our author's opinion, takes a northern direction across the eastern part of Russia (stretching, as it seems, west of the Volga). This imaginary longitudinal range explains some of the puzzling statements in our text, cf. §§ 47 and 50, where a “Khazarian mountain” separates on the east the Khazarian Pechenegs from the Khazars; § 46, where a mountain is mentioned to the east of the Mirvāt; § 53, where a mountain is mentioned west of the V.n.nd.r. It is possible that this mountain represents the watershed between the Caspian and Black seas and that its extension to the north is due to the fact that our author wrongly moved to the east the peoples Mirvāt and V.nnd.r who were divided by the Carpathians. This latter
range was then imagined to stand somewhere in Eastern Russia near the Volga!


18 a. The Taurus in Asia Minor.

18 b. The central and western part of the Great Caucasian range is represented as starting from Daghestan within the loop which the principal (outer) range is supposed to make here. The real Caucasus, treated here as a branch of that outer range, stretches west to the Georgian (Black) Sea. Lower down (22.) it is called “Georgian mountain”. See Map xi.

18 c. This offshoot of the great range (18.) starting from the middle Sarīr in an easterly direction corresponds to the lofty chain (heights reaching 13,656 feet) which separates the basin of the Qoy-su from that of the Terek.

18 d. The last branch following a westerly direction seems to be that of the Qazbek (16,546 feet) overlooking the Darial pass. Of the two castes the first (18 c) is perhaps that mentioned under § 49, i., while the second (18 d) corresponds to § 48, 3., but the details must have become confused. Like the rest of the data on the western shore of the Caspian, this paragraph contains some information which would be vainly sought elsewhere, even at a much later period.

19. This mountain very probably represents the Urals. Curiously enough neither under § 18, nor under § 44, are the territories of the Kimāk and Rūs represented as contiguous, and § 5, 19. may mean only that the mountain at one end reached the Rūs and at the other the Kimāk. The Kimāk territory is supposed to stretch down to the Volga in the west (§ 18) and the Urals to stand between the basins of the Irtish and Volga, cf. note to § 6, 42. and 43. Under § 44 the Rūs territory is bordered in the east by the Pecheneg Mountains which may refer exactly to the Urals (on the space separating the Rūs from the Kimāk).

20. Cf. Wensinck, *Aṣḥāb al-Kahf* in EI. The Seven Sleepers’ cave, according to I. Kh., 106, lay in Kharama, a district situated between Amorion and Nicaea, at 4 days’ distance from the Cappadocian fortress Qura. Another Muslim tradition places the cave in Asfūs. This latter name has been interpreted either as the Ephesus of the Christian tradition, or as Arabissos (Arab. *Absus*, Turk. *Yarpuz*) situated at the foot of the Kūrd-daghī. Cf. Yāqūt, i, 91: “Absus, ruined town near Ablastayn [now Albistān]; from it were the Companions of the Cave”, Khuwārizmī, 128, calls Ephesus *al-fāsim* and Birūnī in his *Canon*.

21. If by the town (province?) of Afrakhūn (cf. § 74, 10.) Paphlagonia is meant, the mountains in question are the Pontic Alps.

22. On the Georgian mountain see above 18 b, but the details on the mountain possessing mines are too vague.

24.درهمي looks like a mis-spelling of *Buwait* on which see *Buwait* in EI. I am obliged to Mr. R. Guest for this suggestion and for a quotation from Ibn Duqmāq, iii, p. 3, who remarks that Abwait is situated in رأس الجبل الذي يصعد منه إلى التيوم, i.e. “on the top of the bank (of the Nile) whence
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the road goes up to Fayyûm". [The difficulty is that in our author's two principal sources (I.Kh. and Išt.) Abwayî (or Buwayî) is not found. I now see that Prince Youssouf Kamal (v. i., § 39), p. 665, restores باریق as *أبريق. The translation must accordingly run: "(this mountain) also starts straight from the Nubian frontier and follows a northerly direction down to the Fayyûm region, until it reaches the Rif" (i.e. the fertile region near the delta). This seems to be a satisfactory reading. On the name أبريق see note to § 6, 49.]

25. If the author means here the Seleucia (now Selejfe) situated north-west of the Gulf (khalîf) of Iskenderun, this mountain corresponds to the Cilician Taurus.

26. Here the eastern watershed is meant, which separates the basins of the Guadalquivir, Guadiana, and Tagus from the rivers flowing eastwards towards the Mediterranean. Shantariya corresponds to Shantabriya whence, according to Išt., 42, the Tagus comes, cf. § 41, 4. Then the watershed between the Tagus and the Guadiana is taken for the continuation of the range (in the opposite direction NE. to SW.). This watershed is naturally continued by the Sierra de Toledo.

27. It is quite natural that after the range stretching south of the Tagus the one stretching north of it (Sierra de Gredos–Guadarrama) should be mentioned. Coria is more or less suitable for the southern point of it, but Turjâla (Truxillo) situated south of the Tagus on the slope of the Sierra de Guadalupé (which continues towards the south the line of the mountains of Toledo), is entirely out of place. Morón (Maurûn) would be a suitable point to mark the northern limit of the range starting from Coria.

28. The Balkans, cf. § 42, 17. The name Balqan belonging originally to the mountain east of the Krasnovodsk bay, on the eastern shore of the Caspian, was probably transferred to the Balkans by the Turcomans who remembered the toponymy of their ancient country; see Barthold, Balkhân, in EI. Cf. note to § 3, 5.

29. The reading of جبل القمر "Moon Mountain" corresponds exactly to Ptolemy's τὸ τῆς Σελήνης δρός αφ' οὗ ὑποδέχοντα τὰς χιόνας αὐτοῦ Νείλου λίμνας. However the reading of القمر in the later geographical literature of the Arabs has given rise to some controversy, see Ferrand, Relations, p. 330. Ibn Sa'id (circa a.d. 1208–86) warns explicitly against the pronunciation with a fatha (*qamar) to which he prefers a form with u (*Qumr, Qumar?), but this evidently with the intention of justifying his very interesting theory about the inner Asiatic people قمر (Khmer?) who after having ousted from Central Asia went to Indo-China, then colonized the island *Qumr (Madagascar) and finally passed over to the continent and occupied the slopes of the Jabal-al-Q.îr, Ferrand, o. l., p. 317.

§ 6. The Rivers

This chapter too (v. s. § 5) is very important as facilitating a more exact location of numerous places.

1 Or: "runs straight in a northerly direction".
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1. The river of Khumdān (§ 9, 1.) is evidently the Huang-ho and not its tributary the Wei-ho on which Ch'ang-an-fu (Hsi-an-fu) really stands. The distances are of course too short. On the Sarandib mountain (Mānisā) cf. § 5, 3. The Huang-ho comes from the region of lakes on the north-eastern border of Tibet. The swamp on its middle course is imaginary, unless the author thinks that through the Lob-nor the Huang-ho is connected with the Tarim, vi. i. 3. In this case he describes the same river twice over using under 3. some unknown original source and reproducing under 1. the information known already to Khuvārizmī. The latter, p. 125, mentions the river چاپسosas rising from the mountain of the river مسماس, and then flowing through a swamp (بَاتِیْحًا), after which the river crosses the City of China (madīnat al-Ṣīn) and disembogues into the sea. Our author substitutes for this vague “City of China” (= Σήρα νησσοπολίς, Ptolemy, vi, 16, 8) the name of Khumdān, and for the indication of longitude and latitude his simplified reckoning by day-marches.

2. The name Kisāu (کیسی)، if emended into *کئسی = K. nsw, might be confronted with Kin-sha-kiang, the principal source of the Yangtze, rising in the north-eastern part of Tibet, south of the K'un-lun range. The reading *Ghiyān (کیان) “The River”, as the Yangtze is usually called) is confirmed by Gardīzī’s Qiyān. On the names of the provinces see notes to § 9.

3. This river is an imaginary combination of the Tarim and Huang-ho of which the latter is represented as a continuation of the former through the Lob-nor.

The description of the Tarim proper contains several curious details. The sources of the river of Khotan are placed in the localities of *Wajākh (cf. § 11, 12.), Bariha (cf. § 11, 13.) and Kūskān. Of these at least بَریا which presents some resemblance to the col of Brinjak (= بَریجک) in the mountains south of Khotan (evidently understood under the Mānisā, v. s. note to § 5, 3d.).

The names of the three tributaries of the Khotan (Wajākh) river look Iranian with their terminations in -and; the element -ghūn stands apparently for “river”, but in what language? The obvious course is to identify the three rivers with the principal streams joining the Khotan river, i.e. respectively with the rivers of Yārkand, Kāshghar, and Aq-su. One cannot, however, ignore the difficulties raised by the eventual identification of Khūland-ghūn (vi. i. 5. and 7. and §§ 12, 5. and 13.) with Aq-su. The mountain of Ighrāj-art (“the col of Ighrāj”), located by our author “in the neighbourhood” of Khūland-ghūn, as explained in the note to § 5, 7., looks more like the higher eastern Muz-art, than the lower western Bedel.

1 Khuvārizmī adds that another river rising also from the “mountain of the river مسماس” falls into the same swamp.
2 Perhaps بَریا, Ptolemy, vi, 16.
3 A remote parallel of the name کورکسکان could be that of the Kashtūl glacier situated above the locality of Nisa [south of Khotan].
4 The names of the rivers Gunt [*Ghund], in the Pamir, and Tasghun (?), south of Kāshghar, may be recalled here as parallels. [Or ghūn = Pers. gūn “colour”?]
5 On the earlier names of Aq-su see note to § 15, 15.
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pass situated above the sources of the Aq-su, i.e., p. 296. On the other hand, the town of Ark (Δλ) belonging to the Toghuqghuz (§ 12, 5.) is said to be situated near Khuland-ghūn. In the itinerary quoted by Gardizī, 91, Δλ (probably corresponding to our Δλ) is placed to the east of Kuchā, see note to § 12, 5. These considérations suggest for Khuland-ghūn an easterly position in the neighbourhood of the Muz-art pass, though here again we are confronted by some difficulty for neither the Kuchā nor any other river in this region now reaches the Tarim, whatever may have been the case in the past.

If the Khuland-ghūn is to be placed so far east it is possible that the other two rivers should also be moved to the western T’ien-shan and this would entail further uncertainty about the localities of Gh.zā and Khānkh between which the affluents join the *Wajākh river. Under § 11, 21., Gh.zā is placed “at the very beginning of Tibet from the Toghuqghuz side, near the river of Kuchā”, but we shall presently see that the use of this last term involves us in fresh complications.

The river Tarim is further represented as continued beyond the Lob-nor (v. s. 1.) by the Huang-ho. The Chinese themselves were responsible for this belief: “This river [Sita = Tarim] on the east enters the sea. Passing through the Salt Lake [Yen-tse = Lob-nor] it flows underground and emerging at the Tsih-shi mountains [west of Lan-chou?] it is the origin of our [Yellow] river”, Hsūn-Tsang, Life (Beal), p. 199, less clearly in Hsūn-Tsang, Life (Julien), p. 273, cf. Richthofen, China, i, 318 and Chavannes, in T'oung-Pao, 1907, p. 168, note 4. Consequently the sentence: “thence [from Lob-nor] it flows (down) to the limits of Kuchā, then passes through the province of Kūr.sh and the province of F.raj. and empties itself into the Eastern Ocean”, ought to come under § 6, 1. which, however, is based on a different source.

Following our text (§ 6, 3.) the “limits of Kuchā (sic)” where the Tarim received the name of “Kuchā river” lie downstream (i.e., E. or S.) of the swamp of *Sha-chou by which only the Lob-nor can be meant. In principle it would be embarrassing to surname any reach of the Tarim after the well-known town of Kuchā (§ 9, 10.) which lies on a river of its own rising from the western T’ien-shan and losing itself (at present!) short of the Tarim. Thus we are led to admit that by Kuchā كاش our author may mean a different locality, namely Kuchā كاش (see note to § 9, 5.) which most likely is to be sought on the real course of the Huang-ho, near Lan-chou-fu. If so “the river of Kuchā” must refer not to the Tarim, but to the Huang-ho (cf. § 7, 2.), and Ghazā is then to be placed accordingly.

The curious passage on the ‘akka-birds nesting on the banks of the Tarim can hardly be connected with what Idrisī, i, 502, says about the lake

1 Δλ is certainly *Sha-chou [§ 9, 15]. Sanju, near Khotan, is out of the question.

2 It is true that the Huang-ho [v.s. 1.] is called “river of Khumdān” though this is geographically inexact.

3 In this case the tashīd over the first form may be a simple mis-spelling of the final ئ of the second form.

4 Under § 7, 3. the Lob-Nor is called جلالة رود كاش but it remains a moot point whether the “swamp” is called after the
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of which he places somewhere in the Toghuazhuzhuz country: “on voit voler au dessus de sa surface quantité d’oiseaux d’une espèce particulière qui pond et qui fait ses petits au dessus de l’eau. Cet oiseau ressemble à une huppe (hud-hud) et son plumage est de diverses couleurs.”

4. The reference to “this” fortress (not mentioned before!) indicates that this paragraph is copied from a description of Tibet. K.rān is another name of Lhasa (see notes to § 11). In this case the river in question must be the left affluent of the Brahmaputra on which Lhasa stands. This would agree with the statement that the river comes from the Mānīsā, i.e. evidently from its western face (cf. note to § 5, 3). The detail about its being a branch of the Yangtze is an obvious misunderstanding.

5. The Ilā (i.e. Ilä) river, emptying itself into the Balkhash (not the Issik-kul!), rises from the corner formed by the T’ien-shan and the southern Dzungarian range. Kāshgharī, i, 85, writes Ilā (Ilä) and calls the river “Jayhūn of the Turkish country”. On the Ighrāj-art (central T’ien-shan) see § 5, 7; and § 6, 3.

6.-12. The system of the Amū-Daryā (Oxus). See Barthold, Turkestan, ch. 1; Le Strange, The Lands, ch. xxxi; Barthold, Irrigation, pp. 71–102; Barthold, Amū-daryā, in EI.; Tājkhīstān (by several authors in Russian) Tashkent, 1925, map. On the source of the Oxus, v. i. 14. See Map ix.

6.–7. Our author distinguishes clearly between the Jayhūn and Kharnāb (خَرْنَاب) of which the former (flowing immediately north of Bolor) is certainly the Vakhān river (Panj), and the latter must be the Murghāb, which rises to the east of the Vakhān and after a north-eastern sweep crosses the Pamir and joins the Panj near Bārtang. Our writer is right in attaching more importance to the Kharnāb-Murghāb, though for some time this river has been dammed up at Sarez (following the 1911 earthquake). Išt., 296, confuses the two headwaters: “the principal stream (‘amūd) of the Jayhūn is called Jaryāb (جَرْيَاء) and rises in Vakhkhan”.

See Map iv.

8. The Kulāb river (Kchi Surkhāb) is composed of two branches: Yakh-su (=Iranian Akhbār, cf. Išt., 296, Akhshuvā) and Qizil-su. The village Pārkhar still exists. Munk = Baljūvān, on the Qizil-su, Hubuk = Hubāq, south of Kulāb, on the Yakh-su, cf. Barthold, Turkestan, 68–9. Our author considers this river quite correctly as forming one drainage area, while Išt., 296, presents Pārkhar as a separate stream. On the contrary, our author forgets the following river Andijārāgh, on which see § 26, 3. I.R., 93, speaking of the course of the Vakhshāb and the Vakhkhāb (=the Vakhān river, Oxus) mentions south of the latter a rustaq of the Upper Tukhāri-stān called پُرگَر (Pārgār) i.e. Pārghar and this form led astray Marquart, Erānīahr, 234, and Barthold, see § 23, 69. Our text very rightly places Pārghar to the north of the river, therefore the name found in I.R. must most probably be restored as پُرگَر (Pārgār), cf. Išt., 275, 339. Ārhan

which flows towards Kujā”. The distinction between this stream and a river which is mentioned immediately after it is strange. On the route v. i., p. 255.
was the well-known place where the Oxus was crossed and lay undoubtedly on the left bank, upstream from and opposite the estuary of Vakhshāb, Isf., 296. On Āhran see Barthold, *Turkestan*, 69, note 7 and cf. note to § 26, 9.

9. Vakhshāb, now Vakhsh (called in the upper course Surkhāb), a powerful river coming from the Alai valley (Vakhsh mountains). In Greek *Ωκός < Vakhsh has become the name for the whole of the Amū-daryā. 

10. This river undoubtedly is the Kāfir-Nīhān which flows between the Vakhsh and Surkhān, Barthold, *Turkestan*, 72; Marquart, *Wehrot*, 89–90. The modern name of the river is due to the village of Kāfir-Nīhān¹ lying on its upper course. On the Kumijās see § 26, 10. Nūdiz (nau-diz “The New Fort”) lay probably on the lower course of the Kāfir-Nīhān, see note to § 26, 5.

11. On Chaghāniyān see § 25, 25. The river is now called Surkhān, Barthold, *Turkestan*, 72–5. Under § 25, 31, * исследуй (Regar?)* is placed on the Nīhān river, which is also mentioned in I.R., 93 (but wrongly considered as a source of the Kāfir-Nīhān). The middle one of the Surkhān’s headwaters is still called Dara-yi Nīhān. On the easternmost of the Surkhān headwaters lay probably Hamvārān (§ 25, 32.) which Marquart, *Wehrot*, 62, identifies with Qara-tagh, whereas Kasāvān (v.i. note to § 25, 32.) must have belonged to the Kāfir-Nīhān basin.

12. The form دمام دمام درطم confirms that the Arabic spelling درطم in I.Kh., 33, and I.R., 93, is based only on a popular etymology (“the Lion river”). Marquart, *Brānakahr*, 230, has shown its identity with Ptolemy’s Δάρυος. Valvāli (§ 23, 73.) has been long identified with Qunduz, which lies between the rivers Dōshi (Surkh-āb), coming from the south-west, and the Ṭalāqān river, coming from the south-east. The latter, according to I.R., 93 and Maq., 303, was composed of two sources درطم and درطم. The names (several variants) may mean “Lower river” (* jil-āb, cf. Persian zūr “below” ) and “Upper river” (bar-āb), and the rivers correspond respectively to the Varsaj and the Ishkūmish rivers. Of the two large rivers uniting below Qunduz, the Dōshi is by far the more important. It flows precisely between Qunduz and Khulm. Our text leaves no doubt that Le Strange’s identification of the درطم with the Kokcha is wrong.

13.–16.: Rivers of India, among which the Ganges (Khuwarizmi, 133, and Mas‘ūdi, *Murūj*, 1, 214: *janjīj*) has been entirely overlooked, though I.R., 89, who uses mostly the same sources as the *H.-i-Ā.,* mentions the *Gang.* The Ganges is disregarded to such an extent that the Vindhyā mountains are supposed to join the Himalaya (§ 5, 9.).


13. The Kābul river is considered as the principal course of the Indus. It is represented as being formed by the waters of Lamghān and Dunptūr (§ 10, 54–55); on Nīhār < *Nagārahār = Jalalābād* see § 10, 50.

¹ Nīhān may be related to Nīhām, though the latter is the name of one of the Surkhān’s headwaters. However, the upper courses of the Kāfir-Nīhān and Surkhān form one single stretch of highlands, which fact may also explain I.R.’s (p. 93) confusion of the two rivers, Barthold, *i.e.*, and Marquart, *i.e.*
Multān is out of place both here and under 14., as lying on the Chenāb (though our author speaks only of the “confines” of Multān). The locality جهان near which the Indus disembogues into the sea is undoubtedly the Kori creek which is in fact the ancient estuary of the Indus, see map in H. Cousens, Antiquities of the Sind, quoted in § 27.

14. This is the principal course of the Indus, here considered as a left affluent of 13. On the Qasak mountain see § 5, 9 b. The story of the fountain springing from its summit (told under 15.) is probably inspired by I.Kh., 173. Masʿūdī, Murūj, i, 212, denounces the error of those who make the Jayhūn flow into the Mihrān, but himself seems to incorporate a headwater of the Indus (the river of Yasin-Gilgit) into the basin of the Oxus, see Marquart, Wehrot, ch. iii: “Oxus und Indus”, and especially its §§ 67, 70, 82.

15. No trace of the name Hīvān could be discovered, but the mention of Bīrūza in its neighbourhood is in favour of the identity of this river with the Sutlej, see note to § 10, 51. The Sutlej, as the longest of the affluents of the Indus, could hardly be overlooked. Consequently instead of “the western side” of the Langhān river one must read “the eastern side”.

After the junction of 13., 14., and 15. the Indus was called Mihrān. Khūwa- ṭizmī, 131–3, gives an elaborate description of this river which unfortunately remains obscure until the editor’s commentary becomes available.

16. Khūwa-ṭizmī, 131, mentions a Mihrān al-thāni al-kabīr “The Second Great Mihrān”, to which our “Lesser Mihrān” may correspond. The position of the latter is a complicated problem, but the joint evidence of the relevant passages is in favour of its identification with the Narbadā. The town Qandahār, which this river skirts, is certainly that mentioned under § 10, 17., i.e. Ghandhar in the Bay of Cambay. The name of Kūlī is very misleading for its form is identical with the Kūlī just mentioned as the estuary of the Indus (13.). Under §§ 5, 9., our author distinctly refers to the district of Kūlī in Kanbāya, which is also mentioned by I.Kh., 62, as lying 18 farsakhs north of Sindān (§ 10, 14.), evidently at the entrance to the Bay of Cambay. It may correspond to Kūlīnār of the Mohīt and Qulīnār, Curinal shown on the Portuguese maps north-west of Diu, whence the Arab sailors could make straight for Sindān, though the distance between the two points exceeds that indicated in I.Kh. The names of the places mentioned on the Lesser Mihrān are obscure; cf. notes to § 10, 18, 24.

17–22.: the system of the Sīr-Daryā (Jaxartes), on which see Barthold, Turkestān, 155–65; Le Strange, The Lands, ch. xiii; Barthold, Irrigation, 129–54. The old name of the river is given in § 25, 47: Khashart. It is also to be found in I.Kh., 178, and Birūnī’s Canon, under *Sutkand. Marquart in his Chronologie d. alttürk. Inschr., 1898, 5–6, first explained ‘Iaγάρτη as yaxša-arta “wahre edle Perle” (cf. Barthold’s criticism in Irrigation, 130), then interpreted it as Soghdian Yaxšart < Rxs-a-arta (?), Kiszzen s. hist.

1 ونهر السند هو نهر نهر جيحان. More detail in the confused additional paragraph ibid., 178.
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Topographie vom Kaukasus, Vienna, 1928, p. 16, and finally, Catalogue, 35, considered as the old form of the name *Opēdrus, "i.e. Old Iranian *Ruka-
tra, the true Araxes"! The attested Iranian form remains Khashart.

17. This is the main stream of the Sir-Daryā (Jaxartes) coming from the south. Üzgand is situated at the easternmost end of Farghāna. On its two rivers, Tābgh. r. and Barskhdn, see § 25, 58, and § 15, 11. Dārā ushu is must be improved into *iya khu, in view of Khashghari, iii, 27, who says that "Yabāghū-
suwi is the river flowing from the Kāshghar mountains past Üzgand in Farghāna". Yabāghū was a Turkish tribe which according to Kāshghari, i, 29, lived much more to the east but yabāghū means also "felt" and may have been used here as a personal name of the local chief, see the story in Gardīzī, v.i., p. 288. See Map v. [Cf. p. 256, note 2.]


19. Now called Aq-Bura, Barthold, o.c., 159. 20. Ibid., 159.

21. The north-eastern headwater of Jaxartes now called Narin, rises north of the Western T'ien-shan (= Mānās, v.s. note to § 5, 3 e), see Barthold, o.c., 157. On Khatlām (Khaylām?) see § 25, 59.

22. Parak, now Chirchik, Barthold, o.c., 169, flows into the Sir-Daryā, south of Tashkent. The Khalilkh mountains mentioned here must be the hills separating the Narin from the basin of the Chirchik, i.e. Chatkal (Arab. fīdghil) mountains. Banākat lay near the point where the more southern Aḩangarān (Angren) joins the Sir-Daryā, ibid., 169. The wall of Qalās on the northern side of the Chirchik was built for protection against the Turks, ibid., 172, and Barthold, Ibn Sa'īd, 238.

23. The basin of the Sughūd river (now Zarafshān), Barthold, Turkestan, 82., Barthold, Irrigation, 103–25. The Middle Buttamān is the Zarafshān range stretching between, and parallel to those of Turkestān and Ḥiṣār. The lake Daryāzha is now called Iskandar-kul and the āvāza of Paykand is the Qara-kul, cf. § 3, 34.

24. The river of Bālk was called Dah-ās ("Ten mills"), I.H., 326. The translation: "skirts the confines" is justified by the fact that Madr (§ 23, 80,) does not belong to its system. Foucher, De Kaboul à Bactres, in La Géographie, July 1924, 155, places Madr between Kāmard and Du-āb-i shāh, evidently still in the basin of the Surkh-āb (western headwater of the Qunduz river, v.s. 12.). On Ribāt-i karvān see § 23, 63.

25. Several branches of the Hilmānd rise south of the Kūh-i Bābā in the immediate neighbourhood of the sources of the Harāt river. As Išt, 265, places the latter "in the neighbourhood of Ribāt-i Karvān" (§ 23, 63.), there is no wonder that the sources of the Hilmānd were also located in the region of the same ultima Thule of the Gūzgān possessions. On Durghush, Til, and Bust see § 24, 12.

26. On the upper course of the Marvarūd (Murghāb) see notes to § 23, 38., 46., &c.

27. See notes to § 23, 46. and § 24, 1.

28. Cf. § 28, 3. and 7. The name of the river is Dīvrūd.


30. corresponds in Ist., 120; the river bearing this latter name watered the districts of Khūbadhān and Anbūrān of the Sābūr province (Ist., 110) and then that of Jalādājān of the Arrajān province (Ist., 113), consequently it flowed from east to west. The Fārs-nāma, 151, identifies خریذان with the Naubanjan river, flowing into the Nahr-i Shirin (i.e. 32.). Our author having found Khūbadān among the districts of "Bishāvur" (§ 29, 19.) must have taken its river for one of the headwaters of the Nahr-Sābūr, probably for Ist.'s Ratin. The Nahr-Sābūr, now called Rūd-i Hilla (left out in our text!), flowed past Tavvaj. The error may have resulted from the fact that in Ist., 99 and 120, the rivers Khūbadhān and Ratin follow one another in the enumeration.

31. According to Ist., 119, Shadhagān rose in Bāzranj (province of Arrajān) and flowed to the sea through Tambūk-i Mūristān (province of Sābūr) and Dasht-i Dastagān (the town of which was مارَ ماه, § 29, 9.). Shadhagān is not mentioned in the Fārs-nāma. As suggested by Le Strange, o.c., 274, the river meant here may be one of the streams emptying themselves into the sea south of Ganāwa. In point of fact recent English maps show a considerable river Rūd-i Shīr of which the estuary is located 12 miles north of that of the Rūd-i Hilla (= Shāpūr), and south of Bandar-Rig. The course of this little known river can be traced for some 60 miles northwards up to the parallel 30°. This must be the Shadhakān.

32, 35, 36. (and 30.). In the mountainous region connecting Fārs with Khūzistān there are only two important basins, viz. the rivers of Hindiyān (in the south) and Arrajān (in the north). Both rivers flow parallel to one another, and *grosso modo* from east (Fārs) to west (Khūzistān). Until very lately their lower course in the plain, on the way to the Persian Gulf, was very insufficiently known, and even now the region of their sources remains unsurveyed.

The confusion in our sources with regard to these two rivers will be best presented in the following comparative tables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ist.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affluents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>course</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following questions arise with regard to this table:

a. The estuary of the “Širín” river lies now south of Hindiyān; the river crosses the peninsula protruding into the sea, first north to south and then, beyond Tuwaisha, east to west. Even if the river has changed its course, it could never have flowed near Šinīz (§ 29, 13.), and still less near Ganāva (§ 29, 10.), which are shut off from it by mountains. Here all the three sources are in error.

b. The river of Arrajān (§ 29, 16.), which is now called Mārān, flows first to the north until it joins the river of Rām-Hurmūz; then their joint stream, called Jarraḥī, flows south-westwards to Fallāhiya and, through the Dauraq canal, comes into connexion with the Khor-Mūsā creek (which is the terminus of the new Trans-Persian railway). It is quite possible that, formerly, at least a branch of the Jarraḥī joined the Kārūn,¹ though the mention of *Rīshahr (§ 29, 14.) on the course of the river shows that it flowed in a south-westerly direction. In any case it is unimaginable to place the estuary of the Tāb between Šinīz and Ganāva, in which case it would have flowed across the basin of the Hindiyān river.² In our text, Māhīrūbān, lying west of Šinīz, comes nearer to the point, though there are good reasons in favour of the location of Māhīrūbān in the region of Hindiyān, i.e. on the Širīn river, cf. § 29, 15.

c. It is quite evident that our author has committed a grave mistake in joining together the upper course of the Širīn³ with the middle course of the Tāb; therefore his Širīn rising near Mt. Dhanbādī⁴ flows past Arrajān and Rīshahr.⁵

1 And this might account for the mention of Tustar in Iṣṭ’s original text, for the Kārūn was rightly called “Tustar [= Šustar] river”, cf. § 6, 37. Then Iṣṭ’s text should be read تَمْ يَخَالَبَ في البر شَور [i.e.] “then the river falls into the sea at the frontier (of the estuary) of the Tustar (river)”.

2 For our author the situation had no difficulty as, according to him, the Širīn flowed in a north to south direction.

3 Vāyagan and Lārāndān named near its course are mentioned under § 29, 17.

4 Iṣṭ. دِيَار [var. دِيَان]. The mountain meant is surely the lofty Kūh-i Dīnā [17,000—18,000 ft.] though on the latter’s western side rise in fact only the headwaters of the Khirsan, the south-easternmost affluent of the Kārūn, see C. Haussknecht, Routen im Orient, iv [map edited by Kiepert] and the English i : 2,000,000 map.

5 [Cf. infra, p. 378.]
34. Farvāb, now Pulvār, cf. Le Strange, O.C., 276.
36. This Sardan river is called Masin in Iṣṭ., 119, and Fārs-nāma, 152. This headwater of the Tāb rose, according to Iṣṭ., from the limits of Isfahān and came out (vāshur) in Sardan. The Fārs-nāma more precisely locates its sources in the mountains of Sumayram and Simtakht (*Sīsakht of English maps*?), which does not seem to contradict our author’s mention of the Kūh-Jilū region. However, at least some parts of the Sardan district may have belonged to the Kārūn basin, see note to § 29, 42.
37.-39.: System of the Shūshtar river (Arabic Dujayl, now Kārūn). The changes in the lower course of the Kārūn in historical times are still very little known; therefore the location of many places of this region is at present impossible. See a detailed study of the texts in Schwarz, Iran, 294-312, and Streck, Kārūn, in EJ. [Cf. A. Kasravī, Tārikh-i pānsad-sāda-yi Khūzistān, Tehran, 1934, pp. 77-88: on the old course of the Kārūn.]
37. The enumeration of localities is probably borrowed from Iṣṭ., 89, 94, and passim. The only curious and new detail is “the mouth of Shīr” (dahana-yi Shīr) which may refer to the Bahamshīr canal running to the east of the ‘Abbadān island, parallel to the Tigris. According to Maq., 419, a canal between the Kārūn and Tigris was built only under the Buyid ‘Aḍud al-daula (A.D. 949-83), cf. Barthold, Obzor, 127, and the canal, now called Bahamshīr (still navigable), was probably the natural outlet of the river into the Persian Gulf. Cf. The Persian Gulf Pilot, Admiralty, 1864, p. 225.
38. Masruqān = Āb-i Gargar, i.e. the left (eastern) of the two branches into which the Kārūn is divided by the famous weir at Shūstar.
39. Only the latest English maps present a clear picture of the hydrographic conditions south of the lower course of the Kārūn. The oasis of Fallāhiya (ancient Dauraq) is watered both by a canal coming from the Jarraḥī and by streams evidently coming from the Kārūn, but appearing on the surface only south of Ahwāz. The waters of these latter are used in the western part of the oasis, while the waters of the Jarraḥī canal are taken down to the sea by the Dauraq canal. Our author evidently considers the whole of these streams as a branch of the Kārūn, spreading its waters down to Rām-Hurmuz. But in reality the chief source of irrigation of Fallāhiya is the Jarraḥī, of which one branch comes from Rām-Hurmuz and the other from Arrajān-Bebeḥān (note to 35.). Schwarz, Iran, 373, identifies Dauraq with Fallāhiya. In a westerly direction Iṣṭ., 95, gives the distances: Dauraq–Khān–Mardawaih (var. مدنو, &c.)–1 marhala; thence to Bāsīyān (where the river splits off into two)–1 marhala; thence to Ḥīs-n-Mahdī–2 marhālas; thence to Bāyun (on the Tigris)–1 marhala. [Consequently Bāsīyān cannot be Buziya, situated 6–7 km. east of Fallāhiya.]
40. The river of Susa (Daniel, vii, 2: Ulai) is now called Shā‘ūr (< Shāvūr). If we are to interpret B.ḍūshāvūr as Gundē-Šāpur the situation is geographically inexact. Perhaps the text could be improved into: *miyān-i Shūsh va-Bīd va-Shāvūr (?).* Iṣṭ., 89, mentions a place Bidhān belonging to Shūsh, and the existence of a Shāvūr could be postulated from the present name of the river.
41. The river corresponds to the which Gardizi, 83, mentions on the road from the Jaxartes to the Kîmâks. Marquart, Komanen, 92, 206, noted the likeness of this name to that of the Ishim (Ishim), a left affluent of the Irtish; cf. note to § 5, 12. Though the mountain forming the frontier "between the Kîmâk and Khirkhîz" (cf. § 5, 12.) might be taken for the Altai, &c., whence the real Irtish comes, the fact that, both according to our author and Gardizi, the river flows westwards to the Caspian points clearly to some confusion. The Kîmâk (note to § 18) lived probably east of the Irtish but extended also in a north-westerly direction towards the Urals. If our author thought that the road to the Kîmâk ran from the lower course of the Sir-daryâ northwards, we could possibly identify the Asus with the Ilâk1, which is a southern tributary of the Yayiq but might have been taken for an independent river flowing to the Caspian.

42. The spelling Artush (or Artiush) is corroborated by the popular etymology found in Gardizi, 82, "Artiush, i.e., come down", referring to the Turkish phrase dür tîsh "man, come down (from the horse)!", Barthold, Report, 106. The mountain from which the real Irtish rises is the region of the Altai evidently referred to in § 5, 12, where a mountain is described stretching between the Kîmâk and Khirkhîz. In the present paragraph, however, the mountain where the sources of the three rivers (41.–3.) lie is meant to be the Urals (most probably referred to in § 5, 19.). As the text stands, our author's Artush represents the Yayiq (Const. Porph. Γηγξ, in Russian "Ural river") which rises from the south of the Urals mountains, flows to the west (down to Uralsk) and then to the south (down to Guryev) and empties itself into the Caspian, east of the Volga estuary. Our author has wrongly taken it for a tributary of the Volga. Ibn Faqîlân, who in 309–10/922 travelled the whole distance between Khwârzâm and Bulghûr, ought to be our principal authority on the region to the south-west of the Urals. The complete version of his Risâla described by A. Z. Validi, (Meshedskaya rukopis Ilmul-Faşîha, in Bull. de l'Acad. des Sciences de Russie, 1924, pp. 237–48) mentions a number of large rivers. Beyond [A.Z. Validi: Emba, cf. p. 312, note 2], in the direction of the Pecheneg territory, were found جحش اشت ارش اردن اذل جحش [restored by Marquart, Komanen, 100, as *Kîmâk yabghû],3 a branch of

---

1 The Ilâk rises in the Mugojar hills separating it from the sources of the Irgîz. It is difficult to take Asus/Rs for the Emba. The latter, though rising from the same mountain and flowing to the Caspian is not on the eventual route from the Sir-daryâ northwards, see notes to § 5, 12, and 18.

2 Note that the waters of 41. and 42. are called "black" in our text.

3 [See however note to § 18, 3, where a tribe called *Yûghur (still doubtful)
Turks beyond the Balkh river [*i.e. Oxus*]. On these two rivers live the Turkish Ghuzz." Cf. also Masʿūdī, *Tanbih*, 62, where the estuaries of the two rivers are said to lie at 10 days’ distance from one another. Marquart, o.c., 102, has already detected the connexion of these rivers with Gardizī’s (p. 83) and thought that what Masʿūdī had in view were the rivers Yayiq and Emba (*v.s. note to 41*). Our author clearly uses the same source as Gardizī but tries to give to the data a more systematic and complete form.

43. The Ātil (Volga) rising from the same mountain as the Irtish, is an extraordinary slip, but Iṣṭ., 222, also says: the Ithil, "as I have heard, rises from the neighbourhood of the Khirkhiz and flows between the Kimāk and Ghuzz forming the boundary between them; then it takes a western direction behind (‘alā zaḥr) Bulghār, then turns eastwards until it has passed the Rūs, then it flows past Bulghār, then past Burṭās until it falls into the sea". In spite of the erroneous start it is clear that the name *Ithil* (*Ātil < Ątil*) is given to the Kama rising from the Ural mountains (§ 5, 19.) and joining the Volga below Kazan. Cf. Map 11 (after Idrīsī).

44. The Rūs river can be either the upper course of the Volga above its junction with the Kama (as suggested by Toumansky), or the Don. The terminology of I.Kh., 154, who speaks of the Russian merchants navigating "the (Tanais?), the river of the Šaqāliba" does not completely tally with that of our author. On the other hand, the testimony of I.H., invoked by Barthold in favour of the identity of the Rūs river with the Don, is doubtful. According to I.H., 276, the Caspian does not communicate with any other sea “except for what enters it from the river Rūs, known (under the name of) Itil; the latter is joined to a branch (šuʿba) which leads from it towards the outlet (khārij) (which leads) from Constantinople towards the Encircling Ocean”. 1 Here the Don (or rather its lower course) 2 is considered as a branch of the Volga, but logically the name Rūs is applied to the Volga. In our text, the Rūs river, rising in the Slav territory, flows eastwards (sic) and even skirts the confines of the Khīfjakh (who are supposed to be one of the northernmost peoples). Though our author knows the Maeotis (§ 3, 8.) and gives its dimensions in accordance with I.R., 85, he does not explicitly say that the Rūs river forms its outlet, whereas I.R. lets the Tānis come from the Māwīth. Contrary to our author for whom the Rūs river is an affluent of the Volga, I.R. treats the Tānis as a separate river flowing to the Black sea (Bontos). Even the fact that the three Rūs “towns” (§ 44) 3 were “skirted” by the Rūs river seems to suit the upper

is mentioned in the neighbourhood of the Aral sea. This brings us nearer to the Caspian (Khazar) sea into which the two rivers flow according to Masʿūdī, *Tanbih*, 62.]

1 Cf. also Masʿūdī quoted under § 3, 8. The idea of this junction is already found in Ptolemy, v, 5, though according to Marquart *Streifzüge*, 153, the right reading is ἐπιστροφίς (not ἐκβολής).

2 The Don [above Kalach] is separated from the Volga [near Tsaritsin, now Stalingrad] by a narrow neck of land across which smaller craft could be easily dragged from one river to the other. It is the place through which the projected Volga–Azov sea canal will be built.

3 *Shahr* may mean “land”, *v.t.*, p. 436.
Volga better than the Don. Consequently, even admitting that I.Kh.’s
“river of the Ṣaqālība” stands for the “river of the Rūs” (for I.Kh. does not
discriminate between the Rūs and Slavs, cf. note to § 43) and knowing that
Idrīsī (see Map ii) understands the Don under nahr al-Rūsiya, we are
obliged to interpret our text in the light of its internal evidence and adhere
to Toumansky’s conclusion.

45. With the Rūtā we are right in the centre of the confusion. The name
Rtā, in Arabic script looks very much like Gardīzī’s ṬṬ, which most
probably refers to the Danube (*ṱṬ), see notes to §§ 22 and 53. However,
our description of its course is extremely puzzling. It apparently flows west-
wards, from the Rūs to the Saqālība (the latter living to the west of the Rūs,
§§ 43 and 44). Its sources are placed on a mysterious mountain standing
between the [Turkish] Pechenegs, Majghāri, and Rūs. The Rūs river, as
we have just seen, is the upper Volga, and north of the Volga there are no
rivers flowing westwards. We must then admit that the Rūtā is one of the
rivers to the south-west of the Volga’s great bend. The Turkish Pechenegs
(§ 20) are said to live north of the *Bulghār (§ 51) and *Burţas (§ 52). The
latter, both historically and according to our author, lived on the right
(western) bank of the Volga; therefore the Turkish Pechenegs, in order
to be found to the north of the *Burţas, must have occupied a part
of the Volga’s right bank. As the southern boundary of the Rūs (living
along the upper course of the Volga) was the Rūtā, and the northern
boundary of the Turkish Pechenegs was the Rūthā (ṬṬ), it is clear that the
river Rūtā, or Rūthā, divided the Rūs from the Pechenegs. To the south-
west of the Volga and north of the Burţas only the Oka could be taken
into consideration in this connexion. From the point of view of the script
ṬṬ or ṬṬ, greatly resemble ṬṬ, Ógā<Oka, and it is not excessive to
imagine that the Oka was known to the informer originally responsible
for the description of the Rūs territory [Iṣṭ.’s text suggesting that the
observation point was the town of Bulghār on the Volga]. However, the
Oka flows to the Volga in a north-easterly direction and no other con-
temporary source does mention the Oka! That there is a confusion is
clear from the fact that our author after having placed the capital
of the Slavs Khurdaḥ (see notes to § 43, i.) on the Rūtā does not
know what more to do with the Rūtā. To sum up, the river in question
is an imaginary stream due perhaps to a confusion of two different names
looking similar in Arabic script (*ṬṬ and *ṬṬ); as a whole it cannot
be located on the map but the elements of its description may refer to
several rivers of the central part of Eastern Europe (cf. §§ 20, 22,
43, i.). [Cf. ‘Afi’s spelling ṬṬ, v.i., p. 324—]

Some light on our river is thrown by a passage in Idrīsī (ii, 435) according
to which there exists in the Northern Qumānī a lake غَنْم (Gh.nim) form-
ing the outflow of eight rivers, of which the more important is شَرَى
(Sh.rvi). The annexed sketch is based on Idrīsī’s map reproduced in
K. Miller’s Mappae, Band 1/2, fol. v, but the names are spelt as in Idrīsī’s
text. The lake forming a special basin is placed somewhere between the
Commentary § 6

Volga and Nahr al-Rūšiyat1 It is interesting that Idrīsī's Sh.rwī (according to K. Miller Sh.lwt) flows westwards similarly to our Rūṭā. I think that the confused idea about the existence of a river between the Volga and Don is common both to our author and Idrīsī, but that the name Rūṭā (t pers) which our author gives to it is due to some confusion with Ṭābābā, i.e. the Danube.

46. In this passage the usual western course of the Lower Tigris during the Middle Ages is described. Madhār is mentioned as lying on the river, though according to I.R., 96, this was only the case before Islam. Cf. Le Strange, The Lands, ch. ii, and Map II; R. Hartmann, Didīla, in El; Marquart, Süddarmenien, 232-452: an extremely detailed analysis of the descriptions of the Tigris by Kisrawī, Maq., Masʿūdi, and Ibn Serapion.

48. 'Ukbara, which now lies west of the Tigris, stood first on its eastern bank, Le Strange, o.c., 51, and Map II (Sāmarrā). The Nahr Sābus, Išt., 87, I.H., 168 (where the variant Shāsh is also found), seems to correspond to the 'Adaim, though the latter rises, not in Armenia but near Kūrkhū, in Southern Kurdishtān. By the Nahravān river the Diyālā (Sīrvān) is meant, rising in Persian Kurdishtān, cf. I.R., 90.

49. On the Euphrates see Le Strange, o.c., 117, &c., R. Hartmann, Furāt, in El. Here the western headwater of the Euphrates seems to be regarded as the principal one. The name of the mountain ʿUqār is evidently disfigured. I.R., 93, says that the Euphrates rises in the Kūm land from above the locality ʿĀqiq, Greek Tēphrikē or Aphrikē, see Diworī, in El, but Khwvārīm, 139, calls the mountain whence the Euphrates comes جبل اودخس. Cf. Ṭabarī, iii, 1434, where a Byzantine expedition is said to march من ناحية منيرا فرساس.

50. See Barthold's Preface, p. 29, on the confusion of the upper course of the Atrak with that of the Gurgān (§ 32, 1.). The H. Rand river bore also the name of Andar-haz, Ṭabarī, ii, 1332, cf. Marquart, Erânshahr, 73 (for the second element cf. Har-haz-pey, river of Āmul).

51-3. The rivers of Mazandaran, now called Tījīn, Bābol, and Harāzpey (Har-haz-pey). See Minorsky, Mazandaran, in El.

54. Grave misunderstanding: the Safīd-rūdhi rises, not from the Lesser Ararat (Ḥuwayrith) but from Persian Kurdishtān. I.Kh., 175, and I.R., 89, rightly state that it comes min bābi Sīsar, see Minorsky, Senna and Sīsar, in El.

56. The author seems to think that the Kurr rises from the main Caucasus range, though he knows that it flows past Tiflis (§ 36, 28.). See a correct description of the upper Kurr in Masʿūdi, Murūj, ii, 74. On Bardj see § 36, 35.

57. On the Ḥadramāt river see Schleifer, Ḥaḍramaut, and Grohmann, Shabwa, in El.


1 The latter is evidently the Don and its course is shown as separate from the imaginary "Volga branch" flowing to the Black sea (v.s. 43 and note to § 3, 8.). However, Idrīsī's views cannot be taken as merely traditional and more likely he combines both the earlier sources and his own information, cf. p. 438.
BLACK SEA LANDS
according to Idrisi (A.D. 1154)
[ad § 6, 45]
58. *Nahr al-kurūm*, “river of the vineyards”. I.Kh., 108, among the towns of Buqallār, names Anqara and Šamālūh (?). This river [which has nothing to do with the place al-kurūm or al-kurum, next station west of Budhandūn = Podandon = Bozanti] is most probably the Halys (Qizil-Irmaq) flowing east of Anqara to the Black Sea. [Šamālūh = Σημαλόδος κάστρον.]¹

59. All depends on the name. It cannot be I.Kh.’s, 101, Santabaris, which Ramsay, o.c., 445, places on a source of the Sangarios. If we restore it as Kangri, now Kiangri or Changri (Greek Gangra), the river could be one of the left affluents of the Halys, e.g., the Devreschay. [Our author several times gives for the estuary of an affluent that of the principal river, see the Kābul river, § 6, 13.]

60. If 61. is the Sangarios, this river (60.) must be either the Tembris (now Porsuq-su), left affluent of the Sangarios, or some river west of it (cf. Rhyndakos, I.Kh., 103, Rundhāq, though this latter flows into the lake Artynias). The solution depends on the phrase بَرَّ شَهْر بُندَاقُس وُدَمْدُون بَكْدِر. The first element of بُندَاقُس can be Greek βαῦδα “banner, district” (in Arabic usually band, plur. bunāṭ, I.Kh., 109, but the form bandā could survive in status constructus) and the sentence would mean “skirts the town of the district بَكْدِر”. This last element [usual confusion of final س with ه] could then stand for قلعة Kotyaeion (now Kūtahye), a well-known fortress on the Tembris, I.Kh., 103. As regards دَمْدُون it seems to have been copied from Budhandūn² which is out of place on the Tembris. The most celebrated place on the latter was Dorylaion, in Arabic دَرَازِليْيَا which becomes Darawliya, now Eski-Shehir, cf. the detailed account of it and its river in I.Kh., 109, and it is most likely that our text refers to Darawliya which in Arabic script has been confused with Badhandūn, better known to the Muslims as the place of death of the caliph Ma’mūn. In I.Kh., 109, in fine, the name of the Darawliya stands with the preposition bi- and so بَرَّ شَهْر بُندَاقُس وُدَمْدُون بَكْدِر could be more easily confused in script with بَرَّ شَهْر بُندَاقُس وُدَمْدُون بَكْدِر.

61. This river is Sangarios which exactly flows north of Amorion (‘Amūriya, placed by I.Kh., 107, in Nātulūs) and west of Anqara (placed by I.Kh., 108, in Buqallār). I.Kh., 110, calls the river Şaghari and makes it flow into the Black Sea (Bahr al-a’zam?), while our author wrongly makes it empty itself into the lake of Nicaea. The mysterious ِحَلَق earth”; it is a Persian translation of Arabic, γράφω for I.Kh., 102, precisely mentions an “Earthen Fort” حصن الخرا (مَنْطِقَةُ بِابُ الْبَرْدِ) and adds that it stands opposite Nicaea (cf. Marquart, *Streifszüge*, 214.)

62. The direct source of this description of the Nile may be Jayhānī. Maq., 20, says: “The Nile comes out from the Nūba country... Jayhānī says that the Nile rises from the Qamar mountain, flows to form two lakes beyond the Equator and turns towards the Nūba land; he also says other things of which the origin is unknown, and no one knows on what authority he puts them forward.”³ Jayhānī himself could have borrowed his account

---

² Podandos, nowadays Bozanti, near the Cilician Gate, see Ramsay, *Asia Minor*, p. 348.
³ Maq. himself, 21, tells fantastic stories about the sources of the Nile.
from Khuwārizmī, 106 (see also plate IV), or from the complete version of I.Kh.’s work, now lost. In the abridged version, I.Kh., 176, says only that the Nile forms two lakes beyond the Equator. Idrīsī’s map, reproduced in Reinaud’s Introduction, strictly follows the same tradition (10 rivers, 2 lakes, then again 6 rivers). As regards Sukar I.H., 103, mentions Askar between Fayyūm and Fuṣṭāṭ; Yāqūt, iii, 107, says: “Sukar . . . to the east of Upper Egypt (Ṣa’īd); between it and Cairo (Mīšr) two days’ distance.”

63. The river is more likely the Blue Nile than the ‘Atbara (Ptolemy, iv, 7, Ἀγαθόρας). Kābil is the title of the king of Nubia, see § 59. His capital lay most probably in the province of ‘Alwa, near Khartūm (ruins of Sūba). The town of Berber situated at the junction of the Nile with the ‘Atbara does not seem to have played a role in Nubian history.

64. The western branch of the Nile, called after the town Tarnūṭ.

66. The river must be the Marīta erroneously combined with the aqueduct supplying water to the capital, as suggested by Barthold, v.s. p. 41, note 1. I.R., 126, says: “Constantinople possesses a water-conduit which enters it from the town of Bulghar. This water flows for a distance of 20 days and on entering Constantinople is divided into 3 parts.” The town Bulghar stands here for the locality Belgrad situated only a few miles north of Constantinople. Cf. § 42, 16. and 18.

67. Hār.da, as suggested by Barthold in his Index, is Mārida (Merida) which lies on the Guadiana, but the name on the original map could easily occupy the space between the Guadiana and the Tagus and so give place to an error. On Shantarīn (Santarem) cf. § 41, 14.

68. Perhaps the Barka flowing northwards in Eritrea, or the Okwa.

§ 7. The Deserts and Sands

The terms biyābān and rig correspond respectively to Arabic ᵐᵃʳʳᵃ and raml. The first term does not naturally mean a waterless and uninhabited land. As the text shows, biyābān, as opposed to rig, must be often interpreted as “plain, steppe, or depression”. V.i. 8. and 10. where the two terms are clearly distinguished.

1. This desert (plain ?), generally speaking, covers a terra incognita in the east, but its situation south of the Huang-Ho may point to the depression between the lower course of the Huang-Ho and the Yang-tze (the province Kiang-su). The author evidently opposes this southern “desert” to the northern one described under 2. According to the China Year Book some gold is produced in Shantung.

2. This is the Great Mongolian desert. The “Kuchchā river” must be the Huang-ho, cf. § 6, 3.

3. As the swamp formed by the “Kuchā river” (sic) is the Lob-nor, these sands must be those separating Turfan from Kan-su. The distance indicated is too short. Between Qumūl and Sha-chou Gardīzī counts seven days. On the two towns see § 9, 20. and 21.

1 On the sources of the Nile see in great detail Maqrīzī, ed. Wiet, i, 219–36.
4. The Tarim depression is meant here, but the bearings are evidently displaced, as if the author was facing E. or NE. instead of N.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Our author</th>
<th>Real bearings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tibet</td>
<td>E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian lands</td>
<td>S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transoxiana</td>
<td>W.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khallukh</td>
<td>N.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Here, evidently, the lowlands of the Carnatic are meant, which stretch along the east coast up to the Godaveri beyond which the Eastern Ghats approach the coast.

6. This desert is Makrān.

7. Kargas-kūh “the Vulture mountain” is the name of a mountain near Kāshān, Le Strange, o.l., 208. It is unexpected to see the name applied to the whole of the Central Persian desert (Kāvir, Lūt) but Maq., 487, 490, also describes the Kargas-kūh as the highest point of the desert. On the bearings v.s. note to 4.

8. The Transcaspian desert. On the bearings of the Caspian Sea and Volga, v.s. 4.

9. Jand and J.vāra (Khwāra?) are situated on the Jaxartes, § 26, 27. The situation of the steppe depends on the identification of the river beyond which lived the Kimāk (cf. §§ 6, 42, and 18). [Qara-qum? Cf. p. 309.]

10. The description of Arabia is sufficiently exact. On the southern [read: south-western] border, the Red Sea (daryā-yi ‘Arab) must be followed by the Bābarī Gulf (§ 3, 3a.) instead of which the Ayla has been named, whereas in the following sentence the latter is rightly mentioned west of Arabia (cf. § 3, 3b.). The sands within the bādiya are clearly distinguished from the latter. The pilgrims from ‘Irīq had to cross these Habīr sands. The term Habīr is not found in Išt. or Maq., but I.H., 30 and 104, in his detailed account of the deserts mentions al-raml al-ma‘rūf bil-Habīr. His text is not very clear but seems to indicate that on one side these sands stretch towards Egypt, and on the other extend “from the two Tayy mountains to the Persian Gulf and are adjacent to the sands of Bahrayn, of Başra, and of ‘Oman, down to Shihr and Mahra...”. Originally al-Habīr must designate the desert al-Dahnā “the red one”, uniting Great Nufūd with al-Rub‘ al-khāli, see Hogarth, Penetration of Arabia, Map. I.H. mentions yellow, red, blue, black, and white sands but does not say anything of the use of the red sand for smithing purposes.

11. The term aḥqāf in Southern Arabia is a synonym of the northern nufūd; cf. de Goeje, Arabia, in EI.

12. The [Arabian] desert between the lower course of the Nile and the Red Sea, cf. §§ 53 and 59. The bearings are evidently displaced and the combination of the Gulfs of “Barbar” and Ayla is a result of some confusion (vs. 10. and note to § 3, 3a.).

13. The Nubian desert following 12. immediately to the south. According
to 12, its name appears to be “the Buja Desert”, while the “country of Buja” lay south of it. Under Ḥabasha seems to be understood the coastal line (Eritrea, &c.) considerably to the north of the present-day Abyssinia.

15. The Ṣaḥārā. Sijilmāsa in Southern Morocco is usually mentioned as the limit of the cultivated zone, cf. Iṣṭ, 37.

§ 8. On the countries

For the commentary on the order of enumeration see Barthold’s Preface, p. 34. This second part of the book (§§ 8–60) can be divided into the following groups of chapters:

(a) §§ 9–11. China, India, Tibet.
(b) §§ 12–17. South-eastern Turks.
(c) §§ 18–22. North-western Turks.
(e) §§ 27–36. Middle zone of Islām (Sind-Persia-Jazīra).
(f) §§ 37–41. Southern zone of Islām (Arabia-Spain),
(g) §§ 42–53. Byzantium, Northern Europe, Caucasus.
(h) §§ 54–60. Southern countries.

§ 9. Chīnīstān


Timurid times, see the well-known report of Ghiyāṭ al-dīn Naqqāsh, one of the members of Baysunqr’s embassy to China in A.D. 1421–2, edited by Quatremère, in Notices et Extraits, xiv, part 1, pp. 308–41 and 387–426, after the Maṭla’ al-Sa’dayn (a more complete text found in Hāfiz-i Abrū’s Zubdat al-tawāriḵh, Oxford MS., fol. 383b–412a, ed. by K. M. Maitra, Lahore, 1934); in the annex of his edition Quatremère quotes (pp. 474–89) an interesting account of the Tarim basin translated from ῨAmīn Ahmad [sic] Ῠāzī’s Haft Iqīlm (towards the end of the sixth clime); Kahle, Eine islamische Quelle über China 1500, in Acta Orientalia, 1934, xii/2, pp. 91–110.]

As early as A.D. 300 the Arabs are supposed to have had a settlement in Canton. Islam is said to have been brought there even in Muḥammad’s lifetime. In A.D. 738 the Muslims in Canton were numerous enough to plunder the town, cf. Hirth and Rockhill, Chau Fu-kua, pp. 4, 14–15.1

Here we are only concerned with the actual geographical description of China by the Muslims. As was natural, the exploration of the maritime zone was carried on quite independently from that of northern China. Sulaymān the Merchant (before A.D. 851) is the earliest Arab authority on the situation obtaining in خان فو Khan-fu<Kuang-(chou)-fu = Canton.2 Already I.Kh., whose work was finally completed towards A.D. 885, v.s. Barthold’s Preface, p. 12, gives a detailed description, pp. 62–72, of the sea-routes to the Far East. Several Muslims are even said to have reached from the southern Chinese ports the capital of the T’ang dynasty (Ch’ang-an-fu, Hsi-an-fu, Khumdān). Masʿūdī, Murūj, i, 307–12, mentions a merchant from Samarqand who travelled from Sirāf to Canton (خان فو) and from there visited the capital called Anmewā (?): (variants: أصو أسو).3 A rich Quraisyhite Ibn al-Wahhāb, a descendant of Habbār b. Aswād, went from Canton to see the king of China “who at that time (i.e. shortly after A.D. 870) resided at the city of Khumdān”, Murūj, i, 312–21. Abū-Zayd Muḥammad Sirāfī, the editor of Sulaymān’s report (p. 77), interrogated Ibn al-Wahhāb when the latter was an old man, and left a record of this conversation, cf. Reinaud, Introduction, p. lxxiii. Later Masʿūdī, who in 303/915 met Abū Zayd in Bàṣra, wrote down the same record, Murūj, i, 321–4.

1 [Much more cautiously O. Franke writes in Zur Geschichte d. Exterritorialität in China, in Sitz. Berl. Ak., 1935, p. 897: “Die genaue Zeit, wann die Araber zuerst in China gelandet sind, wann sie angefangen haben, ihre Niederlassungen zu gründen . . . wissen wir nicht.” An indirect indication can be inferred from the fact that “an inspector of the overseas trade” in Canton is mentioned already in A.D. 712. Moreover, according to the T’ang-shu, already in A.D. 651 an envoy of Han-mi mo-moni (*amr al-mu’min) visited the Chinese court, see O. Franke, Geschichte des Chinesischen Reichs, ii, 1936, p. 369.]


3 I now see that Anmewā several times occurring in Masʿūdī’s text is but a mis-reading of خومن (Murūj, i, 305) (Sulaymān, 64), cf. note to § 11, 9.
The northern overland routes to China used by the silk-traders were known from very early times (at least from 114 B.C.), see Herrmann, *Die alten Seidenstrassen zwischen China und Syrien*, 1910. The Soghdian settlements, all the way from Transoxania to China, undoubtedly possessed a detailed knowledge of the roads; and the probably Iranian (Soghdian?) appellations of Chinese towns (e.g. ɹ., 2., 22.) indicate the channels through which, later on, the Muslims received their information on China. From the first century of Islam the Muslims in Central Asia were in close touch with the Chinese in military engagements, as well as in more peaceful activities. Enough to say that between the years A.D. 716 and 759, nineteen Arab embassies are mentioned in Chinese sources, see Chavannes, *Notes additionnelles*, of which the relevant passages have been separately studied by H. A. R. Gibb, *Chinese Records of the Arabs in Central Asia*, in BSOS, vol. ii/4, 619–22.

This state of things is very insufficiently reflected in early Muslim geographers whose allusions to the north-western China and the roads leading thereto are extremely few and vague. I.Kh.'s routes, pp. 29–31, stop at the capital of the Toghuughuz. Qudāma, 264, in a legendary report on Alexander the Great's campaign, only mentions Khumdān and خمدن; the latter name has been restored as *شِجْرَ،* Sharag = Kashghar, or better as شَرَاج Sarag = the eastern capital of the T'ang dynasty Lo-yang which appears as Saragh in the old Soghdian letters of the second century and in the Nestorian inscription of A.D. 781. See Yule, o.c.; Marquart, *Streifzüge*, pp. 90, 502; Pelliot, *Jour. As.*, July 1927, pp. 138–41, and *T'oung-Pao*, xxv, 1928, pp. 91–2; Schaeder, *Iranica*, 1934, pp. 47–9. [It appears strange that an early Arab writer used ș to render the sound گ or gh! The interpreter Sallām’s account of his trip to the wall of Gog and Magog under the orders of the caliph Wāthiq (A.D. 842–7) is a wonder-tale interspersed with three or four geographical names, I.Kh., 162–70, cf. de Goeje, *De muur van Gog en Magog*, 1888.1 Abū Dulaf Mis'ar b. Muhalhil's pretended journey to China in the company of a Chinese embassy returning from Bukhārā in 331/941 is a series of disconnected notices, of which some are genuine, and some imaginary, see Yaqūt, iii, 445, cf. Grigorieff, o.c., and Marquart, *Streifzüge*, pp. 74, 95. [The complete text of Abū Dulaf’s Risāla is contained in the Mashhad MS. of Ibn al-Faqrī, first described by A. Z. Validi, o.c., p. 215 and Appendix B.]

Mas'ūdi, i, 347–9, says that he met at Balkh an old man who had several times travelled to China overland and that he knew some other persons in Khorasan who went to Tibet and China via Soghdiana and saw on the road the mountains producing ammoniac salt (جبال النشادیر). Mas'ūdi himself (?) saw these mountains from a distance of 100 farsakhs: fires were seen over them at night and smoke during the day-time. Reinaud, o.c., p. clxiii, thought that these details might apply to the ammoniac mines

---

in the T'ien Shan, north of Kuchā. However, Mas'udi's account of the road is fantastic and does not contain a single geographical name.

The earliest systematic description of the lands to the south of the T'ien Shan was perhaps contained in Jayhâni's lost work, but even I.R., who seems to have been the first to utilize that work, did not transcribe these data. The H.-Ä and Gardizi are the first to speak of China and Tibet. Their lists of places have striking resemblances but do not entirely coincide, and each author adds numerous details of his own. In Gardizi the places are arranged into itineraries; our author simply enumerates them but the order of enumeration closely follows Gardizi's system which certainly belongs to the original source (Jayhâni?).

The information contained in the present chapter and in those on the mountains (§ 5, 1.-6.), rivers (§ 6, 1.-4.), and deserts (§ 7, 1.-3.) has certainly been borrowed from several sources (cf. 6. Khâlb.k). Parts of it may even refer to the earlier part of the ninth century, v.s., p. 28, and v.i., p. 227, line 8. The capital of China is still placed at Khumdân (Ch'ang-an, Hsi-an-fu), though after the fall of the T'ang dynasty in A.D. 907 it was transferred first to Lo-yang and then to K'ai-fêng (A.D. 936). Likewise there is no hint in our author at the formation in China of numerous local dynasties after the fall of the T'ang, whereas Gardizi, §2, speaks of "many kings in China, of whom the greatest is the Faghfir", referring probably to the post-T'ang times. More than this, the statement concerning the majority of the people professing Manichaeism could hardly be true after A.D. 843 when, following the collapse of the Uyghur empire on the Orkhon, the Chinese government took energetic measures against the Manichaeans, cf. Chavannes and Pelliot, Un traité manichéen, in Jour. As., 1913, i, 295-305. We might eventually admit that our author has in view the special conditions obtaining in the Kan-su province which he knows best. According to Marquart, Streifzüge, 88, in A.D. 844 (one year after the events on the Orkhon) Long-tegin, the chief of the south-western branch of the Uyghurs which occupied the region between Sha-chou and Kanchou,2 proclaimed himself khâqân. In A.D. 924 an Uyghur khâqân was

1 The Wei-shu, quoted by S. Lévi, Jour. As., Sept., 7913, p. 346, mentions "l'arsenic vert" among the products of Kuchā. A Chinese source, written before A.D. 527, ibid., p. 347, says: "Au nord de Koutcha, à 200 li, il y a une montagne; la nuit, elle a l'éclat du feu; le jour c'est tout fumée. Les gens recueillent le charbon de terre de cette montagne pour fondre les métaux; le fer de cette montagne est le plus généralement employé dans les trente-six royaumes." Cf. also the T'ang-shu in Chavannes, Documents, p. 115, on the "montagne A-kie-t'ien [*Ag-tagh?]... appelée aussi la montagne blanche; il y a là constamment du feu".

2 See notes to § 12. Deguignes, Histoire des Huns, ii, 25-7, whom Marquart quotes, spells the name of the chief Long-te-le, whereas Bichurin (v.i., § 12) reads it (in Russian transcription) Pang-de-le (*P'ang-t'ê-le?) . The characters p'ang and *lung differ only by one stroke. In principle no Turkish name would begin with an l. As regards the second elements Chavannes, o.c., p. 225, note 3, and p. 367, confirms that "le titre turc de tegin est constamment écrit en chinois t'e-le" [the characters le (*lê) and h'in (*ch'in) being easily confused].
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still residing in Kan-chou. The king "of China", called Qalin b. Sh.khir (*Chakhîr*?), to whose court the Šâmānid embassy went in 381/941 must have been the ruler of the same branch of the Uyghurs. But as our source is silent on the presence of the Uyghurs in the province of Kan-su and only mentions the struggle going on in Kan-chou (7.) between the Chinese and the Tibetans, the impression is that it has in view the state of things before the arrival of the Uyghurs in that province in a.d. 843-4. Under 10. it is said that the Toghuzghuz are attacking Kuchâ but it is possible that the question is not of the T'ien-shan Uyghurs but still of the Western Tu-ch‘üeh, *v.i.*, p. 267, because Kuchâ (*v.i.* 10.) and Khotan (*v.i.* 18.) [cf. also Käshghar, § 13, 1.] are still reckoned to China, though entirely encircled by Turkish and Tibetan dominions. The above-mentioned towns, with the addition of Sui-shih on the Chu river (or, from 719, of Qarashar), constituted precisely "the Four Garrisons" on which the Chinese power rested in the west. In a.d. 670 the Four Garrisons were taken by the Tibetans, but in 692 the Chinese reoccupied them. In 760 the Tibetans became masters of the whole country to the west of the Huang-ho, but the garrisons of Pei-t‘ing (= Bish-baliq) and An-hsi (= Kuchâ) still held out till 787, see Chavannes, *Documents*, pp. 113-14. Our author's statements must reflect China's incessant struggle for political influence and the possession of the strategic positions in the present-day Hsin-Chiang province. [With regard to Khotan, the author may have in view the re-establishment of connexions with China after a.d. 938 (*v.i.* 18.).]

The statement that the emperor of China was descended from Faridhûn is certainly explainable by the tradition according to which Faridhûn's son Tûr became the master of the Turk and Chîn and was accordingly called Turân-shâh or Shâh-i Chîn, see *Shâh-nâma*, cf. Minorsky, *Tûrân*, in EI. More directly our author's source may be I.Kh., p. 16, who says that *baghpûr* is a descendant of Afâridhûn. The same geographer also, p. 70, gives a list of the products of China, though more complete and not entirely coinciding in details with that of our author.

In the *H.*-'A. China is called *Chînistân* and *Chîn*. The first form which appears in the Soghdian letters of the second century, *o.c.*, 15,¹ and in Middle Persian and Armenian, is not usual in Modern Persian which prefers the form *Chîn*.²

The description of China consists of very distinct parts: 1., 23., 24. belong to the southern seas; 2. these provinces are said to lie on the south coast of China;³ 5.-6., 13., 15. lay on the road from Ch‘ang-an-fu to Kan-su, while 4. is the only town mentioned on the Yangtze; 10. is situated north of the Tarim; 16., 17. are to be sought in the neighbourhood of Tibet, and

---

¹ *v.i.*, p. 300.
² Persian *Chîn* is derived from the name of the dynasty Ch‘în which ruled in China 221-206 B.C.
³ It is curious not to find mentioned in the *H.*-'A. the well-known ports of *Khânfû* (= Canton, *v.s.*) and Zaytûn (Ts‘üan-chou, near Amoy). About the 9th cent. a portion of the sea trade was diverted to the latter, *Chau ju-kua*, p. 17. Abul-Fidâ, 363, calls it "Shîn-fû, known in our time as Zaytûn".
18.–21., as well perhaps as 11. and 22. (?)—south of the Tarim; of 12. nothing can be said. This analysis shows that the source utilized by our author was chiefly acquainted with the Tarim basin and Kan-su, inclusive of the road leading to the T’ang capital Ch’ang-an-fu.

1. Muslim information on Wāqwaq is utterly confused. It has been exhaustively analysed by Ferrand in his articles Wāk-Wāk in EI and especially Le Wākwāk est-il le Japon?, in *Jour. As.*, avril 1932, pp. 193–243. Ferrand comes to the conclusion that two Wāqwaqīs must be distinguished, of which the one lying in Africa in the Zanj country corresponds to Madagascar, *o.c.*, 211, 238, whereas the other, belonging to China, is identical with Sumatra, *o.c.*, 237 (and not with Japan as de Goeje had supposed). The confusion is increased by the fact that several other names are applied to Sumatra and its localities (see Zābaj, Fanṣūr, Bālūs). In our text (§ 4, b 3.) the Gold-island (= Sumatra) is inhabited by the Wāqwaqīans, and the latter are confused with the homonymous Wāqwaq of the Zanj country. This entails a further complication: the Wāqwaqī disappear from the immediate neighbourhood of Zangistān but the latter (§ 55) becomes a neighbour of Zābaj (= Sumatra = Chinese Wāqwaq = Gold-island, § 4, 3.). The detail about gold collars used in Wāqwaq is also found in I.Kh., 69. The town مقياس is unknown.

2. The names of the Nine Provinces are unknown and most of them have a non-Chinese appearance. None of them correspond to the names of provinces in Rashid al-dīn, ed. Blochet, GMS, pp. 484–98. Ir.sh (ایرش) and Khūr.sh (خورش) are the provinces between which the Yangtze-kiang passes before disemboguing into the sea (§ 6, 2.). On the other hand, the localities similarly divided by the Huang-ho are Kūr.sh (کورش) and F.r.jākli (فرجا کلی) (§ 6, 3.). The absence of غرین in the present enumeration could be best explained by the identity of غرین and خورش. In this case, Kūr.sh/Khūr.sh would be located between the Yangtze and Huang-ho, Ir.sh south-west of the Yangtze, and F.r.jākli north of the Huang-ho, in Pei Chih-li. According to our text all the Nine Provinces lay on the shore of the Ocean and following the order of enumeration (from S. to N.?) the last six mentioned provinces should be situated in the extreme Far East. Consequently (d) Thay can hardly refer to the former T’ai kingdom in Yün-nan (Nan-chao), destroyed by Qubilay khan in 1253.¹ To take (f) تکیه for Tangut (Waṣṣāf, ed. Hammer, p. 22; Rashid al-dīn, 492; تکیه would be an anachronism. (h) فوری can hardly stand for Corea: in earlier sources (I.Kh., 70, I.R., 82) this country is called Shīlā or Shīlā² whereas Rashid al-dīn, p. 486, gives a different transcription: کل. As on principle we must prefer the explanations consistent with the attested Muslim tradition it is more probable that فوری

¹ Nor does T’ai in Shansi [Dr. P. Fitzgerald] suit our case.
² Shīlā=Sin-lo, the native kingdom comprising the central and eastern part of Corea. The Corea proper (Ko-ku-rye) lay in the north. In 904 Ko-ku-rye rose in arms against the Sin-lo rulers and in 935 Corea became united under the national Wang dynasty, R. Grousset, *Histoire de l’Extrême Orient*, 1929, p. 290.
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refers to the people mentioned under § 14, 1., for the Khirkhīz were supposed to extend to the coast; in this case یک might also be considered as a mis-spelling for ین (usually coupled with یمن, see note to § 14, 1.). Khasāni, Būnāghnī and ائنس (perhaps ائنس) are obscure.

3. 9. 13. 15. are to be located along the following itinerary found in Gardīzī, 92: from Chinānjkat in the Toghuqghuz territory (§ 12, 9.) via B.gh-shūrā (where a river is crossed in a boat) to Qomūl (§ 12, 9.)—8 days; from Qomūl, across a steppe with springs and grass, to the Chinese town Shā-chū—7 days; thence to Sang-lakh—3 days; thence to S.kh-chū—7 days; thence to Kham-chū—3 days; thence to K.jā—8 days; thence 15 days to the river Qiyān (Yangtze-kiang); from B.gh-shūrā to Khumdān, by a road of ribāts (fortified stations) and mansils (stations) 1 month. As the last-mentioned distance does not sum up the distances previously quoted, we must conclude that Gardīzī's text is out of order. Indeed the first mention of B.gh-shūrā (between Turfan and Qomūl, where no such place is known and no such important river exists!) is only a misplaced part of the second passage where B.gh-shūrā comes in the enumeration immediately after the Yangtze. This correction is fully confirmed by our author, who says (§ 6, 2.) that the river Kīsāu, after it has entered the limits of Bughshūr, is known under the name ُGhiyān (<kiang). Consequently it seems that Gardīzī’s itinerary first follows a southerly direction, from Turfan down to the Yangtze, and then from the important place where the river is usually crossed (Bughshūr?) turns back northwards to Khumdān (Ch’ang-an-fu). See Map iii.

Another important point is that in Gardīzī, 91–2, the name spelt لک stands for two totally different places: (a) the well-known town Kuchā, north of the Tarim, and (b) a place lying between the Kan-su province and the Yangtze. Our text to some extent distinguishes between the two names (v.f. 10. and 5.).

Our author follows Gardīzī’s itinerary in the opposite direction.

3. Khumdān is Ch’ang-an-fu, later Hsi-an-fu. The name is already quoted [from some Nestorian source?] in Theophylactus Simokatta [circa a.d. 582–602], vii, 9, Χονμαδαν (or Χονβδαν), see Coedes, o.c., 141. Marquart, Komanen, 60, considers the name as Iranian (Soghdian?) and explains it as “potter’s kiln”.1 Our author is very vague on the situation of Khumdān. The town is said to lie on the Khumdān river apparently confused with the Huang-ho (? 6, 1.). A lake is mentioned “in the region of Khumdān” (§ 3, 35.), and finally (§ 2, 4.) Khumdān is placed on the shore of the Green Sea!

---

1. See now some doubts on this interpretation in Schaeder, Iranica, 2. Fu-lin, Berlin 1934, p. 48, who suggests that the name might belong to the Wei dynasty. The latter is reckoned to the Sien-pi race which, according to Pelliot, was Turkish. In any case Marquart's interpretation receives an indirect confirmation from the fact that Fakhr al-dīn (see note to § 12) calls a Buddhist stupa tanūra “funnel” semantically very close to Khumdān. Could not the capital of China be called “stupa [town]”? On another Khumdān see the Index.
Commentary

4. *Baghshür (spelt: Bughshür and B.ghsüz) is very probably an Iranian name. A homonymous place (§ 23, 33.) lay between Herat and the Murgháb, Išt., 269. The name is explained in the Burhān-i Qāʾī as "a pool of salt water". Baghshür is said to be an important commercial town, and as such could be known to the Soghdian merchants who probably re-named it in their language. All the indications point to its being situated on, or near, the Yangtze. As it is impossible to imagine a road connecting Khumdān with the north through a place lying on that river, the distance between Baghshür and Khumdān must represent a special route, not directly belonging to the road Chānānjkāt–Khumdān. According to the China Year Book the Yangtze receives the name of Kiang in the neighbourhood of Yang-chou, in the Hu-pēh province; but one would rather look for Bughshür much higher upstream, in the region of Ch'ung-ch'ing where the highroad from the north approaches the river. [With regard to the meaning of "a pool of salt water" Dr. P. Fitzgerald kindly tells me that the celebrated salt wells in the Yangtze basin are situated at Tszū-liu-ch'ing.]

5. Kuchān (کچان) is said to be a small town where both Chinese and Tibetan merchants were found. The latter detail points to the western part of Kansu, or Ssū-ch'üan. The mention under § 6, 2, of the Yangtze as flowing towards "the limits of Kujān (sic) and Bughshür" is rather vague and means perhaps only that the river approaches the road leading from Kuchau to Bughshür. Gardizi calls the place ḵš Kuchā and places it at 8 days south of Kan-chou, and at 15 days north of the Yangtze. Following these distances it is difficult to identify Kuchān with Kung-chang in southern Kan-su and one should rather place it in the region of Lan-chou. In the confused § 6, 3., the Tarim is represented as continued by the Huang-ho. Beyond the swamp the imaginary watercourse is said "to flow down to the limits of Kuchān". This latter form چان very probably stands for Kuchān چران. Were this hypothesis correct, we should have an additional argument for placing Kuchān in the region of Lan-chou through which the Huang-ho flows. On Kāshghari's Map, south of the Tarim, the following places stretch W. to E. in one line: Yārkand, Khotan, Jarjān (Cherchen), then behind a mountain چان (Shan-chou, probably *Sha-chou) and towards the south-east چان (sic).

This Kūshān may be another spelling for our Kuchān (or for 16. K.sān).3

1 Cf. L. Richard, Comprehensive geography of the Chinese Empire, Engl. transl., Shanghai 1908, p. 114: Ch'ung-ch'ing—principal trading centre of Ssū-Ch'üan; Tszū-liu-ch'ing—a great industrial centre with 1,000 salt-wells (it lies at circa 200 Km. to the west of Ch'ung-ch'ing in the basin of the Lu-ho tributary of the Yangtze).

2 If restored as *Arjān, may stand for Er(i)-chou, a Mongol name for Liang-chou, cf. Zhamsungano in the Festschrift to S. F. Oldenburg (in Russian), Leningrad 1934, p. 194.

3 In the old Sogdian letters ed. by Reichelt, o.c., pp. 13, 15, &c., the name of a town Kē'n or Kē'n (read: K. chān) is found several times. Reichelt, o.c., 5, tentatively identifies it with Kao-ch'ang (see note to § 12, 1.), and this looks probable on account of the cold winds said to blow from its direction (i.e. from
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6. Khâlb.k looks non-Chinese. In Arabic cursive خالب (see especially its three last letters) has some likeness to مكش as Mîs'âr b. Muhalhil (v.s., p. 225) calls the capital of the “king of China”. A curious point is that Khâlb.k is mentioned precisely before Kan-chou with which Marquart, Streifzüge, 86-8, identifies Sandâbil, see also ET under this name. As Khâlb.k (said to be a large town) is not mentioned in Gardizi it must have passed into the Ḥ.-Ā. from some additional source, perhaps Mîs'âr b. Muhalhil.

7. Khâmchû is Kan-chou, cf. Rashîd al-dîn, 497, “پچم, one of the towns of Tangqut”.

8. سکج، wrongly vocalized Saukjû is Su-chou, old pronunciation Suk-chou. Turkish Yögru of this region still pronounce Suk-chû, see Potain, Tangut.-tibet. okraina, 1893, ii, 435. The Mongols say Tszeghî.

9. S.khchû (?), ditto in Gardizi, at three days’ distance from 7. Khâmchû. As Gardizi does not mention سکج and as, on the other hand, Su-chou could scarcely be omitted in the itinerary from Sha-chou to Kan-chou, one cannot dismiss the possibility of both 8. سکج and 9. سکج equally referring to Su-chou. It is true that our author distinguishes Suk-chou from S.kh-chou but he connects them administratively. [In the Turkish document written in Orkhon script Suycu-balîq seems to refer to Su-chou, see Thomsen in J.RAS, 1912, p. 186.]

10.-12. seem to disturb the order of enumeration.

10. Kûchâ (کچ) is the well-known town lying north of the Tarim (in Chinese Kuei-tszû or Chi’ü-tszû, French trans. K’ieou-tse or K’ieu-tse). On the long history of this Aryan (later Turkicized) principality see S. Lévi, Le ‘toharian B’, langue de Koutcha, in Jour. As., Sept. 1913, pp. 323-80. The T’ang annals stop in their description of the city at A.D. 730, and between A.D. 787 and 1001 Chinese sources are altogether silent on the great revolutions in the region brought about by the arrival of the Tibetans, the Uyghurs, and the K’i-tan. Our source (v.s., p. 227) still reckons Kûchâ to China, and leaves it out in the enumeration of the Toghuqghuz possessions (§ 12) though the Toghuqghuz are said to raid it constantly (v.s., p. 227). In Kâshghari i, 332, Kusan (کس) is given as “the name of a town called Kujã (کچ) which is the frontier of the Uyghurs”. The form Kûsân is also found in the “Secret history of the Mongols”, cf. Pelliot, Notes sur les noms anciens de Kûchâ & c., in T’oung-Pao, 1926, p. 126.

11. Kûghmar is a puzzle. It is true that on the right bank of the Qara-qash river, circa 16 miles south-west of Khotan, there is a sanctuary on the Kûhmârî hill which Sir A. Stein, Ancient Khotan, 1907, pp. 185-90, and Serindia, 1921, i, 93-5, identifies with Hsüan-tsang’s Mount Gâtrîgâ “Cow’s horn”. However, the passage of کشمارى کشتar into کشمار into Kûshmar [so according to Sir A. Stein’s transcription!] is not at all obvious, to say nothing of the mention of Kûghmar in our text after Kûchâ and before the “Stone-tower”, the eastern T’ien-shan?). [I now see that A. Herrmann in his commentary on Kâshghari’s map (1935) tentatively identifies Kûshmar with Kuei-shun, Ning-hsia. Phonetically this identification presents some difficulty.]
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13–15. again in Kan-su. The mention of Manichaean in 13. and 15. agrees with the reports on their safe existence in Kan-su, even during the persecution following the collapse of the Uyghur empire on the Orkhon, Marquart, *Streifzüge*, 88. Cf. also the general remarks on the time to which our source refers, v.s., p. 227.

13. Khajū = Kua-chou, i.e. the present day An-hsi oasis on the Su-lo-ho river and on the road from Su-chou to Sha-chou, see Stein, *Serindia*, p. 1040.

15. چاجو Sha-chou, “Town of the sands”, mentioned in Gardizi as the first Chinese town on the road from Qomul, is the name of the Tun-huang oasis near which the celebrated Ch’ien-fo-tung “Caves of the Thousand Buddhas” are situated. It would be tempting to identify with the latter place our 14. Sanglakh with its Buddhist (?) associations. It is true that Gardizi places Sanglakh at 3 days from Sha-chou and at 7 days from S.kh-chou whereas in fact the caves “are carved into the precipitous conglomerate cliffs overlooking from the west the mouth of a barren valley some 12 miles south-east of the oasis”, Sir A. Stein, *On Ancient Central Asian Tracks*, 1933, p. 193. Though the distance does not suit that given by Gardizi, the place of Sanglakh (14.) before 15. Sha-chou would be easy to understand in our enumeration which goes from south to north (resp. NW.), and its Iranian name Sanglakh, “The Stony Place”, would accord with the natural characteristics of the Ch’ien-fo-tung. However, Sanglakh may be a mere popular etymology of some Chinese name compounded with sang-, cf. Playfair, *The Cities and Towns of China*, 1879, Nos. 6062–71. In the Tibetan documents edited by Prof. F. W. Thomas, *JRAS*, April 1930, p. 294, *Sen-ge-lag*, closely resembling our Sang(a)lakh, occurs as a personal name in the Khotan region.

16. All we can say of K.sān is that it lay in the direction of Tibet, probably west of the Nan-shan, or south of the K’un-lun.† See also note to 5.


† A town called Kushai or Gushai lies to the west of Lan-chou between the Yellow river and the Hsi-ning-ho,

Commentary § 9

to go hunting wild camels in the country round Turfan, Tarim, Lob, and Katak". Even now the memory of a Shar-i-Katak lives in the region, cf. Barthold, Tarin in EI.

18. Though surrounded by Tibetan possessions (see note to § 11, 10.) Khotan is not included in Tibet, and, on the contrary, reckoned to China. Its king, styled 'aṣīm (which is not a very high title), appears as an autonomous ruler over a population consisting of Turks and Tibetans. This situation is well in keeping with what is known of the history of Khotan, cf. Sir A. Stein, Ancient Khotan, London 1907, ch. vii, section iv, pp. 172–84: "the T'ang period". The Tibetan attacks on Khotan began in a.d. 714, and in 790 all connexion with China by the road south of the Tarin was suspended. However, "there is nothing to indicate that Khotan had lost its local dynasty during the period of Tibetan ascendancy", the latter being checked by the Turkish tribes of the T'ien-shan. Only in a.d. 938 the Khotanese succeeded in sending an embassy to China which was followed by those of 942, 947, 948, 961, 965, 966. It is probable that the 'aṣīm mentioned in our text is the king Li Shêng-t'ien in whose long reign most of the above-mentioned embassies visited China. The embassy of 971 brought the news of a war between Khotan and Kashghar, and, some thirty years after, Khotan succumbed in the struggle and was occupied by the Muslim Qara-khânid Turks of Kashghar, cf. Barthold, Turkestan, p. 281, and notes to § 13. Gardzí, p. 94, gives a detailed description of Khotan. Our source accurately records the items on the two rivers, silk and jade.

19. As a name similar to Kh.2a may be mentioned that of Khada-lik, lying east of Khotan, between the Chira and Keriya rivers. In the ruins of its sanctuary Sir A. Stein found coins of a.d. 780–8, Ruins of Desert Cathay, 1912, i, 245.

20. 21. Under § 7, 8, our Hutm and Sârnîk are spelt Khuthum (sic) and Sârnîk (perhaps: Vasârnîk). These were two Chinese towns in the neighbourhood of the Lob-nor, between which a sand desert stretched for a distance of 3 days. Of the two towns the southern one must be sought in the region of the present-day Charkhlik and the northern one in that of the ancient Lou-lan (the city of Lob). *Vasârnîk (of which the initial v could have been misconstrued into the conjunction "and")] has an outward likeness to Vash-shahri, the westernmost oasis of the Charkhlik district, where T'ang and Sung coins have been found, Sir A. Stein, Ruins of Desert Cathay, i, 332–3. In this case Hutm/Khuthum could lie in the immediate neighbourhood of the Lob-nor swamp. Vash-shahri is situated half-way between Charkhlik and Charshan of which the latter must have been reckoned to Tibet (cf. § 11, 8.). [V.i., p. 485: B.rwân.]

22. The meaning of bar karân-i dâryâ is dubious. Perhaps the mention of Bûrkhmû and Navîjkath just before 23. Sarandib is accounted for by the interpretation of dâryâ as "the sea". But Navîjkath looks distinctly Iranian (Soghdian): "the New Town". Therefore the two localities seem

1 The Mu'mal al-tawârikh also calls this king 'aṣīm al-Khotan, Barthold, Turkestan, i, 20.
to have lain still in the Tarim basin where the Chinese could most likely have Soghdian subjects. Since the second quarter of the 7th century there existed, in the Lou-lan region, a Soghdian settlement Tien-ho ch'êng. In 675 the whole region was included in the Sha-chou administration, see Pelliot, La Colonie sogdienne de la région du Lob-nor, in *Jour. As.*, 1916/17, pp. 111–23 (after a document written in a.d. 885). Consequently one would have reasons to translate bar karân-i daryâ as "on the bank of the river", or perhaps "in the riverine region", i.e. of the Tarim. Less probably N.vijkath "the New Village" could be compared with Yangi-bâlik ("the New Town") which Kâshghari, i, 103, mentions among the Uyghur settlements near the Eastern T'ien-shan, see note to § 12, 2.

23. 24. have been added from some totally different source. Sarandib (Ceylon), left out under India, is treated as a mountain under § 5, where it is somehow brought into connexion with the continental system of mountains (cf. § 6, 1. and § 9, introduction), and it is possible that it was sometimes looked upon as a continuation of Indo-China.¹ Under the name of Taprobana (Tabarnâ), and perhaps (?) of Nâra, it is described as an island (§ 4, 4. and 13.). 24. Gh.z.r (?) is unknown. Being a small town it cannot be identical with Muvas, mentioned under § 4, 4. No such name is found in Ptolemy, vii, ed. by Renou, in Khuwârizmî, 97–8, in the *Mo'hit*, and on the Portuguese maps, *Mo'hit*, Maps XVII and XVIII.

§ 10. India


Some important additional information on India will be found under § 5, 2, 4.–8. (mountains), § 6, 13.–16. (rivers) and § 7, 5. (deserts).

In his *Preface*, p. 27, Prof. Barthold suggests that as regards India "the original source (pervostokhnîk) of I.Kh. and other early Arab geographers was Abû 'Abdillâh Muhammâd b. Išhâq". However, even for I.R., p. 132, who alone names this authority, the latter does not exhaust the

¹ Ceylon may have been confused with Sumatra. On Kâshghari's map Sarandib and the "Sarandib mountain" are shown on the dry land! [Cf. § 4, 4.]

² On the Arabic sources of the *Mo'hit* see G. Ferrand's detailed articles *Shihab al-dîn Ahmad b. Madjid* (Vasco de Gama's pilote) and *Sulaimân al-Mahrî in EI* and his edition of these two pilots' works, Paris, 1921–2 and 1921–3.
sources on India. Abū 'Abdillah, who [probably before the beginning of the 9th cent.] spent two years in Khmer (Qimār), could hardly know much about northern India. I.R. himself, \(1395_2, 1396_4\), distinctly quotes some other sources of information on India. Finally, Sulaymān the Merchant's report is still extant: it was completed in 237/851 and could have been known if not to I.Kh., at least to I.R., as it was known to Masʿūdi. [V.s., p. 172.]

For the maritime part of India our author pretty closely follows I.Kh. and I.R., but gives some entirely new information on Central India and the sub-Himalayan region for which after him we find fuller data only in Birūnī. The present chapter contains numerous points not otherwise known, but their interpretation is rendered difficult by confusions inherent to Arabic script, by the absence of indications regarding the epoch to which these data belong, and by a very inconvenient system of enumeration of the localities, partly based on some unknown itineraries (cf. 38., 48.) and partly on an arbitrary division of the map into a number of zones, running in various directions, without much consideration for political and geographical divisions (see Qinnauj and its dependencies treated under 29., 38., 39., 46., and 53.).

The Kings of India.

All Arab travellers pay much attention to the political organization of India and to the mutual relations of the Indian kings (cf. Yule-Cordier, i, 241–4). The system described by them is recognizable also in our author.

In the extreme east three kings are mentioned: that of Assam (Qāmarūn), represented as master of Sanf and Mandal, that of Fanṣūr (Sumatra) called S. tūhā(?), and that of Qimār (Khmer), see i–6. To the same group belong the three countries 8–10, lying on the Chinese frontier, (evidently west of Yun-nan).

On the east coast of India proper is named the king Dahum (sic), lord of a mighty army of 300,000. Roughly speaking, his possessions comprised the country between Carnatic in the south (cf. § 7, 5.) and the Ganges basin in the north. Dahum's kingdom marched in the north (north-west?) with that of the "Indian rāy" (the raja of Qinnauj?) along the Vindhya Range and the Lesser Mihrān (Narbadā), evidently in their more easterly parts.¹ Dahum's name has numerous variants in Muslim sources. Sulaymān the Merchant, p. 29 (Ferrand's tr., p. 50), has رهمن. He places him in the immediate neighbourhood of the Ballah-rā (v.i.) and the kings of Gujra and Taqin (v.i.), adding that he is at war with both the Ballah-rā and the king of Gujra. Though not of noble extraction Ruhmī was a powerful monarch.² I.Kh., 67 (whose relation to Sulaymān is not quite

¹ For in the west was the kingdom of the Ballah-rā.
² He had 50,000 elephants and 10,000–15,000 fullers and washermen in the army, and in his country were found gold, silver, aloes, sm.r (chowries, yaktails), cowrie-money, and spotted rhinoceroses. [H. A. R. Gibb suggests that the sentence ويقال أن قصارى عكبة منهم عشرة ألف إلى خمس عشر ألفا must mean:
clear), says: “and after [the Ballah-rá] (comes) the king Jurz who has ṭātrí-dirhams; after him Ghāba; after him R.hmí (coming variant: ṭāmu) (coming), between whose (possessions) and (those of) the other (kings) is a distance of a year, and he is said to possess 50,000 elephants as well as cotton and velvet garments and Indian aloes. Then after him (comes) the king of Qamarūn, whose kingdom adjoins China...” Yaʿqūbī, Historiae, i, 106, mentions that between Dānq (perhaps: *Jurz?) and the Ballah-rá and considers him the most important of the kings ruling over a most extensive country which lay by some sea and produced gold. Masʿūdī, Mūrib, i, 384, says that R.hmí’s territory is conterminous with those of Jurz and the Ballah-ray; he possesses 50,000 elephants and some people pretend with exaggeration that in his army there are 10–15 thousand fullers and washermen; R.hmí’s possessions comprise both land and sea. Beyond him lives the king of the kānōn in whose possession there is no sea and whose people are white and have pierced ears. The latter kingdom evidently corresponds to the al-ins, which I.R., 133, mentions after Qimār (good-looking people, boys married at a tender age).

Yule-Cordier, i, 243, suggested the identification of *Ruhmī, &c., with Pegu, called in Burma Rahmaniya [Ssk. Rāmya-deśa], but with a noteworthy reservation: “I should be sorry”, says he, “to define more particularly the limits of the region intended by the Arab writer [i.e. Masʿūdī].” This cautious suggestion becomes still less alluring in view of our text which attributes to Dahum the whole of the east coast of India.

Our analysis of the Arab sources enables us to infer the identity of the forms ṭāmu, ṭām (coming, coming), but it is still to be seen whether our author has not transferred to the original Ruhmí/Dahum some traits of a king whose name was very celebrated in the second half of the 10th century, namely of Dhaṅga (A.D. 950–99) who was the best-known king of the Chandél family which ruled in the province of Jejakabhuki, i.e. the present-day Bundelkhand lying between the Jumna and Narbadā. The Chandéls, who first came into notice about A.D. 831, had gradually advanced from the south until the Jumna became their frontier with the rajas of Kanauj in whose affairs they intervened on several occasions. In 989–90 Dhaṅga joined the league formed against Mahmūd of Ghaznī by Jaypāl of Vayhind (explicitly mentioned by our author under 56.). See V. Smith, o.c., 405–7. If,
however, *d* in *Dahum* and a common frontier between Dahum and Kanauj may refer to Dhaňga, the mention of the great part of the east coast of India as belonging to Dahum does not apply to this king. The basic characteristics of *Ruhmi/Dahum* point back to the times before A.D. 850 and it must be left to the specialists in Indian history to decide to which dynasty of north-eastern or eastern India they may refer (Orissa, Eastern Chalukyas of Vengi who ruled A.D. 815–960, &c.).

The *southernmost* part of India (Madura?) is described as the realm of a queen (rāṇīya) [12. and perhaps 11.].

On the west coast the king Balharay, or better BALLAH-rå [in our text several times *Ballahraý; Persian rāy = raja], is represented as paramount. His name probably reproduces the Indian title *Vallabha-raja*, which several times occurs in the Rāṣṭrakūṭa dynasty, cf. Ray, o.c., 577, and Sir T. W. Arnold's article *Balhra*, in EI. Even apart from the title of Ballah-ra, the kings so called who, according to the Arabs, were powerful opponents (from the south) of the rulers of Qinnauj, can only be the Rāṣṭrakūtās of the Deccan (A.D. 743–974). Sulaymān, p. 28, says that the Ballah-ra's kingdom starts from the coast called *al-Kumkam, i.e. Konkan*, the region stretching along the sea between Bombay and Goa,3 Mas'ūdī, i, 162, 177, and Iṣṭ, 173, definitely mention, as the Ballah-ra's residence, Mānkir, *i.e. Manyakhetā*, now Malkhed, south of Gulbarga (Harzadābād). The Muslims living in great numbers in the Ballah-ra's possessions sided with him against the raja of Qinnauj, and consequently were likely to exaggerate his power. Sulaymān calls him "the king of the kings of Hind", cf. I.Kh., 67. The same tendency accounts perhaps for the inclusion of Malabār by our author in the dominions of the Ballah-ra. In the north 15. Qāmuhul (v. i.), situated at 4 days' distance from Kanbāya, belonged to the Ballah-ra. Cf. also Idrīsī (Jaubert), pp. 176–7: "la ville de Nahrvāra [Biruni: *Anhilvāra <Anhaltvəta*, now Pattan in the northern Baroda] est gouvernée par un grand prince qui prend le titre de Balhara."

Another great king was the RAJA OF QINNAUJ (such is the Arabic spelling, in Indian Kanyakubja > Kanauj) whose army is mentioned under 29, as consisting of 150,000 horse and 600 elephants, and under 38, as being 100,000 horse strong. His other title seems to be "Raja of the Indians", (§§ 5, 9. and 6, 16.). Our author includes in his possessions 38. Jāhanār (though this latter had princes of its own, Ray, o.c., 138) and even considers as his vassals the Shāhi kings of Gaddhārā (56. Vayhind) and those of 75. Qasmīr (but v. i. 57.).

Sulaymān does not mention Qinnauj but speaks, p. 28, trans. Ferrand, 48, of the jūrj king who possessed the best cavalry in India, was at war both with Ballah-ra and the king of Ruhmī, hated Islam and the Arabs

1 § 5, 9.: "a mountain", perhaps "a watershed"?
2 I.Kh., 67, I.R., 134, and Mas'ūdī, Murūj, i, 383, have somewhat misunderstood Sulaymān in saying that *Kum-
India and reigned over a “tongue” of territory (ṣaw ḥuwa ʿalā lisānīn min al-ard). Yet Sulaymān’s continuator Abū Zayd, p. 127 (Ferrand, 123), mentions Qinnauj as “a great city in the Jurz kingdom”. Masʿūdī, on the one hand, speaks of the king of Qinnauj called baʿūra (v.i. under 53. Bīrūza) who possessed four armies, each seven to nine hundred thousand strong, of which the northern one was directed against the Muslims of Multān, the southern against the Ballah-ray, and the two others against any eventual enemy, see Murūj, i, 372-4, cf. Marquart, Brānšahr, 263-4. On the other hand, he, o.c., i, 383, separately speaks of the king Jurz (sic), whose kingdom lay “on a tongue of territory” and who “from one side” attacked the Ballah-ray’s possessions.

In fact the kings of Qinnauj belonged to the Gurjara-Pratihāra dynasty (8th century—A.D. 1037) and the name *jurrz (<Gurz) stands correctly for Gurjara.1 Our author’s statements with regard to the extent of the Qinnauj dominions may appear somewhat exaggerated (cf. 38., 56., 57.) yet the latest authority (Ray, o.c., Introduction, p. xxxvii) confirms that “the Gurjara-Pratihāra empire embraced the whole of Northern India (excepting Sind), western portions of the Panjāb, Kashmir, Nepal, Assam and portions of Bengal, Central Provinces and Orissa”.

In the SUB-HIMALAYAN region five principalities are mentioned, of which 41. Hytal, 42. Tythal, and 43. Bytal (Nepal?) lay in the region of Nepal (v.i.), whereas 44. Tāqi (Takka-desa?) and 45. Saltaqī (Chambā?) must be looked for in the neighbourhood of Kashmir. The Sūqī king was particularly famous for his nobility (v.i. 45.).

As regards Muslim possessions (see now Ray, o.c., p. 24.) Maṅṣūra belonged to the descendants of ʿOmar b. ʿAbdīl-ʿAzīz, a native of Bāniya, descended from the Quraishite Habbār b. Aswad, Iṣṭ., 173, cf. § 27, i. and v.i. 16., whereas the ancestor of the amirs of Multān was the Quraishite Sāma b. Luʿayy. The dynasty of Maṅṣūra recognized the ʿAbbāsid caliphs, whereas that of Multān, the Fāṭimid caliphs of Egypt, Maq., 485, (v.i. 32). The amirs of Multān were the immediate neighbours and enemies of the raja of Qinnauj and they are said to have had under their sway even the town of 53. Bīrūza (named after the title of the raja of Qinnauj) and Lahore, in which case the communications of Qinnauj with its northern feudatories were of a precarious nature.

Description of India.

We shall now proceed to the identification of single localities mentioned in the text.

The plan of the chapter is the following: 1.–6. localities to the east of India, stretching east of the Bay of Bengal from north to south; 7. localities of the east coast of India enumerated from south to north; 8.–10. localities

1 The mention of the “tongue of territory” most probably refers to the peninsula of Gujarāt which owes its name to some other branch of the Gurjara tribe. On the Gujrāt of the Panjāb, v.i. 46.
on the Chinese frontier (west of Yün-nan); i1.–14. localities along the south (?) and west coasts of India (beginning to the south of 7); 15.–29. localities of a semicircular zone beginning south of the Indus, then following upstream the course of the Narbadâ and ending at Qinnauj on the Ganges; 30.–40. localities on the left bank of the Indus (beginning in the north of Sind) and of the Panjâb; 41.–5. sub-Himalayan principalities; 47.–57. northernmost zone going west to east from southern Afghanistan to Kashmir.

1.–4. and 6. are well-known names but their sequence in our text reflects some confusion in the author’s ideas. From Assam he passes to Sumatra (already treated in the chapter on the islands, § 4, 5.–6. and Indo-China (in the latter, Šanf and Qimar ought to be named side by side but by some mistake Šanf is placed under Assam!).

1. Qamarun (*Qamarîb), I.Kh., 13, is Kamarupa, modern Assam. The dynastic history of Assam is little known. From circa A.D. 800–circa 1000, the Prałambha dynasty ruled in Assam, Ray, o.c., 241, 268.

2. Šanf is the regular Arabic rendering of Indian Champa. The celebrated country of aloes was Champa, southern Annam, on which see Georges Maspero, Le Royaume de Champa, Paris 1928 (reprinted from the T’oung-Pao, 1911). Cf. I.Kh., 68: Šanf at 3 days’ distance from Qimar (v.i. 6.). There seems to have existed a Muslim colony in Champa as shown by P. Ravaisse, Deux inscriptions confiques du Champa, in Jour. As., Oct. 1922, pp. 247–89; one of the documents is a tumular inscription of some Ahmad b. Abi Ibrâhim b. ‘Arrâda al-rahdâr who died in 401/1039, and the other a sort of tariff for Muslim merchants [unfortunately the exact place of the finds is not known]. If our author’s report on Šanf being a part of Qamarun is not a mere mistake, the name in our case stands for some different place. The names of the type Chamba, Champa, etc., are frequent in India, see the state Chambā, south-east of Kashmir, Champa east of Bilaspur, Central Provinces, and curiously enough a Champa is situated near the source of the river Manās, which rises in Bhutan and falls into the Brahmaputra; this Manās formed the western frontier of Kamarupa.¹

3. Mandal by its meaning (maṇḍal “province”) is a vague term, Elliot, i, 390. I.Kh., 51, mentions a Mandal in Sind. Ferrand, 315, tentatively locates the celebrated place producing aloes at Mandalî (v.i. 12.), on the continent opposite Ceylon, which is doubtful. In our text Mandal belongs to Assam (!) and in this case ought to be sought in its neighbourhood (cf. Vyaṅgiratati Maṇḍala in the Ganges Delta?). [But Mandalay is a late name.]

4. 5. Fanṣūr <Panchūr, celebrated camphor port, lay on the western

¹ In modern Persian cham pā, or champa, is applied to (1) a white flower resembling a zambar (and also called gul-i champī) and (2) a kind of rice; according to the Burhān-i qâti both “came to Iran from Hindūstān”. The name of the flower <Sanskrit champa ha, is already attested in Pahlavi chambak; the name of the rice birinj-i cam pā may reflect a geographical name, but which exactly?
coast of Sumatra immediately south of Baros (§ 4, b 8.), see I.R., 138, and *Mohît, Maps XXV–XXVI. Cf. Ferrand, Črîvidjaya, pp. 55, 95, who, moreover, p. 72, admits the existence of a second *Panchûr, an island off the eastern coast of Sumatra. The town H.dd.śūįra (?) and the king S.tiḥū are unknown unless its existence stands either for Śailendra, “lord of the mountains”, title of the Śêrivjaya dynasty, or for the later (15th–16th century) *Śveltûr or *Śveltûr, Sumatra, cf. Ferrand, *ibid., pp. 80 and 86.¹ The mention of a port of Sumatra is out of place in the present chapter and ought to come under § 4, b (5–8.).

6. Qimâr = Khmer, i.e. Cambodia on the Me-kong. The Khmer empire formed in a.d. 802 lasted till the middle of the thirteenth century, Grousset, Histoire de l’Extrême Orient, 1929, pp. 559, 568, 587. I.Kh., 68, counts from Qimâr to Sawâ 3 days following the coast. Prohibition of adultery is also mentioned in I.Kh., 47, and I.R., 132 (who names as the original author of this report Abû ‘Abdillâh Muḥammad b. *Ishāq, v.s., p. 27).²

7. I.Kh., 63–4, gives an itinerary along the eastern coast of India (going northwards): from the estuary of the Kûdāfarîd (Godavari) 2 days to Kaylân (Portuguese: Calingam?), al-Lâvâ (?) and K.nja (= Ganjam); thence to Samundar <Samudra (north of Ganjam, south of the Rio de Paluro = Baruva, *Mohît, Map I), 10 farsakhs; thence to *Urîshîn (spelt: عرنين = Orissa) 12 farsakhs; thence to Gondâni 4 days. Our Ür.shîn and S.m.n.d.r are the firm points of comparison. According to the order of enumeration Andrâs would lie south of Orissa, somewhere towards the Godavari. The name ادراس Andrâs (or perhaps Andrâ’îya, Andrâ’îya, Andrâ’îya?) recalls Andhra, as the region between the Godavari and Kistna is called. H.rk.n.d and N.mıyâs must be sought north of Orissa. In the Preface to the second edition (1906) of Maq., de Goeje quotes Marquart’s emendation: Harkand = *Harikel (مركل or هركر). Indeed, Harikela is the name of Eastern Bengal. An inscription of the end of the tenth century mentions the conquest by the king of Harikela of Chandradvîpa (which is still the administrative name of the districts of Bakergunj, Khulna, and Farîdpur, on the western bank of the Ganges near its estuary), see Ray, o.c., i, 322. This Harikel excellently fits our case, but some difficulty persists with regard to the general use of the term هركر which seems to stand for several similar but different local names (v.s., note to § 4, 11.). In Sulaymân, pp. 5–9 (and Abû–Zayd, ibid., 123), the Harkand sea comprises the waters between the Laccadives and Malabar, as well as those round Ceylon, and stretches even as far as Ramni, i.e. Sumatra (§ 4, 5.)! Our N.mıyâs, according to its place in the enumeration, seems to lie still farther east. It must be identical with N.yars which Ibn Iyâs, Arnold’s Chrestomathia Arabica, p. 71, mentions in the neighbourhood of China (before [= east of?] Orissa). As regards the produce of the region, I.Kh., 64, mentions both the elephants and the aloe “carried in fresh water” to

¹ The state of Shumutra (?) on the NE. coast of the island is mentioned by Ibn Baṭtûṭa, iv, 230.
² Chau Ju-kua (a.d. 1225), p. 61, says that adultery was severely punished in San-fo-ts‘i (Palembang in Sumatra).
S.m.n.d.r from places 15–20 days distant from there. I.Kh. evidently means that the aloes wood was floated on rivers, such as Godavari. Cf. Idrisi, trans. Jaubert, p. 180: “On apporte [à Samundar] du bois d’aloès du pays de Kārmūt, distant de 15 jours, par un fleuve dont les eaux sont douces.” I.Kh. confirms the high rank of the king of this region (cf. our Dahum?). (read: شنک) is Sask. "sānkha. The text suggests perhaps that the sānkha is the peculiar trait of this country, but these conchs were usually employed as insignia of the kings, cf. Sulaymān, p. 7, Ray, o.c., i, 456 and Yule, Hobson-Jobson (1903), p. 184 b: chank, chank.

8.–10., located on the frontier of China, come as an intermezzo in the description of the Indian coast.

Yaʾqūbī, Historiae, i, 106, also places them near China with which they were at war. Sulaymān, p. 32 (Ferrand, 52), says that the Mūja have a white complexion and dress like Chinamen; good musk is found in their country, through which stretch long ranges of white mountains; Māb.d is a larger country, and the inhabitants, of whom many live in China, have still more resemblance to Chinamen.

The three countries must be sought in the neighbourhood of Burma (west of Yūn-nan). Prof. G. H. Luce of the Rangoon University, to whom I submitted my passage, has most kindly communicated to me (21 v. 1933) a series of very valuable materials1 and personal suggestions. As regards T.sūl (Yaʾqūbī: T.rūsūl; absent elsewhere), Prof. Luce quotes as a parallel the name Tirchul found in the old Mon inscription (circa a.d. 1101) edited by Dr. C. O. Blagden. On the other hand, in the New T'ang History (ch. 222) it is said that “the P’iao call themselves T’u-lo-ch’ü. The Javanese call them T’u-li-ch’ü.” Consequently the Tirchul may be the people known in Burman history as Pyū (P’iao) who together with the Mons were in occupation of the plains of Burma during the ninth century. Later on the Mons probably pushed back the Pyū into the central and upper Burma. By a.d. 1060 both had yielded to the domination of the Mrauma (Burmans).2

The Man-shu composed by Fan-ch’o after A.D. 863, in the enumeration of the barbarian kingdoms bordering on the T’ai kingdom of Nan-chao (Yūn-nan), mentions at the first place the Mi-no (*mye-nāk) and Mi-ch’en

---


2 Sulaymān and Masʾūdī give here a name which looks entirely different from our *Tirsūl: Sulaymān, p. 32, says that Qīr.nj lies beyond the kingdom by the sea which deposits much amber; the country also produces much ivory and a small quantity of pepper. According to Masʾūdī, Muriyī, i, 388, F.r.nj lay on a peninsula.
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(*myie-šién). The former apparently lived on the river Mi-no = Chindwin (one of the head-waters of the Irawaddy); the latter, according to P. Pelliot, lived near the mouth of the Irawaddy. Prof. Luce compares the names of these peoples with those of the Mânak and Müja\(^1\) though he does not conceal some difficulties for such an identification: according to the Chinese sources the people of Mi-ch’èn had “black short faces” (not “a white complexion”!); likewise doubtful are the points on musk and “strong fortresses”. One may remark that the “white” mountains do not necessarily refer to snowy peaks; Dr. Blagden tells me that many of the mountains in Burma are of calcareous formation.\(^2\)

II.–IV. continue the description of the coast towards the south (in opposite direction to the enumeration under 7.).

II. نوین تابی، \(^{63} \text{I.Kh.} \), “from which the inhabitants of Sarandib receive their provisions”. De Goeje, following Yule, reads Bâpattan (?). Whatever the proper reading of the first element of this name, the place certainly lay south of the Coromandel coast.

12. دی‌اشرفین اروفسین corresponds to I.R., \(^{134} \text{I.Kh.} \), places in the bilâd al-aghbâb adding that its queen is called Râbiya and that the tallest elephants are found there. De Goeje took for اروفسین ارمین in I.Kh. (\(^{v.s. 7}. \)), but this is surely a confusion. Our author clearly discriminates between the two localities respectively belonging to the queen Râniya (*râni*) and Daham. He describes اروفسین as a sort of peninsula and mentions pepper among its products which points to a southern situation. He follows I.R. in saying that the sea near Urshfin is bahr al-aghbâb. This name, omitted in § 3, is usually applied to the sea near the southern extremity of India. Abû Zayd (in Sulaymân, p. 123) says: “opposite (Sarandib) vast aghbâb are found. The meaning of ghubb is a huge river [or valley, wâdi] extremely long and wide which disembogues (mašabb) into the sea”\(^3\). On the strength of our passage S. Lévi (d. 6.xi.1935) suggested for Urshfin the Mandam peninsula continued towards Ceylon by the Ramesvâram island. Instead of our I.Kh., \(^{63} \), mentions مُیْبیَن, where the maritime route for eastbound ships bifurcated: one branch followed the east coast of India while the other went to Ceylon and China.\(^4\)

\(^1\) The name مَوْرَس resembles that of the Mo-so tribes in south-western China, but its alternative مَوْرَص suggests that their common original contained a ch sound: *Mücha*, or *Mocha*.

\(^2\) On Tomaszchek’s Map I, Mohî[f, the kingdom “Ruhmi” occupies the estuary of the Ganges; al-Müja occupies the coastal region of Burma; al-Arman is located in Pegu (near Rangoon) and al-Mâyad (compared with Moi) is shown round the Bay of Tonkin.

\(^3\) Dozy, *Supplément aux dict. arabes*: “ًغَب golfe, appartient au dialecte de Yémen, Edrisi, Climat I, sect. 6, Jaubert, i, 394, has an interesting

\(^4\) Dr. Barnett suggests for B.llîn “Baliapatam, more correctly Vaḷâpaṭ-tam, a few miles NW. of Cannanore in Cirakkal Tahuk, Malabar District, which is Prolemy’s *Bâlapatâra*” [ed. Renou, 1925, vii, ch.i, § 6: *Bâlapatâra*]. This would indicate for B.llîn a much more westerly position than Urshfin. However, it must be remembered that I.Kh. places B.llîn at 2 days’ distance to the south (or SE.) of Malay (Malabâr) and at 1 day’s distance from Ceylon.
passage in which immediately after the king of Sarandib is mentioned the king of *Manifattan*. (variants *Mandurpatan* and *Menorpan* "which is a country opposite the Sarandib island, as well as opposite Qimär . . . [text out of order] . . . and every king ruling the country of *Mandurpan* is called the king of al-Qayday") [the last element perhaps -ray instead of -day].

Biruni, Canon, describes *Mandurpatan* (or *Mandur-patran*) as "the harbour and embarcation point (ma’bar “ferry”) for Sarandib, lying in the ghubb". Idrisī (Jaubert), pp. 185–7, describes it as a small town on the sea-coast near which lies a celebrated island of the same name where elephants are caught. This island is also known for its rhubarb, iron-mines, and a tree called "Sharqar. From *Mandurpatan* (in the direction of China) the distance is of 3 days. Abul-Fidā, p. 335, mentions a town *Manifattan* on the Ma’bar coast, identified by Yule with Malipatun which the Jesuit traveller Bouchet places “on the shore of Palk’s bay, a little north of where our maps show Devipattan”, see Yule’s remarks in Elliot-Dowson, viii, Index, p. xi, [though probably Manifattan is only a mis-spelling of *Mandur-fattan*, found by Abul-Fidā in some other source of his]. The *Mohit*, Map XVII, mentions in the same region a locality *Adalatun* as the first place which the boats coming from Indo-China find on the east coast of India [on Portuguese maps *Beadala, Bedala*].

If the first elements of these names are still doubtful, the second part of the compounds can be safely restored as -battan [v.s. ii.], or -fattan, rendering Indian *pattan*. The names all refer to the same important locality in the southernmost part of India from which the roads of the east-bound ships bifurcated, but it is possible that in the course of time several different harbours were used by the navigators, or even that the site of the principal port was moved.

13. Malay = Malayabār, “Malabar coast” (Abul-Fidā, p. 353: المياج) could hardly be under the direct rule of the Ballah-ray. In I.Kh., 64, whose enumeration runs from west to east, Malay comes immediately before B.linn, v.s. 12.

14. Iṣṭ. (whom our author follows in the opposite direction) gives the distances, pp. 172, 179: Kanbāya to Sūbāra 4 marḥalas; thence to Sīndān 5 marḥalas; thence to Saymūr 5 marḥalas; thence to Sarandib 15 marḥalas. Mas’ūdī, *Muruji*, i, 330, who visited the Ballah-ray’s possessions in 303/915, gives a somewhat different enumeration: Saymūr, Sūbāra, Tāna, Sīndān,

Generally speaking a place on the west coast of India is hardly suitable for bifurcation of roads leading farther east.

1 *King*, not *queen*, as in I.R. and the H.-ʿA. In Sulaymān, p. 6, a queen is mentioned in the *Dhībūdī*, i.e. the Laccadive, &c. islands.

2 Ferrand, *Crīcīdyaya*, p. 62, explains the name as “*Mandūrspatan, la capitale de Madura*”, but the city of Madura lies far inland.

3 Abul-Fidā, p. 333, in his quotation from the Canon seems to have misread بِين into بِين “between”.

and Kânbâya; like our author he, too, praises the sandals of Kânbâya. صور in our text is a mis-spelling for Iṣṭ., 170, Maq., 477: صور and Birûnî, India, 102, جمیر, both transcriptions standing for *Chaymûr which was identified by Yule with Ptolemy’s, vii, i, 6, Συμύλα, modern Chaul in the Kolaba district of Bombay. Sindân, Sanjam of Portuguese maps and St. John of English ones, lay south of Daman in the Thana district of Bombay; Sûbâra = Σουππάρα (cf. Mas’tûdî, i, 253, Sûfâra) also in Thana; Kânbâya = Cambay in Gujarat. On the Kûlî of Cambay v.s., § 6, 16.

15. Iṣṭ., 176, 179, places Qâmûhul at 4 marhâlas from Kânbâya at the beginning of the frontier of Hind (i.e. the frontier of the Ballah-ray’s possessions with Sind).

16. Iṣṭ., 175, spells Bûniya adding that the said ’Omar was the grand-father (jâdd) of the conquerors of Maṅsûra.

17. This Qandâhâr (Indian Ghandhâr) is totally different from its Muslim namesakes in Afghanistan and the Panjab, v.i. 56. Some light on its position is thrown by § 6, 16. Idrîsî counts from it to Nahravâra (Anhilvara) 5 days in a cart. It stood in the eastern corner of the gulf of Cambay, see Ibn Bâṭūṭâ, iv, 58, cf. Marquart, Érânsahr, pp. 266–8. Both the Mohût, Map XIII (Bandar-i Ghandârî), and Portuguese maps, ibid. (Bandel Guandari), show it between Cambay and Broach (evidently in the bay of Amod, SW. of Baroda).²

18.–24. were situated in the neighbourhood (more or less immediate) of the Narbadâ, for in the description of that river (§ 6, 16.) our 21., 23., 24. (with the addition of Nu’ûn) are mentioned in the opposite direction, i.e. following the course of the river, whereas the enumeration in § 10 starts with 17. Qandâhâr, situated near the estuary of the river, and then goes eastwards up the Narbadâ river. This must be the clue for the future identification of the localities, of which the names are disfigured. The additional نزّن must correspond to one of the towns 18., 19., 20., or 22., and more probably to کورس which not only is mentioned immediately before Nu’ûn (cf. the order in § 6, 16.) but in Arabic cursive has some resemblance to نزّن. It would be tempting further to consider both these forms as corruptions of لوجن, i.e. Ujjain, a place of great fame, through which Indian geographers drew their ो° of longitude, v.s. note to § 4, 13.; Greek Ὀξύην; I.R., 22: Birûnî, Canon: ‘اوذین بیحال قیّمّ الاطّر و علم حسابات البدد. بیرنی، Ind. p. 159. Ujjain does not lie on the Narbadâ, but the terms of § 6, 16. cannot be interpreted too strictly. As regards the important Nu’ûn (نحون) one would tentatively identify it with the capital of Mâlāvâ: Mandû (*مَندُو or perhaps مَانَدو in Arabic script) situated to the north of the Narbadâ on the top of an offshoot of the Vindhya range and possessing unique natural defences: it could hardly be overlooked in

¹ Perhaps this form has been influenced by the name mentioned under § 5, 9. which seems to stand for a different place.

² For earlier identifications of Qanda-
Commentary

§ 10


24. It is not known whether B.lhārī has anything to do with the king Ballah-ray whose capital Mānkhīr = Mānyakheta lay some 350 miles south of the Narbādā. Bīrūnī, Indiā, 102, mentions a locality called Vallabha, but places it south of Jynwī (*Chaynur > Chaul, v.s. 14.), i.e. probably in Konkan, v.s., p. 239, line 18.

25. and 26.–8. are obscure but in view of the closing sentence of 25. seem to lie in Central India in the direction of Qinnauj.

29. Qinnauj (so in Arabic, for Kanyākūḥja > Kanauj) on the Ganges, seat of the powerful Gurjara-Pratihāra kings (A.D. 836–1037), Ray, o.c., 570–611, v.s., p. 239, and v.i. 38–39, 46., and 53.

30.–44. Muslim possessions on the Indus forming a digression in the middle of the enumeration of the Qinnauj dependencies. Our author, who takes the Indus for the geographical frontier between Sind and Hind, describes here also some towns of the left bank of this river which Ist., 171, does not separate from the rest of Sind (§ 27).

30. Ist., 171, 175, places Qallārī, Annārī, Bulrī, and Rūr in Sind. The two first lay far to the east of the Indus on the road from Manṣūra to Multān. The situation of Annārī is uncertain. Bulrī lay to the west of the Indus, where a branch (khaltīj) separated from the river beyond Manṣūra. A Bulrī is shown on Cousens’s map [cf. § 27], 40 miles south of Haydarābād. Rūr, encircled by a double wall, was not second in size to Multān, and formed the limit of [the possessions of] Manṣūra. The ruins of al-Rūr (Arūr, Alor), the ancient capital of Sind, are situated near Rohri, see H. Cousens, o.J., 76–9, and Minorsky, Les Tsiganes Lūli, in Jour. As., April 1931, p. 286.

31. Ist., 175, places Basmad at 1 farsakh to the east of the river, at 2 marjhalas from Multān, and at 3 marjhalas from Rūr.

32. I.R., 135–7, Ist., 173–5. According to I.R., 135, the amīr of Multān did not obey the lord of Manṣūra, but read the khuṭba in the name of the caliph (amīr al-mu‘iminīn). By his term “Maghrībī” our author means that the khuṭba in Multān was read for the Fāṭimid caliph, and this fact is confirmed by Maq., 195b (Cod. Constantinopolitanus), where it is said of Crete that “the Western One (i.e. the Fāṭimid caliph) delivered it from (the Byzantines)”.

33. According to Ist., 175, Chandrār was the military camp of the amīr.

34. Jab. rs.řī unknown. 35. Bahraiyij. The amīr of Multān could not possibly control the town and district of Bahraich, situated north of Gogra, some 125 miles to the north-east of Qinnauj; consequently some different place is meant here.

36. Lahore must be Lahore on the Rāvī (Ssk. Layapura, modern Lāhaur),

1 Contrary to Barthold, v.s., p. 27.

37. *Rāmayān* must correspond to रामायण which Maq., 478, mentions among the dependencies of Multān. It lay at a distance of 5 days from 38. and evidently to the west of it, seeing that 38. belonged to Qinnauj and 37. to Multān.

38. 39. Qinnauj (Kanauj) itself was quoted under 29. as the last in that series of localities. With 38. and 39. we come back to the possessions of the raja of Qinnauj, this time approaching the basin of the Ganges from the Panjab (N. to SE.).

38. Jāhandar = Jalandhara, now Jullundur in the Panjab, between the Bias and Sutlej. Cf. Hsüan-Tsang, Si-yu-ki (Beal), i, 175.

39. No parallel could be found for S.lābūr, unless it is related to *Simpahpura (Seng-ha-pu-lo)* which Hsüan-Tsang, *Life*, St. Julien, p. 89, Beal, p. 67, and Si-yu-ki, St. Julien, i, 172, Beal, i, 143, mentions on the way from Takshasilā to Kashmir (and further to Jalandhara, *v.s.* 38.). Seng-ha-pu-lo lay at 700 li = circa 403 Km. to the south-east of Takshasilā, had no king, was a dependency of Kashmir and possessed a natural fortress. The location of Seng-ha-pu-lo cannot be regarded as finally settled. Cunningham, *Ancient Geography of India*, re-edited by S. M. Sastri, Calcutta 1924, p. 145, identified Simhapura with Ketōsa (Katās, Kaṭāksha), lying on the northern side of the Salt Range (which stretches along the right bank of the Jhelam), but Watters in his commentary on Hsüan-Tsang, i, 248, ii, 263, thinks that the Chinese traveller, rightly or wrongly, thought of Simhapura as lying north (or north-east) of Takshaśila, not south-east of it! In our text both S.lābūr and Kashmir (*v.i.* 57.) are dependencies of Qinnauj. To judge by the variety of currency in S.lābūr it was a busy commercial town but it is noteworthy that salt is not mentioned among its products.

40. (or [[ Providence (ریحان) (سیدنی)]] which Maq., 478, mentions as a dependency of Qinnauj. The detail about the sacred water makes one think of Benares (Vārāṇasi, Biruṇī, *Canon: Bānlīṣ*), which was a part of the dominions of the rajas of Qinnauj, Ray, o.c., 579, but “5 days to Tibet” is evidently too short a distance for Benares, even if by Tibet some of the principalities 41.–3. are meant. The name, apparently disfigured, has some outward resemblance to Buda'un (بداون) but it is still to be seen whether the latter fulfils the conditions of our text.

41.–3. undoubtedly situated in the sub-Himalayan region. 41. About (or [[ تبت (Tibet)]] § 5, 5 b.) we know that it was the nearest of the three to Qinnauj from which it was separated by a high mountain. Beyond Hitāl

---

¹ This detail is repeated in the *T'ang-shu*, Chavannes, *Documents*, 167.
² The names of the coins were un-known to the specialists whom I have had the advantage of consulting.
(H.btâl) the range of mountains crossing India from west to east split into two branches. Hitâl possessed a ruler who was hostile to the raja of Qinnauj. 42. Tithâl is the wild mountainous country separating Hitâl from 43. Baytâl (Nîtal) described as a commercial centre from which (Tibetan ?) mûsk was imported. Two of our names also occur in Bîrûnî’s Canon at the end of the third climate (the text unfortunately without dots):

the region سال which is the observation point between (?) 

المصرد (ب) long. 104° 35', lat. 30° 10'.

the region سال which is the observation point between Hind and Inner Tibet: long. 120° 5', lat. 32° 5'.

The second country lying to the north (?)-east of the first, according to the explanatory sentence, seems to be Nepal and to correspond to our 43. which, by moving the dots, easily becomes نایپال, i.e. Nepal. It is, however, much more difficult to identify the two other names. 41. follows on 40. which, with regard to Qinnauj, lay evidently in the direction of “Tibet” (Himalaya). If 40. is Budâ’un (?) the continuation of the line Qinnauj-Buda’un may indicate the direction in which Hitâl ought to be sought, but the identity of 40. is not certain. Hitâl was evidently an important valley considered as “splitting” the Himalaya range: the valleys of Sarda, or Gogra in westernmost Nepal would serve that purpose. As a name resembling our Hitâl سال (Bîrûnî: سال) one may quote Nainîtâl (*نینتا) to the west of the Sarda river though as an administrative term it seems to be of a later origin, The Imperial Gazetteer, xviii, 322-32. 2 As regards 42. it must be sought in the neighbourhood of Dhaulagiri, to the west of the central part of Nepal.

The route from Qinnauj to Nepal quoted in Bîrûnî’s India, 98 (transl., 201) ran eastwards along the foot of the mountains and did not touch our 41. and 42. From Qinnauj to Bârî, 10 farsakhs; thence to Dûgum, 45 fars.; thence to the Sh.lhat kingdom (ملکة شلہت), 10 fars.; thence to the town of Bh.t or B.h.t, 12 fars. “Farther on the country to the right is called T.lwt (ترت) and the inhabitants Tarû, people of very black colour and flat-nosed like the Turks. Thence you come to the mountains of Qâmûrî, which stretch away as far as the sea. To the left [i.e. to the north of Tlwî] is the realm of Naiypâl.” Some informer of Bîrûnî’s travelled that way: “when in T.nwt (ترت), he left the easterly direction and turned to the left. He marched to Naiypâl, a distance of 20 farsaks, most of which was up-hill country.”

1 Perhaps “Outer Tibet” is here meant for Bîrûnî, ibid., places Inner Tibet in the fourth climate at long. 94° o’ lat. 36° o’ [perhaps 37° o’ ?]. For comparison’s sake one may quote the position of

Yârkand long. 95° 35’, lat. 43° 40’
Sîkhashim long. 96° 20’, lat. 37° 0’
Abul-Fidâ, 361 (quoting Ibn Sa’id and al-Atwâl), mentions among the towns (مودن “lands”?) of Qinnauj Outer and Inner Tibet, of which the latter lay at 7 marhâlas from Qinnauj. On the Outer Tibet cf. § 11, 9.

2 In the region of Nainîtâl there are several names ending in تال “lake” (< Ssk. tâla).

3 The identification of the route must
44.-6. These kings must undoubtedly be sought in the direction of Kasmir. Of them Sulaymān, pp. 28–9, mentions malik al-Jurz and malik *al-Taqin; I.Kh., p. 16: *jāba, malik al-Taqin, malik al-Jurz, *Ghāba; and p. 67: al-Taqin, *jāba, al-Jurz, *Ghāba; I.R., p. 135: malik al-Taqin, N. *jāba, al-Jurz. I.Kh.'s is perhaps a dittography for Ḡaba (Ghāba/Ghāba); in any case it cannot be confronted with I.R.'s (Mas'ūdī, 394) which belongs to the southern group of rulers enumerated by I.R., p. 133 (as it seems, on the authority of Abū ʿAbdillāh Muḥammad b. Iṣḥāq).

44. On Ṭaqī (or Ṭaqin) see Sulaymān, 27, I.Kh., 13, I.R., 130. It is the country Ṭakkā-deva, or Ṭakkā-niṣaya mentioned in the Rājatarāṅgini, ed. by M. A. Stein, 1900, i, 205 and passim. Hsūn-Tsang, Si-yu-ki (Beal), i, 165, calls it Tṣeh-kia and describes it as bordering in the east on the Vīpāśa (Biāśa) and in the west on the Indus. Its capital lay circa 15 li (= 8.6 kilometres) to the north-east of Shē-kie-lo (Śākala, Sialkot). Cf. C. S. Lévi, Notes chinoises sur l'Inde, in BEPEO, v, 1905, p. 300, and Ray, o.c., 119, and Map 3, where Ṭakkā-deva is shown south of Kasmir and east of Sialkot, between the upper courses of the Chenāb and Rāvī. The Arab authors all speak of the beauty of the Ṭaqin women. In the immediate vicinity of Kasmir Bīrūnī, Īndia, 102 and 206, mentions jointly Ṭākār and Lohār, of which Lohār is certainly Lohāra, valley of the Upper Tohī on the western approaches of Kasmir (and not the town of Lahore) while Takēshar (Ṭakkā-deva) stands for Ṭaqin of the earlier geographers.

45. This name undoubtedly applies to the ruling dynasty and not to the country itself. The form S. Ṭūqīyīn (Arabic gen. plur.) shows that the name S. Ṭūqī has been found in an Arabic source. I.R., 135, says: “and after [the king of Ṭaqin], (comes) a king called N. *jāba (*jāba) who enjoys an honourable position among (the kings), and the king Ballah-rā takes wives from among them, and they are S. Ṭūqī, and on account of their pride (sharaf) take wives only from among themselves. The well-known S. Ṭūqī-hounds [wind-hounds, Salukhs] are said to have been brought from their country. In their country and its forests (ghiyād) red sandal wood is found.” Instead of N. *jāba I.Kh., 16 and 67, has *jāba, and clearly distinguishes this *jāba from his namesake Jāba (see § 4, 9.) whom he calls “Jāba the Indian” and the Jāba of the dry land, continental Jāba”, as Barthold has suggested. In the same passage the inner range of the Himalaya (in the neighbourhood of Kasmir) separates Jāba’s country from that of Lhrz (v.i. 46.). It would be left to the specialists. Bārī, later capital of the rajas of the Gurgara-Pratīhāra dynasty, lay east of the Ganges; then the road would cross the distance between the Gogra and Great Ghandak rivers (ancient Northern Kosala) and on the left bank of the latter reach Battish (our *b?,). The country T.lwt would be the region between Nepal and Mithila inhabited by the forest people Ṭhāru (our ʿTarū). Going farther east towards the Jamuna the road would enter Assam (Kāmarāpa, our ʿAmrū). T.lwt and T.mut evidently represent the same name corresponding to modern Tirhut <Ṭīrā-bhukti).
be tempting to identify Jāba's kingdom with Chambā, on the head-waters of the Ṛavī, north-east of the Ṭakka-ṭeṣā, see J. Ph. Vogel, *Antiquities of Chambā*, in *Archaeological Survey of India*, N.S., vol. xxxvi, Calcutta 1911. This small but ancient principality is well known in the history of Kashmir, whose kings, under the Lohara dynasty (A.D. 1003–1171) [and probably earlier?], intermarried with the rulers of Chambā [took wives from them]; cf. Ray, o.c., 107, &c. According to Prof. Vogel, o.c., 97, the founder of the Chambā dynasty towards A.D. 700\(^1\) was "a Rajput chief of the Solar race, Meru-varman by name, who not only assumed the proud title of 'King of Kings' but actually must have been the liege-lord of feudatory chiefs". Our S.līqī may somehow reflect this Solar.\(^2\) Prof. Vogel himself (letter of 4.iii.1935) would rather compare our Jāba with another hill state Jammū (<*Jambū*) lying on the Chenāb and now united with Kashmir. However, the most ancient name by which this territory seems to have been known is *Durga* (mentioned in two title-deeds of the eleventh century); the Rājatarangini does not know either *Durga* or Jammū and only mentions the old capital *Babbapura>*Babor; in the town of Jammū (which alone interests us from the point of view of the name) there are no ancient remains, or evidences of antiquity, see J. Hutchison and J. Ph. Vogel, o.c., ii, 515–16. Therefore Chambā still seems to me the most suitable correspondence for Jāba (<*Chāba*>).\(^3\)

46. In I.Kh., 16 and 67, and I.R., 135, the al-jurz follows immediately on Jāba and there is no doubt that our al-jurz (bearing the trace of an Arabic source) stands for it. The item on the justice of this king corresponds to what I.R. says about him. The Jurz are the Gurjara (Gurjara-Pratihāra) kings of Qinnauj; their identity with the rajas of Qinnauj (29., 38.–40.) has been overlooked by our author, who this time comes back to Qinnauj from another direction. As Jālhandar is reckoned to Qinnauj, the inner range\(^4\) of the Himalaya can really be said to divide al-Jurz (= Qinnauj) from

---

\(^1\) In the latest work by J. Hutchison and J. Ph. Vogel, *History of the Panjab Hill States*, Lahore, 1933 (printed by the Superintendent, Government Printing, Panjab), i, 268–339, Chambā is described as "one of the oldest Native States founded not later than A.D. 600 and perhaps as early as A.D. 550".

\(^2\) From a purely phonetical point of view S.līqī corresponds best to Chalukya. Moreover, according to V. Smith, o.c., 440, "there is some reason for believing that the Chalukyas or Solankis were connected with the Chāpas, and so with the foreign Gurjara tribe of which the Chāpas were a branch". This combination of Chalukya with Chāpa would be a curious parallel to our pair of S.līqī and Jāba (<*Chāpa*>)! However, I hear from Dr. Barnett that Chalukya and Chaulukya must be distinguished and that the Solāṣki-Chaulukya dynasty of Rājpūt origin could not as yet be traced much farther north than 25°.

\(^3\) As in Sumatra Jāba has a Chinese parallel chan-pei (note to § 4, 9.), it appears that the original nasal element of the name was dropped in Arabic rendering. The same method may have been applied in arabicizing the name of the sub-Himalayan Jāba (<*Chambā*>). The variations of length may be due to a different timbre of the long vowels.

\(^4\) Our author (§ 5, 9 b.) may be wrong in calling this range Q.s.k which name, according to the story of § 6, 15., ought to belong to the region of the passes between the Indus basin and the Oxus, say between Gilgit and Andamin, see Map iv.
Jāba’s possessions (Chambā?). I.R. distinctly says that al-Jurz was at war with the Ballah-rā, the king of Tāqīn, and N.jāba (*jāba). [It must be remembered that a locality Gujrāt (reflecting the name of Gurjara) exists in the Panjab, north of the Chenab and south of Naoshera, at the very threshold of Kashmir.] See Map iv.

47.-57.: Places of the northernmost zone of India (beyond the Indus), enumerated in the order from west to north-east.

47.-50. and 54.-5. lie near the southern frontier of Afghānistān. 47. Gardiz (Gardēz), the birthplace of the well-known author of the Zayn al-akhhār, is situated 34 miles to the east of Ghaznī (§ 24, 19.), in the plain of Zurmat. Maq., 349, gives an itinerary: Ghaznī to Gardiz, 1 marhala, thence to Īgh, ditto; thence to L.jān (?), ditto; thence to Vayhind—the whole stretch being of 17 stages (mansīl). Apparently this road was a short cut from Ghaznī, across the mountainous region of the Pathan tribes, to the Indus, of which it then followed the right bank upstream to Gandhāra (region of Peshāwar). Our author distinctly speaks of a road from 47. Saul (lying in a very mountainous and turbulent region) to 49. Hūsaynān (lying near the plain). Therefore our 48. and 49. following immediately on 47. Gardiz, may respectively correspond to Maqdisī’s Īgh and L.jān. Birūnī in his Canon, mentions on the road “from Ghaznī to Multān” (immediately after Gardiz) i.e. *Farmul, or Parmul. This district, named after the [Tājik?] tribe inhabiting it, lies precisely on the road from Ghaznī to Bannū, i.e. towards the Indus region. South-east of Ghaznī the road crosses a pass 8,000 feet high to penetrate into the basin of the Tochi, the right affluent of the Kurram on which Bannū is situated. In the upper part of the Tochi valley the first stage on the road is Urgūn, which is the centre of the Parmul district (23 kurohs to the south-east of Ghaznī). According to the order of enumeration in our sources it is probable that *Farmul, or Parmul refer to the same locality, i.e. Farmul. The direct road from Ghaznī to Farmul seems to leave Gardiz to the north; but in the 10th–11th century travellers from Ghaznī could have reasons for making a circuit in order to pass through Gardiz, situated at the junction of the roads from Ghaznī, Kābul, and Bannū. Cf. Raverty’s description of the route in Notes of Afghanistan, 1888, p. 85.

Geographically 54. and 55. ought to come between Kābul (mentioned unexpectedly under the Marches of Khorāsān, § 24, 20.) and 50. *Ninhār. The exact situation of the town of 54. Lamghān (Laghmān), Ptolemy, vii, 1, 42, Ḋawmār (Ssk. Lampāka, Birūnī, Canon, کلم) is not indicated on the maps, but as regards the district of Lamghān (Laghmān) the Emperor Bābur says that originally it consisted of Alangār, ‘Ali-shang, and Mandrāvar, situated on the left side affluent of the Kābul river, which flows from Kāfīrīstān (to the NW. of the Kunār basin). Alangār is the eastern valley and ‘Ali-shang the western one; their waters join below Mandrāvar and form the


\[\text{2 Indistinctly written in the MSS. Could it echo the name of Urgūn?}\]
Bārān river falling into the Kābul river, cf. *The Bābur-nāma*, trans. by A. S. Beveridge, 1922, i, 207–13. *Bar miyāna* has been translated “on the middle course” in view of § 6, 58.; an alternative would be “a middle sized” town, cf. § 12, i.

(§ 6, 13, دیور) according to the description lay over against Lamghān, consequently on the right bank of the Kābul river. Birūnī in his *Canon* gives the positions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>long.</th>
<th>lat.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lamghān</td>
<td>96° 10'</td>
<td>33° 50'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynwr</td>
<td>96° 25'</td>
<td>33° 45'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the latter being placed to the south-east (*south-west?*) of the former (corrected latitude in Birūnī, *India*, 167). Anyway, *Dynwr* must correspond to *Adīnapur*, as also suggested by our text, was situated north of the Surkh-rūd, which is the right-side affluent of the Kābul river and falls into the latter downstream from the estuary of the Bārān, v.s. 54., and upstream from the present-day Jalālābād. The name *Adīnapur* is said to reflect Ssk. *Udyānapūra* which would confirm the pronunciation of our name as being *Dunpūr*.

The Afghans are mentioned under 48. (and 50.) *i.e.* only in the southernmost part of the present Afghanīstān. As Barthold, *Preface*, p. 30, remarks, this seems to be the earliest contemporary record of the name, although Ibn al-Athir (13th cent.) mentions the Afghanīs under the year 366/976–7.

50. The name is spelt better under § 6, 13. (*Ninhār?*), where it is explained that the place lies downstream from Lamghān, on the northern (?) bank of the latter’s river. The name certainly refers to the Jalālābād district of which a detailed description is found in G. H. MacGregor’s article in *JASB*, 1844, xiii/2, pp. 867–80: “the country which is subject to the control of the governor of Jullalabad is the valley of the Cabul river, but it is generally termed Ningrahor, or Nunghiar, the former being a corruption of the latter word, which signifies in the Afghan language nine

---

1 In the *Shāh-nāma* the name has the form دینور; see the passage describing the extent of the fief granted to Zāl by Minūchichr, ed. Vullers, i, 144: “The whole of Kābul and D.n.b.r and Māy-hind, from the China sea to that of Sind, from Zābulistān to the lake of Bust.” On Māy-hind v.i. 56.

2 The distance is confirmed by Birūnī’s route, *India*, p. 101: Vayhind-Purshāvar 14 farsakhs; thence to Dunpūr 15 f.; thence to Kābul 12 f.; thence to Ghazna 17 f.

3 See Mrs. Beveridge’s notes in her translation of the *Bābur-nāma*, Appendix, p. xxi.
rivers, or rivulets, and has reference to those by which the valley is intersected.” The Bābur-nāma (Ilinsky), p. 161, gives both نیگنها (Ningnahār) and the more correct تکهار (Nagarahār), cf. also A. S. Beveridge’s translation, ii, Appendix, pp. xvii–xxviii. The mention in our text of the three idols of *Ninhār is curious, as this locality (Hsüan-Tsang’s Na-ha-lo-ho, i.e. *Nagarahāra, cf. Watters, pp. 182–90) was a famous centre of Buddhist cult. However, the chief ruins of the stupas, indicating the situation of the ancient town, lie, contrary to our text, on the southern bank of the Kābul river, some 8 Km. south of the town of Jalālbād. See J. Barthoux, Les Fouilles de Haγhda, i, 1933, pp. 1–12 (geographical account).

51–3. according to § 6, 17., are situated on one of the Panjab rivers, perhaps the Sutlej. Light on 53. Bīrūza is obtained from Mas‘ūdī, Murūj, i, 206–7, who says: “The king of Qinnauj, one of the kings of Sind, is (called) B.rūza (ب.ر wildfires, &c.). This is the title of the king of Qinnauj, and here (too) stands a town called B.rūza (named) after the title of the king. It is now the territory of Islam forming a district of Multān. From the town comes one of the rivers which form the Mihrān of Sind.” The spelling Bīrūza (perhaps influenced by a popular etymology) is very near ب.روس, which Marquart, Erānsāhr, 264, has restored after the Leiden codex. [Less satisfactory seems to be a later surmise by Marquart, Komanen, 100, according to which Mas‘ūdī erroneously made a title of the king of Qinnauj out of the name of his town ب.روس which should be interpreted as Mahodaya?.] If we keep to our texts, Bīrūza lay in Panjab, and Ray, o.c., p. 16 and Map I, places it, with some probability, in the neighbourhood of the Sutlej, for the Panjab river flowing past Bīrūza is likely to be the one nearest to the system of the Ganges, where the kings of Qinnauj were at home. However, certainty will be acquired only when Hīvān, B.lwt (ب.روست) and J.lwt (ب.روست) lying upstream from Bīrūza have been identified. The reading of the two last names is uncertain. Under § 6, 15. they are spelt B.l.vv.t and J.l.vv.t, but they may possibly be B.lūt, B.lvw.t, J.lūt, J.lvw.t, &c. A fort of Bilwat is mentioned in Nī‘matullāh’s Makhzan-i Afghānī, Elliot-Dowson, o.c., v, 107, as the place against which Bābur marched from Lahore. Elliot thinks that it is identical with Milwat found in the Tusūk-i Bāburi, ibid., v, 248: moving from Kalanūr (situated half-way between the Rāvī and Biyāh) Bābur crossed the Biyāh (opposite Kamvahīn). Thence three marches brought him to the valley in which lay the fort of Milwat. These indications suggest for Milwat (Bilwat?) a position between the Bias (Biyāh) and Sutlej, which is an argument in favour of our supposition. [On the other hand, the Bilwa-ferry mentioned in the Bābur-nāma, GMS, 364 (Mrs. Beveridge’s translation, p. 688) situated on the Ganges, downstream of Benares, has nothing to do with Bilwat/Milwat; equally T.lwt (ب.روست) mentioned in Bīrūni, v.s. 43., is an entirely different place.]

54–5. v.s. after 47–50.
56. Vayhind, Indian Udabhānda>Ohind, lay between the Indus and

1 Firdausi’s Shāh-nāma (Vullers), i, 144, and 154 seems to refer to Vayhind, v.s., p. 252, note 1.
Commentary

§§ 10-11

the Kābul river, just above their confluence. Maq., 477, 479, mentions Vayhind as a provincial capital (qasaba) and enumerates its towns: V.dhēnān, Bit.r, Nuj, L.vār, S.ūnān, Qūf. Vayhind was the capital of the kingdoms of Gandhāra (Biruni, India, 101: Qandahār, cf. Marquart, Brānsahr, 271), which was ruled by the Hindūshāhī dynasty. The latter was founded in the second half of the ninth century by the Brahman Lalliyā, who had deposed his former master, the Turkish ruler of Kābul. According to Muhammad Nāzim, Sultan Mahmūd, p. 194, the possessions of the masters of Vayhind stretched from Lamghan to the Chenāb, and from southern Kashmir to the frontier of the principality of Multān. The name of the town may belong to an earlier source, but the mention of the king Jaypāl (Jayapāla) must have been added by our author. Jaypāl, who reigned a.d. 965–1001, was the gallant, but unfortunate, opponent of Sultan Mahmūd, cf. Ray, o.c., 78, 103. Jaypāl’s feudatory ties with the raja of Qinnauj are rather unexpected.

57. The fact that the name is spelt here Qashmīr, while under § 26, 19–20, it appears as Kashmir, shows that our author depended on several sources. § 26 suggests the existence of a road linking Kashmir with Transoxiana and running through Bolor and Vakhān. More detail on Kashmir is found in Biruni, who personally visited the country, see his India, p. 101, and Canon, where he calls Srinagar Addishtān <Ssk. Adhiṣṭhāna “the residence”.¹ From 855 to 939 (and even down to a.d. 1003) the Utpala dynasty reigned in Kashmir, Ray, o.c., 181. It is true that the tenth century was a time of considerable weakness of these kings, but nothing seems to confirm their vassal dependence on Qinnauj.² Nor can Dimashqi’s late and indirect evidence be understood in the sense that Qinnauj and Kashmir had formed one territorial unit. This author (who died in a.d. 1327) speaks of the Inner and Outer Kashmir, the former with 70,000 villages and the latter with more than 100,000; the two provinces are divided by a high mountain in which lie the passes (aevāb) leading to China. In the middle of this description of Kashmir a paragraph on Qinnauj is found saying that it was “the residence of the kings of Hind” and that, according to Mas’ūdi, it possessed 108,000 villages. This looks like an interpolation in the text which is obviously out of order, and Mehrén, in his French translation of Dimashqi, Copenhagen 1874, p. 246, was wrong in placing Qinnauj in the Inner Kashmir. On the other hand, the term “Inner” Kashmir can be traced up to the Bundahishn where Kashmir-e andarōn is mentioned, see Christensen, Les Kayānidès, 1932, p. 3. See Map iv.

§ 11. Tibet³

I am greatly obliged to Prof. F. W. Thomas, M. Bacot, and Dr. W. A. Unkrig for valuable suggestions on matters concerning this chapter.

¹ A complete survey of the early exploration of Kashmir is given in Sir A. Stein’s Memoir quoted under 36.
² Only the western marches of Kashmir could depend on Qinnauj, v.s., p. 239.
³ The text of this chapter (without translation) was published by Barthold in Comptes rendus [Dokladi] de l’Acad. des Sciences de Russie, 1924, pp. 72–4.
Mirzā Haydar’s Tārīkh-i Rashīḍī, trans. by E. D. Ross and commented by Ney Elias, 1895, contains a mass of important data on Tibet and the neighbouring countries, but more than five centuries separate it from the period interesting us, and our author has in view an entirely different situation near the K’un-lun. It is a pity that Minchul Khutukhtu’s Geography of Tibet, written circa A.D. 1380–9 and translated into Russian by the late Prof. V. Vasiliev, Spb., 1895, is not accompanied by a commentary and is therefore difficult to use for a layman. A new translation of it by Dr. Unkrig is in the press. [See Barthold, Tibet, in EI.]

The present curious chapter on Tibet has no parallel in the known works of Arab geographers. On the other hand, its data are chiefly derived from a source (Jayhānī?) common with that used by Gardīzī, 88–9, 94. Gardīzī described three routes leading to Tibet:

(a) from Kāshghar a road passes between two mountains and follows an easterly direction until it reaches the province of Ādh.r (آذرب) which is 40 farsangs long and consists of mountains, plains (read: سریل instead of سریل), and barren hills (kauristān); the text, which is out of order, seems to indicate that Ādh.r formerly belonged to the khāqān of Tibet, but at the time to which the source refers was under Kāshghar. From the “province of Kāshghar” the road goes to Sār.msābkath and then to Alishār (اپشیر) after which it follows the stream of K.jā (کیا) on which, in the direction of the desert, lies the village of Ḥusayan (حسین) where Tibetans are found; then a river is crossed in a boat and the travellers reach the frontier of Tibet;²

(b) from Kāshghar to Khotan by the places enumerated in the note to 10. down to روسته which is the first village of Khotan; “and at this stretch (اراد in miyān) comes the river Y.ra (یرا)”; thence [from R.ṣūya or Ṭ.ṣūya] to the village of S.mywb.m, then to the “barren hills belonging to the Muslims” (کورستان مسلمانان),³ then to a stream (جری) coming from China (چین, or *Khotan جن?) then to the town of Khotan; at 15 days’ journey from Khotan lies the large town of Kay (کی, perhaps *کیا K.jā) which is within the limits of China but is occupied by the Toghuţghuz;⁴

(c) from Khotan オン, the road (b) is continued to the south: it goes to Al.shān, then to a bridge built by the Khotanese between two mountains and finally across the mountainous tract (Kūh-i zahr “Poisonous

---

1 In Turkestan (e.g. in the Samarqand region) the word adir means “low foot-hills”, cf. Tajikistān (by several authors), Tashkent 1925, p. 47. Radloff, Worterbuch, quotes adir (in Qirghiz and Qara-Qirghiz dialects) in the sense of “broken, mountainous country”. Very probably the Persian correspondence of adir is kauristān standing in our text.

2 This road seems to stretch north of the Tarim down to the region of Kuchā and then turn southwards, across the lower Tarim, to some place near Cherchen. [Alternatively it would run along the southern bank of the Tarim and then the river finally crossed would be the Cherchen?]

3 Barthold read: gūrīstān “cemetery”.

4 The final portion of the itinerary seems to describe a short cut across the Tarim from Khotan to Kuchā, cf. § 9, 10., where similar particulars on Kuchā are given.
mountain”) where the travellers suffer from mountain sickness, to the
“Gate (dar) of the khoqan of Tibet”.

Our author says nothing on the first two roads but incorporates the names
of the road (β) down to R.stüya (see notes to 10.–20.). The rest of the
places of the present chapter is not in Gardizi; of them 1, 3, 9, 21, 22.
(K.lbänk) are also mentioned in the chapters on the mountains and rivers
(§§ 5, 3, and 6, 3); one rare name (9.) is also found in Birüni; one name
23.) has a parallel in the Tārīkh-i Rashidi; the names 5., 6., 7., 8., and 22.
(Binā) occur only once in our text.

The order of enumeration of the places is quite fanciful and reflects the
compilative character of our author’s work: after 1. Rāng-rong which
seems to lie in the south-east of Tibet, comes 2. at the north-western
extremity of the country, then 3. which is a north-eastern march, and,
after a doubtful 4., follows unexpectedly Lhasa (5.), described for a second
time under 23.

Both our author and Gardizi refer to the times of Tibetan expansion
in the heyday of which the Tibetan influence was felt even in the neigh-
bourhood of the T’ien-shan where the Tibetans came into contact with
the Arabs. It is for the Tibetan scholars to see whether our chapter
contains any details permitting a more exact definition of the epoch of
the original source. Our author seems to have used several different
sources: in the chapter on China (§ 9, 7. and 8.) no mention is found of
the [Sari]-Uyghurs who occupied Kan-su (§ 9, 7. and 8.) towards the
middle of the ninth century and whose advent meant a considerable check to
Tibetan power. On the other hand, the whole region north of the Tarim
is represented as free from Tibetans and the presumed connexion of
Khotan with China (see § 9, 15.) may even indicate the situation towards
A.D. 937. [Cf. also 20. as interpreted on p. 280, l. 14.] [P. 92, l. 23, and
p. 97, l. 17, may refer to p. 96, l. 9.]

According to our text, the home of the kings of Tibet (Tubbat-khoqan) was

1 This road, also mentioned in Birüni, 
v.s., p. 24, evidently led across the K’un-
lun range to the Tibetan proper. From
Khotan it must have followed one of the
head-waters of the Khotan river. The
Tārīkh-i Rashidi, 324, 327, mentions a
bridge on the Aq-tash river in the
Qaranghu-tagh valley. See now on this
valley Sir A. Stein, Ruins of Desert
Cathay, i, 193, 267 (with photographs
of such dangerous bridges), and ibid., 58,
on the “poisonous air” as supposed by
the natives to cause mountain sickness.

2 The Arabs are twice mentioned in
Chinese annals as co-operating in the
T’ien-shan region with the Tibetans
against the Chinese, Chavannes, Docu-
ments, p. 148, n. 3 (year A.D. 715), p. 289,
n. 2 (year 717). Later they were engaged
in a long struggle, see a penetrating
analysis of these data in H. A. R. Gibb’s
articles, The Arab Invasion of Kashgar
in 715, in Bull. S.O.S., ii/3, pp. 472–3, and
Chinese Records of the Arabs in Central
Asia, ibid., ii/4, pp. 616–18. The situa-
tion in the 8th–9th cent. is reflected in
such notices as Qudāma, 208: Aṭbāsh
(in the Narin basin) “situated between
Farghāna, Tibet, and Barakhân”, cf. also
our § 25, 58.

3 On the frontier of China see § 9, 5.,
7.–8., 18. On the frontier between the
Tibetans and their northern neighbours
see §§ 12 and 15.

4 Cf. Gardizi’s remark on Adh.r, v.s.,
p. 255, line 18.
in the north-east of Tibet. Dr. W. A. Unkrig, whom I consulted on the matter, very ingeniously suggests to me (letter of 25.ii.1935) that the name of the tribe to which the kings belonged, *Ma-yul*, meaning in Tibetan "mother country, or the mother's country", may reflect the matriarchal habits of the Tibetans, whereas *vl*; among whom the chiefs (vice-roys) were recruited, may be explained as *Akhâ-yul* "the land of elder brothers" with a possible hint at the paternal connexions of the candidate.¹

Our text does not indicate the seat of the king of Tibet (Tubbat-khâqân) whose troops occupied 9. Tûsmat (evidently lying in the neighbourhood of Khotan), and whose treasure was kept in a fortress, south of the road leading from Kâshghar to Khotan. [It cannot be identical with the fortress mentioned in the confused § 6, 4. which lay to the south of the K'un-lun as it was situated on a river flowing down towards Lhasa.] Separately from the Tubbat-khâqân is mentioned the Lord of Khotan (§ 9, 18.) whose subjects were both Tibetans and Turks.

The record on the cheerfulness of the residents in Tibet is found in I.Kh., 170, and I.R., 82. This feature is confirmed by modern travellers, cf. G. Roerich, Trails in Inmost Asia, 1931, p. 459: "The village street is blocked on either side by heaps of refuse forming veritable ramparts in front of each house from behind which peep curious crowds, dirty beyond description but quite content [l V. M.] and eager to see foreigners."

¹ The second element of *(vl) vîl* has been tentatively transcribed as *rong*, in Tibetan "defile, valley". The first element too must be some Tibetan name like *Rang, Zang (Tsang), &c.* The province, as adjacent to Hindûstân and Chínistân; must be looked for in the south-east and east of Tibet, cf. the description of the Mânisâ range (§ 5, 3.) which crosses Râng-rong from the neighbourhood of India to a northern point where Tibet borders only on China (perhaps in Ssû Ch'uan, see note to § 5, 3c.). Prof. F. W. Thomas suggests the possibility of Râng-rong standing for "Sgân-Ron, i.e. the Sgân and the Roñ, the two different kinds of territory which make up south-east Tibet towards China", whereas Dr. W. A. Unkrig's restoration would be *gTsang-rong* with the suitable meaning of "defile of the great river" [perhaps of the Brahmaputra]. Gold is found principally in western Tibet, but also in the Nan-Shan; cf. Sir A. Stein, On Ancient Central-Asian Tracks, 1933, p. 241, on the gold pits worked by the people "from the side of Hsi-ning in the north-eastern border of Tibet".

¹ *Akhâ* in Mongol "elder brother, elderly, respectable person" = *yul* in Tibetan "country, land". If the possibility of such compounds be admitted, cf. *talâ* = *lama*, the first element *vl* may eventually be interpreted as *âchâ* [with Arabic *imâla*: *â* for *a*] and explained as Mongol *eche* "father". In the region now occupied by the Sarâi-Yêgûrs a word *aja* is quoted for "father", with the difference that in G. N. Potanin, Tangutsko-tibetskaya okraina Kitaya, SPb., 1893, ii, 435, it is attributed to the Turkish-speaking part of the federation, whereas in Mannerheim, Jour. de la Soc. Finno-Ougrienne, xxvii, 1911, p. 630, it figures as *acha* in the speech of the group mentioned, and as *aja* in that of the Mongol-speaking group. This *acha* may be a local form of Mongol *eche*.
2. The “Bolorian Tibet” corresponds to the Great Bolor (Pu-lu of the Chinese sources, Chavannes, Documents, 149), i.e. Baltistan, as opposed to the Lesser Bolor (Gilgit, &c.) on which see § 26, 19. See Map iv.

3. N.zvan (T.rvan, T.zdan?) is placed by the Mānisā range at the point where the latter bends to the north-west (§ 5, 3). Geographically it may be identified with the Koko-nor and Tsaidam, and the name may be Tibetan. On the interpretation of Mayūl as “mother country” or “the mother’s country”, v.s., p. 257. It apparently has nothing to do with Mar-yul “the low country” which in the Tārikh-i Rashidi, pp. 410, 456, is applied to Ladak.

4. Mayūl may correspond to Gardīzī’s Ḥasan which (v.s., p. 255) seems to have been situated north of a river. This latter detail makes it difficult to identify the two names with Cherchen (Kāshgharī: چرخان) on which v.i., 8.

5. It is extraordinary to find the name of Lhasa so perfectly transcribed in Arabic characters لَهَـَسَ. The report about a mosque in Lhasa is quite unexpected and M. Bacot doubts its truth. V.i. 23. K.rsāng.

The localities 6.–22. seem all to belong to the northern possessions of the Tibetans which at the epoch of the original report extended beyond the K’un-lun range into Chinese Turkestan.

6. On Zava see under 9.

7. Ḥasan admits of very different readings. M. Bacot suggests *Ajā-yul, “the Ajā Country”. The name transcribed in Tibetan characters Ḥa-ṣa [French transcription 'A-ṣa] belongs to the people whom the Chinese call Tu-yū-hun and of which the original form is restored as *Tu’u-yun, or *Tyuy-yun. This people, in the beginning of the fourth century A.D., founded a kingdom in the region of the Koko-nor among the Tibetan K’iang, with a capital lying 15 li = 8·6 Km. west of the Koko-nor. The kingdom was destroyed by the Tibetans in A.D. 663, but the name ‘A-ṣa still survived as shown by the Tun-huang documents. According to the Chinese sources (Sung-shu) “the Tu-yū-hun or Barbarian A-ch’ai [Tibetan: Ḥa-ṣa] were the Sien-pi of Liao-tung”; as regards the name A-ch’ai it was that given to the Tu-yū-hun by the “mixed tribes of the North-West”, and was consequently a popular, local name. Various opinions have been expressed with regard to the nationality of the *Tyuy-yun; some scholars took them for the Tunguz, others for the Mongols. The last opinion has been lately supported in the light of fresh evidence by P. Pelliot, Note sur les T’ou-yü-houen et les Sou-p’i, in T’oung-Pao, xx, 1920, pp. 323–31. Prof. F. W. Thomas, Tibetan Documents, v, in JRAS, Oct. 1931, p. 831, states that “the Tibetans (who speak of a Ḥa-ṣa kingdom long after the overthrow of Tu-yū-hun) understood by the term Ḥa-ṣa the people of the Shan-shan [i.e. Lob-nor] area and knew the Tu-yū-hun, who had long dominated the Shan-shan kingdom as Drug-cun”. In this case our *Ajā-yul has a chance of being located to the south of the Lob-nor. On the other hand, Dr. Unkriq’s suggestion of a curious popular etymology (v.s., p. 257), supported by his interpretation of the name Ma-yūl, is very
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Muslim sources on far-away countries could readily draw
on popular lore as explained to them by interpreters and intermediaries.
and Ttismat, has a twofold outward
8. J.rm.ngan, quoted between
likeness. On the one hand, “to the south of the (Khotan) oasis and not far
from the left bank of the Yurung-qash” two ancient sites are found, now
called Jamada and Chalmakazan. At the latter place, situated 13 miles
south-south-east of the ancient Khotan, coins were found dating from c.
A.D. 713-83 and c. 1102-6, cf. Sir A. Stein, Ancient Khotan, i, 233, and
Map. On the other hand, 600 li
346 Km. to the east of Niya, and
interesting.

1,000

li

=
= 576 Km. to the south-west of Lou-lan, Hsiian-Tsang, Si-yii-ki
ii, 247, and ditto (Beal), ii, 325, mentions a CM-mo-t' o-na
the same as the country called Ni-mo”. Sir A. Stein, ox. i, 311,

(St. Julien),

“which

is

with Chalmadana mentioned in Kharosthi documents,
corresponds to the present Charchan”.
The situation of our J.rm.ngan “on the edge of the desert” better fits the
region of Cherchen, and in this case the occupation of the inhabitants
sayyadl was perhaps “fishery” in the swamps of the lower course of the

note

7, identifies it

and

states that “it manifestly

—

—

1898, xxxiv.
9. Twsmt, vocalized Tiismat, according to § 5, 3., must have lain somewhere to the south of Khotan. As a dependency of Tusmat our author
mentions 6. Zava. A place of this name is found immediately north of
Khotan on the western bank of the Qara-qash (western river of Khotan) and
eventually such an extension of Ttismat would indicate that Khotan, too,
was practically comprised in it. However, our author places Khotan
under China (§ 9, 18.) and says that a range of mountains separates
Ttismat from China (Khotan ? § S, 3 .). It is curious that in the enumeration
of the places lying between Kashghar and Khotan {v.i. 10.-20.) our author
at the last place mentions some
instead of Gardizi’s Khotan. This
name looks like a trace of the indistinctly written o*-- A in which case our
author (who would contradict himself if he mentioned under Tibet a road
leading up to Khotan which latter is described under China), wanted
perhaps to connect the road with the neighbouring Tusmat. This may be
the reason, too, why he leaves out one or two localities mentioned by
Gardizi immediately before Khotan. Prof. F. W. Thomas draws my
attention to the likeness of the name Tusmat to Tibetan ’Mdo-smat
“Lower Mdo”, south of the Koko-nor region.^ Has our author misunderstood the situation of Tusmat? In Biruni’s Canon (the fifth climate)
I now read
(indistinctly written without dots); it is placed in “Outer
^ Abu Zayd
(= Sulayman, 64) in the the parallel passage Mas'udi, Muriij, i,

^

,

story of the revolt of
that the

ci-Jl

emperor

Huang-Chjao says
jLj

fled to

p. 109, a locality of

M’.du {d-maudV al-mdruf M-M.du) is
mentioned on the Tibetan frontier, and
it is said that its inhabitants are constantly at war with the Tibetans. In

305 and 297, gives L. Already Reinaud,
note 134 to Sulayman’s text, compared
M.dhau with Mdo (Amdo). In any case,
the tradition oi Twsmt in the
and
Birupi is different from SulaymanMas'Qdi’s
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Tibet” and mentioned along with Chinänjkath (§ 12, 1.):

Tūsmat  long. 110° o’ lat. 39° 10’
Chinänjkath long. 111° 20’ lat. 42° o’

This position of Tūsmat is certainly very remote from Khotan of which the centre (qaṣaba) according to Biruni was

āḥme (?)  long. 100° 40’ lat. 43° 30’

10.—20. As the author says, the places quoted here belonged formerly to China but “now” are held by the Tibetans. They exactly correspond to the places which Gardīzī, 94, enumerates along the road from Kāshghar to Khotan. The mention of a fortress “to the right of Künkra and Rāy-kutiya”† seems to be a trace of the original arrangement of the places along an itinerary. Our author, with his usual care about elaborate geographical and political “areas”, mentions Kāshghar under Yaghmā (§ 13, 1.) and Khotan under China (§ 9, 18.). Consequently in the present paragraph Gardīzī’s itinerary is quoted without its initial and terminal points. One would think that in the author’s opinion the Tibetan territory began immediately south of Kāshghar, and Khotan was a sort of enclave in Tibetan dominions retaining some connexion with China (cf. § 9, 18.). On the Toghuzghuz Turks said to live in large numbers at the intermediary stages between Kāshghar and Khotan, see § 13. Here is Gardīzī’s itinerary with the corresponding names of the Ḥudūd al-ʿĀlam:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gardīzī</th>
<th>H.-ʿĀ.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kāshghar</td>
<td>see § 13, 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yaṣh</td>
<td>10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kṛyan</td>
<td>11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḫajmān</td>
<td>12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḡaḍ</td>
<td>[Ḡaḍ 21.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ẓuwa (Ẓuwa)</td>
<td>13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḫikāk</td>
<td>14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kūdūr</td>
<td>15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raḵordīn</td>
<td>16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Rāʾ]</td>
<td>17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ẓa &amp;[ūr]</td>
<td>18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ẓawī</td>
<td>19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ẓawī</td>
<td>20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sūmo</td>
<td>Ẓawī, 20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kūrستان  Mūslimān</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† The fortress would have a sense in protecting some road across the K’un-lun. The road to the Qaraqoram pass runs through Sanju, the latter lying to
The comparison of the two columns is instructive as it indicates the extent of the alterations which foreign names underwent in Arabic script. Even this double set of names does not facilitate identification. The road from Kashghar to Khotan must have followed, as at present, the belt of cultivated lands on the border of the mountains. Our author excludes from Gardizî’s series 21. Ghazā (v.i.), which he evidently places lower down on the Khotan river (§ 5, 3.). But is then Gardizî’s enumeration in a straight line? Our 11. might be Kilian, though in this case it would be strange that, contrary to the actual distances, only one name would be found between it and Kashghar, whereas some eight names would separate it from Khotan lying nearer. 13. Brikha looks like the name quoted at the upper course of the Khotan river (§ 6, 3.), in which case our identification of the latter with Brinjak becomes less probable. There is some graphical likeness between our 18. and the Tiznaí river but the latter flows too far west (immediately east of the Yarkand-daryā). Perhaps only 19. could stand a comparison with Zanguya (Khan, Kama) situated between the Sanju and Qara-qash rivers, nearer to the former. Its situation would suit Gardizî’s remark that it was the first village on the road belonging to Khotan. In this case 15. might be Gundulik or Gundaluk (Khan), now Gunduluk-Langar. In a Chinese itinerary quoted by I. Bichurin, Opisanie... Vost. Turkestan, SPb., 1829, 1, 236, the distances are: Ilchi (= Khotan) to Kialma (Pialma), 110 li (circa 68 Km.); from Kialma to Gundulik, 90 li (circa 52 Km.). According to P’evtsov, Putesh. po Vost. Turkestanu, SPb., 1892, p. 107, Gundulik lies among reeds at some 10 Km. to the north-west of Zangûya, and near it great masses of shards are found. On the fortress v.s., p. 260, note 1. 21. 23. According to § 6, 3. the three tributaries of the Khotan river joined the latter between Ghazā and K.l.bînk. The first name recalls the names of Ghaz-daryā and Ghaz-qum, which lie on the Khotan river just above its junction with the Aq-su after the latter has received the joined waters of the Yarkand and Kashghar rivers. However; the particulars on Ghazā contained in the present paragraph do not facilitate this identification (cf. note to § 6, 3.). K.l.bînk is obscure and Bina is not found elsewhere. 23. Barthold, v.s., p. 25, has recognized the identity of our Karian (Esan, Õsæng?), which name in Mirzâ Haydar’s Tarikh-i Rashidi refers to Lhasa. Haydar, p. 130, calls Ursāng “the Qibla of Khitay and Tibet”, and p. 48, gives an account of an unsuccessful expedition which in the summer of 939/1533 he led with the object of destroying the idol-temples of Ursāng. Elias in his commentary on the Tarikh-i Rashidi, p. 136, explains that Ursāng is a probable corruption of the names of the two central provinces of Tibet, Wu and Tsang, which in speech are usually coupled together. Vasiliev, p. 32, transcribes the name of this “Middle Country” Vuy-Tsang (=-DVus-gTsang). The name of the province (comprising Lhasa and Shigatse) was consequently used by the Muslims for the south of the road from Kashghar to Khotan. Zangûya is the turning point for the travellers going from Khotan to Sanju.
its capital. The form كَاَرْيَارَكُ in our author may have arisen from the vowel sign (damma) أَرَيَّانُ.\(^1\) The second name of the place, “Great Farkhār”, i.e., in usual interpretation, “Great Vihāra”, suits Lhasa quite well.\(^2\) A vague report on Farkhār is found in the Nuzhat al-gulūb, p. 260, where it is said that it is a country (mamlakat) of the 6th (?) climate with numerous provinces and possessing a population renowned for beauty.

\[\text{§§ 12-17. The South-Eastern Turks}\]

Additional authorities for §§ 12-17: Radloff’s Introduction to Das Kudatku Bilik, part i, SPb., 1891, pp. i-lxxxiii (contains a survey of the sources on the “Toghuqghur” and Uyghurs known at that time; the Introduction is now out of date, except for the Persian texts of the Mongol epoch quoted in the original); Bretschneider, Mediaeval Researches, i, 236–63; Chavannes, Documents; the following are the editions and translations of the Orkhon inscriptions to which reference is made in the text: V. Thomsen, Inscriptions de l’Orkhon, Helsingfors, 1896 (tumular inscriptions for Kūl-tegin and Bilgā-qaghan) and his later translation (1922)\(^3\) to Danish (inclusive of Tonyuquq’s inscription) rendered into German by H. H. Schaeder, ZDMG, 1924, pp. 122–75; Radloff (fourth version) in Die alttürkisch. Inschriften, Neue Folge (Kūl-tegin, Bilgā), SPb., 1897 and ditto, Zweite Folge (Tonyuquq), SPb., 1899; P. Melioransky, Pamiatnik v chest’ Kūl-Tegina, in Zap., xii (1890), i–144. See also Marquart, Historische Glossen zu d. alttürkischen Inschriften [quoted: Glossen], in WZKM, xii, 1898, pp. 157–200; Die Chronologie d. alttürkischen Inschriften, Leipzig, 1898; Streitsüge, see Index; Komanen, see Index; Barthold, Die historische Bedeutung d. alttürkischen Inschriften, 1897; Die alttürkischen Inschriften und die arabischen Quellen, 1899; Erforschung d. Geschichte d. Türkischen Völker, in ZDMG, 1929, p. 130; Ghuzz, Tarim, Toghuqghuz, Tūrfān, and Türk in EI; Vorlesungen, pp. 48–9. [O. Franke’s, Gesch. d. Chines. Reiches, ii, 1936, contains numerous data on the Turks, but it comes to late to be utilized in this commentary.]

\[\text{§ 12. The Toghuqghuz}\]

Even though the reading تُقَرْحُذُ "Toghuqghuz" (and not Toghuqghur as formerly supposed) and its interpretation as Toquz-Oghuz, i.e. “the Nine (tribes of the) Oghuz”, are now generally accepted there remains still some obscurity with regard to the origin and use of the term in Muslim literature.

\(^1\) As another possibility Dr. Unkrig suggests in Tibetan mK'ar bZan (=> K'arzang and even K'arsang) with a meaning of “Fine Castle” (“schöner Herrensitz”, “prächtige Burg”). Could such a name apply to the Lhasan potala?

\(^2\) Etymologically Soghdian farkhār (sāyār) is not connected with Indian vihāra, and is an Iranian word < *par-u-χvāra, “full of happiness”, cf. Benveniste, Bull. Soc. Ling., 1928, xxi, 7–8.

\(^3\) There seems to exist a still unpublished final translation by Thomsen.
Before the sixth century A.D. the peoples now called "Turkish" were known under various tribal and political names. In the first half of the sixth century a group of Turks living in the Altai began a movement to regroup the neighbouring peoples and in a short time succeeded in organizing a great empire which from Mongolia spread its influence down to the neighbourhood of the Black sea. The founders of this new empire for the first time assumed the name Türk (or Türük "strength") which the Chinese rendered as T'u-chüeh, and in order to avoid confusion with other occasional uses of the term Türk we shall adopt this conventional Chinese term in speaking of the first Turkish empire. From the very beginning the T'u-chüeh dominions split into an Eastern and a Western part. The administrative centres of the former lay on the Orkhon in Mongolia, and those of the latter in the present-day Semirechie. Both kingdoms at different times had to recognize Chinese sovereignty. In A.D. 742 a coalition of the Uyghur, Qarluq (Khalukh), and Basmil destroyed the Eastern T'u-chüeh kingdom and in 745 the Uyghurs, former associates of the T'u-chüeh, took the leadership on the Orkhon. Cf. Bichurin, Sobr. sved., i, 338.

The rule of the Western qaghan (khâqân) of the original T'u-chüeh dynasty lasted till A.D. 657, when the Chinese subjugated them. From A.D. 685 to 688 the territories of the Western T'u-chüeh were constantly invaded by the tribes of the Eastern qaghan. The Indian summer of the Western T'u-chüeh is connected with the rise of the Türkish clan (v.i., § 17) whose leaders with some interruptions ruled from the end of the seventh century till A.D. 739. At this latter date begins the decline: the Arabs press the Türkish from the west; the Chinese interfere with their affairs from the south; in A.D. 751 the Chinese are defeated by the Arabs near Talas; the "Black" and "Yellow" clans of the Türkish exhaust themselves in internal struggles until finally towards A.D. 776 the Qarluq (§ 15) as a tertius gaudens come to occupy the Chu and Talas valleys, Chavannes, o.c., 4, 43, 79, 85, and passim. Such was the end of the two original T'u-chüeh kingdoms.

The Uyghurs remained on the Orkhon till A.D. 840, when in their turn they were defeated and decimated by the Qirghiz (§ 14). The remnants scattered in various directions; the chief group seems to have gone to Kan-su where the Uyghurs founded a new kingdom which survived till the times of the Tangut supremacy, i.e. circa A.D. 1020. Towards A.D. 860 a second

1 Soon after A.D. 572 Turkish troops cooperated with the Utûgurs during the siege of the Cimmerian Bosphorus (= Kerch, at the entrance of the Azov Sea). In Hûsun-tsang's time the dominions of the western qaghan reached the Indus, Chavannes, o.c., 241, 256.
2 To the English transcription T'u-chüeh corresponds the French transcription Tou-queue. The Chinese presumably had in view not the singular Türk but its Mongol plural Türküüt (Pelliot).
3 Officially since A.D. 582, Chavannes, o.c., 219.
4 Hûsun-tsang in A.D. 630 found the khan of the Western Turks at his encampment on the Chu river.
5 V.s., notes to § 9. According to the T'ang-shu, transl. by I. Bichurin, i, 419, after the catastrophe of 840 the minister of the former Uyghur khan called Si-ch'i P'ang-tê-lê led 15 aymaqs from
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kingdom was founded by the Uyghurs in the eastern T'ien-shan which preserved its independence till Mongol times.

The above-mentioned term Toghuqghuz found in Muslim authors applies more usually to the later Uyghur kingdom situated in eastern T'ien-shan, cf. Qudāma, 262, Mas'ūdi, Muruj, i, 288, Ist., 10, Gardizi, 90–2, as well as our author. Kāshghari, who personally knew the region, quietly substitutes Uyghur for the antiquated Toghuqghuz and the latter term occurs no more in the literature of Mongol times. How, then, did it happen that the T'ien-shan Uyghurs were surnamed Toquz-Oghuz ("Nine Oghuz")?

In the authentic Orkhon inscriptions of the Eastern T' u-chüeh qaghans the term Toquz-Oghuz is well known and seems to be almost a synonym of Türk, with the difference that the latter refers more to the political and the former to the tribal side of the organization, cf. Barthold, Türk in EI, for not always and not all the Oghuz recognized the qaghan's authority.

On the other hand, the Uyghurs are separately mentioned in the same inscriptions. The account of Bilgä-qaghan's campaign in the Selenga region (ii, E 37 in which a few words are unfortunately missing) is immediately followed by the record of the flight of the Uyghur eltübir with 100 men, cf. Thomsen, ZDMG, 1924, p. 157. These two passages seem to suggest that the Uyghurs lived separately on the Selenga. For the time of Uyghur supremacy on the Orkhon we possess the inscription of Shine-usu commemorating the deeds of the Uyghur qaghan Moyun [Pelliot: Bayan], chur who reigned a.d. 756–9. On it the On-Uyghur ("Ten Uyghurs") and

Mongolia to the Qarluq country, whereas the rest of the Uyghurs retreated to Tibet and An-hsi. At a later date, ibid., 424, P'ang-t'ê-lê is found in Kan-chou; having proclaimed himself khan (qaghan?) he was ruling over the towns "situated to the west of the Sand Desert". The emperor Hsüan Tsung (847–59) confirmed P'ang-t'ê-lê's title. (This passage is not included in Chavannes, Documents.) On these Uyghurs v.s. note to § 9. Their descendants are the Sarı-Yoghur living in north-western Kan-su (near Su-chou). This small colony is now supposed to have played a considerable role in the cultural life of the Mongols. See Potanin, Tungut.-tibet. okrana Kitaya, SPb., 1893, i, 440, ii, 410, 435, Mannheim, A visit to the Sarō and Shera Yöhurs in Jouz. Soc. Finno-Ougrienne, xxvii, 1911, pp. 1–27 [reviewed by S. E. Malov in Zhvaya Starina, 1912, pp. 214–20]; S. E. Malov, Ostatkii shamanstvo u sholitikh Uyghurov, 1912, pp. 61–74; W. Kotwicz, Quelques documents sur les relations entre les Mongols et les Ouïgours in Rocznik Orijentalistyczny, ii, 1925, pp. 240–7, and L. Ligeti, Les Pérégrinations de Csoma de Körös, in Revue des études hongroises, July 1934, pp. 233–53. [On the disruption of the Uyghur empire see now O. Franke, Gesch. d. Chines. Reiches ii, 1936, p. 491–4.]

1 The T'ang-shu, ibid., i, 424 sq., says that in the reign of I Tsung (860–73) the chief of the Uyghurs called Pu-kuts'un attacked the Tibetans from Pei-t'ing and took from them Si-chou (Yarkho) and Lun-t'ai = Urumchi. He also was confirmed by the emperor (though the latter seems to have lost the throne at that very moment). Marquart, Streifzüge, 390, gives a.d. 866 as the date of the Uyghur occupation of Kao-ch'ang.

2 Cf. Thomsen, Inscriptions: i, N 4 and ii, E 30, translation, pp. 112 and 124 (= ZDMG, 1924, p. 154), where Bilgä-qaghan says that the Toquz-Oghuz people was his own people but became his enemy. A similar situation existed between the Seljuks and the Ghuz tribes at the time of Sanjar.
Commentary § 12

Toquz-Oghuz ("Nine Oghuz") are separately quoted side by side, see G. Ramstedt, *Zwei uigürische Runeninschriften*, in *Jour. Soc. Finn.-Ougr.*, xxx/3, p. 12. [Theophylactus Simokata, book vii, 7–9, definitely speaks of the conquest of 'Oγωρ by the Turkish qaghan.]

As regards Chinese sources the earlier Chiu T'ang-shu says that at the time of the Later Wei (a.d. 386–circa 558) the Uyghurs (Huei-ho) were called T'ieh-lé (usually restored as Töls or Tölös, v. supra, p. 196.)¹ The nine subdivisions of the Uyghurs are further enumerated and it is added that their number was increased [after 745?] by the Basmil and Qarluq, as respectively the tenth and eleventh divisions.

It must be admitted that the terminology of Chinese, Turkish, and Arabic sources presents still considerable difficulties. The former reading of the name ḫeq as Toqugaghur was in favour of its further interpretation as Toquz-Oghuz, but the solidly established reading Toghusghuz (found in a Middle Persian text!) and the fact that the Uyghur khans called their federation "On-Uyghur [and] Toquz-Oghuz" makes it difficult to explain the Muslim use of the name Toquzghuz by the supposition that that was the name rightly belonging to the Uyghurs.

The theory of the identity of the Oghuz with Uyghur was supported by Thomsen, o.c., 147, who, however, in his later work, *ZDMG*, 1924, p. 128, says much more cautiously: "Wahrscheinlich ist Uygur eigentlich der Name für eine Dynastie, die sich nicht lange vor dieser Zeit zum Herrn über eine Anzahl von Stämmen gemacht hat, die ihre Sitze nördlich von den Türken haben, in der Gegend des Selengafusses. Die meisten dieser Stämme scheinen zu dieser Zeit zu einer anderen grossen Konföderation von Stämmen, die in den Inschriften Oyuz heissen, in einem nahen Verhältnis gestanden oder ihr angehört zu haben." The most decided partisan of the identity of Toquz-Oghuz and Uyghur was Marquart, see *Chronologie*, 23, *Streifzüge*, Index, and finally *Komanen*, 35–6 (and in a modified and very involved form *ibid.*, 199–201).

On the other hand Barthold, who repeatedly insisted on the necessity of discriminating between the original Toghuš-Oghuz and the Uyghurs, thought that the term Toghusghuz was transferred to the T'ien-shan Uyghurs from the earlier occupants of this region, namely the so-called Sha-t'o, i.e. "Sand Desert people", see *Semirechye*, 15, *Toghusghuz* in *EI*, and *Vorlesungen*, 53–4. According to the T'ang-shu (Chavannes, o.c., 96–9) this group, which had separated from Western T'u-chüeh, lived in the seventh century near the Barkul lake (at the eastern extremity of Eastern T'ien-shan) and after 712 near Pei-t'ing (Bish-baliq) from where it was

¹ Chavannes, o.c., 87–94. The later T'ang-shu enumerates the 15 tribes of the Chi's-lè (> T'ieh-lè), among whom the first place is occupied by the Yuan-ho (Uyghurs). To judge by Chavannes's analysis these tribes occupied by far a more limited territory than what Hirth, *Nachworte zu Inschrift des Tonjukuk*, p. 37, says of the "Töls in the other of the Sin (sic) ... deren Stämme vom Schwarzen Meere ostwärts ... bis zum Amurgebiete hin ..."! Cf. also Chavannes, o.c., 221, and Barthold's critical remarks in *Zap.*, xv, 0172–3. [Is the reading T'ieh-lè correct?]
dislodged by the Tibetans in 808.¹ The principal argument in support of
this theory is that Abū Zayd, the continuator of Sūlaymān’s work, pp. 62–6,
speaking of the revolt of Huang Ch’ao (الشیر)² and the expulsion of the
emperor Hsi-Tsung (A.D. 881), says that the latter asked for the help of “the
king of the Toghuzghuz who live in the land of the Turks. The Chinese
and the Toghuzghuz are neighbours and their royal families are allied.” So
the king of the Toghuzghuz sent his son with an army who restored the
emperor to his throne. According to Chinese sources, see Wieger, Textes
historiques, 1905, pp. 1759–61, the emperor was restored by Li K’o-yung and
his 10,000 men of Sha-t’o and Ta-tan.³ Although these parallel texts show
that the term Toghuzghuz could refer to the Sha-t’o, the evidence in favour
of the Sha-t’o having been alone responsible for the transmission and
perpetuation of the name Toghuzghuz as applied to the inhabitants of
Eastern T’ien-shan does not seem very decisive. It is curious that Mas’ūdī,
Murāj, i, 305, speaking of the same events of A.D. 881 calls the emperor’s
ally “king of the Turks (الشیر)”, as he also calls, i, 288, the king of Kūshān
(o.i. 1). In both cases the name is undoubtedly to be restored as
*Uyghur-khan, as both Birūnī, Canon, and Kāshgarī, i, 28, spell the name
Uyghur. This fact would suffice to show that there was no great con-
stancy in Arab terminology regarding such remote regions. Other
passages quoted by Barthold in his Vorlesungen, 53 (Ṭabarī, iii, 1044; Ibn
al-Athīr, xi, 117; Maqrīzī, Khītāt, i, 31328) seem to indicate that the name
Toghuzghuz was often given to the Western T’u-chüeh and their successors
in general. The case of the Sha-t’o would be only an instance of the
application of this rule. More than this, the common origin of Western
T’u-chüeh and their Eastern cousins could not escape the Arabs, whereas
the events of A.D. 745 were most probably regarded as mere internal
changes within the same group of tribes, similar to the rise of the Türkish
within the Western Turkish federation. If even, as time wore on,
the Arabs learnt to discriminate between the single tribes nearer to
Transoxiana, the new group arriving from the Orkhon after the events
of A.D. 840 could rightly be regarded as a wave having risen from the
original home of the Toquz-Oghuz.

It remains to explain the two curious passages from Jāhīz (died circa
A.D. 868) quoted by Marquart, Streifzüge, 91–3. Jāhīz ascribes to the
effeminating influence of Manichaism the decline of “the Turkish
Toghuzghuz after they had been the champions of them [i.e. of the Turks]
and were the leaders of the Khallukh although [the latter] were twice as

¹ The town of Bish-ballih does not seem to have belonged to the Sha-t’o,
v.i. under 2.
² According to Pelliot, T’oung-Pao
xxi, 1922, p. 409, the Arabic form must be *Bānshva (Bansha?) which gives an
equivalence of the southern pronunciation of Huang Cao, “mot à ancienne
gutturale initiale laquelle s’est complète-
ment annue dans les dialectes modernes
de la côte chinoise au sud du Fleuve
Bleu”. However to render *Wang as
Bān the Arabs must have heard it as
*Vang for b in Arabic may stand for v
but not for w.
³ Li K’o-yung had previously sought
refuge with the Ta-tan.
numerous as they". Even if this passage hints at the catastrophe which befell the Manichaean Uyghurs in A.D. 840, the name Toghuzghuz as applied to them would only confirm our point of view on the indiscriminate use of the term by the Arabs who could not very accurately distinguish between the Orkhon tribes and who have not left any record of the role played by the Qırghız in the events of 840. It is more likely, however, that Jähiz (with some confusion in the details, cf. p. 290, n. 2) had in mind the subjugation of the Türgish (Western T’u-chiieh) by the Qarluq towards 766.

The earliest visit to the Toghuzghuz country recorded by the Muslims seems to have been the journey of Tamim b. Bahr called al-Muțawwi’i (i.e. belonging to the class of the volunteer fighters on the marches of the Islamic empire). An abstract of his report has survived in Yāqūt, i, 840, and iv, 823. The following analysis will show to what extent it was utilized by the early geographers. [D stands for ditto and A for abest.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tamim (Yāqūt)</th>
<th>I.Kh., 31.</th>
<th>Qudāma, 263.</th>
<th>Abū Dulaf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 months of great cold</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>journeying 20 days in the steppe and 20 days in the inhabited country</td>
<td>from the Upper Barskhān 3 months among large villages</td>
<td>from the Lower Barskhān 45 days: 20 in the steppe and 25 among large villages</td>
<td>“we travelled among them 20 days”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the inhabitants fire-worshippers and Manichaean</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>inhabitants have no places of worship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the town has 12 iron gates</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distance to China 300 farsaks</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to the right, the country of the Turks</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to the left, the Kīmāk</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>straight on, China</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>before arriving in the town saw a golden tent and 900 men on the top of the castle</td>
<td>tent containing 100 men</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Turks possess a rain stone</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Barthold, Vorlesungen, 55, places Tamim’s journey in the period between A.D. 760 and 800. [See Appendix B.]
Marquart, *Streifzüge*, 81, was at first disposed to think that I.Kh.'s distance from the Upper Barskhan to the kháqân's town, *vis.* 3 months' journey, might refer to the Orkhon capital, but as I.Kh. undoubtedly depends on Tamīm's data the distance of "three months" has been probably calculated from the latter's indication that he was riding day and night at the rate of 3 sikka per day. Consequently I.Kh. must have converted Tamīm's 40 [Qudâma: 45] days into more quiet stages. Yāqūt omits to mention the starting-point of Tamīm's journey, but it could certainly not be Barskhan al-avālā, as I.Kh.'s text has it, but (as Qudâma, 262–3, clearly implies) the Lower Barskhan which lay in the neighbourhood of Tarâz (see note to § 15, i.r.). In this case 40–5 days to Bish-baliq would be no great exaggeration. That the terminal point of Tamīm's journey was Bish-baliq is shown by his mention of the "golden tent" which probably is the Buddhist stupa which had stood there since the times of the Western T'u-chüeh (the Qaghan-stupa, in Chinese K'o-han-fu-t'uan Chavannes, o.c., 12 and 305). The Arabs call it khaima "tent" but Fakhri ad-dîn Mubârakshâhî, ed. Sir E. D. Ross, p. 39, uses for it the curious Persian term tanūra "funnel" [not = the Arabic tannūr.] [See Appendix B.]

The traces of Tamīm's tradition are also found in Idrîsî, i, 491, who says that the capital of the Toghusghuz read Bish-balîq (?), has twelve iron gates, the inhabitants are Zoroastrians and some are Magians and fire-worshippers. From a different source Idrîsî, i, 502, has the name of the "principal city of the Toghusghuz" خُرَّاکَی which seems separated from the kháqân's town [perhaps Yar-khoto?] by a distance of one light day's march. From it to a kârâf lying on the bank of the lake there is a distance of 4 days. The name of the first town corresponds most probably to جَيْنَيٌّ (v.i. 1.). The second name, mutilated as usual in Idrîsî, could be پَنْجیکَث Panjikath (v.i. 2.), i.e. the Iranian name of the same Bish-baliq. The detail about the lake would suit Bish-baliq, and the distance of 4 days between the "khaqân's town" and Panjikath would be approximately right in view of Idrîsî's tendency to reckon in heavy stages. According to the Chinese itinerary, Chavannes, o.c., p. 11, there were 370 li (= 213 Km.) between Chiao-ho (Yar-khoto) and Pei-t'îng (Bish-baliq) which roughly corresponds to 4 days' journey.

There are no indications of a direct dependence of our § 12 on Tamīm's report. More probably, in common with Gardîzî, the author derives his

---

1 It is true that 40 × 3 = 120, i.e. 4 months, but I.Kh. with his experience as a postmaster probably made some allowance for Tamīm's exaggeration of his powers of endurance.
3 Cf. Qudâma, 262: "to the capital of the Toghusghuz [namely: Bish-baliq?] belongs a lake round which, close to each other, lie villages and cultivated lands." Cf. the report of the Chinese envoy Wang Yen-tê, transl. by S. Julien, *Jour. As.*, 1847, ix, 62.
4 [Very puzzling, however, is Tamīm's indication (Yâqūt, i, 840) concerning the religion of the Toghusghuz ("most of them are fire-worshippers of the Magian religion, and among them are found sindis of Mānî's creed"). What does Tamīm take for the majority's religion? Does he confuse Buddhists with Zoroastrians and use the term 'abadat al-
principal information from Jayhâni, who certainly had numerous opportunities for completing the data on the Turks from direct sources. The Šâmânid s at whose court he lived must have keenly watched the rivalry of the Uyghurs and the Khâllukh in the hope that the former might check the rising power of the latter, who as direct neighbours of Transoxiana were more dangerous. Our text contains some traces of this particular interest (§ 12, 10. and § 15, 11.).

The bearings of the Toghuzghuz frontier are displaced as usual: the bulk of the Khâllukh lived north-west of the Toghuzghuz (and not south of them). In § 13 the Yaghmâ are said to have the Toghuzghuz on the east, but, to say nothing of Kuchâ reckoned to China, the Khâllukh (§ 15) also intervened between the Yaghmâ and the Toghuzghuz. On some Khirkhiz found to the west of the Toghuzghuz see notes to §§ 14 and 15, 13. The Toghuzghuz (probably in a wider sense) are also said to have been numerous along the road from Kâshghar to Khotan (§ 11, 10.). The real frontier of the Toghuzghuz towards the north-east seems to have lain near the Tarbaghatâi (v.i. 8.), but under § 3, 1. the Eastern ocean is said to adjoin the extreme eastern limits of the Toghuzghuz and Khirkhiz. This statement, due to some earlier source and not tallying with § 12, may contain a vague reference to the times of the Orkhone empires. Very curious is also the tradition according to which the Toghuzghuz were once the kings of the whole "Turkistân", the latter term being of course used in the sense of "territories occupied by Turkish tribes" and not in the later acception of Transoxiana, or even Semirechye. The same ancient recollections may account for the item of the Toghuzghuz-Tâtâr (i.e. Mongol) affinities. In the table of contents (v.s., p. 47) the heading of our § 12 is even formulated as "The country of the Toghuzghuz and Tâtâr". Finally the item on some prosperous "Turks" belonging to the Toghuzghuz may refer to the remnants of the Western T’u-chüeh and their Türgish continuators (see notes to § 12, 10.). Some remains of the Sha-t’o (v.s., p. 266) at the eastern extremity of the T’ien-shan could also be called Turk.  

nîrân in the loose sense of “heathens”?
A Manichaean minority could certainly exist in Bish-Balîq even in the times of Western T’u-chüeh. Had Tamîm known the real Uyghurs (who according to Marquart occupied this region towards a.d. 866) his presentation of the religious situation would have been quite different. Should we then (contrary to Marquart, Streifzüge, 390) assign an earlier date to Tamîm’s journey, this assumption would be in favour of a further hypothesis that this traveller may be the source of information on the situation in Kan-su as described in our § 9 (v.s., p. 227). Cf. Barthold’s Preface, p. 26 and p. 268, note 1.]

1 Cf. Marquart, Streifzüge, 81, on a similar statement in Idrîsî, i, 491.
2 Even in Mongol times the Uyghurs kept up their national traditions, Juwayni, i, 39-45.
3 Gardîzî mentions the Tâtâr (sic) only as one of the Kimâk tribes (§ 18). But the item referring to a definite clan has nothing to do with our author’s statement about the relationship of the Tâtâr and Toghuzghuz.
4 Tamîm, v.s., p. 268, mentions the Turks to the “right” (i.e. to the south) of the Toghuzghuz. If the term Turks does not stand here for the Tibetans (considered as Turks) it may refer to the Sha-t’o.
The Tojushguz

Our author starts (1. and 2.) with the two residences: the winter one south of the T'ien-shan, and the summer one north of the range with its dependencies (to which 9. may also belong?). 3.–5. (and perhaps 6.) lie along the road from Turfan to Kuchâ. 7.–8. and 10.–17. are the northern possessions of the Tojushguz in the region stretching across the T'ien-shan down into the Ilî basin and perhaps farther east. See Maps iii and v.

1. Ch'inânjkath, “the Chinese town”,¹ is the well-known place lying circa 45 Km. east of Turfan and called in Chinese: Kao-ch'ang (later: Huo-chou) and in Turkish: Qocho. In fact Qocho was first a military colony of the Chinese (settled “at the wall of Kao-ch'ang”), cf. Pelliot, Kao-Tch'ang, &e., in jour. As., May 1912, p. 590. Birüni, Canon, f. 1032a, quotes “Chînânjkath which is قيوچ قوچو the residence of the Uyghur-khân”. Kâshghârî, iii, 165, calls the town قيوچ Qocho (on his Kūshân see note to § 9, 5.; on his Kûsan see note to § 9, 10.). Juveyînî, i, 32, spells (with a popular etymology) Qara-Khvâja and the Masâdîk al-âbsâr, transl. by Quatremère, Notices et extraits, xiii, 224: Qârâ-Khvâjâ. The ruins of Qocho, now known as İdîqût-shahrî,² were first described by the Russian expedition of 1898, see D. Klemenz in Nachrichten über die von der Kaiserl. Akademie d. Wissenschaft. im Jahre 1898 ausgerüstete Expedition nach Turfan, i, SPb., 1899. On the remarkable discoveries of the German expeditions see especially A. von Leccocq, Chotscho, Berlin, 1913. The latest description is found in Sir A. Stein, Innermost Asia, Oxford, 1928, pp. 566–609.

2. The mountain Tâfqân, separating Chînânjkath from Panjîkath, cf. § 5, 6., is certainly Eastern T'ien-shan (Boghdo, highest peak 12,080 f.). The name, otherwise unknown,³ looks like a mis-spelling of Turfan (the name of the town Tturfanmi-kantha occurs in the Saka document, written probably in the latter part of the eighth century).⁴ See Barthold, Turfan, in EI.

The “Five Villages” lying behind the mountain did not form one close group. The village called Panjîkath was only one of them. The Turkish equivalent of this Iranian (Soghdian?)⁵ name is Bish-ballîq, both meaning

¹ The name Chinânjkath “the Chinese town” was also borne by a town of Shâsh, Işt., 323. The name is distinctly Soghdian, the element -ânj being a feminine suffix to suit the word -kath, cf. also Gurgânî in Khwârazm and perhaps Khabûdjan-kath “the Blue (?) Village” in Soghd, Işt., 322. Cf. Benveniste, Essai de grammaire sogdienne, ii, 1929, pp. 87–8, and Jour. As., Oct. 1930, p. 292.

² İdîqût was the official title of the Uyghur rulers probably inherited by them from their Basmîl predecessors.

³ Gardîzî’s تفخان is certainly an entirely different name, see note to § 15, 15.

⁴ F. W. Thomas and Sten Konow, Two Medieval Documents from Tun-huang, Oslo, 1929, pp. 130 and 131, line 23.

⁵ I owe to H. W. Bailey the reference that in Middle Persian the form pnêknbdy kw'dy, “the lord of Panjékand”; is found together with ëynêknbdy kw'dy, cf. F. W. K. Müller, Ein Doppelblatt aus einem manichäischen Hymnenbuch, in Abh. PAW, 1913, pp. 45 and 55. In our case P.nîjk.th (with 3) is written clearly. In the Saka document quoted above, o.c., p. 131, lines 20–1, stands misti kantha Panji-kantha “the great town of P.”. On another place called Panji-kath see note to § 15, 7.
“Pentapolis”, probably in the sense of “administrative centre of the Five Towns”. The Chinese called it Pei-t'ing “Northern Court”. Bish-baliq is mentioned in the Orkhon inscriptions (ii, E 28) in connexion with Kultegin’s expedition of A.D. 713, Thomsen, ZDMG, 1924, p. 153. The region first belonged to the tribe Basmil (Chinese Pa-si-mi) who helped the Uyghur to overthrow the Eastern T’u-chüeh in 742. But immediately after, the Uyghurs and Khallukhs defeated the Basmil and since 744 the latter had been incorporated in the Uyghur federation, Chavannes, o.c., 94. So towards the middle of the eighth century the Uyghurs already had Bish-baliq under their sway. In 791 the Qarluq (§ 15) occupied “the valley of the stupa which belonged to the Uyghurs”, Chavannes, o.c., 305. The town is the one visited by Tamīm b. Baḥr (v.s.). In the year of the composition of the H.-'Ā. the Uyghur prince Arslan was entertaining at Pei-t'ing the Chinese envoy Wang Yen-tê, see S. Julien in Jour. As., 1847, ix, pp. 50-66; Chavannes, Documents, p. 11; Barthold, Bishbaliq in EI, Sir A. Stein, Innermost Asia, 1928, p. 582 sq. On the mention of Bish-baliq in Idrisi, v.s., p. 269. The ruins of Bish-Baliq lie some 47 Km. west of Guchen near Timisar. They were first visited in 1908 by B. Dolbezhev and described by him in Izvestiya Russ. Komiteta d’la isucheniya Sredney i Vostochnoy Azii, No. 9, April 1909, and Zap., xxiii, 1915, pp. 77-121. An archaeological description of the ruins is found in Sir A. Stein, o.c., pp. 554-9.

The other names quoted behind the mountain do not correspond to those given in Kāshghari’s list, i, 103, of the “five towns” composing the Uyghur possessions, namely, Sulmi (founded by Alexander the Great), Qocho (= our I. Chīnānjkath), Jambaliq, Bish-baliq (= 2. Panjikath), Yangi-baliq. Bretschneider, Mediaeval Researches, ii, 27-33, quoting the Yüan-shí mentions under Pei-t’ing the following five places: Qara-khocho (= Chīnānjkath); *Taksin (T”a-ku-sin) shown on the old Chinese maps between Qumul and Bish-baliq; Jambaliq shown west of Bish-baliq and east of Manas; Khutukbai (Ku-’a-ba) west of Jambaliq; and Yāngi-baliq (the Yāngi-balghasun station between Khutukbai and Manas). If our author, as is his habit, enumerates the five places east to west, Kūẓar.k and J.m.lkath must be placed east of Panjikath (Bish-baliq), and Bārlughand Jāmgh.r west of it. This surmise is corroborated by the fact that the

1 Biruni, Canon, mentions Slmn situated long. 113°0’, lat. 43°0’, i.e. north-east of Chīnānjkath lying long. 111°20’, lat. 42°0’. On some other mentions of this town (called Ul-Solm in an Uyghur colophon) see Pelliott in T’oung Pao, 1931, xxviii, 494.

2 This does not correspond to the present Toksun lying at some 50 km. to the south-west of Turfan. Biruni, Canon, places a Taksin far down in the south-east at long. 120°15’, lat. 32°5’.

3 Many towns of this region are mentioned in the Saka document quoted above, o.c., p. 130: apart from *Turfan, Yrrüncum̄n̄ kanthä is probably Urumchi and Cammaidži Ba-talke nāmma kanthä [read: *Jamil-balq?] may stand for our J.m.l-kath = Jam-balq, or (less probably) for our J.m.l-kath.

4 گراز has some outward resemblance to the lake of گراز which according to Idrisi lay probably near Bish-baliq (cf. p. 269, note 3) though on Idrisi’s map this lake seems to correspond to the Lob-nor.
same Jāmgh. r is for a second time quoted in § 15, 12. at the eastern limit of the Khallukh territory as a place which “in the days of old” belonged to the Khallukh.¹ The name is perhaps to be pronounced *Chāmghar* in view of the similar name belonging to a place on the road from Farghāna to Khujanda spelt in I.Kh., 30, صامقار, and in Maq., 341, صامر (with Arabic ʃ for ʃ). On the name of *f.m.ikat* (cf. the present-day Jimisar?), *v.i.*, note to 10.

3.-5. belong to the itinerary given in Gardizi, 91: Barskhān²-B.nchūl (?)—Kujā—أرال—Sikat-M.k.shmīghnāthūr—Chīnanjkath. Our author quotes them in inverted order (reckoning Kuchā to China, and B.nchūl and Barskhān to Khallukh). The same itinerary is mentioned by Raverty in his translation of the *Tabaqāt-i Nāşirī*, p. 961: Barskhān—سکیت—سحل—چینانجکت (read: چینانجکت؟). Raverty, with his exasperating vagueness about references, pretends to quote from I.Kh., but all the details of the passage coincide with Gardizi, of whose work Raverty must have had a defective copy.

3. The strange كیسیجیا كشمیئاوفارχ (in which the element χορ is perhaps an additional name or term, for Gardizi’s text runs: “from Sikat to M.k.shmīghnāthūr, and from *Thur* to Chīnanjkath”). Raverty (on what authority?) places the two (or four?) last-mentioned towns at 1 day’s distance from one another, in which case our place would have to be looked for near the present-day Turfan. The only parallel to our name is another very difficult name found in Rashid al-dīn, ed. Berezin, *Trudi V.O.*, vii, 100—xiii, 237: كوسوفیارچه with numerous variants. This place lay near the region of كوشان (or كوشانان) “on the frontiers” of China (or Khotan?) and Kashghar. Whether كوشان (K.sān) refers to Kao-ch’ang (v.s. i.) or to Kuchā (§ 9, 10)³ the place described by Rashid al-dīn geographically suits our K.misghyā. Pelliot, in *journ. As.*, April 1920, p. 183, quotes a parallel Chinese name: k’iu-sien-khu-tch’d-eul-ko-sseu-man [in English transcription: Ch’ū-hsien-ch’ü-ch’ē-ērh-ko-ssté-man]. The first three syllables seem to run parallel to our Kamsīghiyā and Rashíd-al-dīn’s کوسهغی (؟).

4. Gardizi’s *Sikand* <سی-وئند or شی-وئند is a better name for a group of 3 villages (cf. Soghdian ʃy “three”). It must be also remembered that the Chinese called سی the district of Yar-khoto, situated at 12 km. to the west of Turfan.

5. ارال lying near the Khuland-ghūn river (§ 6, 3) corresponds to Gardizi’s ارال⁴ and Raverty’s أرال. Barthold, *Report*, 116, suggests the reading *Aral* (“island”) though he feels embarrassed by the position of a village

¹ In this case Bārlugh (“wealthy”) cannot be compared with Barkul (*Barskul* “Tiger lake”) at the north-eastern extremity of the T’ien-shan. Hardly, either, can our Bārlugh have anything to do with the mountain of this name belonging to the Dzungarian Ala-tau range, north-west of Manas across the plain.

² On the passes south of Barskhān see note to § 15, 15.


⁴ P. 91: پئزل *ba-As.t.*
of this name 1 to the west of Kucha, whereas Gardizi places *Aral east of the latter town, i.e. in the direction of Qarashar and Qurla. The comparative importance of our place is confirmed by the story recorded in Gardizi, 90, speaking of the strife between a former khagan of the Toghuqghuz and his brother Kûr [Kûr]-tegin he says that the capital (hadrat) of the Khaghan “was” [at that time?] in Azal (*Aral?). The nearest place of importance to the east of Kucha is Bûgür (on the western bank of the Qizil river). Kâshghari, i, 301, says: “Bûgür is a fort (gal’a) between Kucha and Uyghur lying on a height (“alâ shâhîq) and it is a frontier-post (thaghhr)”. From a palaeographic point of view a confusion of *Kûr and *Aral 2 is not impossible (cf. note to § 15, 15. on Azær <*B.d.i.). 3 Some complication in the way of this identification lies, however, in the fact that it is difficult to take Qizil-su for the important Khuland-ghûn (cf. § 6, 3. and § 13). [The latter probably corresponds to the Muzart river which flows west of the Kucha-river and before reaching the Tarim turns off eastwards. Its course, parallel to Tarim, can be traced almost down to the Lbnor region. See Map of Kucha studied by A. Herrmann in S. Hedin, Southern Tibet, 1922, viii. p. 431.]

6. is obscure. In Idrisi’s confused text, i, 495, a mention is found of a middle-sized town to the east of (var. كشي) and it is probable that the last-named place situated in “Outer China” is *Kûchâ.

7. These five villages belonging to a beg-tegin and inhabited by Sogdians must be distinguished from the village of somewhat similar description mentioned under § 17, 3. Barthold in his article K voprosu o yazikakh soghdíyskom i tokharískom, in Iran, i, 1906, pp. 29-41, while commenting on our § 12, 7. recalls the finds of exclusively Christian documents made in the villages of Bulaiq east of Turfan. However, Beg-tegin’s villages lay in the cold zone, which does not tally with the hot Lukchun depression.

8. Kûmas (Kîmis?)-art has some likeness to K.mîz-[art?] 4 which Gardizi, 86, mentions on the road from Toghuqghuz to Khirkhiz (see note to § 14). The route is very vague and only tentatively would one place K.mîz-art (after which a mountainous tract succeeds to the plains) somewhere to the south of the Tarbaghatai, say near Chuguchak. On the other hand, Kâshghari, i, 306, and iii, 177, speaks of a كي تالاس Kûmi-Talas (or Talas-yüs) 5 forming the frontier (thaghhr) of the Uyghur; on his Map he shows it between the upper courses of the Ilî and Irtish, south of a mountain (Tarbaghatai?). At 1,500 li due north of Yar-khoto the T’ang-shu mentions a “To-lo-se valley” which Chavannes, o.c., 32, identifies with that of the Black Irtish. This may be another hint for the location of Kûmi-Talas, though the connexion of the latter with Kûmas-art 6 is still problematic.

1 On Grum-Grzhimailo’s map this Aral lies circa 90 Km. west of Kucha and 11 Km. east of Bai.
2 See p. 273, n. 4.
3 [Ark may be the generic Persian word “citadel” = Kâshghari’s gal’a.] 4 Cambridge MS., fol. 182a: K.mîdz.
5 To be distinguished from the Ulugh-Talas (v.i., § 25, 93.).
6 In script Kûms and Kmy can be easily confused. Kâshghari’s orthography is different, for he expressed the vowels by harakat while the Persian authors use in Turkish names matres lectionis.
Both the name of Küm.s-art and the detail about its inhabitants being hunters point to a mountainous locality. The alternative tentative explanation would be to connect the name *Kümös with that of the river Künges (upper course of the Tekes which latter is a left affluent of the Ili) and to place it near some pass leading over the T'ien-shan into its valley (Daghit, Narat, Adun-kur). The fluctuation of ʰʰ in is not unknown in Turkish (qonshu>qomshu).

9. The obvious restoration of خورد would be *Khumüd for Qumül which Gardiži, 92, places on the road from Chínänkath to Sha-chou (see note to § 9, 3). The fluctuation of ʰ in would not make difficulties in Eastern Iranian; in the Soghdian letters published by Reichelt Qumül is called *Kumül. Our author having split the itinerary into political areas could, of course, insert Qumül in his enumeration out of definite order. If, however, in his usual way he followed some system one ought to consider the fact that Kh.üd is mentioned among the places lying in the north-western corner of the Toghuzghuz possessions, immediately before J.mlykath, and its description would suit the upper valleys of the Qarashar drainage area (the two Yulduz valleys). [Eventually خورد could be improved into *خیدر Khaidu, but this latter name of the Qarashar river seems to be of later Mongol origin!]

10. According to the description جملک mentioned above under 2, but their names have a striking likeness and it is possible that both are composed of the same elements: *km or *kmly1+kat or kath. As a parallel one would quote the name of the tribe جمل to which Käshghari, i, 28, assigns the following place in his north-to-south enumeration (al-qabā'il al-mutawassita bayn al-țanūb wal-shimal): Chigil, Tukhsī, Yaghmā, Ighrāq, *Charuq, Jumul (Brockelmann reads *Chomul?), Uyghur, Tangut, Khitay. If really the Jumul were the Uyghurs' neighbours in the direction of the Ili their name could very well account for 2. and 10. An important detail in our text is that the chief of J.mlykath bore the title of *yabghū. That he was distinct from the Khallukh yabghū (§ 15) results from the facts that he is mentioned under § 12, evidently as a vassal of the Toghuzghuz, and that his village was exposed to the Khallukh raids. Perhaps a passage of the T'ang-shu, Chavannes, o.c., 86, may give us a clue to the situation. Speaking of the disruption of the Western T'u-chüeh (i.e. Türgish) federation towards a.d. 766 (see notes to §§ 15 and 17) it says: "when this people was destroyed there was a certain T'ê-p'ang-lé who settled in the town of Yen-ch'i (= Qarashar) and took the title of shē-hu (= yabghū)." One could then take our yabghū for a descendant of T'ê-p'ang-lé and his residence for Qarashar. It would be strange indeed if this

1 Cf. our Panj.kath (§ 12, 2.) = Panj-kath in Gardiži, 90, note 8.
2 On Käshghari's Map the Jumul (or a section of them?) appear much farther to the east on the Obi upstream from the Qāy, o.c., p. 285.
3 In the T'ang times Qarashar was usually under the Western T'u-chüeh until a.d. 719 it was included in the number of the "Four Garrisons", occupied by Chinese troops, Chavannes, o.c., 110-14.
Commentary

important locality had been left out in our author's enumeration. Apart from its historical associations it certainly occupied an important position; cf. Chavannes, o.c., 21 and 5: “une... route dont l'existence nous est révélée par les textes historiques est celle qui partait de Harachar [Qarashar], remontait le Khaidou-gol [v.s. 9.], suivant la vallée de Youldouz,1 puis traversant la passe Narat pour arriver sur le Koun gües et dans la vallée d'Ili. Mais le T'ang-chou ne nous en fournit pas la description.” Precisely the existence of this road connecting the territories lying south of the T'ien-shan with the Ili valley could account for the variety of tribes which raided J.mlikah from the north. By his very origins this yabghā must have been opposed to the Khallukh encroachments, and this may explain the state of tension round the neighbouring Barskān, at which our source hints under § 15, 11. On the Yabghā-pass see note to § 15, 5.

11.-17. called “stages” (mansil) must belong to the routes in the northern region of the Toghuzghuz possessions, partly in the T'ien-shan and partly in the Ili basin. The order of enumeration is obscure. See Maps i and v.

11. probably *تَارَِغ تَوْبَرْغ “earth” to suit the explanation that the mountain was “earthen”. Situation uncertain except that the “stage” lay by a pass.

12. Our مانچ Yafinj, “a town situated by a large river very likely corresponds to Kāshghari's (iii, 277) يِنْجِن Yafinj, “a town situated near the Ili”. Juwaynī, GMS, ii, 88, records the limits of the Qara-Khitay empire as stretching from Ṭaṛāz to ااصحاب or (or ٍتامسح), which must represent the same name. On Kāshghari’s Map the name Yafinj is inscribed south of the Ili. However, at another place (i, 58) he says that the town of Iki-Ōgūz (v.i. 16.) is situated between the rivers Ili and Yafinj and the name of this Iki-Ōgūz is inscribed north of the Ili. It is not clear whether Yafinj is an independent river or an affluent of the Ili but for the reasons quoted below one might take Yafinj for the Qara-tal flowing to the Balkhash lake north of the Ili. [On Idrīsī’s Map, Bib. Nat. Paris, MS. arabe 2221, f. 178v., a مصح is shown on the right bank of the river ش.رماقح flowing to the lake B.rwan.]

14. A name parallel to our Siṃṅk-kuḷ, as according to Kāshghari, iii, 99 and 273, a lake was called near Qochingar-bashī (>Qochgar-bashī) but the latter place, see Barthold, Vorlesungen, 81, lay on the upper Chu and consequently could not belong to the Toghuzghuz territory as described in our source. [Siṃṅk < सित-“to urinate” may refer to the climate of our 14., v.s., p. 95.]

16. In view of 12. the name ایکیبَرکوکك most probably represents (with adjunction of -kat “town”) Kāshghari’s frontier place (baldatun bil-thaghr) Iki-ōgūz, i.e.”(situated between) the two rivers”, namely the Ili and Yafinj. Near Iki-ōgūz lay the township of Qamlanchu, ibid., 184.

1 Kāshghari, iii, 99, mentions a lake Yulduz-kūl, situated on the frontier (thaghr) between Kuchā, Kyk.t, and Uyghur. The name Kyk.t is suspect and may be identical with Kingt mentioned on the Uyghur frontier, iii, 268.
The Toghuqghuz

As mentioned above, Iki-ögüz appears on the Map to the east (north) of the Ili, and to the west (south) of Kūmi-Talas (v.s. 8.). Rubruquis (A.D. 1253–5) quotes the name in the amusing Latin disguise of Equius (<iki [or eki]-ögüz), see Recueil de voyages, iv, 1839, p. 281. After having crossed the Ili, probably near the present-day crossing at Iliysk, Rubruquis entered a valley where a ruined castle could be seen. "Et post hoc invenimus quandom bonam villam qui dicitur Equius, in qua erant Saraceni loquentes persicum. Longissime tamen erant a Perside. Sequenti (sic) die, transgressis illis alibus que (sic) dependebant a magnis montibus qui erant ad meridiem ingressi sumus pulcherrimam planitiem habentem montes altos a dextra, et quoddam mare a sinistra sive quadem lacum qui durat XXV dietas in circitu (sic). Et illa planicies tota irrigatur ad libitum aquis descenditibus de montibus que (sic) omnes recipiuntur in illud mare. In estate reddimus ad latus agilonare illius maris ubi similiter erant magni montes. . . . Invenimus ibi unam magnam villam nomine Callac (Coilac) in qua erat forum et frequentabant eam multi mercatores." F. M. Schmidt, Über Rubruks Reise in Zeitschr. d. Ges. f. Erdkunde, Berlin, 1885, xx, 203, places Callac (*Qayatlq) between Kopal and the Balkhash lake, and Equius to the south-east of it near the mountains (Dzungarian Ala-tau). Barthold, Report, 70, locates Equius near Chingildi which is the first stage after the crossing of the Ili (at Iliysk). Perhaps it would be better to take Iki-Ögüz (Equius?) one stage farther east to Altun-Emel which is an important junction of the roads from the south-west (Almata = Verniy), east (Jarkant), and north (Kopal). Altun-Emel lies at the southernmost source of the Qara-tal and (if this river is Yafinjl) can without much exaggeration be said to correspond to Kāshghari’s description of Iki-Ögüz. Another possibility would be to derive the name of the town from the two sources of the Qara-tal between which it lay. This, however, would be contrary to Kāshghari’s text.¹ See Map v.

17. Ighrāj-art occurs several times in our text as the name of the Central T’ien-shan, see note to § 5, 7. At this place evidently only some important pass is meant. The detail about its "never being free from snow" may refer to the Muz-art ("Ice-pass") skirting the Khan-Tengri peak. In Kāshghari only the name Ighrāq, v.s. 10, approaches our Ighrāj. Cf. also the mysterious راپ عراق where according to Gardizi, 84g, the Kimāk used to take their horses in winter. But then the *Ighrāq (instead of ‘Irāq) comprised some warm valleys!

§ 13. The Yaghma

Gardizi, 84, recording some older traditions² says that a party of Toghuqghuz having separated from their tribe joined the Khallukh who by that time had succeeded in establishing friendly relations with the Haytal of

¹ I now see that the explanation of Equius by Iki-ögüz is already found in Barthold, Vorlesungen, 95.
² Marquart who has commented on this passage, Komanen, 13–15, thinks that their source is Ibn al-Muqaffa’ whom Gardizi quotes among his authorities.
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Ṭukharistān. The Turk-khāqān [of the Tūrgish] felt some uneasiness at this combination and directed the above-mentioned Toghuqghuz to settle between the Khallukh and the Kimāk, where they were reinforced by some other people from among those who lived “to the left of China”. As the Khallukh and the shad-tutuq of the Kimāk oppressed the new federation the latter moved to the neighbourhood of the khāqān. The name of the chief of the Toghuqghuz in question was Yaghmā and now the khāqān called him tutuq in order to spite the Kimāk chief (who had a similar title).

In the H.-Ā. we find the Yaghmā (Yaghiyā) living astride of the Ighraj-art (Central and Western T’ien-shan) and occupying both the region south of the Khatlam river, i.e. Narin (§ 6, 21.) and the north-western corner of the present-day Chinese Turkestan. We do not know how the Yaghmā came to occupy this region. § 13, i. suggests a previous struggle between the Chinese, the Khallukh, and the Yaghmā. From the fact that Kāshghari, i, 85, mentions on the river Ila (Ili) the tribes of Yaghmā and Tukhiš and a clan of the Chigil, we may infer that the Yaghmā known to Gardizi’s source had split into two. The presence of some Yaghmā near the Ili basin may be inferred from § 12, 10., but the important group of the tribe must have centred round, and north of, Kāshghar. The Mūjmal altawārīkh, Barthold, Turkestan, i, 20, definitely says that “the king of the Yaghmā is called Boghra-khān”. The title undoubtedly points to the first Turkish Muslim dynasty which in A.D. 999 put an end to the Samanid rule in Transoxiana and which has been differently designated under the names of Āl-i Afrāsiyāb, “khans of Turkestan”, Ilāk-khāns, Qara-khanids (see Barthold, Ḥaık-khāns in EI). Our source insists on the esteem enjoyed by

---

1 Possibly referring to the infiltration of the Khallukh into Upper Ṭukharistān (see note to § 23, 69.). Under A.H. 119 Ṭabarī, ii, 1412, line 9, mentions the ḫaghtiyā al-Tukharī and ibid., line 16, calls him ḫaghtiyā al-Khārlukhī.

2 The region “between” the Khallukh and the Kimāk would lie somewhere near the Sarı-su (cf. § 18). This would render possible a contact between the Toghuqghuz and the Altaı tribes to which evidently the text refers, as may be inferred from the items on the situation “to the left of China” and the “Chinese sable-martens” coming from their country (s. mojāt restored by Marquart as samār-i chint), cf. note to § 5, 8. [Eventually the legend may refer to the earlier seats of the Khallukh near the Tarbaghatai, v.i., p. 286.]

3 Very puzzling is the mention of the Khuland-qhūn (§ 6, 3. and § 12, 5.) as the southern frontier of the Yaghmā. Does Khuland-qhūn stand here for the Aq-su and its western tributaries (Taushqan)? The name Taushqan or Taushkan is found in Gardizi (see p. 296) but is omitted in our § 6, 3. Our author may have substituted for it the name belonging to the more easterly Muzart. In this case, the Yaghmā occupied in the westernmost T’ien-shan (see p. 96, line 1) the corner between the Narin and Taushqan, whereas the valley of the Taushqan and the salt lake south of it (§§ 3, 17, and 15, 6.) were held by the Khallukh (§ 15).

4 Did the khāqān establish them there simultaneously with giving their ancestor the title of tutuq?

5 Cf. the name of the founder of the dynasty; Satuq Boghra-khan. Marquart, Guwains Bericht über die Bekehrung der Uiguren, in Sits. Berl. Akad., 1912, xxvii, 491, has shown that Abū Dulaf Miṣ‘ar b. Muhalhil (cf. note to § 9) while speaking of the shi‘a tribe يراجع Pérry refers to the dynasty of Boghra-khān, v.i.i.
the Yaghma kings among their subjects. The composition of the Qara-khanid army may be still a moot question, cf. Barthold, Turkestan, 254,1 but there is hardly any doubt that the ruling dynasty arose from the Yaghma group (a branch of the Toguzghuz).2 In our source we find the Yaghma at their beginnings before they spread north into the Chu and Jaxartes basins. According to Niẓām al-mulk, Siyāṣat nama, ed. Schefer, p. 189, some “infidel Turks” conquered Balāsāghūn (in the Chu valley) a short time before A.D. 943. If Barthold’s surmise is right, Semirechye, 20, that this people “in all probability was identical with the one from which the Qara-khanid dynasty arose”, the date would form the terminus ante quem of our author’s original source. It is also noteworthy that Üzgand which was destined to become an important centre of the Qara-khanids is still reckoned (§ 25, 58.) to Transoxiana. In the south the Qara-khanids waged war on the kings of Khotan (§ 9, 18.) and the mention of the Toguzghuz (= Yaghma?) on the road from Kāshgar to Khotan (§ 11, 20.) may be a portent of the final absorption of the latter place toward A.D. 1000.

1. On Kāshgar (in Chinese Shu-lê, Sha-lê, Ch’ia-sha, in Tibetan Shulig) see Chavannes, Documents, 121, Sir A. Stein, Ancient Khotan, 47–72, H. A. R. Gibb, The Arab invasion of Kāshgar in A.D. 715, in Bull. S.O.S, ii, part iii, 467–74 [the author doubts the fact of the invasion], Barthold, Ilek-khan and Kāshgar in EI. At the time of the earlier Chinese dominion Kāshgar was one of the “Four Garrisons” (cf. § 9) though it possessed a dynasty of its own.3 Towards A.D. 676–8 it was subjugated by the Tibetans. In 728 China again entered into relations with the “king” of Kāshgar. After a new struggle in which the Chinese, the Tibetans, the Turks, and the Arabs took part, Kāshgar, to judge by our source, was annexed by the Khallukh but became a bone of contention between the latter and the Yaghmā. Marquart, Guwainis Bericht, &c., p. 492, has shown that Mis’ar b. Muhalhil mentions the YaghmA kingdom twice over: once under the name Bughrāj, and a second time under that of Khargāh, “the tent” (?), corresponding to the Turkish Ordū-kand, “the Army cantonments”. Birūnī in his Canon (6th climate) clearly says that “Ordū-kand is Kāshgar”. Khargāh as the name of a country lying somewhere near India

---
1 Cf. the mention of a multitude of clans composing the Yaghma federation. As regards the B.lāq (Y.lāq?), Kāshgharī, i, 317, mentions a tribe Alkā (sic) Bulāq (الك Bulāq) but the fact that it was subjugated by the Qifchaq points to its much more northern situation. [Separately, ibid., i, 57, is mentioned an Oghuz clan called *Alqabotāk.* As a mere guess, could one take the B.lāq “mixed with the Toguzghuz” for the group of the Yaghma living on the Ili where they could be in touch with the Toguzghuz?

2 So Barthold, Semirechye, 21, but later, Vorlesungen, 77, he expressed himself in favour of the Khallukh origin of the dynasty.

3 Kāshgharī, i, 9 and 31, says that in the districts of Kāshgar a non-Turkish language was spoken, called kāŋjāki. In the town itself the kāŋjāngi Turkish was used. [In later times a place called K.n.j.k is often mentioned in the neighbourhood of Talas, cf. Waṣṣaf, Tārkīkh, ed. Hammer, i, 22. It may have been a colony of the same tribe.]
The Yaghní

is mentioned in the Shāh-nāma, ed. Vullers, p. 782, note 7, and p. 787, note 7. Rustam speaks to Kay-Khusrau of a land belonging to Zābulistan which Manūchihr had freed from the Tūránians but which was again seized by the latter under Kay-Ka'ūs:

Mar ân mars Khargāh kho'ānad ba-nâm
jahān-dīda dihqān-i gustarda-nâm.
Za-yak nīma bar Sind dārad guzar
Ba Qinna-'u Kāshmīr-'u ān bīm bar;
Dīgar nīma rāhash su-yi marz-i Čhin
Bi-payvast bā marz-i Tūrān-zāmīn.

Kay-Khusrau sends Rustam for the deliverance of
Zāmīnī-ki payvasta-yi marz-i tu-st:
Za Khargāh tā bīm-i Hindūsītān
Za Kāshmīr tā marz-i Jādūsītān.

2. Instead of Bartūj one must read *Artūj. Kāshghari, i, 87, mentions two villages of the name Artūj in the Kāshghar region.1 Both (now called Artīsh) are still extant beyond the hills north of Kāshghar. The Upper Artīsh lies some 35 Km. to the north-west of Kāshghar and the Lower Artīsh some 45 Km. to the north-east of it. Near the two villages exist interesting Buddhist remains, cf. Petrovsky (former Russian Consul General in Kāshghar) in Zap., vii, 295 and ix, 147. The founder of the Qara-khanid dynasty Satuq Boghra-khan lies buried in Artīsh, see Jamal Qarashi, Mulṣaḡāt al-Šurāh in Barthold, Turkestan, i (texts), 132: māta Satuq Bughra khan al-ghāzī fī sanat 344 wa mashhadahu bi-Artūj min qurā Kāshghar, wa [huva] al-yaum ma'mūr wa mazūr, cf. Grenard, Jour. As., January 1900, p. 6. The legendary details on the decay of Artūj are likely to refer to the time before Satuq Boghra-khan's burial in 344/955 (?) because Islamic tradition would hardly have allowed the resting-place of a famous champion of Islam to become a ruin.

3. The easiest solution is perhaps to identify Khīrmkī inhabited by *Artūjians with the second of the two villages mentioned. On the other hand, Idrīsī, tr. by Jaubert, i, 492, mentions a town and a fort of Kirmq situated at four days from Bākhwān (see note to § 15, 14.), at 10 days from Barskhān and at 14 days from the "town of Tibet" (= Khotan?). As the duty of the governor of this place was to repel the attacks of the "Tibetan princes" one would think that J.rm.q lay to the south or to the west of Aq-su. As a mere guess one could identify the town with the important Maral-bashi (according to Kuropatkin, circa 232 Km. west of Aq-su) which in former days was called Barchuq (Kāshghari, i, 318: بَرْقِع). In a similar way our Khīrmq could be another mutilation of the same name [?]. The fact that the village was inhabited by Artūjians (evidently considered as a special tribe) may be connected with what Kāshghari, i, 9 and 31, says about the kānjaḏī (v.s., p. 280, note 3).

1 He says that artūj means "juniper-tree" (ارا), i.e. probably the tree called in Turkestan arha "Juniperus polycarpus".
§ 14. The Khirkhiz

Marquart, Komanen, 65–8; Barthold, Kirghiz in EI, and Kirgizî, istoricheskiy ocherk, Frunze = Pishpek, 1927 (an important historical essay written by Barthold at the request of the Qirghiz Soviet Republic in which the data of the H.-Ā. have also been utilized).

This very ancient people, first mentioned by the Chinese in 201 B.C.,¹ lived north of the Sayan mountains on the Upper Yenisei. To judge by the appearance of the Qirghiz (Qirzî), as described by the Chinese and Muslim sources (blue eyes, red hair, white skin)² they did not originally belong to the Turkish race and were probably Turkicized “Yenisei Ostiaks”. Towards a.d. 710 the Turkish (T‘u-chüeh) rulers of Mongolia undertook a victorious campaign in the Qirghiz country, but the real conquest took place only in 758 after the power in Mongolia passed to the Uyghur Turks. In 840 the Qirghiz rose against their masters, expelled the Uyghurs from Mongolia and founded a new nomad empire which lasted till about 917, when the K‘itan (Qitay) united under their aegis Northern China and Mongolia. The qaghan (khāqān) of the Qirghiz returned to the old residence on the Yenisei, and Muslim reports on the Qirghiz must have in view this stage of the Qirghiz history. [But see § 3, i. and p. 94, l. 11.]

Gardizi, 86, describes a road from the Toghuzghuz to the Khirkhiz which may be divided into four sections: (a) From Chīnānjkath to Kh.s.n, thence to Nūkhb.k, and thence to K.mīz-[art]; the journey lasts 1–2 months in a grass-steppe and 5 days in a desert. (b) From K.mīz-art to Mān.n.klū;³ 2 days among hills, after which begins the region of forests; then come steppes, springs, and hunting grounds until the high Mān.klū mountain is reached, which is wooded and abounds in sable-martens, grey squirrels, musk-deer, and game. (c) From Mān.n.klū to Kūkmān (Kökmān), by a road along which grazing grounds, pleasant streams, and abundant game are found; in 4 days the traveller reaches the Kökmān mountain which is high and very wooded; here the road grows narrow. (d) From Kökmān to the Khirkhiz encampment (ḥāyīṭa): 7 days by a road on which one finds steppes, verdure (sabsī), water, and trees growing so close to one another as to prevent an enemy from passing. The road is like a garden until it reaches the said encampment where the army quarters (lashkargāh) of the Khirkhiz are situated.

The distances indicated are vague. As mentioned in the note to § 12, 8.

¹ The Chinese transcription (Ch‘ien Han-shu) of the name Qirghiz Kien-k‘un is explained by Pelliot as imitating the (Mongol?) singular form: Qirgu; corresponding to the plural Qirgiz; see Jour. As., April 1920, p. 137. L. Ligeti, Die Herkunft des Volksnamens Kirgiz, in Körösi Csoma-Archivum, i, 1925, pp. 1–15, takes Qirq-tis for an old Turkish plural of qirq “forty”.

² Gardizi, 85, reports a legend according to which the founder of the Khirkhiz tribe was a Slav(!): “the signs of Slav origin are still apparent in the Khirkhiz, namely their red hair and white skin”.

³ In the Camb. MS., fol. 182a, these four last names have respectively the forms: Khîn or Khîn (f?); Nūkhīk; K.mrāz and K.mīz; Mān.n.klū and Mātiklū.
§ 14  

The Khirkhiz  

K.mîz-art may lie on the southern skirts of the Tarbaghatai range. Mânêb.klû would grosso modo correspond to the Altai mountains. Kökmân, known also in the Orkhon inscription, cf. Thomsen, *Les inscriptions*, p. 149, n. 24, is more likely the Tannu-ola (south of Uriankhai)¹ than the Sayan mountains (north of Uriankhai). The khaqân’s residence must have lain on the upper Yenisei, in the Minusinsk region known for its excellent climate and picturesque nature. See Map 1.

Gardizi mentions three roads from the Khirkhiz territory: (a) following a north-to-south direction (just described in the opposite direction); (b) a western road leading to the Kimâk and Khallukh; (c) a road leading eastwards to the great tribe of Fûrî (v.i. 1.).

In our source the Khirkhiz territory is represented as extending down to the Northern Uninhabited Lands and the Eastern Ocean (§ 3, 1.). On the west a mountain separated them from the Kimâk (§ 5, 12. and § 18). As the Kimâk lived on the Irtish the mountain must be the Altai (= Mânêb.klû, v.s.). In § 6, 41. it is said that the “Ras” river rises from the same mountain [or its continuation?]. The Tülas (Töläs, Tölös) mountain where the Khirkhiz were also found (§ 5, 8.) may be another name for the Altai, borrowed from a different source and wrongly placed north-west of the Issik-kul (cf. §§ 16 and 17).² Some isolated groups of the tribe must have wandered even into the Tarim basin: they are mentioned in the neighbourhood of Kashghar (§ 13, 1.) and more definitely in B.njûl (§ 15, 12.) which, to believe our author, formed a Khirkhiz enclave in the Khallukh territory.³

1. Gardizi, 86, gives much more information on the Fûrî. The eastern road from the Khirkhiz, says he, has two variants of which the one runs in the desert is 3 months long, and the other, more to the north, only 2 months long but more difficult, for the narrow path has to cross forests, marshes, and numerous streams. In the marshes⁴ live wild people who do not mix with others and do not understand their languages. They are clad in skins and feed on game, their religion forbids them to touch other people’s clothes. Their families accompany them in their campaigns. They destroy the booty and only keep the enemy’s arms. If the Khirkhiz take them prisoners they go on hunger strike. They suspend their dead on trees in order that their bodies should decay, &c. The text could be literally taken as indicating that the said wild people were found on the


² The name is evidently that of the well-known Turkish federation (Töläs, Tölls, Tölös, in Chinese T’ieh-lê, Thomsen, *Inscriptions*, 61, Chavannes, *Documents*, 87) to which the Uyghur originally belonged. At a later date, Eltarish qaghan ( Bilga qaghan’s father) organized the Tölls and Tardush tribes (Thomsen, *Inscriptions*, 103, *ZDMG*, 1924, 147) which Thomsen, *ibid.*, p. 174, considers as “the two great tribes, or rather administrative sections of the Eastern Turks”.

³ This statement need not necessarily be connected with the epoch of the Qirghiz Empire, see Barthold, *Preface*, p. 28. The B.njûl group could be only a colony of the tribe.

⁴ Gardizi, 842, read: âb-gîr as two lines down!
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went to the Turkoman land and the Ghuz (i.e. Turkomans!) into that of the Pechenegs near the Armenian sea (v.i., notes to §19). After the Marqa-Qun 'Aufi mentions the Khirkhiz who lived between the “aestival east” (mashriq-i sayfi) and the Kimak (living north of the Khirkhiz). There is no doubt that تون and قون refer to the same people, and Barthold in his edition of 'Aufi’s text quotes the variants: قون (Br. Mus. Or. 2676) and تون. Marquart adopts the reading Qun and boldly makes it the starting-point of a series of far-fetched hypotheses having in view to prove the identity of the Qun with the later Qoman (in Hungarian Kün), see Komanen, 7730. Linguistically Qun cannot account for Qoman which still awaits an explanation. Consequently the reading Qūrī, as found in the older source from which both the ه.-ﺄ. and Gardizi derived their information, and having good parallels in Chinese and Old Turkish sources is preferable in the present state of our knowledge.¹

In Biruni, on the Syriac map, and in 'Aufi the name Qun is coupled with the name of another people ياقوت (Yaqūt: تون) which several times occurs in Kāshgharī, whose enumeration (i, 28) of the outer belt of Turkish tribes (running west to east) is as follows: Pecheneg, Qifchaq, Oghuz, Yimāk, Bashghirt, Basmīl, Qāy, Yabāqū, Tatār. On the map the Qāy are shown on the left bank of the Yumar (Obi), and south of them are found the Jumul (of the inner [north-to-south] belt of tribes). Further (i, 30) Kāshgharī says that Jumul, Qāy, Yabāqū, Tatār, and Basmīl have languages of their own (perhaps dialects?) but at the same time speak good “Turkish”. In Chinese sources and the Orkhon inscriptions the name Qāy has not been found and one might suppose that this tribe did not originally belong to the earlier federations (Tolš, Türk, Uyghur). In Kāshgharī’s time the Qāy seem to have shifted to the west, perhaps subsequently to the displacement of the Qūrī/Qun of whom no trace is found in the Divān lughat al-turk composed A.D. 1077.²

As the easternmost Turkish (?) tribe our source regards the Fūrī < Qūrī. Meanwhile in the description of the provinces of China are found the names:ي (§ 9, 2d) and قون (§ 9, 2h). It is tempting to identify the first of them with قون (as located in Biruni) and take the latter as a mere repetition

15 Km.) lying in the southern Altai, north of Zaisan. The lake could possibly indicate one of the stages in the peregrinations of the *Marqa tribe.

² Kāshgharī makes a distinction between the Qāy and the Qaylgh (i, 56), the latter being one of the 22 clans of the Oghuz. This distinction was insisted upon by M. F. Köprülti-zade, Ilk mutasavvifler, Istanbul, 1919, p. 146. The names have been often confused, and even Yaqūt’s (i, 33) reflects Qayl(gh) rather than Qāy.
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of (§ 14, 1.) easily explained in an enumeration made in an opposite direction (i.e. east to west). Should this surmise prove acceptable, the rest of the enigmatic “Chinese” provinces (§ 9, 2.) would also have to be explained from Turkish and cognate languages.

2. The town كُئْبُكْجَ كُئْبُكْجَ, according to Barthold, may correspond to Mi-ti-chih-t'o mentioned as the royal camp of the Qirghiz in the T'ang-shu, Schott, Über d. achtten Kirgisen, 1865, p. 434. Then our name ought to be accordingly restored as *Kashim (كَشَم). [Idrīsī, 1, 500, calls the principal river of the Khirkhīz country, i.e. evidently Yenisei: مناخ which may be a mis-spelling of the name of the capital.]

3. Judging by the traits of likeness between the K.saym (كَسْيْم) and the more westerly tribes, they must have lived to the west of the Khirkhīz proper. A possible restitution of this name would be *Kishtim (كَشْتِم), a people which was conquered by Chengiz-khan simultaneously with the Qirghiz. Aristov, Notes on the Ethnical Composition of the Turkish Peoples (in Russian), in Zhivaya starina, vi, 1896, p. 340, sees in them some Turkicized Yenisei tribe (Chinese: Ting-ling); in Russian seventeenth-century documents the Turkicized tributaries of the Qirghiz are indiscriminately called Kishtim. [A. Z. Validi reminds me of the Turkish town of كشتم mentioned in the Mashhad MS. of Ibn al-Faqih, but its whereabouts are not quite clear to me.]

§ 15. The Khallukh

The T'ang-shu translated by Bichurin, Sobraniye sveedeniy, i, 437, and by Chavannes, Documents, 85; Tomaszek’s review of de Goeje’s De Muur van Gog en Magog, in WZKM, 1889, iii, 103–8; Barthold, Semirechye, pp. 14–20; Barthold, Ču, Issik-kul, Karluk, Türk, in EI.

The original name of the tribe is Qarluq (in Chinese transcription Ko-lo-lu) but more frequently the earlier Muslim authors use the forms Qarloğh and Khalkuğ of which the latter (خُلك) is very easily confused with Khalaj (خُلّاج <Qalakh), cf. § 24, 22. and § 23, 69.

According to the T'ang-shu the Ko-lo-lu originally belonged to various clans of the T’u-chüeh. They lived to the north-west of Pei-t'ing (§ 12, 2.) and to the west of the Kin-shan (“Golden mountain” = Altai), astride of the river Pu-ku-chen (Black Irtish?). Their territory included the mountain To-ta [perhaps Tarbaghatai?], Chavannes, Documents, 85, note 4.1 In the south the Qarluq were the neighbours of the Tu-lu group of the Western T’u-chüeh which lived to the east of the Issik-kul in the Ili basin. In a.d. 742–5 the Qarluq helped the Uyghurs to destroy the federation of the Eastern T’u-chüeh, after which they considered themselves as candidates to the succession of the Western T’u-chüeh (at that time under the leadership of the Türgish clan) and gradually moved westwards. At the time of the famous battle of Talas (133/751) the Qarluq revolted against the Chinese

1 This fact may explain § 5, 8. (p. 196). Cf. also p. 278, n. 2.
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and joined the Arabs thereby securing the latter’s victory, Chavannes, *Documents*, 143, 297. Towards 766 the Qarluq occupied Suyāb (§ 17, 2.) and Talas (§ 25, 93.), i.e. the habitat of the western (Nu-shih-pi) group of the Western T’u-chüeh, Chavannes, o.c., 286, 297.1 It is very possible that to this initial expansion of the Qarluq refer the two curious passages in Jahiz (v.s., p. 267) who ascribes the decline of Toghuzghuz valour to the influence of Manichaeism and adds that formerly “the Toghuzghuz excelled the Khallukh even if the latter were in double numbers (wa kānū yataqaddimūna al-Khallukhiyya wa-in kānū fil ‘adād aḍ‘āfahum."

In Muslim literature two curious reports are found on the earlier events in the Khallukh history. The one by Gardizi, 84, suggesting some contacts between the Khallukh and Yabāghū is still obscure (v. i., p. 288). The other by ‘Aufi (Barthold, *Turkestan*, i., 99–100, and Marquart, *Komane*, 40) is much nearer to the Chinese version: “Another tribe of Turks are the Khallukh. Their habitat lay at the Yūn.s mountain which (produces) gold. The Khallukh were the subjects of the Toghuzghuz but having revolted against them invaded the land of Turkistān [perhaps: Tūrghishān?] and some of them came (even) to the lands of Islām. There are nine clans (of them): three figilī, three H.ski, one N. dā (B. dovā), one K. valīn and one T. khsīn.” The name of the mountain must stand for *Tūlā*, i.e. exactly Altai (Kin-shan) on which see note to § 5, 8.3

When after a.d. 840 the Uyghurs, ousted from Mongolia by the Khirkhīz, occupied the eastern part of the T’ien-shan, they evidently pressed the Khallukh from the east. The struggles in the region between the Ili and Issik-kul must have been carried on with alternate success. Our source suggests that the Khallukh had occupied or recaptured the important town of Barskhān (v. i. 11.), but on the other hand lost Jamghar (v. i. 12.).

The Qarluq might possibly have gathered round themselves a new strong federation but for a new move of Turkish tribes led from the south by the Qara-khanids (see § 13). Our source (§ 13, 1.) hints at some previous struggles between the Khallukh and Yaghma for the possession of Kāshgar. Finally (towards a.d. 943) the Qara-khanid lords of Kāshgar (see § 13) penetrated into the Chu valley (which our author still describes as being in the possession of the Khallukh and Chigil) and invaded Transoxiana. The Khallukh as the rest of the tribes of the region were then merged in the kingdom of the new lords.

Another group of Khallukh, under their own yabghū lived south of

1 In spite of these events several tribes of the latter federation seem to have maintained their independence in various degrees (see notes to §§ 16, 17, and 19).

2 V. i., line 16, where ‘Aufi’s term *Toghuzghuz* most probably refers to the Western T’u-chüeh (= Tūrghish). Qu-dāna, 262, speaking of the people of Upper Barskhān (who undoubtedly had belonged to the T’u-chüeh), calls them “the bravest among the Turks” and adds that ten of them could fight 100 Kharlukh. But v. i. 11.

3 It is noteworthy that in the 13th century a later Qarluq principality still existed north of the Ili (probably near Kopal), i.e. in the neighbourhood of the original Qarluq home, cf. Barthold, *Karluţ în EI*. [Cf. p. 94, l. 21.]
the Oxus in Upper Ṭukharistān, Ṭabarī, ii, 1604. Gardīzi’s record of the friendly relations between the Khallukh and the “Ḥayṭāl of Ṭukharistān” (see note to § 13) may echo the penetration of the Khallukh into that province; quite possibly the Khallukh themselves established in Ṭukharistān are understood under the name of their Hephtalite predecessors (in Arabic Ḥayṭal). Our source (§ 23, 69.) confirms the presence of the Khallukh in Ṭukharistān, and even now the name Qarluq survives in one of the Uzbek clans of Northern Afghanistān, cf. Barthold, Turks in EI and Kūshkākī [see note to § 24, iva], p. 200 (Shahr-i Buzurg) and p. 203 (Rūstāq).

The item on the title of the Khallukh ruler (jabghū or yabghū, often mis-spelt yabghū) may have been borrowed from I.Kh., 16, who says that the kings of the Turks, Tibetans, and Khazars are styled ḥāqān, “with the exception of the Khurāsh king (who is) called jabghūya.” According to Kāshgharī, iii, 24, yabghū was a title two degrees lower than ḥāqān.1

The title yabghū (Kāshgharī, iii, 24: yabghū < yafghū) must be distinguished from the name of the tribe Yabāghū which is placed by Kāshgharī, i, 28 and passim, considerably more to the east between the Qāy and Tatār. In Gardīzi’s (p. 82) still obscure report on the origin of the Khallukh Yabāghū is the nickname2 of a man who having run away from the “Turks” (to whom the original Khallukh belonged) came to the land of the Toghu ghuz. The ḥāqān of the latter placed him as a chief over the Khallukh living in his possessions who were accordingly surnamed Khallukh-i Yabāghū. Later on a part of Yabāghū’s tribe was induced to migrate to Turkistān (*Tūrgishān?) and was settled by the ḥāqān of the latter who gave them a jābū ( < jabāya?).3 Finally the people of Turkistān (*Tūrgishān?) rose against the ḥāqān* Khutoghlan (خثولان) who was killed and whose kingdom passed to (the) Chūnpān (clan?) of the Khallukh.4 The first Khallukh ruler who sat on the throne was ʿIlāmīn.s.n *jabāya (يلامرسن جبه sic). It is likely that under the “Yabāghū Khallukh” are understood the Khallukh who stayed at their original home in the Altai. The migration of some of the “Yabāghū” westwards is supported by the fact that the Ḫuzgand river “rising from behind the mountain of the Khallukh” (§ 6, 17.) is called *Yabāghū (§ 25, 58.), and Kāshgharī, iii, 27, confirms this name: Yabāghū-suwi. This would indicate that the “Yabāghū Khallukh” were settled south of the original bulk of the Khallukh federation on the western headwater of the Jaxartes near the pass leading to Kāshghar.

1 According to the Chū T’ang-shu the T’u-čhih used to give the title shē-hu and t’e-lé (which Chavannes, Documents, 21, identifies respectively with jabghū and tekin) to the sons, younger brother, and relatives of the ḥāqān. However, at another place I.Kh., 40, merges the two titles into one: jabghūya-ḥāqān, probably referring to the earlier times, for according to Chavannes, Documents, 38, note 5, the kings of the Western T’u-čhih were called jabghūqaqhan.

2 Yabāqū according to Kāshgharī, iii, 27, means “felted wool” (al-qarada min al-sūf).

3 It is possible that the slightly simplified form jabāya contained some particular shade of meaning. Cf. Persian padshāh > Turkish pāshā.

4 Cf. infra pp. 300–1.
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(“to Tibet” according to our author’s ideas, § 25, 28). From § 6, 21. one should conclude that the valley of Yabāghū was already hemmed in by the Yaghmā whose frontier with the Khallukh reached the more northerly Khatlām (i.e. Narin) river. The Yabāghū group may have been specially used by the Khallukh as a wedge between themselves and the aggressive Yaghmā (§ 13).

As usual in our source the bearings of the Khallukh territory are quoted as if the author was facing east instead of north. *Grosso modo* the Khallukh occupied most¹ of the Chu basin, both north and south of the Alexandrovsky range,² as well as the region stretching south of the Issik-kul and overlapping the T’ien-shan into Chinese Turkestan along the Aq-su valley. The enumeration begins with the places mentioned under Transoxiana (§ 25, 93.) as the “Gate of the Khallukh”. 1.–3. (and 4.?) are situated along the road from the Jaxartes to the Chu basin (north of the Alexandrovsky range); 7.–9. in the Chu valley (?); 10.–12. south of the Issik-kul [12. perhaps much farther east]; 5.–6. and 13.–15. south of the T’ien-shan, the first two lying to the north-east of Kāshghar and the rest on the road connecting the Chu and Issik-kul basins with Kuchā (§ 9, 10.) and the towns of the Toghuizghuz (§ 12, 5. 4. 3. r.). See Map v.

1. 2. Cf. I.Kh., 28, Qudāma, 205–6, and Maq., 275 (the latter with different details). Kūlān corresponds to the present-day Tartī, and Mirkī is still known under its old name. As regards the tribes A. Z. Validi writes to me (17. ix. 1932): “Berish seems to be still in existence; Bystān is perhaps related to *B. Chalūn* in the Stambul MS. of Maq.”

3. After Mirkī we find here Nūnkat, whereas under § 25, 93. Mirkī is followed by N. vikat. I.Kh., 29, gives the following itinerary: Kūlān, 4 farsaks to Brkī ( = Mirkī); thence 4 f. to Asbara (*Ashpara*); thence 8 f. to Nūnkat (var. *Nunkat*); thence 4 f. to Kh. r. nj. wān (several variants); thence 4 f. to Jūl; thence 7 f. to Sār. gh; thence 4 f. to the town of the Türkīsh khāqān; thence 4 f. to Navākat; thence 3 f. to K. bāl (var. K. nād); thence 15 days to *Barskān*. So Nūnkat must be distinguished from Navākat, the former lying west of the Chu and the latter apparently east of it. According to Gardizi, 89, from a place called Tūmkat (تریک) ³ started a road running in a south-easterly direction and leaving Issik-kul to the left (i.e. north), while (ibid., 102), from a place called N. vikat started a road leaving the basin of the lake to the right (i.e. south). Barthold, Report, p. 114, simply substitutes the reading تریک for تریک (and, ibid., 32, identifies N. vikat with Kök-muynaq), but in view of the facts just quoted this is surely a mistake and one must distinguish between تریک ( = I.Kh. Nūnkat)

¹ Sūyāb is quoted under § 17, 2.
² Meant under the “Khallukh mountain” from behind which the Parāk river (= Chirchik) is said to rise (§ 6, 22.). On the other “Khallukh mountain” (Yasīl pass), v.i. note to 11.
³ More rightly from the more easterly Kūmbr. kat. Tomashchek, *WZKM*, 1889, although he did not know Gardizi, already restored the name of Nūnkat as *Tūmkat* or *Tūmkat* in view of the Chinese name of the stage lying 50 li (= 28.8 Km.) east of A-shih-pu-lai (*Ashpara*), namely Tun-kiên, cf. Chavannes, *Documents*, 10.
and نونکت (I.Kh. تونکت). Our author (who did certainly use I.Kh.) says that نونکت "was a town". But both I.Kh. and Qudāma call نونکت/نونکت simply "large village" (قراون اشیماتون), while Navikat is styled by Qudāma, 206: "a large town (میدیناتون کابیراتون), from which a road leads to Barşkhan". As in our § 25, 93. Mīrki is followed by Navikat, we may suppose that in the present paragraph نونکت has been given the characteristics of Navikat. Our author, evidently mistaken by the similarity of the two names, simply skipped from Mīrki to Navikat leaving out the places lying to the west of the Chu. If such is the case, the mountain Úrūn-Ārj must correspond to the range forming the watershed between the Chu and III. On the eastern side of the difficult Kastek pass (8,470 feet high) by which a road crosses this mountain lies the station Uzun-Aghach (اورون اغاج "the long farsakh, or stage") which provides a very satisfactory correction for the impossible اورون مارج. Gardizi's report (p. 102) on a mountain in the same region by which the Turks took oath and which they considered as the abode of the Almighty undoubtedly refers to the same range. Ṭabari, ii, 1593 (year 119/737) confirms that the khaqan possessed near Navikat a mountain and a meadow which formed a forbidden zone reserved for commissariat purposes in case of expeditions. See Map vi.

4. تونکت is obscure. If the interpretation of 5. and 6. is right, it may represent the starting-point of a southern route.

5. and 6. As the Khalilukh bordered on the Yaghmā in the south-west (v.s., p. 278, n. 3), 5. Tūzūn-bulaq must be looked for near the Western T'ien-shan. If the Tūz-kūl corresponds to the Shūr-kul (§ 3, 17.) Tūzūn-ārj lay in its neighbourhood. All three names: Tūzūn-bulaq, Tūzūn-ārj, and Tūz-kūl may contain the same Turkish element توس "salt", whereas a similar element -ārj under 3. has been restored by us as *aghach. In spite of the outward likeness of توس and اورون مارج توزن مارج it is impossible to identify them in view of the geographical details. The element اغاج (yighach) "farsakh, stage" is common in Turkish names. Kāshghari, i, 77; Ala-yighach; i, 108 Qara-yighach; iii, 118: Bay-yighach. [Cf. also note to § 5, 7.]

1 Very often old Iranian ē is rendered alternately by ə and l, the latter to be read withināda: ā. [Tūnkat=Tqmaq?]
2 The importance of the Navikat results from the facts that it was the seat of a Nestorian bishop, Assemano, Bibli. orientalis, ii, 458 (Kasimghar [Kāshghari] and Navakath) and iii/2, p. 639 (Chasimgarah and Nuachet), cf. Yule, Cathay, p. 179 (2nd ed. ii, 24) and that Manichaeans were particularly numerous in it, Fihrist, i, 338: Nūmbath, but ii, 125: Navikath. The Fihrist has chiefly in view the situation in the early 10th century but it also records the previous emigration of Manichaeans to Turkish lands.
3 The same mountain is also mentioned in the T'ang-shu, Chavannes, Documents, p. 10: "to the north of the Sui-shih town is the Sui-shih river. At 40 li to the north of the river is situated the Kie-tan mountain; there the qaghan of the Ten Tribes (i.e. of the Western T'u-chüe) has the habit of making appointments of the chiefs." Hirth, Nachworte, 73, seems to give a better sense: "Hier ist der Ort, wo der Kakhun der zehn Stämme zum Führer erhoben zu werden pflegt."
4 I admit that grammatically the form توس-un from توس is not easy to explain. However see Kāshghari, i, 92, تله "full" and i, 336, 터문 어 "full moon". [Cf. also p. 195, l. 30.]
5 Taking the text as it stands.
7.-9. seem to have been read off a map in a north-to-south direction starting on the right bank of the Chu in the neighbourhood of 3. *Navikat and following the Chu (upstream!) and then the southern bank of the Issik-kul. Such a purely mechanical system of enumeration cutting itineraries into disconnected sections is frequent in our author (v.i. 13.—15.).

7. Gardizi, 102, describes a route from Navikat to the "Chigil and Türkshi", i.e. running from the Chu basin north of the Issik-kul.¹ Gardizi says that following this road one must travel from Navikat towards Panjikat,² close to which lies the village زک. To the left (north?) of this village three other villages are situated: (a) *Süyâb (the text is not quite in order), (b) دلغرخ and (c) دلغرخ of which the first and the third lie at the foot of the mountain whereas the lord of the second lives in the steppe. After the third (c) village comes the pass (atagaba) over the mountain venerated by the Turks.

Gardizi's text is closely connected with Qudâma, 206. Both are in a very sad state but they mutually complete one another. Qudâma (much more complete than I.Kh., 29, v.s., p. 289) says that the road Navâkat–Barskhan goes (first) to B.njikat (2 farsakhs), close to which (at a distance of 1 farsakh) lies the village called زک. At 2 farsakhs from B.njikat lies Süyâb to which [cf. the variant sözâb] belong two villages ساورکال fø and ساورکال fø and from the latter the road continues to Barskhan. It is obvious that Süyâb with its two villages corresponds to Gardizi's three villages lying "to the left" of Panjikat. These preliminaries facilitate the explanation of our text, which starts in the north with the village called in Qudâma ساورکال and corresponding to Gardizi's حورکال (of the Mujmal al-tavârikh, Barthold, Turkestan, i, 20). One of the remaining three villages mentioned together with Kukyä (? ) ought to be Süyâb but our author quotes the latter as belonging to the Tukhs (§ 17, 2.). Therefore it is not impossible that both sözâb and sözâb may be two different readings of the same difficult name which Gardizi transcribes دلغرخ. (The Mujmal, l.c., mentions a village تیرک but the title of its prince suggests its identity with § 17, 3.). See Map vi.

8. In Gardizi's text, 102 (lines 16 and 17), the word لَوَرْكَ is found twice; the second of these لَوَرْكَ is superfluous and may belong to زک (ibid., line 15) though لَوَرْكَ seems to be an old form for it stands in Qudâma's received text, v.s. 7.

9. As Navikat had already been mentioned by our author in his west-to-

¹ This route is quoted separately from that starting from Tûmkat and running south of the lake, Gardizi, 89.
² Entirely different from § 12, 2.
³ Gardizi enables us to check de Goeje's edition: ذهیب زک does not refer to the road to Báskhan but to the village near B.njikat. Read: ذهیب زک. Qudâma's passage is full of explanatory notes (formerly written on the margin and later incorporated by the scribes?).
⁴ It is very tempting to associate this Sâghûn—with the later Bald-Sâghûn. According to Kâshghari, i, 337, ساغم was the title of the Qarluq nobles. Cf. Barthold, Baldásâghûn in El, and his Vorlesungen, 81.
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east enumeration, Kirmān-kath quite naturally follows on 8. It undoubtedly corresponds to which Qudāma quotes immediately before (i.e. south or west of) Navikat and to through which Gardızi traces the road running from Tāmkat to the south of the Issik-kul. It is probable that the two roads leading from Talās to Barskhan separated at this point (see notes to § 16). The name of the tribe Lbān, as pointed out by Barthold, looks non-Turkish, but Mujal, i.e., gives the title of the “king of Lbān” Q.tāk-i Lbān, probably *Out-tegin which is good Turkish.1 [A possible restoration of the name لان would be *lan (cf. similar mis-spellings in § 10, 46. and § 17, 1.) albān, in Mongol “tribute, service”. Rashīd al-Dīn, ed. Bérénine, v, 259, mentions a tribe called Albāt (in Mongol albāt is a plural of albān). Another derivative of the same word is alpāghūt or alpādūt “the subjects, estate-owners”, which occurs in the Russian Annals as well; it is attested as early as the end of the eighth century in the Saka document edited by F. W. Thomas and S. Konow, line 27, where imjuva and adapahutti should be respectively read *injū (“the tribe belonging to the chief’s house-hold”?) and *alpaghut (“the men bound to pay a tribute or to take service”). Our *Albān would refer to a similar class of men.]

10. Of these two names the first is found in Gardīzi on his southern road. Our author drops out the two stages: Jīl [explained as “narrow” = Jīl-arīq at the entrance of the Buam2 defile] and Yār, which Gardīzi mentions between Kūmār-kat (?) and Tūng. Barthold, Report, 56, 114, has identified Tūng with the present-day Ton (<Tong) valley, on the southern bank of the Issik-kul. The name undoubtedly refers to one of the four sons of the legendary Turk: Tūng (*Tong), Chigil, Barskhan, and Îlāq as enumerated in the Mujmal at-tavārikh, Tabāqāt-i Nāsirī, tr. Raverty, 872, and Abul-Ghā zi, ed. Desmaisons, 9 (quoted in Barthold, Turkestan, i, 19).

11. This Upper (i.e. farther distant) Barskhan3 is to be distinguished from the Lower (i.e. nearer) Barskhan which, according to I.Kh., 28, lay at 3 farsakhs east of Tarāz (Maq., 275: only at 3 sīha, each equal to half a farsakh). The situation of the Upper Barskhan had been much discussed, though the road leading to it from Farghāna and described in I.Kh., 30 (Qudāma, 20)4 was rightly explained by Tomaschek.5 I.Kh., 29, and Qudāma, 262, describe the northern road leading to Barskhan from the Chu valley. Gardīzi and the M.-̧ Ā. complete these data and describe a third route along the southern bank of the Issik-kul, see Barthold, Report, 32, and our notes to § 15, 3., 7.–9., and § 16. On the fourth road from Barskhan to the South over the T’ien-shan, v.i. under 15. According to

1 See it used as a personal name in Gardīzi, ed. M. Nāzīm, p. 41 (?).
2 The official Russian “Buam” is said to be a mis-spelling for Ulam (?).
3 The reading of the name Barskhan (and not Nūshān) was already clear from the Mujmal (v.s. 10.) which after Tūng (*Tong) names another son of Turk: Barskhan. The name is confirmed by Kāshghari, iii, 306: Baraghān (sic).
4 Qubā-Ẓosh-Uzgand, then 1 day to the qaaba (Yasi pass leading into the Narin valley); thence 1 day to Atbash (At-bash, in the Narin basin); thence 6 days to Barskhan.
5 V.s., p. 286, l. 25.
Quādāma, 262, the Upper Barskhān (or rather its district) consisted of 4 large towns and 5 small ones. The fighters of Barskhān, 20,000 strong, lived in the town situated on the bank of a lake surrounded by mountains. Our source leaves no doubt that the lake in question is the Issik-kul. Tomaschek placed Barskhān in the Barskau valley drained by a river which flows south-west into the Nārin. However, both Quādāma and the Ḥ.ʿĀ. are positive in placing the town in the basin of the Issik-kul, i.e. north of the Barskau watershed, most probably near the present-day Przhevalsk (Qara-qol). As the Barskau valley begins close to the southern bank of the lake it may have received its name from Barskhān simply because it led up to this town. This would find a parallel in our § 25, 58., where one of the two rivers of Üzgand is called Barskhān and is said to come from the Khallukh country. This eastern river of Üzgand can be only the one coming down from the Yasi pass (I.Kh., 30, al-ʿaqaba) which forms the watershed between Üzgand and the Nārin valley. On the other Üzgand river (*Yabūghā), v.s., p. 288. This short stream is very remote from the presumed position of Barskhān and it could have received its name only because the road to Barskhān from Farghāna followed it up to the pass (I.Kh., 30). Our author only says that the dihqān of Barskhān was a Khallukh. Gardīzī, 90, gives him the title of Manāf (*M.n.gh) which Barthold compares with the name of the Turkish [Soghdian!] ambassador Mawdāx found in Menander, see Frgm. hist. græc., iv, 225, but this seems doubtful. One would rather think of the title Manaf (مئف) common among the Qirghiz. The Mujmal calls the king of Barskhān ṭabīn. [See Appendix B.]

12. *Jāmghar, as the name and description shows, must be the westernmost (?) of the "Five Villages" lying north of the "Tafqān" mountain (§ 12, 2.). Following the order of enumeration in the present paragraph Jāmghar lay east of Bārkshān at the extreme limit of the Khallukh territory. Tentatively one would place it in the region of Manas. Jāmghar, isolated from the later possessions of the Khallukh, may have been their outpost at the time when they lived south of the Altai (v.s., p. 286).

13.-15. After Jāmghar, lying east or south of Barskhān on the Toghuṣghuz frontier, our author seems to return to Barskhān from the south-east by the road starting from the Toghuṣghuz country. Following his habit he splits that road into political sections and quotes K..msīghīya, S.tkah, and Ark under the Toghuṣghuz (§ 12, 3.-5.), and Kuchā under China (§ 9, 10.). Skipping all these stages he now starts with B.nchūl (which Gardīzī, see note to § 12, 3., mentions between Kuchā and Barskhān) and then mentions Aq.rāq.r and Üj (of which Kāshgharī, i, 329, says that the Badal-art, i.e. Bedel pass, separated it from Barsghān). That 13. B.nchūl was more remote from the main territory of the Khallukh is shown by the fact that it had first belonged to the Toghuṣghuz and that at the moment to which our source refers it was occupied by some Khirkhīz. On the other

---

1 See Idrīsī, i, 495: "ville . . . forte, entourée de bonnes murailles et c'est là que la majeure partie des Turks qui habitent la contrée viennent se réfugier et se procurer les objets dont ils peuvent avoir besoin."
hand, the author insists on 14. A.qraq.r and 15. Új being still in Khallukh possession.¹ This evidence leads to the conclusion that the author has in view the following sequence of stages: Kuchā—B.nchul—A.qraq.r—Új—Badal-art—Barskhan, and consequently B.nchul must have lain south of Új.

In his earlier Semirechye, p. 9, Barthold identified B.nchul with the town of Aq-su, evidently on the ground of some phonetic resemblance of the names: B.nchul and Chinese Wen-su. Here is the abstract of the original Chinese itineraries (from the T'ang-shu, &c.) quoted in Chavannes, Documents, pp. 8—10: 60 li west of Kucha the river Pai-ma-ho was crossed; 180 li farther the stone desert of Kū-p’i-lo was entered and after another 120 li the town of Kū-p’i-lo reached. Thence 60 li to A-si-yen; thence 60 li to Po-huan (also called Wei-jung, or Ku-mo district). Thence in the north-western direction the middle course of the Po-huan river was crossed; thence 20 li to Siao-shih, thence 20 li to the river Hu-lu of *Yu-chou; thence 60 li to “Ta-shih also called Yu-chou, or also district of Wen-su”; thence 30 li north-west to Su-lou-feng; thence 40 li to the Po-ta-ling, i.e. Bedel pass.

So far as the distances go Chavannes’s first identification of Yu-chou (Ta-shih, “Wen-su district”) with Aq-su could not be maintained and under the influence of F. Grenard he finally took Po-huan for Aq-su,² the Hu-lu for the Taushqan river, and Yu-chou [so instead of the impossible Yu-t’ien = Khotan!] for Uch, see Les Pays de l’occident d’après le Wei-liao, in T’oung Pao, 1905, p. 553. More in detail the question was studied by Pelliot in his Notes sur les anciens noms de Kučā, d’Aq-su et d’Uč-Turfan, in T’oung-Pao, 1923, p. 126. Pelliot identifies Aq-su with Ku-mo of the Han epoch, Pa-lu-kia of Hsian-Tsang, Po-huan of the T’ang epoch and Idrisī’s Pahlak. On the other hand, he identifies Uch with Hi-chou-kia < Hechuka (sixth century), Wen-su (Han period), and Yu-chou (T’ang period), and seems to connect the names Wen-su (<Ürsük, Urchük) with Yu-chou (<Učhik, Hechuka).

These then were the reasons for Barthold’s hypothesis on the identity of Új and B.nchul which, however, goes counter to our text. In his recent note in T’oung-Pao, 1931, p. 133, Pelliot takes exception even to the eventual connexion of the names B.nchul and Wen-su for the latter in older times sounded *Un-siuk with final ḫ̣. This consideration makes, however, no insuperable difficulty for الف in the H.-‘Ā. and Gardizi may stand for *فَتَرَ B.nchuk (a very usual confusion in Arabic script).

In any case the Chinese itinerary still presents some difficult points and it is enough to say that the distance from Yu-chou to the Po-ta-ling pass (70 li = 40.3 Km.) is too short for the distance from Uch to the Bedel pass.³

¹ Yaqūt, i, 397, also confirms that Új belonged to the Khallukh.
² Cf. also Pelliot, La Ville de Bakhoutan dans la Géographie d’Idrīṣī, in T’oung-Pao, 1906, pp. 553–6, but the origin of the form Bāḵhwaṅ is still somewhat mysterious, v. i., pp. 295, 297.
³ From Uch-Turfan to Aghacha-qul where the ascent only begins there are 78 verst (= 83 km.), see Kuropatkin, Kashghariya, 1879, p. 306. [On a similar uncertainty of distances in the Chinese itinerary from Aq-su to Kāshghar see Sir A. Stein, Innermost Asia, p. 839.]
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Then, so far as the text of the T'ang-shu is available in Chavannes's translation, o.e., 9, it seems to suggest that Ta-shih or Yü-chou at that time was the centre of the Wen-su district, but the situation might have been different both at the earlier periods and at the time to which our author refers.¹

Our 15. Új (lying in the mountains) remains the firm point and certainly corresponds to Uch-Turfan. It is followed by 14. Dela which, if read *aقار-هاگ, could mean in Turkish something like "watershed" (usually: *ه‌ر-هاگ) and refer to a divide between the Khallukh and their neighbours. More probably the name is distorted. Following on Üzgand, Balasaghun, Qochqar-bashi, Barskhan, At-bashi, Ordū (= Kāshgar), and Yārkan, Biruni, Canon, quotes at the very end of the 6th climate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>long.</th>
<th>lat.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Új</td>
<td>99°20'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>اسه</td>
<td>100°40'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بایران</td>
<td>101°40'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>کئانه</td>
<td>102°20'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of these the second (and the southernmost) is said to be the qašaba of Khotan and the fourth must refer to Kuchā. In any case *Bārmān must be placed to the south-east of Új. Kāshgarī, iii, 272, says: "يک (Yīngū?) is the name of a large river flowing past the township (bulaidā) of Bārmān built by Afrāsiyāb's son² on its bank." In view of these two authorities it is not impossible that in Idrisi's usually inaccurate text پاکونی stands simply for بایران. Jaubert’s translation, i, 491, runs as follows: "Bakhwan . . . est une ville dépendante du *Toghuzghuz et gouvernée par un prince appartenant à la famille du khaqān de cette contrée. Ce prince a des troupes, des places fortes et une administration; la ville est ceinte de fortes murailles; il y a des bazars où l'on fait toutes sortes d’ouvrages en fer avec une rare perfection; on y fabrique aussi diverses espèces de . . . [three words left out by Jaubert].³ Bakhwan est bâti sur les bords d’une rivière qui coule vers l’orient . . . De Bakhwan à j.f.m.q⁴ on compte 4 journées . . . De

¹ To quote a parallel: Zeitsch. d. Gesellsch. f. Erdkunde, xx, 1885, p. 75, recording the contemporary changes in Chinese administrative terminology states that the tao-t’ai of Aq-su had under his authority four districts: Wen-su chou, i.e. the territory of Aq-su ("engeres Stadtgebiet von A."), Kucha, Kharashar, and Wu-shih-ch‘eng, i.e. former Uch-Turfan.

² The person in question is certainly Bārmān, brother of Pirān, son of Visa (Tabari: Vēsaghnā). The two brothers were only commanders in Afrāsiyāb’s army. Pirān was the prince of Khotan. See Shāh-nāma, ed. Mohl, i, 338, ii, 58, iii, 564, 573, 584, Tabari, i, 600 and 610, and Tha‘ālibī, Ghurar akhābār mutāk al-Furs, ed. Zotenberg, p. 206.

³ MS. arabe 2222 of the Bib. Nat. in Paris, fol. 120v. reads at this place: يصنع به من الحديد (الحرق) كل غريبة من جميع المناخ من أتباع الود (بشو) الحار (الجارة)؟ وغير ذلك. Consequently the specialities of Bakhwain were objects in iron and wood. The former were exported as far as Tibet and China. Idrisi adds that round the town lay the fields and pastures of the Turks, and in its mountains musk deer were found.

⁴ Cf. § 13, 3. The distances in Idrisi are usually too short.
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From à Barskhan la supérieure 10 journées.” I presume that our B.njul and جار, as well as Bärman and Bakhwān must somehow refer to the same locality which can be identified with the neighbourhood of Aq-su.¹ But which Aq-su? The “New Town” (Yangi-shar) of Aq-su lies at some 6 Km. from the left (northern) bank of the important river after which it is called and which must be Kāshgharī’s Yüngü. Another Aq-su lies also near the left bank of the river upstream from Yāngi-shar. Finally to the north-east of these two towns, on the Qizil-üstāng (left tributary of the Aq-su now not reaching the latter), there is a Kone-shahr “Old Town”, see Sir A. Stein’s map in Ruins of Desert Cathay, 1912. On Map 23 which accompanies the same author’s later work Serindia, 1921, the Old Town is not indicated, but to the west of the Qizil-üstāng is found Pāman-üstāng of which the name strongly reminds one of our Bärman [local Turks drop r before a consonant, e.g., apa<arpa, see G. Jarring, Studien zu einer O斯塔rkischen Lautlehre, Lund, 1933, p. 114]. Therefore our 13. and 14. may correspond to different avatars of Aq-su. Kone-shahr (as well as the Pāman-üstāng) lie nearer to the mountains and thus better satisfy the conditions of our 14., while for 13. we must maintain a situation to the south or to the east of 14. The reading of our *B.nchūl (B.nchūk?) and its origin cannot yet be finally settled, though, in view of the considerations presented above, the possibility of *B.nchūk=Wen-su(k) cannot be discarded. Gardīzī does not mention our 14. and it must have been borrowed by our author from another source which can be traced also in Birūnī (cf. § 10, 41., § 11, 9., &c.). Kāshgharī relied of course on his personal information.

With regard to this section of the road connecting Barskhān with Aq-su, Kuchā, and Chinānjkath, Gardīzī, 91, infra, one must also consider Gardīzī’s passage, 90 supra, on the T’ien-shan passes: “To the right (i.e. the south?) of Barskhān there are two passes, one called Bayghū (*Yabghū) and the other Azār (cf. note to § 12, 5.); and the river called T.f.shkān flows eastward to the limits of China. And this pass (Yabghū?) is very high so that the birds coming from the direction of China cannot fly over t.” Kāshgharī, iii. 23, also mentions a village and a pass of Yafghū in the neighbourhood of Barsghān. One of the two passes must stand for the Bedel pass and as Kāshgharī separately speaks of Bādāl-art and Yafghū-art one must conclude to the identity of Azār (palaeographically the former may be a mere mis-spelling of the latter). The Yabghū pass would then be either the Janart or Muzart pass, and more probably the Janart which lies in the Kok-shaal-tau (in Central T’ien-shan) to the east of the Bādāl-art near the source of the Aq-su river, while the Muzart lies much farther to the east and only indirectly (through the III basin) connects the Issik-kul with Chinese Turkestan. The name of the river can be best restored as *Taghushkhan²>Taushqan (in Turkish “hare”), in which case it is the important western affluent of the Aq-su along which the road leads up to the Bedel pass. Consequently the name of our

¹ See note 4 on page 295. ² Or Tawushkhan, see the Index.
The Khallukh

*Yabghū-pass refers to the original *yabghū of the Khallukh inside whose possessions it lay on the road from Barskhān to the Aq-su region.¹

[Additional note. Our *Taksin* most probably stands for *Taksin-i Barskhan* attested in two independent authorities (Biruni and Kāshgharī) and confirmed by the present-day name of Pāman-īstāng. The explanation of the name from the Shāh-nāma is fantastic but it confirms its pronunciation by the Muslims and may merit more attention than the Chinese Po-huan. The question is how the form *Pāman* got into Idrisi’s compilation. Does it attempt to reproduce the Chinese form, perhaps on the authority of the mysterious Jānākh b. Ḫāqān al-Kīmākī whom Idrisi quotes among his sources (cf. Jaubert, i, p. xii)? In the latter case, why did the son of a Turkish chief use a Chinese (?) form distinct from that current among the Muslims of the eleventh century? After all *Taksin* may be a mere mis-spelling of *Pāman* (the group -'r- having been wrongly transcribed as -'r- if the original ı was written too closely under ı). [See also Appendix B.]

As regards the exact relation between Wen-su (= our *B.nēūk*) and Yū-chou (= our Ü) the question is perhaps not so much of their phonetic identity as of their belonging to the same historical site.]

§ 16. The Chigil

Barthold, Semirechye, 90; Türk in EI; Vorlesungen, 75.

The real form of the name *Chigil* appears from the Persian popular etymology (*in chi gil?*) quoted from Kāshgharī, i, 330. The name often occurs in Persian poetry, see Mathnawī, ed. Nicholson, ii, 3149, iii, 4131; Ḥāfiz, ed. Brockhaus, i, 318, says: *ba-mushk-i Chīn-u-Chigil nist bū-yi gul muhtāj.*

Our author’s data on the Chigil are scarce and contradictory. In § 16 the Tukhs (whose centres lay on the northern bank of the Chu) are placed east (?) and south of the Chigil, but in § 17 west (sic) and south of them; under § 3, 18., the author says that the Issik-kul separated the Chigil from the Toghuqghuz.² The fact that some Khirkhīz are mentioned west of the Tukhs and north of the Chigil is evidently to be explained by the wrong conception of the Tūl.s mountains (§ 5, 8.).

Gardizi has two passages on the Chigil. P. 89: “The road³ to (Upper) Barskhān from Tūmkat goes to Kūmb.ṛkat (which lies) on the Chigili road; thence to Jil which is a mountain and the explanation (tāfsir) of *jil* is “narrow” [Buan defile through which the Chu flows]; thence 12 farsakh to Yār which is a village turning out 3,000 men and in it are found the tents of the Taksīn’s Chigil⁴ among whom there are no villages (*ābdānī*). To

---

¹ I have finally given up my first idea that T.f.shkān reflected the name of the Tekes river (left affluent of the ili flowing to the east of the Issik-kul.)
² Cf. Kāshgharī, v. i. and § 17. Under § 6, 5. our author confuses the Issik-kul with the Balkhash.
³ For the beginning of the passage v.s. note to § 15, 3.
⁴ MS. *Chikel Mangīs*, restored by Barthold as *Chikel Mangīs* which means “the Chigil of the taksīn” rather than “the taksīn of the Chigil” (cf. *taksīn-i Ḟigil*, as the Muhammad al-tavārikh calls the king
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the left of the road lies the lake of Isigh-kul &c.” This text ought to be immediately followed by the description of the “road to the Chigil and Türgish” which through some misunderstanding is given only on p. 102. The description starts at Navīkat (v.s., note to § 15, 3.) which was the next stage to the east of Kūmb.rkat,¹ the latter evidently being the point from which the two roads separated: the one “to Barskhan” passing south of the lake and the other “to the Chigil and Türgish” north of the lake.

On the situation on the right bank of the Chu (west of the Kastek and Kurday passes) some light is thrown by the following list of rulers which will be examined in more detail under § 17, 2.:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gardizī</th>
<th>Mujmal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Navīkat</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.njikat</td>
<td>Kūlb.qār</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z.kāt</td>
<td>separate dihqān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sūyāb</td>
<td>Baygha’s brother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khūṭkīyāl</td>
<td>B.ghlīla (a Türgish)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The situation behind the mountain, i.e. east of the Kastek pass, is described by Gardizī as follows: “When you have crossed the pass, to the left of it (i.e. the road?) lies the country of Turkestān (*of the Türgish) consisting of the Tukhs and *Az. There lies a village turning out 1,000 men. Close by lies a village Bigliż where the *jabīya’s brother lives. . . . Five hundred men mount with him, and if necessary 1,000 men. In the neighbourhood a village whose dihqān of local origin (اَنْتَ مَسَاءً) is called B.dān-Sāṅkā (or Dān-Sāṅkā); (the village) turns out 7,000 men. And near this pass (Kastek or Kurday?) there is a river (āb) beyond which appear the Chigil (and their) tents and felt huts.” [Cf. Appendix B.]

A close study of these two texts shows that both slopes of the watershed evidently belonged to the subdivisions of the Türgish (§ 17) and only beyond a river² lay the region of the nomadic Chigil whose other group is mentioned south of the Issik-kul round Yār; the latter region, according to our author, would rather belong to the Khalbukh zone of influence, but we must not forget that the nomad tribes of the same Turkish origin could live in great promiscuity mindless of the chasses-croises movements which such state involved.

Kāshghari, i, 330, 354, mentions the Chigil in three places: the nomad Chigil (as well as the Tukhsī) lived near the township of Quyās (*Quyash) lying beyond Barsghān and watered by the two Keykān rivers flowing into the Ili, ibid., iii, 132, v.i., p. 301, note 4. Quyash (“Sun” in Turkish) is supposed to have lain on the left bank of the Ili; in Mongol times it was the

¹ Qudāma, 206, quotes كرمروآ (*Kūmb.rkat) immediately before (i.e. to the west of) Navākat (*Navēkat).

² This river flowing to the east of the pass and consequently belonging to the Chu basin can be either the Uzun-aghach, or the more easterly Almata on which Verniy stands.
camping place of Chaghatay, see Juvaynī, GMS, i, 226–7, Barthold, Otchet, 66. Another group of the tribe lived in the township of Chigil, near Tarız (Talas), cf. Maq., 274, and a third one in the villages of the same name near Kāshghar.

Map vi

Under the Qara-khanids the Chigil tribe formed the main body of their troops, Barthold, Turkestan, 317. Therefore probably Kāshghari, i, 330, says that the Ghuz used to call “Chigil” all the Turks between the Oxus and Upper China.

1. The town Sikūl (*Isik-kul) stood probably on the northern bank of the lake, where the Carta Catalana (A.D. 1375), too, places a town Yssicol, and where an Armenian monastery seems to have existed, see Barthold, Issik-kul, in EI. It must be borne in mind that in the north the lake is separated from the Ili basin by a double range of mountains, Kūngey and

1 Kāshghari records a legend claiming that originally the name Chigil belonged to this town.
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Ala-tau, between which flows the Great Kebin, a right tributary of the Chu. This valley situated between the town and the chief seats of the tribe was also presumably in Chigil occupation. The line of communication of the town with the clans living to the south-west of the Issik-kul must have followed the western bank of the lake.¹

§ 17. The Tukhs

Barthold, *Semireckye*, 16–18; *Otchet*, 31; *Die alttürkischen Inschriften*, 18; Türk, in *EI*.

Gardizī and Kāshgharī spell the name Tukhsī and it is possible that our Tukhs has been formed on the analogy of such plurals and singulars as Khirkhiziyān < Khirkhiz, Khallukhiyān < Khallukh, ergo Tukhsiyān < Tukhs! It is not clear whether the original name is of Turkish origin. In an early Soghdian letter (second century A.D.) presumably the same name appears in the form of Txs’ye < Tukhsich in which the ending -ich, or -ch must represent the Iranian suffix of origin. The text, Reichelt, *Die soghdischen Handschriften*, Heidelberg, 1931, ii, 53 and 59, refers to Txs’ye būtak, i.e. to a slave whose personal name was T.khsich or to a T.khsīch slave.

According to our author to the north and east of the Tukhs lived the Chigil, to their south the Khallukh, and to their west a group of the Khirkhiz (on which see § 5, 8, and § 14). All these bearings must be taken with the usual reserve, v.s., pp. 270, 289. Further details show that in our author’s opinion the Tukhs lived chiefly on the northern bank of the Chu (intermingled with the Khallukh) and on the eastern slope of the mountain separating the basins of the rivers Chu and Ili.

The point of interest of the Tukhs is that they evidently were the remnants of the great Türgish federation. The Türgish (in Chinese Tu-ki’-shih)² were one of the five clans composing the Tu-lu group of the Western T’u-chüeh. One part of the Türgish lived in the Ili valley and the other to the west of the Ili, Chavannes, *Documents*, p. 271. Towards the end of the seventh century the Türgish Wu-chih-lē spread his power to the west and is said to have possessed two residences, one north of the Ili and the other on the Chu; *ibid.*, 43, 77, 282. A much more important man was the Qara-Türgish Su-lu who may be regarded as the restorer of the Western Turkish power. In A.D. 716 he proclaimed himself khaqān of the Türgish, *ibid.*, 44, 81–6. The Arabs nicknamed this doughty opponent of theirs Abū Muzāḥim, Ṭabarî, ii, 1593, Barthold, *Turkestan*, p. 187, Gibb, *Arab conquests*, pp. 60–65.

¹ On the other hand, apart from the great Issik-kul lake, there are two small lakes and a locality of the same name in the hills to the south-east of Almaša (Verniy), see Prince Masalsky, *Turkestan*, p. 777. These lakes (called by the Qirghiz jasli “green”) lie at the altitude of resp. 5,450 and 5,866 feet and can serve only as a summer camping ground.
In 738 Su-lu was assassinated by the lord of the Yellow Türkish called Kil-chur (Ṭabarî, ii, *passim*: Kûr-sûl). After a period of troubles¹ the Qarluq (towards 766) extended their power to the Chu valley and subjected both the Black and Yellow Türkish, Chavannes, *o.c.*, 46, 85.

The advent of the Qarluq meant not only the passage to them of the political leadership but undoubtedly also the occupation by them of the better pasture lands. However, the tribes of the Türkish federation could not be destroyed; some of them migrated westwards (§ 19), but some maintained their more remote haunts and probably even enjoyed some autonomy.² I.Kh., 31, still knows the Türkish tribe and, p. 29 (= Qudâma, 206), places the town of the [former ?] Türkish khâqân³ at 4 farsaks to the west of Nâvâkât. In the tradition going up to Balkhi (*i.e.* in İşt. and I.H.) the Türkish are no more mentioned (perhaps in view of the fact that they were comprised under the Kharlukh and Ghuzz), but the authors depending most likely on Jayhâni (*i.e.* in the Ḥ.-‘Ā. and Gardizi) include some additional details on the destinies of the Türkish. As suggested by Barthold and Marquart, in several passages in Gardizi (81, 84, 102, 85) one must read Tûrgishân instead of Türkistan. The paragraph on the Khallukh (see notes to § 15) contains the story of how the Khallukh came to live on the territory of the Türkish khâqân and how the power finally passed to them. In the paragraph on the Yaghmâ (see notes to § 13) Gardizi tells how the latter were exploited by the khâqân (of the Türkish) as an offset against the Khallukh, Haytal, and Kimâk. Finally, in the description of the route to the “Chigil and Türkish” (see notes to § 16) Gardizi mentions in the Chu valley two (?) dihqân of Türkish origin and says that to the east of the [Kastek or Kurdai] pass lies the country of “the Türkish (who consist) of Tukhsî and یان ین).” A parallel of the second of these names is found only in the Ḥ.-‘Ā. (*v.i.* 1) while the first (Tukhsî) is known to the Ḥ.-‘Ā. (the whole § 17 is devoted to them), to the Mujmal al-tawârîkh (the king of it حسین *Tukhsî (?) is called Qûtêgin, *cf*. supra, p. 292), to ‘Auffî (who includes them together with Chigil, *etc.* in the Khallukh federation, *v.s.*, § 15), as well as to Kâshghari. It is curious that the Ḥ.-‘Ā. and Gardizi who know very little about the Ili (§ 6, 5.) speak of the Türkish and Tukhsî only in the neighbourhood of the Chu, whereas Kâshghari, whose ideas of the Chu (iii, 305, 307: Shû) are vague, mentions, i, 85 and 342, the Tukhsî tribe (تیبَلَة) on the Ili, where according to him it lived together with the Yaghmâ tribe and a clan (تیفا) of the Chigil.⁴

¹ On the fate of Kûr-sûl the Arabs and Chinese give different reports, see H.A.R. Gibb, *o.c.*, 91. [*Cf*. supra, p. 288.]
² According to the تَمْرُش, Chavannes, *o.c.*, 85–6, apart from the tribes subjected by the Qarluq some tribes joined the Uyghurs; a certain تُهْبَانْ-تُمْرُش became یابغُو of Qarashar (§ 12, 10.) and the rest of the tribes (200,000 men strong) retained their independence in the Kin-so mountains (according to Chavannes, north of Urumchi?).
³ مدينة خاناک التركان (*var.*). Ṭabarî, ii, 1613, strangely transcribes the name with َوَيْلْنْيُ. Perhaps this place is identical with Su-i-shîh = Toqmaq (?)
⁴ See also *ibid.*, i, 28 (in a north-to-south enumeration: Chigil, Tukhsî, Yaghmâ); iii, 129: Quyâs (*Quyash ?)* is
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1. East of the watershed range Gardizi mentions "the Türgish (consisting) of Tukhsiyán and Arában". Our author evidently takes the Tukhs for the successors of the Türgish and the latters' name no more occurs in the H.-Á. Of the former and of which who are mentioned as the clans of the Tukhs the first most likely represents the same name as Arában (as well as its companion) reflects an Arabic form (al-Ázíyán) while Ázíyán gives the name in Persian garb (cf. Tukhsiyán, Halluchhíyán, &c.). A name beginning with an l is unlikely in Turkish; therefore al-Ázíyán must be further improved into al-Áziyán.1 Already in his earlier Semireche, 15, and Die alttürkischen Inschriften, 18, Barthold compared this name with the one found in the Orkhon inscriptions where the combination az budun occurs in two different meanings: "a small people" (1, E29) and "the people of Az", as is particularly clear in the following passage (1, N2): az budun yaghí qaldi; qara-költä sünişdimis . . . Kül-tegin . . . az-el티bârîg tuîdi; az budun anda yoq qaldi. "the Az people proved to be in revolt; we fought at the Qara-kül lake . . . Kül-tegin captured the ullahân of the Az; on this occasion the Az people was broken (annihilated)". This interpretation has been accepted by Radloff, Melioransky, and finally by Thomsen, ZDMG, 1924, p. 154. It makes clearer the other passage which comes earlier in the inscription (1, E19) and refers to the revolt of the Türgish qaghan and its repression; immediately after it stands an unfinished sentence in which Bilgá qaghan says: "in order that our ancestors' land should not remain lordless [I] organized the Az people (az budunigh itîp yarâtîp)".2 This quotation is particularly interesting as it establishes as it were some link between the Türgish and their Az successors.3 [budunigh—definite accus.]

On the other hand, according to the Chinese sources, Chavannes, Documents, 67, 271, 307, there were two divisions of the Türgish: So-ko Mo-ho and A-li-shih. One knows also the fatal struggles between the Yellow and Black clans of the Türgish, ibid., 83–6. As the Yellow clans were descendants of So-ko, their Black rivals (to whom the famous Su-lu belonged) might be identical with the group called A-li-shih, though of course the line of clan scission could be more complicated! Our az al-Ázíyán might perhaps have a connexion with A-li-shih in which case Gardizi's Áziyán would be due to the wrong treatment of initial al- (as in al-Lân< Alân) taken for the Arabic article. This supposition is, however, less probable

the country of the Tukhsá and Chigil; to it belong three castles: Süblîgh Q., Urung Q., and Qara Q.  

1 Cf. § 10, 46. احجز for the suffix.

2 Thomsen, ZDMG, 1924, 148, seems to hesitate here between "Áz people" and "small people" but the former is better as preparing 1, N2. Cf. also, ibid., 1, E20, where the organization of the Az [and?] Qirghiz peoples is mentioned. Barthold, Vorlesungen, 37, compares the Az who "oft [? V. M.] zusammen mit den Kirgizern erwähnt werden" with the "Yenisei Ostiks" who call themselves Kott or Assin, but this hypothesis going counter to the association of the Türgish and Az is not conclusive.

3 The meaning of the passage 1, E38 mentioning a dignitary called az tutüq in connexion with another war with the Türgish cannot be discussed here. See Barthold, Die historische Bedeutung, p. 34, Melioransky, o.c., 124.
in view of the fact that the representation of the Black clans could be better associated with the other name *Qara-jya* or *Qaraj* in the Orkhon inscriptions (i, E38) the Qara-Türkish are especially mentioned.

2. In Ṭabarī, ii, 1594, Suyāb is quoted as the starting-point of the expedition of the khāqān Abū Muzāḥim (*i.e.* the Türgish Su-lu), and connected with Navākat and the sacred mountain situated near the latter. According to Gardīzī (see note to § 15, 7.) Suyāb belonged to the group of three villages of which one (*Khūtkiyāl*) is distinctly said to have a Türgish lord (*va ʿū Tūrgišt-st*). With regard to the diḥqān of Suyāb Gardīzī’s text is out of order unless the passage is remembered, that this title is usually associated with the Khallukh (cf. § 15) and not with the Türgish (cf. also infra 3.). The number of warriors in Suyāb (20,000) greatly exceeds that given in Gardīzī (500), and possibly our author roughly sums up the forces of all the villages enumerated by Gardīzī on the way to the Chigil (25,300).

According to Gardīzī the Suyāb group of settlements lay to the left (*i.e.* north) of Navākat, evidently on the right bank of the Chu. This Muslim Suyāb cannot be identical with the Chinese *Sū-shih* which the *T'ang-shu*, *etc.* mentions on the road from the present-day Chinese Turkestan to Taraž (Talas). It lay to the south of the Chu river (whereas the sacred mountain Kie-tan lay beyond the river at a distance of 40 li); Chavannes, *Och, 31* and *Christen., 9* (not very clear). The archeology of the Chu valley is still in a rudimentary state and only systematic excavations will bring certainty in identifications.

3. According to Gardīzī this village lay to the east of the watershed range, perhaps on the river Kop which is the north-westernmost of the Ili headwaters and rises on the eastern side of the Kurdaï pass. The details can be tabulated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H. A.</th>
<th>Gardīzī</th>
<th>Mujmal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>name</td>
<td>Biglih</td>
<td>Athlīgh (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prince</td>
<td><em>Yinal-beg-tegin</em></td>
<td>brother of the <em>j.mūba</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forces</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>Yinal-tegin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>500 to 3,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Barthold, *Semirechye*, 18, identifies it with Qara-bulaq, but if by the latter is meant the stage lying near the Great Kebin on the road from Toqmaq to Jiharq this position does not suit Gardīzī’s indication (“to the left” of the road). I should suggest for Suyāb a position in the direction of the Kurdaï (*qurday “pelican”) pass over which the Russian wheel-road crosses the mountain and which lies north of the Kastek pass. [See on the Map the position of the Sughat station.] [As *yāb < ʿāb* means “water”, *Sū-yāb = “the Chu canal”]*
Gardizi omits to give the title of the prince and only indicates his family relations to some 45,as he also calls the lord of Suyab (v.s. 2.) bayghu's brother. Both these forms may reflect the same title yabghu and indicate that Suyab and Bigiligh were under the control of the same family. In our source both places are quoted under Tukhs (= Turgish) and we are placed before an alternative: either the Turgish-Tukhs rulers enjoyed a title similar to yabghu jabghu of the Khallukh, or Gardizi introduces some later data suggesting the gradual absorption of the Tukhs by the Khallukh.2

The alternative Soghdian name of Bigiligh indicates the presence there of a Soghdian colony, cf. Barthold, On the Soghdian and Tokharian languages (in Russian) in Iran, 1926, i. 35. Our Bigiligh looks entirely different from the five villages also inhabited by Soghdians and also ruled by a Bektegin, but mentioned (§ 12, 6.) under Toghuqghuz.

4. According to the order of enumeration this village ought to be the easternmost of the Tukhs possessions. Gardizi speaks of a village lying in the neighbourhood of Bigiligh whose dihqan B.dan Sangu was of "local" origin. This would suit our description according to which the village only lay "between" two Tukhs villages. However, the number of its warriors (7,000) is in sheer contradiction with our author's statement. The alternative is to take our Ûrkath for a repetition of Úzkath (§ 15, 8.).

§§ 18–22. The north-western Turks

After the description of the south-eastern Turks our author begins the series of the more northern tribes. He proceeds east to west and, more especially, §§ 20–22, refer to the Ural region. This system explains some important points in our text (see § 22).

§ 18. The Kimâk


The legend quoted by Gardizi, 82–3, shows that the Kimak were supposed to have separated from the Tatär. The eponyms of the original seven clans were: İmî, İmâk, Tatär, Bayândur, Khîchâq, *Nilqâz,3 and

---

1 The same form j.nâba (jabbâya) stands in Gardizi, 82a, as the title of the first Khallukh chief who succeeded to the last (Türgish) khaqân. Just before, 82a, the title given to the Khallukh ruler is spelt خر. On the different forms of yabgu see Marquart, Erânsahr, 247, Wehrât, 143, Provincial capitals, 10: the Middle Persian text gives Yabb(i)-

khakân. Cf. also Armenian yebu-khak'ân. [V.s. note to § 15.]

2 The latter assumption would contradict our emendation of the text *va ā Turgish-i-st.

3 So instead of L-nilqâz; the clan Nilqaz is still known among the Shâhsevân of Sâwa; see Minorsky, Sâwa in EI.
Ajlad (?). Our source seems to suggest that there were eleven divisions of the tribe. The name Kimak (to be pronounced Kimāk), according to Marquart, is an abbreviation of Iki-Imāk “the two Imāk” (probably with reference to the first two clans of the federation). Kāshghārī no longer knows the Kimāk, but only the Yamāk (*Yimāk), of whom he says, iii, 22, that “with us they are (considered as) Qifchāq, but the Qifchāq Turks consider themselves as a different group (ḥizb)”; this statement shows that the process of regrouping the remnants of the Kimāk federation had already been accomplished under the leadership of the new influential tribe, the Qipchaq (§ 21).

It is no easy task to locate the Kimāk territory. The confusion and fluctuation of our sources may reflect some historical displacement of the habitat of the tribe or the seasonal movements of its clans from the winter quarters (qishlaq) to the summer pastures (yaylaq), cf. Marquart, Komanen, 162 and 101. The chief geographical error of the source common to our author and Gardizi was that not knowing the lower course of the Irtish, it presumed its junction with the Volga in the region where the left affluents of the former and the left affluents of the latter almost dovetail into one another. Consequently the Ishim, too, flowing inside the supposed bend of the Irtish was thought to flow westwards and confused with some of the rivers disemboqing into the north-eastern corner of the Caspian. Finally, it is possible that Gardizi who is our chief authority for the route to the Kimāk has amalgamated several variants of the itinerary.

As regards the frontiers our source says that the eastern neighbours of the Kimāk are the Khirkhīz (confirmed under § 14), whereas 'Auft (cf. note to § 14), locates the Kimāk north of the Khirkhīz. In fact, with the Kimāk, our author, too, launches on the description of the northernmost belt of Türkish tribes: Kimāk, Ghūz, Pecheneg, Khīfchakh, and Majgharī, and we shall see the important conclusions to be drawn from this arrangement with regard to the location of the Majgharī (§ 22): That the “Artush” and the “Ātīl” are placed south of the Kimāk only means that the Kimāk lived beyond these rivers. [Moreover ḥ at this place may be a simple misunderstanding for اسم/اسم] The bearing of the Khīfchakh and the Northern lands, both located “to the west of the Kimāk”, must be taken as meaning north-west. All seems to indicate that the principal territory of the Kimāk lay in Western Siberia, north of the Irtish, say up to the Obi. Gardizi says that the land of the Kimāk is very cold and that in winter their horses are taken to the place ارناغ (Ük-tagh) in the country عرق (perhaps عراق, cf. note to § 12, 17.) On the other hand (§ 5, 19.), a mountain, apparently the Ural, is said to stretch “between the end of the Rūs frontier and the emptying into a lake. The Y.māk (Yimāk, a clan of our Kimāk) are shown on the left bank of the Art.sh, and the J.m.j and Qāy on the nameless river. *Yumār = Obi, cf. Barthold, Vorlesungen, 96.
beginning of the Kimāk frontier", which evidently means that the two peoples adjoined the opposite extremities of the range without being direct neighbours of one another. This may indicate that the Kimāk (or at least their Khīshchākh branch, §21) extended, at some time, to the southern part of the Ural. The raiding activities of the Kimāk covered a still larger area, for under §12, 10. J.mlīkah, in the Toghuzghuz country is mentioned as exposed to their attacks.

In §6, 42. the Artush is described as flowing between the Ghūz and the Kimāk, but in §18 the Ghūz are not mentioned among the immediate neighbours of the Kimāk, though the latter are said to visit in winter the country of the former. This last detail may explain Maq., 274, where, in the enumeration of the dependencies of Isfījāb (§25, 84.), Saurān (= §25, 90. Šabrān) is said to be a frontier post (thaghr) against the Ghuzz and the Kimāk, and Sh.ghl.jān a frontier post in the direction of the Kimāk. According to these indications, in the second half of the tenth century the region along the right bank of the Jaxartes also bordered on the Kimāk territory.

Passing now to the roads leading to the Kimāk we must register, in the first place, the indication of the earlier I.Kh., 28, and Qudāma, 209, who make Ťarāz (§25, 93.) the starting point of the route to the residence of the Kimāk king. The position of the first stage on the road (κράκτ or κρίκτ), and consequently the initial direction of the route, are still dark, but Qudāma, 205,10 and 26216, distinctly says that to the left, i.e. north of the road Ťarāz-Kūlān lies a sand desert which stretches up to the territory of the Kimāk. The fact that the traveller before setting out from *Kuvehkat had to lay in stores of food (I.Kh.) for a journey lasting 80 days also suggests a northward direction through the steppes. In any case the road to the Kimāk ran entirely separate from that linking up Ťarāz with the Semi-rechye, see notes to §§15-17 and §25, 93. The itinerary of Mis’ar b. Muḥalhil, Marquart, Streifzüge, 79, and that of Idrīsī, Marquart, Komanen, 111–12, are very confused and still of no practical help. The only detailed description of a route to the Kimāk is found in Gardizī, 83. It started from an entirely different point (some 850 Km. to the north-west of Ťarāz as the crow flies) and its successive stretches were as follows:

a. from Pārāb (spelt پیاه اب, cf. §25, 88.) to Dih-i Nau (§26, 29.);

b. a river and the sands called (اروون) (or اروون) are crossed;

c. the river (سقیر) is crossed beyond which begins a salt desert (cf. §7, 81.) leading up to the K.ndāv.r-tāghī (§5, 12.);

d. the wooded banks of the “same” river (S.qūq) are followed up to the source of the river which rises from the large mountain K.ndāv.r;

e. from this mountain the road, for 5 days, descends through woods to the river (اسم) (§6, 41.) of which the waters are black and which flows from the east to the Ṭabaristān (Caspian) sea;

f. from the Asūs to the following river (§6, 42.) where the Kimāk frontier begins. This river is large and its waters are black.

Marquart, Komanen, 205, takes for the Sarī-su, which flows from
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north to south and disappears in the sands to the north-east of the town of Perovsk; he identifies *Kundāvar with the Ulu-tau and the ارتش of the Ishim and finally traces the road to the Irtysh in the direction of Pavlodar. This is a very ingenious suggestion. The identification of K.nāv.r (perhaps *Kāndür for Kāndur) with the Ulu-tau (“Great Mountain”, cf. § 5, 12.) which is a prominent land-mark (2,070 feet) is very tempting. Moreover, the names of the two sources of the Sari-su coming from this mountain: Sari-Kāngir and Qara-Kāngir have some remote likeness to *Kāndür. However, we must bear in mind the fact that the starting-point of Gardizi’s route is Dih-i Nau = Yāngi-kānd = Qaryat al-ḥaditha which lay near the present-day Kazalinsk, some 280 Km. downstream from Perovsk! To follow the Sari-su there would have been no need to descend the Sir-darya to the neighbourhood of its estuary. If we accept Gardizi’s initial point we must rather trace the route northwards of Kazalinsk, taking the first river (b) for the Irgīhz, and the *Su̯qu (c) for the Turghay; having crossed the latter the road would follow its western (right) bank to its source; the K.nāv.r would be the watershed between the Turghay and the western elbow of the Ishim, where the two rivers come very near to one another; beyond the Ishim the road, probably still following the course of this river, would reach the Irtysh. This alternative suggestion has a considerable disadvantage in the fact that the watershed between the Turghay and Ishim is formed by insignificant heights (northern continuation of the Ulu-tau) and I do not know how to conciliate Gardizi’s data unless by supposing that in his description he somehow merged the data belonging to two different roads to the Kimāk. In the present state of our knowledge we should not easily sacrifice the identification of the K.nāv.r with the Ulu-tau.

Until now we have proceeded on the supposition that ارتش stands for the Irtysh, contrary to the description of the course of the Asūs in Gardizi, and of the كندwis and ارتش in our author, where these rivers are represented as considerably increased.]

1 V.s., note to § 5, 12. Near Qarqarali (§ 18, 2) stands the peak of Kend (4,644 feet), but it is difficult to fit in Qarqarali into our route. [For K.nāv.r v.i., p. 324, and the Russian and Georgian family name Kazalinsk-ov]

2 [As in Abul-Ghāzi’s text (v.i. 3) ][الراغب،] designates the Irgīhz-Turghay region, Shūqu evidently refers to the Turghay river which is not otherwise mentioned in this detailed enumeration. It is very tempting to compare the name Shūqu “cold” with Gardizi’s which already Marquart interpreted as a Turkish word for “cold”. In this case the probability of my explanation of Gardizi’s itinerary (as running along the Irgīhz and Turghay rivers) is con-
flowing westwards. In this latter case the two rivers would eventually be the Ilâk and the Yayîq (see notes to § 6, 41. and 42.) and the route should be imagined as running north-westwards.¹

1. 2. “Andar az Khîfjâq” formed evidently the north-western march of the Kimâk territory, while Qarqar Khân (? ) was the southern march of it. If the words about the Irtish flowing “between” the Kimâk and the Ghûz are not to be interpreted too strictly, one may think of Qarqarî, lying in a mountainous region south of the Irtish, and circa 350 km. to the SW. of Semipalatinsk. In the translation (v.s. p. 100) I tentatively interpreted the term as “Cis-Khîfchaqia”, but if az replaces here an idâfat the term may mean “The inner (part) of Khîfchaq”. [Cf. H-‘A, fol. 3a 18].

3. The location of Y.ghsûn-yâsû depends upon the identification of the two rivers. The real Irtish and Volga lie too wide apart. Moreover in § 18, 3, al, through a graphic mistake, may stand for the river mentioned in § 6, 41.

[Additional note. The complex يِنْصُرُ یَاسَو to some extent resembles the names of the two northernmost peoples known to the Muslims respectively as “Yimak” (or Ṭehrû) and “Ism” (or Ṭah), see references in Marquart, Arktische Länder. In Biruni’s Canon the two peoples are mentioned at the very end of the table of co-ordinates, after the 7th climate. بَلْ الْسَّرْ (read: بَلْ اَسَرَ) has the caption: “the Bulghar trade with them”, and the other people is described as follows: َغْيَدْ عِينَ مَا وَهَوَاهُمْ يُتَجَرِّ مِنْ مَعْدَنَاتِ اَلْرِيْلَةِ “the forests of the Yûra, who are wild and trade by bartering the objects placed on sight”.

The Wisû are usually identified with the Finnish Ves’ (see note to § 44), and the Yûghra with the Ugrian Ostiaks and Voguls (v. i., § 22).

In the year a.d. 1216 Khwârazm-shâh Muhammad led an expedition against Qâdir-khan, leader of the Qanqil.² Guzgâni, as available in Raverty’s translation, p. 267, says that he “penetrated as far as Yîghur of Turkistan, so far to the north that he came under the North Pole and reached a tract where the light of twilight did not disappear at all from the sight”, &c. The passage is evidently inspired by the stories about the northernmost lands which since Ibn Faḍlân’s report (Yâqût, i, 755–6) were current among the Muslims.

Whether the Khwârazm-shâh really went so far north is another question. Of the authors speaking of the same campaign Nasawî, ed. Houdas, p. 9, mentions on this occasion مَا اِلْغَرْ “river Ḳâhîz”, and Juwaynî, i, 101, speaks of the Qara-qum occupied by the Qanqil (فَقَامَ كَمَوْعِضَ which I read: كَيْ بَيْسَرَ-ِيْ Qângîyân-î Tatâr bûd. The Qanqil were closely associated with the Qipchaq, cf. Barthold, Vorlesungen, i 14 and 116. The latter formerly belonged to

¹ On the source of the possible confusion of the routes, v.s. p. 305, line 11.
² Br. Mus. Add. 25. 785 (fol. 145a) قَرْنِّ يَبِينَ مَا بَيْسَرْ شَقَفَانَ تَائِلَ which I read: كِيْ بَيْسَرَ-ِيْ Qângîyân-î Tatâr bûd. The Qanqil were closely associated with the Qipchaq, cf. Barthold, Vorlesungen, i 14 and 116. The latter formerly belonged to
Commentary

§ 18

As Nasawi's Irgiz cannot be one of the more northern Irgiz rivers flowing to the Volga downstream from Samara; in Abul-Ghazii, ed. Desmaisons, p. 10, Shiban's ulus, of which the western limits were the Yayiq and the Sir-daryâ, comprised both the Irgiz-Savuq and the Qara-qum which must respectively correspond to the names quoted by Nasawi and Juvayni and refer to the same locality.¹

One thing is certain, namely that some connexion existed towards the end of the twelfth century between the Qifchaq (of whom the Qanqli were probably a clan) and some tribe called Yighur or Yughur. In a document of 578/1182 emanating from the Khwârazm-shâh's chancery, Barthold, Turkestan, 370, (and texts i, 79) the Khwârazm-shâh records the submission of Alp-Qara Ariran with all the Qifchaq tribe, adding that he sent to the king's camp his eldest son with a large number of aggregated Yughur.²

Very probably another reference to the name is found in Mas'ûdi, Muruj, i, 213, where describing the Black and White Irtish flowing to the Caspian (v.s., § 6, 42.), he remarks that on them lay the kingdom of كمك يوغور. Instead of Marquart's restoration *Kimâk-yaghbhuy (going counter to Gardizi, 83, who calls the chief of the Kimak shad-tutuo) I should restore this name as *Kimâk-Yighur (ييغور) and compare it with Guzgani's ييغور ² and the just quoted.

According to Mas'ûdi's text this was the name of a Kimâk territory, or of a Kimâk division. The expression Yûghur-zâda ( = *bântu Yûghûr) is in favour of the latter supposition. Some confusion on the part of our author is of course possible but it is certain that this Kimâk tribe had nothing to do with the northern Yûghra.

The fact that our ييغور is described as lying between the Atil (*Asus?) and Irtish (Artush) is reminiscent of the natural conditions described in the Muruj, i, 213, and at least our § 6, 42. is identical with one of Mas'ûdi's rivers. The first element ييغور can very easily be improved into ييغور (the s may have been mis-read from a longish joint between غ and ژ). More difficult is ييغور. As in Turkish ياست means "broad, wide", could it have stood here for "a plain"? The fact is that ياست is attested as the name of a town on the Yaxartes since at least the twelfth century, see Barthold, Vorlesungen, p. 141.]

4. Very probably ييغوري يمانيка? For the distance of 80 days see I.Kh., 28, who counts from Taraz to كارك 7 farsaks and thence 80 days to the residence (ماد) of the Kimak king, ditto in Qudama, 209, 262.

5. Dih-i Chub (§ 6, 42. and 43. Dih-i Chubin) "the Wooden Village"; on its position, v.s., § 6, 43. Mis'ar b. Muhalhil speaks of the town of the Ghuzz built of stone, wood, and reeds.

¹ The Qara-qum sands lie to the south-west of the Chaljar lake into which the Irgiz disembogues.
² Raverty does not give the Arabic spelling of Yighur which he found in some of his MSS. but seeing that in the Br. Mus. MSS. Add. 26. 189 (fol. 120b) and Add. 25. 785 (fol. 145a) stands تا بفهر (؟) تركستان ... ريف one would think that the original had ييغور.
§ 19. The Ghûz


§§ 19–22 describe a special group of northern “Turkish” tribes adjoining the Ural region. See Map vii.

The Ghûz (Arabic transcription *Ghuzz*) as their name suggests were a part of the people called Oghuz in original Turkish sources (v.s. notes to § 12, and Kâshgharî, i, 56–8). The infiltration of Turkish (Oghuz) tribes in the direction of Transoxiana and Khorâsân began before Islam: the steppes in the south-eastern corner of the Caspian Sea were occupied by the Turks probably in the sixth century a.D. (prince Şûl of Dihistân, cf. Marquart, *Erânsâlîr*, 73, Barthold, *Turkmeniya*, pp. 12–13); on a similar early migration of the Khalaj see note to § 24, 22. An important movement of the Ghûz (Oghuz) was caused by the Qarluq occupation of the territories previously possessed by Western Turks (Türğish), see note to § 17. According to the T'ang-shu the Qarluq transferred their residence to the Chu valley after a.D. 766, and in a remarkable passage explaining the origin of the Ghuzz of the Balkh region who captured Sulțân Sanjar, Ibn al-Athîr, xi, 117 (year 548/1153), says: “Some historians of Khorâsân have given much more definite data about them. They say that these Ghuzz came over to Transoxiana from the region of the marches (var. ‘from the Toghuzghuz country’), from the remotest Turkish (lands), in the days of the caliph Mahdî (a.D. 775–85); they accepted Islam and helped al-Muqanna', the doer of miracles of jugglery, until his end came. When the army marched against him they abandoned him, as they were wont to do in every kingdom in which they were. Such used to be also their practice with the Khâqânîan kings but the Qarluq punished them and expelled them from their seats.” Though this passage refers chiefly to the Balkh Ghuzz, the disruption of the Western T'u-chüeh must have occasioned many similar migrations. ¹

Later the Ghûz were chiefly known under the name Türkân of which the most likely interpretation is that offered by Jean Deny, *Grammaire de la langue turque*, 1921, p. 326, according to which Türk-mân is formed with the “augmentative” suffix man/mân having in Turkish an intensifying or aggrandizing sense (qa'ja-man “huge”); according to this theory Türkân would mean something like “Turk pur sang” or in Italian “Turcone.” ²

¹ It is also characteristic that the Russian chronicles specially apply to the Ghuz (Oğê) the name Türk < Türk connected with the T'u-chüeh. Cf. Aristov, *Zamethi*, in *Zhivaya Starina*, 1896, p. 312.

² This explanation fully agrees with the story quoted by Barthold from
Our author represents the Ghuz country as stretching, roughly speaking, between the Irtish, the Volga, the Caspian Sea, and Transoxiana. In § 6, 42, he says that the Irtish (Arrush) down to the Wooden Village (§ 18, 3) separated the Kimak from the Ghuz, but he adds (§ 18) that in winter the Kimak visited the Ghuz territory. Gardizi, 107, also places the Kimak country beyond the Irtish but without any reference to the Ghuz. It is difficult to see how the Volga could constitute the frontier of the Ghuz both in the west and north (?) but it is clear from § 50 that the Khazar had very little control over the territories beyond the Volga, and Mas'udi, Muruj, ii, 49, positively mentions the Ghuzz raids across the Volga when the river freezes over. A similar (but clearer) definition of the Ghuzz territory is found in Isf., 9, who places it between the Khazar, the Kimak, the Kharlukh lands, the Bulghar, and the Islamic lands along the line Jurjan (Gurgan)-Farab-Ispajab.

The historical situation in the steppes stretching between the Irtish and Volga is still insufficiently known. On the way from Gurgan to the Pechenegs running west of the Aral Sea Gardizi, 95, omits to mention the Ghuz but he does not mention any other tribe either. On the other hand, Ibn Fa'dlan, who in the spring of A.D. 929 travelled approximately the same way from Khwârazm to Bulghar, found the Ghuzz in the region between the Úst-yurt (plateau between the Aral Sea and the Caspian) and the river Jâm identified by A. Z. Validi, o.c., 246, with the Emba. Beyond the Jâm the traveller found the Bashghurt patrols.

In § 19 the author says that the Ghuz have many chiefs and possess no town, forgetting that under § 26, 29, he mentions Dih-i Nau on the Jaxartes as the winter residence of the Ghuz king. The source of this latter passage may be common with that of I.H., 393. Ibn Fa'dlan, see A. Z. Validi, o.c., 245, styles the king of the Ghuzz yabghu and his viceroy küdärkin (?).

The source of the characteristics of the Ghuz is uncertain. Gardizi, 81, who has no special chapter on the Ghuz, only mentions their eponym je and says that the original rain-stone was in their possession. Our author omits this detail, but perhaps his item on the power of the "doctors" (i.e. Turkish sorcerers qam) is somehow connected with this story. According to Misar b. Muhalhil, in Yaqût, iii, 448, the rain-magnet (hiyāra wa hiya maghnātis al-matar) belonged to the Kimak.

§ 20. The Turkish Pechenegs


1 In Mas'udi, Muruj, i, 213, the Ghuzz are placed on the Black Irtish and the White Irtish, though the latter is described as the territory of the *Kimak-Yighur (i.e., p. 310).

2 Abul-Ghazi, p. 92, has ١٥٧ for the Emba.
§ 20  

The Turkish Pechenegs  

and Polovtsi before the Mongol Invasion (in Russian) in Kiev. Universit. Izv., 1883–4 (not found in London or Paris libraries); Marquart, Streifzüge, 63; Marquart, Komanen, 25–6, 98–9, &c. A short survey in English is given in C. A. Macartney, The Pechenegs, in The Slavonic Review, viii, 1929, pp. 342–53. J. Németh, Die Inschriften des Schatzes von Nagy-Szent-Miklós, in Bib. Orient. Hungarica, ii, Budapest, 1932 (inscriptions found on vessels dating, as it appears, from the beginning of the tenth century; the author attributes them to some princes of the Pechenegs, who shortly before that time settled in the present-day Hungary, and it is curious to read in Gardizi that the Pechenegs possessed numerous gold and silver vessels). D. A. Rasovsky, The Pechenegs, Turks, and Berendeys in Russia and Hungary (in Russian), in Seminarium Kondakovianum, Prague, 1933 (concerns later times; very complete Russian and Hungarian bibliography).

§§ 20 and 22, as well as 43–4 and 48–52, find close parallels in the respective chapters of I.R., Gardizi, Bakri, and 'Aufti who all depend on one principal source and vary only in details.

Our author speaks of the Pechenegs in two chapters: under § 20 is described the old Pecheneg country and under § 47 their new habitat. Taking his information from two distinct sources he presents the two consecutive stages of the Pecheneg peregrinations as existing simultaneously.

The fullest presentation of the facts is found in Constantine Porphyrogenitus, De administrando imperio, chap. 37, which Marquart, Komanen, 25, calls the "basis of the historical ethnology of Southern Russia". The Byzantine author says that the seats of the Παρζανακται were first between the Volga (Άρτψα) and Yaylq (Γεψά, the "Ural river") where they had for neighbours the *Majars (Μαζάπος)1 and the Oghuz (Ογχζ). Fifty-five years before the composition of the book (written A.D. 948)2 the Khazars and the Oghuz simultaneously attacked the Pechenegs and drove them out of their country, which was occupied by the Oghuz. The Pechenegs settled in a new country (namely that formerly occupied by the Magyars)3 from which the distances were as follows: 5 days both to the Khazars and the Oghuz, 6 days to Alania (cf. § 48), and 10 days to Mordia (cf. § 52). In chap. 42 of his work Constantine explains that at a later date (after the expulsion of the Magyars from Atelkuzu, § 22) the Pecheneg possessions extended from a place opposite Distra4 on the lower Danube to Sarkel (a Khazar fortress on the Don). These events of the end of the ninth century are known to Ist., 10, who says: "A tribe of Turks called Bachanák (Pecheneg)

1 Cf. Ibn Faḍlān on the Bāshghurt = Majhār, v.s., p. 312, line 19.
2 In 889, according to Reginonis Abbatis Prumiensis Chronicon. Cf. Németh, o.c., p. 48.
3 More precisely the region which Constantine calls Ασβέδλα and which must be located somewhere north of the Αζόβ sea, its river Χόμας alias Χόγγουλσ being sometimes identified with the Chingul (?) river flowing into the Molochnaya. The Magyars moved to the country called Atelkuzu ("between the rivers"?) stretching between the Dniepr and Sereth. A new advance of the Pechenegs made the Magyars move across the Carpathians into their present land (shortly before A.D. 900).
4 Distra = Durustulum = Silistria.
Commentary

§ 20

having been ousted from its land settled between the Khazars and Rûm. Their place is not their ancient home, but they have come to it and occupied it.” In our author the seats of the Pechenegs near the Azov Sea are described under § 47, and in that connexion we shall have occasion to examine Auft’s interesting text on the further migrations of the tribes.

Our § 20 undoubtedly has in view the situation before a.d. 893 (or 889). It is true that Const. Porph., o.c., admits that until his own time (μέχρι τοῦ νῦν) some of the Pechenegs (τῶν ἐκ αὐτῶν) stayed on under the Ghuz, but according to our author the Turkish Pechenegs were at war with their neighbours which shows that they were still independent. This is still clearer from the parallel text of Gardizi who uses the same source. He describes the Pechenegs at the zenith of their power possessing herds, horses, precious vases and girdles, battle-trumpets in the form of bulls’ heads, and plenty of arms. Gardizi, 95, describes a road from Gurgânj (in Khwârâzim) to the Pechenegs which touched the Khwârâzim mountain¹ and left the Aral Sea to the right. After a journey in the desert, where water was found only in wells, on the tenth day a more pleasant country was reached with springs and abundant game. The whole journey to the Pechenegs took seventeen days. Their country stretched for 30 days and their neighbours were: towards the east the Qipchaq, towards the south-west (at 10 days’ distance) the Khazars, and to the west the Slavs (sic). This picture is entirely different from what Ibn Faḍlān as an eye-witness found in 922. He met the Pechenegs to the south of the river Ḥwīl (A. Z. Validi: *jayiḵh = Yaylq) and he opposes their poverty (undoubtedly a result of the events of a.d. 893) to the wealth of the Ghuzz. A. Z. Validi, o.c., p. 246, thinks that these Pechenegs belonged to the class of nomad “proletarians” (jataq) adding that they, too, shortly after crossed the Volga in a westerly direction.²

Our author considerably embroils the description of the Pecheneg frontiers. He does not say that their lands reached the Uninhabited Northern Zone, but the comparison with the Kimâk country shows that the Pechenegs lived in a very cold region. Under § 44 it is said that east of the Rûs lay the Pecheneg mountains under which only the Ural mountains or their (western) spurs can be understood.³ Under § 6, 43: the Itil downstream of Bulghār separates the Turkish Pechenegs from the “Burtâs” by which, owing to some mistake, our author (see § 51) usually means the Volga Bulghârs. In our § 20 the Burtâs and Barâdâs are mentioned to the south of the Pechenegs. In § 19 the Itil (Volga) forms the western and northern frontier of the Ghûz while according to § 20 the western neighbours of the Ghûz were the Turkish Pechenegs. Did, then, our author think that the Pecheneg territory somehow stretched from the Ural hills down to the right (western) bank of the Volga? Still more embarrassing is § 6, 45,

¹ i.e. the Chink of the Üst-yurt. Bakri, 42, places the mountain at 10 farsaks from Gurgânj.
² But v.s., Const. Porph., o.c., cap. 37.
³ At its northern and southern extremity respectively the Rûs and the Kimâk were supposed to live, cf. § 18.
The Turkish Pechenegs

according to which the enigmatic Rūtā river (flowing westwards!) rises from a mountain on the frontier between the Pechenegs, Majgharā, and Rūs. Such an involved idea would be comprehensible to some extent only if the author imagined that the Pechenegs and Majgharā, or a part of them, were found to the south-west of the great bend of the Volga (in the region of Kazan).\(^1\) The Rūtā was evidently considered as the frontier between the Pechenegs and Rūs (cf. § 42).

It is curious that neither in § 20 nor in § 50 are the Turkish Pechenegs and the Khazars explicitly considered as neighbours, though from Const. Porph. we know that the Pechenegs were ousted from their former seats by the concerted action of the Ghu and Khazar. Gardīzī's text (\textit{v.i.}) is also clear in this respect.

\[\frac{\text{§ 21. The Khifchākh (Qipchaq)}}{215}\]


The name \textit{Khifchākh}<\textit{Khifchākh}, \textit{Qipchaq} is already attested in I.Kh., 31. The Russians called the Qipchaq \textit{Polovtś} (from \textit{polovьbьl} "yellowish, sallow") to which name in western languages correspond the terms: \textit{Pallidi}, \textit{Falones}, \textit{Valani}, \textit{Wakwen}, &c. This group of names has no correspondence in Muslim literature.\(^2\) Another name under which the Qipchaqs were known in the Byzantine empire and Western Europe is \textit{Kŏmavọ̙}, \textit{Comani}, \textit{Commanii}, which is also found in Idrīsī, who (perhaps quoting from a European source)\(^3\) calls the Qipchaq \textit{emine} and their land \textit{Fanağ} (Jaubert's translation, ii, 395, 399, &c.). The identity of all these appellations is clear from Rubruquis (Paris, 1839, p. 247): "Commanii qui dicuntur Capthat.

1. If the Pechenegs lived north of the Burtās (\textit{i.e.} Bulghār) and Barādhās, how could they neighbour on the Ghāz along the Volga, unless under Ḍīl we have to understand the Kama? But this surmise would create new difficulties. According to Mas'ūdī, \textit{Tawbīh}, 160, the operation zone of the Pechenegs extended (at some time?) down to the Aral Sea.


3. One must, however, keep in mind the still insufficiently explained names \textit{Aravot} (variants \textit{Aravot}) which Gardīzī quotes on the road to the Kimāk (see note to § 18) and \textit{Qum Anī} (variants \textit{Qum Anī} and \textit{Tum Anī} given by Rashīd ad-dīn, ed. Bérénice, \textit{Trudi V.O.}, vii, 162, as the name of the tenth tribe of the Uyghurs, cf. Marquart, \textit{Komanen}, 91 and 58.
[*Qipchaq]; a Teutonicis vero dicuntur Valani [read: Falani] et provincia Valania [read: Falania].” The origin of the names Coman-/Qoman remains dark (cf. note to § 14, 1.). The name ُقُن (still suspect!) to which Marquart attaches such an exceptional importance might explain the Magyar form ُکُن but it does not account for Qoman. Even without taking ُن into consideration we can imagine the derivation of Magyar ُکُن from Qoman but there is no explanation for the expansion of an earlier ُقُن into Qoman, simultaneously with its supposed survival (?) as ُکُن in Magyar.

Like the Khirkhîz, Kimâk, and Rûs the Khifchâkh are represented in our source as living in the immediate neighbourhood of the Northern Uninhabited Lands. To their south1 are placed the Turkish Pechenegs. Our source (§ 6, 44.) adds that the Rûs river (Volga above its junction with Kama?) skirted the Khifchâkh confines.2 Were then the Qipchaq imagined to live down-stream from the Rûs on the left bank of the upper course of the Volga? This, however, would be an entirely imaginary construction due exclusively to our author, for Gardîzî, who uses much the same materials, distinctly says that the Khifchâq lived to the east of the Pechenegs. Having substituted north for east our author fitted in the peoples into his scheme without much care for the actual situation.

Gardîzî, 82, mentions the Khifchâkh as one of the seven tribes of the Kimâk. Our author seems to refer to a later stage of the Khifchâkh emancipation: he admits the vassal dependence of their king upon the Kimâk but considers the Khifchâkh as a special tribe, maybe separated from the Kimâk by the territory called Andar az Khifchâkh. To what an extent the form of association of the Qipchaq with the Kimâk was changed towards the end of the eleventh century is witnessed by the quotation from Kâshgharî (iii, 22), v.s., p. 305, which shows the Yimâk, i.e. presumably one of the two original clans of the Kimâk, as a kind of poor relatives of the Qipchaq. In a.d. 1318 al-Warrâq quotes the Yimâk as a clan of the Qipchaq, cf. Marquart, Komanen, 157.

Marquart, ibid., 100, must be right in assuming that the Qipchaq first profited by the victory of the Ghûz over the Pechenegs. To characterize the further succession of nomad tribes in southern Russia suffice it to mention3 the following facts: in 1036 Yaroslav of Kiev inflicted the final crushing defeat on the Pechenegs. Under 1054 Russian chronicles for the first time mention the appearance both of the Torks (= Ghûz) and the Polovtsî (= Qipchaq). The former were evidently fleeing under the pressure of the latter. Henceforth for 170 years up to the Mongol invasion

2 On the other hand the northern boundary of the Turkish Pechenegs was the mysterious river Rûthâ (§ 6, 45.) which is not mentioned in connexion with the Khifchâkh. We may imagine then that, on our author’s Map, the Rûthâ divided the Rûs and Pechenegs only on the right bank of the Volga. [Or should we read eastern, instead of northern, boundary, cf. supra note 1.
3 Here we cannot discuss the migrations farther south and west. See now Rasovsky, o.c. [The first attack of the Pechenegs on Kiev is recorded in the Russian Chronicle under a.d. 968.]
§ 21-2

The Khîfchâkh (Qipchaq)

(A.D. 1224) the Qipchaq remained masters of the steppes down to the Caucasus.

Explaining the process of formation of the Qipchaq tribe Marquart assumes three gradual stages of its mongolization (?). According to Gardizi the original Kimâk separated from the Taṭâr (following Marquart, o.c., 95, in the seventh century); for a second time the Qûn, a clan of the Mongolian Marqua mentioned in 'Auft (see note to § 20) put into movement the original tribes in the beginning of the 11th century, o.c., 55, 57; for a third time the foundation of the Qipchaq (in the Yûan-shàh: *Kin ch’â) state is explained by the arrival towards A.D. 1120 of some princes whose original habitat was near Jehol in Northern China, o.c., 115, 117, 137. Many of these facts still need confirmation and their interpretation by Marquart is subject to considerable caution (see the reviews of Marquart’s book by Pelliot and Barthold and the latter’s Vorlesungen, p. 114).

It remains to mention here that in ‘Auft’s much discussed passage the chain of moves among the nomadic tribes is opened by the invasion of the Qûn (Q.rî) into the Sârî land (zâmîn-i Sârî). The inhabitants of Sârî (ahl-i Sârî)1 press the Ghuz-Türkmâns and the latter move into the southern seats of the Pechenegs (§ 47). Barthold in his review of Marquart’s Komanen thinks that by Sârî the Qipchaq are meant, and this hypothesis is certainly supported by the fact that the Qipchaq were the people who drove before them the Ghuz (Yûn Oţ'î) and gave their own name (Dasht-i Khîfchâkh) to the steppes formerly associated with the name of the Ghuzz. Barthold even suggests that sârî<sârî, in Turkish “yellow”, is not an unsuitable name for the people known in the west under the names: Polovtsi, Pallidi, &c. [One wonders whether the original group of the Qipchaq had something to do with the “Yellow” clans of the western T’u-chûh, v.s., § 17.]

Against Barthold’s hypothesis is the fact that in ‘Auft’s text ahl-i Sârî can only be interpreted as “people of [the territory called] Sârî”. However, the name of the Sarî-su could form a connecting link with some “Yellow” tribe (v.s., p. 284, n. 5). Moreover, on the road supposed to lead to the Sarî-su (notes to § 18) lay the sands called by the Turks اروطن (v.s., p. 315, n. 3). Had this latter name anything to do with the Qomans it would pave the way to the demonstration that the “people of Sârî” were not different from the “Qomans” (= Qipchaq).

§ 22. The Majgharî

Chwolson, Izvestiya . . . Ibn Dasta (read: Ibn Rusta), pp. 101-23; Marquart, Streifzüge, pp. 27-74 and passim; Dietrich, Byzantinische Quellen, Index sub verbis: Mazarer, Ungarn; B. Munkácsi, Die Urheimat der Ungarn, in Keleti Szemle, vi, 1905, pp. 185-222; Barthold, Basjîrî, in EI; J. Németh, Magna Hungaria, in Mzik, Beiträge, pp. 92-5; Németh Gyula,

1 The text as it stands does not suggest any leadership of the Qûn over the people of Sârî.
A honfoglaló Magyarság kialakulása, Budapest, 1930 (a short résumé of this important work is La Préhistoire hongroise, in Nouvelle Revue de Hongrie, Budapest, June 1932, pp. 460–8, the communication of which I owe to the kindness of the author); C. A. Macartney, The Magyars in the Ninth Century, Cambridge, 1930 (a painstaking revision of Byzantine and Oriental sources, the latter being used in translations; Gardízi’s text accepted in Marquart’s earlier interpretation); J. Moravcsik, Zur Geschichte der Onoguren, in Ungar. Jahrbücher, x, Heft 1–2, 1930, pp. 53–90. See Map xii.

The question of the remote Hungarian (Magyar) origins depends chiefly on linguistic evidence and more especially on that of loan words in Magyar and its cognate idioms. As the nearest of kin to the Magyars are the Voguls (on both slopes of the Northern Ural) and the Ostiaks (in the Obi basin), it was formerly admitted that the original home of the Magyars must be sought in Siberia. So Marquart, Streifzüge, 53, located the “Ursitze” of the Magyars in “southern Yugria, in the neighbourhood of the Ishim and in the Baraba [steppe east of Omsk]”. More usually, following the indications of the Muslim authors (v.i.), the seats of the early Magyars were placed in the neighbourhood of the Volga Bulghars, i.e. near the present-day Bashqirs territory. Munkácsi in his Urheimat der Ungarn, p. 212, while criticizing these theories took an entirely different view, to wit that the region where the Magyar language underwent the influence of the [older] Turkish and Caucasian languages1 lay in the northern Caucasus and that accordingly this was “das Urgebiet des Bildungsprocesse des Magyarentums”; and if some Magyars were found near the Volga this must be explained by some emigration from the Caucasian home in the northward direction.

Turning now to Muslim sources we must recognize that under Majgharí, Basjirt, and other similar names2 Arab and Persian authors speak of two distinct groups, vis. the Uralian “Bashqirs” (whether Turks or Finno-Ugrians) and the Magyars (Hungarians) in their earlier country north of the Black Sea.

According to Prof. Németh’s latest researches, the Bashqirs are originally a Hungarian tribe, which probably together with the Volga Bulgars had migrated from the northern Caucasus northwards, cf. Munkácsi, o.c., 221.3 The name of the Bashghirs4 mixed with that of the Hungarians living near

---

1 For traces of former contact of the Magyars with the Ossetes see now Hannes Skjold, Die ossetischen Lehnrörter im Ungarischen, in Lund Universitets Årsskrift, N.F., Avd. I, Bd. 20, No. 4, 1925 (where the Magyar-Osset contacts are placed circa A.D. 600–800). In principle it is hazardous to associate the Iranian (i.e. Alān > Osset) elements in Hungarian exclusively with the Caucasus for the Alāns once stretched well to the neighbourhood of the Aral Sea. [The theories on the earliest home
and migrations of the Magyars are necessarily very controversial.] [Cf. Appendix B.]

2 See their enumeration in Chwolson, o.c., 112, and Marquart, Streifzüge, 68–9.

3 Moravcsik, o.c., 89, thinks that this migration took place simultaneously with the westward trek of the Onoghundurs (§ 53) about the middle of the 7th century.

4 Németh explains it as *bāsh-ghur “Five tribes” [?].
§ 22  

*The Majghari*  

the Black Sea (*Mod'eri*) resulted in the form: *Mojgher*. This, together with the common origins of the two peoples, led to a situation under which the two were indiscriminately called now *Bashghird*, and now *Mojgher*. Those Hungarians who had travelled from the Caucasus to the north carried along with them some Turks, and later became Turkicized by other Turks coming from Western Siberia. Kāshghari considers the Bashqirs as Turks speaking a dialect akin to that of the Kimāk, but the Dominican Julian who, in search of the lost Hungarian tribes, visited the region of the Volga in 1235 found a “Magna Hungaria” near the “Magna Bulgaria” (*i.e.* the Volga Bulghārs). Moreover, some of the clan names of the Hungarians mentioned by Constantine Porphyrogenitus (A.D. 948) coincide with those of the present-day divisions of the Bashqirs (*Koupriyevymouν = Hung. Kürt + Gyarmat = Bashq. Yarmatu; Ἔναξ = Hung. 恹ғ = Bashq. Yeney). See Németh, *Magna Hungaria*.

The clearest and simplest presentation of the case in Muslim sources is found in Iṣṭ., 225, who says: “there are two classes of Basjirt (*سَجِرَت*). The one is found at the farther end (*ākhīr*) of the Ghuzz behind the Bulghār (*'alā ẓahr B.*) and they are said to be about 2,000 men¹ and to be protected by impassable thickets (*mashājir*); they obey the Bulghār.² The other class of them borders on the Pechenegs; both they and the Pechenegs are Turks and they border on Rūm.*³

Much more entangled is the group of sources represented by I.R., 142, Gardizi, 98, and Bakrī, ed. Rosen, 45, who under the name Majghari mechanically string together the information referring to two different territories and most probably derived from different sources (Muslim al-Jarmī, Hārūn b. Yahyā, &c., cf. Marquart, *Streifzüge*, 28) as if the Uralian territory stretched without interruption down to the Black Sea.⁴ The introductory paragraph (A) of these authors places the Majghari in the north

---

¹ In the curious legend on the formation of the Khirkhīz, Gardizi, 85, says that their ancestor after having been obliged to leave the court of the Khazar-ḵāqān joined Bashjirt who “was one of the Khazar nobles and with 2,000 men lived between the Khazars and the Kimāks”.

² It is possible that I.Kh.'s (p. 31) الْجِرْلَة quoted in the series Toguzguz-Kharlukh-Kimāk-Ghuzz-جموعة-Bajaṅak-Türkish stands for the ġirāl rather than for the ġirāl₁ supossed by de Goeje and Marquart to represent Chīgil. The same consideration may apply to Masʿūdī's (*Murūj*, i, 288): الْجِرْلَة. On other passages in Masʿūdī relative to the Magyars see Marquart, *Streifzüge*, and our notes to § 53. (In principle I. Kh. 31, could hardly mention the little-known Ćaqır, or render Čigil by *Čighir*.)

³ In another passage Iṣṭ., 227, reckons from the Pechenegs to the Inner Bashjirt 10 days, and from the latter to Bulghār 25 days. This last distance could only refer to the Magyars living north of the Black Sea. A parallel term to *Bashjirt al-dāhkhil* is Bulghār al-dāhkhil (*i.e.* the Danubian Bulghār) mentioned in Iṣṭ., 226 (v.i. § 43). In Mongol times the Magyars occupying their present seats in Hungary were still called پاشتر, cf. Juvayni, GMS, i, 225.

⁴ In a convenient form the texts are synoptically presented in Macartney, *o.c.*, pp. 30 and 42. There are, however, some misprints in the translations and Gardizi’s text is given without the final sentences.
between the *Pecheneg [our "Turkish Pecheneg"] country and the Bulghär tribe of Asgil|Ashkël (see § 51). In a later part (B) they describe an extensive Majghari territory reaching down to the Black Sea. However, in a more detailed description of this southern country the three authors disagree. I.R. and Gardizi (B 1) place the Majghari between two large rivers disemboguing into the Rūm Sea, and in connexion with this land Gardizi particularly names the peoples *Nd.r and M.rdt. On the other hand, Bakrí (B 2) says nothing about the rivers and as the neighbours of the Majghari quotes the یی and ژر, undoubtedly connected with the Caucasus, cf. notes to § 50, 4.1 Contrary to Marquart2 I am inclined to think that, even supposing that I.R. (B 1 a) has in view the Αλβαδία home of the Magyars near the Azov see, Gardizi (B 1 b) refers to the Αρελκονον stage of Magyar peregrinations when, expelled by the Pechenegs (A.D. 889), they spent some years in the region of the five great rivers emptying themselves into the north-western corner of the Black Sea, cf. Const. Porph., chap. 38, v.s., p. 313, note 3.

[Additional note. Only in Gardizi and in the H.-'Ā. we find traces of the additional source (B 1 b) to which we can assign our details on the southern (*western) frontier of the Magyars, as well as on the V.n.nd.r (§ 53), Mirvāt (§ 46), and perhaps the "Christianized Slavs" (§ 42, 17.). The source must originally belong to the very last years of the ninth century. It has nothing to do with Muslim b. Abī Muslim al-Jarmī (see notes to § 42) and one particular detail is in favour of its association with the name of Hārūn b. Yahyā (see note to § 42, 17.).]

The best introduction to our text is Gardizi’s passage which is not only illustrative for the tradition (B1) but which also contains details (B 1 b) on the neighbours of the Majghari found nowhere else except in the H.-'Ā. Our literal translation follows the text as edited by Barthold, p. 98 (after the Oxford MS.) with the addition of some insignificant variants found in the Cambridge copy (marked C.): "Between the Bulkār [read as in I.R. and Bakrí: *Pecheneg, cf. also § 6, 45.] country and that of the Asgil who are also of the Bulkār lie the frontiers of the Majghari.3 They are a class of Turks and their sālar (has) 20,000 horse. They call this sālar k.n.da and this is the name of their greater king, (whereas) the sālar who makes the appointments (shughlā khwānād) is called jula and the Majghārī do whatever he orders them. They possess a wide plain all covered with grass. Their country is 100 farsakhs by 100 farsakhs. Their country adjoins the Rūm Sea into which flow two large rivers [instead of ارود چهرون: read ارود چهرون] and they live between these two streams (مین این ارود) and when (C. چرون) winter comes those who had gone far from the river (jayhūn) come

1 Cf. also Mas’ūdī, v.i., notes to § 53.
2 Marquart’s attempt to identify these two pairs of names (Streifstüge, pp. 176 and 496) has been followed by the later writers though Marquart himself finally changed his opinion (see notes to § 53).
3 This definition of the territory has in view the northern Majghari, i.e. the Bashqirs (item A). The rest of the passage seems all to refer to the real Magyars (item B).
near to it and stay there in winter. They catch fish and live on them. And [with regard to] the river (jayhūn) which is to their left [we must add that] towards the Saqlab (country) there is a tribe of Rūm who are all Christians. They are called N.nd.r. They are more numerous than the Majghārī but weaker than they. And of these two jayhūns the one is called Atil (اَطِل) and the other Dūba (دُوْب) and when the Majghārī are on the bank of the river they see the N.nd.rians. Above (sabar; C. xiţ: 'below') these N.nd.rians on the bank of the river stands a large mountain and a water rises (from it) and flows on its side. Behind this mountain a nation of Christians is found whom they call M.rdāt. Between them and the N.nd.r there is a distance of 10 days. They are a numerous nation. Their clothes resemble those of the Arabs and consist of a turban, a shirt, and a coat (jubba). They have cultivation and possess vines (rasān; in C. the text is slightly disturbed). Their water flows on the surface and they have no underground canals (kāris). And it is reported that they are more in number than the Rūm. They are a separate nation. Most of their commerce is with the Arabs. And that (other) river which is on the right of the Majghārī flows to the Saqlab and thence to the Khazar lands and that river is the largest of the two (wa ān rūd az in har du rūd buzurgtar-ast). The country of the Majghārī is all trees and marshes (ābīr ‘lakes’?) and the soil is damp. They always vanquish the Saqlab and constantly impose tribute on them and treat them as their slaves. The Majghārī are fire-worshippers and raid the Saqlab and Rūs and bring captives (barda) from them. They take them to Rūm for sale. These Majghārī are handsome and pleasant looking. They dress in satin (dibā). Their arms are embellished with silver and gold (instead of سَمِينَاتْ وَدرَود— read: سَمِينَاتْ وَدُرُود). They constantly go to sack the Saqlab and from the Majghārī to the Saqlab there is a distance of ten days.2

The crucial point is the identification of the two rivers which Gardizī, perhaps misunderstanding the Arabic original (cf. I.R., 142) but following a regular Persian usage, calls jayhūn in the sense of “a large river”. The author distinctly starts on his location of the N.nd.r from the river flowing “on the left” of the Majghārī, i.e. evidently on their west, because the peoples living beyond it lived in the direction of the Saqlab, one of the westernmost peoples of Eastern Europe (§ 43). This makes it evident that the river درا is one of the rivers of the north-western corner of the Black Sea, and probably Barthold was right in restoring in his text *Dūnā* (Dūnā, “Danube”) instead of درا.3 As regards the river flowing “to the

---

1 I.R., 143, mentions كرخ as the point where the Majghārī slave-traders were met by the Byzantine merchants. If this place (cf. § 3, 6. and 8. and § 42 15.) is كرخ Kerch (at the entrance of the Azov sea) there is an indirect indication that I.R. still referred to the Lebedia home of the Magyars.

2 I.R., 143, quotes the distance of 10 days between the Pechenegs and Slavs and, ibid., 142, records the Magyars attacks only on the Slavs. Gardizī’s variants may reflect an influence of his special “N.nd.r-M.ırdat” source (B 1 b).

3 The Khazar king’s letter (which also mentions the name V.n.m.t.r, cf. § 46) positively applies the name Rūnā/Dūnā
right” of the Majghari, the mention of the Khazars shows that it must be
sought in the eastern part of the southern Russian plain. Marquart,
Streffzüge, 32, quotes the Hungarian chronicler Simon de Keza according
to whom the Hungarians called the Don Etul. This may be a hint for the
identification of Gardizí’s *Atil* which at this place cannot apply to the Volga
held at that time by the Khazars. More than this, the Khazars at the zenith
of their power controlled the steppes up to Kiev, and so historically even
the Dniepr would suit the condition of flowing from the Slavs to the
Khazar lands. The name *atil* was certainly employed in a general sense as
is shown by the term ’*Aτελκονζου* explained as “(the land) between the
rivers”, see Marquart, Streifszüge, 33. If the element *κουζου* corresponds to
Magyar köz, köze “terra intermedia”, the first element is undoubtedly *atil*
taken in the sense of a river (cf. *jayhun*). As Const. Porph., chap. 38,
enumerates the five rivers of Atelkuzu we know that the latter comprised
the space between the Dniepr and the Sereth. Might Gardizí’s *Atil*
perhaps be an echo of the term *Atelkuzu*?

Coming now to the *H.-*Ā. we see that its author with regard to the
Majghari territory followed exclusively the tradition A and entirely dis-
regarded the tradition B. He places the Majghari near the Ural mountains
as the last territory in the series of the northern Turkish lands (§§ 18–22,
est to west: Kimák, Ghûz, Turkish Pechenegs, Khîfchâkh, Majghari).
This disposition of chapters is still more significant in view of the fact that
the southern territories of Eastern Europe (§§ 43–9) are described in an
opposite direction (west to east: Saqlâb, Rûs, Inner Bulghârs, Mirvât,
Khazarian Pechenegs, Alân, Sarîr) and that the two series of countries are
even separated by an intermediary zone of countries (§§ 50–3) enumerated
in a sort of *bustrophedon* east to west: Khazar, Burțas, Barâdhâs, and
V.n.nd.r. Cf. Map xii.

Our author undoubtedly represents the same tradition as I.R., Gardizí,
and Bakrî, and in his sources certainly the two different Majghari homes
were found. As in § 22 he proposes to describe the Bashqir country (A), the
question is what he has done with the residue of information relative to the
Magyars (B)? In the immediate neighbourhood of the Magyar territory
Gardizí mentions the people *Nd.r* screened by a mountain from another
people *M.rdât*. These peoples are also described in our text: the Majghari
75 and 92, but this document is suspect.
1 Cf. I.Kh., 54, on the Tanais, “the
river of the Saqāliba” which the Rûs
merchants follow before reaching the
Khazar capital.
2 See in Volga-Turkish dialects,
Yayiq-itili, Vâtkâ-itili, Aq-itili, &c. Cf.
Marquart in Ungar. fahrâ., ix/1, 1929,
p. 96. [The word is said to be of
Chuvash (<Bulghâr) origin.]
3 If *Dubâ* is the Danube and *Atil* the
Dniepr (or even the Don) it is difficult
to call the eastern river the larger of the
two. One could perhaps imagine that
in the original Muslim report based on
Byzantine sources *Dînâ* as a more
familiar name stood for its less known
affluent Sereth, cf. a similar confusion
of an affluent with the principal river in
§ 6, 13. [I.R., 142, only says that “one
of the two rivers is larger than the
Jayhun”, which gives a better sense.
Cf. *Aufi, v.i, p. 324.]
are the northern neighbours of the V.n.n.d.r (§ 53) and the Mirvät (§ 46) live south of the V.n.n.d.r mountain. Consequently the order of enumeration of the peoples is maintained, but the starting-point being different, the Majghari, V.n.n.d.r, and Mirvät are disposed in a north-to-south direction, so that, instead of the Majghari, the Mirvät come to be the maritime people on the northern coast of the Black Sea. This basic error¹ will be especially considered in the notes to §§ 53 and 46. See sketch on p. 440.

Having ignored the southern Magyars our author transferred to the inhabitants of the northern territory all the characteristics found in the sources with regard to the “Majghari” and as a matter of fact belonging mostly to the southern Magyars.

Population: 20,000, as in I.R. and Gardizi.
Country: 150 × 110 farsakhs; Gardizi and Bakri: 100 × 100 farsakhs; I.R.: “extensive country”.
The King’s name: خلَق (read: جلَّ). I.R. and Gardizi, principal king, but جلَّ real administrative chief; Bakri, title جلَّ.
The Majghari live on fish. Ditto in Gardizi, but I.R. and Gardizi more decisively say that they are fishermen [an important feature for the inhabitants of the region of great rivers].
Rich but vile (?) [not found elsewhere; does the last trait refer to the northern Majghari?]?
Trees and waters, as in I.R. and Gardizi.
Good-looking, as in Gardizi.
Victorious wars against “infidel” neighbours. I.R.: dominate over the Slavs (several details on slave trade); Gardizi: raid the Slavs and Rus.

Apart from the general epitomizing tendency of our author one seems to discover on his part a desire to smoothe the details not tallying with his general conception (cf. the point on enemies and perhaps fishing).² As regards the name of the king, the form خلَق is explained by the confusion of the final š with š. The name is certainly جلَّ *Jula, cf. Const. Porph., chap. 40, pp. 174–5: Ἰουλᾶς and Hungarian Gyula. Our author omits the name of the chief of executive power k.n.da for which Const. Porph. strangely gives καρχάς (perhaps: καρχαν). The title as it stands in Muslim sources may be connected with that of the dignitary who occupied the third place in the Khazar hierarchy: جلَّ ("k.n.d.r khāqān" or "the

¹ On its disturbing influence, cf. note to § 6, 45.
² It is true that the Rus are mentioned as the western and northern neighbours of the Majghari. In § 6, 45. the river Rūtā rises strangely from a mountain situated between the Majghari, the Rus, and the Pechenegs (cf. notes to §§ 20, 47 and 52 on the supposed seats of this people on the right bank of the Volga).

This is a hint at some non-Uralian seats of the Magyars but our author, who does not say a word on the presence of this people near the Black sea, goes halfway in placing the Magyars somewhere near the Oka (?) and imagining that this territory was connected with the Urals. One of the western sources of the Oka is called Ugra (= Hungarian!). According to N. P. Barsov, Ocherk ruskoy istoricheskoy geogr., Warsaw 1885, p. 241, Ugra lay on the road connecting the Dniepr with the Volga.] See Map xii.
khāqān's *k.n.d.r*""). Yāqūt, ii, 436–40 (after Ibn Faḍlān). Munkácsi, in *Keleti Szemle*, x, 1909, pp. 179–80, compares it with *kündi/kündü* which the Altai Turks in quite recent times used to give to their dignitary next in rank to their ruler (*sayyān*).¹

[Additional note. In his *Streifzüge*, 161, 164, Marquart, misled by the idea that the two pairs of names "N.n.d.r and M.rdā" and "Twōdā and *Aughaz*" were identical (cf. § 50, 4.) came to the conclusion that the river ْدِرَا was "Kuban". In *Komanen*, 99, Marquart was less categorical and wrote with reference to our ْرُو (which he found in Toumansky’s translation, *Zap.*., x, 1897): "Auf die Frage, welcher Fluss unter dem ْرُو zu verstehen ist, gehe ich hier nicht ein. . . . Die Erörterung dieser Frage, welche bekanntlich für die Bestimmung der älteren Wohnsitze der Magyaren von grosser Wichtigkeit ist, ist zwecklos, so lange die Parallelberichte des Muḥammad-i *Auṣi* und der *Hudūd al-Ālam* nicht veröffentlicht sind."

We have commented on the identity of the names Dūbā/Rūṭā/Rūṯā (§ 6, 45.) as resulting from the comparison of the *H.*-*Ā*. with the other sources and may add that *Auṣi* does not contain any important new data on the subject. Here is the passage on the Magyars (mis-spelt سربا) according to Brit. Mus., Or. 2676, fol. 67v.): 'Auṣi first quotes the well-known data on the vastness of the Magyars’ country (100 × 100 farsaks), on their 20,000 horse and on the *ra’īs* called *K.n.da*, adding that the Magyars own tents (*khargāh*) and wander with their herds. Then he goes on: "Решедий Айшан пошто аьест бедили ат Ром и Вагикаке, бо бума жаром 6р баканар, бо врапас тье Рана сана [cf. *Krin* 0к1 Ко Ат Раг Бехин Беркетен Виан Айшан Радлашиан за Дин йоиет Диня Баш Айшан Мадам Бтан Скаж Гал баш Айшан Айшан Радеа Кем Радом Бран Бурион Йоиет Йоиет Сыгар Сыгар Абад *Their lands adjoins the Rūm [= Black] sea. The haunts of this people are on the banks of two rivers (daryā) of which the one is called *W.fā* and the other *Atil* both being larger than the Jayḥūn. Between them and the Saqlāb goes on a perpetual war about religion and they are constantly victorious over the (Slavs), and taking prisoners from them carry them to Rūm and sell them. They are continuously in possession of great wealth on account (of this) trade."]"

§ 23. Khorāsān


¹ In the *Shāh-nāma*, ed. Mohl, iii, 76, 179, 190, &c., *K.n.d.r* is the name of a Saqlāb hero fighting in the Turānian army on the right hand of the khāqān. The name of the mountain *Kandār* (§ 5, 12.) may be connected with the same title. Under § 18 the name was tentatively restored as *Kändir-taghī*, in view of the name of the river *Kangīr*. But should the analogy be sacrificed, the simplest restoration would be perhaps *Kandā’ur*, v.s., p. 308, n. 1.]
§ 23  

Khorāsān


The influence of the Balkhi tradition (as represented by Išt.) is apparent in this chapter, but numerous details are also common with Maq.\(^1\) who undoubtedly used Jayhānī. Several details find parallels in Ya’qūbī’s short but graphic description of Khorāsān, BGA, vii, I.R., and Birūnī’s Canon. The interdependence of the authors is difficult to trace in view of the absence of preparatory works on the BGA and interpolations in different MSS. Very original is the description of Gūzgān, whose ruler was our author’s patron (see notes to § 1).

In the introductory paragraph the bearings of the frontiers are displaced as if the north-east were taken for the north. In this our author follows Išt., 253. By the former kings of Khorāsān (who unlike the Sāmānids did not rule over Transoxiana) the Tāhirids and Ṣaffārīds are meant. Among the products of Khorāsān, gold was found in Gharchistān and Badakhshān, and silver in Panjhir, cf. Maq., 326.


Very notable is the author’s tendency to give the names their true Iranian form as is also the case in the Persian translation of Išt.

I. The province of Nīshāpūr

1. Our author agrees with I.R., 171, who also counts in Nīshāpūr 13 rustāqs and 4 “quarters” (arbā’), whereas Maq., 300, has 12 rustāqs and 4 khāna (khānāt).\(^2\)

For 1.–5., 7. cf. Išt., 256–7. As regards 8. Išt. also gives Khūjān but Jarmagan and Sibinagan have a parallel only in Maq., 300\(^l\) (MS. C) who under the dependencies of Nasā mentions “Isfīnāqān, Jarmaqān, Afrāva, and Shāristāna”. Under § 6, 50. Ustuvā (the district of Khūjān > Qūchān, ancient *'Arvatān*) and Jarmagan are mentioned on the Hirand (Atrak) river.\(^3\) Consequently Sibinagan and Rāvīnī, coupled with them in our 8.,

\(^1\) Especially with the Constantinople MS. C which contains numerous additions.

\(^2\) The present-day Khorāsānian divisions, such as Sunnī-khāna, ‘Arab-khāna may be a trace of the ancient khānāt.

\(^3\) V.s., p. 29.
ought to be looked for in the same direction. However, Rāvinī is probably identical with Khān Rāvan (var. Rāvinī?) which Iṣṭ., 257 and 284, mentions at one marhala from Nēshāpūr on the road to Isfārā'īn, and which must correspond to Maq., 300, Rīvand (*Rēvand) mentioned as one of the four khānīnī of Abarshahr (= Nīshāpūr). The famous fire temple of Burzin-Mīhr according to the Bundahishn, xii, 18, stood on the Rēvand mountain which in a larger sense may refer to the Bīnālūd range separating Nīshāpūr from Tūs, see Hoffmann, Auszüge aus syrischen Akten, 1880, pp. 290–1. 6. Jājarm is also found in Maq., 300, but not in Iṣṭ.

9. 10. 12. Now in ruins. The town Nasā lay near the village of Bāgr (Bājgr?), west of 'Ashqābād. Bāvārd lay near the present villages of Abīvārd, at 8 Km. west of the Qahqa station of the Transcaspian railway. Mayhana, now Me'āna, lay between the Dūshak station and Sarakhs, to the west of Chahcha. Maq., 300 l, alone mentions Ribāt-Mahna. See Barthold, Irrigation, 37, 41, Semenov, Po Zakaspiyskim rasvalinam ("Along the ruined sites of Transcaspia"), Tashkent 1928, and Semenov and others, Drevnosti Abiverdskogo rayona ("Antiquities of Abīvārd"), Tashkent 1931; Minorsky, Nasā and Bāvārd in EI. According to Isidore of Charax royal Parthian graves (Basiška kal tafa) lay in Nīsad. Recent excavations, southeast of Bāgr, brought to light a building with strong columns of good craftsmanship and a temple by a vast central square (Russian newspapers of the end of July 1934). Later in the year (November 1934) a large building covered on the outside with sculptures of human beings, animals, &c. was discovered. Still later (May 1935) a towerlike construction with a staircase (formerly crowned by a statue) was unearthed.

11. Tūs, see Minorsky, Tūs in EI. Iṣṭ., 257: Rādhagān (now Rādkān), Tābarān, Buzdighīr, and Nūqān. B.nvādha may be a dialectic form of Junāwidh (*Gundvidh) which Maq., 300 l, mentions among the minbars of Tūs (cf. Persian gunjishk:bunjishk). This town is different from 13. According to the Tārikh-i Nādirī, Junābid lies between Tūs and Mashhad. Maq. also mentions among the produce stone kettles (birām) and trousercords.

Ia. Kūhistān.

13.–19. Kūhistān, i.e. the region lying south of Nīshāpūr, towards Sīstān. See Le Strange, o.c., pp. 352–63 and Map viii. Administrative limits between Nīshāpūr and Kūhistān were certainly confused. In Iṣṭ., 256, 273–4, the arrangement is different. Of the places mentioned under 13. Iṣṭ. speaks of Turshīz and Kundur under Nīshāpūr, p. 256, and of Bunābidh (Maq., 309: Junābid, var. MS. C., B.nābid, now Gunābād) and Kūrī under Kūhistān, p. 273. In our text Kūrī is repeated under 16. Instead of Ṭābasayn (under 15.) it would have been better to mention only one Ṭabas (the so-called Ṭabas al-Tamr, or Ṭabas-i Gilakī called after Gilakī b. Muḥammad, ra’s of Ṭabas, see Nāṣir-i Khusrau, Safar-nāma, ed. Schefer, p. 94) and let it be followed by 16. and 18. after which ought to come 17. Ṭabas-i Masīnān (or Ṭabas al-unnāb). Under 19. are grouped
the places lying in the north-eastern part of Kūhistān towards Harāt, cf. Ist., 256 (Būzajān, Jāymand, Salūmak, &c.). 14., 15., and 18. are described entirely after Ist., 274 (where the last name is spelt Khaušb-
*Khōsp*).

II. Province of Harāt.

20. Description of Harē (Harāt) chiefly based on Ist., 264–7. The expression which our author uses with regard to the mosque ʿabādhiyār ba-mardum az hama exactly corresponds to Ist.’s layṣa masjidun a’maru bil-nās, &c. Among the products Maq., 324, does not mention manna. To Harāt belong 28. and 34. (details copied from Ist., 266).


24–27. Bādghīs, closely following Ist., 268–9 (Kābrūn [*Kālvān], Kujiştān, Jabal al-fidā). Kāṭān (?) must be Kālvūn (Maq., 298 f.; variants Kābrūn, Kālvān, Kālyūn) which is often mentioned in the Šabāqāt-i Nāširī, cf. Raverty’s index under Kāl-yūn. Bādghīs was the residence of Nizak Tarkhān, the famous opponent of the Arabs who was said to be a Hephtalite (Haytal); therefore Yaqūt, i, 461, calls Bādghīs dār mamlaqat al-Hayätīla, see in great detail in Marquart, Wehrot, 39–43.

29. Ist., 267: Asfūzār with the towns Adraskar (also in Maq., 298, now Adraskand), Kavārān, Kūshk (var. Kūsd), and Kavāshān; the area of the district is 3 marhālas by 1 marhala; the Kāhrijites only in the Kāshkān ward.

30. Sarakhs as in Ist., 272. On the Khushkarūd see interesting details in I.R., 173, who says that it reaches a place called al-Ajma, lying towards Abīvard (ajama “wood, thicket”?). Marquart, Wehrot, 5–7, identifies it with the river Sind mentioned in the Bundahishn, xx, 30, of which the name was misread in Firdausī as چَه (see note to § 3, 27).

31–33. Ganj-rustaq lay towards Marvārūdh, cf. Ist., 269. 31. On Bahn, cf. Yaqūt, i, 764, who personally visited it and calls it Bārna and Bābn. 33. Baghsūr, according to § 5, 9 B.C., was separated from Marvārūd by a mountain. The detail on the wells may explain the name baghsan which, according to Vullers, i, 25, means: “a pool of salt water” (gav-i āb-i shūr), see another place of this (?) name in China, § 9, 4. According to Wāṣṣāf, in Mongol days the Khorāsānī Baghsūr was called Mūr Šibirghān (the first element [in Mongol “horse”] still survives in Qal’a-yi Maur, the name of the Russian railway station near which Baghsūr was situated), cf. Barthold, Irrigation, 64.

35., 36. Ist., 271: Gharij al-shār with two towns Bashān (Armenian Geography: Abshīn) and Shūrmīn. Geographically Gharchistān corresponds to the present-day Fīrūz-kūh. The shārs were faithful vassals of the Sāmānids. Later they submitted to Mahmūd and in 389 H. (25 years after the composition of the Ḥ.-ʿĀ.) ʿUtbī, the author of the Tārīkh-i Yamānī was sent to receive their oath of allegiance. He speaks favourably

1 Puchagan (cf. Le Strange, o.c., 357), Tārīkh-i Nādirī, in connexion with the Sangān, &c. are mentioned in the operations of 1141 and 1143 H.
of the old shār Abū Naṣr b. Muḥammad and of his son Shāh Muḥammad, but finally in 403/1012 Ghārāštān was annexed by Māhmūd, Uṭbī-Manīnī, ii, 133 and 146 (Persian transl., 337–41). Cf. L. Darnes, Ghārāštān in El, M. Nāzīm, o.c., 60–2. A part of Ghārāštān was in vassal dependence upon Gūzgān (v. i. 47).

III. Province of Marv.


40–45. On Marv-i Shāhījān see in great detail V. A. Zhukovsky, o.c., where the H.-’Ā. is also quoted, p. 21. Our author follows Iṣṭ., 258–63, but adds some details (e. g. the products).

40. Bārkādīz, according to Samʿānī, was the original name of the village of Qarinān (so surnamed on account of its being reckoned now to Marv and now to Marvārūd, Zhukovsky, o.c., 41.). Qarinān was situated on the left bank of the river near the present day Imām-Bābā railway station. Opposite it, on the right bank, stood Logar mentioned in § 6, 26., cf. Maq., 299, Laukar, and Yāqūt, iv, 370. By Bih-Āfārīdī is evidently meant the followers of Bihāfārīd b. Māḥfarvardīn, who tried to reform the Zoroastrian faith but at the instigation of the mobads was put to death by Abū Muslim (circa a.d. 750), see Houtsma, Bihʿafīrd, in WZKM, iii, 30–8; Barthold, Turkestan, 194, note 7. Qudāma, 209, also speaks of the majūs in Qarinān whom he calls کرکن (Kirīn). 41. Girang, Iṣṭ., 263, Jiranj, though a pun in Anvari’s satire presupposes the pronunciation kirang. 43. Iṣṭ., 263, Sinj, but Maq., 299, and qdī-yi Kirang (t), Ān-ki dārad si-sang-i khrād nang. 44. Maq., 312, says that outside Dandānaqān stood a ribāt. 45. Iṣṭ., 263, mentions Kushmayhan, Bāshān (*Pāshān), Sausaqān, (Yāqūt, iii, 245: Shavaskhān) and p. 261, Zarq (with a water-divide). Msf. is a popular name for Hurmuzfarra, Samʿānī in Zhukovsky, o.c., 42: Masfara. Shābīrīnjī, a village at 3 farsakhs from Marv, ibid. 47, and Yāqūt, iii, 225: Shābīrīnjī.

IIIa. Gūzgānān.
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Maq., 298 (quotes among the towns or otherwise unknown); cf. Marquart, Erânsahr, 80, R. Hartmann, Djuâdân in EI, and Barthold, Preface, v.s., pp. 4–6. In the first place this principality occupied the area

Map viii

between Marv and Balkh watered by two rivers, now called Āb-i Qaysār and Āb-i Safīd, which rise on the northern face of Band-i Turkistān and disappear in the sands a long distance short of the Oxus towards which they flow. Yahūdhān and Pāryāb stood on the two different branches of the Āb-i Qaysār (so spelt in Isfizārī, Zap., xiv, 028–032), and Ankhudh on their joint course; Anbār and Ushburqān stood on the Āb-i Safīd. Moreover,
Commentary
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in the south the sway of the king of Guzgānān extended over some places situated on the upper course of the Marvarūd (Murghāb) to the east of Gharchistān, and over the locality of Ribāt-i karvān (v.i. 63.). On the contrary, our author’s assertion that Guzgānān reached the “limits” of Bāmiyān (§ 23, 78.) and that the amīr of Ghūr drew his force from the king of Guzgānān (§ 24, 1.) can hardly be taken à la lettre. His statement that the frontier of Guzgānān extended to the extreme limits of Ghūr and marched with the boundary of Bust must refer only to some vague feudal suzerainty (based, perhaps, on the reception of presents from Ghūr). On the produce of Guzgānān our author speaks twice under 46. and 51. Our 47.-51. 63. (and probably 64. and 65.) enumerate the southern dependencies of Guzgānān, while 52.-62., 64., and 65. describe the localities in the drainage area of its two principal rivers.

[Additional note. An interesting question is the relation between Guzgān (*Gōzgān or Gōzgān*) and Gozbun mentioned in the Armenian Geography (eighth century). The meaning of Gōzgān is obviously “walnut-trees” and for the moment we know of no ancient tribal name that might have accounted for a more remote origin of the name. As to Gozbun (*Gōzbun*) it was my lamented master R. von Stackelberg’s merit, Die iranische Schützensage, ZDMG, 1904, pp. 853-8, to have established the reading of the name [cf. Marquart, Eränšahr, 9, 93, 138, corrected in Hushardzān, p. 31, and Wehrot, pp. 14-15] and to have connected it with the legend of the mighty Aryan archer Ārish (Avestan verša) who shot an arrow to fix the frontier between Iran and Türān.

The event is briefly alluded to in Yāšt, 8, 6, where the shaft flies from the mountain Aryo-xšūda to the mountain Xvanvant, both still obscure. 2 In Muslim times it was admitted that Ārish stood somewhere in Māzandarān (Rūyān, § 32, 15., or Sārī, § 32, 9.) but there was a considerable divergence of opinion about the exact spot which the shaft struck, reflecting the important political interests at issue and the historical fluctuations of the eastern frontier.

According to Ťabari, i, 435-6, the arrow reached the river of Balkh. Tha’ālibi, ed. Zotenberg, p. 133, reports that it was about to fall in Bādhghūs but an angel carried it on to a place near Khulm (§ 23, 68.) called گرزین which name Stackelberg restored as *کرزین Gōzbun. Biruni, Chronology, 220, places the goal 3 at the farthest end of Khorasān, between خزاغان (؟) and طارستان(؟). The latter name was improved by Stackelberg as *طالبستان but I should rather restore it as *طالبان (L could have been mis-read into a longish س, v.i. p. 340), and take the impossible فرغانه for فرغان which lies upstream from Talaqān, whereas, between Talaqān and Farkhār, a tributary joins the river from the east and along it lies the small district of Gulpānān separated by a col from the basin of the Badakhshān rivers.

1 V.i. 47. (additional note).
2 Herzfeld, Mitt. aus Iran, 11/2, 1930, pp. 83-4, transfers the exploit to western Persia (Pāpqā-Alvand), which, however, is contrary to all the later tradition.
3 “The root of a walnut-tree” (اِسْل shajarat al-jauz).
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(Kishm flowing into the Kokcha). This is really the easternmost point of Ṭukhāristān (comprised in Khorāsān) for Badhakhshān was often considered as a district of its own (v. i., § 24, 24.). It is possible that some confusion was provoked by the existence of two Tālaqān, the one just mentioned in Ṭukhāristān (§ 23, 76.) and the other lying on the western threshold of Gūzgān (§ 23, 72.).

Finally Gūzgān in his Visu Rūmān, ed. M. Minovi, 1935, p. 366, and Zahīr al-dīn, ed. Dorn, p. 18, place the limit of Ārīsh’s exploit near Marv, i.e. more or less in the neighbourhood of Gūzgān.

In the light of these data, we shall now consider the two relevant passages of the Armenian Geography. In the first, Gosbūn concludes the list of the districts of Khorāsān, which may merely reflect the general tendency of the legend. Secondly, in the free paraphrase of Ptolemy’s chapter on ʿApsēa (vi, cap. 17) the author winds up by saying that the Persians call this region Khorāsān and reckon to it the provinces of Kūnī (Kūnīsh), Vrkan (Gūzgān), Appsaahr (Nīshāpūr), Mvē (Marv), Mtōt (Marvarūdūh), Hreev (Harāt), Kadsān (cf. the present-day Kādīs in Bādghīš), “Gosbūn, from where the kingly horses come”, *Gosbūn down to the river called Arang of which it is said that it carries sulphur, is wide and impassable, and which seems to be the Phison which the Persians call Vehrot.2 And it is impassable in the sense that it has been rendered so for the ... Persians and Indians in virtue of a treaty.3 [Follow Hreev with Vagēēs (Bādghīš) and Tukharstān.] It seems that in that land of Kūsakan (sic) the captive Jews were settled who according to the scriptures settled on the Gozān river.” It is curious that in this list, entirely based on Persian sources, the enumeration runs west to east in a straight line (from Kūnīsh to the Oxus), the last provinces (Harāt, Bādghīš, and Ṭukhāristān) forming an additional south-eastern zone. So finally there is a probability that Gosbūn is to be placed between Gūzgān and the Oxus. As a parallel to the name Gosbūn (Gozbon)4 one can quote سکبین (§ 23, 64.) and Tunakābūn which Rabino, Māsāndarān, 153, explains as “below Tunakā”.5 Whatever the origin of the name Gūzgān (or Gōzgān), Gosbūn (< Gōzbūn) might be interpreted as “lying below Gōz[gān]”, which would be another reason for locating it in the direction of the Oxus, perhaps in the neighbourhood of Ribāt Afrā’hūn mentioned by Maq., 347,

---

1 Cf. the story of the Qāhūs-nāma, quoted in § 1, v. s., p. 176.
2 This point is confused, Marquart, Wehrot, 153, but the system of enumeration appears to me quite clear.
3 Evidently referring to the agreement between Manūchehr and Afrāsīyāb who made the decision depend on Ārīsh’s shot.
4 The forms found in Armenian writers are Gosbūn, Kasbūn, Gasbūn. The form Gosbūn, suggesting in Persian *Gōzbūn, may have been influenced by the name of the neighbouring Bābūn, Bābūn>Bōn, the chief place of Ganj (§ 23, 31.) and later even of the whole of Bādghīš, Yāqūt, i, 46r. [7]  
5 Cf. the verse quoted as the first Persian rubā’ī in Shams-i Qays’s Mu’jam, GMS, p. 39, ghallān ghallān hamār ravad tā bān-i gau “slowly rolling (the walnut in the walnut game) goes down to the bottom of the hole”.

---
between Andkhūd (§ 23, 61.) and Karkūh (now Karkī on the Oxus), v.s., p. 6.

In any case it would have been only too natural to connect the boundary of Irān with the region of Gūzgān for Marquart, Erānšahr, 64, 70, has shown that the eastern frontier of the Sāsānian empire “with few fluctuations lay almost always near Ṭalaqān” (“fast immer bei Ṭalakān”), see our § 23, 52., and in point of fact Gūzgān itself was reckoned to Ṭukhārīstān, see I.Kh., 36.]

47. Following the description, Rūshārān (*Rəvšərān) lay on the upper Murghāb, downstream of Mānshān and upstream of Gharchistān. Geographically it belonged to Gharchistān, but politically was placed under the suzerainty of Gūzgānān. As regards the name, I.Kh., 40, calls its ruler malīk al-Rūvšərān (cf. Ṭabarī, iii, 1876), but has a variant Rūvšərān. One of the vazirs of the Ghūrid Muḥammad b. Sām was Jalāl al-dīn *Rivšāri, Ṭabaqāt-i Nāṣirī, transl., 390.

[Additional note. In the revenue list of 217 A.H. quoted by I.Kh., 36, Rūvšərān stands between Siminjān (§ 23, 70.) and Bāmiyān (§ 23, 78.), and under 259 A.H. Ṭabarī mentions the ruler of Rūvšərān alongside with that of Bāmiyān. These hints might favour Marquart’s surmise, Erānšahr, 218, that “Rəvšərān must have lain in the neighbourhood of Bāmiyān”1. However, in support of his theory, Marquart quotes also I. Faqīh (in Yāqūt’s description of the Oxus, ii, 171 and v, 146) according to whom the Jayhūn (Oxus?) flows from a place called Rūvšərān. “It is a mountain bordering on Sind, Hind [the Panjāb?], and Kābul and from it flows a spring rising from the locality of عدیم (اندب).” The place referred to seems to lie much farther east than the sources of the Balkh river for which Marquart, ibid., 219, 227, takes I. Faqīh’s “Jayhūn”. It is noteworthy that a place Andamīn (now spelt Andāmīn) exists in the Lesser Pamir and comprises the lake Chilāb (Turkish Chaqmagting). Kūshkakī, p. 163, particularly stresses the fact that the insignificant Andamīn rivulet is the source of the mighty Oxus! Therefore Marquart’s interpretation of I. Faqīh seems doubtful. Finally in Bīrūnī’s Canon Rūvšərān comes in the list of the 3rd climate between *Panjwāy (§ 24, 16.) and Ghaznīn (§ 24, 19.), and separately from Bāmiyān, Kābul, Lamghān, Kashmīr, &c., mentioned in the 4th climate, viz.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Long.</th>
<th>Lat.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Panjwāy</td>
<td>93°5’</td>
<td>32°50’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Rūvšərān</td>
<td>93°30’</td>
<td>33°20’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghaznīn</td>
<td>94°20’</td>
<td>33°35’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kābul</td>
<td>94°20’</td>
<td>33°45’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bāmiyān</td>
<td>94°50’</td>
<td>34°15’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Even the second argument is specious. Ṭabarī, iii, 1875, records some operations in Khūzistān where, on the side of the governor (called حسن (عندخان) (اصنوین), acted Nizak with some of his generals (فی جامع المین علی -گوئکذ)). Among the latter, Harthama “the Shār” and Ḥasan b. Ja’far “the Rūvšhār (read: Revshār)” were taken prisoners. No particular conclusion as to the respective position of their fiefs can be drawn from their association in an expeditionary force.
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Consequently Bīrūnī’s indication may as well refer to a different homonymous place. The indirect evidence of I.Kh. and Ṭabarī could be confronted with our author’s item on the extent of the Gürgānān dominions “down to the limits of Bāmiyān”. Were we, however, to maintain his other statement that some of the Murghāb waters come from Ṭīvshārān, we should perhaps move the latter to the south-easternmost corner of the Murghāb basin. Cf. infra 64. The final certainty can be attained only by an investigation on the spot.] [See Appendix B.]

48. D.rm.shān (V.rm.shān, Varmsān?) must have been a considerable principality, for, in the north, a part of it lay in the Murghāb basin, while in the south it bordered on Zamīn-dāvar (§ 24, 12.-15.). It had a chief (mīhtar) of its own, but our text, which is not very explicit, divides Darmashān into two “regions”, the one depending on Gürgānān, and the other on Bust. The part of the Gürgānān zone which lay in the Murghāb basin must be placed south [or west] of the R.būshārān, perhaps on the “Sar Acha” (Sarācha?) affluent of the Murghāb, communicating in the south with the Shorak valley leading to Āhangaran (v.i.).

So far as geography goes, Darmashān certainly belonged to Ghūr (§ 24, 1.), but as the latter’s king had a different title (Ghūr-shāh) we ought to conclude that Darmashān formed a special march of Ghūr under a special dynasty. The history of Ghūr at this period is very obscure. According to the Ṭabaqāt-i Nāṣirī, transl., 312-16, there were two rival families in Ghūr, of which the one (that of *Shanasp<Shnasp = Gushnasp, cf. Marquart, Das Reich Zābul, in Festschrift E. Sachau, p. 289), since the time of Hārūn al-Rashīd (?) possessed the princely power (imārat), while the other (that of Shīth) had the military command (pahlavān). The later Ghūtrids, o.c., 300-420, descended from Shanasp and the author of the Ṭabaqāt was brought up in the house of a Shanaspid princess. This circumstance may have obscured the situation of the other family, but in view of our author’s statements one wonders whether towards 372/932 the Shanaspid lord was not considered only as Darmashī-shāh, while the title of Ghūr-shāh (§ 24, 1.) belonged to some rival family (that of Shīth?). As regards the name D.rm.shān, the reading *Dar-i Mashān “Gate of M.” would not be satisfactory for such a vast tract on purely geographical grounds. On the other hand the author of the Ṭabaqāt says that the amīr B.njī (presumed contemporary of Hārūn al-Rashīd, A.D. 786-809) was the son of Nahārān, son of V.rm.sh, son of V.rmshān, and it is likely that these names and with many variants (V.rm.thān, D.rm.nshān, V.rm.shān) correspond to our Darmashān. As a parallel to the district Ṭīvshārān called after its king’s title (or ancestor) Ṭīvshār, D.rm.shān would be the fief of the descendants of V.rm.sh/D.rm.sh. The important fortress of Ghūr called Āhangaran which was taken by Sultān Maḥmūd was situated on the Hari-rud (see notes to § 24, 1.) and this fact again is in favour of the identification of the Darmashī-shāhs with the Shanasp family.

1 If only Darmashān is not a popular name for Ghūr itself! V.i., § 24, 1.
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49. For the location of T. mrān and T. māzān we have to go by the following indications: Mānshān (§ 51) which we take for the Mák valley lay in the Tamrān mountains; Tamrān and Tamāzān lay near the limits of Ribāt-i karvān (63.). The two districts must be sought south of Mānshān on the easternmost sources of the Murghāb. Tamrān could be the Chiras valley, and Tamāzān that of the more southerly Āb-i Vajān. Tamrān was the more important and its mountains comprised probably the whole (?) watershed region between the Balkh river and the Murghāb. The Ṭabqāt, 319 (text, 39), places in Tamrān the highest of the peaks of Ghūr called (80). The most elevated points of the whole area are situated south of Bāniyān in the Koh-i Bābā range (16,874 feet), but north of the sources of the Harīrūd (i.e. in the neighbourhood of the presumed district of Tamrān) there is a peak of 14,845 feet. Several natives of Tamrān were in the service of the Ghūrīds, Ṭabqāt, 390. “Abul-Abbās Abul-Ḥasan Khalāf” whom Bayhaqī, pp. 128, 795, mentions as an important muqaddim of Ghūr may have been the chief of Tamrān for his fortress lay at three days’ distance from Ribāt-i karvān (§ 23, 63.), and he seems to have been a neighbour of Shīrvān (v.i. 50.).

50. As Sārvān (Shārvān ?) comes in the enumeration between Tamrān and Mān-shān one would suggest for it a place near the Falakhar (*Farkhār ?) mountains. Under the name of Shīrān Bayhaqī, 127, probably refers to its chief. During his Ghūr campaign in 411/1020 Masʿūd was joined by Abul-Ḥasan Khalāf (v.i.), “and following the latter came Shīrvān, who was another chief from the frontier of Ghūr and Guzgānān. Masʿūd had gained him to his side and he came with many horse and foot and brought numberless gifts and presents.” Amir Muḥammad [Masʿūd’s brother and governor of Guzgānān, cf. note to § 1] in view of the fact that “this man was living close to Guzgānān employed many stratagems in order to induce him to join him and be on his staff, but he did not listen to him because all the people preferred Masʿūd”. The twofold way of spelling  and would suggest the reading *Sārvān or *Shārvān (cf. Shīr, and Ab-i Sār, and Ab-i Shār).

51. Mānshān is mentioned in the Armenian Geography, Marquart, Erānsahr, 17, 85, and Huchardsan, p. 301, as well as in the T’ang-shu list of provinces incorporated by China towards a.d. 657 after the subjugation of the Western T’u-chüeh, Chavannes, Documents, 71, note 9 a (on I.H., 270, v.i., under 55.). Mānshān was adjacent to Dar-i Andara. If this latter name ("The Gate of Andara") belonged in the first place to the military camp lying at the mouth of the valley above Jahudhān, it would seem probable that the upper valley itself was called Andara, but the term Dar-i Andara in the larger sense could cover that valley, too. Then Mānshān, lying south of the Dar-i Andara (and its valley), must be identical with the Mák valley, watered by the northernmost of the eastern sources of the Murghāb (Māk tagāb, or tagād). The upper part of this valley lies immediately to the south-west of the sources of the Astarāb (the western of the headwaters of the Āb-i Safīd). In § 3, 26. a small lake of Mānshān is mentioned lying close to “B.starāb”. The latter is undoubtedly identical
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with Astarāb, and this detail confirms the identification of Mānshān with Māk. Some day the lake will be found there! The title (nick-name?) *Barāz-bandā “Herdsmen of wild boars (?)” according to I.Kh., 39, belonged to the king of Gharchistān, but the attested title of the latter was shār, v.s., under 36. Consequently our author’s statement merits more credit.

52. Iṣṭ., 270, and Maq., 299, mention Tālaqān under Marvarūd. This Tālaqān, which lay at three marhālas both from Marvarūd and Pāryāb (Ya’qūbī, BGA, iv, 287, counts 4 marhālas from Tālaqān to Pāryāb) must not be confounded with the other Tālaqān in Ṭūkhāristān (v.1. 81.). The names of both places are sometimes spelt Ṭāyaqān. According to Marquart, Ėrānsahr, 80, the Tālaqān of Marvarūd was the Sāsānian frontier-town towards the east. Le Strange, o.c., 423, places Tālaqān at Chachaktu, cf. Zafar-nāma, i, 806, whereas Barthold locates it at Qal’a-Valī.

53. Jahūdān corresponds to Maymana (ancient *Nisāk-i miyānak, Marquart, o.c., 78). Birūnī, Canon: al-Maymana wa huwa (sic) Jahūdān. The military camp (“Gate of Andara”) evidently lay upstream of the town at the mouth of the Pushta (?) valley to which most probably the name Andara belonged, v.s. 51.

54. Pāryāb, now Daulatābād, on the eastern branch of the Āb-i Qaysār. Ṭabarī, ii, 1206 (year 90/709) mentions a king of Pāryāb called ANCELED (?), distinct from the ruler of Jūzjān.

55. Naryān, mentioned in Yāqūt, iv, 775, may correspond to I.H., 322, "Astarāb, Shāhīān, &c.

56. Gurzīvān, Ya’qūbī, 287, Qurzumān, a district from which the Pāryāb and Andkhoi river (Shirīn-Tagāb) takes its outflow, cf. Yāqūt, ii, 59. A ruined town (Shahr-i virān) exists on its eastern side. South of it lies the central part of the Māk valley, v.s., under 51. The district covering the headwaters of the Pāryāb river is still administratively called Darzāb-va-Gurzīvān.1

57. Kundarm, Ya’qūbī, 287, and I.H., 322, كندرم, 270, كندرم, Iṣṭ., 270. It lay in the mountains at one marhala from Jahūdān (and according to § 5, 9 b c. to the east of Anbīr).

58. Anbīr < Anbēr, as in Birūnī, Canon; Ya’qūbī, 287, and Iṣṭ., 270: Anbīr, now Sar-i pul (altitude 2,040 feet) on the eastern of the two rivers of Gūzgān (Ab-i Safīd). The Imām Yahyā b. Zayd b. Ḥasan b. ‘Ali b. Ḥasan b. ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭalīb was killed there, see Yāqūt, i, 370, under Anbīr. Under Anbīr, i, 367, Yāqūt, using a different source, vaguely says: “a town in the neighbourhood of Balkh (?) ; in it was the government centre, it lies on a mountain and is larger than Marv al-rūd.” According to Ṭabarī, ii, 1773, the Imām Yahyā was captured in “a village of Jūzjān”.


60. Ushbūrqān, now Shibarghān,2 downstream of Anbīr (altitude 1,303 feet). As appears from Birūnī, India, 158–9, some “undiscriminating

1 Very curious are the names in -ivān/-īvān in Eastern Iran: Gurzīvān, Shābīvān (district above Farāh), Pārsīvān (usual designation of Persians in Kābul), &c. Cf. also § 36, 38.

2 shāburaqān means “steel”.
Muslim astronomer” placed this town on the 0° meridian passing also through Ujjayn (India), see note to § 10, 18.–24. An echo of this theory is found in Ya’qubī, 287,11.

61. Antkhudh, now Andkhoy, on the lower course of the Āb-i Qaysār. According to Iṣṭ., 270, the town of the district of Antkhudh bore the name of Ushtrurj (Biruni, Canon: آلئم).

62. Under § 5, 9 B Sān is coupled with Chāryak. Both elements survive in the name of the Sangchārak (sic) district in which numerous streams form the eastern headwater of the Āb-i Safīd. Ya’qubī, 287, has اسان و دراز عشاقی which Marquart, o.c., 86, suggests to read as with Arabic § for Iranian č. The Bābur-nāma, GMS, fol. 57a and 184b, gives سان و چهاریک.

63. Of Ribāṭ-i karvān (karvān?) Iṣṭ., 265, says that the Harāt river rises “from its neighbourhood” (min qurb R.-K.), and further, 272, that it belongs to the province (īnam) of Ibn Farīghūn (i.e. the king of Güzgān) and lies on the frontier of Ghūr. Under 49. Tamrān and Tamāzān are placed near Ribāṭ-i karvān, and under § 6, 24. the Balkh river is said to skirt the confines of Mādr and Ribāṭ-i karvān. Following Iṣṭ. one would place Ribāṭ-i karvān on the uppermost course of the Harī-rūd, but the expression min qurb R.-K. is somewhat vague. Our § 6, 24. makes it possible to locate Ribāṭ-i karvān even on one of the westernmost sources of the Balkh river, perhaps on the one which joins the principal stream (Band-i Amīr) at Dahan-i Kāshān. It flows straight south of our 62. and immediately east of the region where we have placed *Tamrān and Tamāzān. Tentatively Ribāṭ-i karvān could be identified with Kūshkh-i khāna standing in the said valley. In Bayhaqī, 494–5, Ribāṭ-i karvān is mentioned as a dependency of Güzgānān and a place of sheep-breeding; ibid., 791, 795, Masʿūd, in his pathetic letter written from Ribāṭ-i karvān after the defeat at Dandānaqān (A.D. 1040) places it at a distance of 6–7 marḥalas from Ghazna.

64.–65. Nothing is known of these two, but with 795–b.n (perhaps *Shing-bun to distinguish it from 43.) we are again near 47. Rivshārān. Coming as it is after Ribāṭ-i karvān which is the farthest point of the Güzgān frontier towards the south-east it may, as an antithesis, mark the south-western extremity of the territory (towards Gharchistan). [See however the additional note to 47.]

66. These Arabs evidently occupied the steppe between Andkhoy and the left bank of the Oxus, now held by the Salor Turcomans. According to I.H., 322, in the steppe of Andkhudh there were 7 villages and the “houses of Kurds possessing sheep and camels”. In this case the term “Kurds” may refer simply to the nomadic habits of the inhabitants, for I.H., 221, uses the same term “Kurds” even with regard to the Kūfīkh of Kirmān (§ 28, 7.).1 The Arabs mentioned in Sulṭān Mahmūd’s troops

1 I.R., 128, says that the Lombards lived "in the Kurdish way" in the steppes round Būšīs (in the plains of Pavia, according to Marquart’s ingenious correction, Streifstüge, 240).
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were very probably recruited from among such nomads, cf. Siyāsat-nāma, ch. xxiv, p. 92.

IV. Province of Balkh.


67. Only for a short time were the Sāsānians masters of Balkh, Marquart, o.c., 47-70, but the discovery of Sāsānian antiquities on the Khulm river renders plausible the existence of Sāsānian vestiges in Balkh as well. The detail about the paintings in the Nau-bihār is very curious. It is not mentioned in the description of the Buddhist Nau-bihār (Nū-bahār) in Yaʿqūbī, 288, Masʿūdī, Mūriǧ, iv, 48, Yaʿqūt, i, 713, iv, 817-18 (after 'Omar b. Azraq al-Kirmānī). The products of Balkh are enumerated after Iṣṭ., 280. Yaʿqūbī, 288, who wrote a century before our author, says that outside the walls of Balkh nothing but sands was found. The existence of marshes in the suburb agrees with the observations of a recent traveller who mentions marshy places in the neighbourhood of Balkh, see Vavilov, Agricultural Afghanistan, Leningrad, 1929, p. 504.

68. Khulm which our author seems to reckon still to Balkh is the present-day Tāsh-Qurghan.

IVA. Ṭūkhāristān.

On Ṭūkhāristān see Marquart's penetrating chapter in Ėrānšahr, 199-248; Barthold, Turkestan, 66-8, and Ṭūkhāristān in EI; Le Strange, The Lands, 427-8. Burḥān al-dīn Kushkakī, Rāḥ-numā-yi Qataghan va Badakh-shān (quoted: Kāshkakī), Russian trans. by A. Semenov and others, Tashkent, 1926 [this valuable and detailed description of the north-eastern corner of Afghanistan was compiled under the orders of the sipahsālār Muhammad Nādir Khan who later became King of Afghanistan].

The notion of Ṭūkhāristān varies with different authors, Marquart, o.c., 229. Barthold in EI quotes Ṭabarī, ii, 1180, where Shūmān and Akharūn belonging to Khuttal and lying north of the Oxus are reckoned to Ṭūkhāristān, but usually only the region east of Balkh and south of the Oxus is understood by Ṭūkhāristān. Neither Yaʿqūbī, 262 (where Khuttal is distinguished from the Upper Ṭūkhāristān) nor I.R., 93 (of which the reading must be improved, see note to § 6, 8.) can be interpreted otherwise. Arab authors usually distinguish between the Lower (western) and Upper (eastern) Ṭūkhāristān. Yaʿqūbī, 290, places the beginning of the latter at Bāmiyān (v.i. 78). Yaʿqūt, ii, 518, is evidently wrong in locating the Lower Ṭ. to the east of the Upper Ṭ. Iṣṭ., 275, 279, has two short paragraphs on Ṭūkhāristān. Our author very probably follows Jayhānī but may also use his personal materials.

The order of enumeration is the following: 68. (lying on the frontier of
Commentary

70. Simingān [so according to Yāqūt, iii, 142, but 'Abdul-Qādir Baghandādī’s Lexicon Shanamianum, ed. Salemān, p. 131, gives Samangān and this corresponds to the common use] and Ru’b (usually mentioned together with Simingān) correspond respectively to Ḥaybak and Rūy which lie upstream from Khulm, on its river. The very curious description of the rock-dwellings evidently refers to the site now known as Qal’a-yi Nūshirvān and Dukhtar-i Nūshirvān, which has been recently explored and described by J. Hackin in Les Antiquités bouddhiques de Bāmiyān, by A. and Y. Godard and J. Hackin, P. 1928, 65–74.

71. Sakalkand. In the enumeration of the localities of Ṭūkhāristān, Ya’qūt, 288, 1ṣ., 275, this town is mentioned between Baghlān and Valvālij but its place in our author is rather in favour of Marquart’s surmise, o.c., 229, 237, that Sakalkand lay south of Baghlān.† Birūnī, India, 149 (transl. 299) says that in the revenue books Sakalkand figured as Fārfza.2 It is possible to identify Sakal-kand with Iskar (Kūshkāki: Iṣkan?) lying in a side-valley, at the entrance to the district of Barfak whose name could be an echo of Birūnī’s Farzār (sic) = Farzār [this restoration seems preferable to Marquart’s Farzār based on a suspect passage, v.s., § 6, 8.]

[Additional note. Some light on the situation of Sakalkand is thrown by Ṭabarī’s report, ii, 1218, of Qutayba’s expedition against Nizak³ Ṭarkhān. The latter having taken up his position in Baghlān, near the source called نبع جام, was expecting the attack from the direction of Khulm but the Arabs aided by the Ru’b-khān, master of Ru’b and Siminjān, succeeded in taking the fort protecting the road. Nizak, obliged to flee, sent his baggage to the Kābul-shāh and himself crossed the Farghāna (?) river and went to Akhrz (فُل طالب رفعانه وعى حتى نزل الكرز). From Akhrz there was only one road of escape for Nizak but it proved too difficult for his horses. Here he

---

1 Cf. also § 5, 9b. (Hindukush).
2 I.Kh., 37, quotes a Farzār under Kābul (the latter being said to lie on the frontier of Ṭūkhāristān). I quote the name merely as a parallel. (In his Das Reich Zābul, 269, Marquart repudiates his former hypothesis (Fārwāf = Qūsān) in Erānšahr, 256). ³ Nīṣuk, Chin. Ni-chou.
was besieged by Qutayba’s brother and finally had to surrender. Most probably Nizak sent his heavy loads along the usual Bāmiyān road up the Doshi river (on which Baghlān is situated). He himself could not help following the same direction by some short cut. He undoubtedly crossed from the left to the right bank of the same Doshi river of which the upper course is now called Barfak. This name must correspond to Bīrūnī’s *فارفاک mutilated in Ṭabarī’s MSS. into فگانه. Above its junction with the Andarāb, this river receives from the right side a small tributary on which stands the village of Iskan (Map: Iskar). Over it climbs the road to the Chahār-dar valley, and to the Chahār-dar pass leading to Ghorband and situated near a Hindukush peak which stands 16,466 feet. Ṭabarī distinctly says that the winter season was well on and Nizak must have been blocked here by the snow. The name the κραζες accepted in the printed text has several variants κραζες κραζες κραζες and it is quite possible that its ṭ has been mis-read from a Sa written in a straight line, while the group ṭℓ may represent ṭς. With the form ṭς we decidedly approach the form ṭςκαζες Iskal-kand, attested in Maq., 49. The difficult name may have been contracted in usual pronunciation, as its present-day avatar Iskan seems to indicate. If this theory is right, the place of Sakalkand in our enumeration is right, showing that it lay upstream from Baghlān, Marquart’s hypothesis (o.c., 219) that Nizak fled in an easterly direction (die Burg Kurz (sic) auf dem Wege zwischen Baghlān und Andarāb) is less satisfactory for it does not explain the names and does not take into consideration Nizak’s natural desire to rejoin his baggage train.

[However, Bīrūnī’s Canon gives:

Baghlān  long. 92°35’ lat. 35°40’
Sakalkand , 92°50’ , 35°50’
Ṭayaqān , 93°0’ , 36°0’

and consequently the position of Sakalkand, between Baghlān and Ṭayaqān (Ṭalqān), if right, would be considerably to the north of Iskan.]

72. Baghlān, on the middle course of the Doshi river (formed by the Surkhāb (= Barfak) and Andarāb).

73. Valvalij corresponds to Qunduz (Kuhan-dis “the fortress”), situated at the junction of the Doshi river with that of Ṭalqān. Bīrūnī, Canon: “Valvalij, the capital of Ṭukhāristān, which in the days of old was the country of the Ḥaytal (Hepthalites)”.

74. Maq., 303, Iskimisht, now Ishkamish, on the western affluent of the Talaqān river. Not to be confused with Ishkāshim, § 26, 14. Marquart, Wehrrot, 86, identifies Ishkamish with the old Tokharian capital, in Chinese Kien shih (<Kam šig) or Shēng Kien shih.

75. The small mountainous kingdom of  NavLink (i) is perhaps identical with NavLink which Ya’qūbi, 288, mentions between Tarakān and Bakhshān. The Talaqān river, formed by the streams of Gulfaqān and Farkhār, receives from the left side an important affluent formed by the rivers of

\[1\] Different from فارفاک <Farkhār, o.s., p. 330, line 39 [?].
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Khost, Chāl, and Ishkāmish. The district Chāl [now united with Ishkāmish], is well known for its salt-mines (kān-i namak), situated near the confluence of the three rivers. This is an important detail for the identification of Yūn. The Chāl valley itself does not seem to have ever risen to prominence, but the Khost valley (खूटिया or خوتو) adjoining Chāl immediately to the east and to the south and communicating with it by several roads, is well known on account of its inexpugnable character, Kūshkākī, o.c., 28. Consequently it is probable that by the prince of Yūn the ruler of Khost is meant. The fact that in our enumeration Khost is not mentioned can be explained by its having been included in Yūn. A lord of Khost could easily have extended his power to Chāl, or, at least, to the salt-mines situated almost at the mouth of his own valley. Another interesting detail is that the king of Yūn was a feudatory of the amīr of Khuttal. Our author is positive in mentioning Talaqān as the easternmost town of Tūkhāristān, and apparently all the localities of the Kokcha basin (left out in the description of the rivers!) were also reckoned to Khuttal, v.i., § 26, 12., 18. A branch of the Khuttal family ruled even in Balkh, v.i. 77. However, the special title of our ruler seems to indicate that he belonged to a local family.

76. Tāyaqān (Talaqān, Tārakān), entirely distinct from 52., is the well-known town lying on the river coming from Farkhār, above its junction with the left affluent mentioned above. Birūnī, Canon, also gives Tāyaqān. On its position v.s., p. 330 ult.

77. Andarāb lies on the south-easternmost headwater of the Doshī river (v.s. 77-79.). This important valley leads up to the Khāvak pass south of which Panjhir is situated. On the north-east Andarāb adjoins Khost. Iṣṭ., 279, names the two rivers of Andarāb: Andarāb and Kāsān (the latter is a right affluent of Andarāb). Our items on the mint and the king are new. The title may be of local origin but in the later part of the ninth century and in the beginning of the tenth Andarāb was chiefly held by the Abū-Dā‘ūdīs of Balkh (a branch of the Khuttal family, § 26, 1.). See on this little-known dynasty R. Vasmer, Beiträge z. Muham. Münzkunde in Wien. Numism. Zeitschr., Band 57 (1924), pp. 49-63. Among the coins struck in Andarāb, Vasmer finally recognizes as belonging to the Abū-Dā‘ūdīs the dirhams of 264-78/877-91, 288/900, 290-4/902-6, and 316-13/922-5. According to Codrington’s Manual coins were struck in Andarāb also by the ʿAbbāsids, Sāmānīds, and Ghaznavids. On the dynasty of Balkh, cf. note to § 24, 12.

78. The statement that Bāmiyān lay “between” Gürgānān and the marches of Khorāsān (§ 24) must be understood cum grano (v.s. 46.). The shēr1 of Bāmiyān is mentioned both in I.Kh., 39, and Iṣṭ., 280. On this dynasty see Marquart, o.c., 93. Yaqūt, i, 481, has the same Persian terms for the famous statues.

79. Iṣṭ., 286: Andarāba to Jārbāya 3 marḥalas, thence to Panjhir one

---

1 Certainly not “lion” as Yaʿqūbī, represents Old Persian xšābriya, Marquart, Erāntāhr, 79.
day, thence to Parvân (§ 24, 21.) 2 marhalas. Maq., 296, gives جاری‌پایه but, 346, جارپایه (*Garpāya?).

80. 1st., 286: Balkh to Madhr 6 marhalas, thence to Kah one manzil, thence to Bāmiyân 3 marhalas. Madhr is situated in the basin of the Surkhāb which after its junction with the Andarāb coming from the east, forms the Doshi (v.s. 76.-79.). Mūy corresponds perhaps to Kah which is now called Kā-Mard. The combination مدر و مرن figures in the report of Sabuktegin's death, Ţabaqat, Raverty's trans. 75, cf. M. Nāzīm, Sultan Maḥmūd, 32. [Mūy can hardly stand for Rū' (Tabarī, ii, 1219: Ru'b) lying upstream from Sīmīgān on the Khulm river.]

§ 24. Khorasanian marches

By the ḥudūd, in a special sense (see Barthold, Preface, p. 30), our author means the frontier regions (marches) of Khorāsān (§ 24) and Transoxiana (§ 26).

Maq., 337, speaking of the "Eastern Clime," says that over its whole extent the provinces and khūṭba belonged to the Sāmānīd family; but the princes of Šījistān, Khwārazm, Ghārj al-shār, Jūzjān, Bust, Ghaznīn, and Khuttal sent only presents (hadayā) and the Sāmānids were gratified with this substitution for the kharāj. "The (Sāmānīd) commander of the army resides at Nishāpūr; Šījistān is in the hands of the family of 'Amr b. Layth, Ghārj in those of the shār, Jūzjān in those of the Fārīghūn family and Ghaznīn and Bust are in the possession of the Turks."

In spite of the introduction to § 23 where he mentions the mulūk-i aṭrāf, our author seems to treat the subject of § 24 not so much from the political as the simply geographical point of view. Therefore Ġūzgānān and Gharchistān, though enjoying a particular feudal status yet being hemmed in by the provinces of Ĥarāt, Marv, and Balkh, are described under Khorāsān (§ 23). In § 24 only the more southern zone is described (chiefly the basins of Sīstān and Kābul) with the addition, in the east, of the buffer territory of Badhakhshān stretching between Ťukhāristān [of which the frontier-points were Tāyaqān, Andarāb, Bāmiyân, and Panjhir, § 23, 76.-79.] and the southern dependencies of Khuttal (§ 26, 12.-20.).


I. Ghūr.

1. Although our author had, in Ġūzgānān, exceptional opportunities for collecting information on Ghūr, the present paragraph is desultory. It is not at all clear in what relation Ghūr stood to Darmashān1 which (§ 23, 48.)

1 D.rm.shān or Vrm.shān may be a popular expression ("dominions of the family of D.rm.sh/Varmish"), whereas Ghūr as a merely geographical term may be due to literary sources.
occupied the space between Gūzgānān and Bust. L. Dames, Ghūr, Ghūrī in EI, admits that in the beginning there must have been several clan chiefs in Ghūr but considers as its central region the basin of the left affluent of the Farah-rūd which still bears the name of Ghūr. This locality is exactly within the area of our “Darmashān” and consequently for all practical purposes Darmashān looks identical with Ghūr. Ist., 272, 281, 285, defines the limits of Ghūr as follows: the Harāt province down to Farah, then to Baladay-Dāvar (v. i. 12.), then to Ribāt-i kvarān (§ 23, 63.), then to Ghar-chistān, then back to Harāt. In any case Ghūr comprised the upper part of the Harī-rūd for (Ist., 285) one entered Ghūr at қẖe [{'superscript': '1'}] situated to the east of Aua (now Oba). The name қẖe must undoubtedly be қẖe, as in ānuṣhat al-qulub, 154, and correspond to the present-day Khwāja-Chisht. The name of the old capital of Ghūr is not found in Arabic geographers, but Āhangarān was considered as its important place at the time of Sulṭān Maḥmūd’s campaigns, see Ṭabaqāt-i Nāṣirī, p. 321, and Muḥammad Nāẓim, Sulṭān Maḥmūd, pp. 70-3, as well as in Mongol times, ānuṣhat al-qulub, 150. As the latter source assigns to Āhangarān the position of long. 99° and lat. 35° (Gūzgān lay at long. 98°, lat. 35°20’), it is clear that this capital is identical with the present-day Āhangarān, situated at 260 Km. east of Harāt, at a point where a road coming from the north (from Maymana = Yāhūddān) crosses the Hari-rūd (to the south of the Shorak pass). As the home of the ruling Shaniṣpād dynasty very often is named M. n. d. sh or Maṇdāsh (probably *Maṇdēsh to judge by the popular etymology in the Ṭabaqāt, 308); it lay at the foot of the lofty mountain Zār-i Murgh but its exact position is not known, ibid., 318.

Bayhaqi’s report on Mas’ūd’s campaign in Ghūr in 411/1020 contains many valuable details, but the geographical and personal names in the printed edition are in a very unsatisfactory state. Mas’ūd reached the frontier of Ghūr in 6 stages by the road up the Harī-rūd described by Ist., 285, and Maq., 347 (cf. also Maq., 307). He entered Ghūr at Bāgh-i Vazār, the first ribāt of Ghūr beyond қẖe (*Buṇ-i Chisht?). Mas’ūd was accompanied by two chiefs of Ghūr: Abul Ḥasan Khalaf (v.s., § 23, 49.) and Shīrvān (v.s., § 23, 50.). After the conquest of the fortresses of қẖe and қẖe (or Қẖe) қẖe march to his chief goal қẖe (Maṇdēsh) the residence of қẖe Varmash-bat, Varmash-pat? situated at 10 farsaks’ distance (from R.zān?). Varmash-bat was subdued and had to surrender the fortresses of Ghar-chistān, which he had seized. See Bayhaqi, pp. 127-35 [Tehran ed., 111: Chisht, ʃ.ʃ.wos, V.rmysh-b.t.], cf. Ṭabaqāt, 326.

Ist., 272, particularly insists upon Ghūr being a dār al-kufr and finds an

---

1 In Bīrūnī’s Canon two points are mentioned in Ghūr: Қẖe. *K. jūrān lying in the mountains and “Rūf, capital of Āhangarān, also lying in the mountains”:

Қẖe long. 89° 0’ lat. 33° 0’
Rūf " 89° 0’ " 33° 30’

cf. the co-ordinates quoted under § 23, 47. In the description of Ghūr the author of the Ṭabaqāt-i Nāṣirī (Raverty, p. 319) places in the mountain of V.r.mū "the territories of Dāvar (?) and Vālīššt [§ 24, 18.7], and the castle of K.jūrān’’.
II. Sístān.


5. The detail not found elsewhere.

9. Bust (now Qal’a-yi Bist) was situated at the confluence of the Hilmand with the Arghandāb (Maq., 304, calls the latter خردوری). The Turkish ruler whom Maq., 337 (writing in 375/985) mentions in Bust, is certainly Maḥmūd’s father Sabuktegin, who had seized Bust soon after 366/977, cf. M. Nāzīm, o.c., pp. 29–33. Our author must also have in view Sabuktegin while speaking of “Bust” as being conterminous with Gūzgānān, § 23, 46. and § 24, 12. The Farīghūnids lived at first on excellent terms with the Ghaznavids, v.s., notes to § 1. The following route in Istā, 252, is useful for the understanding of our text: “from Bust [via Firūzqand] to Sarvān 2 marhālas along the road of Balad al-Dāwar; then the *Hidhmand is crossed at a marhala beyond (min) Sarvān and the traveller enters Till; thence a marhala to Darghash lying on the Hidhmand on the same bank; from Till to Baghnīn 1 day in the qiblt (western, or south-western?) direction; Bishlang lies in the southern direction of Baghnīn”, cf. Le Strange, o.c., Map viii.
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11. On the road from Bust to Zamīn Dāvar (v.s. 9.) Iṣṭ., 248, mentions as the first stage Fürūzqand (v.i. 17.) from which, Maq., 349, a road branched off towards Ghaznīn. In spite of some outward likeness al-yun, which cannot be ṭamm, of which which lay far too east beyond Panjvāy, perhaps on the site of Qandahār, cf. Iṣṭ., 251, and Gardīzī, ed. M. Nāẓim, p. 14, where Ya'qūb b. Laith marches from Sīstān to Bust and then to Panjvāy, Tekīnābād, and Ghaznīn. On the other hand Maq., 304, says that at half a farsakh from Bust in the direction of Ghaznīn there was a township called al-'Askar in which the governor resided. Perhaps this ṭamm al-askar or ṭamm al-makr (? the reading does not seem certain) is responsible for our mysterious al-yun which, then, ought to figure under 9. and not 10. Another suggestion is found in Ya’qūb’s, 281, interesting list of kūras of Sijistān: Bust, Juvain, Rukkhak, Khushshak, Khwāsh, Zaranj. Is al-yun = ️?

12. Iṣṭ., 244, speaks of Bilād al-Dāwar under Sīstān, whereas Maq., 305, writes: “There are some people who reckon this kūra to Sijistān, and such is the opinion of Abū Zayd al-Balkhī, but the minority discriminates between its towns and Sijistān.” Maq. himself describes it under Bust. At the time of the Arab conquest Zamīn Dāvar had a separate marzubān, Marquart, Ėrānšahr, 37. It is also possible that a special position for this region was created by the still obscure expedition of the governor of Balkh Dā’ūd b. Abī Dā’ūd (b.) ‘Abbās (of the Khuttalān family, § 26, r.) against the king of Zābulistān Fürūz. This expedition must have taken place before 258/872 when the ṣaffārid Ya’qūb occupied Balkh where Dā’ūd b. ‘Abbās was ruling. See I.Kh., 180., Masʾūdī, Muriṭ, viii, 42, Marquart, Ėrānšahr, 40, 302. In his description of the frontier of Ghūr I.H., 323 (= Iṣṭ., 272) curiously enough replaces Iṣṭ.’s unexpected Baladay Dāwar, “the two districts of D.” (?), by Balad banī Dā’ūd b. ‘Abbās. This substitution suggests that for a time some members of the Khuttalān family remained in possession of Zamīn Dāvar until they were dispossessed probably by Sābuṭegin.

Till and Durghash (many variants) lay on the right bank of the Hilmand. Marquart, Das Reich Zābul, p. 271, locates these two towns at Daravāt, east of Baghni, cf. Le Strange, o.c., Map viii. Here, too, he places the site of the famous sanctuary of the [Indian] god Zūn (Zūn) in whose honour the king of Zābul was called *Zunbil (so instead of Rutil!) and of whom a second sanctuary was known in Ubula (§ 33, 9.), ibid., 285. Marquart thinks that Zamīn(-i) Dāvar means “the land of the Just One”, i.e. of Zūn (cf. Ṭīwād and Zundaber of the Christian authors), cf. Minorsky, Zūn in EI. Bayhaqī, 125, says that peacocks were bred in Zamīn Dāvar in great numbers (khāna-zād-and dar Z.-D.) and adds, 123, that Māḥmūd considered Zamīn Dāvar as “blest” (mubārak) “for it was the first governorship which Sābuṭegin gave him”. It is not clear whether Zamīn Dāvar originally belonged to the region traditionally called Zābulistān, see Ėrānšahr, 37, 39. The term Zābulistān is very vague, see Nushat al-qulūb,

1 The consonantal resemblance of Zābul and *Zunbil looks merely fortuitous.
p. 146 (Zavul), cf. Barthold, Zur Gesch. d. Saffäriden in Festschrift Nöldeke, p. 188, note 4. As however Marquart, Das Reich Zabul, 282, connects the name Zabul (Maq., 299, Chinese Tsau-ki-ta) with the Indian name for saffron (jāgudā) the special mention of saffron in Darghush found in our author is a suggestive detail.

13.-15. belonging to Ghur seem to represent the part of “Darmashān” (§ 23, 48.) depending on Bust. Here the practical identity of “Darmashān” and Ghur is obvious. Ist., 244, says: wa Bilād al-Dāvar ʾiqlimun khīsbun wa huwa thagrūn lil-Ghur wa Baghnīn va Khalaj va Bishlān va Khāsh (var. ḥās-) wa layya ’alayhā (i?) sūrun wa lahā qalʿatun. Though the text is out of order (cf. Marquart’s tentative restoration, Ėrānsahr, 252) the mention of these places after, or under, Bilād al-Dāvar must be attributed to the latter’s situation on the frontier of Ghur. Baghnī and Bashling are still shown on the maps. Our ʿasās-खराबेदn certainly corresponds to Ist.’s ʿasās-खराबेद and must be distinguished from 8. ʿasās (lying on the left bank of the river Khwāsh and placed by Ist., 252, at ʿi marhāla from Qarnīn). Bayhaqī, 127, also describes ʿasās-खराबेद as “a province of Ghur adjoining Bust and Zamīn-Dāvar in which the unbelievers were slithier (palītār) and stronger (than elsewhere)”. In 405/1015 Maḥmūd led an expedition against it.

16. Rukhudh, Ist., 244, and I.H., 303, spell Rukkkhaj, but Maq. has Rukkhudh (according to Marquart, o.c., 225, *Rakhwad). It is the ancient Arachosia, i.e. the region of Qandahār watered by the Arghan-dāb and situated between 12. and 18. Qandahār is mentioned in I.Kh., 56, and Yaʾqūbī, 281, but not in Ist., I.H., or Maq., who, like our author, name ʿasās-खराबेद the chief place.

17. Kuhak, Ist., 244, belonged to Rukkhaj, while Rūdhan, Ist., 248 [= Balābdhūrī, 396, R. sān?] was situated in the neighbourhood of Firūzqand (var. Firūzfand; v.s. 11.), to the left of the road leading to Rukkhaj, and its produce was salt.

18. ʿasās as in Ist., 244 (var. Bālish). Maq. has both this form, 486, and Vālshtān, 207. Cf. Marquart, Wehrot, p. 124, note 6. This is the well-known region of Baluchistān south of Quetta and the Bolan pass, of which the rivers, though not reaching the Indus, belong to the latter’s basin. Sīvī (Maq., Sīva) lay at 2 marhālas south of Isfinjāy. Our Ėshk, as usual, stands for Arabic Qāshr. Ist., 239, gives Isfinjāy.

III. Ghasnī and Kābul.

19. Ghazaq ʿasās, see Barthold, Preface, 30, is a clerical error for Ghasnī (खशनी) for lower down (22.) Ghasnī is explicitly referred to. Ist., 280, calls Ghazna the trade-port of India (*furdat al-Hind). Our author (v.s. 9.) wrote at the momentous epoch when Sābuktegin was spreading his rule from Ghazna (see Maq., 337, quoted supra, p. 342); but only the words about Ghazna having joined Islam contain a remote echo of the events, v.s. 9.

20. Entirely after Ist., 280, with the difference that the latter speaks of the local shāh [I.H., 328, malīk] while our author makes the raja of Qinnauj receive his investiture in Kābul! Ist. speaks of Ghazna and Kābul under
§ 24  

Khorasanian Marches  

347  

the Bāmiyān province ('amal), but Maq., 296, echoing the successes of the Ghaznavids, speaks of a kūra of Ghazna which comprised Kābul and numerous other places (lying chiefly in the south).

21. Cf. Iṣt., 280 and Maq., 296. Bīrtīnī, Canon, mentions "the fortress of *Sukāvand in the *Lahogār → Logar rustaq"; the latter is the valley of the southern affluent of the Kābul river. In Sukāvand stood the temple of an Indian goddess (Marquart, Catalogue, 89; Sukhavatī = Lakṣmī) which was plundered by 'Amr b. Layth circa 283/897, cf. Erānsahr, 296. Maq., 349, gives the following route: Ghaznīn–Ribāt al-Bārid–Bīrtīnī–Khalaj. Consequently Istākh (Asnākh, &c.) lay at two marhalas to the north of Ghaznī towards Bāmiyān.

22. As regards Ṭukhāristān the name *Khallukh standing in our text is right and confirms § 23, 69. On the contrary, with reference to Ghaznīn, Bust (and probably Gūzgānān, cf. Masūdī, Murūj, iii, 254, and v.i. quotation from the Ḥahān-nāma) it must be taken for *Khalaj. Like Ṣukavand the vast Khazar (§ 50) and Ġorē Jurz (§ 42, 15.) the complex *Khālak is a source of endless confusion for Muslim geographers. The locus classicus on the Khalaj is Iṣt., 245: "The Khalaj are a kind of Turks who in the days of old came to the country (stretching) between Hind and the districts of Sijistān, behind Ghūr. They are cattle-breeder (ahl al-na'am) of Turkish appearance (khilaq), dress, and language." Marquart, Erānsahr, 251–4, sees in the "Khalach, or better Kholach" remnants of the Hephthalite hordes (cf. Khuwārizmī's curious passage quoted in the note to § 26, 10.) and he further connects the restored form *Kholach with the names Khulas (mentioned in a Syriac source under A.D. 554) and Xolārāi (used by the ambassador Zemarchos in 569). This development (based chiefly on Masūdī, Murūj, iii, 254, v, 302) still awaits further confirmation. I.Kh., 31, says: "The lands of the Turks are as follows: the Toghuqghuz whose country is the most extensive among the Turks and borders on China, Tibet, and Khālukh (al-Year)." In this statement the Khalaj are distinctly separated from the Khalukh No. 1 (to whom the variant Khalaj belongs). In another passage, ibid., 28, I.Kh. seems to contradict himself: having placed the winter quarters of the Khalukh near Kašrā-bās (in the neighbourhood of Ṭarāz, § 25, 93.) he unexpectedly adds: "and near them are the winter (sic) quarters of the Khalaj (var. al-Shirt)". To say nothing of the distance, it is absolutely unimaginable that a tribe living on the western side of the Oxus could travel to its winter quarters across two such rivers as the Oxus and Jaxartes! Either the names

1 It is noteworthy that in the oldest Arabic poems the names Türkūn wā Kābulu are constantly used together though perhaps only as a sort of "Ultima Thule", cf. Kowalski, Die ältesten Erwähnungen der Türken in der arabischen Literatur, in Kürsii Csoma Archivum, ii/1–2, pp. 38–41.
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Khārlukh and Khalaj in this passage are only two variants of the same name (خَلَعَجَ), or the second name refers to some small and otherwise unknown tribe, distinct from the Khalaj. Only such a tribe (in view of the variant), and not the Khalaj, could be a remnant of the hypothetical *Kholach. As regards Masʿūdī, Murūj, iii, 254, and v, 302, where the Turks, the أئش و الخلج are mentioned in the region adjoining Sīstān and stretching towards *Gharch and Bust, it is possible that the term Ghās refers to the Khalaj. Kāshgharī, iii, 307, precisely says that the Oghuz consisted of 24 clans but the two Khalaj clans separated from the federation, and “therefore these two are not [evidently: now] counted as of the Oghuz”. Masʿūdī could have in view only the language and the general appearance of the Khalaj and not their intertribal policy and relations. In this case Masʿūdī’s Khārlaj stands not for Khalaj (*Kholach) but simply for the Khārlukh who were not Oghuz but whose early penetration into Ṭukhāristān is a well-known fact. From Ṭukhāristān a group could easily push farther to the south.

The Khalaj Turks are the putative ancestors of the well-known Afghan tribe Ghalzay (Ghilzāʾī, Ghiljāʾī). This fact has been doubted by L. Dames in his article Ghalsāi in EI, but reaffirmed by Barthold, Khalaj, and T. W. Haig, Khalajī, in the same Encyclopedia. In favour of the latter opinion may be quoted an interesting passage from the rare ǧihān-nāma written circa A.D. 1200–20 by Muḥammad b. Nājīb Bākrān (fol. 17 of the copy bound together with the Ḥ.-ʿA. MS. and fol. 206 of Bibl. Nat., anc. fonds pers. 324):

"The Khalaj (Kh.l.j) are a tribe of Turks who from the Khārlukh limits emigrated to Zābulistān. Among the districts of Ghāznī there is a steppe where they reside. Then on account of the heat of the air their complexion has changed and tended towards blackness; the language, too, has undergone alterations and become a different dialect. A tribe of this group went to the limits of Bāvard and founded some settlements. By mistake (in writing) the people call the Khārlukh Khalaj."

23. Parvān situated at the confluence of the Ghōrband and Panjīhīr rivers ought to come geographically after § 23, 79., but just between them must have passed the frontier of Ṭukhāristān and Kābul. Parvān is still shown on the maps to the north-east of Chārkār. There may be possibly another Parvān in the upper Logār valley between Ghāznī and Bāmīyān, where Raverty, Ṭabagāt, pp. 288, 1021, and 1042, places the battle between the Mongols and Jalāl al-dīn, cf. Barthold, Turkestan, 441, note 6. No such name, however, figures in the itinerary quoted in the note to 21.
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IV. Badakhshan.

24. The itineraries of Arab geographers to the east of Balkh usually stop at Talaqán (§ 23, 76.). However, Ya’qūbī, 288, in his enumeration of the towns of Balkh, and following on the towns of Tārakān (Talaqān), and Badakhshan mentions “the town of Jirm (v.i. 25.) which is the last of the eastern towns following on Balkh, towards the country of Tibet (m-immā yali Balkh ilâ nāhiyati balad al-Tubbat)”. Here the territory of Badakhshān is implicitly reckoned to Balkh. Coming another time from the north Ya’qūbī, 292, winds up his description of the road Tirmīdī-Chaghānīyān –Khuttal as follows: “and from Khuttal [the road goes] to Upper Ťukhāristān and the kingdom of Khumar-big, king of Shiqīnān, and Badakhshan, and from it [i.e. Khuttal] the great river [Oxus stretches up] to Shiqīnān, and this all is Upper Ťukhāristān.”

Iṣṭ., 279, speaks of Badakhshan (or Balakhshan) and its products (garnets, lapis-lazuli, musk from Tibet and Vakhān) jointly with Khuttal, but a little above, 278, assigns to Badakhshan a more special position: “it is a clime (iqlīm) with rustāqs; its town is Badakhshan; it is the kingdom of Abūl-Fath.” I.H. drops this passage and nothing more is known of this prince (who must have been one of the scions of the Khuttal house, Marquart, O.C., 302).

Maq., 296, places Badakhshan under Balkh but outside the towns of Ťukhāristān, and adds, 303: “Badakhshān which is con-terminous with the country of the Turks [Ya’qūbī’s Khumār-beg?] lies above Ťukhāristān; there is a mine in it of the precious stone resembling the ruby (yāqūt) and there are no other mines of it except this one, and this (place is called) “Ribāt Fādil” (ربی رباط فاصل). There (also) stands a wonderful fortress (built) by [Hārūn al-Rashīd’s wife] Zubayda, and there (also) are found mines of lapis lazuli, (rock)-crystal, bezoar-stone, wick-stone (asbestos) . . . and a stone which being placed in a dark house lights up the smallest objects.”

Our author in this short paragraph follows Iṣṭ. only adding that there are merchants in Badakhshan and that silver is found in it. He solves the difficulty about the special position of Badakhshan by including it in his category of “Khorāsānian marches”. In § 23, 75., we have an important indication as to the little kingdom of Yūn (?) depending on Khuttal. If Yūn, belonging still to the system of the Qunduz river, was under Khuttal, one cannot help admitting that the Kokcha basin situated east of Yūn

1 Such is the editor’s vocalization confirmed by the Chinese Shīh-kī’-ni, Chavannes, Documents, 162; but starting from the present-day Shughnān one could read the name as *Shugnān.

2 Masʿūdī, Tāmbīh, 64, says that the Jayhūn rises beyond the ribāt of Badakhshan situated at 20 days’ distance from Balkh at the very end of its province. This ribāt stands over against various kinds of “Turks”, viz. Aukhān (*Vakhān), Tubbat (Tibet), and Ayghān (?), cf. Marquart, Wehrot, 100. Niṣām al-mulk, Sīyāsāt-nāma, 128, confirms the statement that Zubayda built “on the frontier of Kāshghar (sic) a mighty town which she called Badakhshān, as well as several strong ribāts in the same region”. [Ayghān < possibly *Abghān, as I. Athīr, xi, 108, 110, calls the Afghāns.]
could not escape the same suzerainty (see above Išt., 278, on the prince Abul-Fath).

25.-27. prima facie are unknown, but as they follow on Badhakhshan they must be sought in the neighbourhood. See on them also § 26, 12.-17.

25. The "Gate of the Arabs" built by Ma‘mūn stood perhaps near Jirm which is described by Ya‘qūbī, 288, as the last of the towns of Balkh in the direction of Tibet. Jirm lies in Badhakhshan, south of its present capital Faydābād, see Kūshkakī, o.c., 120-34. The place of the gate would be between Jirm and Zaybāk (§ 26, 12.), e.g. at Bahārak or in the Zardiv valley, so as to intercept the traffic coming from Vakhān and the countries neighbouring on the latter (Chitrāl, Gilgit, Kāshghar). As regards the construction of the gate it is not known whether Ma‘mūn himself ever visited Badhakhshan, but in 196/811-12 he appointed Fādīl b. Sahl, governor of the eastern provinces "from Hamadān to the mountain of Shiqinān and Tibet", Tabarī, iii, 341. Very probably Maq.'s Ribāt Fādīl (v.s.) stands for *Ribāt al-Fādīl. However, if we leave aside Ma‘mūn's name it will be easier to suppose that the ribāt of Badhakhshan was, at an earlier date, built by the Barmakid Fādīl b. Yahyā b. Khālid as a counterpart to the gate built by him in Rāsht (see note to § 26, 9.). The advantage of this hypothesis would be that we know for certain (Ya‘qūbī, 304) that Fādīl b. Yahyā whom Hārūn al-Rashid appointed governor of Khorāsān in 178/794 "conquered a number of kūras of Ṭūkhāristān, of Kābulshāh, and of Shiqinān", i.e. exactly in the region interesting us. Tabarī, iii, 631, says of Fādīl’s activities in Khorāsān: wa banā bihā al-māsājid wa-riḥātāt. Ya‘qūbī, Historiae, ii, 492, mentions Fādīl’s victory over the Turks near Tālaqān.

26. The special mention of Muslims shows that S.Eng.s lay amid an infidel region. A pass called سکس Sanglich quoted under § 26, 16.? does not seem to exist in the Hindūkush unless this name be identical with *سکل Sākla. It is possible that our author has twice over described the same locality, once as an extension of the Badhakhshan territory and another time as a branch of the road from Khuttal to Kashmir (§ 26, 12.-20.). In this case our Dar-i Tāsiyān would be identical with Dar-i Tubbāt (§ 26, 12.) and the pass of سکس Sākla (perhaps *سکل Sākla which is a possible Arabic rendering of Sanglich) would be the Dora pass.

27. The simplest solution is to restore شقین Shaqīna for Shughnān, the region lying downstream from Vakhān on both banks of the Upper Oxus where the latter having changed its course flows south to north. The usual spelling is شغنا Shugnā, cf. Ya‘qūbī, 292, I.Kh., 37 (in the revenue list of the Tāhirid ‘Abdullāh), and I.R., 89, but I.Kh., 178, mentions a ford on the Oxus leading to "the Turks" called Shakīna" and Išt., 290, gives exactly Shaqīna. Our author only occasionally mentions Shakhnān (§ 5, 9a and 9b, § 6, 6.) coupled with Vakhān but forgets to describe this country. See Minorsky, Shughnān in EI. As the name of "a large village" Shaqīna at

1 See note to § 26, 1α: road from Khuttal.
§ 25. Transoxiana


The chief source of this chapter is Ist.'s (<Abū Zayd Balkhi’s) excellent account (pp. 286-346) of the Mā-warā' al-nahr. Farther to the east, especially in Farghāna, I.H.’s additions (in his account of Transoxiana, pp. 335-406) offer some useful parallels, and for the regions lying beyond the Jaxartes several names could be found only in Maq. In the region of Chaghāniyān there are some points of special likeness with I.Kh. and I.R.


The bearings of the frontiers are again (as in § 23, &c.) given as if the author was facing north-east:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H.-‘A.</th>
<th>Real bearing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tibet</td>
<td>v. i. 58.</td>
<td>E. SE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khorāsān</td>
<td>S.</td>
<td>S. to SW.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghūz and Khallukh (?)</td>
<td>W.</td>
<td>W. to NW. (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khallukh</td>
<td>N.</td>
<td>NE. (?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Iṣt., 286, shows a similar peculiarity of orientation while he quotes as the Transoxian frontier in the east (in a straight line): Pāmnir, Rāsh, and the parts of Hind adjoining Khuttal; in the west (?) (in a semicircular line): the Ghuzz and Kharlukh from Ṭarāz to Fārāb, Biskand, Sughd, and then the districts of Bukhārā up to the Khwārazm lake; in the north: the Turks and Kharlukh from the extreme limits of Farghāna to Ṭarāz; in the south (in a straight line): the Jayhūn from Badakhshān to the Khwārazm lake.


**Khorasanian Marches**
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§ 25

Of the general remarks very few are not in Ist., 286–95, 312–13, such as the mention among the products of sulphur and arsenic (v.i. 66.).

I. Province of Bukhārā.


II. Province of Sughd.


9. Zarmān (numerous variants), Ist., 334, 343, between Rabinjan and Samarqand at 1 farsakh’s distance from Ishtikhan.

11. This Farinkath, now Prinkant, not mentioned in Ist., I.H., or Maq., but found in Yaqūt, iii, 885, is entirely different from 74. It lay north-west of Samarqand towards Ishtikhan, see Barthold, Turkestan, 96. *Ganjkath must lie in the same region.


From the Fihrist, 337, we know that under Muqtadir (a.d. 997–32) the Manichaeans, in fear for their lives, fled to Khorāsān. Some 500 of them gathered in Samarqand and the [Sāmānid] ruler of Khorāsān would have killed them, but for a warning from the “king of China, but I think [says al-Nadīm] from the lord of the Toghuzghuz”, who threatened to take reprisals against the Muslims living in his country. This diplomatic protection may account for the security which the Manichaeans in Samarqand enjoyed perhaps down to our author’s times.

III. Basin of the Kashka-dāryā.

IV. Basins of the Chaghān-rūd and Kāfirnīhān.


25–35. Cf. Barthold, Chaghānīyān, in EI. Maq., pp. 283, 290, says that there were 16,000 villages and 10,000 warriors in Chaghānīyān, though economically it was inferior to Khuttal (§ 26, 1). On the rulers of Chaghānīyān of the Āl-i Muḥtāj dynasty see Muḥammad khān Qazvīnī in his edition of the Chahār-maqāla, pp. 163–6. For the position of 27–33 the following “route of Chaghānīyān” quoted in I.Kh., 33–4 (Qudāma, 211) is essential: Tirmidh to Ṣarmanjān (Charmangān) 6 farsakhs; thence to Dārzanjī 6 f.; thence to Brunjī 7 f.; thence to Şaghānīyān 5 f.; thence to Şagān 6 f.; thence (across a wādī which is 2–3 f. wide?) to H. mvārān 7 f.; thence to *Abān Kasavān 8 f.; thence to Shūmān 5 f.; thence to Vāshjīrt 4 f.

26. 28–31. Cf. Išt., 339–40 (without our details). The town of Chaghānīyān corresponds to the present-day Denau (Dīh-i nāw). 26. lay certainly south of the town of Chaghānīyān (in view of Yaʿqūbī, 289, دارنکا the name must be *Dārzanjā) and the other four towns on the various roads diverging from the Chaghānīyān town in westerly and northerly directions. 28. in view of our detail is Baysun. 29. may be Zīnā-āb (north of Denau). 30. towns perhaps better than aqra, Išt., 340, Maq., 268 (many variants). 31. must be Regar (half-way on the road from Denau to Qaratagh, see note to § 6, 11.); Išt. gives رگدشت (var. رگ) and Maq., 268, Rykdsht <*rēg-dasht. [Rēg-ar, cf. lang-ar, Cand-ar.]

32. Hamvārān is not in Išt. but has a parallel in I.Kh., v.s. 25. On the river K.s.vān “near” (?) which our author places Hamvārān see § 6, 11. Hamvārān may be identified with Qaratagh and *Abān-Kasavān with Ḥišār which already lies in the Kāfirnīhān (Kasavān?) basin.

33. Shūmān mentioned usually together with Akharūn was a considerable principality, Marquart, o.c., 226, probably comprising the Kāfirnīhān basin, or rather its upper part. The town of Shūmān may have lain on the site of Du-shanba (now Stalinābād), capital of the small Tājikistān republic. Gardizi, ed. M. Nazim, p. 36, counts 12 farsakhs from Chaghānīyān to Shūmān, probably by a short cut.

34. Aftīn (in Arabic: فشگرد and درشگرد) *Vēshgīrd or Vēshagīrd is explained by Marquart, o.c., 227, as *Vēsagīrd, i.e. the legendary town of Vaṣa, Frānrašiyan’s henchman, which Yasht, v, 57, places in the Xšaθrō-suka defile, high up in Kaňha (Sughd). Vēshgīrd must correspond to Faydābād.
on the Īlāq, left affluent of the Kāfirnīhān river. Īlāq is mentioned in Iṣṭ., 340, as the next station situated at one day's distance from Vēshagird towards the east, but from Vēshagird on the road may have followed this river. On Shaqiq Balkhī see 'Aṭṭār, Tadhkīrat al-awliyā, ed. R. A. Nicholson, i, 196-202. Ibn al-Aṭṭīr, sub 194/809, says: "in this year was killed the hermit (ṣāhid) Shaqiq Balkhī during a Muslim expedition (ghasāt) to Kūlān in the Turk country", cf. § 15, i.

The identification of 27., 32.-35. would roughly follow the distances indicated in Arabic sources, at the rate of 4 Km. to one farsakh:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Šaghāniyān</th>
<th>Denau</th>
<th>13 (2 days)</th>
<th>55</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hamvārān</td>
<td>Qaratagh</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abān Kasavān</td>
<td>Ḫīṣār</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shūmān</td>
<td>Du-shanba</td>
<td>one day</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afdiyan (?)</td>
<td>Kāfirnīhān</td>
<td>one day</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vēshagird</td>
<td>Faydābād</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. Uṣrūshana.

The name has several readings. De Goeje in Iṣṭ., I.H., and Maq. gives the variant Uṣrūshana but in I.Kh., 29, and Ya'qūbi, 293, Uṣrūshana. Consequently it is safer to render our ʿuṣrūshān as Surūshana though the frequent occurrence in Iranian of the group -šn- would favour the pronunciation *Surūshna. The district, Iṣṭ., 225-7, lay to the west of the Jaxartes on the northern slopes of the Buttāmān mountains (ranges of Turkestān and Zarafshān). Our author says nothing on its former kings called afshīn, I.Kh., 40. The last afshīn was the famous Khaydar (?) b. Kāvūs executed by Muʿtaṣim in 226/841. Iṣṭ. and Maq., 323-6, are silent on the produce of Uṣrūshana. On the market of 39. Marsmanda, cf. Maq., 278. Instead of 41. Faghkāth, Iṣṭ. spells Vaghkāth (now Vagat, Barthold, Turkestān, 167). Sābāt means in Arabic "covered passage, awning". Kurkāth, perhaps ancient Cyropolis (Benveniste)? On 42. Buttāmān, cf. § 5, 9a. Iṣṭ., 327, mentions in the Buttāmān mountains mines of gold, silver, vitriol, and ammoniac. 43. Barghar now Falghar (not to be confused with Pārghar, § 6, 8.). This upper part of the Sughd river was indeed reckoned to Uṣrūshana, Barthold, o.c., 168. On the lake see § 3, 24.

VI. Province of Farghāna.

44. Khūjand (or Khujanda) belonged to Shāsh but lay on the frontier of Farghāna.

45. On the minerals of Farghāna, cf. Išt., 313 and 334 where al-jirāgh-sank [sic] is also mentioned. The kings of Farghāna bore the title of *ikhsād, I.Kh., 40 (Maq., 279, gives this title to the kings of Samarqand, cf. Ya‘qūbī, Historiae, ii, 344).

47. On the Jaxartes see note to § 6, 17.

48. Vāthkath, Išt., 346, places Vān-kath (?) at 7 farsakhs to the northeast of Akhsikath on the frontier of Īlāq.

49. There is nothing corresponding to this paragraph in Išt., but I.H. (who, according to de Goeje, Preface, p. viii, has reproduced the “complete” text of Išt.’s description of Transoxiana) writes, p. 397: وربّى زعيم سرخ من جبال سوكح “quicksilver is produced in Sōkh (sic, cf. BGA, iv, 438) from its mountains”. Our author took سرخ for a special name (cf. variants in I.H., 395) and separately mentioned it almost immediately before Sōkh.

50. Išt., 347: Bāmkakhush. The two villages of the Isfara district in southern Farghāna, I.H., 395, cf. Barthold, o.c., 159, 161. The Sōkh river (51.) is the left affluent of the Jaxartes, watering the Kokand (54.) region, and the Isfara river is the following affluent downstream, parallel to the Sōkh.

52. Išt., 347, Avāl, 10 farsakhs from Sōkh, south of Margelan, Barthold, o.c., 161. Our author follows I.H., 396, in mentioning the villages of Avāl.

53. مسکان which according to I.H., 396, was the town of the Naqād district (نام, var. بینان) mentioned immediately after Avāl.

54. All three in Išt., 335, خوکاند Khwākand is the present-day Kokand (کوکندر).


57. The rivers of Khurshāb and Usrash are found in I.H., 392. Cf. § 6, 18. and 19. where the Ōsh-river (Barthold, o.c., 159) is said to flow between Usrash and Ōsh.


59. Išt., 334: Khaylām (this reading adopted in Barthold, o.c.). Its river is the present-day Narin (§ 6, 21.).

60. The name گورکی كورکی appears in Idrīsī at one day’s distance from Akhsikath (towards the east?), Sprenger, Postroumen, 27. One must distinguish between Bāb-Akhsikath “the Gate of A.”, Išt., 335, in which Barthold, o.c., 162, sees a suburb of A lying on the left bank of the Jaxartes, and Bāb (in our source and at present Pāp), a village lying at 4 farsakhs from A. on the right bank of the river, Išt., 336, I.Kh., 30.
61., 62. In spite of the concluding formula following on 60., these places, too, must have lain in Farghana. The only certain place is Sh.lät, Iṣṭ., 346, S.lät (with variants). According to I.H., 396, S.lät and Biskant lay beyond Miyän-rūdhan, i.e. the district between the two headwaters composing the Jaxartes. I.H. adds that the locality was called Haft-dih “Seven villages” and our 61. may enumerate the remaining five villages.

VI. Province of Ilāq and Shāsh.

63.–83. Cf. Iṣṭ., 328–33. See Map in Barthold, Turkestan.

63. The province Ilāq lay on the Āhangarān river (in Russian: Angren) and was hardly distinguishable from Shāsh (Chāch) situated on the Chirchik, both rivers being right affluents of the Jaxartes, downstream from Farghana, Barthold, o.c., 169. Some “dīhqāns” struck coins in Ilāq even in 388 and 399 a.h., see Markov, Inventarniy Katalog, SPb., 1896, pp. 218–19, and Barthold, o.c., 307.

According to the Mafāṭīḥ al-’ulūm, p. 28, the mubayyida “wearers of white raiment” (in Persian safād-jāmāgān) were the supporters of al-Muqanna’ (“the Veiled Prophet of Khorāsān”) who, as I. Athīr, vi, 25–6, says, placed Abū Muslim above the prophet Muhammad and denied the death of the imām Yaḥyā b. Zayd (v.s., note to § 23, 50.). Cf. Barthold, Turkestan, 197, and Marquart, Histor. Glossen, in WZKM, 1898, 177. On the other hand in Birūnī’s Canon, f. 25, the Zoroastrians of Irānshahr living to the west of the river of Balkh (i.e. Oxus) are distinguished from those who lived beyond that river and were called Mubayyida or Isfandiyāriya, cf. Sachau, Zur Geschichte von Khwārizm, Sitz.WAW, 1873, lxixii, p. 485 (15). [In MS. Or. 1997, fol. 25a below, the name is spelt الإحسان الأقصاریه. Sachau’s interpretation may refer to Isfandiyār’s exploits in Tūrān, but it is more likely that the reading is *al-isfīd-yāriya (< al-isfīd-dāriya, cf. *shahradār > shahriyar)1 of which al-mubayyida is the exact Arabic rendering.]

64. Iṣṭ., 331, calls the provincial capital Tūnkath (variant یکه), cf. Barthold, o.c., 172. According to Russian papers (14.vii.1934) its imposing ruins were found at 90 Km. from Tashkent; the town was well planned and had wide and straight streets, large squares and huge water-tanks; the town walls reached the height of 7 metres.

65. Iṣṭ., 332, I.Kh., 28, ma’dīn al-fīdā. The spelling saym would indicate the pronunciation *sēm instead of the usual sim. The word is derived from (ἀργύρων) ἀργυρος, in Latin (argentum) infectum, i.e. “not-finished, not-coined silver”. The Syriac form is sēmā, cf. H. H. Schaeder, Iranica, 1934, p. 35.

66. Iṣṭ., 332, 345: Dakhkath. The mention of arsenic gives more precision to Maq.’s mention (p. 326) of it (dhul-fūr [sic]) in Ilāq.

67. Iṣṭ., 331: N.mūdhlugh, *Arpalikh (Maq., 265); [Iltiakh, “the Dog village” abest]; Banjkash (Maq., Bānkhash), cf. also under 75.

1 According to Melgunov, the aspen is called, in the Caspian provinces, both اسفنا (‘‘white tree’’) and اسفنا (‘‘white tree’’).
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68. Išr., 345: Sâmsîrâk. 69. خَحَّ، perhaps اَمَّ، Maq., 265 (in Shâsh).


71. Išr., 331: Turkkath; cf. 79.

72. Išr., 329: K.Lsh.y.k, Ardalanâkth, and Ishînghû (in Shâsh); ibid.,


73. Išr., 330: K.dâk, Ghazâk. خُيْلُ ُم، unknown? Išr., 229: Vârdûk,

K.b.r.na, Gh.drank,—all in Shâsh.

74., 75. Išr., 330: Anûdîkâth, Baghûnâkth, Farankâth, Jabghûkâth, all

in Shâsh. In view of several other Turkish names in the region Baghû-

kath could contain the Turkish name Baghûy; cf. Dib-Bâquy (one of Oghuz-

khan’s mythical ancestors). Abul-Ghâzi, ed. Desmains, i, 10, explains that
dîrap means “the place of a throne” and bâquy “the leader of a nation”
(îl-ulûnih).

76. Išr., 331: Sh.kâkâth, Bânjîkâsh (in Ilaq), cf. 67. 77. This Tunkath

is decidedly different from 71.

78. Išr., 331: Bâlâyân (in Ilaq). On the river see § 6, 22. The name is

not found either in A. Markov’s Inventarny Katalog, nor in the list of

mints in Codrington’s Manual of Musulman Numismatics, 1904. The

presence of the mint must probably be connected with the silver-mine of 65.

79. Châch, Arabic Shâsh. On the trees khalang and khâdang see BGA,

iv, 222, 229. Khâdang is mentioned in Transoxiana, Išr., 289a, but not

khalang. [Cf. also notes to § 52.] On the Shâsh bows see Maq., 325.

80.–83. Išr., 328, 330, gives, in a different order, the following parallels:

BÎnkâth, Nûjâkâth, Barkûsh, Khâtûnkâth, D.nf.ghânkâth, Bânûkâth,

Kharashkâth, Bîskâth, Nâjâkâth, K.nk.râk (all with numerous variants).

81. Bînkâth is the present-day Tashkent. Bîrnûnî in his Canon writes:

“کُتْبُک*Bînkâth, chief place of Shâsh; in Turkish and in Greek (called)

Stone Tower (burj al-hijâra)”. The hint is at the popular Turkish etymology
tash “stone” + kând “village” brought into relation with Ptolemaic
liðwos πώρος, v.s., § 9, 12. However *Tâsh-kând most probably con-
tains the name of the province Châch (v.s. 79): Châch-kând or Shâsh-kând
>Tâsh-kând, with a dissimilation similar to ēâdr->Middle Persian tas-
“four”; Shâsh.tar>Arab. Tustar; *sarpîsh>Arab. tarbûsh [see s.v. Turban
in EI]. 81. Nûjâkâth near the Chirchik railway station, Barthold, o.c., 174.

83. خَرَمَك* which Išr., 332, places in Ilaq. Shutûrkâth,

Maq., 342, at a marhala from Bînkâth. On the rivers of 81 see § 6, 17. and

22., cf. Barthold, o.c., 163.

VII. Region of Ispîşâb (*Ispêchâb).

The original part of the Ispîşâb region occupied the basin of the Arîs,
a right affluent of the Jaxartes, downstream from Shâsh, but in a larger sense
it comprised also the adjacent territories on the Jaxartes (though not its
lower course, cf. § 26, 27.) and the Talas valley, Barthold, o.c., 176. Ispîşâb
belonged to the Turks and, though subjugated in A.D. 840 by the Sâmanîd
Nūḥ, still enjoyed great privileges. The town of Ispījāb is the present-day Sayram; on their identity cf. Kāshghari, i, 78.


85. For Sānīkath, Iṣṭ., 346, gives Usbānīkath, and Maq., 263, Arsubānīkath; it lay at 2 days' distance to the north-west of Ispījāb (in Kunjīda, cf. 89.).

86. |I.H., 390, Budakhkath, Maq., 263, Adhakhkath (in Isfījāb); different from 66. Dhakhkath in Īlāq.
87., 88. Pārāb (Pārāb) occupied a small area on both banks of the Jaxartes. Its chief place Kadir is also in Iṣṭ., 346, Barthold, o.c., pp. 176–7. For Sutkand I.H., 335, 391, gives Bīskand; its ruins lie near the Qara-kul lake, Barthold, o.c., 177.

89. I.H., pp. 390–1: Kunjīda; see 85.
90. Şabrān, Iṣṭ., 346, details in I.H., 391.
91. Dharmūkh may correspond to Maq., 263f, 274: Turār-Zarākh: “a town belonging to a rustāq lying behind Saurān [cf. 90.] in the direction of the Turks; it is small and fortified; it possesses a citadel; Zarākh is a village in this rustāq”. It is possible that this ترār is but another spelling for طرār (v.i. 92.) and corresponds to اطرار Otrar where Timur died in 807/1405. It must be carefully distinguished from طرāر (v.i. 93.).

92. Sūnākāh corresponds to “Sughnaq, town of the Ghuz”, in Kāshghari, i, 392; cf. Maq., 323k: طرāر و صحناخ, i.e. Otrar and Sighnakh. In Turkish sīghnakh means “place of refuge”; cf. the name of a town in Georgia and of several places in Qara-bāgh (Transcaucasia). The ruins of Sighnakh are situated at 20 Km. north of the Tūmān-aryq post station, cf. Yakubovsky, Ruins of Sīghnak (in Russian) in the Soobshcheniya Gosudar. Akademii materialnoy kulturi, Leningrad, 1929, pp. 123–59. (It is open to doubt whether سوسor سوس in Iṣṭ., BGA, iv, 424, and Maq., 263g, mentioned under Ispījāb may conceal the name of Sūnākāh).

93. These places belonging to the Talas and Chu basins were situated in the locality which our author calls the “Khallukh Gate”. They lay along the road from Ispījāb to Barskhan, on which see I.Kh., 28–9, and Qudāma, 105–6 (v.s., § 15, 10.). Maq., 263, 274–5, describes them under Isfījāb, though all of them certainly did not belong to the latter. Tārāz (Talas) was situated on the Talas river near the site of the actual Auliyā-Ata and is entirely different from Otrar on the Jaxartes (v.s. 91.). Shalji stood in the mountains at 4 farsakhs to the south of Tārāz, Barthold, Report, 14–17. P. P. Ivanov, K voпросу o древностах o верховьях Talasa, in the Fest-schrift to S. F. Oldenburg, Leningrad, 1934, p. 241–51, identifies Shalji with the ruins of Aq-tapa (near the village Dmitrievskoye) on the upper course of the Talas. Farūnkath (Afrūnkath) is not in the Arabic texts unless it is the ribāt انتن, *Anfarūn (?) which Iṣṭ., 336–7, places in the Qalās steppe, on the frontier between Shāsh and Isfījāb. Between Takābkath and Mīrkī, Maq. mentions Kūlān; both Kūlān and Mīrkī will be found in the description of the Khallukh territory, § 15, 1–2. Their mention in the present paragraph may refer to the time after Nūḥ’s campaign of A.D. 840.
§ 26. Transoxanian marches

These “marches” consist of two entirely distinct groups: the eastern [*south-eastern] one, comprising the localities on the upper Oxus (1.–16.) and the upper Indus (17.–18.) and the western [*northern] one, to which belong Khwārazm (19.–26.) and the localities on the lower Jaxartes (27.). Briefly the two regions can be called Khuttalan and Khwārazm respectively.

As in §§ 23 and 24, the difference between Transoxiana and its marches is more geographical than political, for the amīr of Chaghāniyān (§ 25, 27., to say nothing of 46. Farghāna, 63. Īlāq, and 79. Chāch) is mentioned in Transoxiana whereas his neighbour of Khuttalan ruling over the south-eastern wedge of the territory is included in § 26. See Map ix.

1. Khuttalan, Išt., 349: Khuttal, occupied the area east of the Vakhsh river down to the Panj (cf. § 6, 6.–9.). The principal authorities for the region are: Ya’qūbī, BGA, vii, 289, I.Kh., 37, I.R., 92, Išt., 297, 339, Maq., 283, 290. The pronunciation Khuttalān is confirmed by the popular song quoted in Ṭabarī, ii, 1492, 1494, which is considered as one of the earliest specimens of Modern Persian.¹ The princes of the Bānījūr family bore the title of Shēr-i Khuttalān, I.Kh., 40, Marquart, Erānšahr, pp. 300–2 (genealogy),² Barthold, Khuttal in El. On the celebrated Khuttalān breed of horses (v.i. 3.) see I.Kh., 180 (and transl. 141); cf. Marquart, o.c., 300–1 (Chinese sources), Wehrot, 88 (myths connecting horses with springs).

Following on Saghāniyān, Kharūn, and Māsānd (§ 25, 27., 33., 28.) Ya’qūbī, 289, enumerates without any clear system خراسان (I.Kh., 37, I.R., 92, قزوین, Qub̲ādhiyān, جوز) = Nūdīz, Išt., 298, v.s., § 6, 10.), Vakhsh (≈ Lēvkand), Halavard, Kārbang, Andishārāgh, Rustā Bīk, Hul-buk, and Munk. More useful are the distances quoted by Išt., 339, under “Khuttal and Saghāniyān and the region between them”. Marquart, o.c., 232, has analysed these data, but I believe that two emendations are necessary in the text to render it intelligible. Išt. starts from the two fords on the Jaryāb (Oxus); the one lying higher up on the river is (A) Ma’bar Badhakhshān (v.s., note to § 24, 24.), and the other (B) Ma’bar Ārhan. The former almost certainly is the ford of Bahārak crossed by the road from Rustāq (in the Afghān Badhakhshān) to Kulāb = Hulbuk (in the Soviet Tājikistān); the latter lay near Ḥadrat-Imām-Ṣāḥib, Marquart, o.c., 233, Barthold, o.c., 70. Išt.’s passage consists of several distinct items.

From the Badhakhshān ford (A) to Munk 6 marhālās, thence to the Stone Bridge (on the Vakhshāb) 2 ditto; thence to Lēvkand 2 ditto; (thence) downstream to Halāvārd 1 ditto (both Lēvkand and Halāvārd lying on the Vakhshāb).

From the Ārhan ford (B) to Halāvārd 2 marhālās.³

¹ The name Khuttal as well as several other names of the region (Hulbuk, Munk) sound non-Iranian (Tokharian, Hephthalite?).
² More specially on the Abū Dā’ūdid branch v.s., § 24, 12.
³ This sentence is probably an interpolation. To complete his east-to-west semicircular description Išt. would have better said: “and from Halāvārd to the Ārhan ford.”
From “the” ford (al-mā‘bar)\(^1\) to Hulbuk 2 days; thence to Munk 2 days.

Kārbanj lies above the Ārhan ford, *circa* 1 farsakh.
Tamlıyāt to the Stone Bridge 4 farsakhs (along the Munk road).\(^2\)

From the Badkhshān [read: *Ārhan]\(^3\) ford to Rustāq Bīk 2 marhālas; thence across the Andīchārāgh river (= Ṭā‘ir-su) to Andīchārāgh 1 marhala; thence across the Pārghar river to Pārghar 1 day; (thence) across the Pārghar river [p. 296, I.H., 401, I.B., 347, read *Ṭalवār = Munk river] to Hulbuk (distance left out).

2. At present Hulbag to the south of Kulāb, cf. § 6, 8.
3. “Nuchārā” coupled with Rustā Bīk certainly corresponds to Andīchārāgh (the name has several variants and the alternating of Ġ and Ǧ in them confirms the Ǧ of Nuchārā), see Ya‘qūbī, *BGA*, 279, Išt., 296, 339, Maq., 290 r. Misunderstandings in the available manuscripts and editions have complicated the identification of Andīchārāgh,\(^4\) but Barthold, o.c., 69, is certainly right in placing it near the Ṭā‘ir-su (a small river between the Pārghar and Vakhshāb). In our text we must certainly assume that Nuchārā lay between “*Vakhshāb* (not Ǧarāb Khárnāb) and Jayḥūn”, for placing it between the Khárnāb (= Bārtaŋ, § 6, 7.) and Jayḥūn would upset Išt.’s distances and, as regards the other indications of our text, would be contrary to the order of enumeration and to the item on Nuchārā being the store-place of Khuttalān. Maq., 291, confirms that Andijārāgh lay close to the Jayḥūn, and as regards the mountain mentioned in our text, the hills stretching east of the Ṭā‘ir-su (3,700 feet high) would fulfil this condition as well. Russian sources evaluate at 124 Km. the distance between Ayvāj (situated at the estuary of the Kāfīr-nīhān river, cf. Maq., 292, أرزز في, 292, جوذاي) and Saray lying upstream from it (opposite the Afgān settlement of Ḥāḍrat-Imām-Ṣāḥib). Beyond the Qaraul-tūb post (circa 97 Km. upstream from Ayvāj) the road “ascends the Jīlī-kul plateau, famous for its pastures, on which the Qirghiz and Uzbeks successfully breed horses”, and then near Faydābād [different from the one mentioned in the note to § 25, 35] descends into the thickly inhabited Saray plain, see Prince Masalsky, *Tūrkestanskiy kray*, SPb., 1913, p. 738. Therefore I should more exactly identify Nuchārā to Saray and Rustā-Bīk to Jīlī-kul (lying to the east of the Vakhsh river). The Jīlī-kul pastures must still carry on the Rustā-Bīk

---

\(^1\) Marquart takes it for the just mentioned (B). I decided take it again for (A) in view of the distances: 6 marhālas from (A) to Munk easily = 4 days, with Hulbuk lying half-way; moreover Hulbuk and Munk are on the road leading up from (A) and not from (B).

\(^2\) Tamlıyāt adds another detail to the road first described roughly from (A) to Munk and thence to the Stone Bridge.

\(^3\) I decidedly think that the route stretched entirely on the right bank of the Oxus in a SW. to NE. direction.

\(^4\) Marquart, o.c., 234, following his interpretation of I.R., 92 (o.s., § 23, 69.), placed it on the left bank of the Oxus. Le Strange, *The Lands*, 435, identified the Andīchārāgh river with the Bārtaŋ (= Aq-su, Murghāb, Sarėz in the Parnīs) having taken it for the first affluent of the Oxus, whereas Išt., 296 (= I.H., 347) and Maq., 22, assign to it only a fourth place.
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tradiations, now one thousand years old! Some coins struck in Andichärâgh have come down to us. See Markov, Invent. Katalog.

4. Now Pârkhar, east of the river formed by the streams of Baljuvân and Kulâb, cf. note to § 6, 7.

5. Having mentioned separately the capital of Khuttal (2.) our author seems to carry his enumeration from the south-eastern corner of the province (3.) in a north-easterly direction (4.) to 5. Munk, thence to turn back southwards along the course of the Vakhshâb (Tamliyat, Halâvard, and Livkand). In this case Bârsârâgh (not otherwise known) ought to be looked for somewhere between Pârghar and Munk on the Munk-Hulbuk river. If, however, we examine the outward form of the name the only parallels are خُوْرُ بَطَرَ and Ya'qûbî names somewhere in the Kãfînîhân basin. I.Kh., 39, names Bâs.râ between Şaghâniyân and Vâshjird. In I.R., 92, B.sîr seems to be due only to de Goeje’s surmise, cf. Marquart, Erânshahr, 234. Bâsârân/Bâs.râ lay outside the Khuttalân proper but it could be an acquired fief of a member of the Khuttalân family. Ya'qûbî names a Ḥâtim b. Da'îd in which comes in the enumeration immediately after Qubâdhiyân. It may correspond to our Nûdz (§ 6, 10.) which in this case must be looked for on the lower course of the Kãfînîhân river.

As regards the other two names of our 5., according to Iṣt., 297, Munk (= Baljuvân) was larger than Hulbuk. Tamliyat (in Iṣt., but not in Ya'qûbî) lay probably at Shîr-guzâr near the loop of the Vakhsh.

6–8. Halâvard = Qurghan-tûbe; Lîvkand = Sang-tûda, both on the Vakhsh, the latter upstream from the former. Cf. Barthold, o.c., 69.

9. Our source clearly spells مَلاَكَّيْ شَمْس مَلاَكَّيْ and so does Gardîzî, ed. M. Nâzîm, p. 35. The usual reading is شَمْس مَلاَكَّيْ (Râshî) and a sukûn over ش which could be taken for the three dots over ش. More curious is the fact that Ya'qûbî, 290 e gives *fāsh < *fâsh which is a good parallel for Zâshî. Yaqût mentions separately, ii, 733: Râshî and ii, 907: Žâshî, though he does not even explain where this latter locality (maudi') was situated. I.Kh., 34, says that Râshî is the farthest distant point of Khorâsân in the [north-eastern] direction; Râshî lay between two mountains and the Turks used to penetrate through it on their raiding expeditions; therefore the Barmakid al-Fâdî b. Yahyâ b. Khâlid constructed (allaqa) there a gate. The thirteenth-century Spanish geographer Ibn-Sa'id pretends that this َفَدِلٌ بَابٌ al-Fâdî was connected with the well-known wall in the Qalâs steppe, see Barthold, Ibn-Sa'id, p. 239, and Turkestân, 175. According to I.R., 92, the Vakhshâb rising in the Kharlukh region flowed through the lands of Pâmîr (Pâmîr), Râshî, and Kumêdî. Iṣt., 340, continues his route from Vâshjird (v.s., § 25, 35.) to Ïlâq (the Faydâbâd river is still called Ïlak) 1 day; thence to Darband 1 day; thence to Jâvkân 1 day; thence to the fortress of Râshî 2 days. Râshî is certainly Garm (in Turkish Qara-tegin, see Barthold, Karategin in El). Zâshî had an amîr of its own, v.i., under 11.

10, 11. The Kumîji and the K.nîna-Turks were evidently remnants of some earlier population or wave of invasion. Both our text and Bayhaqî,
Commentary § 26

611, 696, mention these two groups distinctly. Only the K.njina-Turks (whose number was small and who occupied only one valley between the Khuttalān and Chaghāniyān) are classed as “Turks” in our author as well as in Maq., 283, Bayhaqī, 696 (§ زرک مکینه؟), and the Mafātīh al-'ulūm (written in 365 or 381 A.H.). The latter, p. 110, has a curious passage: “The Hayātīla (Hephthalites) are a tribe of men who had enjoyed grandeur and possessed the country of Tukhārīstān; the Turks [called] Khallukh (cf. notes to § 15, § 23, 69., and § 24, 22.) and K.njina (انترک تلخ و کنه) are their remnants.” The use of the term “Turk” in early Muslim literature is loose and even the Tibetans are considered as Turks, see Birüni, Indiā, 101, 207, cf. Marquart, Wehrot, 102–3; therefore the racial appurtenance of the Hephthalites is still obscure. Marquart derived the name of Chaghāniyān from Mongol tsaghnā “white” and took it for an indication as to the Hephthalite origins, Wehrot, 93, note 3, and Komanen, 73. In his Wehrot, 93–4, he boldly restores Maqdisi’s (p. 283) (آهنتك) as *Kamiğina in order to compare this name with that of the Kamiğ Hephthalites whom the Armenian historian Moses Kalankatvats’í mentions in the Caucasus (i, ch. 27, Patkanian’s trans., p. 70). [Cf. also Marquart in Ungar. Jähr., 1929, p. 98: “die hephthalitischen Kamiğ-j in Chaghāniyān und Kamiğ Hep’t’alk’ im nördlichen Daghstān, die wohl nach ihrer Heimat am Kām (Jenissei) benannt sein werden”.]

The question of the K.mījī is still more complicated. Two earlier authors, Ya’qūbī and I.R., refer to a locality of which the name may be restored as *Kumēdh. Ya’qūbī, 290, says that Munk (§ 26, 5.) was the frontier “towards (ilā) the lands of the Turks, towards the locality called Rāsht, *Kumēd (کامہ), and Bāmir (Pāmir)”. This awkward sentence, if considered in the light of the parallel passage in I.R., 92 (v.s. 9.), seems to refer separately to the [Khallukh-] Turks and the three last mentioned localities. I.R. (v.s. 9.) certainly places the Kumēdh downstream of Rāsht. On the other hand our author, Maq., 283, Gardīzī, ed. M. Nāzīm, Index, and Bayhaqī, 499, 576, 611, 696, speak of the people K.mījī (K.mējī?) Maq., 283, somewhat vaguely says that “neighbouring on Șagḥāniyān are the people called *K.mīji and the K.njina Turks (قم یقال لههم گیجی و گرک)”, whereas our author not only clearly separates these two peoples but among the K.mījī distinguishes two groups, of which the one (that of Chaghāniyān) occupied the locality of Saylākān between Shūmān and Vēshgird (ورشگرد), v.s., § 25, 35., and the other (that of Khuttalān) lived between Tamliyāt and Munk (on a distance hardly exceeding one marha, v.s., Iṣt., 339). It is added in our § 6, 10. that the Kāfīrīnān river rises from the limits of the K.mījī. [Shaykh Muhammad khān Qazvīnī draws my attention to Nāṣir-i Khusrau’s Wajh-i dīn, ed. Berlin, p. 53, where the Kūfkean of Khorīsān and the Kīsfchān of Kīrman stand for barbarity, as they have no divine book. The first name is certainly *Kumījīyān.]

1 Here the Turkish K.njina are mentioned distinctly from the tribe (qaum) called *K.mījī.
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The term Kumēdh undoubtedly corresponds to the mountainous tract (ὄρεων) which according to Ptolemy, vi, 12–13, was inhabited by the Saka tribe Kowmpādai. More particularly ἡ τῶν Kowmpādōw ὄρεων must be distinguished from ἡ φάραγξ (defile) τῶν Kowmpādōw, of which the former comprised the region of the so-called Buttanān mountains (§ 5, 9.) and the latter might correspond to the upper Vakhshāb valley (Rāshī) through which, as accepted by Marquart, Wehrot, 63, and Sir A. Stein, v.s., § 9, 12., ran the silk trade route described in Ptolemy. Our K.mijī can hardly be detached from Kumēdh. The indications of the Ḥ.-�. are particularly precious as showing that the K.mijī were scattered along the whole of the Comedian ὄρεων. Therefore the name K.mijī must be read *Kumeji<* Kumēd-ji with the Iranian suffix of origin -ji, -zī, &c. The Kumējī were certainly remnants of the former inhabitants of the region and more probably of the ancient Saka than of the later Hephthalites. Muslim sources (v.s.) do not distinctly call the K.mijī “Turks” which they probably would have done had the K.mijī been regarded as Hephthalites. In any case, pending a proof to the contrary, it is safer not to dissociate the *Kumējī from the territory Kumēdh which in its turn is connected with the Saka (i.e. Iranian) Kowmpādai.1 On the historical role of the Kumijīs see Barthold, Turkestan, Index. Very characteristic is the following passage in Gardizi, ed. M. Nāzim, p. 36: pas Abū ‘Alī (lord of Chaghāniyan) az amīr-i Khuttalān yārī khwāst va khud lashkar jam ‘ard . . . pas madad andar rasid Abū ‘Alī-rā az Kumijīyan va amīr-i Zhāshī, which confirms our yārī khwāstān in the sense of “ask for aid”.

Ia. Road from Khuttal to Kashmir.

This is the road the beginning of which is hinted at by Ya’qūbī, 396, and vaguely described in I.Kh., 178. The latter says that the merchants starting from the “town of Khuttal” (madīna Khuttalān) travel one farsakh to some ribāt (ribāt fulān). Thence by a narrow path their goods are carried by the local people up a mountain situated on the bank of the great river (right bank of the Oxus?). From the top of the mountain the carriers make signals to the people of Shikhinān and the latter arrive with camels specially trained for fording the river. A contract is then made with the merchants and the camel-men recross the river. “Thereupon (‘alā hādhā) every merchant takes his route travelling (al-rā’ih) towards China or Mūltān.” I.Kh. adds that the said ford is situated at 3½ days’ distance [?] from the place where the Oxus splits into two branches of which the one is supposed to flow towards Sind and the other is the Jayhūn (Oxus, v.s., § 6, 15.). The terms Shikhinān and “Shikina Turks” undoubtedly refer to the subjects2

1 Less certain is their relation to the name of K.mūdūḥ (*Kum-rūdh?), as I.R., 93, calls one of the headwaters of the Chaghāniyan river (Surkhān). In any case, our author, § 6, 10., places the sources of the Kāfīrniyan river in the territory of the K.mijī. The Kāfīrniyan flows between the Vakhsh (coming from Zhāshī 9.) and the Surkhān.

2 And rather to his Turks (camel-men) than to the real Shighni Tajiks.
of the Turkish chief whom Ya’qūbī, 292, calls *Khumār-bīk (v.s., § 24, 24.). *Shikrūnān in a larger sense is applied here to the whole wedge of Afghān territory round which the Oxus sweeps to the north-west of the Pamīr. Khumār-bīk’s possessions are mentioned in Ya’qūbī separately from Badhakhshān, and the reason for the choice of a difficult ford was probably the desire to deal only with the one chief whose territory could, in no case, be avoided, and who controlled many important roads. There is a number of roads on the left (Afghān) bank of the river representing a short cut between Khuttal and the Shughnān, properly so called. Once in Shughnān (usually merged in Vakhān) the merchants could follow up the stream or cross into Chitrāl and Gilgit by the well-known passes in the Hindūkush (Dora, Baroghil). See Map ix.

As an appendix to his account of Khuttal our author describes the route to Kashmir, but he omits its first stretch (luckily preserved in I.Kh.’s account) and starts his description from Shughnān. It is possible that using two different sources he did not remark the identity of some points belonging to the said road (going N. to S.) with those mentioned as the extreme extension of the road from Balkh and Badhakhshān to Shughnān (W. to E.). Following his habit of reading the names off his map in a straight line he may have also merged the data belonging to different branches of the road. The following list enumerates all the points mentioned to the east of Badhakhshān:

§ 24, 24. Badhakhshān
  — 25. Dar-i Taziyān
  — 26. Dīh-i S.nk.s
  — 27. S.qliya

§ 26, 2. Hulmuk
  — 12. Dar-i Tubbat
  — 13. R.kht.jab
  — 14. Sikāshim
  — 15. Khamdād
  — 16. Sanglnj
  — 17. Bljm
  — 18. Samarqandāq
  — 20. Andrās

§ 10, 57. Kashmir

1 This ford undoubtedly lay considerably upstream from the Badhakhshān ford, v.s. 1., somewhere in Darvāz, for example near Lārān (whence a road runs to Baljuvān over Langar), or still higher upstream, near Qal’a-yi Khum.

2 The roads passing through Rāgh and the Afghān Darvāz. The roads on the right bank were and are much more difficult.

3 I.Kh., 178, has in view this road when speaking of the sources of the Oxus rising from the mountain “of China and the regions beyond China” and flowing in a rocky bed. Hsüan-Tsang travelled that way. See now the description of the road over the Vakhjīr pass in Sir A. Stein, *Ruins of desert Cathay*, 1912, pp. 84–8; and *On Ancient Tracks past the Pamirs*, in the *Himalayan journal*, iv, 1932, with a clear sketch map.

4 This may be one of Jayhānī’s lists of “little-known stations and far-distant halting places” referred to in Maq., 4.
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Here § 24, 25. may be identified with § 26, 12.; § 24, 26. with § 26, 16., and § 24, 27. with § 26, 14. In § 26 the road to Gilgit (over the Baroghl pass) is represented by 12., 14., 15., 18.–20., whereas 13., 16., and 17. must refer to the branch going to Chitral (over the Dora pass). Some useful parallels to our names are found in Biruni's Canon, where much of the same sources are utilized. See Map ix.

12. The "Gate of Tibet" standing apparently west of 13. is very possibly another aspect of the "Gate of the Arabs" (see details in § 24, 25.), unless there were two gates: one between Jerm1 and Zaybāk (near Bahārak) and one between Zaybāk and Ishkāshim (near Zirkhān, where now stands the ribāt Sirājiya?).

13. Birūnī in his Canon (towards the end of the 4th climate) enumerates in a NW. to SE. direction:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>long.</th>
<th>lat.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Badhakhshān</td>
<td>95°10'</td>
<td>30°0'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>district of K.rān</td>
<td>95°20'</td>
<td>34°50'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaybāk</td>
<td>96°0'2</td>
<td>37°30'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikāshim</td>
<td>96°20'</td>
<td>37°0'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the geographical point of view it is very likely that Zaybāk stands for Zaybak which is the only important point between Jerm (v.s., note to 12.) and Ishkāshim. Zaybāk lies in the valley of the Vardoj river which rises from the neighbourhood of the Dora pass in the Hindākush, and after having flowed past Sanglich, Zaybāk, Tīrgārān, and Chākarān joins from the eastern side the river of Munjān (downstream from Jerm). The present high road from Jerm and Bahārak to Ishkāshim running in an easterly direction seems to leave Zaybāk somewhat to the south, but Zaybāk certainly lies on the road which branches off in the southern direction and, farther up the Vardoj valley (in the neighbourhood of Sanglich), splits into two: one branch of it running SE. towards Chitral and the other (by an easy pass) leading in a SW. direction into the upper part of the Munjān valley. The Afgān scribes spell جابك, see Kushkakī, Rāhnumā, p. 138, which very closely resembles زابك, whereas Sir G. Grierson, Ishkāshmī, Zebakī, and Yāzghulami, London, 1920, spells throughout (see p. 4) Zebāk, i.e. زيبك. There is hardly any doubt about our spelling being identical with Birūnī’s Zebak, but it may be a distortion of the slightly different arabisced form زيبك, *Zaybag "quick silver" which a popular Arabic etymology might have easily substituted for the Iranian زيبك.

Much more thorny is the interpretation of the caption accompanying Birūnī’s co-ordinates: جابال, جابال, جابال. As regards the script the best restoration is that suggested to me by Shaykh Muhammad khān Qazvini: جابال, جابال, جابال. I must

1 Called by Ya’qūbī, 288,15., the last town to the east of Badhakhshān before Tibet.
2 Or. 1994 gives as the longitude جابال, i.e. 97°o'. As Birūnī’s tables are arranged in the order of increasing longitude "97" cannot precede "96".
3 [See Appendix B.]
add that on the Map 13 of Sprenger’s Posstruten the reading \( \text{وچلنو وسحان} \) is inexact: the text of the Or. 1997 runs as quoted above and the Berlin Or. 8° 275, fol. 102r., of which Dr. W. Gottschalk has kindly procured me a copy, has \( \text{وركان... ولايو وسحان} \). Leaving aside the first letters the group دحان... وچلنو دحان... strongly reminds one of (Ba)dhakhshân. The tentative translation would consequently be: “\( \text{ربال ربال} \) lies within the limits (or on the frontier) of the ruby mines and opposite it is Badhakhshân”. The mention of the ruby mines in connexion with Zaybâk can be explained but the meaning of "\( \text{زویا} \)" is decidedly vague. In a caption where every word must have a clear sense, what would mean the indication that Badhakhshân (already mentioned before it) lies “opposite” it?\(^2\) In view of this vagueness I suggest the reading *\( \text{ورراه مندجاان} \) “and beyond it is Mundajân” which involves more alterations in the text but gives a more satisfactory reading. The form مندجاان is attested in I.Kh., 37, and looking from the road Munjân would appear as lying “beyond” Zaybâk. In more detail this hypothesis will be developed under 16. [See Appendix B.]

14. In the later T’ang-shu the capital of Hu-mi (= Vakhân) is also *\( \text{ Sai-kia-shen} \) (so instead of *\( \text{Han-kia-shen} \)), Marquart, o.c., 224, Chavannes, o.c., 164, but in Bîrûnî, Canon, Sikâshim (now Ishkâshim) is distinctly called "\( \text{قیصة سکان} \) "capital of *\( \text{Sh.knân} \)". Under § 6, 6, and § 10 (introduction) our author seems to include "Shaknân" in Vakhân. Shaknân (\( \text{Sic in our text} \)) has no separate description in the \( \text{H.-t.} \) unless we take for it § 24, 27. (evidently borrowed from a different source). In the course of time the extent of the Shuhnân territory considerably changed. Hsüán-tsang (seventh century) evaluates its circuit at 2,000 li (20 days). The basic territory of Shuhnân lies on the Oxus downstream from Ghârân and upstream from Darvâz, see Minorsky, Shuhnân in EI.

15. Khmandâh is undoubtedly Khandûd, a considerable village in Vakhân (on the Afghan side), opposite which (on the Russian side) are situated the ruins of an ancient fort to which our description may refer (as the description runs south-east, “left side” means north), cf. Kûshkâli, o.c., 165: \( \text{Qal’a-yi Sangî} \); Sir A. Stein, Innermost Asia, 1928, pp. 402-3, and pl. 47: ruins of Zamr-i atâsh-parast near Yamchin, opposite Khandûd, on the

\(^{1}\) It is strange though that, after having correctly spelt and dotted the name of Badakhshân two lines above, the scribe should have mis-spelt it at this place. This is an argument in favour of a different name in the original.

\(^{2}\) [The explanation may be that, though Zaybâk is separated from Ishkâshim by a watershed, the whole Zaybâk-Ishkâshim tract forms one geographical area shut off by narrow gorges from Badakhshân, Vakhân, and the present-day Shuhnân. The Ghârân district (“the caves”) lies in the defile through which the Oxus forces its way northwards to Shuhnân, see Sir A. Stein, Innermost Asia, p. 873, and it is noteworthy that Kûshkâli, 140 and 148, mentions Ghârân both under Zaybâk and Ishkâshim.]

\(^{3}\) Ghârân (v.i. 16) lying on the banks of the upper Oxus outside the basin of the Badakhshân river might perhaps be said to lie “opposite” Badakhshân, but the exact wording of the caption is “and opposite it lies ... "سحان". Why should the author in an enumeration going NW. to SE. have defined a point “backwards”, with reference to the already-mentioned Badakhshân?
Russian side. Hsüan-Tsang, Si-yü-ki, St. Julien, ii, 425, describes Hun-t'o-to as the capital of Hu-mi (Vakhān): "In the centre of the town there rises a convent built by the first king of the country. For its construction the hill-side has been cut and a gully filled in." In the great vihāra of the convent there was a canopy of gilt copper suspended over a stone statue of Buddha, cf. Sir A. Stein, Serindia, 1921, i, 60-71 (Vakhān), and Innermost Asia, 1928, ii, 863-71. The present-day Khandūd possesses a famous ziyārat of "Shaikh Beg", which seems to confirm the "tenacity of local worship", Innermost Asia, p. 866.

16. سَلْخَة, read: *Sanglīx or Sanglēch (perhaps identical with § 24, 26.), lies to the south of Zaybāk (v.s. 13.) on the road to Chitrāl. A crucial test for S.nІ.l.n = *Sanglīx is the identification of the hot lake near its mine. Our maps show the little "Dufferin lake" at the northern foot of the Dora pass but unfortunately no description of it seems to be available. Badhakhshān was ever associated with rubies (old English balas, old French balais < balakhs, i.e. badhakhsh, with eastern-Iranian l for ﾙ); however, geographically speaking, the best-known mines lay in Ghārān outside the Kokcha basin which alone constitutes the territory of Badhakhshān proper. On the Russian bank the mines (according to Serebriannikov) lay south of the junction of the Shākh-dara1 and Ghund rivers (south of the Russian post of Khārōgh). The inhabitants of the village of Ghārān (غران), Russian transcription Goron) remembered in 1911 that from a grotto near-by rubies were extracted even in the nineteenth century but now the mines are abandoned, see Barthold's note ad Semenov in Mir Islama, 1/3, 1920, p. 300. Further 80 Km. upstream from Khārōgh lies the village Kūh-i la'ī where some garnets are still found, cf. Tājtikstān, p. 261.2 As regards the Afghān side Kūshkākī, p. 148, says that the ruby mines "in Ghārān" were closed down as economically unprofitable. Ghārān lies entirely apart from Sanglíx and in order to give credit to our author we ought to admit the existence of other ruby mines in the Vardoj valley, now exhausted and forgotten. Apart from the above-mentioned passage from Bīrūnī's Canon where Zaybāk is placed in the region of the mines,3 our text may be supported by Qazwīnī's Āthār al-bilād, ii, 325, where silver and garnet mines are mentioned in يمکان Yumgān. This valley (Nāṣir-i Khusrav's home where he was born and buried) lies on the middle course of the Munjān river. On the mountain separating Yumgān from Zaybāk lapis lazuli mines are situated, and besides them Yumgān now possesses only lead mines, Kūshkākī, o.c., 134.

17. The rūstā زم or مَلَح is most probably Munjān4 lying on the river of

---


2 As a rumour Kūshkākī, o.c., 179, mentions the presence of a ruby mine near Qal'a-yi Sangī (v.s. 15.).

3 [v.s. p. 366, n. 2, for a new explanation of this item.]

4 Unless it refers to some unknown name in the Afghān Kāfrīstān (Nūristān) to which also a road leads from Sanglíx. [Kūshkākī, p. 235, mentions a road connecting Faydābād with Nūristān over a difficult pass called مُتَلال (alt. 15,300 f.).] The road, ibid.,
the same name upstream from Yumgān (v.s. 16.) and communicating with Sanglich by an easy pass. This suits perfectly our text which after *Sanglich (i.e. evidently continuing the road Zaybāk-Sanglich) adds: \textit{va az ānjā bigudhari nāhiyatā āyadh ā-rā ārūstā *M.lj.m khwānand}, “and when you are out of it (= beyond it) comes the district called *M.lj.m".1 Remembering now Birūnī’s caption (v.s. 13.) which accompanies Zaybāk: وخلاو مسحان = Sanglich, one may see in it a parallel to our 17. confirming our restoration *M.lj.m. Birūnī speaks of *Zaybāk and our source of *Sanglich makes no difference: Birūnī leaves out Sanglich for which he has no co-ordinates but both Zaybāk and Sanglich lie on the same road and in the same Vardoj valley. In Birūnī’s copy the name *M.lj.m may have been influenced by the better-known Badakhshān, but the form Munjan is attested in I.Kh., 37, where it comes after Karrān, Shiqinān, and Vakhkhān, and even now the Sanglichi neighbours of Munjān call it Mandeṣān. It was not a rich district for its contribution in taxes (2,000 dirhams) looks insignificant next to the 20,000 of Vakhān and the 40,000 of Shiqinān.2 Marquart suggested the identification of Munjān with the land of the Sakāh-Haumavrgah (Σακαωφράγα), Markwatt, \textit{Das erste Kapitel des Gāthā uṣṭavaṭi}, p. 42; cf. now Morgenstierne, \textit{The name Munjān, &c.} in \textit{Bulletin SOs}, vi/2, 1931, pp. 438–44.

1\textit{Additional note.} In the easternmost part of Badakhshān the revenue list of 211/827, I.Kh., 37, mentions the following group of districts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(السیمان)</th>
<th>var.</th>
<th>(السیمان)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Karrān (sic)</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shiqinān</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vakhkhān</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-M.nd.jan</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marquart, \textit{Erānsahr}, 222, restored the first name as *Yanbagān > Yamgān (better Yumgān), and the second one as Kurān (with a damma for the tashdīd). As mentioned above, Yumgān occupies the middle course of the river of which the upper part waters Munjān, and the lower part is called after the borough of Jerm. The Kurān tributary joins this river from the left, upstream from Yumgān. If the identifications are right, I.Kh.’s list does not follow any strict system, for beginning with Yumgān it runs south-west to Kurān, then skips to the Oxus valley (Shughnān and Vakhān, enumerated N. to S.) and finally returns westwards to the upper course of the Yumgān valley.

Ist., 297, says that the following districts neighbour (yutākhim) on the Vakhsh (v.s., note to § 26, 1.): “al-Khuttal, Wakhkhān, *al-Sh.qina, and

137, seems to run up through the Munjān villages Magnul, Takāb, and Vilav. The Mandāl pass is very clearly shown on the map in Sir G. S. Robertson’s \textit{The Kafirs of the Hindu-Kush}, 1896.]

1 میلاح may be a comprehensible mis-spelling for *منجم.
2 Hsüan-Tsang’s \textit{Mung-kien} (Beal, \textit{Si-yü-kì}, ii, 288–9: \textit{Mung-hin}) is still difficult to identify and locate, Marquart, \textit{Erānsahr}, 231.
Karrān, which [the latter three?] are lands of infidels’. At another place, p. 279, he makes “the infidel countries Wakhkhān and Karrān” follow on Munk and Hulbuk. It is not very clear whether Karrān refers here to the little-known Kurān, but in the affirmative case Iṣt. seems to give to this term an extensive meaning covering the whole of the headwaters of the Yumān-jerm river.

The enumeration in our source may be confronted with Bīrūnī’s Canon in the following way:

| ¡3 | R.kh.tj.b | nāhiya K.rān |
| ¡4 | Sikāshim |
| ¡5 | Kh.mdād |
| ¡6 | S.ng.lnj |
| ¡7 | M.lj.m. |
| ¡8 | Samargandidq |
| ¡9 | B.lūr |

As K.rān is located by Bīrūnī to the south-west of ḥār, there is a probability (a) that it refers to some of the districts left out in his table (e.g., 17.) and (b) that it is used in the sense in which Iṣt. uses it.  

18. Samargandidq looks like a derivative of Samargand. A village of Samargand existed in Western Mongolia at 7 days’ distance from Bishbalīq, cf. Juvaini, GMS, xvi, 215, xviii, 250. Barthold, Die histor. Bedeutung, p. 4, note 2, and K voprosu o yazikhkh soghd. i tokhar., in Iran, i, 35, took this name as an indication of the existence of a Soghdian colony in western Mongolia. The name “Samargandidq” could be explained in a similar way, particularly as the presence in it of a motley population suggests its commercial importance. Most probably Samargandidq lay in the Vakhān district now called Sarhadd (“Frontier”) and situated opposite the Baroghil pass, over which goes the traffic with Gilgit and the neighbouring countries. It is not improbable that Sarhadd is a remote popular etymology of the ancient Samargandidq. [In the Russian translation of Kūshkā, p. 150, the name is spelt in Arabic characters سرخ. Is it a mis-print?]

19. Cf. Bolor in Marco Polo, 3rd ed. by Yule-Cordier, i, 172, 178–9. In the words of Muḥammad Ḥaydar, Tārikh-i Rashidi, Engl. transl. E. D. Ross, 385, B.lūr was “bounded on the east by the provinces of Kāshghar and Yārkand; on the north by Badakhshan; on the west by Kābul and Lamghān; and on the south by the dependencies of Kashmir”. N. Elias grosso modo includes in Bolor “Hunza, Nagar, possibly Tash-Kurghan, Gilgit, Panyal, Yasin, Chitral, and probably the tract now known as Kāfriśtan”, as well as some small states south of Gilgit and Yasin, but excludes from it Baltīstān. This latter view is corroborated by our author who treats the “*Bolorian Tibet” (§ 11, 2.) separately from *Bolor (§ 26, 19.). A very curious light is thrown on the story of the descent of the kings

1 Cf. Buqaraq=Bukhārā in Orkhn Turk.  
2 Pelliot contests the reading and says the place was really called Qum-singir, see T’oung-Pao, 1931, p. 460.
of Bolor from the Sun by the legend recorded in Hsüan-Tsang, Si-yü-ki, St. Julien, ii, 109-16; Beal, ii, 298. A Chinese princess betrothed to the king of Persia (Po-la-sstü) was on her way to join her fiancé. For fear of some troubles which broke out at that time the princess was placed on some inaccessible peak and there became enceinte from a knight who, at noon, came down from the Sun. The attendants dared not continue their journey with the princess who remained on the peak and became the founder of the local dynasty of K‘ie-p‘an-t‘o. This latter name refers, most probably, to Sarıkol situated on the south-eastern slopes of the Pamirs, on the road from Kāshghar and Yārkand both to the Pamir and to the region of the northern sources of the Indus, which is known under the name of Bolor. [Marquart, Das Reich Zābul, 251, interprets *Hat-pān-t‘o as *Gharband “angustiae“.]

Sir A. Stein identifies the peak of Hsüan-Tsang’s story with the Qīz-qurghan “The maiden’s castle” in Taghdumbash-Pamir, Serindia, i, 1921, p. 73, and On ancient Central-Asian tracks, 1933, p. 47. See Map iv.

20. Andrās lying on the road to Kashmir could be tentatively identified with Drās (east of the Zoji-La pass) situated at c. 100 Km. to the east of Srinagar, in the Indus basin, on the road leading up to Gilgit (v.s. 19.). As this part of the Ḩ.-‘Ā. has several points in common with Birūnī’s Canon, one can postulate the identity of Birūnī’s Andrās (or Andarkūl) with Birūnī’s Sarikūl (or Sarikol) which is said to be “the Gate of Kashmir, situated in the direction of several of its roads” باب كشير ال يص دروه. The Tārīkh-i Rashīdī, p. 485, mentions a fort Andarkūl (اندرکول), which also may be identical with our Andrās. The next stage south of Andrās must be Kashmir which is mentioned as the last place in India (§ 10, 57.).

[Additional note. N. Elias identifies Andarkūl (or *Indrakot?) with Bārāmula (circa 40 Km. to the north-west of Srinagar, on an important road to Gilgit, &c.) whereas Birūnī, who describes the western approaches of Kashmir, gives the following co-ordinates:

B.rhān (?) long. 98° 0’ lat. 33° 25’
Srinagar ,, 98° 40’,, 33° 20’

After all Andrās, Andarkūl, and B.rhān may be different places. Sir A. Stein in an additional note to his Memoir on map . . of Kasmir, Calcutta 1899, p. 222, finally admits the identification of Birūnī’s place “lying halfway between the rivers Sind and Jaylam” with Babarhān, as the basin of the three rivers uniting near Chamhad is still called. Chamhad lies south-west of Abbotabad in the Mian Khaki Nullah drained westwards to the Indus.]

II. Khwārazm.


21.-22. The description of Khwārazm is extremely brief. The author says nothing of the destruction of Kāth by the Oxus, cf. Iṣṭ., 131, I.H., 351,

1 Mīrzā Iskandar invaded Kashmir over Zoji-La, Tārīkh-i Rashīdī, 423.
and Barthold, Turkestan, 145. In our author’s days the old dynasty of the
Khwarazmshahs descended from the legendary Siyavush and from Afrigh (said to have flourished towards A.D. 305) was living its last days. Abü ‘Abdillâh, the 22nd and last of the shâhs, was killed in A.D. 995 by Mâ’mûn b. Muḥammad, the eponym of the Ma’mûnid dynasty, see Sachau, Zur Geschichte von Khwârizm, Sitz.WAW, 1873, lxxxi, 500 (30). Cf. also M. Nâzîm, Sulṭân Mâmûn, pp. 56–60 and 184–5. In common with the detailed list of products in Maq., 325, our list has only rukhâin and, perhaps, qâshâgand (if the latter stands for durî ‘armour’).

23. Khushmîthân (Aradvakhsmitthân), 24. Nûzhabân (Nûzvâr), and 25. Gurgânj (Arabic: Jurjânîya) follow each other in Işt., 341. Maq., 287 and 289, has a variant Nûzâbân and also speaks of the iron gate of this town. The description of Gurgânj in our author contains some original traits: double town, a separate amîr. The old rivalry (ta’âṣubî qadîm) between the dynasty of the Khwarazmshahs of Kâth (on the right bank of the Oxus) and the amîrs of Gurgânj (on the left bank of the river) is an interesting portend of the events of A.D. 995, see Gardîzî, ed. M. Nâzîm, p. 57. Cf. notes to § 1. [On the ruins of Gurgânj see A. Yakubovsky, Razvalini Urgenchâ in Izv. Akad. Mater. Kult., vi/2, 1930, 68 pp.]

26.–28. The form کردناغار (Khurjâdgar) is nearer to Maq., 287, than to Işt., 299. For Işt. and Maq. give مدينه (with variants) and for Qara-tagîn, B.râ (F.râ)-tagîn. The details of 27., 28. are new.

29. This paragraph exactly corresponds to I.H., 393. Neither Işt. nor Maq. mention these three towns on the lower course of the Jaxartes. Cf. Barthold, Turkestan, 178, and Irrigation, 149. Jand is identified with the ruins of Khisht-qal’a, in the locality of Tumar-utkul, on the left bank of the Jaxartes at circa 25–30 K.m. west of Perovsk (now Turkestan). The “new Settlement” (in Arabic. al-qaryat al-jadîda) = the ruins of Jankent, situated at 5–6 K.m. south of the old Khivan fort Jan-qal’a (which latter stands at 22 K.m. downstream from Kazalinsk), see Barthold, History of the Cultural Life of Turkestan (in Russian), Leningrad, 1927, p. 68, and Barthold, A Historical Sketch of the Turkmens (in Russian), 1929, p. 15. See Map vii.

§ 27. Sind

In addition to the works enumerated in the notes to § 10 (India), see H. G. Raverty, The Mîhrân of Sind and its tributaries, in JASB, li, part i, 1892, pp. 155–297 (2 maps); Le Strange, The Lands, 329–33; many arduous problems connected with the Muslim itineraries across *Mukrân (Makrân) and Sind have been studied in detail by Marquart, Erânisahr, 177–99: “Zur historischen Topographie von Kermân und Mukrân”; H. Cousens, The Antiquities of Sind, Calcutta, 1929, vol. 46 of Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India (with a detailed map of the ancient course of the Indus); N. G. Majumdar, Explorations in Sind, 1934, vol. 48 of the same series (map); Sir A. Stein, Archaeological Reconnaissances in Southern Persia, in GJ, Feb. 1934, pp. 119–35 (clear sketch map).
By “Sind” (as distinguished from Hind, cf. § 10) Muslim geographers mean Baluchistān and the lower region of the Indus, up to Aror. It must be borne in mind that formerly the Indus (Mihrān) followed a more easterly course (the Eastern Nara or Ḥakra river-bed stretching straight south of Rohri) and emptied itself into the Kori creek, and that already the Arabs found it flowing much more to the west (past Brahmanābād = Mansūra) but still to the east of its present course, Cousens, o.c., plate ciii (general map).

The present chapter is a brief résumé of Īṣṭ., 170–80, but the region is better defined, inasmuch as the Indus is taken for its eastern frontier, while Īṣṭ., with the usual displacement of bearings, names in its stead the “Fārs sea”; cf. also Maq., 484. [See p. 246, l. 16.]

1–4. are in the Sind proper; 5.–11. Mukrān (Baluchistān); 12. the Tūrān district; 13.–14. the Bud-ha district.

On the products of Sind our author has more details than Īṣṭ. Somewhat unexpectedly Maq., 481, mentions Kanbāya-shoes (al-ni‘āl *al-kantā‘iyā?) exported from Mansūra (sic).

1. According to Īṣṭ., 172, the local name of Mansūra was Brahmanābād (<Bahmanābād). Birūnī, Canon: “مهربه (؟) or the Greater نزارة (؟) Thatha, v.i. 4.] is (called) Mansūra because its conqueror said: naṣartu”. The ruins of Mansūra lie 47 miles to the north-east of Ḥaydarābād, Cousens, o.c., 48–73, and plates iv–v. Īṣṭ., 173, calls the Quraishite king a descendant of Ḥabbār b. al-Aswad. Cf. notes to § 10.

2. Manjābāri (?), Īṣṭ., 175, lay opposite Mansūra on the right bank of the Indus, and Sādūsān west of Manjābāri, perhaps between Sabbān (now Sahwan) and the Indus, cf. Elliot, i, 401, Marquart, o.c., 188, 190.

3. Birūnī’s nisba refers to the Bērūn (>Arabic Bayrūn) suburb in his native Khwārazm and generally speaking the thirteenth-century Spanish geographer was hardly in a position to improve the reading of a doubtful Indian name. Abul-Fidā speaks of the town as “a port of Sind, situated by a salt-water gulf, separating from the sea of Fārs” (?). M.svāhī (?) stood to the west of the Indus.

4. Daybul (Debul). Its ruins are differently identified with the localities lying south-west of Tatta (<*Thatha), cf. Le Strange, o.c., 331, Cousens, plate ciii. The Turkish admiral Sīdī ‘Ali (1556) speaks of the port of Tatta called *Bandar Lahori, situated on the site of the former دیوارِ سند (sic. Portuguese Dioli-Čindi), see Tomaschek, Nearc, p. 9, and Mohi. Birūnī, Canon, immediately after Daybul mentions separately a place called *Lorhānī “which is the Lesser مَهْر" M.naha [*Thatha? v.s. i.], situated at the place where the Indus disembogues into the sea".
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All the localities in Balûchistân are quoted after Iṣṭ. with a noticeable tendency to iranizice the names.

Iṣṭ. gives the following itineraries (which are from place to place and not in one line, see Marquart, l.c.): Tiz (6.) to Kiz (7. Kîz and Kîj) circa 5 marâhalas; thence to Fannâzbûr (10. Panjûbûr)—2 m., thence to Dizak (7.)—3 m., thence to Râsk (8.)—3 m., thence to Fuhlafahra (11. Puhlpara)—3 m.; thence to Isfaqa (7. Isk.f with metathesis)—2 light m.; thence to Bind (7.)—1 m.; thence to Bih (7.)—1 m.; thence to Qâsrqand (7. Kûshk-i Qand)—1 m.; thence to Qanbâlî (5. F.nîkî)—2 m.; thence to Daybul—4 m.; thence to Mânshûrâ—6 m. Most of these places still exist in Balûchistân.

6. Tiz (Ptolemy vi, cap. 8, Tησω) is situated in the bay of Chahbûr, a short distance to the west of the Chahbûr village; 7. *Këch (Kîz, Kîj) is the name of a district east of the Nihang river. Kûshk-i Qand (Qâsrqand, north of Chahbûr), Bih (Geh), Bint, and Dizak follow in good order, but Iskaf (now Ispaka, south of Bampûr) ought to precede Dizak (situated south-west of Jâlk). 8. Râsk lies on the middle course of the Sarbâz river, but the original Râsk lay probably more to the north of the site of the town of Sarbâz. Its district in Iṣṭ. is called Kh.rûj (I.Kh., 55, Kharûn, read: Kharûz, as suggested by Marquart).

9. *Mûshkî (Iṣṭ., 178, ممشکی) hardly corresponds to the Mashkai river. As, according to Iṣṭ., it lay near to Kirmân, it may be more likely identified with the important district of Mashkîl (also Mashkîdh). Iṣṭ. distinguishes Mashkay (a district stretching for 3 marâhalas and possessing some palms) from Mâsakân (belonging to the Khârijites and producing some sugar-candy). 10. Panjûbûr, now the Panjgûr district, south of Mashkîl. 11. Puhlpara (*pahra), “the bridge watch”, now Pâhrai, east of Bampûr. Iṣṭ. says nothing about its belonging to Kh.rûj. Less clear are the names 5. Armâbil and Qanbâlî (F.nîkî). According to Iṣṭ., 178, Armâbil lay at half a farsakh from the sea.

12. See Minorsky, Tûrân, in El. Quzdâr, now Khuzdar, 85 miles south of Kalât, altitude 4,050 feet. Kîzkânân (= Qîqân, Balûdûrû, 432?) where the local ruler resided is probably identical with Kalât. Shora-rûd is the name of the lower course of the Kalât-river (off Quetta).

13., 14. The capital of the district belonging to the people called Bud-ha was Qandabil, now Gandawa, 75 miles (120 Km.) north-west of Khodzâr, north of the Indus, altitude 314 feet (102 m.). Ayl (Utl, &c.?) was the district between Kîzkânân and Qandabil, named after its conqueror.

§ 28. Kirmân

Le Strange, The Lands, 299–321; Schwarz, Iran, 211–88. On the tribes of Kirmân see Marquart’s survey in Catalogue, pp. 74–81: Balûch, Kûfîch, Bâriz, Mûzjâ, Rasûkh, Jut (ancient Yutîya, not Indian Zûtî). To their number must be added the Indian Āshgar settled in a district of Kirmân in
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the direction of Sistān, see Baladhūrī, 375–6. [In this and the following chapters bearing on Persia references are made chiefly to the 1:2,000,000 Map of Persia and Adjacent Lands, Survey of India.]

Except for some insignificant details this chapter is entirely based on Ištakhrī, 157–70. On the mountains of Kirmān see § 5, 10.

1. I.Kh., 49, says: ‘‘Jiruft is the largest of the towns of Kirmān, but the wāli lives in Sīrjān’’, although already Ya‘qūbī, BGA, vii, 286, considers Sīrjān as the greatest of the towns of Kirmān. Our author probably substitutes king for I.Kh.’s wāli in view of later information regarding the semi-independent rulers of Kirmān, viz. the short-lived dynasty of the Ilyāsids (of Soghdian origin) who ruled from 317 to 359/929 to 969. Under 324/936 Ibn Miskawī, ed. Margoliouth, i, 350, 353, ii, 249, while speaking of the seizure of Kirmān by Ibn Ilyās, already names Jiruft as the capital and the fortress Bardašūr as the treasury of Ibn Ilyās. Sīrjān was only the residence of a son of this ruler, ibid., ii, 250 (under 357 H.); cf. Le Strange, 304. For the rest our text follows closely Išt., 167 (wells, houses with āsāj). No special mention is found in the older geographers of the Qamādīn suburb of Jiruft (Marco Polo’s Camadi) frequently mentioned in the History of the Seljuks of Kirmān, cf. Houtsma, Zur Gesch. d. Seljuken v. Kirmān, in ZDMG, 1885, p. 380 and Houtum-Schindler, ŽRAS, 1898, pp. 43–6.


3. Išt., 166. On the river see § 6, 28.


6. The Balūch whose language belongs to the north-western group of Iranian dialects are apparently later immigrants in the Kirmān region, see L. Dames, Balōčistān in EI. One of the typical traits of Balūchī is the initial ġw corresponding to Persian initial b (cf. ġwād/bād ‘‘wind’’). Traces of the same phenomenon in the dialects spoken in the central desert of Persia and in Khorāsān toponymy (cf. Bākhārz < Išt., 256: Gwākhārz) may indicate the stages of Balūch migrations. Maq., 471, says that the Qufs lived in terror of the Balūch whom ‘Adud al-daula finally defeated. However, ‘Adud al-daula also defeated the Kūfīch and in the long run the Balūch must have profited by the weakening of their neighbours.

7. On the Kūfīch mountains see also § 5, 10. *Kūfīch means in Persian simply ‘‘mountaineer’’; in Arabic transcription Qufs with s for č. Išt., 164, says nothing about their agriculture but Maq., 471, mentions palms and fields in the Qufs mountains. On the peculiar language of the Qufs see Išt., 167. Maq. compares it (as well as Balūchī) with Sindi. Very possibly the Kūfīch were of Brahūṭ origin. About our author’s times the power of the Kūfīch was crushed by ‘Adud al-daula, v.s., p. 28. The details on the Kūhīstān-i Abū Ghānim not in Išt. Under this term our author seems to understand the hills round Khānū to the east of the sources of the Mīnāo
river (Rūdhān, now Rūdbār). However, Iṣṭ., 162, places the Ḥauma Qūḥistān Abī Ghānim in the neighbourhood of the Bāriz range.


10. All in the cold zone of Kirmān, Iṣṭ., 159: Jiruqān, K.shistān, Rūbīn, Surqān, M.rz.qān with many variants.


12. Cf. § 5, 10. Iṣṭ., 162g (Gothan Persian version) gives دهج و فير. The name Dihā also in I.H., 220.

13. Iṣṭ., 161, after enumerating the localities mentioned under our 15. (and ending with Dārjīn) goes on: “and between Jiruf and Bamiy the town of Hrmz (many variants) is situated known under the name of Qaryat al-jaws”. This last name (“the Walnut village”) is found in our text in the Persian form Dih-i gūz. The name Dārjīn coupled with it has been erroneously repeated from the preceding paragraph instead of Hrmz. The cinnamon (dārχhīn) coming from Dārjīn seems to be due merely to a popular etymology. [According to Laufer, Sino-Iranica, 1919, p. 541, the cinnamon tree is a native of the Ceylon forests.]

14. Iṣṭ., 162, says that some people placed Khāsh (or Khowsh) under Sīstān; he himself places it on the frontier of Kirmān and immediately after it mentions Rīqān (now Rīgān) near the Bāriz mountains. The inhabitants of Khowsh (الإعشار) were tent-dwellers and evidently belonged to the Bāriz tribes who, besides Persian, possessed another language, Iṣṭ., 167–8. Khowsh probably lay in the neighbourhood of the Bazmān-kūh (= Dunbāvān in I. Faqīh, 106, this latter appellation hinting at some migrations from Māzandārān to Kirmān). Cf. Schwarz, o.c., 252.


16. In Iṣṭ., 166, madīnah corresponds to our author’s shahrīstān and ahl al-jamaˈa to our “Muslims” (the latter substitution is suggestive for our author’s sunnite confession). The turbans and handkerchiefs do not figure in the lists of products of Bām, cf. Schwarz, o.c., 237.

17.–19. Iṣṭ., 162, gives no details on Narmashīr and only Maq., 463, speaks highly of its commerce, but our author does not necessarily depend on Maq. Sibih is evidently a popular form (Iṣṭ., 162, S.nīj *S.biʃ); the Bālūches still give the name Ispl to the present-day Nušratābād, Le Strange, 325. Nhla seems to stand for *Fahla < Fahraj.

20.–21. Iṣṭ., 161, Firzān, Māhān, Khabīs, Bardashīr, Janzrūd on the road from Sirjān to the desert. Bardashīr (*Bih-Ardashīr) is the present-day Kirmān. Le Strange, 303, considers the form Yazdāshīr, under which it sometimes appears, a clerical error. But the continuator of Miskawaih, iii, 190, mentions ‘Ays Ardashīr “forest (?) of Ardashīr’ in the immediate neighbourhood of Bardashīr. This can be a popular Arabic etymology of a name like *Yazdāshīr.]

22. For this group Iṣṭ., 161, gives Unās, K. rdaḵān, and Bīmand. Under § 29, 44., too, Anār stands in our text for Iṣṭ.’s Unās (but cf. Tōs in § 5, 11.).
The name Bimand (Mimand) is firmly attested in numerous Muslim writers; our كونئین may be a compound *Kūt-Mimand or *Kūh-Mimand. Maq., 464, particularly speaks of the strong position of Mimand.

23. The mountains between Sirjān and Kirmān reach the height of 13,000–17,500 feet.

§ 29. Fārs

Le Strange, The Lands, 248–98, and Schwarz, Iran, i–211, contain very good descriptions of Fārs according to Muslim geographers. See also the Fārs-nāma, ed. by Le Strange and R. A. Nicholson and the excellent Fārs-nāma-yi Naṣīrī, by Ḥasan Fasāʿī, Tehran, 1314 A.H.1 (the illustrative map was separately printed and is very rare; I owe a copy of it to the courtesy of the author’s grandson, the present Minister of Public Instruction of Irān, A. A. khan Ḵekmat). Prof. C. Haussknecht’s series of maps Routen im Orient, 1865–9, published by Kiepert, contains also numerous valuable details. For the coastal region see C. G. Constable and A. W. Stiffe, The Persian Gulf Pilot, London, 1864; the subsequent editions of the Pilot (the latest 8th edition, 1932) pay less attention to the problems not directly bearing on navigation. Numerous points of the geography of Fārs are discussed by E. Herzfeld in his thesis Pasargadae, Berlin, 1907 (with a carefully prepared map), reprinted in Klio, viii, 1908.

The present chapter is a mere abridgement of Ḵ., or perhaps, of a Persian translation of the Arabic original (see below under 39.). The abundant toponymy of Fārs in Ḵ. is not devoid of doubtful points and the names in our text appear in an aggravatingly mutilated form.

With some inevitable inconsistency the author follows his habitual system of enumerating the places as they come on the map in straight lines. He begins with the two capitals, giving the first place to the Islamic Shīrāz, then skips to the south and follows the coast westward, then through Arrajān returns eastward to Shāpūr, then goes on eastward to Dārābjird and after a leap towards the south winds up with the enumeration of the northern districts. This arrangement disregards the administrative divisions as can be seen from the following distribution of the names quoted in the text, according to the five great provinces (kūra) of Fārs: Iṣṭakhr (A): 1., 20.–24., 36.–44.; Ardashīr-Khurra (B): 2., 3.–11., 29., 30., 33.; Arrajān (C): 13.–17.; Shāpūr (D): 12., 18.–19.; Dārābjird (E): 25.–28., 31.–32. The provinces are quoted below respectively under the abbreviations: A., B., C., D., E.

On the products of Fārs see Schwarz, 158–67. Ḵ., 155, denies the existence of gold in Fārs, but the Leiden epitome (BGA, iv, 399) and I.H., 215, mention gold in Sardan, v. i., under 41. Some curious information on Fārs is found in the sections on the lakes (§ 3, 13.–16.), on the mountains (§ 5, 11.), and on the rivers (§ 6, 29.–36.).

1 G. de Morgny’s Les tribus du Fars in RMM, 1913, xxii, pp. 85–150, xxiii, pp. 1–108 is entirely based on Ḵ. Fasāʿī.
1. Shirāz, Iṣṭ., 125. The flower is called rayhān “sweet basil” in Iṣṭ., 152.
2. Iṣṭ., 123, admits that his native town was only middle-sized. On the apples Iṣṭ., 150.
3. Ḥiṣn ibn ‘Umāra, Iṣṭ., 105. This famous castle (cf. § 36, 18., Marquart, Erānsahr, 45) was the easternmost point belonging to Fārs on the coast, 160 farsakhs distant from the westernmost Iṣṭ., cf. Iṣṭ., 135.
5. Gūr, renamed Firuzābād under the Būyids. Iṣṭ., 153, seems to indicate that only the qaisūm-water was the exclusive speciality of Jūr.
7. These four names look badly mis-spelt. Tentatively one might suggest as parallels to *Chīmkān جَمَائَن (the Bundahishn places Yama’s castle Yamkert near the Chīmkān mountain in Fārs), cf. also Pars-nāma, p. 139; to *Khabr (Khfr) خَمْر; to *Nāband تَابُد (i.e. the inland Nāband (Maq., 422 p) and not the one lying on the coast south of Tāhirī); and to *Samirān سَمِّرāن (but see 32.). All these places are mentioned in Iṣṭ., 104–6, I.H., 182, Maq., 422, as appertaining to B. in which lies Jūr.
8. According to the distance Najīram lay on the coast south of the Mānd estuary, near the present-day Dayyir (Iṣṭ., 135: twelve farsakhs from Sirāf), Tomáschek, NeArCh, p. 58; however, the indication of our § 6, 29, supported by the Fārs-nāma, p. 141, is in favour of Le Strange, who on his Map vi, places Najīram north of the Mānd river.
9. Iṣṭ., 106, places صَفْاَر var. صَفَد in the Dasht-i Dastaqān (?) district crossed by the Shāhdakān, see § 6, 31. Contrary to Le Strange, 259, note 1, it is impossible that this *Ṣūfāra should have anything to do with the “shore” Sīf bānī Ṣaffār (or Ṣaffāq) which bordered on the territory of the Kāriyān Kurds (this territory, Iṣṭ., 115, lying in Ardashir-Khurra and extending eastwards towards Kirmān). Our پلاران (indistinct) cannot be بُلار (placed by Iṣṭ., 111, in D.) and stands perhaps for كَرْجِان (کرچگان) mentioned in Iṣṭ., 106, under B. soon after *Ṣūfāra.
10. On the Qarāmaṭīn Hasan Abū Sa‘īd, the flour-merchant (daqqāq) of Jannāba, and his son Sulaimān, see Iṣṭ., 149. Schwarz, 126, places the death of the father circa a.d. 900, and that of the son circa a.d. 944. Cf. also Niẓām al-mulk, Sīyāsat-nāma, p. 195.
11. Tavaz or Tawwaj [Bīrūnī, Canon, gives also the form Tavl] lay on the river Rātin (now Rūd-i Hilla), probably near the junction of its headwaters coming from Shāpūr and Dālikī, cf. Iṣṭ., 120. Cf. § 6, 30, and 31.
12. On the two fire temples of Kāzarūn see Iṣṭ., 118.
13. Le Strange, 273, places the ruins of Sinīz at Bandar-i Daylam and H. Fasā’i at some distance to the north of this port. However, south of Bandar-i Daylam the maps show a small inlet (khor) called Sini, which is most likely Sinīz. The Pilot, 1864, p. 222, says: “Khor Sini is a small creek about midway between the tomb [of Sabz-pūshān] and Ra’s at-Tamb, with deep water inside it. To the southward of it is an old tomb or mosque called Imām Ḥusain. . . . There is a small village and some trees near it. Cap. Brucks states that there are extensive ruins at Khor Sini.”
14. In view of Iṣṭ., 112 and 119, both at this place and under § 6, 32, Rishahr must be read for شه. According to Iṣṭ. the Tāb river after having flowed past Arrajān yaṣaq rustaq Rishahr thumma yaqi’u fil-bājr. I think that here "rustaq of Rishahr" must be taken for what it stands and distinguished from the town belonging to it which according to Maq., 426, bore the name of دی. *Dayragān? This town, which is not explicitly mentioned on the Tāb, may have lain to the south of it and nearer to the Shīrīn river. This may account for our author’s puzzling transfer of Rishahr to the Shīrīn basin (see note to § 6, 32.) with the usual disregard for the smaller administrative divisions. Incidentally this explanation facilitates the interpretation of Maq.’s route between Arrajān and Mahrūbān (v.i. 15. and 16.). If only Mahrūbān lay where we have located it the road could not fail to cross the Shīrīn river. In Sāsānian times Rishahr1 was the seat of a Nestorian archbishop, Sachau, Vom Christentum in der Persis, Berlin, 1916, p. 9. The name of the town دی. may be a derivative of "convet"?

15. In Iṣṭ., 113, Maq., 422, Mahrūbān, but I.R., 97, gives Māhirūbān. Iṣṭ., 135, fixes the western maritime frontier of Fārs at Mahrūbān. Maq., 453, counts from Arrajān to Rishahr 1 marhāla, and thence to Mahrūbān 1 ditto, and further says: “and from Mahrūbān to Sinīz, or to the river (al-nahr), 1 marhāla, and from the river to Arrajān 1 ditto.” It is not impossible that in the second passage al-nahr stands for شه. or, that, Rishahr lying near the Shīrīn river, the distance to Rishahr, or to the river, was practically the same. [The traveller in both directions could like to cross the river not in the evening but in the morning of the second day.] According to our author Māhirūbān was situated “in the sea between (the bends or branches of) the Tāb river” (§ 6, 35.), but as explained in the notes the courses of the Tāb and Shīrīn (§ 6, 32.) rivers have got confused in the text. The estuary of the river Tāb (Jarrahi), i.e. the Khor-Mūsā, lies too far west for the distances indicated in Maq., and most probably was reckoned to Khūzistān and not to Fārs. Therefore the only estuary at which Mahrūbān could lie is that of the Shīrīn. The Shīrīn may have changed its course but approximately Mahrūbān should be sought in the region of Hindiyan and Tuwaysha. Still more curious is the fact that on the older maps (see Russian 40 verst map of Persia, German 1: 800,000 map of 1918) a place “Mahruyak” appears on the left bank of the Shīrīn (Hindiyan) river quite close to the latter’s estuary. This name unmistakably reminds one of Mahrūbān, though the Pilot, 1864, p. 223, mentions no such name near the entrance of the “Tab river” (by which the Shīrīn river is meant).2

16. This curious popular form for Arragān is confirmed by Yaqūt. In the Zafar-nāma, i, 600, the river Tāb is called Aḥ-i Aṛghūn (popular Mongolian etymology?). The town stood north of the present-day

---

1 This Rishahr must be clearly distinguished from Reshir (on our maps Rishahr), situated south of Būshīr. See Marquart, Erānsahr, 147, who tentatively restores its name as ره. 

2 The Shīrīn (Hindiyan, Zuhra) river is still called “Tāb” on our maps. Our author’s confusion of the names Tāb and Shīrīn may point to an ancient origin of this ambiguous use.
Behbehān mostly on the southern bank of the Tab (now Kurdīstān, Jarrāḥī) at about a farsakh’s distance from the gorge through which this river comes out into the plain. On the well near the Chahuk village, Iṣṭ., 151. On dūshāb, Iṣṭ., 95.

17. As under 7., this residue of information on Arrajān is in a desperate state. Cf. Iṣṭ.’s lists of localities of Arrajān, pp. 112-13. Our فرز in Fryād (cf. Fryād or Fryād) might be (?) a simple repetition of the mis-spelt یفرز. Lārāndān and Vāyāgān are mentioned under § 6, 32. near the sources of the Shīrīn. Lūrdagan, the chief place of Sardan (the Lūrdagan lake is shown on Haussknecht’s Map between the two headwaters of the Kārūn). Vāyāgān, though not impossible as a name (cf. Vāyghān in the north-eastern corner of the Urmia lake), is not found in Iṣṭ., and stands perhaps for روکاکان, mentioned under § 6, 29. in a region where several rivers rise.

19. Bishāpūr<Bihi-Shāpūr, see Le Strange, o.c., 262. On the two fire temples, Iṣṭ., 118. On the images of kings, Iṣṭ., 150. On the well of Hindijān near Sābūr, from which smoke rises, Iṣṭ., 151; Schwarz, 34, places it near the oil-wells of Dālīkī.

20. In Iṣṭ., 110, after Kumārij (sic) follows Hindijān but Vāyāgān is perhaps a repetition of *Rūyāgān (cf. above under 17.).

21. Iṣṭ., 104. The Persian form is Gūyum, as given for its homonym under 32.

22. Maq., 430, says that the best water of Shīrāz was from Juyum, just mentioned under 21. Under 32. the name may have been repeated in the Persian garb of Gūyum.

23. B.ṛsarkān, B.ṛskān, perhaps Kāskān, Iṣṭ., 102. On the term kauristān see p. 255, note 1. The only Kauristān mentioned in the Fārs-nāma-yi Nāṣīrī is the one on the road from Lār to Bandar-i ‘Abbāsi, but this does not suit our case. Here the name may stand for Kavār, mentioned under § 6, 29. as lying on the river Sakān.


26., 27. All lying in E. (see under 27.) and found in Iṣṭ., 107-8, Schwarz, 101-5. On the tables (ma‘wā‘id) made of rock-salt see Iṣṭ., 155. On múmīyā see Nuzhat al-qulūb, p. 207.

28. Ramm [Shahriyār], Shaqq (or Sūq) al-Rustāq, Furtj, Tārm (now Tarom) in Iṣṭ., 109, but Maq., 428, gives a nearer form to ours: Rustāq al-Rustāq.


Commentary §§ 29–30

32.–34. Išt., 106–9, mentions under E.: Mādavān, Jūyum (our text at this place gives the Persian form Gūyum, see above 21., 22.), and Jahrum, but places under B.: Samīrān, Iraz (now Iraj, south of Nirīz), and Kīz. Ruftā is obscure.


36. Išt., 108–9, under E. Khiyār was the town of Nirīz. Išt. spells Ištāhbanāt with ʃ.

37. Abādha belonged to E., Išt., 107, but B.rdangān (Išt., 101 p) and *Chāhuk (Išt., 102, Sāhuk) belonged to A.

38. All under A., Išt., 101–3, except Khurra, placed by Išt., 112, 118, under D. Išt., 102, also writes *Shirvanak for Pāpak.

39. All under A. in Išt., 101–3, who gives the forms M.shkān, Iqlīd, Arkh.mān, S.rm.q. The Persian translation of Išt., edited by Ouseley, confirms that Iqlīd and Surmaq “in Persian are called Kilīd and Surma”, Išt., 101 b.


42. The district Sardan lay in the Kūh-gilū mountains between the provinces A. and C. The details given under § 6, 36. show that the district belonged to the Ṭab basin (cf. Išt., 119, on the two headwaters of the Ṭab uniting near Misin), but it is possible that it included also the region of the headwaters of the Kārūn. Išt., 103, calls Lurdagan capital of Sardan. On the mine of sufr in Sardan see Išt., 155. Sufr is “copper” and, though occasionally it means “gold”, Išt. at this place clearly distinguishes it from dahab.

43. Išt., 102, under A. The form Abrajam (not Iraj) is correct, Le Strange, o.c., 281. Instead of ʃ� some of Išt. MSS., 102 k mention ʃ explicitly.

44. Išt., 102, under A. Our D.ṛkān corresponds to al-e Ḵᵛān.

45. Our clear Anār, for Išt., 102, Anār is rather against Le Strange’s theory about Anār being an error for Umās, o.c., 266. The remaining four names are given by Išt., 100, in the Yazd district of Ištākh (he spells Faḥraj). Katha is the present-day Yazd.

§ 30. Khūzistān

Le Strange, The Lands, pp. 232–47, Schwarz, Iran, pp. 289–455.

This chapter, too, (cf. §§ 28–9) is almost entirely based on Išt., 88–96 (see under 14.) and shows no trace of acquaintance with I.H. or Maq. The details in 7. and 8. are borrowed from I.Kh.

On the rivers of Khūzistān see § 6, 35–40.

The description of 1.–4. follows Išt.’s route, p. 95, in the opposite direction: Arrajān to Āsk (two easy marhalas); thence to Zaydān (1 ditto); thence to Dauraq (1 ditto); thence to Khān Mardawāih (1 ditto); thence

1 On the Lurdagan lake v.s., under 17.
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to Bāsiyān (1 ditto); thence to Ḩiṣn Mahdī (2 ditto); thence to Bayān [cf. § 33, 11.] on the Tigris (1 ditto); thence on to Baghdaḍ.

1. Iṣṭ., 90, places it in the centre of several waterways of which the course is now difficult to trace, for hydrographical conditions in Khūzistān have greatly changed. Schwarz, 330, places it near Sabla, upstream from Muḥammara.

2. Iṣṭ., 95, Dauraq, Khān-Mardawaih, Bāsiyān, all three on the road from Arrajān to Başra, cf. § 6, 39.


4. Iṣṭ., 92 (the fire seen on the Āsk mountain is due to some burning naphtha), 94 (battle of the Azraqī Khārijites).

5. Iṣṭ., 93: Abū'Alī, imām of the Muʿtazilites (d. in 303/916), see Ḏubbāʾi in EI.

6. Iṣṭ. has nothing on the position of Sūq al-arbaʾā but our author derives his record from Iṣṭ.’s Map, cf. § 6, 37., where Sūq al-arbaʾā is placed upstream from Ahwāz (?)

7. Iṣṭ., 88, is extremely brief on Ahwāz which he calls Hurmuz-shahr, and this particular detail is not in our author who at this place transcribes I.Kh., 170. Vullers, ii, 451, explains mār-i shikanj as mār-i surkh. Our author translates I.Kh., 170: مَّارٍ الصَّخْنَجِ.


9. Iṣṭ., 93 (Mānī). The form of the name Ramīz is half-way between the official form (cf. under 12.) and the popular pronunciation Rāmīz. The northern river of R.-H. (Rūd-i Aʾlā, or Ġūpāl) is not mentioned under § 6. See Minorsky, Rām Hurmuz in EI.

10. Iṣṭ., 91 (sugar from Masruqān comes to 'Askar Mukram). The specification of sugar not in Iṣṭ.

11. Masruqān is a locality, not a town, Iṣṭ., 90.

12. Rām Ürdmizd (اردمر) is probably a simple error for Ürmizd, cf. § 6, 39.


14. Īdhaj, now Mālāmīr, is barely mentioned in Iṣṭ., 89, 90, 92. This paragraph in reality describes Shūṣhtar (Tustar), Iṣṭ., 9218. I.H., 175, explicitly says that at his time the cover for the Ka’ba was more prepared at Tustar. Cf. § 6, 37.

15. V.dnūš-hāvūr is an interesting form [cf. 12.] for Jundāy-sābūr, Iṣṭ., 93 (*Gunde-Shāpūr). The town founded by Shāpūr I, according to Ṭabarī, i, 826, was named Bih az Andāw Shāpūr. Nöldeke considers this explanation (probably hailing from Ibn Muqaffa‘) untenable. Marquart interpreted it first as “better than Antiochia is (the town) of Shāpūr”, Ėrānshahr, 145, and later as “better (is) the Antiochia of Shāpūr”, Catalogue, p. 98. In the Middle Persian list of towns edited in the latter book, the name of Gundē-Sābūr has the form of Vndw (or Vndwg)-Shahpūr which Marquart emendates into Vand<iyq>og-Shahpuhr. But whatever the learned
Commentary §§ 30-1

etymologies of the original Sasanian name may have been, the fact is that V\textit{ndw}\textsuperscript{2} exactly corresponds to the first part of the Byzantine \textit{Bevdosagbōrov} and to our \textit{rodostosaros}, which all agree in showing that the people simplified the name into a compound \textit{Vindōy-Shāpūr}. On the well-known name \textit{Vindōy} see Justi, \textit{Iranisches Namenbuch}, 370. Hübschmann, \textit{Armenische Grammatik}, 85, explains the Armenian form \textit{Vndoy} (borrowed from Middle Persian) as a pet-form of some name like the Old Persian \textit{Vindafarnah} ("he who obtains glory"). Ibn al-Qiftī, ed. Lippert, 133-4, confirms that the name of \textit{Janding sāvar} was regarded as a combination of the names of \textit{Janding sāvar} (*Jandwi\textsuperscript{1}), a former master of the land, and Shāpūr. For the explanation of \textit{Mian Shuštī waḥdoster} in § 6, 40. see note to it. [However, a simpler restoration might be ]


§ 31. The Jibāl

Le Strange, pp. 185-231, Schwarz, pp. 445-957 (an amazingly detailed analysis of Arabic sources).

This chapter, too, is based on Ḩāṣṭ., 195-204, drastically abridged. Of the original details some could, as a matter of fact, have been found by the author in the MSS. of Ḩāṣṭ.'s work which, as usual, contain many additions (cf. notes in \textit{BGA}, i and iv). The description has been arranged according to Ḩāṣṭ.'s itineraries (or his Map). 1. the capital; 2.-7. the road from Isfahān to Hamadān (the latter town forgotten!); 8.-12. ditto from Hamadān to Khūzistān; 13. ditto from Hamadān to Kirmānshāh; 14.-15. western localities; 16.-18. the road from Qazvīn to Tabrīz; 19.-21. Rayy and its neighbourhood; 22. the road from Rayy to Hamadān; 23. ditto from Rayy to Isfahān.

1. Ḩāṣṭ., 198, I.H., 241, give the distance of 2 miles (variant: 1 mile), which is approximately equal to half a farsakh. The list of textiles is a crucial point. Ḩāṣṭ., 199, speaks of \textit{al-\textsuperscript{i}attābī wał-waṣñī} wa sā'īr thiyyāb al-\textit{ḥarīr} wał-gatun but the Gothan epitome (ed. Moeller) adds \textit{rājāl waś̄l̄aṣ̄l̄atān}, cf. also \textit{BGA}, iv, 407 (from the Leiden epitome): Our author omits ые and incorporates the addition which is interesting, for no other writer seems to speak of \textit{siglatun} being fabricated in Isfahān, see Schwarz, 888-90. This heavy figured silk stuff was chiefly produced in Armenia and Baghdād (where it was of blue colour), though Heyd, \textit{Histoire du commerce du Levant}, ii, 700, admits that some of it came to Europe from Persia. See now G. S. Colin, \textit{Latin "siglatun"}, &c., in \textit{Romania}, 1930, lvi, 178-90 and
418. The Zarinnūdih is not in Iṣṭ., but in I.Kh., 20, 176 (whose story on its reappearance in Kirmān is not reproduced in our author).

2. Iṣṭ., 198. This Khān Lanjān has been wrongly taken for the place of refuge of Firdausī, cf. Le Strange, 207. In fact the details found in the MS. Br. Mus. Or. 1403, described in Rieu’s Catalogue, ii, 535, refer not to Firdausī but to the scribe (who apparently wrote in 779/1377).

4., 5. Iṣṭ., 199, cf. Qudāma, 199, under Ighārayn. The mention of the ruin of Burj may have been suggested by what Iṣṭ. says of the past glory of Abū Dulaf’s dynasty in Karaj.

7. No details on Rāmin in Iṣṭ. but I.H., 258, calls it مدينة صالحة.

8., 9. This Karaj was the minbar of the Rūdrāvar rustāq, Iṣṭ., 199. The indistinctly written ٢ in view of the explanation seems to be ٦ cheese”, but no other author mentions cheese in Rūdrāvar, Schwarz, 504. Perhaps the word was misread from ٣. 10. cf. Minorsky, Nihāwand in EI.

11. Lishtar, Iṣṭ., 197 and 201 (hazelnuts). Now Alishtar, in Northern Luristān, one of the localities of the ancient Kassite country where the “Luristān bronzes” have been discovered. According to the Nuskhat al-qulūb, p. 107, there stood (formerly) in Alishtar the fire temple of اَذارخش اَذارخش, i.e. either ādharakhsh “a thunder-bolt”, or ādharakhsh “the 9th day of the Ādhar month”. [Marquart, Erdnšahr, 82, and Streifzüge, 347, restores Ādharakhsh in I.Kh., 120, &c., as Ādhar-jushnasf. He adds in Wehrot, 88: “der Hengst weitsnap ist das Symbol des Blitzfeuers, das aus dem Wasser geboren wird.” However, the famous temple of Ādhar-gushnasf lay in Ādharbāyjān, and with regard to Alishtar we may hardly go beyond the restoration*آذارخش ]

12. Shāpurkhāst, as results from Maq., 401, is Khurramābād (surnamed probably after the Khurramī sectarians who, in the tenth century, were very numerous in this locality, cf. Ibn Miskawaihi, The Eclipse, i, 278). See Minorsky, Luristān in EI.


15. The words on the sociable character of the inhabitants belong only to Dināvar, Iṣṭ., 198. On the other hand both Shahrazūr and Suhraward are described as having fallen into the hands of the Kurds. This is the only ground for coupling the two towns of which the one lies west of the Zagros (cf. Minorsky, Shehrisār in EI) and the other between Hamadān and Zanjān. The spelling شهر زور (cf. also Sharaf-nāma, ed. Veliaminov Zernov, i, p. 20 ult., شهر زور) shows that the name was not considered as an idāfat construction. It rather confirms the etymology *Shah-rāsūr “the Kingly Forest”, for Siyyā-razūr “the Black Forest”, in view of the Byzantine Συήραςος, τόν Συήραςος, and the similar Pahlavi and Syriac forms, see Marquart, Stidarmenien, 1929, p. 558, and Herzfeld, Mitt. aus Iran, ii, 2, 1930, pp. 73–4.

19. Ţalaqān, district on the upper Şāh-rūd; not to be confounded with § 23, 52., and 76.
20. Išt., 208, under Daylam.

Of the produce of Rayy, our author borrows from Išt., 210: cotton and cloaks (abrad) and ibid., 208 o (in the Gothic epitome): cotton stuffs. Maq., 396, mentions precious taylasūn-scarves, produced in Sudd near Rayy, and Ibn al-Faqīh, 253, glazed plates (al-ṭābq al-mudahhana). It is curious that our author speaks of (ضاورد و روغن) “china and oil (?).” Ghādāra means “greenish plastic clay”, “big plate”, and “china”. The word روغن in our author’s source very probably (“raughan kashida?” echoes the term mudahhan which in the first place means “covered with oil (glaze?)”. The mention of china in Rayy has certainly in view the famous “Rayy potteries” and confirms the fact that they were fabricated long before the Seljuks. Cf. also the name of the poet Ghadārī who was a native of Rayy and died in a.d. 1034.

22. Išt., 214, places Sāva on the road from Rayy to Jibāl. Áva (usually coupled with Sāva) is mentioned several times in Maq., 386, 401. Rūdha and Būsna (?) , Išt., 198b, belong to the same locality.

§ 32. Daylamān

For a long time the knowledge of the Caspian provinces was considerably behind the general standards of Muslim geography. Baladhuri’s and Baladuri’s remarks, valuable as they are, have a fragmentary character. I.Kh. and Qudāma do not describe the Caspian provinces. Ya’qūbī, 276–7, and even I.R., 149–51, are too brief. I. Fāqīh, 101–14, chiefly follows Baladhuri and gives little purely geographical information. The oldest systematic accounts available until now were Išt., 204–17, I.H., 267–76, and Maq., 353–73. Even in comparison with Maq.’s interesting data, our author considerably increases our knowledge of the country. His extremely exact information on the neighbourhood of Lāhijān suggests the idea that he might himself have sojourned there, or perhaps been a native of that region. Our author’s description is separated by some three centuries from the next independent and valuable account of Gilān found in ‘Abdullāh Qāshānī’s Tārīḵ-i ʿUlţūyū, Bib. Nat., supplément persan 1419, ff. 38b–45a (partly and inadequately edited in Schefer, Chrestomathie persane, ii,

The tenth century A.D. is the period of the expansion of the Daylamite tribes whose original home lay in the mountainous districts between Gīlān, Qazvīn, and Zanjān. On the episodes of their extraordinary career see Minorsky, *La Domination des Dailamites* (No. 3 of *Publications de la Société des Études Iraniennes*), Paris, 1932, the object of which is to show that in a period when the Arab dominion had waned in Persia and the Turks were still lingering on the eastern frontier of the Sāmānīd empire, the Daylamites took up the task of reviving the Persian national tradition in the western part of Persia and that the Daylamite “interlude” was of great importance as a connecting link in the history of Irān. The Daylamite successes are reflected in the terminology of the contemporary geographers who under “Daylam” enumerate all the lands round the Caspian Sea, including even the Khazar territory in the north, see Maq., 353–73. Our author does not go to such extremes but under “Daylamān” describes: Gūrān (1.–5.), Ṭabaristān (6.–15.; 21.–23.), Kumis (16.–19.), Daylam “proper” (24.), and Gīlān (25.).

1. Gūrān. The seat of the king of Ṭabaristān proper was Āmol, as rightly stated under 13. Gūrān was the seat of the more important Ziyārid dynasty (A.D. 928–1042). Maq., 357, also mentions both Shahristān and Bakrābād, but the name of the river Hirand (on which cf. Barthold’s Preface, p. 29) does not seem to occur anywhere else.

Dihistān undoubtedly echoes the name of the ancient nomad people Aḍa’i Dahae one of whose branches were the Aparnoi; from the latter arose the family of the future Parthian rulers, see Tomaschek, Da’ai in Pauly-Wissowa, Real-Encyclopädie, viii, 1945-6. I.Kh., 118, seems to quote a different Dihistān in Ṭabaristān; another Dihistān is mentioned by Iṣṭ., 268, in Bādḥghās (§ 23, 24.). On the peninsula called Dihistānān-sur (?) see § 4, 38.


4. In the fifteenth century the dialect of Astarābād was used for religious propaganda by the Ḥurūfī sect, cf. Huart, Textes persans relatifs à la secte des Houroufis, GMS, ix, 1909.

5. Abaskūn (or Ābaskūn, cf. Yāqūt, i, 55 and 91) must correspond to Σωκανάνα πόλις which Ptolemy, vi, cap. 9, mentions in the south-eastern part of the Caspian. Abaskūn was an important port after which the whole Caspian Sea was sometimes called, cf. Juvaynī, GMS, ii, 115: bahr-i Ābaskūn. It is usually located near the estuary of the Gurgān river (at Gümüş-tāpā), cf. Dorn, Caspia, pp. 67–8, 92, Barthold, Irrigation, 33; Le Strange, The Lands, 379. Hamdullah Mustaufī, Nushat al-qulūb, 239, calls Abaskūn “an island” adding that in his time it was submerged by the sea of which the level had risen when the Oxus [temporarily] changed its course and flowed into the Caspian.

6. Cf. Minorsky, Māzandarān, in EI. The situation of 7.–13. appears from the following route given in the opposite direction by Iṣṭ., 216: Āmol to Mila 2 farsakhs; thence to B.žī (?); 3 ditto; thence to Sāriya 1 marhala; thence to Mār.st [or Maq., 372: Abār.st] 1 ditto; thence to Abādān [or to Limrāsk] 1 ditto; thence to Ṭamīsha 1 ditto; thence to Astarābād 1 ditto; thence to Ribāt Ḥafṣ 1 ditto; thence to Jurjān 1 ditto. A detailed analysis of this route is found in Marquart, Untersuch. z. Gesch. von Iran, ii, Leipzig, 1905, pp. 58–60. According to I.R., 149–50, the eastern frontier of Ṭabaristān lay at ḫāʾit al-jurr (“the burnt brick ribāt”) which probably is connected with the brick wall (ḫāʾit . . . min al-jurr) which stretched between the mountain and the sea and was attributed to Anūshirvān, cf. also I. Faqīh, 303. In later times Shah ‘Abbās built (or rebuilt?) the wall on the river Kirind (cf. Ptolemy, vi, cap. 9, Xpínōs) which was called jar-i Kūlbād, cf. Dorn, Caspia, 103. Our author seems to have imagined that the wall surrounded Tamīsha. The latter is identified by Marquart, o.c., 56, with Bandar-Gaz.

10. Māmṭīr = Bārfurūsh.

14. Iṣṭ., 217, ‘Ayn al-Humm, but the name Alhum may be of local origin. This place situated at an easy marhala from Āmol on the sea must be identical with Ahalom (sic) which the Russian 5 verst map shows in the delta of the Āmol river to the south-west of Mahmūdābād, cf. Melgunov, 177: ʿalām رو.
15. Rūdhān "copper (mines?)", later Rūyān and *Rūyanj (so instead of Rūbanj in Iṣṭ., 204) formed a separate kūra, I.R., 149, and was ruled by the dynasty of Ustundārs, see Justi, *Iranisches Namenbuch*, p. 433, and Minorsky, Rūyān in *EI*.

16. Kūnish (*Kūnish*) is the region lying outside Tabaristan proper along the southern foot of the mountains, cf. Ptolemy, vi, cap. 5: ἢ μὲν παρὰ τὴν Ῥωμανίαν Κομισρήν, ἢ μὲν παρὰ Ῥωμανίαν Ἰμπρίμ. standing in the text must be an error for *Kūnish* for Yaʿqūbī, 276, says explicitly under Qūmis that the inhabitants of its capital Dāmghān, who are of Persian nationality (*ajami*), are extremely skillful in production of woollen qūmiš-textiles (آکیه الصوف الفرنسیة).

17. Dāmghān (now Dāmghān) is probably Ἐκατομπυλος βασίλευον of Parthian times. In the list of its products I translate the word *alam* by "border" preferably to "banner", as it grammatically belongs to *dastār*. Curiously enough one of the imām-zādas of Dāmghān, built according to Khanikoff, Mémoire sur l’Asie Centrale, p. 74, in the fourth century A.H. is called Pīr-i **ʿ**Alamādār (here "beflagged" would be a more suitable interpretation).

20. On A. F. Stahl’s map Umgebung von Tehran, in Peterm. Mitteil., 1900, Shalamba is shown circa 6 Km. to the south of the town of Damāvand.

21.–23. The Qārin mountain lay to the south of Sārī. The castle of Pirrīm was probably situated on the western branch of the Tījin river. Sāmār corresponds to Iṣṭ., 205: Sahmār which stood at 1 day’s distance from Sārī and was the only city (*madīna*) of the Qārin-kūh. The last prince of the original Qārinid dynasty (which claimed descent from the legendary Kāva) was Māzyār, executed in 224/839, cf. Minorsky, *Māzyār in EI*. Then the rival and more important Bāvand dynasty (supposed to descend from Kayūs, brother of the Sāsānian king Kavād) must have seized Pirrīm. Several princes of this dynasty bore the name of Shahriyār, after which the mountains were called Shahriyār-kūh. The story of the miraculous spring in the Qārin mountains is not identical with what is found in Ibn al-Faqīh, 310 (on the spring at al-Ṭāq), Zakariyya Qazwīnī, ii, 239, 270, and Ḥamdullāh, Nuzhat al-qlūb, 277 (on the spring Bādkhāna near Dāmghān), cf. Vasmer, *Die Eroberung Tabaristāns*, pp. 101–2. However, all these reports point to a former adoration of springs which is clearly confirmed by the *H.-ʿĀ* and consequently must be added to the list of wonderful customs existing in the Caspian provinces, see Maq., 268–71, analysed by Inostrozhev in his *Études sasánides* (in Russian), SPb., 1909, pp. 110–35.

24. Of the districts of Daylam proper (cf. Iṣṭ., 204, *al-Daylam al-mahd*) Latra and Varfū [for the ending cf. Laspū south of Somām] are mentioned in Ibn Isfandiyār, p. 162, and Langā, home of the ‘Alid Abul Ḥusain (d. 421/1030), *ibid.*, 54, all three in connexion with Rūyān; consequently they must be located on the eastern side of Daylam. A Langā on *RM*, Map, is shown in the eastern part of Tunikābun, south of ʿAbbāsābād and Aspichān, cf. Melgunov, *o.c.*, 182. M.rd is unknown. Chālkārūd river is some 65 Km. west of Chālūs, *RM*, 131. K.rkūd must correspond to Karkarū-sar lying immediately east of the Chālūs, Melgunov, *o.c.*, 180, *RM*, 151,
and Dinär-rūd to Dinā-rūd, a narrow strip of coast mentioned in the Tārīkh-i Khānī, ed. Dorn, SPb., 1857, p. 212, between Sakhtasar (eastern frontier of Gilān) and Khushkarūd (in Rānikūh). Judāhanjān and Dālamā (Dorn, 1614, 211-17) have not been found.1 Haussam, according to RG, pp. 336–7, is identical with Rūdisar, which lies 13 Km. east of Langarūd. With regard to Haussam we have Ḟāhr al-dīn’s indication (ed. Dorn, 1850, p. 19) that the western frontier of Ṭabaristān is Malāt “which village of the town of Haussam is now known as the port of Rūdisar”. It must be admitted, however, that such a position for Haussam does not tally with its place in our author’s enumeration. As to the mountainous districts, Pazhm must be Bashm lying west of Somām (not Bashm west of the Chālūs), cf. RG, pp. 306, 351, and RFG. Shīr is the mountain south of Ashkavar. Vastān, considering the order of enumeration, must be sought east of Somām on the southern frontier of Gilān. All these names in the tenth century referred to districts rather than to the single inhabited points. Our author distinctly says that the towns of Daylam were Kalār and Chālūs, but as Iṣṭ., 206, reckons them to Ṭabaristān, our author evidently means only that Kalār and Chālūs were the market-places which the Daylamites visited. The town of Kalār must have lain near the col of Bashm (west of Chālūs). In the plain of Kālārdasht (on the right affluent of the Sardābrūd) Miss F. Stark found a mound probably of the frontier fortress of Kalār. See F. Stark, The Site of the City of Kalar, in Gf, March 1934, pp. 211–17 (with a map).

25. Gilān. The contents of this passage have been treated by Barthold in Ivesitiya Kaskas. Istor.-Archeol. Instituta, 1927, vi, pp. 63–6, though without any explanation of the geographical terms. In the tenth century the Gil (Gīl), inhabitants of Gilān, were a tribe usually distinguished from the Daylamites, see Minorsky, La Domination des Dailamites, p. 23, note 28, and the Gil often quarrelled with the Daylamites, as our author seems to confirm. The frontier between the two tribes passed roughly speaking between Langarūd (Gilān) and Rūdisar (Daylam).

The Safid-rūd divides Gilān into two parts, viz., “this side” and “that side”, in local dialect respectively called Biya-pīsh and Biya-pas (biya “water” is cognate with Avestan vaday “watercourse”), and each of them had a different dynastic history, cf. Zāhir al-dīn, Tārīkh-i Gilān wa Daylamistān, ed. Rabino, Rasht, 1330 a.h., and the epitome of it in H. L. Rabino, Rulers of Gilān, in JFRAS, July, 1920, 277–96.

On “this side” of the river the districts (not yet towns! as pointed out by Barthold) were Lāfjān = Lāhījān [for f > h cf. Nīfāwān = Nīhāvand]. Miyālaʃjān seems to be identical with Mālf淖jān, on the road from Lāhījān to Siyākhal (Barfjān), RG, 329.3 Kushkajān lies on the eastern bank of the

1 If the second name is *Nylān-rūdār it may be compared with the source of the Langarūd river rising near the village now called Leyl (*Neyl or Na¡?). Cf. p. 410, l. 16.


3 Another restoration of this indistinctly written name may be Niyālfjān (?), cf. notes to § 36, 36–41.
Safid-rūd, *ibid.*, 327. Barfjān is the centre of the district Siyāhkal, southeast of Lāhijān, *ibid.* 278, 284. Dākhīl, in Rūh-shāhī-pāyīn, north of Lāhijān, *ibid.* 322. Tijin, on the road going west from Lāhijān to Kīstum, *ibid.*, 328. Ch.m.a (reading uncertain) may be connected with Chomkhalā, port of Langarūd, north-east of Lāhijān.

On “that side” of the river, Khāṅgajāl (reading uncertain: *fānkajāl*, &c.) could not be identified. The district of Nanak lies south-east of Rasht, *RG*, p. 228, 242. Kūtum (*Kūtum*), even if we judge only by its place in the enumeration, corresponds to the present-day Kuhdum (pronounced: *Kodom*) lying some 5 Km. north of the Imām-zāda Ḥāshim. This latter stands at the point where the highroad from Ḍazvin to Rasht following the left bank of the Safid-rūd emerges from the Elburz mountains into the Gilān plain. ʿAbdullāh Qāshānī in his *Ṭārīkh-i Uljāyūtu*, f. 39v, says: “On the western side of the Safid-rūd the first province (wilāyat) is Kūtum, lying on the bank of the Sabid-rūd (sic); i.e., south of it are the mountains, and east of it the Safid-rūd; the province stretches (?) east to west. Kūtum is the name of the district, whereas the chief place of Kūtum is called Bāzār-i Shahristān. . . . The province of Kūchaspān [now: *Kūchasfān*] is situated north of Kūtum on the sea-coast. . . . Rasht is situated to the north-west of Kūtum.” In later sources there is some confusion as to the location of Kūtum. Ḥamdullāh in the *Nushat al-qulūb*, pp. 163, 217–18, places it on the shore of the Caspian near the estuary of the Safid-rūd and calls it a port (bandar-gāh-i kashti). Abul-Fidā, p. 429, locates it at 1 day’s distance from the sea. This latter indication can only have in view the former centre of the Kūtum district, i.e. Bāzār-i Shahristān or Gūrāb-i Kuhdum, cf. *RG*, 215, which must have lain considerably to the north of the present-day Kuhdum village (even as the crow flies, the latter is situated at 47 Km. from the nearest western estuary of the Safid-rūd). It must be remembered that the Safid-rūd has several estuaries and it is possible that Ḥamdullāh had in view the port of Ḥasan-kiyā-dih as giving access to the Kūtum district. By Sarāvān our source evidently means the upper (southern) part of the former principality of Kūtum (on its extent see *RG*, 215). In Nāṣir al-dīn Shāh’s grant of 1280/1863, quoted in *RG*, 83, the Sarāvān borough is considered as a part of the Kuhdum borough, cf. *ibid.*, 218, 237, and *RFG*. Most probably Sarāvān (“head of the waters”) is precisely the locality now called Kuhdum “tail, or foot of the mountain”, whereas the ancient centre of Kuhdum lay lower down on the left bank of the Safid-rūd. The name of the district of Paylamān-shahr (to which belonged the borough of the same name mentioned separately) has now completely vanished; judging by its place in the enumeration it may have lain between Sarāvān and Rasht. Our record of Rasht (not yet a town!) is the earliest in existence. In the *Ṭārīkh-i Uljāyūtu*, f. 40r., Rasht is described as a seat of a governor and as a place where the tomb of a venerated saint (Ustād Ja’far) and a mosque were found. Cf. also a desultory note

1 The text of this important source is corrupt, and on f. 41a Kūtum is wrongly placed to the east of the Safid-rūd.
§ 32  

Daylamān  

391

in the *Nushat al-qulūb*, 163. The further rise of Rasht is connected with the dynasty of the amīr Tijāspīn the fifteenth century A.D., cf. RG, 69, 416.

The last part of the paragraph enumerates the places on the road going northwards to Transcaucasia and is far from being so complete. The Tūlim (now Tālim) district lies north-west of Rasht and adjoins the Mūrdāb lagoon, RG, 190. The Dūlāb district adjoins the north-west corner of the Mūrdāb; its mountainous part is called Tālīsh-Dūlāb and that lying near the coast Gīl-Dūlāb, *ibid.*, 107–14. Kuhān-rūdī seems to refer to Kergānā-rūd, the central part of Persian Tālīsh, *ibid.*, 89–100. Astārāh most probably is Astārā, cf. Tārīkh-i ‘Alam-ārā, p. 742, Astārā. Khān-Balt (?) must be sought in the region of Mūghān, see Minorsky, *Mukān* in EI. This part of enumeration has a pretty close parallel in Maq.'s route (pp. 372–3): Sālūs (*Chālūs*) to Isbīdrūdī 1 marhāla; thence to Qaryat al-Raṣad 1 ditto; thence to Khūsh 1 ditto; thence to Baylāmān 4 ditto; thence to al-Dūlāb 4 ditto (?) thence to Kuhān-rūdī 3 ditto; thence to Mūghākān 2 ditto; thence to al-Kurr (Kur river) 2 ditto; thence to Ḥāshāddhar 2 ditto; thence to al-Shamākhiya 2 ditto. These distances are not exempt from suspicion and it is right that after Kuhān-rūdī the Ḥ.-‘Ā. should insert Astārāh. As our Khān-B.ī does correspond to Mūghākān, it is very likely identical with Bīlāsuvār, an important centre of Mūghān. [The name, probably *Pila-suwar* "great cavalier" is a familiar Daylamite name.]

The "boroughs" of Gīlān (Gīlābād, Shāl, Dūlāb, and Paylāmān-shahr) cannot yet be located. Maq., 355, mentions the towns in Daylam: B.rvān, V.lām, Sh.kīr.z, Tārām (Tārōm on the middle course of the Safīd-rūdī), Khāsm; and in Gīlān: Dūlāb, Baylāmān-shahr, and Kuhān-rūdī, *ibid.*, 360.

Neither under Daylam (§ 32), nor Adharbājīn (§ 35) does our author mention by name the Tālīsh region extending along the coast between Gīlān and Muqān. In the earlier Arab writers two names occur frequently together astārāh wa al-rādā, see Marquart, *Streifzüge*, 280 (with numerous quotations). As regards Tāyīlasān it is clear that it is an Arabic popular etymology for Persian Tālīsh-ān (whatever the real origin of the interesting Tālīsh people be). In Arabic ṭayīlasān means not only a sort of head-kerchief worn by the learned people, but in a technical geographical sense "a half-moon shaped gulf" which is exactly the case of the south-western corner of the Caspian where Tālīsh is situated. The only place remaining available for the ṭūlī is the mountainous tract lying west of Tālīsh between Ardabīl and Zanjān, called Tārōm (in Arabic al-ṭūlī) and Khalkhāl, see Minorsky, Tārōm in EI. Birūni in his *Canon* quotes al-Ṭarīm between al-Tārīm and Zanjān. I feel sure that both al-ṭūlī and al-Ṭarīm must be read *al-Hīr (Hīr) and refer to Khalkhāl of which the chief place is still called Herow<Her (*Hēr)-āb, see Minorsky, *Transcaucasica*, in *Jour. As.*, July, 1930, p. 72.

1 See Khuwārizmī, pp. 80–1 (Caspian Sea) and the annexed map illustrating different forms of sea-forests. Cf. Rennaud, *Abūl-Fīddā*, i, 19. Nallino, *Rifae-
§ 33. ʾIrāq


Starting with the capital 1. Baghdād, the description follows the course of the Tigris down to 6. Wāṣīt; 7.–13. lie in the region of Başra; 14.–19. on the left bank of the Tigris and up the road to Persia; 20.–25. on the canals joining the Tigris and Euphrates; 26.–28. on the right bank of the Euphrates; 29.–32. above Baghdād on the Tigris. Most of the places are shown on the sketch-map in Le Strange, o.c.

By “the great kings” living in ʾIrāq the Būyids are evidently meant.
8. Maftah mentioned by Išt., 81, and its position is indicated by the canal Maʿqīl (§ 6, 46.).
10. Başra. Išt., 80 ( = I.H., 159) mentions the same graves and states that Başra pays the ʿushr instead of taxes based on the cadastre (mash), cf. I.Kh., 1413. To a different source belongs the item on the “veiled” (burqaʿi); ʿAlī, i.e. the leader of the rising of the black slaves in 255/868. On his supposed genealogy see Tabari, iii, 1742, 1857; cf. Noldeke, Orientalische Skizzen, Berlin, 1892: “Sklavenkrieg im Orient”.
11. Bayān according to Išt., 95, was the last place belonging to Khūzistān. This is a new example of our author’s method of enumeration, v.s., § 29.
12. ʿAḥmadān ( ?) not found. ʿAḥmad-i Pāk lying in the neighbourhood of Baghdād would be out of place here. Perhaps the sāmānī-mats mentioned under 13. are connected with ʿAḥmadān ( ?). ʿAḥbadān may belong to the same locality. ʿAḥbadān with its humble industries had to wait another thousand years before becoming the present-day bulwark of the Anglo-Persian Oil Co.
14. Madhārāb (above Wāṣīt) is to be distinguished from Madhār (§ 6, 46.) which would come naturally at this place.
20. Kūthay-Rabbā, as in Išt., 86.
26. The formula of blessing karrama ʾllāhu wajhahu, as applied to the caliph ʿĀli, is sunnite. Very astonishing is the omission of Karbalā (Išt., 85) which would have been unthinkable for a shīʿa, but see p. 177.

§ 34. Jazīra

I.Kh., 73–4, 93–9; Išt., 71–8; I.H., 137–57; Maq., 136–51 (iqlim aqrū). Le Strange, The Lands, 86–114 (most of the places will be found on Map
§§ 34-6  

**Jazira**


The definition of Jazīra as an "island" is not exact as a large portion of it lies on the left (eastern) bank of the Tigris. On the rivers cf. § 6, 46. and 49.

The description goes as follows: 1.-8. in a straight line from Mausil westwards; 9.-15. on the Euphrates downstream from its bend; 16. on the right bank of the Euphrates bend; 17.-19. near the Balikh river; 20.-22. down the left bank of the Tigris. Āmid and Sinjār are omitted in the enumeration though Āmid is mentioned under § 6, 46.

4. The details on Nişabūn all in Iṣṭ., 73. Sang-i ābghina stands for jawāhir al-sajāf (I.H., 143: jauhar il-zajāf), by which "silica, silicious earth" is evidently meant.

7. Abridged from Iṣṭ., 74.

8. Diyar-Rabi'a is precisely the province comprising 1.-7.


14. 'Abdullāh b. al-Mubārak al-Marwāž, an ascetic and traditionalist, lived 118-81/736-97, see *Ta'rikh Baghdād*, x, 152-62.

16. See Herzfeld, *Bālis*, in *EI*. Jir Manbij is a different place from Manbij reckoned to Syria (§ 38, i.). The spelling Shumaishät, instead of Sumaisāt, is very common, and already Yaqūt, ii, 276, 417, warned against it. *Sumaisāt* (ancient Samosata) lies on the right bank of the Euphrates west of Āmid; *Shimshāt* (ancient Arsamosata) lay north of Āmid on the left bank of the Eastern Euphrates upstream from Kharpūt, cf. Le Strange, *o.c.*, 108, 116, and Markwart [Marquart], *Südarmenien und die Tigris-quellen*, Wien, 1930, pp. 242-4. Moreover, Marquart postulates the existence of two different Shimshāt of which the lesser known lay south-west of Āmid on the eastern bank of the Euphrates. This may give a clue to the spelling of Shumaishāt under § 36, 16., and Sumaisāt under § 38, 1.

19. On the church of Ruhā (Edessa) Iṣṭ., 79; already I.Kh., 161, says: "The Romans pretend that there is no stone monument surpassing in beauty the church of Ruhā."

§§ 35-6. Ādharbāḏhāgan [Arminiya and Arrān]

Münejjim-bashi's work and several rare Ottoman-Turkish sources); Schwarz, *Iran*, viii/1–8, ix/i (new series in progress since 1932).

In the author's table of contents (v.s., pp. 47–8) the description of Armenia and Arrān forms a special chapter. However, in spite of the concluding words after 7., several places, such as 9., 10.–12. (Khoy), 16.–18., and perhaps 19. usually reckoned to Ādharbayjān (cf. Iṣṭ., 181–2), are described under Armenia. Both this arrangement and some other items in the beginning of our chapter (17. 19.) unexpectedly recall Maq., 374, but our author adds several new and interesting details. The part concerning Arrān has certain points in common with Iṣṭ. and the paragraph on Shīrvān is undoubtedly based on the same source as Masʿūdi's passage in the *Murūj*, but here, too, the Ḥ.-ʿĀ. contains a good deal of original information.

I. Ādharbayjān.

Under Ādharbayjān first comes the capital Ardavīl, and then the enumeration, without much order, proceeds from the south-easternmost corner (2. Asnā) to the north-easternmost point on the Araxes (7.). In Armenia first comes the capital (8.) followed by the points lying round the Urmīya lake 9.–12. (Khoī), then north of the Van lake and in Armenia proper (the rest of 12.–15.), then in northern Ādharbayjān south of the Araxes (16.–18. and perhaps 19.). In Arrān: 20. evidently continues the series 16.–19.; then comes the capital (21.), then the places between the Araxes and the Kurr and along the latter river (22.–28.); finally (west to east) are enumerated the places lying immediately south of the Caucasian mountain down to the Caspian Sea and Dagestan (29.–41.). The enumeration is roughly clear but it has all the habitual defects of the author's method (v.s., notes to § 29).

1. The kings of Ādharbayjān for the greater part of the tenth century were the Daylamites of the Musāfīrīd family. See Kasrawī, o.c., Minorsky, *La Domination des Dai lamites*, Paris, 1932, and *Musafīrīn El*. However, the province had a number of local rulers as appears from I.Ḥ.'s enumeration of the Musāfīrī feudatories, *BGA.*, ii, 254.

2. See Minorsky, *Uṣnūn* in *EI*. Sarāv, now Sarāb (I.Kh., 120: ʿl.ʿ). Jābrūqān corresponds to I.Kh.'s 119, 121, Jābrūn, which, together with Nirīz, belonged to 'Alī b. Mūr. Nirīz lay 14 farsakhs south-east of Urmīya, and Jābrūn 4 farsakhs farther south-east. The two places must be located south of the lake of Urmīya, probably in Sulduz, see Minorsky, *Nirūz* and *Sulduz*, in *EI*.

3. See Minorsky, *Tabrīz*, in *EI*. In the tenth century Tabrīz was an insignificant borough. 'Alī b. Ahmad al-Azdī towards 251/865 was the financial agent for Armenia (and Ādharbayjān) and in 260 rebelled against the new wāli of that province 'Omar b. 'Alī b. Mūr, see Ṭabarā, iii, 1584, 1668.

Adharbādhagān

5. Barzand, 6. Mūqān, and 7. Vartān lie north of Ardabil, see Minorsky, Mukān in EI. Vartān (called by the Arabs Warthān) lay on the bank of the Araxes, now ruins of Altan.

II. Armenia.


9. I.Kh., 120: Dākharraqān, actually Dihkharghān (local Turks call it: Tukharghan). Yāqūt, ii, 636, derives the name from that of Kisrā’s treasurer Nakhīrjān (?). It is curious that both Mcq. and our author should have reckoned this town to Armenia though it lies between Tabriz and Marāgha both belonging to Ādharbayjān. This arrangement most probably reflects some complications of feudal dependency: single boroughs could still resist the prevailing Daylamites. An apparently ancient Armenian colony exists in Dihkharghān. In 1905 I saw there a number of old tumular inscriptions in Armenian.

10. and 11. see Minorsky, Urmiya and Salmās in EI.

12. The form Arjīj (perhaps influenced by the popular etymology arziqe > arzīz) is unusual instead of Arjīsh, in Armenian Archēsh (on the north-eastern bank of the Van lake).

13.–16. Malāzgird, Qāliqala (usually Qāliqala, cf. Baladhurī, 193, < Armenian Karin-K’alak’), and Mayyāfārīqīn formed the line of Muslim strongholds in Armenia directed against the Byzantines. On the famous battle of Malāzgird of A.D. 1071, see the sources in Baron V. Rosen, Zap., i, 1886, pp. 19-22, 189-202, and 223-32, and lately C. Cahen, La Campagne de Mantsikert, in Byzantion, ix/2, Brussels, 1934, pp. 613-42. Mayyāfārīqīn in the tenth century belonged successively to the Ḥamdānīs, Būyīds, and Kurdish Marvānīds, see Minorsky, s.v., in EI.

16. See Minorsky, s.v., in EI.

17. Here begins the more original part of the chapter. Mīmādh (*Mīmādhi)¹ is found in Baladhurī, 207, and Maq., 51, but only the mention of 18. Ahar as its centre enables us to locate the district in southern Qarajadagh (this latter name must be a Turkish popular etymology for some Iranian name like *Karaj, see Minorsky, Urm in EI).

Ibn Rawwād was certainly a member of the Rawwādīd dynasty which ruled intermittently in Tabriz and its neighbourhood from the beginning of the third century a.h. till the Seljuk times, see Baladhurī, 331, I.Kh., 119, cf. Minorsky Tabriz, Marand, Marāgha in EI. More particularly our Ibn Rawwād must be identical with Abul-Hayjā b. Rawwād of whom I.H., 254, in his famous passage on the local rulers of Ādharbayjān and Armenia, says

¹ There are several names known resembling our میمن. I.Kh., 23, mentions a میمن in Kūmis and, 43, a میمن in Fārs (Išt., 104: Mā’in, town of the Mymand nahiya); a میمن, Išt., 161, lay between Sirjān (Kirmān) and Fārs and, according to Yāqūt, i, 799, was also called میمن.

It is possible that some of them are connected etymologically.
that from his possessions at Ahar and Varzuqān (this latter situated southwest of Ahar, and upstream from it on the same river) he paid in 344/955 50,000 dinars to the Musāfīrid Marzubān b. Muḥammad, cf. Kasravī, o.c., ii, 37. The earlier Rawwādīds, mentioned with the nisba "al-Azdi", evidently belonged to the Arab tribe which first occupied these parts of Ādharbayjān; the later Rawwādīds have the nisba "al-Kurdi", but there is no need to imagine that the later Rawwādīds were of a distinct origin from their earlier namesakes; more probably the new nisba only refers to the gradual iranicization of the family as a result of marriage ties with local elements. Quite particularly such must have been the case regarding the branch established in the wild region of Ahar and depending on the Musāfīrīds, I.H., 254.

A most unexpected statement is that the said Ibn Rawwād belonged to the family of Jūlīndī bul (more probably *ibn?) K.rk.r (vocalization indistinct). Barthold, Preface, p. 39, has rightly noticed the incongruity of this passage in which a quotation from Iṣṭ., 140, referring to a pirate chief in the Persian Gulf (§ 29, 3.), is applied to a ruler in Northern Ādharbayjān. Iṣṭ. describes Jūlīndī as an Azdīte of Yemen and the first idea that occurs is that our author wanted to hint at the Azdīte origins of the Rawwādīds. However, such an admission would be of no help for the explanation of the patronymic Jūlīndī bullying in our text. It is much more likely, therefore, that instead of the learned Arab genealogy we have to admit here a mere misreading of some little-known complex found in our author’s source. The clue to Jūlīndī bul is given by the appellation Čarg Kīrkan which the poet Qatran uses with regard to the grandson of Abdul-Hayja mentioned above.

The question is only how to read Kīrkan. Our author obviously uses Kīrkan as a man’s name and considering the local possibilities I venture to read the whole complex Jūlīndī bul as *Jawānshīr ibn Grigor. In Persian cursive such a confusion has nothing extraordinary about it. If we start from what looks the least mutilated part of our name Kīrkan we must admit its likeness to the Armenian name of Grigor which was particularly frequent among the princes of Arrān (Caucasian Albania, in Armenian

1 He belonged to a branch of the Khārijite Julandīds of ‘Omān among whom the name Julandī seems to have been hereditary. ‘Abd and Jayfar, sons of a Julandī, are said to have been converted to Islam as early as 8/629, Balāḏurī, 76; Tabarī, ii, 1949 (under 129 A.H.) mentions a Julandī b. Mas‘ūd b. Jayfar b. Julandī al-Azdi, see ibid., iii, 77–9. Cf. G. P. Badger, History of the Imāms of ‘Omān, 1871, pp. xi, 7–8; Zambaur, Manuel de gényalogie, 1927, p. 125. In Persian the pronunciation seems to be Julindī, cf. O. Mann, Die Mundart d. Mukri-Kurden, Berlin, 1909, ii, 361 (the name surviving in Kurdish folk-lore may be a reminiscence of the Azdite tradition in Ādharbayjān).

2 Kasravī, o.c., ii, 57, spells chirāgh-i gargarīyān “lamp of the sovereigns” (?), from gargar “throne”. The former explanation by Rīdā-quli khān was “lamp of the Gargarians” from the little kingdom of Gargar on the Araxes near Julfī, though there are several other Gargars, cf. Hübßchmann, Die altarm. Ortsnamen, pp. 273–4.
The real founder of the Mihrān dynasty (which claimed Sāsānian origins) was Varāz-Grigor ("Wild-Boar" Gregory). His son Javanshīr, who lived in the second half of the seventh century and was witness of the Sāsānian fall and Arab invasion, is the best-known prince of Arrān. In the History of the Alvans written (towards 980–1000) by Moses Kalankatvats’ī the records of his exploits, real and legendary, occupy numerous chapters of Book II (Russian translation by Patkanian, SPb., 1861, pp. 137–84). Javanshīr ibn Grigor was certainly a local celebrity and the descent from him was a title of nobility. The last representative of the Mihrān line mentioned in Moses K’alankatvats’ī is Senek’erim (second half of the tenth century), cf. Manandian, Beiträge zur albanischen Geschichte, Leipzig, 1897, p. 19, and it would be quite comprehensible if the tottering dynasty, pressed by the Kurdish Shaddādids, tried to improve the situation by matrimonial ties with the other families of their neighbourhood. Nothing would have prevented "Ibn Rawwād" from boasting of his Christian ancestors on the maternal side for in a similar way Qaṭrān, see Kasravi, o.c., iii, 54, calls the Shaddādīd Faḍlān sham’-i al-i Bagratūn "lamp of the Bagratuni family" because his mother was from that house. On the Transcaucasian border the marriages between Muslim and Christian noble families were particularly numerous. Cf. the extraordinary story related in I. Athīr, xii, 270, of an Erzerum prince who became a Christian in order to marry the Georgian queen Rusudān. Consequently the strange genealogical detail which in our text accompanies Ibn Rawwād’s name, most likely reflects the ties by which the rulers of Ahar were trying to "redorer leur blason".

19. Sṅgān, mentioned in our text between Ahar and Kapan, must be looked for in the immediate neighbourhood of the Araxes. A parallel name is found in Maq., 374: Sinfān (?). The only place I can think of is the present-day Sūngūn which lies in Qara-jā-dagh, some 20 Km. north of Varzughān on the upper course of the Irgānā-chay joining the Araxes from the south. Sūngūn is the well-known centre of ancient copper mines. The term "Kingdom of Sunbāt" may refer to the Bagratunid Šmbat I (A.D. 890–914). In 344/955 I.H. speaks of the tribute which some "Bānū Sunbāt" paid to the Musāfirid Marzubān, and it is clear that our author, too, mentions Sunbāt as the best-known person in the dynasty and not as a contemporary ruler. It is noteworthy that even at present there are Armenian villages in the northern part of the Qara-jā-dagh.

1 According to Vardan, tr. by Dularieje, Jour. As., 1860, vol. xvi, p. 294, the Mongols on taking Mayyāfrāqin captured "a fine young man Sevata of Khachen [south of Barda’a], son of the Grand Prince Gregory", which indicates the persistence of the local hereditary names. The district of Partav (Arabic Bardha’a) situated on the Terter east of Ganja (Elisabethpol) even under Russian administration bore the name of Javanshīr. [Russian trans. of Vardan by N. Emin, Moscow, 1861, p. 186.]

2 The syllable -ān in common Persian pronunciation sounds -ūn. Moreover, a short i before u (ū) may be assimilated to the latter, bi-kun > bukun. Therefore one can imagine a development Sīngān > Sīngūn > Sungūn, and finally, in Turkish pronunciation, Sungūn.
III. Arrân.

20. Qabân is the Armenian Kapan ("defile"), a locality lying north of the Araxes (north of Ordūbād), cf. Nasawi, Sīrat jātāl al-dīn, ed. Houdas, p. 164: Qabân; Hiibschmann, Ortsnamen, p. 348; Brosset, Collection d'historiens arméniens, ii, 223–55: Davit'-beg on the wars (circa a.d. 1721) of the Armenians with the Ottomans in the region of K’ap'an (Kapan?).


22. The ruins of Baylaqān called Mil-i Baylaqān (Mīlār) are situated south-east of Shūsha, see Minorsky, Mukān in EI.

23. Bāzbār “tollhouse” is probably Javād, below the confluence of the Kur and Araxes [cf. Maq., 373: the station of al-Kūrī], where the travellers used to cross the river, cf. Olearius, Book IV, chapter xxi; J. J. Lerch, Reise nach Persien, in Büsching’s Magasin, x, 1776, p. 421, says that near the bridge of Javād 50 Persians were posted in an entrenchment in order to levy the bridge-toll (Brückenzoll) from the travellers and to watch over the bridge. Cf. under Mukān in EI.


20. Vardūqiyā must be a popular name for *Bardūj, the frontier district of Georgia lying south-east of Tiflis on the river Berduj (now Borchala).

27. Qal’a (as in Maq.) is Qal’a ibn K.nd.mān which Ist., 193, locates at 12 farsakhs to the east of Tiflis. Marquart, o.c., 29, suggests the reading *kūrman which would suit the Georgian district Gardaban, Vakhusht, o.c., p. 179 [to be distinguished from another Gardman, Balādhuṟi, 202, جرمان which lay farther east on a tributary of the Shamkhār river, cf. Hübschmann, o.c., 352]. V.i., note to 33.


29. Shakki (in Armenian Shak’ē) is the province lying to the west of Shīrvaṇ immediately south of the range dividing it from Daghestan. The extent of Shakki is considerably exaggerated. Cf. Minorsky, Shekki in EI.

30. On the expedition of the Rūs see Ibn Miskawaiḥi, The Eclipse, ii, 62–78, cf. Barthold, Preface, p. 29. Moses Kalankavats’i who wrote about our author’s time also recorded this invasion of the Rūzīk, Book III,
DAGHESTAN
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SHIRVAN
[ad §§ 36, 49 & 50]
cf. 31. Mubārakī is unknown.1 If we accept our author’s indication that it formed the beginning of the Shakki frontier, it must be looked for in the north of Bardha’a, perhaps near Yevlakh, for Shakki never extended to the southern bank of the Kur. Such a position of Mubārakī would be in keeping with the two names following it which we are trying to locate between Bardha’a and Shakki. A camp in that region would have been intended to intercept the communications between the northern and southern bank of the Kur. However, a much safer position for the camp would have been lower down on the Kur in the region of Lambarān, which indeed is mentioned in connexion with another expedition of the Rūs in a.d. 1173. Lambarān lies on the lower course of the Khachēn river, flowing south of the Bardha’a river (Terter, Arabic Tharthūr),2 in the direction of the Kur which it does not reach. Lambarān is almost certainly identical with the "Mesopotamia", which according to Išt., 182, lay at a distance less than a farsākh from Bardha’a and its gardens and, for a day’s distance in every direction, stretched between Karna (or Kurra), Lašūb (*Lachūb?), and Yaqtān (or Baqtān) none of which are now known.

31., 32. As the enumeration obviously proceeds in a northerly direction the Sūq al-Jabal can be tentatively sought near the present-day Aresh, and Sunbāṭmān near the Kakhetian (33.) frontier in the neighbourhood of Nukhi. At present a direct post road runs northwards as follows: Barda–Yevlakh (near the bridge on the Kur)–Khānābād (= Aresh qal’asi)–Nukhi. Aresh (circa 40 Km. north of Bardha’a) occupies an important position near a passage through the belt of hills (Na’lbando-daghī) screening Shekkī from the Kur valley. The name Sunbāṭ-mān may have the meaning of "the house of Sunbāṭ", but this gives us no clue, for Shakki lay too far from the Bagratunid dominions, and according to Maš’ūdi, Murūj, ii, 68, the king of Shakki towards 332 A.H. was an Adarnarsa. I.Kh., 122 (= Qudāma, 227), counts 8 stages (sikak) from Varthān to Bardha’a and thence 4 stages to the Kura (M. ‘A. Sa‘īdī). All three places seem to lie in one direct line. Therefore "the Armenian Manṣūra" is to be located to the north of Bardha’a, but nothing can be said yet on its identity with our 31. or 32.

33. Sānār are the Saavapāču, Ptolemy, viii, ch. 8, § 13, in Armenian Tsanar-k’, a spirited Christian people who lived north of the Alazan to the north-west of Shakki and were probably related to the peoples of northern Dagestan. Išt., 193 a (MS. C.), between Shakki and the al-‘arbi, (read: Sanāriya) mentions which may correspond to the valley called in Georgian Eliseni and in Turkish Eli-su, cf. Minorsky, Transcaucasica, p. 102. The name might then be restored as *Mansūra, v.1, 34.

[The identity of the Tsanar (in Georgian T’sanar with ejaculative ts’) does not clearly appear from the sources of which the principal are enu-

---

1 Unless مبارکي is a mis-reading of مبارکي, "Sunday market" (kurakha > Armenian kiurarke > kuperak) which lay in Bardha’a near the "Kurdish Gate" (bāb al-‘akrād) see Išt., 183.

2 As shown by Marquart, Wehrot, 6, the river is mentioned in the Bundahishn, § 24, under the name *Tort-rōt.
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merated in Marquart, Streifszüge, 424. According to the Armenian Geography, ed. A. Soukry, pp. 26–7 (I am using Patkanov’s translation in Zhurnal Min. Nar. Pros., ccxxvi, April 1883, p. 30): “in the same mountain [i.e. the Caucasus] after the Ardozians [an Alan tribe] live the Dajan, then the Dual, then the Tsokkhoy, then the P’urk’a, then the Tsanark’a, in whose land the Alan Gate is situated as well as the other gate called K’tsek’en after this (?) people. After them live the Duts, the Khuţ, the anthropophagous *Kist, the Dzlavat, the *Gudamakar, the Durtsk, the Dido, the Lek, the Tapotaran, the Alutakan, the Khenav, the Shilp, the Chilb, the P’wi. Then the Caucasus splits into two branches of which the one goes straight on and includes Shrvan and Khsrvan [§36, 37.] down to Khorsvem (?). The other branch having let out the river Arm which flows northwards into the At’l [Atil], runs in a north-easterly direction. In it live the T’avaspar, the Hechmatak, the İzmakh, the P’askh, the P’uskh, the P’wik’anak (?), and the Bagan, from where starts the long wall of Abzut-Kavat down to the Allminon marsh and to the sea. North of this [chain or sea?] lives the people Mask’ut’an in the Vardanian (?) plain near the Caspian sea. Here the chain approached the sea where the Derbend wall is found, i.e. the town of the Chor pass, the great rampart built in the sea. North of it, near the sea, is the kingdom of the Huns (Honats’); to the west, near the Caucasus lies the town of the Huns called Varajan, as well as (the towns) of Ch’ungars and Msandr [*Semendr]; to the east live the Savir down to the Atil which separates Asiatic Sarmatia from Scythia. These are the Northern Lands (Apakhtar) i.e. T’urk’astan. Their king is Khak’an and Khatun their queen, the Khak’an’s wife.

It results from this important passage that the famous Alan Gate (Darial pass) in the Central Caucasus lay in the territory of the Tsanar (and their neighbours?). In 239/853 Bughā sent by the caliph Mutawakkil executed the amir of Tiflis and marched against his allies the Şanār but was defeated by the latter, Ya’qūbī, ii, 588. In the parallel report of the Georgian Chronicle, Brosset’s transl., p. 266–8 (cf. Marquart, Streifszüge, 412), Bughā was attacked in Ch’artalet’ by the M’t’uli (“mountaineers”), the latter name usually referring to the highlanders speaking dialects akin to Georgian (Pshaw, Khevsur, T’ushi) and occupying both slopes of the Caucasian range, to the east of the Darial pass. In Ist.’s additional passage, v.i., 34, the *Sanāriya are mentioned roughly speaking between Tiflis and *Elīseni, i.e. in Kakhetia (and perhaps more especially in its northern,

1Only the preceding part of the text is available in Marquart’s translation, Streifszüge, 170. Marquart was not aware of the existence of Patkanov’s article and the valuable suggestions contained therein.

2At another place called Armna. According to Marquart, the Terek. Cf. the name of a valley Arm-khi occupied by the Veppi clan of the Ingush. This river (in Russian Kistinka) joins the Terek from the east near Jarakh (upstream from Vladikavkaz).

3From here to the end Marquart, Streifszüge, 58 and 492.

4According to the ancient history of Christianization of Georgia, the chief appointed by the Sasanians in the defile was the head of the garrisons of the region.
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trans-Alazan, part). It is also noteworthy that both the ruler of the Tsanar and the ruler of Kakhetia are given the same title of k'orepiskopos/korikoz (κωρεπισκόπος), cf. Marquart, Streifzüge, 409.

S. N. Kakabadze, who has lately re-examined the Tsanar question, points out that, according to Vardan the Great (thirteenth century), some princes of Gardaban (i.e. the region lying south of Tiflis, west of the Kur, and north of Shulaveri),\(^1\) probably in the eighth century, moved north and became rulers of the Tsanar, of the neighbouring mountaineers, and finally of Kakhetia. In the ninth to tenth century A.D. the Tsanar are often identified with the Kakhis (inhabitants of Kakhetia). Finally the Georgian-speaking peoples entirely absorbed the Tsanar, see Bull. Kavkaz. Istor.-Arkheol. Inst., Tiflis 1928, Nos. 1–3, pp. 5.6. This gradual evolution of the term Tsanar and the confusion of the original tribe with the territory annexed by its rulers may explain the contradictions in our texts.

As regards the nucleus of the Tsanar tribe, N. Y. Marr, Iev. Ak. Nauk, 1916, pp. 1397–8, hinted at its common origin with the present-day Chechen (a north-Caucasian people occupying the region between Daghestan and Vladikavkaz). Such is also the opinion of A. N. Genko, the undisputed authority on that part of the Caucasus, see Zap. Koll. Vostok., v, 1930, p. 711, and a personal letter of 24.iv.1936.]

34. Qabala, Ptolemy, Χαβάλα, in Armenian کاوالک. Its ruins are situated to the south-west of Shamākhī at the confluence of the two branches of the Tūriyān river. See now a special article on Qabala by my master A. E. Krimsky, Is istorii severn. Azerbeijana, in the Festschrift to S. F. Oldenburg (in Russian), Leningrad, 1934, pp. 289–305. Towards 332/943 Mas'ūdi, Murūj, ii, 68, mentions the King of Qabala "the one-eyed Lion (*Leo?)" and Iṣṭ., 1934, seems to refer to the same king in a passage which is found only in the Constantinople codex:

وَبَيْنَ الْلُّكْرَ وَشَرْوَانِ حَدٌّ وَبَيْنَ لِبَارِنِ حَدٌّ مَتَامٌ وَبَيْنَ لِبَارِنِ الْمُلْوَانِ حَدٌّ

وَكَذَلِكَ بَلَدَة الْعَبْسَا بِهَا كُوَّتَةٌ لَّسْتَ بِكُتَبٍ إِلَّا قَرَىٰ فِيهَا قَلْعَةٌ حَصَبٌ عُظُمٌ مِّمَّا يَلِىٰ بَلَادِ الْلُّكْرِ إِلَىٰ جَالِبَةٍ وَهُمْ يُحَمِّدُونَ عَلَيْهَا لِمِلْحَ صَاحِبِ الْعَبْسَةِ الْيَمِّ وَهُمْ جَوَارِهِ أَيَّامُهُمُ بَلَادٌ شَكِّٰثٌ ثُمَّ الْعَرَبِيَّةُ ثُمَّ السَّارِيَّةُ ثُمَّ تُغَلَّبِسُ

"the Lakz have a common frontier with Shirvān, and so has Shirvān with *al-Lyzān, and so has al-Lyzān with al-Mūqāniya as well as with the land of al-'Absiya (*Anbasa?); and this (al-Lyzān ?) is a district with not very many villages and in it stands a strong castle backing, in the direction of the Lakz, on their mountains; and they (i.e. the people of Lyzān) guard these mountains on account of the good disposition to them of the master of al-'Absiya and his good neighbourly relations with them. Then comes Shakkī, then the *al-'Isiya (<Eliseni), then the *Sanāriya, then Tiflis." It is true that the description would be more easily restored as *الدوبلة السَّمِّيةُ Eliseni (v.s.), but the description shows that it lay to the east of Shekkī. Therefore *الدوبلة السَّمِّيةُ

\(^1\) More exactly some Khalidian (v.i., p. 420) emigrants backed by the Garda-

emanians, see Vardan (transl. by Emin), p. 126.
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(or perhaps *al-jiristan) much more likely corresponds to the (hereditary?) possessions of 'Anbasa's family.

35. In de Goeje's edition of Iṣṭ, 187, the names بَرطح and بَرطح have been accepted as independent names though they are undoubtedly mixed in the MSS. According to I.R., 89, the Araxes flows past Warthān towards the town of *Barzanj and beyond it (idhā jāwaza-hā) joins the Kurr.¹ On the other hand, Mas'ūdi, Murität, ii, 75, says that the Kurr flows at 3 miles' distance from Bardha’a, then past Bardāj [بَرطح] with īmāla must be identical with بَرطح [بَرطح] which is "one of the districts of Bardha’a", and finally joins the Araxes near the village al-Šanāra² (*جواجو). In the description of roads Iṣṭ, 192, gives the following distances: "from Bardha’a to بَرطح (variant بَرطح) 18 farsakhs; thence to the ford on the Kurr³ and (?) to Shammatkiya 14 farsakhs, thence to Shirvān 3 days, thence to al-Abkhāz (?) 2 days; thence to the Samūr bridge 12 farsakhs; thence to Bāb al-abwāb 20 farsakhs." As in the parallel passage Maq., 381, gives 1 mārhal from Bardha’a to Bardij and thence 2 marhalas to Shammatkiya, we are led to conclude that the name of the place where the Kurr was forded (cf. also I.H., 251) was Bardij (*Bardēj) and that it lay much nearer to Bardha’a than is indicated in Iṣṭ, 192 (I.H., 251). There are reasons for locating Bardij on the right bank of the Kurr, opposite the present-day Körpi-känd, "the bridge village". The place situated above the estuary of the southern branch of the Terter river is certainly suitable for crossing the Kur; its distance from Barda (Bardha’a) is circa 34 Km., and from Shammatki circa 100 Km., which roughly corresponds to one light stage and two heavy ones. Our بَرطح may be a mistake for بَرطح. In any case, Mas’ūdi’s بَرطح is in favour of a form without n. Much less certain is the situation and even existence of بَرطح for which we have to depend on I.R.’s vague indication (which may even refer to the well-known Barzand, v.s. 5, situated between Varthān and Ardabil?)

IIIa. Shīrvān.

36-41. On Shīrvān see Dorn, Versuch einer Geschichte der Schirwan- schache, in Mém. Ac. des Sciences, SPb, 1840, iv, pp. 523-602; Pakhomov, Kratkiy kurs istorii Azerbaycana, Baku 1923; Barthold, Derbend, Shīrvān, and Shīrvānshāh in EI; A. Z. Validi, o.c. On the localities neighbouring on Shīrvān see under § 50. See Map xi.

The history and historical geography of the region still raise numerous

¹ I do not think A. Z. Validi is right in locating Barzanj near Javād. The road to Shamāki had to cross the Kur much farther upstream from Javād. Iṣṭ.’s distances cannot be considered as decisive.

² [*Chūnāra?].

³ Wa min Barzanj ilā ma’bar al-Kurr ilā al-Shammatkiya 14 farsakhan. Very probably instead of ilā ma’bar al-Kurr we must read ala ma’bar al-Kurr and place Barzanj "at the ford". The MS. C has the variant wa min-hā yu’bar al-Kurr (confirmed in Yāqūt, iii, 317b) indicating that the river was crossed immediately beyond Barzanj.
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questions and for the better understanding of our text we shall have to examine the following points:

The old centres of Shirvān.
The dynasties of Shirvān-shāhs.
The Mazyadid dynasty


Kh.rūsān-shāh.

THE OLD CENTRES. The earlier transmitted form of the name Shirvān is Sh.rvān (شروان). It does not seem to be connected with the name of its ancient capital 39. Shāvarān (Iṣṭ., 187; Shabarān) situated on the northern slope of the south-easternmost extension of the Caucasian range. It stood in the plain on the left bank of the river Shabran which flows to the Caspian to the south of Qubba (between the Belbele and Gilgine rivers). The Arabic history of Darband, see A. Z. Validi, o.c., p. 42, says that the earlier (Mazyadid) rulers of Shirvān were buried in Shabarān, and that Shabarān was fortified [only] in 373/983-4 (one year after the composition of the H.-‘Ā.). To the south of the Caucasian range lay the centre of the Lyzzān fief held by a collateral branch of the Mazyadids and probably corresponding to the present-day Lāhij (v. i.). The second important place to the south of the range was Shammākhiya, so named in honour of Shammākh b. Shujā', ruler of Shirvān towards A.D. 796-9, see Ţabari, iii, 645, Baladhurī, 210, cf. Marquart, Streifzüge, 455. This place rose to notoriety under the name of Yazidiya when the Shirvān-shāh Yazīd II rebuilt it in 307/918-19, cf. A. Z. Validi, o.c., 44 (where Yazid's genealogy is wrong), but still later only the original name Shammankhiya (>Shamākhi) survived. Iṣṭ., 192, counts from Shammankhiya to Shirvān (= Shabarān!) 3 days.

THE DYNASTIES. Four dynasties of Shirvān-shāhs are known.

I. The original Shirvān-shāhs of Sāsānian times. In the enumeration of the Caucasian "gates" (bāb) I.Kh., 124, does not mention Shirvān but among the kings appointed by the Sāsānian Ardashīr, ibid., 17, he quotes (in Ādharbayjan) یزدیمه who may be identical with Shirvān-shāh.

II. After the Arab conquest the descendants of Yazīd b. Mazyad al-Shaybānī became masters of Shirvān (end of the eighth century to middle of the tenth, or even of the eleventh century).

III. The Kāsrānīd dynasty, very probably of Iranian origin, is numis-

1 Its ruins are mentioned by the travellers on the road from Darband to Baku. Gmelin, Reise durch Russland, SPb., 1774, iii, 36, speaks of "die traurigen Überbleibsel des ehemaligen Schabrans, welche in Steinhaufen, verheerten Festungen und einigen unbewohnten Häusern bestehen". See also F. A. Marschall v. Bieberstein, Beschreibung d. Länder zwischen den Flüssen Terek und Kur, Frankfurt, 1800, p. 25.

2 Though Yāqūt, iv, 147, identifies Yaṣidiya with Shamākhi it is possible that more exactly Yaṣidiya corresponds to the *lashkar-gāh where according to our text the king resided and which lay at 1 farsakh's distance from Shamākhi.

3 See Dorn, o.c., Barthold's supplement to his translation of Lane Poole's Muhammadan dynasties, pp. 294-6, Zambaur, Manuel, pp. 151-2.
matically known since the second half of the eleventh century A.D., but its origins must be earlier for it seems to be connected with the great Daylamite movement of the tenth century, see E. A. Pakhomov, *Kratiy kurs*, p. 28, and a personal letter dated Baku, 19.xii.1932.

IV. In 784/1382 Shaykh Ibrahîm Darbandî founded the last dynasty of Shîrvân-shâhs which lasted till the occupation of Shîrvân by Shâh Tahnâsp in 957/1550.

**The Mazyadids.** Our knowledge of the chart of this dynasty is chiefly based on the work of Aḥmad b. Luṭfullâh Mûnejjim-bashi. This author (d. in 1113/1702) wrote his *jâmi‘a al-duwal* in Arabic but it is accessible only in a Turkish abridged translation printed in Istanbul in 1285/1868 under the name of *Ṣâhâ‘if al-akhbâr*. Mûnejjim-bashi uses very good sources and among them an old Arabic *Ta‘rikh Bâb al-Abwâb* (tenth or eleventh century?), as shown by A. Z. Validi, *o.c.*, who had the opportunity of consulting in Istanbul a MS. of the original *jâmi‘a al-duwal*.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Yazîd b. Mazyad b. Zâ‘ida</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Khâlîd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Muḥammad (ii)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Haytham (ii)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. ‘Alî (i) (<em>circa</em> 300)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Muḥammad (iv) (337-45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Qubâd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Sâlûr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Farîdûn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Commentary

The last three generations of the chart do not inspire much confidence and their Iranian names would suggest that some important changes were taking place in the rulers' house. It is even possible that these princes ought to be quoted under the Kāsrānīd dynasty (v.s.).

On the founder of the dynasty and his sons we possess a long paragraph in Ibn Khallikān (de Slane's translation, i, 68, and iv, 218–32), according to whom Yazid died in 185/801 and Khālid in 230/844–5. [Ṭabarī, iii, 650, says that Yazīd died in Barda'ā'īn in 175/791.]

Several important dates are found in Masʿūdī and I.H. The former in his Murūj, ii, 21, says that at the time of the well-known Russian invasion (soon after 300/912–13) the king of Shirvān was 'Alī b. Haytham which fully agrees with Mūnejjām-bashi. Masʿūdī adds, ii, 4 and 69, that 'Alī b. Haytham having perished [in a war with the Khazars, &c., as we learn from Mūnejjām-bashi, iii, 174], the power, about the time of the composition of the Murūj, was seized (taghallub) by Muḥammad b. Yazīd who (previously?) killed his uncles. As Masʿūdī wrote in 332/943, the beginning of Muḥammad IV's rule must either be placed a few years earlier than in our chart, or Masʿūdī must actually have in view Muḥammad's father Yazīd (the builder of Yazīdiyya). According to Masʿūdī Muḥammad and his father were originally masters of َلآران (variants: لِآران, &c.) to which now were annexed Shirvān, Mūqānīya, and even Darband (v.i. 40.). Muḥammad claimed to be a descendant of the Sāsānian king Bahrām Gūr but we need not interpret this ambitious assertion as a break in the Mazyadīd line for Masʿūdī's text suggests that his rivals were his uncles, and even the names of Muḥammad b. Yazīd and his descendants follow the onomastic traditions of the family. The claim of Sāsānian origin is most probably to be explained by Muḥammad's birth from a lady belonging to some noble local family, and we learn, for example, from the Murūj, ii, 4, that the masters of the neighbouring Sarīr were also "true" descendants of Bahrām Gūr.

Another interesting indication is found in the list of feudatories of the Musāhrīd Marzūbān emanating from the latter's minister Abūl-Qāsim (344/955), and transmitted in a trustworthy text (I.H., 250, 254). In it is quoted the name of Muḥammad b. Aḥmad al-Azādī (sic) šāhīb Shirvānshāh (sic). The contemporary of Abūl-Qāsim could be only 10. Muḥammad b. Yazīd and if I.H. really refers to 12. Muḥammad b. Aḥmad the latter's name must have been subsequently introduced into the table to bring it up to date (I.H. completed his work circa 378 a.h.). The puzzling al-Azādī (instead of al-Shaybānī) may be an auditive slip for al-Yazīdī which latter would eventually indicate that the ruler was one of the hānī Yazīd b. Mazyad.

RULERS OF *LYZĀN AND THEIR FIEF. One detail must particularly attract our attention. Masʿūdī, Murūj, ii, 6, affirms that originally Muḥammad b. Yazīd and his father¹ were rulers of َلآران (variants: لِآران, &c.).

¹ Ibid., 69, more decidedly: hawwā wa man salafahu min ḍabā'īhi, i.e., his ancestors, but perhaps on his mother's side!
This geographical name has been studied in detail by Marquart, Eränsahr, 119, who finally adopted the reading *Erän-shäh and thought that the bearers of this title were the princes of the Arrân proper, i.e. the region between the Kur and Araxes. Marquart's principal argument seems to be that the passage of the Murūj, ii, 5, suggests for the land of "Lāyrān" a position between Shirvān and al-Muğāniya. However, the Murūj, ii, 68–9, distinctly states that the Muğāniya in question lay in the immediate neighbourhood of Qabala and was different from the Muğāniya situated on the shore of the Caspian, see Minorsky, Muğān in EI. Of great importance for the location of Lāyrān is the passage of İst., 193 a (Lyrān, Lyzān), translated above under 34. If our interpretation of it is right, "Lyrān" must have lain above Qabala on the southern slope of the Caucasus range, somewhere to the west of Shamākhi. Such is also the impression given by Yaqūt's additional passage on Bāb al-abwāb, missing in Wüsttenfeld's edition, i, 43838, but quoted in the notes to BGA, i, 187 [we must assume that the description starts here from some point on the coast in a westerly (?) direction]: "and on the coast of the (Caspian) sea, this side (dūna) of M.sq.t (§ 50, 3.) lies the town of al-Shābarān, small, fortified, and possessing numerous rustāqs. Above it is the rustāq of جندان and beyond it (warā' dhālīka) the villages of الحل (*Fabal, v.s. 31. Suq al-Fabal?) and Shirvān down to the frontier of Bākūh, D.rynq (?), al-Lakz, and the confluence of the two rivers [Kur and Araxes ?]. Then al-Lyrān lying behind these (khalfā dhālīka) and in it stands a great and strong castle in which springs coming down in cascades (kharrārā) are said to exist, and it is a very inaccessible castle.''

The source of the H.-'Ā. at this place is undoubtedly the same as the one underlying Mas'ūdi's passage and there is no doubt that our king with the threefold title is either Mas'ūdi's Muḥammad b. Yazīd, or one of his descendants. Our text completes Mas'ūdi very essentially. The name of Lyzān-shāh's celebrated stronghold, mis-spelt in the Murūj, ii, 69: نار, appears in our text in the perfectly correct form of نیال which is the name of the mountain (6,566 feet high) which separates our 37. Kurdivān (in the south) from Lāhīj (in the north). We may then assume with a great degree of probability that the second fortress mentioned in the same neighbourhood is no other than Sulūt (situated at 7–8 Km. to the east of Niyāl) of which an author writing about A.D. 1500 says: "on account of its loftiness the tent-cords of its inhabitants are tied to the pegs of the celestial vault" (Tārīkh-i Aminī, Bib. Nat. Paris, fonds persan 101, fol. 1340, in fine). These two fortresses undoubtedly marked the original centre of the Lyzān-shāh's fief, and it is tempting to identify the nāhiyat of Lyzān with the present-day Lāhīj valley which is situated at the sources of the Gardimān-chay flowing to the Kur east of the Gök-chay. Immediately

1 Cf. Georgian Movakan, which perhaps comprised the lands between the northern bank of the Kur and Eliseni (to the west of Shakkī).

2 i.e. much farther to the north than the position indicated by Marquart.

3 The mention of the Lakz in this connexion is unexpected.
north of Lāhij several passes lead into the territory which must be considered as the original Shirvān and into southern Dagestan (the presumable home of the "Lakz"). The ruins of Qabala lie at circa 80 Km. to the south-west of Lāhij. The Niyāl mountain, our firm point, overhangs Lāhij from the south.

*LYZĀN, “AL-ABKHĀZ”, LĀHĪJ. Though the name لرān has numerous variants (see their list in Marquart, o.c., 119), the majority of MSS. indicate an initial L; the dot over ژ is also sufficiently attested and generally speaking there are more cases of ژ being mis-spelt as ژ than vice versa. As regards our text, the neighbourhood of the perfectly transmitted name of Niyāl is a favourable indication for the authenticity of لرāن with ژ. In view of the analogies explained below the reading *LYZAN is preferable to *Lizān or Lēzān.

Not only geographically is *LYZAN to be placed near the present-day Lāhij, but even etymologically the two names must be connected. Both seem to be composed with suffixes of origin. In several Iranian names of the Caucasian region appears the suffix -ژ, corresponding to -ژ, -ژ, -ژ, &c. of the other dialects.1 By the side of such names as Gur-ژ (§ 42, 15.) and Lak-ژ (§ 50, 3.) our name is likely to represent Lay-ژ. Lāhij,2 too, is apparently formed with a similar suffix, but before comparing the essential part of the two names separated by more than a millenary we have to consider another name of the same region slightly younger than LYZAN. Išt., 187, enumerates the localities of Arrān in the following order:... "al-Shammakhiya, Shirvān,3 al-Abkhāz, al-Shābarān,3 Qabala, Shakki, &c.", and further, 192 (= Maq., 381) in the description of the route from Bardha’a to Bāb al-abwāb (v.s. 35.), places al-Abkhāz between Shirvān (i.e. Shābarān?) and the bridge on the Şamūr river, undoubtedly in the region of Qubba, see Minorsky, Kubba in EI, and A. Z. Validi, o.c., 39. The form لايجان has been adopted by the editor of the BGA but Marquart who collected all the relevant quotations in his Streifzüge, 174-5, was the first to recognize that the MSS. are in favour of some form like لايجان.

*LAYIJAN, LAYIJAN. [In the additional note, ibid., 508, he less happily connected the variant لايەنجان with Balādhi’ī’s (p. 197) بخت.] The inhabitants of the Lāhij valley are at present called Tāt, this Turkish term (cf. Kāshghari, i, 378, ii, 227) applying in general to sedentary, particularly Iranian, populations, see Minorsky, Tāt in EI. They are undoubtedly of Iranian origin and the dialect they speak (Tattī) is closely akin to the modern Iranian vernaculars of the Caspian region. The fact

1 To Marquart, ZDMG, xlix, 1895, pp. 664-7, belongs the merit of having shown the toponymic importance of these suffixes of origin. B. V. Miller, o.c., p. 35, confirms the existence of this suffix (-ژ, -یژ, -یژ) in the Tattī dialects.

2 The name is known only in Russian transcription of which the original must be لايەنجان, but the form لايەنجان is also possible.

3 Shirvān and Shābarān are strangely separated.

* Here it has nothing to do with the well-known Abkhāz people of the Black Sea coast (cf. § 50, 4.)!
that the Lāhij sub-dialect slightly differs from the rest of the Tātī group suggests that its speakers have been secluded in their valley for a considerable period, very probably since the times of the *Layzān-shāhs. The "small" area of *Layzān (v.s., Iṣṭ., 193 a) could hardly account for *Layzān-shāh’s prodigious career had he not some supporters elsewhere. The fact is that the Qubba district is another considerable centre of the Iranian Tāts who still (in spite of the gradual turkicization of the region) occupy 108 villages and form 17 per cent. of the local population. All these Iranian elements of the ancient Arrān territory most probably date back to the Sāsānian epoch when the deliberate policy of the kings was to settle in the sub-Caucasian region a faithful population of frontier guards. These ethnological and historical considerations make it probable that the master of *Layzān in his conquests found succour from the Iranian frontier populations, and on the other hand that these populations were as closely connected in the ninth and tenth centuries as they are nowadays. Therefore the supposition is admissible that their names, viz. لیزان and لیزان, are also related. The former is attested in the ninth-century authors (Baladhuri, 196, I.Kh., 124); the latter is found only in the tenth-century geographers (Iṣṭ., I.H., Maq.). The term Layzān in the tenth century (I. Faqih [in Yaqṭ], Mas’ūdi, Iṣṭ.) seems to survive only as a traditional title.

The difference of the terms *Lay-z and Lay-j (or Lāy-i) is then reduced merely to that of the vocalic length (resp. a/ā) and even in this regard we possess an intermediate variant in Mas’ūdi’s لیزان or لیزان. We may also remember such parallel forms as Arabic آذریجان and Persian آذربایجان, of which the latter (the two latter with a long ā after b). The earlier Arab writers often used ی to render Persian ē (v.s. 35. for Bardej) and to them their short a appeared probably more adequate for rendering the special timbre of the Persian ą. The existence in Arabic of

---


2 Mas’ūdi, Murūj, ii, 2. Baladhuri, 194–5, 197, and I. Faqih, 288, 291, call them الساسون, &c., cf. Marquart, Brān-sahr, 120. In his Aṣina in Festschrift Szinnyei, Ungar. Bibliothek, xiii, 1927, p. 83, Marquart restores the name as الساسون *spasigān "Dienstleute". In his Kulturanaleten in Ungar. Jahrbücher, ix/1, 1929, pp. 71 and 78, he suggests that the "Tät" speaking Jews of Daghestan are descendants of the former camp-followers of the spasigān. [In BSOS, viii/2, 1936, p. 616, J. H. Kramers quotes some forms in the MSS. suggesting the reading nişāstag "the settled ones, setellers".]

3 I.H., 250, after the Shirvān-shāh mentions a king of the الإیخار "possessing a kingdom which adjoins some of the Qab mountains, and his districts (ناواک) are known under the name of al-Abkhāzshāh (sic)". However, in the enumeration of Marzubān’s feudatories, ibid., 254, this king does not appear, and I strongly suspect that this malik al-Abkhāz is no other than the الإیخار who on p. 254 appears only in his new avatar of Shirvān-shāh! If so, the very confusion of the الإیخار and الإیخار is a new indication in favour of the identity of the two names.
two transcriptions of the same name could be paralleled by the double appellation of the Georgians who in the older sources are called * jurz (with -z) and in the later authors (since the Seljuk times) * Gurj (with -j).

We can now return to the present-day Lāh-īj of which the likeness to * Lāyīj (Lāyiz) is very striking. The inhabitants of Lāhij explain this name by the tradition that their ancestors came from Lāhijān (in Gilān). This latter name appears in Zahīr al-dīn, p. 130, and other local historians as Lāhījān but the oldest attested form of it is * Lāfījān (v.s., § 32, 25.) [cf. Ptolemy, vi, 2: * Nīfūwān > later * Nīhāvānd]. We must then admit that the original place in Gilān retained the old form of the name longer whereas in the Caucasian colony the evolution Lāfījān > Lāhījān > Lāyījān (or Līyān) proceeded more rapidly. The evidence in favour of the Lāhij tradition would be considerably corroborated if it were possible to prove that the name of the Nīyāl mountain is also to be found in the Lāhījān region. In Melgunov, o.c., 203–5, Nīyāku (*Nīyākth?) is a village belonging to Lāhījān; another village Līyālāsān or * Līyārastān is mentioned on the road Lāhījān–Lāngarūd (Līyāl < * Nīyāl?). The Caucasian Lāhij would not be the only colony of Lāhījān, for south-west of the Urmia lake a whole district (now inhabited by the Mukri Kurds) is called Lāhījān and several villages of the same name are known in Adharbājān, Fārs, &c., see Minorsky, Lāhīdījān in * EI. See Map x.

Incidentally it is interesting to confront the Lāhij tradition with the possible meaning of the name Shīrūn. In the latter -vān may be a suffix similar to that of the neighbouring Kurdivān (also v.s., p. 335). The remaining element Shīr/Shir is reminiscent of the name of another Caspian locality Shīrīz (< Shīr-īz) in Tabaristan, Tabarī, i, 2658, which in later times was called Shīr-īzān (< * Shīr-īz-ān), Zahīr al-dīn, p. 291, cf. Marquart, * ZDMG, xlix, pp. 650–4. Such an interpretation would suggest that the two groups of the Mazyadid subjects were originally transplanted from two neighbouring localities of the southern Caspian provinces! Cf. the names Damāvand and Balkan (Balkhān) of which the former travelled from

---

1 It is curious that north of the Alazan and south of Zakatali there still exists an isolated village called La'i'j which corresponds to the لاب stage of the name. Russian maps spell it Lajik, differently from Lāhij (Laghi; B. V. Miller: Lajik). However, La'i'j may be due to the Georgian pronunciation in which ħ is dropped. It is further possible to imagine that the local form of the name (*Lāyij) has been at a later time influenced by the better-known literary form of Lāhījān.

2 V.s., p. 404, the form Shīrīyān-shāh = Shīrūn-shāh?

3 Cf. also * ibid., 660, the personal name Shīrān Shāh of one of the ancestors of the Daylamite Buyids. [Shirījān (Shīrūd-hazar) is definitely substituted by Zahīr al-dīn, 291, to Tabarī's, iii, 1884, al-Shīrīz]. Both Tabarī, iii, 1015, and Yaqūt, iii, 275, reckon Shīrīz to Daylām. The river Shīrūd flows to the Caspian in Tūnikabūn, the district intermediary between Gilān and Māzandarān, see Stahl's map in * Petermann's Mitte, 1927, Heft 7, Tafel 13. On the other hand some Shīrīz is often coupled with Lāriz which presumably lay much farther east, Marquart, Erān-šahr, 127, 135, Vasmī, in * Islamica, iii/1, 1927, 119–20.] See Map x.
Adharbādhagan

the Caspian region to Kirmān [cf. p. 375, l. 25], and the latter from the east coast of the Caspian sea to the Balkans [cf. p. 205, l. 27].

KH.RSĀN-SHĀH. As regards the third title of our king, Barthold has already recognized its connexion with خرسان king mentioned in Balādūrī, 196 in fine, as the title of the king of the Lakz. On the common frontier of the Lakz with Shirvān see Ist., 193 a (quoted above) and Masʿūdī, Ṿurūj, ii, 510. Our author under 37. explains that Kh.rsān (Khursān?) lies between Darband and Shirvān near the mountain Qabq. If it is true that the people of *Layzān had to protect the lord of Qabala against the inroads of the Lakz, it is very probable that Lakz in this case refers to the southern Daghestanian tribes (Budukh, Khinalugh, Kriz, Haput, &c.) whose remnants occupy the northern slope of the mountains between Lāhij and Qubba. The Lakz are also named under § 50, 3.

40. The description of Darband is extremely brief and poor in comparison with Ist., 184. According to Masʿūdī, Ṿurūj, ii, 5, Muḥammad b. Yazīd of Shirvān seized Bāb al-abwāb after the death of his son-in-law (or father-in-law ʿībīr) ʿAbdūllāh b. Ḥīshām (*Ḥāshim?), descended from one of the prophet's ansār. [The close relations of the Shirvān-shāhs with the Darband Ḥāshimids can be inferred also from the joint action of 'Alī b. Ḥaytham and the ruler of Darband against the infidels of Sarīr, Shindān, and Khazar, see Münejjim-bashi, iii, 174.]

41. The spelling Bākū shows the antiquity of the present-day form. Ist., 190, writes Bākūh. The Persian form Bādkūba is a late popular etymology "wind-beaten". The Daylamites used naphtha for military purposes; cf. Ibn Miskawaihi, The eclipse, ii, 153; mazāriq al-naft wal-nīrān, a sort of tenth-century "Flammenwerfer".

§ 37. Arabia


See also the seas § 3, 3 b c; the islands § 4, 17.; the mountains § 5, 17.; the rivers § 6, 57.; the deserts § 7, 10–12.

The origin of the details under 4., 6., 9., 11., 12., 15., 19. could not be traced. Other details seem to be due to several different sources. Thus the description of Mekka evidently follows I.Kh. The item on Ṣanʿaʾ can be explained through Hamdānī whose work may have become known rapidly

---

1 In Moses Kalankatvats'ī, book ii, chapters 42–45, the envoy of the "Hun" king of Varāčān are called Zirādkhān-Khursan and Chat-Khazar. The second elements of the names undoubtedly refer to the ambassadors' nationality, i.e. respectively Khursan (sic) and Khazar. The name Zirdkin is of Iranian origin (zird "heart").

2 Cf. Balādūrī, 207, quoted in the note to § 50, 3c.
Commentary

through the pilgrims returning from Arabia. The mention of monkeys in Yemen coincides with Iṣṭ. The items on the coins and measures (cf. also the curious terms under § 10, 39.) are not identical with Maq., 97-9.

In the description of frontiers *Khulān must be read instead of Ḥaulān (the latter name, Maq., 154, belonging to one of the six districts of Damascus). The list of principal divisions is confused and incomplete (cf. Maq., 68, and Sprenger, Postrouent, p. 108). The place under the name may have been confused with Naswa (var. Nasway, Iṣṭ., 26g) situated at some 150 Km. to the south-west of Masqat on the southern slope of the 'Oman range. Its only title to distinction is that it was an important Khārijite centre. Another Nazwa is shown on the eastern side of the Cape Qatar (but the dual of Naswa would be نژوان). Among the Arab tribes *Hijr is a puzzle unless it stands for γαν.

The enumeration, as usual mechanical and erratic, begins with the two sacred towns to which Ṭā'īf is adjoined (1–3); 4–13. lie in southern Yemen; 14–15. in the south-western corner of Arabia; 16–20. in a zone beginning in northern Yemen and ending in the Hijaz opposite Mekka; 21–23. on a line between southern Yemen and the north-eastern corner of Arabia; 24–26. on the southern coast of the Persian Gulf; 27–32. across Arabia from the east to the north-west.

1. Mekka. For the measurements of the Mosque and the Ka'ba our author agrees with I.Kh., 132, and Maq., 72; cf. also Yaqūt, iv, 279. The circuit "round the stone" seems to be a wrong translation of ḥijr (an enclosure adjoining the Ka'ba), which the author must have misread into ḥajar ("stone"). I.Kh. precisely evaluates the circuit of the ḥijr (daur al-ḥijr) at 50 cubits, whereas Maq. assigns to it only 25 cubits. The meaning of the last of the measurements quoted becomes clear in the light of I.Kh. and Maq., who at this place give the length of the circumambulation of the Ka'ba (dharr al-ṭawaf), viz. 107 cubits. The "150 cubits" standing in our text must be the scribe's error provoked by the "50 cubits" mentioned immediately before it. The corrected text ought to run thus: *va as gird-i *ḥijr 50 arash va *darāzā-yi ṭawāf *107 arash.

6. Sa'da. Hamdānī, 67, only says that before Islam it was called Jumā' and in the days of old (fī qadīm al-ḥahr) possessed a castle with plastered walls (qaṣr mashīd). I.Kh., 136, speaks of the tanneries in Sa'da.

7. Hamdānī evidently stands for the important district of which Hamdānī, 199, also places "between Ṣanʿā' and Sa'da". Cf. Schleifer, Hamdān in El. On the other hand, in view of the mention of the *Banū Ḥimyar, Hamdān may have been confused with Ḥājan. Maq., 87, says "al-Ḥimyar is the town (balad) of Qaḥṭān between Zabīd and Ṣanʿā'". Iṣṭ., 26 (= I.H.) 33, mentions the Ḥimyar tribe only in Saba' and Ḥadramūt.

8. Ṣanʿā'. The detail on the crops stands practically as in I.R., 199, and more remotely reminds one of Hamdānī, 199. As regards the antiquity of the town Hamdānī, 55, says that it is the most ancient of the towns (aqdam mudun al- ṣa'd) having been built by Noah's son Shem.
9. Dhimār, cf. Schleifer, Dhamār in EI. 10. probably Shibām-Ḥarāz situated at 2 days' distance to the south-west of Ṣan‘ā’, see A. Grohmann, Shibām (1) in EI.


Iṣt., 2612, confirms that monkeys are very numerous in Yemen: they gather in masses and obey their chief as the bees obey their queen. Cf. W. Schmidt, Das südwestliche Arabien, 1913, p. 49, who says: “Gelegentlich trifft man... Paviane.”


17. I.Kh., 148. The town of ‘Aththar is Baysh, Hamdānī, 120, Maq., 79, 86.

18. Mahjara, I.Kh., 135, Hamdānī, 186, Maq., 111. According to Qudāma, 189, between Sharūm-Rāḥ and Mahjara stood a tree forming the frontier between Yemen and Hijāz.


21. On this famous centre of the Sabaeans and Ḥimyarites cf. Tkatsch in EI. ‘Uqāb is mentioned on the road from Ṣan‘ā’ to Ḥadramāt, Sprenger, Postrouten, 139. [Sprenger quotes Bakrī as his authority, but Prof. Grohmann tells me that the route is most probably quoted after Ibn Mujāwir.] Wādī Mījān, i.e. Bayḥān, “a long valley with fields and palms”, which Ibn Mujāwir, ibid., 142, mentions on the road from ‘Aden to Shibām at 7 farsahs from Dathīna, I.Kh., 138. On *Bayḥān see Landberg, Arabica, Leiden, 1898, v, 4. Mājā looks like مساح which I.Kh., 142 mentions under the mikhlaṣ of Ṣan‘ā’.


23. ‘Ommān spelt with the usual mistake ‘Ommān.

24. Sharja is here evidently the place on the western side of the cape Musandām (Sharja ibn al-Khattāb) and not the dependency of Zabīd, Maq., 53 and 92.


27. Fayd, belonging to the Ṭayy territory, Iṣt., 20, lies half-way between Qādisiya and Mekka, Maq., 251, cf. § 5, 16.


29. Fur’, a district of Medina lying at 4 days’ distance to the south of it, I.Kh., 129, Iṣt., 18.

30. All situated on the Tabūk road, Maq., 250: Tabūk-Taimā’-Wāḍī
§ 38. Syria


The elements of this chapter are mostly borrowed from Iṣṭ. but arranged differently. Our author’s enumeration runs along the routes, in which he also differs from Maq., 154, who describes administrative divisions.

1.–5. and 16. lie west of the Euphrates loop and I. (?), 16. (as well as 27.) have already been mentioned under Jazīra; 6.–11. are situated in the basin of the Jayhān; 12.–14. in Cilicia; 15. on the Mediterranean coast; 17. on the eastern fringe of Syria; 18. in the extreme south in the ‘Aqaba gulf; 19.–22. in the region of Aleppo; 23., 24. in the region of Ḥims; 26., 27. in the region of Damascus (27. already mentioned in § 34, 9.); 28., 29. in the Khārijite highlands; 30.–31. in the Jordan valley; 33.–39. in Palestine; 40.–42. in the basin of the Dead Sea.

1. Cf. note to Jazīra (§ 34, 16.).

2. The river of Sanjā according to Le Strange, The lands, 124, is Bōlam-su, one of the sources of the Kakhtā river, which empties into the Euphrates south-east of Malatya. On the bridge see Iṣṭ., 62.

3. The bridge-head mentioned under Jazīra 16. lay east of Manbij.

4. The two places are united arbitrarily. Ḥiṣn-Manṣūr is now called Adh-yaman. Qūrus, Iṣṭ., 65 and 67, lay much more to the south at 2 marhālas from Manbij and at 1 day’s distance from Aleppo.


14. The detail about the Byzantine sanctuaries is not found either in Iṣṭ. or in I.H. Cf. also Le Strange, Palestine, 404.

15. This enumeration of maritime towns seems to follow a map. مَسْجِد (?), which is not found in Iṣṭ. and I.H., seems to correspond to the الْوَدِّية al-Suwaṣaydīya mentioned in Maq., 54.

17. A similar arrangement of the localities on the eastern border of Syria. The details on the inhabitants are based on Iṣṭ., 61, 65.

18. Ayla corresponds to the Ėlāth of the Jews and the Aelana of the Romans, now al-‘Aqaba, see Nallino in Battāni, ii, 17. See now a very complete study by Ph. Schertl, Ela-‘Akaba in Orientalia Christ. periodica, ii/1, 1936, pp. 37–77.

§§ 38–9  

**Syria**

21. So in some MSS. of Iṣṭ., *BGa*, iv, 386, and I.H., 118 m, but in Maq. Ma’arra Qinnasrin. This place is to be distinguished from Ma’arra Nu’mân lying some 50 Km. south of it, see Honigmann in *El*.

22. A slight development of Iṣṭ., 61. I.H., 117, instead of the nice looks (jamāl) of the inhabitants speaks of their vices (khabāl). The details about the reptiles seems to be a lapsus, as Iṣṭ. (and still more vigorously I.H.) deny their existence in Hims.

23. Kafr-Ṭāb not in Iṣṭ. or I.H. but in Maq., 54.

24. Maq., 181, among the produce of Damascus mentions sufriyāt, which means “copper vases”, *BGa*, iv, 281, but the variant gives msfryāt (?), of which turajj (?)-i zard may be a tentative rendering.


27. Adruḥ, north of Mū’ān (Ma’ān), see Le Strange’s map in *Palestine*, and Lammens, *Adroh in El*.


§ 39. Egypt


The original traits of this chapter are the quotations from some unknown Book of Marvels, see 5., 6., 8., and perhaps 10. A hint at the political situation in Egypt (?) is found in § 10, 32. (since A.D. 969 the Fatimids were masters of Cairo). On the lakes see § 3, 19.; on the mountains § 5, 23–24.; on the rivers § 6, 62–64. In our enumeration 1.–6. and 8. represent lower Egypt, and 7., 9., 10. Upper Egypt (al-Ṣa‘īd).

1. Of the long description in Iṣṭ. only the detail about Shāfi’ī’s tomb (Iṣṭ., 51) appears in our author.
Commentary §§ 39-40

2. These two names are interesting as not appearing in Iṣṭ., and consequently borrowed from some other source. In I.H., 102 and 103 a, the two localities are found together, and the variant of the second name ذَخْرُ in accounts for our ذَخْرِ. The correct form is دَبْقُ (vocalized: Dabqu) or Dabqā, see Maq., 54, 193, but the place is better known as Dabiq, from which the celebrated textiles came. See Becker, Dabik, in EI.


5. The lake of Alexandria is that of Maryūt and not of Tinnīs. The detail on the invisibility of the lighthouse does not seem to be found elsewhere (personal communication by G. Wiet).

6. I.Kh., 159, attributes the construction to “Baṭlimiyūs al-Qalūdhī al-malik” (sic) and quotes an inscription written in musnad, of which the text is: “الدحيمها فان الهيدم Fqīh, 68. Our Arabic quotation resembles it only in the meaning. The size and the item on medical and astronomical inscriptions coincide in both sources. Iṣṭ., 51, I.H., 100, and Maq., 210, say nothing of Hermes. Maq. transcribes I.Kh.’s text of the inscription.

8. Iṣṭ., 53, 100, speaks of the sahara Fir‘aun; Iṣṭ, 154, and I.H., 106, quite briefly remark that off Baṣīr and Fustāt the crocodiles do no harm.

9. For Bulaynā Iṣṭ., 53 i, gives the variant al-Bulaynā (for Isnā given in the text).

10. The details on mines and wild asses not in Iṣṭ., I.H. or Maq. Cf. § 5, 23.

§ 40. Maghrib

Iṣṭ., 36-48; I.H., 41-73 (this remarkable chapter remained unknown to our author); Maq., 215-48. Al-Bakri, Description de l’Afrique septentrionale, tr. by Mac Guckin de Slane, extract from Jour. As., 1858.

This chapter chiefely follows Iṣṭ. with a sprinkling of details from some unknown source. The qualifications “prosperous”, “having great wealth”, &c., seem to be personal additions to the names by our author.

3. 1., 5. the present-day Italian possessions (in a systematic enumeration from east to west the localities ought to come as follows: 3., 1., 2., 4.); 2., 4., 6., 7.—Tunis; 8.—13.—Algiers; 14.—18.—Morocco.

There are two Zawīlas, see Grohmann in EI. The one is the suburb of Mahdiya and the other (which is meant here) a town of Fazzān (SSE. of Tripoli), see al-Bakrī, o.c., pp. 28-9, and E. Banse, Fazzān, in EI. Iṣṭ., 47, Maq., 246, without any detail evaluate the distance from Qayruwān to Zawīla as one month, while I.H., 66, counts from Zawīla to Ajdabiya 2 months, and from Ajdabiya to Fazzān 15 marhās. Cf. note to § 60, 1.


7. Qalshāna is mentioned by I.Kh., 87, among the towns of Qayruwān; Maq., 247, places Qalshāna at one marhāla from Qayruwān.


11. is Algiers, see Yver, Alger in EI. The name of the Berber tribe is
usually mis-spelt: Išt., 38, Mazgħannà, and 37 d, R.'by. Maq., 217, 228, Zaghħannàya, some MSS. Ra'nàya, &c.

12. "Like Tanas", probably in that it lies on the coast.


15. Išt., 38, also says that Baṣrâ lies opposite (bi-ḥidhâ') Gibraltar and in a variant, 39 a, the form Buṣaira is also given. However, Baṣrâ was an island town, cf. Yver, Baṣrâ in EI, and I.H., 55, gives a correct description of it.


17. Cf. Išt., 39, where Tanja is described as a great province (kûra) and Fàs said to be still in the possession of the (Fàṭimid) Idrîsids, but in our author's times the Spanish Omayyads were masters at Fàs (from a.d. 973).

18. The details about gold and panther-skins are not in Išt., I.H., or Maq., but Jâhîz in his interesting treatise on the different classes of merchandise, Tabâṣwar bil-tîfâra, published by Ḥasan Ḥusnî 'Abd al-Wahhâb al-Tunisî, Damascus, 1351/1932, p. 21, mentions among the produce of the Berber country and Maghrib: "panthers, qaraţ ("leaves of the salam mimosa" used as a dyeing stuff), saddle-cloths (lubûd), and black falcons", and, p. 18, particularly praises the Barbari panthers of which the skins are striped in sharp white and black, and which in spite of being of small size reach the price of 50 dinârs.

§ 41. Spain


This chapter is entirely based on Išt. and bears no trace of borrowings from I.H.'s additions. Additional details on Spain are found under § 5, 25.-26. and § 6., 67. On the northern neighbours of Spain see § 42, 19. and 21.

1.-2. the two greatest cities; 3., 4. Tudela, Lerida, Saragossa, Shantabriya in the north-eastern part of Spain; 4.-8. starting with Écija in the south the author, without much system, enumerates the inland towns, moving west, then north, and finally east. 9.-14. southern coast from east to west (all on one route in Išt., 41).

1. Three days' distance from Córdoba to the sea seems to fall short of the reality. I.H., 80, gives 7 days from Córdoba to Mariyya, port of Pechina (near Almeria).

3. On the abundance of samûr in Tudela, Išt., 44. Tudela not mentioned in I.H.

4. Birûnî, Canon: "Làrida on the Gh.î.sk frontier (thaghîr)." Shantabriya (?), mentioned in the neighbourhood of the eastern watershed of Spain (§ 5, 25.), corresponds to Shantabriya where Išt., 42, places the sources of
the Tagus. The province of Shantabriya (Centobriga) comprised more or less the present provinces of Teruel and Cuenca; the capital lay probably at the junction of the Guadiela with the Tagus, see Saavedra, p. 42. Rayya (I.H., Rayyā) is the present province of Málaga, cf. Seybold, Archidona, in El. Saavedra, 23, interprets the name as “regia, or regium” and compares it with the Phoenician name of Málaga, Malkhā. Isinja, so too in Išt. Ghāfiq was the capital of the Fahs-Ballūt province, Išt., 43, which was conterminous with Rayya. According to Saavedra, 50, Ghāfiq corresponds to Castillo del Almegávar, situated at 14 Km. from Los Pedroches in the north of the Córdoba province.

5. 6. Išt., 47, Bāja to Qūriya six days. Bāja lies west of Guadiana in southern Portugal; not in I.H.

7. Išt., 43, too, places Merida (and Toledo) “among the greatest cities of Spain”.

8. The detail is not in Išt.

9. So, too, in Išt., 41. On Ghaliyaskush and Ifranja see under Rūm (§ 42, 20.).

11. Išt., 42 (cf. also 45), among the produce of Málaga mentions the skin, which is taken for crocodile skins, which is put upon the hilts of swords; rough piece of skin of the lizard called ḏabb”.

13. Ocsonaba, or Osonaba, is the southernmost part of Portugal (Faró) in which Santa Maria de Algarve is situated. [Its ruins, as H. A. R. Gibb tells me, lie at 8 Km. north of Faró.]

14. Išt., 42, also says that Shantarīn is the only place in the Mediterranean and Atlantic where amber is found. The town Shantarīn (Santarem) lies a considerable distance up the river Tagus (§ 6, 67.). Consequently the expression ḏikhirīn shahrī-st az ḥudūd-i Andalus bar karān-i daryā must refer to the province of Santarem. Išt., 47, reckons from Beja to Shantarīn 12 days “and to the extreme limit of the Shantarīn province (aqṣā kūra Sh.) 5 days (more)”.

§ 42. Byzantine Empire

I.Kh., 100–13, Qudāma, 252–60, Yaʿqūbī, BGA, vii, 323, and Historiae, ii. 171–8; I.R., 119–30; I. Faqīḥ, 136–56 (see also under Yāqūt); Mašʿūdī, Taḥkīh, 176–89; Išt., 8, 45 (Kharshana), 68–71; I.H., 128–37 (an interesting and independent report based chiefly on Abul-Ḥasan Muḥammad b. Ṭāb al-Wahḥāb al-Taḏmūrī); Maq., 147–8, 150; Yāqūt, ii, 861–6, who quotes a long description of the provinces which he attributes to I. Faqīḥ, though it is not found in BGA, v; Idrīsī, ii, 209–304 sq. Constantine Porphyrogenitus, De thematibus, ed. Becker, Bonn, 1840 (cf. idem, De administrando imperio: additional remarks on Charsianon, Ṭwqavādū, &c.); W. R. Ramsay, Asia Minor; Tomasechek, Zur hist. Topographie von Kleinasien, in Sitz. WAW, 1891, cxxiv, pp. 1–106; Gelzer, Die Genesis d. byzant. Themenvor-

¹ I have also used the commented Russian translation by G. Laskin, Moscow 1899.
§ 42  

Byzantine Empire


In addition to the present chapter some interesting details on the Byzantine Empire are found in § 3, 11, 12. (the lakes); § 5, 18., 20., 21., 25., 28. (the mountains); § 6, 58.–60., 66. (the rivers). On the northern and eastern frontiers of the Empire see under each of the countries mentioned.

As Marquart, *Streifzüge*, xxxiii, 28, 207, &c., has shown, the principal sources from which the earlier Muslim geographers derived their information on the Byzantine Empire were Muslim b. Abī Muslim al-Jarmī and Hārūn b. Yāḥyā. On the former we possess a notice in Mas'ūdī's *Tanbih*, 190, according to which he lived on the Arabo-Byzantine frontier (thughūr) and wrote "on the history of the Byzantines and their kings and dignitaries, on their land and its roads and routes, the times (favourable) for the raids into their territory," the campaigns therein, on the neighbouring kingdoms of the Burjān, Abar, Burghar, Ṣaqāliba, and Khazar*. Mas'ūdī also gives the exact date (231/845–6) at which Muslim was redeemed from Byzantine captivity. I.Kh. *expressis verbis* quotes Muslim as his source.

Much less is known of Hārūn who also was a prisoner of war and taken from 'Asqālān (§ 38, 15.) to Constantinople whence at a later date he may have travelled to Rome. He wrote towards the very end of the ninth century (v.i. 17.) and his writings are known to us through the important excerpt in I.R., 119–32, and some items in Zakariyā Qazwīnī, ii, 406–7 and 397–9. I believe that some traces of his account can also be discovered in the Ḥ.-ʿĀ. and Gardīzī.²

On the whole our author follows I.Kh. (<Muslim). One point is particularly characteristic in this respect. In the introduction of the present chapter he says that the northern Byzantine frontier ran along "some parts of the Ṣaqālib and *Burjān countries and some parts of the Khazar sea".

¹ This part of Muslim's writings has survived in Qudāma, 259.
² See now an English translation of Hārūn’s report by A. A. Vasiliev, with extremely apposite additions by G. Ostrogorsky, in *Seminarium Kongakovianum*, Prague 1932, v, 149–64 and 251–7; critical review by H. Grégoire, *Byzantion*, Brussels 1932, pp. 666–73. The upshot of the conclusions of these Byzantine scholars is that Hārūn, captured probably towards the end of Leo's reign describes Constantinople under the brief reign of the Emperor Alexander (11 May 912–6 June 913). [The most striking of Ostrogorsky's arguments is Hārūn's silence about the presence at the ceremony either of the Empress or of the Emperor's co-regent, which only suits Alexander's reign. However, it appears from p. 252 that, between the years 893 and 894, 896 and 899, and finally 900 and 906, his predecessor Leo VI lived as a widower. This leaves a gap for my tentative dating of Hārūn b. Yāḥyā's report circa 900. The absence of a co-regent may be due to some temporary circumstances, or to Hārūn's oversight. The date 912, even admitting that it is not too late for I.R., may be too late for Jayhānī, if the latter, as is quite probable, was I.R.'s direct source on this point.]
These indications are directly borrowed from I. Kh., 105, who uses the same very uncommon term for the Black Sea. Through his blind imitation our author falls here into contradiction with his own terminology, cf. § 3, 5, and 6, and § 22, 14. The influence of Harun's data is apparent in our 15., 17., to say nothing of the general conception of §§ 22, 46, and 53.

I. Kh.'s (Muslim's) description of Byzantine provinces is very much to the credit of the Arab intelligence service. Gelzer calls I. Kh. "eine höchst zuverlässige zeitgenössische Quelle ersten Ranges". The data refer to the times of the Amorian dynasty (820–67)\textsuperscript{1} for which no similar systematic descriptions in Greek are available.

I. Kh., 105, quotes 3 themes in Europe and 11 in Asia (τὰ περατικὰ θέματα) and the same number is preserved in Qudāma and our author, though the order of enumeration is different in each of the sources as appears from the following table [in each column the numbers refer to the place of the theme within the respective list].

\begin{tabular}{lll}
\textbf{H. 'Ā.} & \textbf{I. Kh.} & \textbf{Qudāma} \\
1. Ṭablān & 1 & 1 \\
2. Thrace & 2 & 2 \\
3. Macedonia & 3 & 3 \\
4. Thracesion & 7 & 7 \\
5. Opsikion & 6 & 6 \\
6. Optimatōn & 5 & 5 \\
7. Seleucia & 13 & 9 \\
8. Anatolicon & 8 & 8 \\
9. Buccelarian & 10 & 12 \\
10. Paphlagonia & 4 & 4 \\
11. Cappadocia & 14 & 10 \\
12. Charsianon & 9 & 11 \\
13. Armeniacon & 11 & 13 \\
14. Chaldaia & 12 & 14 \\
\end{tabular}

Qudāma's order of enumeration\textsuperscript{2} is perhaps geographically the best (see Gelzer's map) but our author's system is very curious as indicating that he had a map before him, for starting three times in the south (4., 7., 11.) he each time moves straight towards the north!

The spelling on the whole is nearer to Qudāma than to I. Kh.

\begin{tabular}{lll}
\textbf{H. 'Ā} & \textbf{Qudāma} & \textbf{I. Kh.} \\
Ṭablān & Ṭaylā & Ṭāfā \\
Tarqāsīs & Tarqāsīs & Tarqāsīs \\
Uṣṭīmāt & Uṣṭīmāt & Uṣṭī-māṭī \\
Nāṭlīq & Nāṭlīq & Nāṭlūs \\
Aflākhūniya & Aflaghūniya & Aflajūniya \\
Kharshana & Kharshana & Kharsiyūn \\
Khaldiya & Kḥaldiya & Kḥaldiya \\
\end{tabular}

\textsuperscript{1} See now the French edition of A.\textsuperscript{2} With which that of I. Faqīḥ (in Vasiliev, Byzance et les Arabes, t. 1, La dynastie d'Amorium, Brussels, 1935.)
§ 42 Byzantine Empire

The name Ṭablān (numerous variants in different sources: طابلان, طابلان, طابلانا, طابلان), has been explained by de Goje (I.Kh., 105, note i) as Τάφρας (Táphros). Suidas, Lexicon, ed. 1853, p. 1053: τάφρος: τό περί τό τείχος ὄρυγμα: καί τάφρη ... παρ᾽ Ηροδότῳ. Consequently the popular name would refer to the Great Wall (τὸ μακρὸν τείχος, I. Faqih in Yaqūt, ii, 863, 863) or rather to the moat (ὄρυγμα) round it. Gelzer, o.c., 86, accepts the interpretation "Θέμα τῆς τάφρου, ου τοῦ τείχους" and compares it with the terms Ἡ Ἀστυπάλαια and provincia suburbicaria. Bury, A History of the Eastern Roman Empire, 1912, p. 224, thinks that "the solution (of I.Kh.'s term) has not been discovered". He starts, however, from the form *Ṭalāyā, whereas the better attested forms are *Ṭafšā, Ṭablān.

Our author takes no notice of the changes which had taken place between Muslim’s times and his own. Constantine Porphyrogenitus, writing half a century before him (a.d. 932), enumerates 12 themes in Europe and 18 in Asia; of the latter, 4 are islands and the rest is as follows: a. Ἀνατολικόν; b. Ἀρμενικόν; c. τῶν Ῥωμαστίκων; d. Ὀψίκων; e. Ὀσπίματος; f. Βουκελλαρίων; g. Παφλαγίων; h. Χαλδία; i. Μεσσηνία; k. Κολωνείας; l. Σεβαστείας; m. Λυκανθόρα; n. Σελευκέας; o. Κιβυρραντών.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ἡ.-τ.Α.</th>
<th>Const. P.</th>
<th>Ἡ.-τ.Α.</th>
<th>Const. P.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>f</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Constantine Porphyrogenitus does not separately mention our 11. and 12. He speaks of Cappadocia under Armeniacaon and adds that Χαρσανάν is the middle part of Cappadocia, De them., pp. 18–20. Cf. now E. Honigmann, Charrianon kastron in Byzantion, x, 1935, pp. 129–60. On the other hand Constantine mentions i, k, l, m, n, unknown to our three authors. Mas'udi, Tanbih, going his own way, mentions 5 provinces in Europe (inclusive of Salonika and Peloponnesus) but only 9 in Asia, viz. our 8, 5, 4, 11, 9, 6, 13, 10. plus Decapolis (mentioned between 4. and 11.).

As regards the number of troops in the provinces our text is certainly out of order. According to Qudama, 258 (<Muslim) the number varied from 15,000 (in Nāṭliq) to 4,000 (Kharshana, Cappadocia, Khaldia).

15. The paragraph on the Gurz ("Georgians") is one of the most confused in the book. Gurz is a parallel Iranian form of Gurj, modern Persian (and Turkish) Gurji, Russian Gurz-in. The element -z (-j) is a suffix of origin, see Marquart, ZDMG, 49, p. 664; cf. also § 36, 36.: Laysān and § 50, 3.: *Laks. The older form of Gur-z is attested in Armenian Vir-k'̣, pointing to Middle Persian *Vr-kān. The earlier Arabic transcription is جزن (i.e. *Gurz-ān), Baladhuri, 202, but already Ya'qūbi, Historiae, ii, 519, gives جزن *Gurj-ān and the later authors write ج سن *Gurj, see Ibn al-Athir, passim, Yaqūt, ii, 219. See now Markwart (Marquart), Iberer und

Some of the information contained in this paragraph undoubtedly refers to Western Georgia drained by the rivers flowing to the Black Sea. With the exception of the early Balâdhuri, p. 202 (conquest of "Armenia"), the Arab authors know nothing of Western Georgia, whereas they usually include Eastern Georgia (watered by the Kur) in Armenia, as also does our author, cf. § 36, 28. (Tiflis). The inclusion of (Western) Georgia in the Byzantine Empire, which may be explained by the fact that the Georgians belonged to the Greek Orthodox Church, is responsible for the statement (§ 49) on the Byzantine Empire being conterminous with the Sarîr. Under § 5, 21. our author speaks of a Küh-i Gurz, perhaps identical with § 5, 17 v. These details refer to the real Georgia.

On the other hand, the designation of the Black Sea as daryâ-yi Gurziyân is entirely without a parallel, and it is astonishing to see the Pontos baptized after a people never known as navigators. Still more amazing is the representation of the Gurz as living "on small islands", whereas there are no islands in the eastern part of the Black Sea.

As already stated in the note to § 3, 6., this part of the information may be due to a confusion of *Warang and Gurz, not impossible in Arabic script. Warang, very rarely met in Muslim sources, is another appellation of the Norman Rûs (§ 44) who according to some earlier source lived on an island. A series of errors with regard to the whereabouts of the real Maeotis (§ 3, 8.) may have caused our author to dissociate the rare Warang from Rûs and finally to misread it into another rare name Gurz. Birûni is the earliest known author mentioning بحر ورنه but he must have found it in some literary source.

The other source of confusion may have been I.Kh., 105 (=Muslim al-Jarmî), according to whom the themes of Tâflâ (Constantinople) and Trâqiya (Thrace) bordered in the north on بحر النتر. This unusual appellation of the Black Sea crept into the introductory paragraph of our § 42, though under § 42, 3. Thrace is said to lie by the Daryâ-yi Gurz. In our author’s terminology the Khazarian Sea is the Caspian. With regard to the general frontiers of the Byzantine Empire (extended up to the Sarîr!) I.Kh.’s strange term may have passed unobserved, but in the particular case of Thrace our author could not help noticing that this province does not lie by his Khazarian Sea (i.e. Caspian). Therefore he may have

---

1 By some mistake Idrîshî, ii, 396, mentions an island مرفك on the way between Taman (on the Azov Sea) and Trebizond. [Const. Porph., *De adm. imp.*, ch. 42, mentions an island near Tamanartîka (evidently a part of the Taman peninsula) and several islands off the coast of Zayîa (Circassia), near the estuary of the Kuban, but none of them has any relation to the Georgians.]

2 On some curious points of contact between our author and Birûni cf. § 10, 55., § 11, 9., § 26, 13., &c.
supposed that I.Kh.'s یُرُز referred not to the Khazar but to the یُرُز (a classical confusion in Arabic script). It only remained, then, for our author, who shows a notable predilection for Iranian terminology, to substitute Persian Gurz for Arabic Jurf. Cf. supra, p. 182.

16. and 18. These peoples are no more distinct than the Spartans and Lacedaemonians. Both names refer to the Danubian Bulghars who, moreover, seem to be described as "Inner Bulghars" (§ 45) and "V.n.and.r" (§ 53). I.Kh., 92, 105, 109, and Qudâma, 257, systematically following Muslim al-Jarmî, call the Danubian Bulghars Burjân.1 On the other hand, Hârûn (I.R., 130) applies this term to the Burgundians whereas he calls the Danubian Bulghars Bulghar.2 Hârûn, too, is most probably responsible for the term V.n.nd.r (= Onoghundur-Bulghars). As it was impossible to unravel such complications in a compilation, our author's source (Jayhâni?) must have solved the difficulty by incorporating all these names as if they referred to separate entities. Consequently the Burjân and Bulghârî were differentiated artificially: the former being imagined to be more submissive plain-dwellers, and the latter highlanders³ "perpetually at war with the Rûmîs" (as in I.R., 12622). The Bulghârî are called Rûmî because they were christianized from Byzantium in a.d. 864. The qualification kâfir is rather strange. One may remember that Bakri, 4520, calls the Burjân "Magians" (majûsiya) and this term is constantly applied to the Normans as well, cf. Lévi-Provençal, Madîs in EI and Idrîsî-Tallgren, pp. 80 and 140.  

17. This short paragraph is of great importance as indicating our author's sources. I.Kh., 105, quoting by name Muslim al-Jarmî, thus describes the boundaries of Macedonia: in the east the walls (v.s. 1.) stretching between the Black Sea (Bahâr al-Khazar) and the Syrian Sea (Bahâr al-Sha'm, here evidently "Marmora Sea"); in the south, the Mediterranean; in the west, the lands of the Şaqâliba; in the north, the Burjân. This quotation leaves no doubt that by the " Şaqâliba lands" the Serbian territory is meant. However, much more decisive is I.R., 127, who quotes Hârûn b. Yahyâ's description of a road from Constantinople, over Saltûqiya (read: Salonica)⁴ and Venice (B.n.d.qs) to Rome. The text is out of order, but Marquart, Streifzüge, 237–59, has suggested a series of very ingenious corrections of it. At 3 days' distance to the west of *Salonica lies Mutr.n (Marquart: *Qutron-Kirpos); "beyond it you travel through wooded lowlands (ghiyyâd min al-shajar) among the Şaqâliba who live in wooden

---

1 It is true that Muslim, v.s., is also said to have written of the Burghar but this term could possibly refer to the Volga, or Azov Sea, Bulghars.
2 The name (I.R., 12623) stands first erroneously for Belgrad (v.s., § 6, 66.) but after this passage on the water conduct comes (I.R., 12623) the remark on the perpetual war going on between the real Bulghars and Byzantines. This last item looks like an interpolation but it is found both in I.R. and our source (18.). Therefore, if it is an interpolation, it must belong to the two authors' common source (Jayhâni?).
3 Cf. § 5, 28. on their mountain and § 6, 66. on their river.
4 Mas'ûdi, Muriû, ii, 318, also has Saltûqiya for Salonica.
houses. They are Christians; they were (gradually) converted (*kānī yatanaṣṣirīna) in the time of the king (*Basil) and to-day they hold the Christian faith. Among them you travel for a month across their woods until you reach the town of Bātās (*Spalato, Const. Porph. 'Aqerdālabos)."

In our text al-Ṣaqālība al-mutanāṣṣira, standing in the Arabic garb, without any doubt reflects Hārūn’s account (through Jayhānī’s medium?). According to Marquart, ibid., 207, Hārūn must have drawn up his report between A.D. 880 and 890, but the text seems to indicate that the Emperor Basil I’s time (A.D. 866–86) was regarded as past; therefore we may bring Hārūn’s date down to the years 890–900. The exact date of the conversion of the Serbs cannot be established. In the years 867 and 870 Basil I subjugated the Serbs (Narentani, Croat) on the Dalmatian coast, and in 879 for the first time the bishop of Moravia (i.e. probably of the Serbian region lying along the southern affluent of the Danube, Morava) is mentioned, cf. F. Dvornik, Les Slaves, Byzance et Rome au IXè siècle, Paris, 1926, p. 239 (where it is assumed that Basil I converted the Slavs between A.D. 879 and 882). To sum up: the mention of “the Christianized Slavs” is a clear indication that besides al-Jarmī our author knew also Hārūn’s report. If so, we may assume, contrary to Marquart, o.c., 28, that in other chapters too, particularly those on the Magyars, V.n.nd.r, and Mīrvāt, our author’s source was Hārūn, who was recording the situation towards the very end of the ninth century, and not al-Jarmī, who belonged to the earlier part of that century. [This admission has a considerable importance for the history of Magyar migrations, u.s., § 22.]

19.–23. are a drastic epitome not devoid of misunderstandings. Rūm (Byzantine Empire) is supposed here to comprise all the countries lying by the Rūm Sea (Mediterranean). The original authority seems to be İṣf., 43 (and also, 68–71), who says: “and among the different classes of infidels who adjoin Andalus the most numerous are the Ifranja whose king is called Qārula (*Carolus), but the Ifranja conterminous with the Muslims are less numerous than the other classes of infidels on account of the fact that the Ifranja protrude into the sea (dukhūluhum fil-baḥr) and on account of the buffer (ḥājix) which other countries of polytheism constitute between the Muslims and the Ifranja. Next in numbers (after the Ifranja) are the Jalāliqa, and less numerous still the Baskunas (though they) are more warlike (ashaddu shaukatan). The places on the Andalus border neighbouring the Baskunas are Śaraqṣṭa, Tuṭayla (Tudela), and Lerida. Then follows a Christian people called Ghaliyaskas who are less harmful than the Baskunas (aqallulhum ghā’ilatan); they constitute a buffer between them (the Baskunas) and the Ifranja.” I.H., 43, says that the frontier line following the eastern coast of Andalus joins on the sea the Ifranja country, and on the west that of the Ghaliyaskas “who are a tribe of al-Ankubarda (Lombards?)”, then the Baskunas country, then that of the Jalāliqa, then the sea.

Our author entirely omits the important Jalāliqa (Galicians). The Baskunas are Vascones (Basques). The Ghaliyaskas are the inhabitants of the
Byzantine Empire
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Jacá region, south of the important pass in the Pyrenees (at present Jacá is connected by a railway tunnel with Oloron on the French side). The Jacá people were already known to the classical authors under the names of facetani, Γακτανοῦ (Ptolemy, ii, ch. 5), Lacetani (Livy, xxi, 60-1).

Ya'qūbī, *BGA*, vii, 355, says that north of Saragossa lies the town of Tudela, situated towards the land of the unbelievers called *Baskunas*, and that to the north of Tudela lies Huesca (*Washqa*) situated towards a tribe of the Ifranji called al-Magribi (the latter name has a variant corrected in a different hand into the latter name has a variant (the latter name has a variant corrected in a different hand into the latter name has a variant corrected in a different hand into al-Jadhrīya; cf. also Ibn al-'Adhārī, ii, 302). Ya'qūbī's passage leaves no doubt on the identity of the people. On the different forms of the name Codera says: "la confusión pudo quizá originarse por la semejanza de nombres entre Jacetanos y Lacetanos de los autores antiguos", but more probably it is attributable to the usual vagaries of Arabic script. I. Faqīh, 87, is wrong in placing *al-Jadhrīya* in the mountains "near the sea". Cf. de Goeje, *Specimen exhibens descriptionem al-Magribi sumtam e Libro Regionum al-Yaqūbī*, Leiden, 1860, pp. 112-13, and F. Codera, *Limites probales de la conquista arabe en la cordillera pirenaica*, in *Estudios críticos de Historia Arabe española*, vii-ix, Madrid, 1917, pp. 235-76. I owe the indication of the last work to Prof. A. González Palencia. Biruni, *Canon*, places Lerida over against the *Gh.H.f.s.k*, see § 41, 4.

About 19. Rūmiya (Rome) I.Kh., 10, says that it was [in turn] the seat of 29 Roman kings (emperors). 21. Britannia is not in I.Kh., Išt., or I.ヘル, but I.R., 130 (after Harūn b. Yahyā) mentions Barṭīniya (note the spelling of our source, too!) as a large town on the coast of the Western Sea. On the confusion about Yūnān and Athīnās see the original text of Išt., 70: "Athīnās is the seat of learning of the Ionians (Yūnāniyūn) and there their sciences and learning are preserved", cf. Barthold, *Preface*, pp. 21 and 41.


The following list of the principal sources, as well as of the works utilizing Muslim sources on Eastern Europe, may be not unwelcome. For details see notes to single chapters.

(Khazar, Burtaş, Basjirt, Bulghar); [Ibrāhīm b. Wastif-shāh], L’abriége des merveilles, tr. Carra de Vaux, 1898 (Slavs, pp. 45–6; Burjān, pp. 123–4); Maq., 360 (Itil, Rūs, Bulghar, `Suwār, Khazar—very brief); Gardizi, 78–126 (Bachanāk, Khazar, Burdās, Bulkār, Majghar, Saqlāb [sic], Rūs, Sarīr, Alān); al-Bakri, ed. Rosen, SPb., 1878 (Ṣaqqālīb, Bajanākiya, Khazar, Furdās, Bulkār, Majghariya, Sarīr, Burjān); ‘Aufī, ʿjawāmī al-ḥikāyāt, part iv, ch. 16, in Barthold, A new Muslim report on the Russians (in Russian), Ζαπ., ix, 1895, 262–7; [the rest of ‘Aufī’s data on the Khazar, Burdās, Majghariya, Saqlābīyān are an abridgement of I. Rusta; the data on Gūrj, Uslān (*al-Lān?), Sarīr, and Darband are very brief, see Br. Mus., Or. 2676, ff. 67–9]; Yaqūt, Itil, i, 112–13, Burtaş, i, 567 [this paragraph refers chiefly not to the Burtaş but to the Bulghārs], Burghar, i, 568 (after Mas’ūdī), Bulghar, i, 722–7, Bāshghurt, i, 468–70, Khazar, ii, 436–40, Khwārizm, ii, 484–5, Rūs, ii, 834–40, Saqlab, iii, 405; Wīsā, i, 34 and iv, 944; Ibn ʿĪyās, in F. Arnold, Christomata Arabica, i, 73–6: Rūs, Bulghar.

Frāhn, Veteres memoriae Chasarorum ex Ibn Fossblano, Ibn Haukale et Schems-ed-dīn Damasceno and De Baschkiris qua memoriae prodita sunt, in Mém. Acad. SPb., t. viii, 1822, pp. 577–620 [separately printed under the title Frāhn, De Chasaris excerpta ex scriptoribus arabicis, pars i, 1822, 44 pp., ibid., De Baschkiris]; Frāhn, Ibn Fossblanos und anderer Araber Berichte über die Russen älterer Zeit, SPb., 1823; Hammer, Sur les origines russes, SPb., 1827; A. C. Mouradja d’Ohsson, Des peuples du Caucase et des pays au nord de la Mer Noire et de la Mer Caspienne dans le 10e siècle, Paris 1828; Frāhn, Drei Münzen der Wolga-Bulgharen aus d. X. Jahrhundert, in Mém. Acad. SPb., série vi, t. i, 1832, pp. 171–204; Frāhn, Die ältesten arabischen Nachrichten über die Wolga-Bulgharen aus Ibn Fossblanos Reiseberichten, in Mém. Acad. SPb., série vi, t. i, 1832, pp. 527–77; Charmoy, Relations de Mas’ūdi et d’autres auteurs musulmans sur les anciens Slaves, in Mém. Acad. SPb., série vi, t. ii, livraisons 3 et 4, 1834, pp. 297–408; Frāhn, Ibn-Abi-Jakub el-Nadím’s Nachricht von der Schrift der Russen im X. Jahrhundert n. Chr., in Mém. Acad. SPb., série vi, t. iii, 1836, pp. 507–30; P. S. Savelyev, Muhammadan Numismatics as related to Russian History (in Russian), SPb., 1846; Defrémery, Fragments de géographes et historiens arabes et persans relatifs aux anciens peuples du Caucase et de la Russie méridionale, in Jour. As., 1849, t. 13, pp. 460–77 (al-Bakri); Chwolson, Izvestiya o Khazarakh &c. Ibn Dasta [read: Ibn Rusta], SPb., 1869; A. Garkavi (Harkavy), Skazaniya musulmanskikh pisateley o Slav'anakh i Ruskich, SPb., 1870 (Supplement 1871); A. Kunik and Baron V. Rosen, Izvestiya al-Bakri i drugikh avtorov o Rust i slav'anakh, SPb., 1878, ii, 1903; Dorn, Caspia, Über die Einfälle der alten Russen in Tabaristan, in Mém. Acad. SPb., série vii, t. xxiii, no. 1, 1875 (Russian edition of the same work, ibid., t. xxvi, annex i, 1875); G. Jacob, Welche Handelsartikel bezogen die Araber des Mittelalters aus den nordisch-baltischen Ländern? 2nd ed., Berlin 1891; F. Westberg, Ibrāhīm’s-ibn-Ja’hib’s Reisebericht über die Slawenländer aus dem Jahre 965, in Mém. Acad. SPb., série viii, t. iii, no. 4, 1898 (a revised edition in Russian: Kommentariy na zapisku Ibrāhīm ibn
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Eastern Europe


§ 43. The Slavs.

See especially Chwolson, Isvestiya . . . Ibn Dasta [*Rusta*], pp. 123-45; Baron Rosen and Kunik, Isvestiya al-Bakrî (Ibrâhim b. Ya’qub, circa A.D. 965); Westberg, Ibrâhim’s-ibn-ja’ikb’s Reisebericht, 1898, and Kommentariy, 1903; also passim in Beiträge, 1899, and K analizu, 1908; Marquart, Streifzüge, 95-160 (Mas’udî on the Slavs), 188-206, 466-73 (“Jayhâni” on the Slavs) and passim; Lévi-Provençal, Șakâlîba in EI (the Slavs in Spain), Barthold, Slav in EI. Our §§ 43 and 44 have been edited and translated by Toumanskii in Zap., X, 1896, pp. 121-37 (where the names quoted are illustrated by parallel readings in the other authors).

Of the sources which were undoubtedly utilized by our author, I. Kh. must be responsible for the item on the Slavs living on the upper course of “the Râs river”; 1ṣf. (<Balkhi), pp. 4, 7, 10, besides being too vague, has very little to say on the Slavs whom he probably mixes up with the Râs; the third and most complete source, which was also utilized by I.R., Gardizi, and ’Auufi has principally influenced our text, as will be seen from

1 Bakrî used it, too, but with regard to the Slavs he chiefly quotes the independent and excellent source—the record of the Jewish traveller Ibrâhim b. Ya’qub
the following comparison [D.—ditto; N.—absent; A.—approximate likeness].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I.R.</th>
<th>Gardizi</th>
<th>H.-À.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 days' distance from the Bajanâk town of راپـ near the frontier wooded plains; no vines or fields bee-hives, 10 Ḳibīq honey from each</td>
<td>D. and 10 days from the Majghari D. Vântît</td>
<td>different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. each hive 50-100 Ṭaḥṣar honey; some people possess 100 Ḳiḥṭaun honey of honey</td>
<td>A. vast wooded plains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A. much honey; honey-wine; wooden casks; some people prepare 100 casks of wine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>herds of swine the dead burnt; women scratch their faces; commemorative feasts on the tumulus favourite wife hangs herself fire-worshippers sow millet; thanksgiving for harvest string instruments and flutes honey-wine and music at funeral feasts horses scarce N. javelins and spears chief called سرخ principal chief Swyyt-mlk lives in Jrawb and drinks mare's milk N. cold climate; people live in underground huts; heat them with vapours the king receives a garment from each member of a household thieves punished N. N.</td>
<td>cow-worshippers D.</td>
<td>A. commits suicide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D. sowing D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A. various string instruments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D. shirts and Ṭabarī shoes N.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D. Swyt-mlk, Jrawt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D. Ṣmût-swyt, Khurdâb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The geographical data on the Slavs scattered in our source seem to refer to two different groups of this people. On the one hand in § 3, 6., the (A.D. 965), adding to it some details from Ma’sûdî. Of this account, as well as of Ma’sûdî’s detailed chapter on the Slavs (Marquart, Streifzüge, 95-160), there is no trace in our author. [Some expressions in Ibrâhîm (e.g. on the women scratching their faces with knives after a death) point to the use of the literary source utilized by I. Rusta.]
Saqlāb are placed to the north of the Black Sea, between the Inner Bulghārs and the Burjān. The identity of these Slavs is disclosed by the comparison with § 42, 16.-18. where the “Christianized Slavs” come in the enumeration between the Burjān and the Bulghārī.\(^1\) With this agrees the beginning of § 43 which places the Inner Bulghārs to the east of the Slavs. As explained in the note to § 42, 17. the “Christianized Slavs” correspond to the Macedonian Slavs, and only through a misunderstanding they have been transferred to the shores of the Black Sea.

The essential characteristic of the other group is that it lives in the immediate neighbourhood of the Rūs [the latter not being mentioned among the nations living on the Black Sea coast]. In § 6, 44. the Rūs river flowing eastwards is said to rise on the Slav territory, then skirt the Rūs towns, and finally fall into the Ātil. In § 44\(^2\) the Rūs are positively the eastern neighbours of the Slavs, but in § 43, by some sort of compromise, our author wants the Slavs to border in the east both on the Inner Bulghār “and some (!) of the Rūs”. In § 3, 8. the Maeotis (i.e. the northern Russian lakes or the Baltic, e.g., p. 181) is placed north of the Saqlābā.

For our author all the Slav lands look apparently as one stretch of territory and in this respect he may have been influenced by I.Kh. who, p. 105, mentions the Saqālība as the western neighbours of Macedonia (cf. our § 42, 17.), couples them, pp. 92 and 119, with the Avars (al-Abār), and places them “north of Spain”. On the other hand, p. 124, he says that the Khazar town Khamlij (§ 59, 3 b.) “lies on the river (Volga) which comes from the land of the Saqālība” and further, p. 154, adds that the Rūs merchants “who are a kind of Saqālība” travel from the farthermost region of Saqlāba to the Rūm sea (Black Sea?); if eventually they “travel by the Tanīs [*Tanais = Don], river of the Saqālība, they pass to Khamlij”\(^3\) "وَانِ سَارَا فِي نَيْسٍ نَهْرَ الصَّقْالِبَةِ مَرَّوا بِخَمْلِيَّ" and finally starting from Spain they either visit Africa or “follow the road behind Rome in the Slav lands and then to Khamlij” (خلف روبية في بلاد الصقالبة ثم إلى خمليج). I. Kh., 17, gives the king of the Slavs the title قَنَّاسٌ, i.e., كَنَّابُ کَنَّاسِ (from Germanic *kuning), common among Slav nations.

The source utilized by I. Rusta and Gardizī seems to have in view a more definite territory. The items regarding the habits and customs of the Slavs are somewhat ambiguous, but the names of the rulers and towns may serve as clues. According to Ibn Rusta, 144, the supreme chief of the Slavs bore the name of Swyyt-mīk (رئيس الروس، سميت ملك) (living in the centre of the Saqlab country?)\(^4\) was called سوْيْج، or سوْيْك. [Similar forms are found in Gardizī whereas in the H.-‘Ā. only the king is

\(^1\) Burjān = Inner Bulghār = Bulgharī.

\(^2\) Ibid. the Slavs among the Rūs.

\(^3\) Though the Don and Volga are often connected in Muslim geographers, here the verb narrū may indicate that the merchant had to cross over from the Don to the Volga. The two rivers off Tsaritsin flow very near to each other. The sources of the left affluent of the Don Ilov’a almost reach the Volga near Kamishin. See Map xii.

\(^4\) The text is suspect here, Marquart, o.c., 470.
Commentary § 43

mentioned whom the people call *S.mūt-swyt*, Westberg, o.c. (1918), p. 12, very ingeniously supposed that the first part of the name is only a disfigured *S.wyt* ("they call him") standing in the Arabic text.] Chwolson restored *S.wyt* as *Svetopluk* (< *Svetoplukia*), and *a* as *supanets* (?) and thought that the first referred to the well-known king of Moravia proper, *Svetopluk I* (870–94) whom Const. Porph., *De admin. imp.*, cap. 40, &c., calls *Σφενδοπλάκος*. Marquart, Streifzüge, 470, admits that this identification dawns naturally on the reader. However, thinking, *ibid.*, 200, 203, that I. Rusta’s report is based on Muslim al-Jarmi and refers to an earlier epoch, namely to the time before the advent of the Norman dynasty in Kiev (and even before the subjugation of the Pol’an’e by the Khazars) Marquart himself suggests, *ibid.*, 471, the identification of the Slav king with the king of the White Croats *Βελοχρωβότατος* whose capital must have been Cracow-on-the-Vistula. The king’s capital (Gardizi, *H.-’Ā,* جزء), جزء, جزء,’, ‘Auﬁ, جزء (خزائن), جزء, جزء) is then restored as جزء, جزء, جزء, جزء, جزء, جزء and taken as a confirmation of the above theory. Apart from the still doubtful attribution of I. Rusta’s report to [or rather exclusively to] Muslim al-Jarmī, the weak point of Marquart’s theory is that no *Svetopluk* has yet been discovered in Cracow. A fact which remained unknown to Marquart is that according to the *H.-’Ā.*, § 6, 45., the capital of Khurdāb was situated on the Rūtā river. It is difficult to say whether this detail belongs to the original source, or is merely our author’s guess. The description of the Rūtā flowing from the Rūs to the Ṣaqālābs, i.e., westwards (?) is very embroiled (*v.s.*, § 6, 45. and cf. § 45) and the river could perhaps with some imagination be taken for the Vistula on the upper course of which Cracow stands. However, this interpretation of a doubtful passage would not be supported by any other contemporary evidence and the comparison of our text with Gardizī, who apparently is more faithful to the source responsible for the details on the Magyars, V.n.d.r., and Mirvāt (§§ 22, 46, 52), suggests that the prototype of our Rūtā is *Dūnā* (Danube). In this case the town of *Khorvāt* standing on the *Dūnā* might refer to the capital of the southern Danubian Croatia. As regards the king’s name, it seems safer to revert to Chwolson’s hypothesis. The Moravian king *Svetopluk* was certainly a close neighbour, if not the suzerain of the southern Croats. Const. Porph., cap. 13, says that *south* of the Magyars

1 ‘Auﬁ, Or. 2676, fol. 67b says: va *ishān-rāra’si-*st ki ṣ-rā *Swyt hkwānand*.  
2 There is not much certainty about this kingdom “dessen Existenz auf Grund der späteren polnischen und östlichen Sagen notwendig vorausgesetzt werden musste, für welche aber bisher nur äusserst dürftige und unbestimmte Zeugnisse aus alteren Zeiten beigebraucht werden konnten”, *ibid.*, 471. Very characteristic, too, is Marquart’s admission, *ibid.*, 139: "wenn wir nun auch Chorwätin unzweifelhaft [sic. V. M.] mit den Bélōchorwätan an der Weichsel gleichzusetzen haben, so scheint es doch, dass er selbst [i.e. Constantine] sie mit den illyrischen Chorwätan zusammengeworfen hat” [sic. V. M.].

3 Chwolson, o.c., p. 142, took جزء for *Grādist-<Hyadistyete*, the residence of *Svetopluk*, cf. Ṣafārīk, *Slavische Alterthümer*, ii, 501. [Very doubtful.]
§ 43  

*The Slavs*

(Tōdρκοι) lay "Great Moravia, that is the land of Sfendoplokos, which was totally ruined by these Magyars and occupied by them", whereas the Croats¹ lived "next to the Magyars on the mountain side". In cap. 40 Constantine positively says that the Croats are the southern neighbours of the Magyars. From the comparison of these two passages it appears that at least some Croats lived immediately south of Great Moravia which had belonged to Svetopluk. [P. 67, l. 24 on Khurdāb is fantastic.]

Although the recent authority, F. Dvorník, *Les Légendes de Constantin et de Méthode vues de Byzance*, Prague, 1933, p. 240, admits that Svetopluk's conquests in Pannonia (i.e., the region between the Danube and Sava) had an ephemeral character, they may have been sufficient to create the impression that he was the supreme lord (raʾis al-ruʾasā) of the Khwarūz. Already Marquart, o.c., 470, pointed out that I.R.'s text on the relations between Suvy-t-mlk and the sūbanj is out of order. The real ruler of the southern Croats was perhaps the sūbanj (*šühān*) and Chwolson's restoration of it as *zupanets* (*zūpan*?), if right, would tally with Const. Porph., according to whom, cap. 30, Croatian lands were divided into ξοπανίας.²

Very uncertain is the reading of the other Slav town. I. Rusta says that the journey from the Pechenegs to the Slavs lasted 10 days and thereupon adds that at the beginning of the Slav land (fi āwāʾîl ḥaddīḥā) stands the town Ya'hāb, of name Zānbat, which he compared with Σαμβαράς which in Const. Porph., cap. 9, is a surname of Kiev (rò kástroν Κιώτα to époxomāzōmenov Σαμβαράς).³ Marquart's theory is hardly contradicted by the fact that in the chapter on the Rūs (§ 45) Kiev seems to come up again under a name belonging to a different tradition (Ịṣ. < Balkhī), but in principle it is strange that in Arabic script 赽 should correspond to Greek σ.⁴

In any case the two towns of the Slavs very probably were situated at the

---

¹ It is not clear whether northern (White) Croats, or southern (Danubian) Croats are meant here.
² Niederle, *Manuel*, i, 141, note 1: "les comitats (*župa*) ne sont attestés que chez les Slaves du Sud et les sources ne nous autorisent pas à les transporter dans le Nord." In the north "les termes *župa* et Čupin (préfet, comitat) ne sont attestés que plus tard et dans un autre sens, celui de ‘fonctionnaire’ et de ‘service de ce fonctionnaire’.
³ The origin of the name is still a moot question. A. I. L'ashchenko, *Kiev Σαμβαράς*, in *Dokladi Akad. SSSR*, 1930, No. 4, pp. 66–72, mentions 22 different explanations of Sammatas (Slavonic, Scandinavian, Hungarian, Armenian, Lithuanian, &c.) and inclines towards the Khazar origin of the name as suggested by Y. Brutzkus.
⁴ If the previous restoration of the name by Marquart as Dānast be adopted, the eastern Slav town might be sought on the Dniestri, cf. Idrisi, p. 395. Westberg, o.c., 1908 (March), p. 22, connected *Vēntīt* with the Vēntīči (Βατήριτί), the Slav tribe on the Oka, which is very doubtful.
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opposite ends of the Slav territory. Nor is it necessary to think that such details as the heathen customs of the Slavs, or the cold climate of their country belonged to the lands under Svetopulk's control. In a text referring to a vast territory they may have in view the eastern Slavs, living under the Rūs, p. 159, the Bulghars, and the Khazars, cf. Barthold in EI.2

§ 44. The Rūs.

See bibliographic note before § 43. The translation and analysis of the principal Muslim sources will be found in the works of Frähn, Chwolson, Garkavi [commented translations from 26 Muslim authors on the Slavs and Rūs; the text used mostly in older, now superseded editions]; Barthold, Zap., 1895 (Muhammad 'Auft); Toumansky, Zap., 1896 (the text and translation of the present chapter); Marquart, Streifzüge, 200–4, 330–53 (Mas'ūdi). The literature in which Muslim data on the Rūs' have been utilized is enormous, see V. A. Moshin, Var'ago-russkiy vopros in Slavia, Prague, 1931, x/i–3, pp. 109–36, 343–79, 501–37 (a digest of the more important works on the subject), and his The origins of Rus'. The Normans in Eastern Europe (in Russian), in Byzantinoslavica, Prague, 1931, iii/1, pp. 33–58, iii/2, pp. 285–307. See also Prof. P. Smirnov, The Volga route (in Ukrainian), Kiev, 1926, which particularly deals with the earlier Muslim sources. [Seippel, v.s., p. 427, and Minorsky, Rūs in EI.]

Since the beginning of the seventeenth century the origin of the name of Russia (Ρωσία, Roscia) has been the subject of hot discussion in Russian and western European literatures. Though the geographical names containing the element *Rus- or *Ros- may have more than one source, it is certain that the name *Rus' as referring to the founders of the Russian state is of Scandinavian origin. The authentic Scandinavian form is doubtful (cf. the name of the coast Roslagen) but even now the Finns call the Swedes Ruotsi and this Finnish form may have given origin to the Slavonic Rus', as the name of Finland itself Suomi has become Sum' in Russian. The name Rus' practically had the same meaning as the somewhat later Variaγ (Bapγs, i.e., Varęgę, Bągągos, Waring3 referring to the parties of Norman adven-

1 Const. Porph., cap. 31, calls the Belor̄ousai (White Croats to whom perhaps the name of the Carpathians Karpat is due) ἄδραινοι.

2 Chwolson, Izvestiya, p. 143, pointed out that in Sęwiet-mlk the first element as restored *Sewt- suggests an eastern Slav transmission instead of which one would expect in the West a nasalized form *Sewt<Ścwnt, cf. Σφυννόλακος. The exact time at which nasal sounds disappeared in Slavonic languages is of course difficult to define. According to Shakmatov in the ninth century no more nasal sounds were in existence in Russian. As regards the Czech the ninth-century form of the name in question was probably Sęwtoplk>now Sęatoplku (my friend Dr. B. Unbegau's letter, Paris, 23.ii.1936).

3 In Arabic درب, is first attested in Biruni, but cf. § 24, 15. [The late Prof. A. A. Shakmatov, Introduction to the history of the Russian language (in Russian), Petrograd 1916, p. 63, thought that the name Variaγ 'reflected that of the Franks or Frangs, as all the western Europeans in general were called in the Balkans and the Levant, though the ways of the transformation Frang>
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...turers bound by an agreement or vow (odr). Since the beginning of the ninth century the fluvial system of the present-day Russia and Poland was constantly used by the Normans for their trade and war expeditions, as it appears from the abundant historical, archaeological, and toponymic evidence, cf. lately M. Vasmer, *Wikingerspuren in Russland*, in *Sitz. Preuss. Ak.*, phil.-hist. Klasse, 1931, pp. 649–74.

The traditional version of the Russian chronicles is that the Variags coming from beyond the sea used to levy tribute on the Čud', Sloveni, Mer'a, and all¹ the Kriviči [of whom the first and third are undoubtedly Finnish tribes and the second and fourth Slavs]. In a.d. 862 the Variags were expelled beyond the sea, but in their absence internal wars broke out. Therefore the above-mentioned peoples invited the Variags called Rus' and so the viking R'urik (*Hrærek*) built the town of Ladoga on the Volkhov river and his two brothers occupied the neighbouring country. In 882 R'urik's successor Oleg (*Helgi*) occupied the capital of the Dnieper Pol'an'e and this was the beginning of the Russian Kiev state. The Scandinavian element of the new body politic was scarce (court, warriors, and perhaps merchants) and in a century's time the mass of Slav population succeeded in assimilating the strangers, see Niederle, *Manuel de l'antiquité slave*, Paris, 1923, i, 209. Even Russian chronicles clearly give us to understand that the Rus' were not the first Scandinavian vikings in Eastern Europe. The Byzantine sources know them at least from the earlier part of the ninth century. The most remarkable fact for our purpose is that the Byzantine embassy which in May 839 visited the Emperor Louis the Pious in Ingelheim was accompanied by some men of the people Rhos who were the envoys sent to Constantinople by their king Chacanus and who now wanted to return home; on this occasion it was discovered that the people Rhos was of Swedish origin (*gentis esse Suecomum*), see V. Thomsen, *The Relations between Ancient Russia and Scandinavia*, Oxford, 1877, p. 39, cf. Marquart, *Streifzüge*, 202.

The principal Muslim sources refer to the momentous period of the establishment of the Northmen among the Slavs and it is essential to disentangle the data referring to its successive stages. Our oldest source I.Kh., as already mentioned p. 429, l. 25, mixes up the Rūs with the Slavs and traces their commercial activities between Spain and China. There is no trace in I.Kh. of a Rūs state. He calls the Don (?) "river of the Slavs".

The common source of I. Rusta, *H.-'aría*, Gardízi, 'Aufi, &c., most formally distinguishes the Rūs from the Slavs. The latter, primarily the

VARANG are still obscure." *Ibid.*, 68, he says that the Rūs were known long before the so-called "invitation of the Variags". He further gives expression to the view that the Rus were the earlier Scandinavians established among the Slavonic and Finnish tribes, whereas the Variags represented a new wave of Scandinavian movement.]¹ The Russian word corresponding to "all" is here an evident mistake for the homonymous *Becb*, the name of another Finnish tribe.
Western Slavs, are represented as living under their own princes (cf. § 43), whereas the Rūs are described as occupying a damp island which has an area of 3 days by 3 days and lies amid a lake. These data point to the northern lands and seem to refer to the times before the foundation of the Kiev state, but it is characteristic that in spite of the modest size of the territory the king of the Rūs is given the pompous title of Khāqān Rūs and that according to Gardīzī the island contained a population of 100,000 men (mardum). [Cf. also Yāqūt, ii, 834, where a similar statement is ascribed to Maq., though it is not found in BGA, iii.]

The Balkhī tradition (Iṣṭ., I.H.) knows very little about the [Western] Slavs (Ṣaqāliba) between whom and the [Volga] Bulghār it places the Rūs. Here we have evidently to do with the Kiev period of Russian history. Iṣṭ., 225–6, distinguishes three “kinds” (ṣin) of Rūs. The prince of those who live nearest to the Bulghār resides in the town of *Kūyāba, i.e. probably Kiev (Const. Porph., cap. 8, Kioðba or Kiośa). The farthest distant Rūs are called صلاریة ٓث.لوايیا, which looks very much like a parallel form of Ṣaqāliba, perhaps referring specially to the Sloveni3 of Novgorod among whom the Normans first settled. The third group are the اث.لرا (many variants) whose king lives in ٓث.ل (many variants). They are the wildest and kill the strangers who would penetrate into their country from which they themselves export black martens and raṣāṣ (tin or lead?) by a waterway. Since Fränk’s Ibn Foszlān, Annex I, p. 162, the name Arthā (Arbā) has been interpreted as Erz’a, which is the name of one of the two great divisions of the Mordva (§ 52). The Constantinople MS., Iṣṭ., 226 n, very definitely says that the اث.لرا (Arba, *Arthā) “are [or perhaps: trade?] between the Khazar and the Great (a’zam) Bulghār”, which eventually suits the Erz’a.6 If the interpretation is right it indicates that there existed some Rūs centre in the Oka region. Fränk pointed out that at Oleg’s times a lieutenant of his lived in the town of Rostov on the territory of the Finnish Mer’a, and it is possible to imagine a similar situation obtaining in the region of the Mordva who, according to Nestor’s “Initial” Chronicle,

1 The “island” most probably refers to Novgorod (in Norse Hölmgarðr, i.e. “the island town”), cf. Thomsen, o.c., Marquart, Streifzüge, pp. xxxiv, 201, Westberg, o.c., 1908, iii, 25.
2 I.H., 285, adds: “and their king is in ٓث.لا, a town of theirs.” The variant صلاریة ٓث.لوايیا might indicate the reading of صلاریة ٓث.لاوی (؟), which, however, would be inexplicable.
3 According to the Ḥypatios chronicle the original settlers in Novgorod were Sloveni (Слобосны).
4 The story of the Arthā killing the strangers might favour the theory that the tribe belonged to the Mordva whose name is supposed to be an Iranian equivalent of the Herodotian ἄρδσοφάγον, v.i., § 52.
5 If the latter is the Bulghār town on the Volga, but the meaning of the term is not clear, v.i., p. 439, n. 2.
6 Westberg, o.c., 1908, p. 398, attaching too much importance to the export of raṣāṣ, interpreted as “tin”, thought that Arthā was Scandinavia! In the Persian translation of Iṣṭ., 226 k, ارذز renders رازی which, our §§ 4, 9, and 25, 13, show that arzīz means both “tin” and “lead”; qal‘ which only means “tin” may be an arbitrary addition by the translator who hesitated between the two meanings of arzīz.
7 V.v., p. 217.
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equally paid tribute to the Rûs. The identification Arthā = Erz’ā conflicts with Iṣṭ.’s indication concerning Kuyāba being the nearest to Bulghār, but on the other hand Arthā must have lain to the east of Slâwiya which was the farthest territory of the Rûs (with regard to Bulghār from which the description apparently starts). [Kuyāba may be the “territory of K.”.]

Our text is essentially a rearrangement of the above-mentioned sources. The dependence on the common source used by I. R. and Gardizī appears from the following synoptic table. [‘Auﬁ in the first part of his report closely follows the same tradition.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I.R.</th>
<th>Gardizī</th>
<th>H.-‘A.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the Rûs live on a wooded, damp island</td>
<td>D. 100,000 inhabitants (l)</td>
<td>entirely different (after Iṣṭ.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khaqān Rûs</td>
<td>D.</td>
<td>D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>raid Slavs by sea, sell them to the Khazar and Bulghār</td>
<td>D.</td>
<td>A. victorious over the neighbours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no agriculture; import food from the Slav land</td>
<td>D.</td>
<td>country rich in necessaries;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>newly born presented with swords</td>
<td>D.</td>
<td>Slavs among the Rûs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no villages*</td>
<td>N.</td>
<td>N.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>traders in furs</td>
<td>D.</td>
<td>furs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neatly dressed; gold bracelets</td>
<td>D.</td>
<td>woollen bonnets [linen mentioned under § 43]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kind to slaves and guests</td>
<td>D.</td>
<td>some of the R. practise chivalry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>numerous towns*</td>
<td>D.</td>
<td>vast country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sulaymānian swords</td>
<td>D.</td>
<td>A. valuable swords</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>united against enemies</td>
<td>D.</td>
<td>N.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trial by kings; duels</td>
<td>D.</td>
<td>N. tithe to the government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>physicians powerful</td>
<td>N.</td>
<td>A. physicians respected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>courageous, enterprising; sailors, not horsemen</td>
<td>N.</td>
<td>A. warlike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trousers of 100 cubits</td>
<td>N.</td>
<td>D. as in I.R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>treacherous</td>
<td>N.</td>
<td>N. quarrelsome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nobles buried with all belongings and wives</td>
<td>N.</td>
<td>A. as in I.R.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Trace of contradictory sources.

1 The name of the important town of R’azan’ may be also connected with Erz’ā. The town (first mentioned under A.D. 1095) was founded in the region where the Slav Vatichi (<Vântici) lived, but originally (from the 7th to the 9th century) the lands along the Oka probably belonged to the Mordva territory. Cf. V. A. Gorodtsov, The ancient population of the R’azan’ province, in Izv. otdel. russ. yazyka, 1908, t. 13, pp. 147–9. [However, the Erz’ā, at least now, live to the east of the Moksha, v.i., § 52.]

2 Arthā has a variant ḍāl which suggested to Chwolson the identification of *Abârma with Biarmia (Perm) of the Scandinavian sagas (Anglo-Saxon Bearnas, Old Norse Bjarmar, cf. Thomsen, o.c., 31). Eventually this identification would have the advantage of explaining our passage on the Pecheneg mountains (Ural?) which formed the eastern boundary of the Rûs and of better suiting the list of produce of the territory. Some indirect evidence in favour of Biarmia might be gathered from the fact that Iṣṭ. does not mention the two northernmost
The third source (Balkhī > İṣfāt) having supplied our author with the names of the three Rūs territories [shahr, “town or land”] the item on the damp “island” (I.R., Gardizī, ‘Aufr) had to be thrown overboard. The country was then described as “vast” [cf. I.R.’s inconsequent mention of “many towns”] and couched into the habitual frame of boundaries. In the description of the “towns” the details on blades and swords are very probably a simple development of I.R.’s and Gardizī’s item on the sulaymānī swords which the Rūs possess (lahum al-su’yūf al-sulaymānīya = wa andar miyān shamsūr-i sulaymānī fārāoan bāshad). On “Solomonic swords” see the Qor‘ān, xxxiv, 10–12, cf. Chwolson, o.c., 195. The detail on Ș.lāba is a development of İṣfāt’s indication as to its remoteness.

The only original statements which we can squeeze out of our text are those regarding the frontiers of the Rūs and the course of the Rūs river (§ 6, 44.).

The situation of the Rūs country, as understood by our author, appears from the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Northern Lands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Șaqlāb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rūs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pecheneg Mts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rūtā river</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

which must be supplemented by the indications that the Majghār (§ 23) had the Rūs to their north and west [=NW.], and that the Turkish Pechenegs (§ 20) lived to the south of the river Rūtā (sic) and had the Majghār and the Rūs to their west [resp. to the west and north-west?]. As the Pechenegs are placed north both of the *Bulghār (§ 51) and *Burtās (§ 52), which peoples were separated by the Volga, it is necessary to admit that the Pechenegs (see note to § 20) lived on both banks of this river. If so, it is difficult to find any other correspondence than the Oka for the river separating the Turkish Pechenegs from the Rūs (v.s., p. 217). The Pecheneg mountains (Ural?) would then form the Rūs boundary somewhere in the region to the north-east of the Volga. The latter river itself, at least down to its junction

people İsū (Ves’) and Yura (Yugra) of which the first, according to R. Hennig, must be sought near Cherdin (Хердинь) on the Kama, see Der mittelalterl. arab. Handelsverkehr in Osteuropa, in Der Islam, xxii/3, 1935, pp. 239–65. [But cf. Marguart, Arktische Länder, 304, who still follows Fröh’s theory according to which the İsū must be placed near Belozero.] In any case the reading Arthā is better attested. Quite lately V. Moshin took Arthā for the Trmutarakän’ colony of the Rūs (on the Taman’ peninsula, east of the entrance channel of the Azov sea) but this hypothesis goes counter to İṣfāt’s indication as to the inaccessibility of the Arthā land, and its exports.

1 See § 5, 19, where a mountain (Ural) is described as stretching between the end of the Rūs and the beginning of the Kimik. Cf. also the eventual restoration of lāmr/4lāmrā as *Abārma < Biarmā?
with the Oka, was evidently thought to flow in Rūs territory (§ 6, 44.) but the description of the “Rūs river” (upper Volga) does not imply that Urtāb, Š.lāba, and Kūyāfa stood on its banks. The text only indicates that the river watered their “confines”. Their enumeration logically goes in the inverse order to Ist. who certainly wrote as if he were looking from Bulghār westward. [Urtāb corresponds to جبال آرناپ, v.s., p. 434.]

In his very interesting work on the “Volga route” Prof. P. Smirnov has lately advanced the thesis (see his conclusions, o.c., 223–9) that before the foundation of the Kiev state there existed on the middle Volga a Norman state under a qaghan. To support this theory he very ingeniously utilized such data as the report on the embassy from the Chacanus of the Rhos in A.D. 839, the mention of the Khāqān Rūs in the common source of I.R., H.-`Ā., and Gardızī, and the item of our source on the Rūs river. Along the latter he disposed the three towns so that Kūyāfa (?) comes to occupy the place of the future Nizhni-Novgorod at the junction of the Oka with the Volga; Š.lāba, that of the later Yaroslavl, and Arthā (?) is tentatively sought between the two, perhaps in the Oka basin. This hypothesis revolutionizes the accepted views on the origins of the Great-Russian nation. Here is not the place to enter upon its consideration as a new theory, but as regards the arguments derived from our source (which the author knew through Toumansky’s excerpts) it is to be feared that no particular and decisive weight can be attributed to a text which is mainly a compilation and a rearrangement of written sources with a dangerous tendency towards artificial systematization.^[1]

§ 45. The Inner Bulghār.


The term undoubtedly belongs to Balkhī for only the two geographers who remodelled his work mention the Bulghār al-dākhil. Ist., 226, writes: “the Rūs trade with the Khazars, Rūm, and Great Bulghār (Bulghār al-a’sam). They border from the north on the Rūm; their numbers are great and their might is reported to be such that they have imposed the

1 I.Kh., 124, is evidently responsible for the indication that it flows from the Slav territory (see note to § 44).
2 Among other sources Smirnov, o.c., 202–7, utilizes Idrīsī, ii, 401, who adds to Ist.’s data some characteristics of the three towns (Š.lāva “sur le sommet d’une montagne”; Arthān “jolie ville sur une montagne escarpée”, at 4 days’ distance from the two other towns, &c.). No trust, however, can be put in these details, for which there is no authority in the earlier sources. These additions left alone, the three names of Russian towns were undoubtedly found by Idrīsī in the traditional sources and must be clearly distinguished from Idrīsī’s original data on his contemporary Rūsiya and Qumāniya, ii, 397–400. Therefore Idrīsī’s كیف Kiev may easily be another avatar of the older كیف. Idrīsī combines various sources of different epochs and Marquart has shown how inaccurate (“Schwindelwerk”) he is in eastern regions, cf. Eränkahr, 261–2 (India), Komanen, 102–4 (Central Asia).
kharāj on those of the Rūm and Inner Bulghār who live near to their country. The Inner Bulghār are Christians.” I.H., 286, gives a considerably different version: “the Great Bulghār border on the Rūm from the north; their numbers are great and their might is reported to be such that in the old days (qadīman) they imposed the kharāj on those of the Rūm who lived near them. As regards the Inner Bulghār there are among them Christians and Muslims.” To this I.H. adds that in his time (fi waqtinā hādhā) no trace (bargiya) was left of the Bulghār, Burṭās, and Khazar for the Rūs having attacked them appropriated their lands. Those who escaped from the Rūs lived scattered in the neighbouring places “in view of their attachment to their lands and in the hope that they would be able to enter a pact with the Rūs and place themselves again under the latter’s authority”.

These parallel passages reflect some vagueness and confusion in the original source. The term “Inner Bulghār” is evidently opposed to “Outer Bulghār” (Bulghār al-kharāji) which name is given by Istī, 10, to “a small madina (town, or country) having few dependencies and known only as the trading centre of those [northern] countries”; cf. a more complete description of the Volga Bulghār in Istī, 225. The Inner Bulghārs were identified by Westberg, l.c., with the Black Bulghars mentioned both in Const. Porph., De admin. imp., ch. 12 and 42, and in Russian chronicles (as raiders of the Crimean Chersonese). However, in the introductory part of his work, Istī, 7, describing the breadth of the earth and starting from the Ocean and Gog and Magog goes on as follows: “then [the line] skirts the farther side (zahr) of the Saqāliba, crosses the land of the Inner Bulghār and Saqāliba and goes along the Rūm country and Syria.” Marquart, o.c., 517, interprets this passage in the sense that Inner Bulghār and Saqāliba both, as a sort of hendiadys, refer to the Danubian Bulghars (“so weist das darauf hin, dass beide Namen bereits Wechselbegriffe geworden waren”). This interpretation is hardly correct and the impression of the

1 I.H., 281, places the devastation of Bulghār by the Rūs in 358/968–9 referring undoubtedly to Sviatoslav’s eastern raids. As Barthold has suggested in his Mesto prikaspiojikh oblastey v istorii musul. mira, Baku 1925, p. 43, the date properly refers to I.H.’s sojourn in Ṭabaristān where he collected the information on Sviatoslav’s raid of 965.

2 The difference between the Inner and Great Bulghar is not clear. The latter name according to I.H.’s improved text refers to the Danube Bulghār. In older Greek sources the “Old, or Great Bulghar” refers to the seats of the Uturghur, to the east of the Maeotis, cf. Marquart, Streifzüge, 503. In the explanation of Bulghār al-a’zam Marquart, ibid., 518, hesitates between the Volga and Danube. In Russian chronicles (1236) the “Great town of Bolgar” (velikij gorod’ Bolgarskij) is the town on the Volga. Similarly the Hungarian Dominican monk Julian who, in search of the Hungarian kinsmen, travelled in A.D. 1234–6 beyond the Volga calls the country of the Volga Bulghars Magna Bulgaria, see G. Fejér, Cod. diplom. Hungariae, Budapest 1829, iv/1, p. 54.

3 Marquart, Streifzüge, 503, places the Black Bulghars between the Dniepr and the Khazar lands, and further identifies them with the Kuturγur mentioned in Syriac and Byzantine sources.

4 Marquart refers to the Tenbīt, 141, where the Burghar are defined as a sort of Slavs. [Cf. p. 429, l. 25.]
text is that the Inner Bulghārs lived north of the [Western] Ṣaqlāiba, or in close contact with them, cf. the indications of the present paragraph.

Our author tries to weld together the data found in Iṣṭ. and in his other source but the result of this operation cannot be trusted. The details on the Ṣaqlāiba as the western neighbours of the Inner Bulghārs and on the Russo-Bulghār wars hail evidently from Iṣṭ., 7 and 226. The Mirvāt living to the east of our Bulghār along the Black Sea (cf. §§ 3, 6. and 46) reflect a wrong interpretation of the source which is better preserved in Gardizī (v.s., § 22 on the basic error with regard to the Majghari territory).

To sum up: our chapter is worth only as much as is due to Iṣṭ. who himself knows very little about Eastern Europe and the Balkans. Westberg’s theory is too specious and Marquart seems to be right in identifying the Inner Bulghār with the Danubian Bulghars. Our author must have taken the different names found in his sources for four distinct peoples:

| I.Kh.  | Burjān (§ 42, 16.) |
| I. Rusta | Bulghari (§ 42, 18.) |
| Iṣṭ. | Inner Bulghār (§ 45) |
| source common with Gardizī | V.n.nd.r (§ 53) (? |

§ 46. The Mirvāt.


This chapter ought to come logically after § 53. Our author’s geographical indications can be resumed in the following schemes:

but all the tentatives to disclose the identity of the Mirvāt from this internal evidence have lamentably failed.1 The solution came from another side.

1 I have been trying successively to identify the Mirvāt with the Magyars expelled by the Pechenegs from their Azov seats (cf. § 47), with the Crimean Goths, and with Mopāša mentioned by Const. Porph., v.s., notes to § 20.
The only sure parallel of our Mirvāt (so vocalized) is Gardizi’s M.rdāt. The discovery of our author’s basic mistake with regard to the Maghāri territory (see notes to § 22) has shown the futility of the attempts of reconciling the views resulting from this erroneous conception with Gardizi’s passage which follows the tenor of the original report without trying to fit it into an imaginary scheme of “frontiers” (ḥudūd). Assuming that Gardizi describes the Atelkuza stage of Magyar migrations we have further identified the N.nd.r/V.n.nd.r with the Onoghundur-Bulghars living beyond the Dūbā/Rūdā, i.e. Danube, or perhaps Sereth (§ 53), and we shall now proceed one stage farther along the same road suggesting that the M.rdāt/Mirvāt must be the “Moravians”. Const. Porph., De admin. imper., ch. 38, p. 170, says that after several years spent in Atelkuza the Magyars were attacked by the Pechenegs and had to look for a new habitat; so they drove out the inhabitants of Great Moravia (ἡ μεγάλη Μοραβία) and settled in the land “in which they are still living”. In ch. 40, p. 173, the mention of Σέρμιον (situated at 2 days’ distance from Belgrade at the estuary of a river), is accompanied by the note that beyond it (ἀπὸ τῶν ἐκείων) lies “the Great Unbaptized Moravia which the Magyars (Τοῦρκοι) destroyed and over which previously ruled Sventopluk (Σφενόπολς)” Finally, ch. 42, p. 177: “The Magyars live beyond the Danube in the Moravian land (ἐκ τῆς Μοραβίας γῆς) and also on this [i.e. southern] side of it between the Danube and Sava.”

Gardizi’s source undoubtedly refers to the Magyars before their occupation of their present country (“Landnahme”). If so, this country lying to the north-west of the Carpathians was still in Sventopluk’s possession and following Const. Porph.’s use could be called Moravia Ἔρατ, to which مرات is indeed found in Mas’ūdi’s report on the Slavs, Murūj, iii, 61–5, where it is associated with *Khurwāt-in (Northern Croats? v.s., § 42) and *Ṣākh-in (Czechs?). As Mas’ūdi wrote in A.D. 943–4, i.e. after the “Landnahme”, it is natural that he restricts the use of the term to Moravia proper and that he mentions the kingdom of the Turk (Τοῦρκοι = Magyars) in the neighbourhood of the kingdom of *al-Firaghi (Prague).

1 Sirmia (Sryem) lies north of the Sava and upstream from Belgrade.
2 A transposition of ٰ and ـ in Arabic script is extremely frequent, and for the substitution in Persian of ـ for the final ـ, we have an example in § 22, v.s., p. 323.
3 If the N.nd.r = Danube Bulgarians, we have to reckon these 10 days from the old Bulgarian capital Prēšlav (at 4 hours’ distance to the west of Shumen).
4 The text was first edited and explained by Charnoy, in Mém. Acad. SPb., ii, 1834, pp. 297–408, and in the last place by Marquart, Streifzüge, pp. 95–160. 5 In Mas’ūdi’s Tanbih, 67, the “Slavonic Nāmīn and Murāw” are mentioned on the river called *Danaba-

---

The Mirvāt 441
We can now return to our author who has complicated the situation by arraying the triad of nations: Majgharî–V.n.nd.r–Mirvât from north to south, so that the Mirvât, instead of being found "behind the [Carpathian] mountains", came to live on the northern coast of the Black sea, to the west and north of the Khazarian Pechenegs (§ 47); from the latter they were screened by a phantom mountain which (v.s., the sketch) was apparently imagined as a southern continuation of the "V.n.nd.r mountains" forming the frontier in the north. This mountain is a reminiscence of Gardizi's mountain standing on the bank of the river "above" the N.nd.r, i.e. north of them. In the west and north the Mirvât are made to border on the "Inner Bulghârs", whose name belongs to a different source (§ 45). All this is possible only in total oblivion of the Magyar seats on the Black sea coast!

As regards the general characteristics of the people in question Gardizi says that the Christian M.rdat dress like the Arabs and trade chiefly with them. The vestimentary detail has nothing strange in itself but the second item is more puzzling, unless we admit that Arab merchants could penetrate into Moravia from the Adriatic coast, or through Macedonia. Both Mas'ûdi's report and that of Ibrâhim b. Ya'qûb, though of a later date, render possible the supposition that some relations existed between the Arabs and Sventopoluk's dominions. Entirely fantastic are our author's assertions that the Mirvât knew Arabic and were tent-dwellers. These may be merely personal deductions from the fact that the Mirvât dressed like "Arabs".  

The confusion in our source is blatant and we are obliged to go in the first place by Gardizi's less sophisticated parallel text. It could be objected that the identification of Mirvât with Moravia conflicts with the description of the Şaqâliba (§ 43), subjects of the same Sventopoluk. We must, however, admit that the source on the Şaqâliba has been utilized by I. Rusta, the H.-'A., and Gardizi, whereas the combination of V.n.nd.r and Mirvât is known only to the H.-'A. and Gardizi on this case must have used some special source [or additional passage!] to which we have to assign a date of circa a.D. 900. Therefore the mention of Moravia (= Ṯεγţâλ Riveria) could easily be disconnected from its famous ruler, associated in the other source with the Şaqâliba.

passage referred to the Serbian Morava, i.e. to the southern affluent of the Danube, downstream from Belgrade. This Morava lay in the immediate neighbourhood of Bulgaria and from king Krum's times (d. a.D. 844) was under Bulgarian sway.

1 Looking from Constantinople as the point of observation.

2 All these details made me at first suspect the author of some knowledge of the Crimean peoples, of whom the Goths were Christians, recognized the supremacy of Byzantium, entertained good relations with their Turkish neighbours of the steppe, and probably carried on maritime trade. See Westberg, Die Fragmenten des Toparcha Gothicus [circa A.D. 963], in Zap. Akad. SPb., 1901, series VII, tom v, No. 2, and lately A. A. Vasiliev, The Goths in the Crimea (in Russian), 1sw. Gosud. Akad. Istorii Materialnoy Kulturi, i, 1–80, ii, 179–282 (especially 239–49). Cf. also note to § 50, 4.
§ 47. The Khazarian Pechenegs.

In § 20 the older territory of the Pechenegs is described, up in the north, *grosso modo* between the Urals and the Volga. Our § 47 refers to the new seats of the Pechenegs when, following the events of A.D. 889–93, they came to occupy the Magyars’ lands near the Azov sea. This chapter belongs to the Balkhī-Iṣṭ. tradition (cf. notes to § 20 where Iṣṭ., ṭo, is quoted) and corresponds to the historical facts. On the contrary, geographically we are in the region where our author artificially strings together information derived from different sources.

Iṣṭ. says only that the Pechenegs settled between the Khazar and Rūm.¹ Our author places some “Khazar mountains” east of the Khazarian Pechenegs.² The latter are imaginary unless they refer to the watershed between the Volga and the Don, but at all events we are given to understand (cf. § 50) that in the east they separated the Khazarian Pechenegs from the Khazars. In the south the Khazarian Pechenegs bordered on the Alān (cf. § 48) and in Mas‘ūdī’s account of the *W.lnd.rî* federation (which comprised the Pechenegs) it is said that these Turkish tribes lived on peaceful terms with the Khazar king and the Master of the Alān (ṣāhīb al-Lān), *v.i.*, notes to § 53. The detail on the Gurz sea lying to the west of the Khazarian Pechenegs is due to some wrong idea about the configuration of the north-eastern corner of the Black Sea. To the north (and partly to the west, cf. p. 440) the Mirvāt are named as the neighbours of the Khazarian Pechenegs, but here we are certainly on a purely imaginary ground for between the Azov sea and the Danube our author tries to drive in, as a wedge, the Mirvāt whose name he found in his special source [or passage] unknown to I.Kh., I. Rusta, or Iṣṭ. The latter author, *v.s.* p. 314, l. 1, is right when he suggests that the Pechenegs extended westwards down to the Rūm, *i.e.*, practically speaking, to the Danubian region, for such was the case in the beginning of the tenth century when the Magyars had already left Atelkuzu behind. With this agrees Mas‘ūdī’s embroiled account of the *W.lnd.rî* hordes operating against the Byzantine empire. But the above-mentioned particular source, common to the Ḥ.-‘Ā. and Gardīzī, refers to the situation circa A.D. 900 (cf. § 42, 18.) when for a short period the Magyars screened the Pechenegs from Bulgaria (associated with the “Rūm” in point of religion). The situation in the steppes in this period is extremely dark and, following Mas‘ūdī’s account, we may imagine that some “swarming” of the tribes was taking place. In any case the victorious Pechenegs, after the Magyars had surrendered to them their Lebedia home, most probably remained in touch with the Magyars, for after a short while they again attacked them and drove them out of their new habitat stretching between the Dniepr and the Sereth. Consequently, at the

¹ Cf. also Const. Porphy. quoted in the notes to § 20.
² Cf. § 5, 18. where *miyān-i nāḥiyat-i* *Bachanāk-i Khazarî* *biburradh*, to suit § 47, ought to read: *miyān-i Bachanāk-i Khazarî [va Khazarî] bigudharadh (?).
Commentary  §§ 47–8

Atelkuzu period of Magyar migrations, which the special source [circa A.D. 900] had in view, our author ought to have mentioned the Magyars as the western neighbours of the Khazarian Pechenegs. He, however, not knowing what to do with the names V.n.nd.r and Mirvât arranged the bearers of them from north to south, so that the Mirvât came to occupy the region somewhere about the Crimea (instead of Transylvania!). So, briefly speaking, the items on the north-western frontier of the Khazarian Pechenegs must be due exclusively to our author’s speculations.

For the further destinies of the Pechenegs ‘Aufi’s text published by Barthold, Turkestan, i, 99, and Marquart, Komanen, 40, is of great interest. ‘Aufi (thirteenth century) writes that the arrival of the Qri (Qûn? v.s., notes to §§ 14, 1. and 21) in the Sârî land made the inhabitants of the latter move into the land of the Türkmâns [= Ghuz] with the result that the Ghuz [= Türkmân] went to the land of the Pechenegs near the coast of the Armenian (= Caspian?) sea.1 Marquart, Komanen, 54, places these events in the beginning of the eleventh century but finally, p. 202, leaves the whole question in suspense. Barthold (in his review of Marquart’s book) admits that ‘Aufi has in view the migration of the tribes in the eleventh century when the Qipchaq (see notes to § 21) drove the Ghûz out of their steppes. For a short time the supremacy in the southern Russian steppes passed to the Ghûz. Russian chronicles under A.D. 968 register the first incursion of the Pechenegs into Russian lands. In their turn the Pechenegs must have been considerably weakened by A.D. 1036 when Yaroslav of Kiev defeated them.

§ 48. The Alân.

Vsevolod Miller, Osetinskiye et’udii, iii, Moscow, 1887, pp. 1–116; J. Kulakovsky, Christianity of the Alans (in Russian), in Vizantiyskiy Vremennik, v, 1898, pp. 1–18 [according to the author the Alans were converted en masse only in the beginning of the tenth century, while Nicholas the Mystic was patriarch in Constantinople in 901–7 and 912–25]; J. Kulakovsky, The Alans according to Classical and Byzantine Authors (in Russian), Kiev 1899 [a very thorough study]; Marquart, Streifzüge, pp. 165–71; Täuber, Zur Geschichte der Alenen, in Klio, ix, 1909, pp. 14–28 (notes on ancient history); Barthold, Alân in EI; Marquart, Komanen, pp. 107–9 (the Alans to the east of the Caspian Sea); Bleichsteiner, Das Volk d. Alenen, in Berichte d. Forschungs-Institutes f. Osten und Orient, Wien, ii, 1918, pp. 4–16; Marquart, Iberer und Hyrkanier, in Caucasica, fasc. 8, 1931, pp. 79–88 (critical remarks on Täuber). [J. Charpentier, Die ethnographische Stellung d. Tocharer, in ZDMG, 71, 1917, pp. 347–88, contains (pp. 357–66) a detailed study of the Osset connections; the author makes a point of showing the identity of the Wu-sun (Chinese name of a people in the neighbourhood of the Issikul), "Arov, Asiani (who towards

1 The term درآی‌ای اردیمه (sic) is very strange and suits the Caspian better than the Black sea which we would expect at this place!
§ 48 The Alān

A.D. 200 became the lords of the Tocharians, as results from Justin’s epitome of Trogus Pompeius) and Alani [?] . As regards the Caucasus Charpentier, p. 363, considers the Ossets as an independent branch of the great Alān people.]¹

§§ 48 and 49 ought to come logically after § 36 (Shirvān).

The Iranian Alāns, later called Ās (cf. § 50, 4. Tūlās) were the ancestors of the present-day Ossets (from Georgian Ows-et’i < As). All the bearings of the frontiers in this paragraph must be rectified by 90° (e.g., instead of east read: north; instead of west read: south). The item on the Alāns bordering in the west (*south) on the Rūm is explained by the fact that the Georgians (Gurz) are described under the Byzantine Empire (§ 42, 15.).

[Additional note. In the Armenian Geography composed towards the eighth century (?) the westernmost Alans are called Ashtigor. The name, most probably, is an Armenian rendering of *As-Digor. Digor (further appearing in the same Geography as Dik’or) is the name of the present-day western Ossets, cf. Marquart, Streifzüge, 170. Ash as an original form is hardly possible there being no s in Osset (at least in the present-day dialects) and the appearance of this foreign sound must account for the surd t of Tigor (instead of *Digor).² The restoration *As can be supported by the fact that nowadays the Ossets call their western neighbours the Balqar Turks Asiąg and their territory As³ having evidently transferred to them the name of their own tribe which formerly occupied the region near the Elburz.⁴ Some temporary elevation of this particular branch may account for the generalization in Muslim literature of the Mongol epoch (thirteenth century) of the term Ās, instead of the older Alān. However, the Mongol dominion, under which many Ās were carried away as far as China must have dealt a fatal blow to the western Ossets. Probably at that time (?) the region near the Elbrus (i.e. the valleys along the westernmost sources of the Terek and the easternmost sources of the Kuban), was occupied by the Turks now respectively called Balqar and Qara-chay.

According to I.R., 148, the noblest (ashraf) of the four Alān tribes, the one to which the king belonged, was called دحاس - قدحاس.⁵ The *Tuwal-Ās mentioned in our § 50, 4. may be another ramification of the Ās. As the Tuwal-Ās are coupled together with the Abkhaz their notoriety may be due to their holding some important pass (e.g. the Klukhor connecting the Qara-chay territory with Abkhazia). At present Twal-tā is the name of the Ossets living on the southern slope of the Caucasian range but they may have been pushed south-eastwards by some wave of Turkish invasion.]

¹ All this is rather obscure.
² That the Osset ē sounded to a foreign ear like s is shown by such names on the Turkish (former Osset) territory as Ashotur < Oss. Was-Totur “Saint Theodore”, Miller, Oset. Et’udi, iii, 8.
³ Miller, o.c., iii, 6–7.
⁴ Const. Porph., De cerimoninis, ii, 48, speaks separately of the ἐξωνυκράτωρ Ἀλαδάς and the ἀρχοντες Ἀλας (in whose land the Καρπετία πῆλα = Darial are situated). This ‘Ala may possibly refer to the Ās?
⁵ Perhaps *رخمس Rukhs-Ās, cf. Rox-alani?
Commentary § 48

1. Kāsak (as in Masʿūdī, Tābhī, 184: مقاک) but Murūj, ii, 45: مقاک, corresponds to Byzantine Καραχία, old Russian Kαραχй, i.e. the present-day Cherkes (Circassians) who are of Caucasian race and speak a non-Indoeuropean language. According to the Murūj, ii, 45–6, the Kashak who did not live united under one king, were weaker than the Alāns but could resist them in the fortresses situated along the coast. Our author must have misunderstood his source for he speaks of the Kāsak under the Alān and consequently draws the latter’s northern (read: “western”) frontier along the Black Sea coast. Marquart, Komnen, 181, explains the later name Cherkes from Persian *chahār-kaš “the four tribes of the Kas” (?), cf. also Streifszüge, 10, 145, 161, 175, 479. The Cherkes call themselves by an entirely different name Adīge.

The Kashak are not mentioned in I.R., Iṣṭ., or Gardīzī and here again, as in the account of Lysān (§ 36, 36.) we find in the H.-ʿĀ. some common traits with Masʿūdī.

2. Khayyān (?) is otherwise unknown, unless it is a repetition of Khayyān mentioned under the Sarfīr (§ 49, 2.), but Khayyān was separated from the Alān territory by the whole length of the Sarfīr.

3. Dar-i Alān, cf. § 5, 18 d., is the celebrated Bāb al-Lān, i.e. the Dariāl pass in Central Caucasus on the Military Georgian road connecting Vladi-kavkaz with Tiflis. The Ossets now live astride of the pass [cf. § 36, 33]. Our author shows no direct knowledge of the description of the Alān castle (Qalʿat al-Lān) in Masʿūdī, ii, 42. The item about the 1,000 guards of the fortress is found in Ibn Rusta, 148. The detail about the Christian religion of the king agrees with Ibn Rusta, 148, and Gardīzī, where it is expressly stated that the king’s subjects are heathens. V.s., p. 444, l. 26.

According to Masʿūdī, ii, 42, the capital of the Alāns was called مغهاش meaning “piety” (dīyāna). It is not mentioned in any other Muslim source but may be connected with the city A-su Mie-kʿie-sz (probably “M., city of the Aš”) which is several times mentioned in Chinese sources (Yūan-shī, &c.) in the accounts of Mangū’s expedition in Northern Caucasus in a.d. 1239, cf. Bretschneider, Mediaeval researches, i, 316–7. See also Pelliot, four. As., April 1920, pp. 168–9, who further identifies the town of the Chinese sources with مغهاش or mentioned in Rashīd al-dīn, ed. Blochet, pp. 43, 47, after the expeditions to قرما (Qırım? “Crimea”) and before that to Darband. However, in Juvaynī, GMS, i, 222, مغهاش (var. مغهاش) mentioned together with Bulghār seems to refer to the Moksha (a Mordvan tribe, cf. § 53) and such may be the case of p. 2251; p. 2244 آس is perhaps also a mis-spelling of the same name.

1 In the Tābhī, 184, both Kāsak and Kashak are mentioned erroneously as separate peoples.
2 Instead of Garš and Kʿut in the Armenian Geography, Marquart, Komnen, 181, suggests to read Kʿarš (i.e. Kashak, Cherhes) and Gut (i.e. Crimean [?] Goths).
3 V.s. p. 68, note 1.
4 It is more difficult to connect the Chinese name with the eastern neighbours of the Ossets the Chechen called in Russian sources Michkiz, Mizjeg, &c.
§ 49. The Sarîr.

Sarîr is no original name of the country, being only an abridgement of the title šâhîb al-sarîr "Master of the Throne" which the Arabs gave to the local king (on his golden throne sarîr, in our text takht, see I.R., 147, Mas'ûdî, Murîj, ii, 41, i, 223). I.R. and Gardîzî, 101, call the king respectively ام ام and ام ام. This detail suggested to Marquart and Barthold (Daghestân in EI) the identification of the Sarîr with the Avar people in Daghestan (on the middle one of the Qoy-su rivers of which the united waters, under the name of Sulaq, flow into the Caspian south of the Terek).1 Balâdhuri, p. 196 in fine, discussing the titles given by Anûshirvân to the princes of Daghestân says: "the khâqân of the mountain (khâqân al-jabal) who is the Master of the Throne is called ام ام (variants: ام ام, ام ام, ام ام). Thomas Artsruni (tenth century) mentions the people Ahrâz-k' (I.P.I.Ps) jointly with the Tsanar-k' (Sanâr, § 36, 33.), cf. Marquart, o.c., 496. In the Zafar-nâma (written in A.D. 1424), i, 772, 777, 779, the Daghestan Avars are called Auhar, and this form is very much like the first element of the king's name in Balâdhuri.2 Mas'ûdî, ii, 41, relates a story of the descendence of the Master of the Throne from Hârêm Gür, and abusively confers on him an additional title of Filân-shâh (v.i., § 50, 3c.). The connexion with the Master of the Throne seems to have been much appreciated for not only Mas'ûdî speaks of the matrimonial ties between the Alân and the Sarîr princely families but we know that Ishaq b. Ismâ'îl, ruler of Tiflis circa A.D. 830–53, was married to a daughter of this king, see ʿTabârî, iii, 1416, and Thomas Artsruni, transl. Brosset, pp. 143, 168. The important historical role of the Avar principality is shown by the fact that the Avar language is still a sort of lingua franca in Daghestan. This language, belonging to the local eastern Caucasian group has, however, nothing to do with the original language of the Avar invaders who first organized the principality of the Sarîr. See Map xi.

[The Avars were the great conquerors of the fifth century who about A.D. 461–5 drove the Sabirs westwards. They are the people which the Chinese call fou-jan or fuan-juan and which, according to P. Pelliot, was of Mongol race.3 In A.D. 551 they were vanquished by the Turks (T'u-chüeh)...

1 The Avars are now an entirely Daghestanian people, but their name may reflect that of some former dynasty issued from the pre-Islamic ʿAbâp, ʿAbâpes, see I.Kh., 92 and 119: al-Abâr, cf. Marquart, Komanen, 74-5.

2 In Armenian Ahrâz-k', k' is the suffix of plural and the group rh, with usual metathesis, must stand for kr. In *Ahras 1 I consider z as an Iranian suffix of origin similar to that of Gur-z, Lak-z, Ldy-z (§ 36, 36.). Consequently the Armenian form *Ahrâ-z (easily < Ahrâr-z) is identical with later Persian Ahar (>Avâr) and in its light we may restore Balâdhuri's title, which consists of a name + suffix z + suffix ân. As regards the form وار we may suppose that it is a result of several tentatives to transcribe the difficult name containing the elements وار and ام usually confused in writing. One of the may be superfluous and with وار (or still better, Âm) we approach the Armenian form. The tentative restoration would be *Aharz-ân-shâh.

3 Cf. T.-Pao, xxxii/4, 1936, p. 235.
and according to Theophylactos Simocatta fled partly to China (Τανγδστ = Tabghach = the Wei dynasty) and partly to the Movk'i. On the contrary, the Avars who first came into touch with the Byzantines towards A.D. 557 only assumed the name of their famous predecessors whereas in reality they belonged to the 'Oydr (Uyghur) tribes Oôpô, Xouvî, &c. Cf. Marquart, Die Chronologie d. alttürk. Inschriften, 94, Eränshahr, 52–5, 84, &c., Streifzüge, passim, and Chavannes, Documents, 229–33. One should think then that the Avars who gave a dynasty to northern Daghestan belonged to the later "Pseudo-Avars", though the question needs still a special investigation. As regards the Mukri who were joined by a part of the true Avars they are usually identified with the Tunguz people Mu-chi (Wu-chi) or Mo-ho which lived north of Corea, cf. Herrmann, Historical Atlas of China, Cambridge, U.S.A., 1935, Map 30, but Marquart, Eränshahr, p. 54, ult. was inclined to take them for the Merkit (see, however, his later Komanen, 88). In favour of this opinion one could quote a fact which seems to have escaped the notice of the scholars. According to Rashîd al-dîn, ed. Bérénzine, vii, 90 (transl. v, 70) one of the four divisions of the Merkit or Mukri was called *Auhar?), which name is, indeed, reminiscent of the title borne by the Sarîr king. This item does not, of course, constitute a proof for the "true-Avar" origin of the rulers of Sarîr, who, following Theophylactos' theory, could have usurped a name which did not strictly belong to them, but the resemblance of the names in both cases is a testimony for its original form. It must be finally remembered that the evidence for the distinction of the true Avars and Pseudo-Avars, depending chiefly on one Byzantine source, is rather frail and a complete disappearance after A.D. 552 of a warrior race would be unexpected.]

On the mountain of the Sarîr see § 5, 18. On the wrong idea of the sources of the Kur see § 6, 56. Our author makes the Sarîr border on the Rûm, the latter term evidently referring only to the Georgians (§ 42, 15.).

No parallels could be found for the story about the giant flies (pasha). Masʿūdî, ii, 42, gives the name *Maghasım to the Alân capital (v.s.). Could not some popular etymology *Maghas > Persian magas "fly" have served as a starting-point for a story reflecting some discontent with the neighbours? [?]

1. On the king's castle see also § 5, 18 c. Masʿūdî, ii, 42, calls the seat of government (dār al-mulâ) of the Sarîr (حَرْج; d'Ohsson quotes the variant حَرْج). This place may correspond to the present centre of the Avar territory, Khunzakh (*خُنزخ). See Map xi.

2. خُنزخ (perhaps repeated under § 48, 2.) corresponds to خُنزخ گیران in I.R., 147, and Gardizî, 109, and خُنزخ in Masʿūdî, ii, 7, 39. Already d'Ohsson in his very good book Des peuples du Caucase, Paris 1828, p. 19, wrote: "Il me paraît hors de doute qu'il faut lire خُنزخ وليس خُنزخ گیران puisque le pays ici désigné est encore habité par les Kaitacs (قَتِّ) dans Abul-Fidaî et

Abul-Fidaî, p. 71, says that جَابِل al-Qvitq (perhaps for *Qabq?) stretches from the coast of the Caspian sea near the town of Bâb al-abwâb in a southern
Marquart in the additions to his Streifsüge, 492, came practically to the same conclusion. The Qaytaq (speaking [now] a Dagestanian language) live on the rivers Gumri (*Humri*) and Darbash, along the coast immediately north of Darband.² I.R., 147-8, quoting from some earlier source calls the king of Khyzan Adharnarsé and says that he is equally respectful to the three religions of his subjects (Muslims, Jews, and Christians). He places Khyzan at 12 mansils "to the right"³ of the Master of the Throne's castle which distance is certainly exaggerated, unless it is based on a confusion with a different Khyzan. According to Mas'udī Khyzan was formerly a part of the Khazar principalities (dākhila fi jumlat mulāk al-Khazar); in his times the king, a Muslim said to be of the Qaṭṭān tribe, bore the hereditary name of ِسُليمان.⁴

A certain difficulty results from some of Baladhuri's data on خيران: p. 204, in the enumeration of Salīm's federates he mentions "Shakki, Khyzan, Shirvān", &c., as if they were neighbours; p. 206, he says that Jarrābī, after having attacked the people of حمرين, settled them in the "rūstāq (sic) of Khyzan" which suggests a place in the rear [?]. Finally I.Kh., 124, in his identification of the places mentioned in the Qor'anic legend of Moses, mentions "the village of Khyzan"⁵ among the Başarvan (south of the Araxes) and Shirvān. Between Baku and Qubba there exists on the Ata-chay a village and a district of Khizi which may be taken into consideration in connexion with the above hints. Its distance from the capital of the Sarīr would roughly suit I.R.'s "12 mansils" (o.s.).

Mas'udī entirely separates Khyzan from the Sarīr but I.R. and Gardizi speak of Khyzan in the middle of the chapter on the Sarīr. This arrangement which evidently existed in the common source is responsible for the place which our author assigns to Khondan in the present chapter. The Sarīrian "generals" living in the town may be only an echo of the original report on the king Adharnarsé.

3. A parallel of رقم in I.R., 148, who places رقم at a distance of 10 farsakhs from the town of Khyzan and describes the cult of the tree practised by its inhabitants, cf. Marquart, Streifsüge, 15. The direction. Then quoting from al-'Azīsī (cf. note to § 60, 4.) Abul-Fidā adds that this mountain is called Jabal al-alsun because some 300 languages are said to be spoken on it. Then he proceeds "and on its northern side are دُكرُدُوْن, who are a (special) race (fīna); and on its southern side the Lazgī who are also a (special) race".

---

¹ Jihān-nūmā, pp. 401-2.
² Marquart, o.c., p. 492, identifies Khondan with Majālis (on the left bank of the Buzum). However, the usual residence of the Utsmi of the Qaytaq was at Bashli, or Barshli on the Humri river, cf. Klaproth, Tableau du Caucase, 1827, p. 139. D'Osson, o.c., p. 10, proposed the identification of this place to خُرداق where according to Baladhuri, p. 195, Anūshirvān met the khāqqān of the Khazars. Consequently خرداق خُرداق [— Armenian Varəc'an].
³ It can mean only to the "south-east" for, p. 148, the Alan territory begins at 3 days' distance "to the left" of the Sarīr.
⁴ The title may be Turkish, cf. the title Se-li-fa many times mentioned in Chinese sources, see Chavannes, Documents, Index.
⁵ Marquart, o.c., 492, was inclined to distinguish it from Mas'udī's Jydan.
only name I can think of is that of the river Rubas which waters the Tabarsarān district to the south-west of Darband. Following the coast north to south the districts come as follows: Qaytaq, Darband, Tabarsarān, but west of Darband the sources of the Darbakh (in Qaytaq) and the Rubas (in Ṭabarsarān) lie very close to one another. Therefore the mention of Rubas would not be unexpected after Qaytaq (*Khayṭāq). رنبس could easily be restored as *Rubkhas > Rubas.¹

The mention of *Masqut lying farther south in the same direction (§ 50, 3.) may be explained by our author’s reading off his map the whole series of names situated in one line. I.R., whose text is our sure parallel, after the intermezzo on Khysān and R̄h, finishes the chapter by mentioning a second castle belonging to the Master of the Throne: “it is called ایل رنیک and has a strong position; in it is the treasury (bayt al-māl) of the king and it was given to him by Anūshirvān”. This fortress is undoubtedly mentioned in Masʿūdī, ii, 39, in the neighbourhood of Zirīgarān and the Sarīr, i.e. the present-day Qumiq situated on the southern branch of the Qoy-su in the proximity of the Avar territory.²

§ 50. The Khazar.

Marquart, Streitsüge, Index; Barthold, Khazar in EI; H. v. Kutschera, Die Chasaren, Wien 1910 (unimportant); J. N. Simchowitsch, Studien z. d. Berichten arab. Historiker über d. Chasaren, Berliner Dissertation 1920, still unpublished; the author’s résumé in Jahrbuch d. Dissert. der Philol. Fakultät . . . zu Berlin, 1919-20, pp. 248-52, is reviewed by M. Palló in Ungar. Jahrbücher, ii, 1922, pp. 157-60 (with a list of Hungarian literature on the subject): Simchowitsch studies the earlier history of the Khazars down to Harūn al-Rashīd’s times; M. Kmoskó, Die Quellen Iṣṭahri’s in seinem Berichte über die Chasaren, Kőrösi Csoma-Archivum, 1/2, 1921, pp. 141-8.; M. Kmoskó, Araber und Chasaren, ibid., 1/4, 1924, pp. 280-92 and 1/5, 1925, pp. 356-68. The Jewish sources on the Khazars have been recently republished by P. K. Kokovtsov, Yevreysko-khasarskaya perepiska v X veke, Leningrad 1932 (exhaustive bibliography and very detailed commentary). Some Byzantine sources are quoted in Dietrich, o.c., Index; see also Constantine Porphyry, De admin. imperio, chap. 10, 12, 42 (scarce details).

The principal Muslim source on the Khazars is Ibn Faḍlān (in Yāqūt, ii, 439-40), many of whose data are found also in Iṣṭ., 220–5, though each of the two sources has a good many independent details. Since Frič has been admitted that Ibn Faḍlān (who travelled in 309-10/921-2) was the

¹ The Ta’rīkh Bāb al-Abwāb quoted by A. Z. Validi, Azerbaycan, p. 39, spells the name رواسب, but the name may have had an older form.
² The territory of Qumiq is occupied by the Lak who are also called Qasi-Qumiq (to be distinguished from the Turkish Qumiq living further north-east towards the Caspian sea). Cf. Dirr, in Peterm. Mitteil., 54, 1908, pp. 204-12.
source of Istakhri, but lately Kmoksò has advanced a new theory of their common dependence on some previous report drawn up towards A.D. 800.

Another source is that utilized by I.R., 119–20, Bakri, Gardizi, and 'Auffi.

Our author's very condensed report reflects both groups of sources and shows a knowledge of I.Kh. For the items of the Ātil town, the seven judges (governors?) communicating with the king, and the maritime customs 1st., 220–5, is undoubtedly responsible, but our author cuts down even such characteristic features as the existence of a dual political system under which the supreme chief only appointed the head of the executive power who was the real ruler. The system is mentioned in all the sources:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Const. Porphyri. cap. 42, (cf. Marquart, o.c., 27)</th>
<th>ὅ χαυάος</th>
<th>ὅ πέχ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Rusta</td>
<td>Khazar Khāqān</td>
<td>Ayshā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mas‘ūdī, Murūj, ii, 12</td>
<td>Khūqān</td>
<td>Malik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Istakhri</td>
<td>Malik Khazar¹</td>
<td>Khāqān Khazar,¹ or Bek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Hauqal</td>
<td>Khāqān Khazar</td>
<td>Malik Khazar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardizi</td>
<td>Khazar Khāqān</td>
<td>Abshād</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the Ḥ.-'Ā. the two persons are run into one and the king (pādshāh) is called Tārkān Khāqān, from the children of Ansā (cf. Ayshā, Abshād). The latter name was borrowed from the source common also to I.R. and Gardizi, whereas the addition to the title khāqān of a further title tārkān finds an explanation in the story of the interpreter Sallām's journey to the wall of Gog and Magog, I.Kh., 163, where Tārkān malik al-Khazar is mentioned, though at another place I.Kh., 41, says that tārkān was the title of lesser Turkish kings. [A Khwārazmian mercenary Rās-Tārkān commanded the Khazar forces which invaded Transcaucasia in 147764. Marquart, Ungar. Jahrbücher, 1924, p. 271, explains by this person's name that of the later town Astrakhan. Cf. Taβarī, iii, 328, استرخان *As-tārkān?.]

Our author equally omits the important statement regarding the outward appearance of the Khazars: being of two distinct types (one very dark, the other fair-skinned and handsome) they did not resemble the Turks. Their language was also different from Turkish, but resembled that of the (Volga) Bulghārs, Ḫıt., 225. According to this description the Khazar language of which no texts have come down to us, belonged to the aberrant branch of Turkish languages of which the only living representative is now the Chuvash language.

Prima facie our enumeration of the Khazar towns presents great difficulties. In fact these towns were only four, of which two were divided by the Volga near its estuary, and the other two lay in the Caucasian region (Balanjar and Samandar). Our compiler mentions the two Volga towns under five different names and thus his total rises to seven, to say nothing of the five additional names wrongly quoted under Khazar.

¹ The places of the rulers are wrong.
Commentary

§ 50

The complication with the Volga towns will be best presented in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Iṣṭ.</th>
<th>Western Ātil</th>
<th>Eastern Ātil</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.Kh.</td>
<td>ِالبها</td>
<td>خُبلَه</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.R.</td>
<td>ِسارع</td>
<td>خُبل</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The three traditions, namely: A (Iṣṭ., < I. Faḍlān), B (I.Kh.), C (I.R. and Gardizi), are all side by side incorporated in H.-'Ā. The order of enumeration fully confirms this conclusion.

1. and 2. are evidently borrowed from Iṣṭ., 220-3, who in the Khazar land knows only these two towns of which ِالبها (read ِالبها ِātil > Etil) was a double town for it was divided by the Ātil river (§ 6, 43.) into a western and an eastern part, the former being the residence of the king and his army, and the latter the commercial centre. The two towns lay probably near the estuary of the Volga. On their different names see the table above.

Masʿūdi, Murāj, ii, 7, reckons from Darband to Samandar 8 days and thence to Ātil (so instead of Āmul) 7 days. According to Iṣṭ., 219, 227, the respective distances are 4 and 7 days, the distance between Samandar and the Sarīr boundary being only 2 farsakhs. These data indicate for Samandar a place somewhere between Kižlar (on the Terek) and Petrovsk (now Makhach-qal'ā) on the Caspian sea. It is usually (Dorn, Marquart) accepted that Samandar1 corresponds to Tarqu/Tarkhu, situated at a few Kms. to the south-west of Petrovsk and in favour of this opinion could be quoted the short distance between Samandar and the Sarīr, and our author’s indication that Samandar lay near the sea-coast. Iṣṭ., 222, mentions extensive gardens and vineyards between Samandar, Darband, and the Sarīr, which detail is also not contradicted by the situation of Tarqu. Finally, in the letter of the Khazar king (though in the more extensive and still suspect version B, cf. Kokovtsov, p. 100) Samandar is placed “at the end of ِلبان T.dliż” which may easily stand for ِلبان Tarkhu!

3. In this paragraph the names borrowed from different authorities are jumbled together into a long list. We shall treat them in three groups.

3a. The first three names come exactly as I.Kh., 124, enumerates them: wa mudun al-Khazar: *Khamīth wa Balanjīr al-Baydā. Of these Balanjar lay certainly in the Caucasian region. During his campaign of 119/737 Marwān penetrated into Khazaria, as it seems, through the Alān gate, i.e. the Darial pass in the Central Caucasus, and then (I. Athīr, v, 160) marched eastwards to Balanjīr, Samandar, and al-Baydā. Consequently Balanjar is to be sought between the Darial and Samandar. The only other geographical detail referring to it is the existence of a river called nahr al-Balanjar, Balādhurf, 204, Ya‘qūbī, Historiae, 194 (in the account of

1 The reading of the name may be *Sumundur, *Samundur, &c.
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Salmān’s campaign). The Khazar king’s letter mentions a river V.r.shan situated at 20 farsakhs from the capital, Kokovtsov, pp. 86 and 102.1 Marquart, o.c., 16–19, compares this name with Balanjar 2 and tentatively identifies the Balanjar river with the Qoy-su “the Sheep river” (Abulfidā, 204: nahr al-aghānām flowing through the Sarir). It is true that according to the Khazar letter the river ought to be placed much more to the north (Kokovtsov: Kuma river?) but then it would be difficult to understand how Marwān could march to Samandar via Balanjar. So besides the Qoy-su (Sulaq), only some of the right affluents of the Terek, or the Khasav-yurt river could eventually be taken into consideration with regard to the still doubtful situation of Balanjar. As Samandar lay by the sea, al-Baydā, whither Marwān 3 marched from Samandar, could lie either to the south, or, more probably, to the north of Tarqu. As I. Athir, v, 160, definitely says that al-Baydā was the Khāqān’s residence it must be identical with one of the two Volga towns, and more particularly with that which I.R., 139, calls سارِغْش. The first element of the name *Sārīgh-shīn is evidently Turkish sargh “yellow”, a colour of which the Arabic al-Baydā “white” might be an approximate rendering, perhaps even more suitable for the original Khazar meaning.4 Marquart, o.c., i, arbitrarily restores the second element خān as shar<shahr, but I am strongly inclined to think that the name *Sarīgh-shīn is the original form of the still enigmatic سخین Sāqsin, as the geographers of Mongol times call a town situated by a mighty river and usually quoted along with the Volga Bulghar, cf. Barthold, Sāqsin in EII.5 To sum up: Baydā may be only an Arabic name for the first of the two Ātil towns already mentioned under i. As according to Išt, the Khāqān lived in the western town, al-Baydā taken by Marwān, must be the latter. There is no record of the Arabs having crossed the Volga and in principle it would have been a most difficult feat.

36. The following two names are borrowed from the source common

1 It is curious that in the account of Maslama’s campaign Ya’qūbī, Historiae, ii, 381, says that he was met by the khāqān of the Khazars in which there is an entirely different place from Varthān in Ādharbayjān and evidently refers to northern Daghestan. [It is very probable, however, that the name refers here to Barshiya, o.s., p. 449, note i, in Armenian Varat’ān, see Moses Kalankatvats’s, book ii, ch. xxix, Russian transl. by Patkanov, SPb., 1861, p. 192.]
2 Marquart, ibid., 166, identifies Balanjar with Varat’ān or Varajan by which name the Armenians call the capital of the Caucasian “Huns”, but he withdraws this suggestion, ibid., 492.
3 He was coming from the west.
4 The Khazar fortress on the lower Don Ṣapkəl = Russian Belaya “White tent” is called in the Khazar king’s letter (version B) Shurkal, cf. Chuvash shura “white” and kil “house”, as suggested by Poppe in Kokovtsov, o.c., 105. [In Chuvash u < old a.]
5 The geographical identity of Sāqsin with the Ātil town was recognized by Westberg, o.c., 1908 (March), p. 40; I think that even phonetically Sāqsin < Sarīgh-shīn (or -sin). [As a parallel cf. the name of Tsartisn “Queen’s town” (now Stalingrad), important centre situated on the Volga above Astrakhan, which is said to be a popular Russian etymology for the original *Sarīch (?) supposed to mean “yellow island” (?). *Sarī-sīn would mean “yellow tomb”.]
also to I.R., Bakri, and Gardiz (see the table above). The unusual form of the first name مَلَك may have been influenced by the two towns شَهْر in Transoxiana, cf. Barthold, Turkestan, 174. The second name, as spelt by our author, would be *Khuttugh "happy" but to judge by I.R.'s variants it looks like a compound with the Turkish word -baligh "town". Very probably another form of the same name is I.Kh.'s خُلْيَج (so instead of خُلْيَج chosen by de Goeje) Khamilikh, possibly with a contraction from <Khammalik<Kham-balikh<Kham-baligh. The first element still offers a difficulty. Marquart, Komanen, 71, rightly criticized M. Hartmann's restoration *Khan-baligh, but his own reading *Qapigh-baligh is still more improbable. That this town stood on the eastern bank of the Volga may be indirectly concluded from the fact that I.Kh., 124, quotes it as the terminus of the road from Jurjän, i.e. along the eastern coast of the Caspian.

36c. The last three names are found in I.Kh., 124, who following on the enumeration of the three Khazar towns says: "and outside al-Bab (Darband) are a. the Malik of Suwar, b. the Malik of al-Lakz, c. the Malik of al-Lân, d. the Malik of Filân, e. the Malik of al-M.sq.t, f. the Master of the Sarîr, and g. the town of Samandar". In this list a. corresponds to our Suwar; b. to our Làn, c. to our M.s.t; g. was already mentioned under 2., and c. and f. are treated in separate chapters (§§ 48 and 49). Only d. Filân has been left out of consideration.

Neither of the three names *Laks, Suwar, and M.sq.t could be quoted in the tenth century under the heading Khazar. Even Darband-i Khazarân (§ 36, 40.) is a purely conventional historical term pointing to the fact that Darband (which from circa a.D. 800 remained in the hands of the Muslims) was a "frontier post" (thâghr) directed against the Khazars and their successors. In our author's times Darband and consequently the lands lying to the south of it belonged to the Shirvân-shâh, v.s., notes to § 36, 36. and Išt., 219. A remote reason for the inclusion of *Lakz, *Suwar, and *

1 Perhaps because our author, like Mas'ūdī, Murūj, ii, 42, took Filân-shâh for the hereditary title of the Sarîr kings. This, however, is incorrect, for Balâdhurî, 106, names separately sâhib al-Sarîr and malik-Filân. Nothing practically is known of this prince and his people. In Yâqût's very valuable passage on the peoples of Daghestân, i, 438 (cf. BGA, 1, 184) immediately after Tâbarsarân (on the Rubas river) is mentioned umma ilâ janbihim tuʿrafi bi-Filân which suggests that the Filân lived quite close to the Tâbarsarân. After the Filân come the Lakz, al-Lîrân, and Shârvân (sic). Balâdhurî, 194, speaks of دَسَالِبُ "the wall of the L.b.n" which the Sasanian Qubâdh built between Shirvân and Bâb al-Lân (Darial), cf. I.Kh., 123, bâb L.bân-shâh. This L.b.n probably corresponds to Lip'in-k of the Armenian authors and Lupenii of Pliny, n. h., vi, 20, and it is not impossible to connect Lip'in, &c. with Fil- by admitting a metathesis *Lîf/Fil. It is true that Balâdhurî, 196, specially mentions Malik Filân but the different sources may account for the difference L.b.n/Filân. [In the eastern part of Shakkî near the sources of the Turiyan-chay several places are found with such names as Filîfî, perhaps <Fil-i Filân (cf. the royal title of Gil-i Filân). This is only a hint to the future investigators on the spot.]
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*Masqut in the Khazar chapter may be the fact that Marwān is said to have brought from his famous expedition (of 119/737) a number of Khazars whom he settled between the Samuḥ river and Shāhbarān in the lower parts of the Lakz lands (fi saḥl arḍ al-Lakz), see Baladhurī, 207. On the middle course of the Samuḥ there is still a village Khazri.<br>
*Khazari.

Lakz stands undoubtedly for لک ِکَ (Lakz). As mentioned above (§ 36, 36.) the Lakz, or a part of them, seem to be identical with the *Khursān (Baladhurī, 196). According to Mašʿūdī, Murūj, ii, 6, the Shīrvān-shāh Muhammad b. Yazīd annexed the possessions of خراسان (خرسان : read شاه ورادان (لايران) شاه) and this agrees with the threefold title of the Shīrvān-shāh in our source (v.s.). Mašʿūdī, ii, 5, even adds that the Lakz kingdom (mamlaka) was the bulwark (muʿawwal) of the Shīrvān kingdom. Baladhurī, 209, mentions a fortress of the Shīrvān-shāh named Khursh. The original extent of the Lakz territory is uncertain but they appear as the immediate neighbours of the Layzān (v.s.). According to Ābul-Fidā, trans. ii/2, p. 299, the Samuḥ river flowed across the Lakz territory and Baladhurī’s passage, 207, indicates that in the region between the Samuḥ and Belbela rivers the Lakz originally occupied even the plains. The name Lak-z as shown by Marquart, ZDMG, 49, p. 666, is formed with the Iranian suffix of origin -z and the stem of the name is *Lak. This is now the appellation of the Daghestanian Qazi-Qumuqs (Arab. غمیق), living on the eastern branch of the Qoy-su. The linguistic evidence shows that the Lak once occupied a much larger area (Prince N. S. Trubetskoy’s lecture at the School of Oriental Studies, 21.iii.1934), but the connexion of the Lakz with the present-day Lak is still uncertain. By metathesis Lakz became Lazg, which form was further used by Persians with the addition of the usual suffix of origin Lazg-i (in Russian Lezg-in, with the Russian “singulative” suffix -in). This later Perso-Turkish term came to denote indiscriminately all the Daghestanian mountaineers, but more especially those of the southern part of Daghestan, cf. Barthold, Dāghestān in EI. See Map xi.

On سووار vocalized Suevar in I.Kh., 124, nothing is known and de Goeje’s annotation: “سوار Vulgo سوار” (cf. § 51) remains on his responsibility. As a guess one might connect the name Swor (*Sawir?) with that of the people Sabir who were defeated by the Avars in A.D. 461; a part of them was settled by the Romans south of the Kur. Mašʿūdī, Tanbih, 83, pretends that the “Turkish” name of the Khazar was سر چی (سپر چی) [V.s., p. 401.]

السطف (cf. also § 49, 3.) vocalized in I.Kh. al-Masqat most probably must be read *Masqut. Marquart, Kulturalekten in Ungar. Jahrbücher, ix/1, 1929, p. 78, quotes as its parallels Armenian Mash’ut’h’, Maskut’, &c., and ingeniously takes the present-day Mushkūr for a later avatar of the old

1 The Swor and Swor whom the Khazar king mentions in the list of his neighbours, Kokovtsov, 98, do not seem to be connected with Dāghestān.

2 Cf. a mountain south of Ganja called Maskut on Russian maps.
name (the passage $t > \delta > r$ is characteristic for the Iranian Tātī dialects, v.s., note to § 36, 36.). The Mushkur district is situated south of the Samur river, between the southern branch of the latter, Yalama, and the river Belbela, see Butkov, Nov. istor. Kaokaza, i, 94, cf. Abul-Fidā, transl. ii/2, p. 229. In Balādhuri’s time (p. 196) Masqu had already ceased to exist as a kingdom.

4. These names [omitted in Gardži] occur in the following writers (cf. Marquart, Streifsüge, 173, and v.s., p. 445):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Türkās</th>
<th>Lūgh.r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.R., 139</td>
<td>Tulās</td>
<td>Lūgh.r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakrī</td>
<td>Tulās</td>
<td>Kūgh.r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>’Aufi</td>
<td>Tulās</td>
<td>Kūgh.r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shukrullāh</td>
<td>Tulās</td>
<td>K.ṛgh.ra</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The earliest and clearest text on these peoples is found in I.R., 139, who says that “on one side” the Khazar lands adjoin “a huge mountain at the farthest end of which (fi aqṣāhu) live the Tulās and Lūgh.r and which stretches to the land of Tīfīs”. To Marquart, Streifsüge, 31, 164–76, is due the ingenious explanation of the two names. He interprets Tulās as *Tūl-Ās in which Ās represents the well-known alternative name of the Alān: old Russian Yas; Georgian Ous-i and, with the suffix denoting the country Ous-eti modern Russian Oset-in. In Muslim literature Ās replaces Alān (§ 48) in Mongol times, cf. Juwaynī, GMS, i, 214, 222: أَسُ; Ibn Baṭṭūta, ii, 448: أَسُ. Bakrī’s أَسُ could then be easily improved into أَسُ, and, as a compound, Tul-Ās would be paralleled by the name of the principal clan of the Alān as given by I.R., 148: دَخَسَ. Tul-Ās.\(^1\)

The second name أَوْزِرُ [Aughaz, i.e. Abkhaz, Arabic أَوْزِرُ, Persian أَوْزِرُ, Greek Ἀβαντολ, [Contarini, ed. Hakluyt Society, p. 144: Avogasia]. This people occupies, on the Black Sea coast, the south-westernmost slopes of the Caucasian range, which quite well suits I.R.’s mention of the “farthest end of the mountain” and Bakrī’s, p. 45, clear indication that the people in question lived “below that mountain on the sea-coast”. In the tenth century all the western Georgians (of the Rion basin) were usually called Abkhaz after the dynasty which ruled them. Mas’ūdi, ii, 65, seems to distinguish between the جَرَال (Eastern Georgians) and the Abkhāz, whereas our author quotes Eastern Georgian lands under Armenia but extends (§ 3, 6.) the name Gurz (Western Georgians) even to the Black Sea. Therefore, following our text أَوْزِرُ أَوْزِرُ would refer only to the real Abkhaz.\(^2\)

---

1 It is indeed possible that the name of one of the clans was substituted to that of the Alān in general. Abul-Fidā, p. 203, who wrote at the epoch when the terminology was changing, says that the Ās are a Turkish (?) people living near the Alān, being of the same origin as the latter (l) and professing the same religion. [V.i., p. 481, 3]  
2  ’Aufi and Shukrullāh consider the Tulās and Kūgh.r (K.ṛgh.ra) as “two kinds of Turks” [cf. also Abul Fidā, quoted above in note 1]. The term Turk is here applied in a loose sense: not only the Magyars but the Rūs as well were considered Turks by Muslim writers.
So far, so good, but Marquart in his *Streifzüge*, 173, 495, overreached the goal by further identifying the *Tüläs* and *Aughaz* respectively with the *N.nd.r* and *M.rdât* mentioned in Gardizi. This part of his theory is undoubtedly wrong and Marquart himself later hinted at the proper explanation of the term *N.nd.r* (see §§ 46 and 53).  

Summing up the situation, we should:
(1.) distinguish between the two pairs of peoples (see notes to §§ 42 and 53);
(2.) locate the *Tüläs* and *Lūgh.r* in the western Caucasus;
(3.) provisionally maintain the first part of Marquart’s hypothesis: *Tüläs* = some tribe of *Ās*, and *Lūgh.r* = Abkhaz.

Our additional remarks will be as follows:
(4.) I.R., 139, only says that at the farthest end of the mountain near which lay the Khazar land, lived the *Tüläs* and *Lūgh.r*, whereas our author makes of the latter “two districts of the Khazar”. It is true that in the seventh century the Khazars penetrated down to Tiflis through the central Caucasian pass but the western Caucasus was hardly ever under Khazar sway. Our author’s mistake may be somehow connected with the frequent confusion of *Khazar* with جَزَر jurz “Georgians”. I.R.’s detail on the mountains “stretching to the land (bilād) of Tiflis” is perhaps a hint of some mention of the Jurz in the original source.

(5.) The first element of *Tūl- Ās* is confronted by Marquart, *ibid.*, 172, with the name of the Alan prince Dula, known from Magyar sources. It is much simpler, however, to identify it with the Osset *Tual-tä*, i.e. the Tual, or Southern Ossets, in Georgian *Dvali*, who on the map annexed to Brosset’s edition of Prince Vakhusht’s *Geography*, St. Petersburg 1842, are shown (1) north of the Caucasian range on the upper course of the Ardon which is the left tributary of the Terek, and (2) in the upper valley of the Great Liakhv which, south of the range, flows into the Kur. The Tuals living in the heart of the Caucasus would very well suit the requirement of our case including the remark on the warlike character of the people. The name طولاس would then be read *Tuala jointly*. See Additional Note to § 48.

(6.) As regards Bakri’s report on the این and، here is a com-

---

1 However, it remains possible that a similar confusion of the two pairs of names had already occurred in Muslim authors themselves and there may lie the explanation of some puzzling characteristics of the *Mirodž* in our author and Gardizi (v.s., § 46).


3 There exists a Georgian family Tulasdze but I am unable to ascertain their origins. Brosset, *Histoire de la Géorgie*, ii/2, p. 151, mentions a locality *Tula* which does not seem to be connected with the Ossets. In any case, the attested Georgian form of the name *Tual* is *Dval-ı* (from which the family name of Dvalishvili is derived). [The imaginary name درازل which Nizami in his *Iskandar-nāma* gives to the Abkhaz king may reproduce *Dvalı*.]
parative table of the relevant passages in I.R.'s and Bakri's chapters on the Khazars:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I.R.</th>
<th>Bakri</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description of the road from the Pechenegs to the Khazars.</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The Khazar country is a vast land one of whose sides adjoins a huge mountain&quot;</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;and this is the mountain at the farthest end of which live the Tūlās and Lūgh.r&quot;</td>
<td>Left out, v.i.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;and this mountain stretches to the lands of Tiflis&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;then [you go taṣīru] to the lands of Tiflis, the latter (Tiflis) being the beginning of the frontier of Armenia.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instead of the sentence on the two peoples left out in the chapter on the Khazars, Bakri, in the chapter on the Majgharī, says: "a frontier of their country adjoins the Rūm country whereas another frontier of theirs, on the steppe side, adjoins a mountain inhabited by the people called ʿAṣ who possess horses, cattle, and fields; under that mountain on the sea-coast lives the people called Aughina; they are Christians and are conterminous with the Islamic lands belonging to the country of Tiflis which is the beginning of the frontier of Armenia." This mountain continues down to Bāb al-abwāb and joins the Khazar country.”

Bakri’s information on the one hand contains some independent traits and on the other reflects his own arrangement of the principal source. The description in I.R. moves from east to west (the Pechenegs in their Ural seats), the Khazars, the mountain stretching to Tiflis, the peoples at its farther end). Bakri proceeds in an opposite direction (the Majgharī in some of their seats on the Black Sea coast), the [Caucasian] mountains, the *ʿAṣ and Aughīnā, then Tiflis, Bāb al-abwāb, and the Khazar). The form of Bakri’s names is peculiar. If *Aughīnā is used for Aughīnā and Aughīnā is due to the general use of forms in -iya (Bajānākiya, Majghariya), *Aughīnā presents more difficulty. Marquart, o.c., 167, restored it as *Aughīnā which is a later appellation of the Alān (§ 48), the latter name not appearing in the known fragments of Bakri. Although the forms *D.khs-ʿAṣ and Tvil-ʿAṣ occur already in I. Rusta as the names of special tribes, the pure form ʿAṣ as referring to the Alāns in general appears only in Mongol times. Moreover Bakri’s description of the Alān lacks the characteristic features of the Alān. Even the combination of *Aughīnā with the *Aughāziya suggests that Bakri has in view the particular clan corresponding to Tvilās. The disclosure of the identity of Bakri’s *Aughīnā (i.e. whether it stands for Alān or Tvilās) is important.

1 The passage in italics is a repetition of what had been said under the Khazar.  
2 As the separation from the name Tvilās of the basic element Āṣ is not at all an obvious matter we are perhaps entitled to suppose that Bakri has been inspired by some later source. Under Pecheneg he quotes the evidence of Muslim captives in Constantinople for the events after A.D. 1009.
for in the former case Bakri possessed some more detailed knowledge of
the early Magyar seats near the Caucasus than is found in the more com-
plete text of the earlier I. Rusta. In the second eventuality the vicinity of
the Magyars to the must be merely a guess on Bakri’s part.

This author’s information on the Magyars [who over a century before
had settled beyond the Carpathians] is certainly traditional and derived
from the same source as that utilized by I.R., Gardiz, and ‘Auft. This
group of authors definitely says that the Magyar country reaches down to
the Rum sea (bahr, dary), instead of which Bakri mentions “Rum country”
(bilad al-Rum), thus considerably modifying the situation. This procedure
does not give us much confidence as to the eastern frontier of the Magyars
with regard to which Bakri quotes a detail not found in I.R., H.-‘A.,
Gardizi, or ‘Auft. We must remember that according to I.R., 143’, the
Khazars “some time ago” entrenched themselves against the Magyars and
other peoples (yuqduh anna-‘l-Khazar fima taqaddama kainat qad khandaqat
‘alá nafsi-há ittiqā ‘a-l-Majghariya wa ghayrihim min al-umam al-mutakhirama
li-biladhihim). Assuming then that the Magyars were the neighbours of the
Khazars, Bakri could logically infer that, more precisely, they bordered
on the peoples who were said to live at the westernmost limit of the
mountain mentioned on the confines of the Khazars. Such then may be
an explanation of Bakri’s mysterious passage.

This hypothesis may be objected to on the ground that according to our
§ 47 the Khazarian Pecheneg neighboured in the south on the Alân and a
similar view is suggested by Mas’udi’s embroiled passage on the W.lnd.riya
(v.i. § 53). Both indications are supported by the well-known passage in
Const. Porph., ed. Bonn, p. 166, according to which the Pechenegs
lived at 6 days’ distance from the Alâns. As the Pechenegs ousted the
Magyars from their Lebedia seats it could have been inferred that the
latter as well had bordered on the Alâns. However, the fact is that Muslim
authors knew nothing of what we ourselves, thanks to Const. Porph., know
about the events, cf. Išt., 10, and our § 47. Therefore a retrospective con-
clusion is highly improbable for a Muslim author. Only the arrival of the
Pechenegs seems to have cleared up for Muslims the situation near the
Azov sea but for Bakri the Pechenegs were still in the north and, living a
century later than I. Rusta and depending on the same source as I.R., he
could hardly have improved on the latter’s data. Therefore I am inclined
to maintain the view that (a) Bakri’s refers not to the Alâns as a whole
but to the little-known tribe of Twlâs, and (b) that the idea that the Magyars
and were neighbours is a result of Bakri’s personal surmise. As a
matter of fact even at the time when the Magyars lived near the Caucasus
the Twlâs mountaineers must have been separated from them by the other
Alân tribes living in the plains. [Cf. p. 458, l. 18?] 1

(7.) During his expedition to the north-eastern Caucasus Timur operated
against the Qaleh Kula, see Zafar-nâma, i, 766, 788. Further Külâ and

1 Marquart, Streifzüge, 28, connects Khazar fortress of Sarkel (on the Don)
this report with the construction of the after A.D. 833.
Commentary §§ 50–1

Ṭa’ūs appear as the names of two local chiefs,¹ though they may represent hereditary titles. The fortress of Ṭa’ūs which was particularly strong, lay at the third range of mountains counting from the north, probably near the sources of the Terek and the Kuban for, immediately after, Timur marched to Balqān (Balgar? at the sources of the Terek). Both the name فاطمی, which could be easily restored as Ṭa’ūs, and the geographical details make it possible to see in our passage an echo of the tenth-century terminology. [Ḥājjī-Khalīfa, p. 402, repeats the statement of the Z.-nāma.]

§ 51. [The Bulkār.]

Frähn, Drei Münzen and Die ältesten arabischen Nachrichten über die Wolga-Bulgharen, 1832 (still valuable); Chwolson, Izvestiya ... Ibn Dasta [*Rustā], 80–101; Barthold, Bulghār in EI (in great detail); R. Vasmer, Über die Münzen der Wolga-Bulgaren, in Wiener Numism. Zeitschrift, 57 (1924), pp. 63–84 (instead of ایوبان read on some coins Vasmer restores the well-known title of the Bulghār kings بختيار); Marquart, Arktische Länder, 365–77.

There are two gross misunderstandings in the present chapter.

Its title "Burtās" is entirely wrong (cf. also § 20). Burtās is only another form of *Burdās (see § 52), whereas here the Volga Bulghārs² are described, i.e. the northern colony of the people from which the Danube Bulghars had separated. The language of the Volga Bulghārs of which we possess only a few specimens in the late funeral inscriptions was probably related to the present-day Chuvash (a special and very aberrant member of the Turkish family). The Danube Bulghars had, at an early date, adopted a Slav language, but some expression in the original Bulghar language are found in the inscriptions, as well as in a Slavonic chronicle discovered by A. N. Popov in 1866. They are still the subject of much speculation, see J. J. Mikkola, Die Chronologie d. türkischen Donaubulgaren, in Journ. de la Soc. Finno-Ougrienne, xxx (1918), fasc. 33, pp. 1–24 (with a survey of the former tentative of decipherment). Perhaps the strongest argument for the Chuvash language being a remnant of the old Bulghar is the great number of loan-words in Hungarian which have a striking resemblance to the Chuvash ("bull" is ókör in Magyar and vākār in Chuvash) as well as the enormous number of Chuvash cultural words in the languages of their Finnish neighbours of the Volga basin, see N. Poppe, Chuvashi i yikh sosedj, Cheboksari, 1927. The present-day Chuvash are of course only a poor and small fraction of the old Bulghars who for the most part have been turkicized. This latter part of the old Bulghars probably can be traced in the so-called "Volga Tartars".

The outstanding authority on the Volga peoples is Ibn Faḍlān, who in 309–10/921–2 took part in the embassy sent by the caliph Muqtadīr to the

¹ Rashīd al-dīn, ed. Blochet, p. 45. ² As Barthold has pointed out, the mentions an Ās chief executed by بزغت and Burtās are also confused in ایوبانی (note the final ة). Yāqūt, i, 567.
§ 51

The Bulkär

461

Bulghär khwaves in view of the latter's desire to be advised on religious matters.

The present chapter is a poor abstract chiefly of Ist. The details on the special language and the number of the Bulghärs and their towns remind one of this latter author who, p. 225, says that the Bulghär language has a resemblance to the Khazar language (the latter, p. 222, being an idiom apart), and that in the towns of Bulghär and Suvär there are some 10,000 men (näs). Gardizä, 97, gives an entirely different number (500,000 ahl-i bayt). The names of the three tribes have the following close parallels:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H.-Á.</th>
<th>Ibn Rusta</th>
<th>Gardizä</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.rsüla</td>
<td>B.rsüla</td>
<td>B.rsüla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ishkil (?)</td>
<td>Ishgil (?)</td>
<td>Ishk (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.Ikär</td>
<td>B.Ikär</td>
<td>B.Ikär</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The form of the latter name points to the Persian (?) origin of the basic source: *Bulkär*. The name B.rsüla (*B.rsüla*) is known in two places: since the fifth–sixth century A.D. the Byzantine and other Christian authors mention *Bororja*, *Berqulía*, &c., in the north-eastern Caucasus whereas Muslim authors (tenth century) speak of the *Barchula* off the middle Volga. According to Marquart this tribe of unknown origin was turkicized by the Huns, see *Die Chronol. d. alttürk. Inscr.*, 87–93, *Streifzüge*, pp. 490–1, and *Arktische Länd*, p. 328. The name seems to have found an echo even in the *Shäh-náma*, ed. Mohl, iv, 70, where Afräsibiyáb is accompanied by his grandsons *al-ala-astfyla* (cf. the name of the river *Ilí*<Ilá*>) and *Barzuwíla* (the *Mujmal al-tawáríkh* gives: *B.rsülá*). Justi’s Iranian etymology in *Iran. Namenbuch*, p. 74, is certainly inadequate. Idrisí, ii, 398, mentions on the Dniepr a place *Barzula* which lay at one day’s journey upstream from Pereyaslav (*B.zl*), *i.e.* in the neighbourhood of Kiev. More to the south from this point a station *Birzula* exists on the Kiev-Odessa railway.

The king *M.s* in Ibn Faḍlán’s original *risála* is called *Almush* and this name resembles the name *Almus* which was borne by the father of Arpd, founder of the first Magyar dynasty, Chwolson, *Izvestiya*, 91, Marquart, *Streifzüge*, 497. Our author dropped *al* which he evidently took for the Arabic article. *Bltwār* must be perhaps restored as *blātar* *Yiltuwar* or *Yiltüver* in view of the Hunnic (= Turkish) title *Alp-Ilutver* found in Moses Kalankatvats’a, Part ii, chap. 41, Patkanov’s transl., p. 198. [Marquart: *Alp-Itätvär* *blātar* *Alp-*]

The second error in our text is that the description of the two Bulghär towns is inserted out of place between § 53 and 54. The ruins of Bulghär (cf. § 6, 43.) are situated near the village Bolgarskoye, or Uspenskoye, in the Spassk district, 115 Km. south of Kazan and at 7 Km. from the left bank of the Volga. Suvär lay on the river Utka near the present village Kuznechikha, cf. Barthold, *Bulghär* in *EI*.2 See Map xii.

1 Chwolson, *Izvestiya*, 97, compares this name with that of the Transylvanian *Székler* (?). [Cf. supra p. 320, line 2.]

§ 52. Burādhās (?).


Although according to Persian phonetics ḡ in *Bakri’s* is consistent with an intervocalic position, the first 1 appears superfluous in view of ḡ in I.R., 140, and Gardizī, and ǰ in Bakri. All these spellings point to a special tradition to which also belongs the form ǰ (§ 51) instead of ḡ. The usual Arabic transcription of the name is ǰ which is found in Mas’ūdī, *Murūj*, ii, 14, Iṣṭ, I.H., as well as in our source (rightly [?] in the chapter on the rivers, § 6, 43., but wrongly in § 51). The form Burṭās is confirmed both by Russian chronicles (under A.D. 1380) and official documents (seventeenth century), as well as by the still extant names of places in the region to the south of the middle course of the Volga. Marquart, *Arktische Länder*, p. 277, explains Burṭās from old Iranian *mrtaśa* “man-eater”.

On the other hand A. V. Markov confronts the name with the Finnish word meaning bridge (*puurdas, pordas, purte*, &c., which also is of Iranian origin, cf. Avestan *parātu*, Kurdish *purū*) and Bakri’s alternate spelling *Furdās* would be in favour of the original form *Purdas* if only we could believe in the independent character of Bakri’s form which may be due to a mere mis-spelling, cf. *supra*, pp. 458–9.

I. Rusta, 140, places the Burdās between the Khazar and Bulkār at 15 days from the former and at 3 days from the latter and adds that their territory was 17 days by 17 days (*ibid.*, 141). Iṣṭ, 227, reckons 20 days from the Khazar capital to the Burṭās boundary, adding that the Burṭās country was 15 days long. In the description of the Volga Iṣṭ, 222, says that after its bend to the east (read: *south-east*) it “flows past the Rūs, then Bulghār, then Burṭās”. Mas’ūdī, *Murūj*, ii, 14, in a confused passage speaks of a Burdās river which from the upper regions flows into the river on which the Khazar capital stands (*nahrun faq al-madīna yashibbu ilā nahri-hā min d’ādi-hā yuqālu la-hā Burṭās*). This river could be taken either for the upper course of the Volga itself, or the Don (supposing that it was considered as an affluent of the Volga, cf. § 3, 8.), or the Oka, but in the *Tanbih*, 62, Mas’ūdī aggravates his statement by saying that “into the Khazar river ... flows the Burṭās river. The Burṭās are a great nation of Turks [?] living between the lands of Khuwārizm [?] and the Khazar king-

---

1 Already Tomasechek, *Kritik d. ältesten Nachrichten über d. skytischen Norden*, in *Sitzungsber. Wien. Akad.*, 1889, t. 107, pp. 7–16, suggested an identification of the Herodotian *Arōphadgos* with the Mordva whose name he compared with the old Persian *μαρτιχόρα* commented in Greek as *ordovaφάγος*.

2 A rigorous interpretation of this text would indicate that Burṭās lay downstream from Bulghār (both these names in Iṣṭ., 222, stand without article).
dom and depending on the Khazar. This [?] river is navigated by large vessels (carrying) various merchandise from the Khwārizm lands and other places. From the Burṭās (country) are exported black foxes which are the best of furs, &c.” The passage must be full of confusion. No other authority mentions the Burṭās in the direction of Khwārizm and such a position in the steppes would entirely contradict the possibility of export of furs. As regards the river the text seems to refer simply to the Volga. No waterway [except the Yayiq?] could be utilized for trade from Khwārizm to the Khazar country and, judging by Iṣṭ.’s indications, one would think that by some mistake Mas′ūdī has substituted Khwārizm for *Bulghār. Of all the sources the Ḥ.-Ṯ. (§ 52) most positively locates the Burādhās to the west of the Ātil river (§ 6, 43. which simply follows Iṣṭ., 222, is less clear).

The fact that the Pechenegs are mentioned as the northern neighbours of the Burādhās suggests that the Pechenegs occupied some territory on the right bank of the Volga between the Burādhās and Rūs. I.R., 140, Bakrī, 44, and Gardizī, 96, say only that struggles were going on between the Burṭās and the Pechenegs and, moreover, speak of the Pechenegs as neighbours of the Slavs.¹ On the western neighbours of the Burṭās cf. notes to § 53 and diagram on p. 440.

Generally speaking our chapter on the Burādhās drastically abridges the source used by I. Rusta and Gardizī and omits many details. The item about the two kings seems to be a misunderstanding. I. Rusta says that the Burḍās have no chief (rāʾīs) but “in every community of theirs (mahalla) there is an elder (shaykh), or two (shaykhayn) to whom they have recourse in the matters which happen to them” (ditto in Gardizī). The religion is described as in I.R. and Gardizī, and the burning of the dead as in I.R.²

Since Frāhn’s time the Burṭās have been usually identified with the Finnish Mordva who, as long as we have known them, have lived between the Oka and Volga. Their remnants (since 20.xii.1934 organized into an autonomous republic with the centre at Saransk) are still found in the same region. Two tribes compose the Mordva people: the Moksha in the basin of the Moksha river which flows to the Oka from the east and of which the southernmost head-water is still called Burtas, and the Erz’a in the basin of the Sura which flows to the Volga to the east of the Oka.³

Rubruquis who travelled in A.D. 1253 writes, ed. Paris 1839, pp. 251–2:


¹ This latter fact, as bearing on the location of the Pechenegs, already attracted Marquart’s attention in Komanen, 98.
² Several tombs of the L’ada mound situated in the Mordva region (on the Saratov-Tambov railway) show traces of cremation of the dead, see I. N. Smirnov, o.c., 249–50.
³ Location rough. The emigration of the Mordva to the east of the Volga dates only from the 17th–18th century.
cription proceeds west to east: Moxel stands for Mokša-ley (many Mordvan names are composed with ley "river"). The Merdini (Mordvin) are evidently the eastern Erž’a but the difficult point is the name Merdas which Rubruquis applies to the latter. Is it a deformation of Morda, or of Burtas? In the latter case the term Merdas (< Burtas?) would be applied to a region outside the basin to which the river presently called Burtas belongs. It is more probable that Merdas is meant to be a form of Morda, which name down to the sixteenth century referred only to the Erž’a. Markov to whom we owe this latter remark says in conclusion, o.c., 19, that the names Burtas (tenth century), Meščera (eleventh century), and Moxel (thirteenth century) equally refer to the eastern-Finnish ancestors1 of the present-day Moksha occupying the Moksha basin (inclusive of the rivers Tsna and Burtas). [The mention of the Meščera is doubtful.]

The identification Burtas = Morda (or better Moksha) still meets with some opposition. I. N. Smirnov, o.c., 271, gave expression to the following views: “1. que les Burtas sont un peuple différent des Mordves; 2. que jusqu’au Xe siècle au moins ils ont occupé la rive gauche de la Volga; 3. qu’au XVIe siècle ils occupent la rive droite de ce même fleuve, tout près des Mordves.” He thinks then, ibid., 270, that “les Burtas seraient des Tchouvaches ou du moins de très proches parents des Tchouvaches”. This theory, so far as Arabic sources go, attaches too much importance to the passage from the Tanbih (v.s.), and on the other hand forgets that according to Išt., 225, the language of the Bulghār (of which Chuvash is at present considered to be a survival) was different from that of the Burṭās. However, even lately Prof. M. Vasmer kindly wrote to me (Berlin, 7.xi.32) that the Burṭās must be distinguished from the Mordva, and that, judging by the toponymy of the Volga region, they formerly lived to the north of the Mordva. He finally adds that such was also the view of the late Prof. A. A. Shakhmatov (“ich hatte den Eindruck, dass auch er bereit war, die Burtas von den Mordven zu trennen”). I must confess that I do not quite see the point of the argument about the toponymy, for the Burtas river flowing into the Tsna is the southernmost source of the Moksha river; of the other names quoted in Smirnov, o.c., 266–70, the Burtas of Kadom and the village of Burtasti of Krasnoslobodsk both belong to the Moksha basin. Therefore, as regards the tenth-century Burṭās,2 I think that their identity with the Moksha is to be retained. The Arab sources may reflect a temporary supremacy of that particular clan, or it may be that the latter first came under the notice of Muslim travellers. It is only natural that the numerous and sturdy Mordva people (even now, after long series of invasions and struggles, counting over 1 million representatives) could not fail to be mentioned by the Arabs. The details on the forests (I.R., 140;

---

1 And as a corollary the identification of Išt.’s 129 (v.s., § 44, 3) with Erž’a would become impossible.

2 In later times (after the 13th century) there may have been some movements of the population obscuring the situation. In the seventeenth century some “Burtas” are called “Tatar”, i.e. Muslims (?), cf. Smirnov, o.c., 266.
§ 52-3

Burādhās

wa hum fi mashājīr), the honey, and the Burṭāsī furs suit the Mordva quite well. The travellers like Rubruquis and Herberstein quite particularly insist on these details. The freedom enjoyed by the Burṭās women (I.R. and Gardīzī) in the choice of their lovers can be traced down to recent times in the habits of the Mordva, cf. Smirnov, o.c., 337, who speaks of the “liberté des moeurs des garçons et des filles”.

§ 53. V.nнд.r.

Marquart, Streifzüge, passim; Moravcsik, Zur Geschichte der Onoguren, v.s., § 22.

The natural sequence of the three closely connected chapters would be: § 22 (Majgharī), § 53 (V.nınd.r), § 46 (Mirvāt). The subject is of considerable difficulty and the following points must be examined:

1. The seats of the V.nınd.r/N.nd.r.
2. Harkavi’s and Marquart’s views
3. The Onoghundur.
5. W.n.nd.r in Masʿūdī.
6. W.nnt.r in the Khazar king’s letter.

The seats of the V.nınd.r. Our peoples V.nınd.r (§ 53) and Mirvāt (§ 46) have direct parallels only in Gardīzī’s N.nd.r and M.rdat. In both the H.-A. and Gardīzī the V.nınd.r/N.nd.r are the immediate neighbours of the Majgharī though the latter’s habitat is conceived differently: our author places them near the Urals, whereas Gardīzī describes the Southern Magyars as living in the region of great rivers in the north-western corner of the Black Sea. Gardīzī’s views on the Magyar territory are supported not only by I.R. and Bakrī but by the consensus of Byzantine and Western European sources as well. Therefore in discussing the location of the V.nNd.r/N.nd.r territory contiguous on that of the Majgharī we have to depend chiefly on Gardīzī and disregard our author’s theoretical constructions. Such is the conclusion arrived at after a long series of attempts to co-ordinate our data with those of Gardīzī until it became evident that our author’s starting-point was based on an error.

According to Gardīzī the N.nd.r lived between the river separating them from the Majgharī and the mountain from which another river flowed down and behind which lived the M.rdat. The reading of the Oxford MS. according to which the mountain stood above the N.nd.r. would suggest

1 The kh.lndg (kh.lng) trees abounding in the Burṭās forests, I.R., 141, have been compared by Chwolson with Mordvan kileng “birch” (the Chuvash form for “birch” khorin does not resemble the Arabic word).
2 The only puzzling detail is that according to I.R. the Burṭās possessed camels and cows.
3 Gardīzī simply describes the facts and our author forces them into a geographical scheme. His error arises the moment that he tries to dispose his materials in map form.
that it stretched in a northern direction. The river from the eastern (or northern) bank of which the Majgharī could see the N„nd.r on the opposite bank is most probably the Danube, or alternatively its northern affluent Sereth mentioned in Const. Porph.’s description of Atelkuzu (v.s.s., § 22). Consequently the N„nd.r lived west of the last mentioned river, or south of the Danube, with the Transylvanian Carpathians standing “above” them. Gardizi adds that the N„nd.r lived in the direction (bar janh “on the side”) of the Saqlāb. As stated in § 43 the latter term may refer to the western Slavs (or even to the Macedonian Slavs, § 42, 17.)

Our author, in spite of his cartographical error, preserves the original disposition of the peoples with regard to one another, but this goes only as far as the original triad Majgharī—V„nd.p.—Mīrvāt is concerned. In § 46, north [east?] of the Mīrvāt are named “some of the Inner Bulghār and [!] the V„nd.p. mountains”. As the Inner Bulghār belong definitely to the Iṣṭ.<Balkhī tradition which does not know the V„nd.p., this combination may be disregarded as the author’s own guess. See diagram on p. 440.

HARKAVI’S AND MARQUART’S VIEWS. In the Hebrew document quoted below Harkavi, as early as 1875, explained the name V„nd.l by that of the Bulgarian ὄβνογούδουροι but it was a long time before the parallel names in Ḥ.-‘Ā. and Gardizi became known. When Marquart first studied Gardizi’s passage, Streifzüge, 172, he was led astray by the fact that Bakri also mentions a pair of the Majgharī’s neighbours. Having very ingeniously located the latter in the western Caucasus Marquart was less happily inspired in identifying them with the two peoples found in Gardizi. He overlooked the fact that Bakri (see notes to § 50, 4.) speaks of their south-eastern neighbours, while Gardizi has in view the later Atelkuzu territory and its south-western neighbours. The identification of Gardizi’s_with Bakri’s امَّرَتَ نَدْر and امَّرَتَ نَدْر نَدْر with Bakri’s امَّرَتَ نَدْر and امَّرَتَ نَدْر has often been taken for granted, but after the publication of the Ḥ.-‘Ā., where the two series of names are separated, no place for doubt could remain as to its inconsistency. Twenty-three years after the publication of the Streifzüge, Marquart dropped en passant a hint for a new identification of the V„nd.p. with a promise to develop the subject. His sudden demise (4.ii.1930) prevented him from carrying out this intention and his note buried, as if intentionally, at an unexpected place does not seem to have attracted the notice which it merits. In his Arktische Länder (1924) Marquart, among other things, studies the disappearance of the sound γ in old Bulgarian and Turkish and gives as an example the name of the Turcoman tribe Salur <Salghur. As another instance of the same phenomenon he quotes (p. 275) “den bulgarischen Hordenamen ὄβνογούδουροι (Nikophoros); النُدْر Ulughundur (Ibn al-Kalbī, † um 820, bei Jäqūt); Oltxontor (Anania

1 In his translation of § 52 (in annex to Markov’s work) Tournansky illustrates V„nd.p by امَّرَتَ نَدْر found in Ibn al-Athīr, i, 243 (<Mas‘ūdī, Murūj, ii, 58–64). On other similar hints cf. now Kokovtsov, o.c., 92.

§ 53  

V. n. n. d. r.  

Širakac'i, VII. Jahrh.) > W(w)(u)ndur Butkar (Ps. Moses Chorenac'i, letztes Drittel des IX. Jahrh.), Wunundur (Hudūd al-ʿĀlam, Ende des X. Jahrh.), bereits mit prothetischem w vor labialem Vokal, wie im ʿCuwaschischen; Wulundur. The exact references of this cryptic passage are: Nicephori Archiepiscopi Constantinopolitanī Opuscula, ed. de Boor, Lipsiae 1880, p. 24; Yaqūt, iii, 404: Japhet's sons: Ḥnān, al-Šaqlab, (sic),1 Burdjān, Jurfān, Fārs, Rūm; Géographie de Moïse de Corene [attributed sometimes to A. Shiraqats'i], ed. by Soukry, Venice 1881, p. 25, transl. p. 34 (Marquart's translation in Streifzüge, 57); Moses of Khoren, History, book ii, ch. 6. The reference to the Ḥ.-ʿA. evidently hails from Westberg's Beiträge. Masʿūdi mentions, both in the Murūj, ii, 58-64, and in the Tanbih, 180, 183 (see in detail Streifzüge, 60-74).

Marquart thinks that Onoghundur belongs to the type of names formed with the Turkish suffix -dur (Bayandur, Mongoldur). The forms attested in the sources would then suggest for our V. n. n. d. r the reading *Wunundur. [Gardizi's N. n. d. r can hardly be compared directly with the Magyar form Nándor; most probably the initial v taken for the conjunction va was dropped by the scribe in the same way as we find in our text Khān instead of Vakhrān, cf. also Masʿūdi's, لدر, with initial w.]

THE ONOGHUNDUR. The people called Onoghundur were a Bulgarian tribe (cf. § 51) which "from the sixties of the fifth century down to the end of the seventh century" lived north of the Caucasus, to the east of the Azov sea in the Kuban region. Their great ruler Kobrat (Koβratos) organized them into a powerful state but after his death (circa a. d. 642) the advance of the Khazars split the Bulgar kingdom; a part of the tribes under Bayan (said to be Kobrat's son) remained in their former seats as Khazar subjects, whereas another of Kobrat's sons Asparukh travelled westwards and after having crossed the Danube (a. d. 679) conquered the territory of the present Bulgaria. Const. Porph., De thematibus, p. 48, says that since that time the name of the Bulgar has become known for "previously they were called 'Onogonoudur'."2 The centre of Asparukh's kingdom was in the strong locality "Oγλον" surrounded on one side by marshes and on the other by very high rocks. Jireček, Geschichte d. Bulgaren, 1876, p. 129, reads the name "Oγλον<Slavonic ογλή "angle, corner" and identified it with the southern part of Bessarabia known under the Turkish name Buqaq which also means "corner". [However the situation of "Oγλον better suits some place in Dobruja.]

Considerably later, in the second half of the ninth century, the Onoghundurs who had stayed in the old seats and became mixed with the Magyars3

---

1 Not in the general index of Wüstenfeld's edition.
2 Marquart, Chronologie, pp. 89-96, Streifzüge, pp. 126, 505; Bury, A History of the later Roman Empire, 1889, ii, 333; Moravcsik, o.c., pp. 65, 71-2, 89.
3 The name Onoghundur (Onoghur, &c.) may be responsible for the western designation of the Magyars as Hungar-.
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began their westward trek which finally brought them into the present-day Hungary, cf. Moravcsik, o.c., 89.

THE SOURCE OF THE H.-'Ā. AND GARDĪZĪ. If our two Muslim sources have preserved the name of the Onoghundur it remains to be seen to which of the two migrations the item can be assigned. It does not look probable that the original name of the Danubian Bulgars, not recorded in the earlier Muslim sources, should have suddenly emerged at a later time.¹ Both in the H.-'Ā. and Gardīzī the v.n.n.d.r/N.n.d.r appear not as an abstract symbol but as a tribe in flesh and blood. As shown in the notes to § 42, 17. our item on the “Christianized Slavs” is due to some later source of circa A.D. 900 when the Magyars sat in Atelkuzu and it is most likely that the additional details on the Magyars’s neighbours (§§ 46 and 53) found in the H.-'Ā. and Gardīzī belong to the same source (Hārūn b. Yāḥyā?). If so, the special information of our two sources must refer to the second lot of Onoghundur pushed on by the Magyar migration.² Neither the H.-'Ā. nor Gardīzī mentions any enmity between the V.n.n.d.r and Magyars. The qualification of the V.n.n.d.r in our source as cowards (bādhi-dīl) may be due to a wrong interpretation of the word tarsā (which means both “Christian” and “coward”).³ In Gardīzī the N.n.d.r are definitely called Christians (tarsā) and Rūmī, i.e. “Byzantine”, very possibly with a reference to their religion. In the list of bishoprics dating from the middle of the eighth century a bishop of the Onoghurs (ἄ Ωγογούβων) is mentioned under the metropolitan of Crimean Gothia (ἐπαρχία Τορθλας), cf. Moravcsik, o.c., 64. The Onoghurs in question were certainly those who still remained to the north-east of the Black Sea and therefore could be controlled from the Crimea.⁴ The rest of our author’s characteristics may be only a development of his initial mistake about tarsā.⁵

See Munkácsi and Németh quoted by Moravcsik, o.c., 81, note 3.

¹ The Khazar king’s letter (v.1.) refers to the events of A.D. 679, but this detail may point to the literary origin of the passage.

² Unless the name V.n.n.d.r < Onoghundur refers to some special Bulghar territory, such as the original “Ογλον occupied by Asparukh?

³ Was then the original source on Eastern Europe, or the text in which it was available, in Persian? The absence of underground canals (kārūs) in the M.rādät country, mentioned in Gardīzī, could hardly strike any one except an Iranian. Cf. also the strange transcription of the name بکار (§ 51) بکار (§ 52). These facts still await an explanation. Masʿūdī, Murūj, ii, 59, says that dissensions among the W.l.n.d.r tribes arose in connexion with the presence among them of a Muslim merchant from Ardabil. Consequently Persian traders penetrated into the southern Russian steppes and could be the source of information for their co-religionists.

⁴ [And also in our § 22.]

⁵ Were it not for the name *Vunundur one might consider as the Magyars’ neighbours the Rumanian Vlachs, see Kunik in Izvestiya al-Bakri, ii, 16, and Niederle, Manuel, Map.

⁶ The Danube Bulgars were baptized under King Boris in A.D. 864. If indeed our data refer to them (= Bulγaγ = Inner Bulghar = Bulghari), their weakness in comparison with the Magyars could be explained by the fact that the latter were moving westwards and their forced energy (under the Pecheneg impact) could be mistaken for strength.
MAS'UDI'S "W.L.ND.R". An entirely independent use of the term is found in Mas'udi's well-known report on the incursion into the Byzantine Empire of the nomads called W.L.ND.R in (or after) 320/932. In the Muruj (written in 332/943), i, 262, ii, 58-64, Mas'udi calls the invaders "Turkish peoples" and enumerates their four tribes, namely, Bajghurt (= evidently Magyar), Pecheneg (the most valiant of the four), and Nukarda (still obscure). In the Tanbih, 180, 182, Mas'udi refers to the incursion "of the Burghar and the Turkish tribes" and under the latter mentions the same four names. The reasons of this association of tribes are not quite apparent and it is possible that information belonging to different epochs has been telescoped in Mas'udi's version. As regards the date, the invasion seems to correspond best to that of the Toorpok (i.e. in Byzantine terminology: Magyars) recorded under 934! However, Mas'udi presents the four tribes as living in the neighbourhood of the Khazars and Alans, which after the events of 889 (e.s., § 22) could be true only with regard to the Pechenegs. The kings of the four tribes appear as independent chiefs and only by the consent of his three colleagues is the king of the Pechenegs invested with the supreme command on the day of battle. Mas'udi says that the tribes were called "after the town of Ulundur situated in the extreme frontier region of the Rum towards the east" and adds that the cavalry dispatched by the Emperor against the invaders reached this frontier post in 8 days. The exact situation of W.L.ND.R has been a matter of much speculation. Some scholars looked for it even in the Caucasus and in the Crimea, but Marquart, Streifzüge, 499-500, with some probability identified it with the fortress of Lebeletrö which lay in the neighbourhood of Burgas and was mentioned in the delimitation treaty of 864 concluded between the Emperor and the Bulgarian King Boris. Jireček, o.c., 499, already suspected in W.L.ND.R a Bulgarian (non-Slavonic) name corresponding to some different official term (Debeltos?). Mas'udi must have got it from some oral source. Already in his innumerable "Zusätze" in Streifzüge, 500, Marquart wondered whether "Walandar" has not preserved the name of the "Unughundur-Bulgars" and in his Arktische Länder (1924) he finally adopted this point of view. The fortress, of which the name must consequently be restored as *Vulundur, could have received this name either

1 The form W.L.ND.R peculiar to Mas'udi results from the dissimilation n.n>l.n. Cf. the Armenian form Vilndur.
2 See Marquart, Streifzüge, 60-74, 499-500, 527.
3 Contrary to Marquart, o.c., 67, بیتی,* Çepmi, as one of the Oghuz clans is called in Kâshgharî, i, 57; on their later history see M. F. Köprülü-zade, Oğuz etnologisine dayîr, pp. 24-7 (e.s., § 18). However, cf. infra the Khazar king's letter. [Rashid al-dîn, ed. Bérénice, vii, 7, among the Oghuz tribes issued from Kök-khan mentions separately "Oghuz" and خپه/هآفهأ] 4 Marquart, o.c., 74: "verblasste Erinnerungen".
5 See now V. Zlatarski, Istoriva na Bulgarskata dîržava, Sofia, 1927, i, 25: the frontier left Develt to the Byzantine Empire.
from some colony of Onoghundurs with whom the Greeks were in relations since the times of Kobrat, Strifebrige, 529, or because it was directed against the Vulundur (in Arabic one might say: 'alā thagr al-Wulundur), and consequently Mas'ūdī’s term *Wulunduriya (referring to all the four, or even five different tribes), most probably has to be taken in the sense of “the coalition attacking on the *Vulundur front”.1 Whatever the explanation of the raid,2 the survival of the name *Vulundur in Mas'ūdī is a firmly established fact interesting as a parallel to our *Vunundur.

**The Khazar King's Letter.** Among the parallels to the name *V.n.n.tr it remains for us to consider *V.n.n.tr יִנְחָּל found in the Hebrew letter supposed to have been sent by the Khazar king Joseph in answer to that of Chasdaï ben Shafrut, an agent to the Cordovan caliph ‘Abd al-Rahmān (A.D. 912–61). The year 961 is the *terminus ante quem* of Chasdaï’s original letter and the king’s reply must have followed it within a not too long period. As has been recently discovered (1924), the existence of King Joseph’s letter was known already to Yahuda ben Barzillai (lived towards A.D. 1100) who wondered “whether it was genuine or not”. The question is complicated by the existence of two versions of the document:3 the one (A) in a shorter form was published in Constantinople in 1577 (this text is very close to the Christ Church College MS. 153); the other (B) in a more complete form came to light only towards 1873 among the manuscripts collected by Firkovich. This fact, in view of this collector’s suspect practices, was not in favour of a blind acceptance of the contents of this particular version.

The passage containing the name *V.n.n.tr is found only in version B. The Khazar king says that his ancestors fought against “many nations” whom they expelled and whose country they occupied. Then comes the additional paragraph: “In the country in which I live lived formerly the *V.n.n.tr. Our Khazar ancestors warred against them. The *V.n.n.tr. were more numerous, as numerous as the sea sand, but they could not resist the Khazars. They left their country. . . .” After this the two versions agree in saying that the enemies were driven beyond the great river Ṛūnā (A. דנה) or Dūnā (B. דנה), “until the present day they are situated on the river Ṛūnā/Dūnā, near Kushtantiniya/Kustandina [i.e. Constantinople] and the Khazars have occupied their country”.4

---

1 Unless the coalition was formed on some special territory, *v.s.,* "Oylov = Bujag.
2 In his final “Zusatz”, o.c., 528, Marquart writes: “was es mit der Erstürmung der Festung Wandalan für eine Bewandtnis hat, lässt sich bei dem völligen Schweigen der Chronisten . . . auch jetzt noch nicht erkennen, so viel ist aber nunmehr klar, dass die Wandalanhorden eigentlich die Bulgaren (B.rgh.r) und ihre damaligen Verbündeten, die Pečeneg, sind . . .” [Cf. C. A. Macart-
3 See Prof. P. K. Kokovtsov, Yeveyeysko-khazarskaya perepisha v X veke, ed. by the Academy of the U.S.S.R., 1932, which gives the originals of all the documents bearing on the correspondence with the Khazar king with translation and a very valuable commentary. The third document discovered lately in Cambridge does not concern us here.
4 Kokovtsov's transl., pp. 75 and 92.
In a later passage the king gives an account of the Khazar boundaries and, immediately after a very detailed enumeration of the localities belonging to the Crimea [Firkovich's home!], the frontier is said to turn northwards to the country of Batsra (נִבָּר most probably נִבָּר) Bačna referring to Bajni or Bajnō whom Masūdī associates with the Pechenegs, e.g., p. 469, n. 3). The (inhabitants) of this country lived near the river V. sg (A. spells Y. sg, very probably *Uzu = Dniepr) and wandered in the steppe down to the limits of the H. gry'ım (A. Hyndy'ım), i.e. evidently Hungarians H. ng. r. Consequently the lands of a (Turkish) tribe and those of the Magyars stretched to the west of the Khazar and separated the latter from the Danube. The writer clearly refers to the expulsion of the V. n. nt. r beyond the Danube as a remote past (events of A.D. 679), whereas the account of the Khazar frontiers presupposes the arrival of the Pechenegs in the second half of the ninth century. The form W. n. nt. r has a striking resemblance to our V. n. nt. r, and on the other hand considerably differs from the forms attested in Greek and Armenian sources. Numerous names in version B seem to have been borrowed from Muslim geographers' and the question arises whether such is not the case of W. n. nt. r as well. The interpolator could not possibly know the H.-Ā. or Gardizi [which in Europe have come to light at a very recent date] but could he not have seen their common source? The text of the Khazar letter as it stands, if confronted with our two Persian authors, would confirm the interpretation of our Rūtā/Dūhā as Danube2 and, on the other hand, suggest the identity of our V. n. nt. r with the Danubian Bulgars. However, the origin of the Hebrew interpolation remains obscure and the clever interpolator may have read his own sense into his source. Therefore in our own explanation of the Muslim texts we have to go principally by their internal evidence.

§ 54. Southern Countries.

The countries described in the remaining part of the book lie in Africa, with the exception of the semi-mythical Zābaj (§ 56) which is a connecting link with the southern islands (§ 4, 8.). The principal sources of the African chapters are Khuwārizmi (indirectly), I.Kh., Išt., and perhaps some Book of Marvels of which traces are also found in the chapter on Egypt (§ 39). The last folio is the only one in the MS. more seriously damaged.

§ 55. Zangistān.


1 The most striking example is the Arabic form يُلْبِس * Slawiyān, Kokovtsov, o. c. 98–9. 2 See, however, supra, p. 217.
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The term Zangistān (later Zangibār > Zanzibār, “the Zang coast”) covers the whole of the eastern coast of Africa known to the Muslims. Moreover, instead of following its real (N. to S.) direction this coast is represented as stretching eastward: “la côte africaine se replie vers l’Orient, comme si la direction qu’on observe entre le détroit de Bāb al-Mandeb et le cap Guardafui était à peine modifiée, de manière à faire face successivement à l’Arabie, à l’Inde, aux Îles Malaises et à la Chine . . . l’extrémité du Ouaqouaq, qui continue la côte de Sofāla, se trouvant ainsi reportée au sud le la mer Chinoise”, Devic, o.l., 46. This explains why our author places Zangistān opposite Fārs, Kirmān, and Sind and mentions the enmity existing between the Zanj and the Zābāj. Cf. Iṣṭ., 11, who assumes that the land of the Zanj “lies opposite Yemen, Fārs, Kirmān, and Hind”. Cf. also ibid., 29. Shahriyār b. Buzurg, Livre des merveilles de l’Inde, ed. Van der Lith, pp. 174–5, says that in 334/945 the people of Wāqwāq [here rather Madagascar than Sumatra, v.s., p. 228] attacked the region of Sofāla in the Zanj country.

1. ملَيئان M.lijān, which stands before Sofāla must correspond to the Arabic M.l.nudī, mentioned in Idrīsī, i, 56, and Ibn Sa’īd (A.D. 1250) in Ferrand, Relations. Malindi lies on the coast north of Mombasa, see Tomaschek, Mohīt, maps I–II, on which Mombasa is shown as the seat of the Zanj king, cf. also Storbeck, o.c., 129–30. [Mas’ūdī, Murūj, iii, 6, calls this king “Waqwāq”, read Ψακώακ cf. in Bantu mfaleme “king”, plur. wafaleme, Ferrand, Four. As., January 1921, p. 163.] This ملَيئان (*M.l.nudī) must be distinguished from the name similarly spelt under § 56, 2.

2. Sufāla (Sofāla) lies in the southern part of the Portuguese Mozambique (south of Beira). The place is mentioned in Mas’ūdī, Murūj, i, 223, as the southernmost point of the Zanj possessions and it was known as a great gold-producing centre. See Ferrand, Sofāla, in EI, and Storbeck, o.c., 141.

3. حُوُو Ḥwfl (?) At this place one would expect راواتق Rāwātq Wāqwāq and such a restoration is admissible in Arabic script. Cf. Mas’ūdī, i, 233: bilād Sufāla wal Wāqwāq (الرَّوْوِوْ حُوُو) min agāsī arḍ al-Zanj wal-asāfīl min bahrihim. See Idrīsī’s map (Reinaud, Introduction, i, p. 120) on which Wāqwāq forms an immediate continuation of the Zanj land. The only other name somewhat resembling Ḥwfl is Ḥwfl (Howa), applied to the southern part of Madagascar (jasārat al-Qumr) by the Turkish admiral Sidi ‘Ali Chelebi in his Mohīt (1554) based on Arabic sources, see Mohīt, map III, and Ferrand, o.c., 502. The name Ḥwfl could, however, hardly be known in the tenth century.

§ 56. Zābāj.

G. Ferrand, L’Empire sumatranaïs de Ḍrīoivaya, in Four. As., 1922, t. xx, pp. i–104, 164–246 (an extremely complete survey of sources), and Zābāj in EI.

That our author pronounced Zābāj (not Zābij) is clear from his other transcription of this name Zāba (§ 4, 6.) on a false analogy with the Persian
forms: Khānaj > Khūna, &c. Zābaj ("javaga" "Javanese") is a term designating now Java, now the centre and south of Sumatra, now the whole of the Sunda archipelago, see Tomeschek, Mohī, map 1, Nieuwenhuis, Java, in EI, Ferrand, L'Empire, p. 241. According to our author, Zābaj adjoined eastern Africa (Zangistān) and formed the southern limit of the Indian Ocean, while farther south of it (as well as of Zangistān) stretched the southern uninhabited lands. Cf. also §§ 4, 6., and 10, 4.

The details on camphor-trees and the king are borrowed from I.Kh., 16, 65, cf. § 4, 6. Of the variants of the king's name quoted in I.Kh., 13, de Goeje adopts which he interprets (transl., p. 16) as Pati- Yaba, "prince of Java" (?). Ferrand, Relations, p. 24, and L'Empire, p. 52, explains the name as Indonesian pungawa "prime minister, officer, hero, courtier" but admits that it may represent the personal name of some Črīvijaya sovereign. Meanwhile, I.Kh., 17, 68, and Ibn Rusta, 137, call the king of Zābaj al-mahārāj.

The town 1.  is unknown. One wonders whether it is not simply a mis-spelling of mahārāj > mahāry (مَحْرَي). The complex shahr-i Mahārāj "the town of the M." could easily be transformed into "M., the town [of Zābaj]."

2. The archipelago, which Sulaymān the Merchant, p. 22, places between Sarandib and Kala (Malay peninsula). The mention of a great island where the king stays in summer may echo the fact mentioned in Sulaymān, p. 18 (and Abū Zayd, ibid., p. 90), namely that the same king possessed the Kalāh-bār (* Kra) and the Zābaj, cf. Ferrand's tr., 1922, pp. 43, 95. [Or Waqīwāq = Madagascar?]

§ 57. Abyssinia.


This and the following chapters (§§ 58-60) must have a common source from which some vivid traits on African peoples have been borrowed. Two details (§§ 58 and 60) undoubtedly point to I.Kh.

By Abyssinia (Habasha) early Muslim geographers understood chiefly the maritime zone of the present-day Eritrea and British Somaliland, cf. 1st, 35. Our § 7, 13. represents Habasha as stretching far north along the coast of the Red Sea. The names quoted in this chapter are terribly mutilated and can be restored only by a comparison with other sources.

1. The starting-point for the identification of rās, is that it was the king's residence. According to I.R., 96, the capital of the Abyssinian (Habasha) king was called Jarmī. This then must be the reading of the name of
which the mis-spelt form can without much difficulty be explained in Arabic script. *Jarmī* greatly puzzled the commentators who since Golius's times, cf. Reinaud, *Abul-Fidā*, transl. ii/A, p. 228, tried to connect it somehow with Axum, supposed to be the contemporary capital of Abyssinia, though as a matter of fact Axum (so instead of *אָקָוּמ* or אֵקָוּמ) appears only in later Muslim sources (Maqrizī). Marquart, *Benin*, pp. ccciii–iv, has finally disposed of the mistake in the Ma'āmīnian map and Khuwārizmī's *Ṣūrat al-ard* caused by Ptolemy's broad use of the term *Aīðlōnēs* in the sense of "dark-skinned people" (and not especially "Ethiopians"). The name *Jarmī* [or rather *Jaramī*] al-Ḥabash has consequently nothing to do with Abyssinia proper, but corresponds to Ptolemy's *Γαράμη Ῥωμόπολις* (liber iv, cap. 6, 12) situated at long. 43°, lat. 21° 30'. Cf. C. Müller's *Atlas* to his edition of Ptolemy, Paris, 1901, table 28, where Garama, the capital of the *Γαραμαντες*, is shown to the south-west of *Φαζάνα = Fazzān* (near Murzūq, in the present-day Italian Libya, cf. § 60, 1.)*1 Idrisi, i, 112, mentions جزيرة and جزيرة as the towns of Fazzān. The ruins of the ancient Garama were discovered by H. Barth, *Travels and Discoveries in Central Africa*, London 1857, i, 155–8; *ibid.*, i, 171, on Tasāwā.

2. The first idea is that by some mistake the word اسوان represents the place Assuan (v.s., § 39, 10.) which in Khuwārizmī, No. 80, is spelt سوان and stands 4 lines below جزيرة, but I now prefer to restore the name as عذاب which, as Ḥṣār, 54, admits, was reckoned to Abyssinia in spite of the fact that its inhabitants were Buja. 'Aydāb is identified with Aidip lying on the sea-coast opposite Jīdā at N. lat. 22° 19' 47", cf. C. H. Becker, *'Aīdhāb in EI*.2 (Different from its homonym § 60, 2.) most probably is دلْه Zayla`, which in Ḥṣār, 36, follows on 'Aydāb. It is the well-known port of British Somaliland, immediately east of the Bay of Tajura. During the late Abyssinian crisis (1935) Zayla` was mentioned as an eventual point of access to the sea for Abyssinia. [November 1936: tempora mutantur]

§ 58. Buja.


These Hamitic tribes living between the Nile and the Red sea formerly occupied the territory between Cairo and Abyssinia, cf. *Ya‘qūbī, Historiae*, i, 218–9, and BGA, vii, 336–7; *Maṣūdī, Murūj*, iii, 32.

In the mutilated part of the text the question was probably of the celebrated gold mines lying in the desert of Buja (§ 7, 12.–13.), see *Ya‘qūbī, BGA*, vii, 334–5, Ḥṣār, 28, 34. The Buja had no towns, 'Aydāb on the

1 Jointly with *Jarmī al-Ḥabash* (long. 41° 40', lat. 10° 40') Khuwārizmī mentions another *Jarmī mādināt al-kabīra* (long. 34°, lat. 19° 30'). Marquart thought that "Gross Garma und Garma der Ḥabaš sind ... in Wirklichkeit identisch", but Mžik, *Afrika*, No. 75, with more probability restores the second name as جزيرة مدينة الكبيرة and explains it as Ṯeîpā Ῥωμόπολις (cf. Ptolemy's *Γεράθος Αἴθλιος*).

2 [See *Geog. J.*., 68, 1926, p. 235–40.]
coast of the Red Sea being considered as Abyssinia's, Iṣṭ., 54, v.s., § 57, 2.
The trait of the king keeping aloof from his subjects is well known in African countries (v.i., under § 60).

§ 59. Nubia.

Quatremère, Mémoires géogr. et hist. sur l'Égypte, 1811, ii, 1-126: "Mémoire sur la Nubie"; Marquart, Benin, pp. ccxlviii-ccxvii; G. Roeder, Die Geschichte Nubiens, in Klio, xii, 1912, pp. 51-83; von Mžik, Africa (v.s., § 57); S. Hilleison, Nūba in EI.

Iṣṭ., 11, says that Nubia is conterminous with Egypt,¹ with the desert lying between Egypt and the Südān, with the land of Buja and the desert lying between Buja and the Red Sea, and finally, with the Impassable Desert (lā tuslak).

According to Ya'qūbī, Historiae, i, 217 (cf. also BGA, vii, 335-6), there were two kingdoms in Nubia, of which the one was Muqurra with the capital Dunqula ("Old Dongola") and the other 'Alwa with the capital Sūba (to the east of the present-day Kharṭūm). Mas'ūdī, Murūjī, iii, 32, confirms these facts adding that in 332/943 he heard in Fustāt that the king living in Dunqula and ruling over Māqurra and 'Alwa was Kbry b. S.rw,² a descendant of a long line of kings. On Dongola cf. also I.R., 96, and I. Faqīh, 78.

I.Kh., 17, gives the king of Nubia the title of Kābīl, which detail is reproduced in our text. كابئلاً and كابئلاً do not seem to refer to the same dynasty. From our § 6, 63, it results that Kābīl's capital lay near the junction of the Nile with the Blue Nile (al-bahr al-azraaq) for near Dongola no river joins the Nile from the east. This would indicate that Kābīl ruled (chiefly?) over 'Alwa though such an interpretation conflicts with Yaqūt, iv, 820,³ where Kābīl is called king of Muqurray and Nūba, whereas 'Alwā is mentioned separately. Idrīsī, i, 33, mis-spelt the name of the king into Kāmil.

The mines situated amidst the sands are mentioned in § 7, 12. See in detail, Ya'qūbī, BGA, vii, 334-5.

The item on the two Christian monasteries may belong to the source from which similar fabulous details on Egypt have been borrowed. The name T.rī (T.hī?) is certainly mutilated.⁴ The late Prof. F. Ll. Griffith to whom I communicated this passage wrote back to me (6.vii.1933): "the find is certainly important for Nubian Christianity but if the names are correct or nearly so (neither Ṭarī, nor Ṭahī reminds me of anything) they would seem to belong to the unknown region which is fairly extensive

¹ I. Faqīh, 78, says that Nubia began at 5 days' distance to the south of Assuan. Cf. § 39, 10., and I.Kh., 83.
² Ya'qūbī, BGA, vii, 339, calls the king of Muqurra (sic) Zakariyā b. Q.rqi = Zacharia son of Kyriakos, cf. Quatremère, o.c., 65.
³ Marquart takes I. Faqīh for the authority of this passage in Yaqūt, but if this is true for the first part of it, iv, 820, lines 3-15, the second part, p. 820-r is introduced with a vague qālā and has no parallel in I. Faqīh's printed text.
⁴ [See now Appendix B.]
in Nubian geography." Outwardly resembles طرا (طب) and طرا (طب) of Kabil. Of these Taḥā was a very important Christian centre which once counted 15,000 Christians and 360 churches until it was destroyed by the last Omayyad Marwān, and Ṭurā and Shahhrān (lying in the neighbourhood of Ṭurā) possessed each a monastery. See Ābū Ṣāliḥ (circa A.D. 1202), *The Churches and Monasteries of Egypt*, ed. B. T. A. Evetts and A. J. Butler in *Anecdota Oxoniensia*, 1896, fol. 47a, 74, and 77. However, Taḥā, I.Kh. 81, lay in Egypt, north of Munya between Ushmānayn and Qays, cf. Mżik, *Afrika*, 12 (No. 148), and Ṭurā was situated still more north near Ḥulwān. Another, equally doubtful, hypothesis would be the restoration of ط ر as كورى [Korii] as originally the lake Tsana in Abyssinia, and later the lake Chad was called, cf. Maqrīzī, *Khīṭat*, ed. Wiet, i, 229.¹ No monasteries could exist near the Chad region, but the existence of some legends referring to the western Abyssinia closely associated with Nubia are imaginable, cf. Conti Rossini, *Notes sur l’Abyssinie avant les Sémites*, in *Florilegium M. de Vogüé*, 1909, p. 143 (bāhра ḥuērā [sic] associated with the people Quārā, Kuwārā) and Marquart, *Benín*, lxxxiv, and additional note in Index, p. 104. [See additional note in Appendix B.]

§ 60. The Sūdān.

W. D. Cooley, *The Negroland of the Arabs* (after Ibn Khaldūn, Ibn Baṭṭūta, &c., whom the author used in Don P. Gayangos’s translations), London 1841; Marquart, *Benín*, Leiden 1913 (a capital work as regards the earlier Arabic sources on the Sūdān); H. v. Mżik, *Afrika* (cf. § 57); Delafosse, *Sūdān* in *EI* refers only to later times.

This unexpectedly long and vivid paragraph particularly contrasts with the aridity of Ist.’s and I.H.’s data on the Sūdān which is not even mentioned in Maq.

I.Kh., 89, also mentions the king of the naked negroes (al-sūdān al-‘urāt) whom he calls Zāghī b. Zāghī, which undoubtedly corresponds to the name *Rāʾī b. Rāʾī* in our mutilated passage. In view of this important point of likeness [v.s., § 59: Kābil] one is tempted to admit that some more complete text of I.Kh. is the source of the whole § 60 (and maybe of the other curious details on Africa). In fact I.Kh. (cf. pp. 153–5) is fond of relating the exploits of merchants’, v.s., § 43. Marquart, o.c., p. cxlv, commenting on I.Kh., 89, calls Zāghī b. Zāghī "eine unbekannte Grösse", but makes several interesting suggestions: the most obvious conclusion is that he was the king of the mighty kingdom of Ghāna (western Sūdān); on the other hand the name resembles the title zā of the ninth-century kings of Gogo, or Songoy (on the middle course of the Niger), see Delafosse, *Songhōi in EI*, among whom such names are found as Zā-Zaikoy, Zā-Akoy, Zā-Kū, see al-Saʿdī, *Tārīkh al-sūdān*, ed. Houdas, pp. 2–3; finally Marquart quotes several Berber names (افراح, &c.) resembling that of Zāghī,

¹ Maqrīzī quotes Idrīsī as his authority on the lake Kuwarā but the passage is not found in Jaubert’s translation.
but our text leaves no doubt that the king in question reigned over Negroes. The ironical remark on the king's moderation evidently refers to the numerous limitations to which the life of an African sovereign is subject. At places like Loango, where they are strictly enforced, no more candidates are found to assume the responsibilities of the throne. See L. Frobenius, *Atlas Africanus*, München 1921, Fasc. C. vi, Heft 2, Blatt 7, and the accompanying text.

The term Südān in our text evidently applies to the whole territory between the Atlantic and the Nile, but the names quoted are of little help as they are as mutilated as under § 57. In this region (First Clime) Khuwārizmī, p. 6, Nos. 41–5, quotes the following places:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Long.</th>
<th>Lat.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'Alwa-Baḥriya (see § 59)</td>
<td>60° 0'</td>
<td>12° 20'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fazzān</td>
<td>62° 0'</td>
<td>10° 45'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaghāwa</td>
<td>60° 0'</td>
<td>11° 0'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gogo</td>
<td>43° 0'</td>
<td>10° 15'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>43° 30'</td>
<td>10° 45'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


2. Kh. fān and Ryn (cf. § 57, 3.) look mutilated. One of them may be جقك Gogo on the Niger to the south-east of Timbuktu, cf. Yaqūt, iv, 329.

3. مقس resembles المقاس الأعلى (maqs < maksiς "toll-house"), an Egyptian frontier post towards Nubia, lying at 6 days above Wādī Ḥalfa, see Maqrīzī, *al-Khitat*, ch. xxx, ed. Wiet, iii, 253, cf. Marquart, *Benin* ccxcix. As our 4. lies on the confines of Nubia, our 3., too, could be situated in the same neighbourhood.

4. In script مل resembles ملا but the latter lay too far west (to the north of the upper course of the Niger, cf. Marquart's map in *Benin*). In view of the location of Lāba near Nubia it is probable that it stands for ملا, a great heathen state of which the centre lay near the lake Chad. It stretched from Nubia to the Niger, and comprised the Kāwār country, Kānem, northern Wadāi, and Darfur. At present one of the five tribes of Darfur still bears the name of Zaghāwa, see C. H. Becker, *Zur Geschichte des östlichen Südān*, in *Der Islam*, i, 1910, pp. 162–77; cf. Yaqūt, ii, 932, iv, 230 (who quotes Hasan b. Ahmad al-Muhallabi’s work *al-'Azīṣī*, written circa A.D. 975–6). Zaghāwa is often associated with Fazzān (v.s. 1.). Khuwārizmī gives wrong bearings according to which Fazzān and Zaghāwa would lie far to the east, beyond the Nile, towards Adūls (!), cf. von Mžik, *Afrika*, Map. On Khuwārizmī’s own map, *ibid.*, Zaghāwa is placed to the south of bilād al-Nūba and this may be the reason for our author's location of Lāba near Nubia. I.H., 66, places Zaghāwa at 2 months’ distance from Fazzān (v.s. 1.). Idrīsī, transl. i, 112, reckons Fazzān to Zaghāwa.
APPENDIX A

MARGINAL NOTES IN THE H.-'Ā.

As mentioned in the Preface, p. v, the marginal notes in the unique copy of the H.-'Ā. do not shed any light on the history of its composition. The uppermost part of fol. 1a is obliterated with ink. Some later possessor of the book evidently tried to destroy the name of his predecessor. One can faintly distinguish the words Kitāb-khāna ... mustaṭāb Ḥājī Mīrzā in a modern hand.

Near the title (v.s., p. 30) are found twelve lines of poetry written by the original scribe of the book (hand A). The single verse to the right of the title is

tor hami rinn dāl bējan bakhari
xumšt ād dī kī kūrem dī kī xari

The first of the two verses (rhyme in -ās) to the left of the title is

kūfūm dī kī kūm xurtr āsur dīraz
ta būk shum bā tor mūrem raż

The poem below the title (9 verses of which the rhyme + radif is -āz rasadh) begins

rozra ráykan dīdīst mādī
nīstamīkan an dī kī yāz rāsūn

I am obliged to my friend 'Abbās Egbāl Āshṭyānī for the indication that this last poem is quoted on fol. 156 of an anthology (tenth or eleventh century A.H.?) in his possession in which the authorship of this moralizing poetry of doubtful value is ascribed to a certain Shaykh Zayn al-dīn Jāmī, otherwise unknown.

Still lower down there are entries in a different hand (B). The first, on the authority of the Qor'ānic Tafsīr by Muḥammad 'Abdullāh ibn 'Abbās (622–87 A.H.), gives the magic formula which being written on pieces of paper and placed in the window would preserve the mother and the new-born child, respectively from the evil of the dīw called Āl, and of that called Umm al-sībyān. The second (hand B?) is a rubā'ī composed by Ḥāḍrat-i Amīr Sayyid Ahmad Lālā'ī, one of the khulafā' of the late Amīr 'Abdullāh Burzishābādī (?), in honour of the latter [the term khulafā' pointing to Safavid times]. The third (hand B?) extols the beneficent properties of a dead hoopoe's eye for the refreshing of one's memory, &c.

The indistinct entry of folios 19b and 20a, in hand B records the events in Merv in the tenth century A.H., first the coming in 915 A.H. (?) of Shāh Ismā'īl who during the seven (?) days of his stay there put to death 70,000 (?) people and had a tower built of skulls, 60 zar high, which events were followed by a famine and the dispersion of the survivors; then the coming in 952 A.H. (?) of 'Abdullāh ibn (?) 'Ubaydullāh-khān Ghāzī which entailed new calamities and the annihilation of the population, so that no one knew the origin of the "present-day" population among whom all sorts of vices prevailed.
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[The dates are indistinct. The first evidently refers to Shāh Ismā'īl’s victory over Shaybak-khān which took place in the winter of 916/1510. The second date may be read 952, or 932 (?). The latter is adopted by Zhukovsky who utilized our entry in his *Ruins of Old Merv*, p. 74. Moreover, Zhukovsky reads the name of the invader 'Ubaydullāh-khān. According to 'Abdullāh Naṣr-ālāhī’s Turkish *Zubdat al-tawārīkh*, 'Ubaydullāh-khān, during his raid of 918/1513, transferred the inhabitants of Merv to Bukhārā, see Barthold in *ZVO*, xv, 1903, p. 202, and his *Irrigation*, p. 67. Zhukovsky, *i.e.*, says that 'Ubaydullāh invaded Khorāsān for a fourth time in 1529. He afterwards ruled from 940/1533 to 946/1539. The fact is that the name 'Abdullāh (without a title) appears in our entry before that of 'Ubaydullāh-khān. I cannot ascertain whether 'Ubaydullāh-khān had a son called 'Abdullāh. The Shībānid khāns 'Abdullāh I (ruled 946–7) and the famous 'Abdullāh II (ruled 991–1006) were remote relations of 'Ubaydullāh-khān. 'Abdullāh-khān destroyed the Merv dam and abducted the population in 1566 (974 A.H.), but this does not suit our date of 952 (?). *Nondum liquet*. Our entry does not seem to be very exact and in this case may belong to a considerably later time (seventeenth century?).]

On fol. 22b Abul-Fadl Gulpāyagānī, the discoverer of the manuscript, in his fine writing recorded some data on the construction of the walls around Bukhārā [evidently borrowed from Narshkhī, cf. *Tārīkh-i Bukhārā*, ed. Schefer, p. 32–3].

The note inscribed in hand B opposite Dāmghān (fol. 30a) mentions the well-known story of the spring which, if polluted, brings down rain [cf. I. Faqīh, p. 310, *Nuzhat al-qulūb*, p. 277].

Several pencil notes (fol. 13b, 24b) are in Baron V. Rosen’s hand.
During my recent visit to Bonn, in connexion with the eighth Deutscher Orientalistentag (3–8.ix.1936), I had the privilege of consulting in the Orientalisches Seminar, directed by Prof. Kahle, a photograph of the Mashhad MS. of Ibn al-Faqih’s geographical work. I also had numerous interesting talks with its original discoverer, Prof. A. Z. Validi, who very kindly communicated to me several passages from the rare texts in his collection.

1. I was particularly interested in I. Faqih’s version (ff. 169a–170b) of Tamīm b. Bahr’s journey to the Toghuqghuz, more complete than Yaqūt’s version quoted above, p. 268. As the publication of this passage has been undertaken by the young German scholar Dr. Haag, I naturally respect his rights. Here I shall only say that the new version corroborates Marquart’s original view that Tamīm visited the Uyghurs on the Orkhon, and not at their later seats near the eastern T’ien-shan (occupied after A.D. 860). The key to the passage seems to lie in the sentence:

ودكر أن خلقان ملك التترغر كان مخاتنا بملك الصين وأن ملك الصين يحمل إليه

which hints at the heyday of the Uyghur political life. Therefore my explanations (pp. 268–9) must be accordingly altered.

2. According to A. Z. Validi, the MS. Or. 1997 of Birūnī’s Canon has proved to be very faulty in comparison with the Stambul MSS. Thus برج اروبان (v.s., p. 180) must be improved into برج جراحان, i.e. “Hyrcania”, whereas خراهان (v.s., p. 369) must be read خراحان. As regards the first rectification I cannot help remarking how unexpected the form *Irqāniyā (for *Hurqāniyā) appears in Arabic. As for *Vakhān, it suits Birūnī’s text quite well but the name which we have to explain in our § 26, 13., viz., “R.kh.t.j.b, a village of Vakhān” may still have a different origin [or may have been misread by the compiler of the H.-Ā. himself].

3. With regard to p. 318, note 1, and p. 445, I want to quote an amazingly interesting passage on the course of the Oxus found by A. Z. Validi in Birūnī’s Taḥdīd al-amākin:

The passage shows how long the “Alān and (l) Ās” remained in the region to the east of the Caspian. Their memory survives in Firdausi’s Dīsh-i Alānān (ed. Vullers, i, 115) and probably in the wall in the Turkman steppe called Qızıl-Alan, cf. my article Tūrān in EI.
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Here are some other additional remarks:

4. Ad p. 67, I. 17. The fact that under § 15 the Khallukh are said to neighbour on Tibet is to be connected with § 25, 28. in which “Tibet” refers to “western T’ien-shan”. This use of the term “Tibet” points to the times of the great expansion of the Tibetan rule in the eighth century a.d., see p. 256, note 2.

5. Ad p. 98. The meaning of the awkward introduction to § 16 may be that the Chigil tribe was originally one of the Khallukh tribes, but the territory occupied by the Chigil still possessed a numerous local population, cf. quotation from Gardizî, p. 298, I. 23.

6. Ad p. 227, I. 35. Our author’s statement concerning 360 districts of China (v.s., p. 84, I. 6) may have been also inspired by I.Kh., 69, who says that there are 300 towns in China, of which 90 are celebrated.

7. Ad p. 293. A detailed account of Barskhân is found in the Mashhad MS. of Ibn al-Faqîh, fol. 170a (cf. Yâqût, iv, 823).

8. Ad p. 297, I. 15. In the Manichaeæn Mahrnâmag edited by F. W. K. Müller, Ein Doppelblatt, SBA, 1913, I. 77, a certain P.rvān-č šâbghû is mentioned among the local rulers. The town (or district) *Parvân of which this šâbghû was the lord may be identical with Bârmân/Po-huan.


*Dév-shârân “Devil’s toboggan”, cf. supra p. 364, note 3, seems to be entirely different from *Rêv-shârân, “Dominions of Rêv-shâr” (cf. § 23, 36 and 78.).

10. Ad p. 365, note 3. A. Z. Validi has found in a Constantinople MS. of the Canon: wa jala’uhi bi-Badhakhshân, “and the polishing (of the rubies) is done in Badhakhshân”, with reference to the preceding item.

11. Ad p. 475. In the rare Operis Cosmographici Ibn al Vardi Caput Primum de Regionibus et Oris, ed. A. Hylander, Lundae 1823, p. 164, among the towns of Nubia is quoted

(read: * طرى وهي مدينة كبيرة على البلطحة التي يجمع بها ماء الليل على صفة (ضفة هذه البلطحة صنم كبير من حجر رائع يدعى صدره يقال أنه كان رجلا طالما فسخ حجار

This is probably identical with our T.rî (T.hu) in § 59.1

1 [The source of Ibn al-Wardi (689–749/1290–1348) is undoubtedly Idrîșî who (tr. Jaubert, i, 27) speaking of the sources of the Nile (cf. our § 6, 6a) mentions the great lake formed by the six rivers and “près duquel est située une ville nommée طرى، طرف قب، populeuse et dont les environs sont fertiles en riz” (follows the story of the statue). This T.rfy (I. al-Wardi: T.rî) must be another avatar of our T.rfy.]
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The present index contains all the names found in the text of the Ḥ.-ʿĀ. and it must be borne in mind that to almost every name corresponds a special note in the Commentary. As regards the latter all the essential names additional to those found in the Ḥ.-ʿĀ. will be found in the Index but imperious material considerations prevented the incorporation of such subsidiary names, or forms of names, to which other references give easy clues.

The names and catch-words have been divided into the following categories:
A. Geographical names (places and tribes).
B. Personal names and titles.
C. Authorities quoted (only the principal passages).
D. Local products and specialities.
E. Selection of catch-words.

A. GEOGRAPHICAL NAMES

The abbreviations are: c.—country; i.s.—island; l.—lake; m.t.—mountain; p.—pass; r.—river; t.—tribe.

Abādān 386
Abādha 129
Abān Kasavān 114, 209, 353
Abarliq (?) 117
Abaskūn 28, 38, 77, 134, 386
'Abbādān 76, 139, 392
Abbotābd 370
'Abdasi 138
'Abdin 381
'Abhar (Auhar) 132, 383
Ab-i Gargar 214
Ab-i Maymana 5
Ab-i Qaysūr 329
Ab-i Safūd 199, 329
Abkhāz (= Aughaz, Lūgh.r.) 43, 168, 324, 445, 456
Abkhāz (= Lāyān?) 403-4, 406-10
Abl (?) 123
Abraj 129
Ab.rdkath (?) 117
Abruq (Apriq) 218, cf. Ibriq.
Abaus see Arabissos
Abū Ghānim's Highlands see Kūhīstān-i Abū Ghānim
Abwayt 204
Abyssinia (Ḥabasha) 33-4, 51-2, 79, 81, 83, 147, 163-4, 179, 223, 473
Abyssinian Sea 145
A-ch'ai see Ajāyul
'Aden 19, 147
'Adhana (Adana) 149
Ādharakhsh, fire temple 383
Ādharbāyān (Ādharbādḥagan) 19, 29, 36, 37, 39, 53, 65, 66, 77, 83, 131, 133, 136, 137, 142, 393
Adhkish t. 347
Ādh.r (*Adhir), cf. Kaurīstān 255
Adhrūḥ 150
Adināpur see Dunpūr
Adishtūn (Srīnagar) 254
Adrama (Adhrāma) 140
Adraskand 327
Adūlis 477
Afghānīs (cf. Ayghānī) 90, 91
Afghānīstān 4, 30, 288
Afīlkhōṇīya see Paphlagonia
Afīrakhūn 68, 204
Afrāva 325
Afrika 33, 53, 78, 153, 154
Afrūdhān 115
Afrūnkat 119
Ağhbāb, Bahr al-Ağhbāb, Bilād al-Ağhbāb 87, 180, 242-3
Ağhrīstān 377
Aḥangārān (Angren) r. 24, 211, 356
Aḥangārān, in Ghūr 333, 343
Ahar 39, 143, 395
Aḥqāf sands 77, 81, 232
Aḥwāz 12, 74, 75, 130, 381
Aja' mt. 203
Ajāyul 93, 257-8
Ajīlad, Kīmāk t. 305
al-Ajma', near Sarakh 327
Ajīgh 200
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anghara r. 284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angren r. see Ahangaran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anhilvāra (Nahrvāra) 238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An-Hsi 227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Ankubarda see Lombards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anmūwā (*Khumānd) 224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annari (Nari) 89, 246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anqara 220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anqartūs 149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antkhudh see Andkhudh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apar t., cf. Apurim 284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aphiikē see Abriq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apsheron 193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apurim t., cf. Apar 284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Aqaba, cf. Ayla 180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aq-Bura 211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aq-rāq.r.? 98, 293, 297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aq-su r. (Taushqan) 27, 184, 206, 289, 296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aq-tagh (A-kie-t'ien) 226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Arab Sea see Red Sea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arābā 36, 145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabian Gulf 52, 81, 179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabisst 204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabs (Taṣṭi) 6, 8, 51-2, 66, 77, 81, 83, 104, 108, 133, 145-8, 150, 153, 160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arachosis 346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aral sea (Khwaraizm sea, Arvāniyān sea)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32, 180, 312, 313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Arandal 415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ararat, Great (Hārīth) 66, 203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ararat, Lesser (Huwayriṭh) 66, 77, 218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aras (Araxes) r. 77, 144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Araskan (cf. Adraskan) 104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aravalli mt. 198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Araxes see Aras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardabil (Aravil) 66, 142, 394, 468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardalanḵāt 117, 357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardashtī-Khurra 376, 377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardun r. 457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arēsh 400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arpyrē is. 186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arhan ford 208, 359, 360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arin see Ujjayan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arjī (Archēsh) 143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arjīnān 129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ark, Arl (Būgūr?) 94, 207, 293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arm r. 401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armābīl 123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Arm.n (al-Kām.n) c. in India 237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armān (Zarmān) 113, 237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia (Armeniā) 19, 29, 36-7, 42, 53-4, 66-7, 77, 142-4, 156, 161, 180, 393, 395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armeniacaon 156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenian mountains 76, 77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Armenian sea (Urmīya l.) 60, 285 (Cas-
| pian?) 444 |
| Arpalikh 256 |
| Arraḵān (Arraghān, Arrājān) 74, 127, 376, 378 |
| Arrān 19, 29, 36-7, 67, 77, 142-4, 393, 396 |
Index A

Ayla 52, 81, 149, 222, 414
'Ayn al-Humm see Alhum
'Ayn-Zarba 149
Ayvání-i Kísra 138
Az (Azíyán) t. cf. Láznína 99, 302
'Aţa (Ha-ţa), cf. Ajáyúl 258
Azádhvár 102
Azália 154
Azám 381
Azár 296
Azbárâ 128
Azd (Urd?) 74
Aživ 108
Azhou sea (Maeotis) 32, 41, 42, 54, 59, 180, 181, 182, 216, 320, 422, 429
'Azr (Gh.ţr?) in India (?), 86, 235
Ba'âlbak 67, 150
Bâb, in Farghâna see Pâb
Bâb-Akhsâkhâ 355
Bâb al-Mandeb 472
Bâb al-Abwâb see Darband
Bâbârân 370
Bâbi 27, 88
Bâbil 130
Bân see Baun
Bâhol r. 218
Bâbr (Hir?) 391
Bâbîn, cf. Nûbîn (?) 243
Bâdakhshân (Badakhshân) 63, 71, 112, 119, 325, 365, 366, 482; ford, 359
Bâdal-Art see Bedel
Bâdghîs 104, 386
Bâdkhâna 387
Bâft 124
Baghaskân (?) 116
Baghdâd 12, 15, 20–3, 37–8, 76, 129, 138–40
Bâghân 109, 340
Baghmi 111
Bagh-râs 67, 150
Baghshûr, in China 26, 70, 84, 229, 230; near Marv 64, 104, 327
Baghûykâth 117
Bahamshîr canal 214
Bahâr (spelt . . . ghâr?) 125
Bahârâk 350, 365
Bahlavân in Fârs 127
Bahâ-nâmâbâd 39, 102
Bâahr al-akhdâr (Green Sea) 32, 51
Bâhr al-A'zâm (Great Sea) 32, 51–2, 56, 72–4, 76–7, 79, 80–3, 85–6, 122–4, 126, 145, 163, 179, 220
Bâhr al-Muhît see Western Ocean
Bâhr Warânk 181
Bahra (Pâhra), in Kirmân 125; in Fârs 129
Bahrah mt., in Syria 67
Bahramâbâd 201
Bahréjî 89, 246
Bâhrâyn 81, 127, 148, 164, 412, cf. Nizâwayn
Bâhrûgân 124, 374

Arsâng (K.râng), cf. Ùsâng 25, 262
Arthânîya (Abârma?) 434, 436–8
Artû (Bartû), 96, 281
Artush see Iríthsh
Arvâniyân (?), cf. Arâl sea 180
Arwâdh, Arwâd is. 8, 58, 190
Arzan (Arzhan) 55, 185
As t. 445, 456, 458, 461
Asâbâd (Aṣdâbâdâh) 132
Asad t. 146
Asâk (Aṣâk, Aṣk) 130, 380–1
Asbuzâr see Aaspuzâr
Asgil (Aškîl, &c.) 162, 320, 461
Asghûtâr see Usâbistân
Ashkhâr 388
Ashkîl see Asgil
Ashmûnâyn 152
Ashpara 289
Ashtigor t., cf. Âs 445
Asia, 33, 82; Central 24, 27
Asiâni t., cf. Âs 444
As-i-yen 294
Askâr see Sûkâr 221
Al-'Askâr in Sîstân 345
'Askâr-i Mukram 75, 130
Aslîf 123
Asna (Ushnu?) 142
Aaspuzâr 63, 64, 104, 199
'Aṣqâlân 81, 149
Assam see Qâmarûn
Assuan (Suwân, Uswân) 68, 78, 152
Astârâb (Astârâ?), on the Caspian 137, 391; in Gûzgân see Bastarâb
Astârâbâd 29, 134, 386
Asus r., cf. Ishim 308
Atak 200
'Atbarâ r. 221
At-Bashi 292
Atelkuzzu 313, 320, 322, 441, 444, 468
Athens 21, 41, 158
'Attâher 147
Atil town 75, 80, 161, 452; r. see Itil
Atâlıgh (Utlâlıgh?) 98
Atlantic 201
Afrâbulus 60, 149, 153
Atâk 29, 200, 218, 385
Auâf see Oba
Augaz see Abkhaz
Auâhr in Âdhârbâijân see Abhar; in Daghgestân see Avâr
Aulâs (Euleusas) 149
Aurhazâk', cf. Avâr 447
Âyâ 133, 384
Âyâl 116, 355
Avâr t. 42, 419, 429, 447, 450, 455
Avars, Pseudo- 448
Avâzâ-yi Paykand, cf. Paykand 56, 73, 185, 211
Awâs see Ephesus
Axum 474
Ayyâj (Auwaj), on the Oxus 360
'Ayyâdâb 474
Ayyâhûn (Abghân, Afghân?) 349
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Abañal l. 284
Bajanač see Pecheneg
Bajaván 449
Bajghurt t. see Bashqurd
Baj农药an 127
Bajia 129
Bajni (Bajná), cf. Čapni 469, 471
Bakhtagan (Bichagan) l. 54, 74, 183
Balhvan, cf. Barmán 281, 295
Bakrabád 133, 385
Bakr (Bakhúr) 77, 145, 193, 407, 411, 449
Balad 76, 140
Balad al-Dawar see Zamín-D.
Balanjar 162, 452
Balas (Bálus?) 76
Balásághún 286, 291
Balavvat (B.l.vv.t) 12, 91, 253
Báliyan 357
Balípatam 243
Balís (Bális, Valíṣhtán), in Balúchistan 111, 346
Báliš, in Jázim 142, 149, 393
Baljúvan (= Munk) 268, 361
Balkhan, cf. Balkhán 265, 411
Balik 16-17, 39, 63-4, 70-1, 73, 81, 105, 107-8, 111, 311, 337, 399; Balkh r. see Dah-áś.
Balikhán (Balqán), east of the Caspian 180
Balikhash (Balqash) l. 208, 276
Balqás mt. 67, 151, 415
Balqán (Balqár?), in the Caucasus 460
Báls (?,) in Kášgharias 93
Baltsa 328, 369
Baluch, Balúchistán 28, 123-4, 372-3
Balús see Barús
Balút see Balavvat
Ban 65, 125
Baníjkat 352
Bámíyán 64, 73, 105, 108, 109, 330
Bámkákhsh 355
Bámpúr 373
Baníkat 72, 73, 118, 211
Bandar-i Daylam 377
Bandar Lahorí 372
Band-i Turkistán 199
Banhá see Nihár
Báníya 27, 245
Banjímkhath see Panjímkhath
Bánjískh 357
Bánjíkhash (Bámkákhsh?) 356
Bankálus see Lankabálus
Banmû 251
Bánu 127
Bára (spelt: Nára) is. 179, 189, 190
Baradán 140
Brádhás see Barús
Barákliz (spelt: B.r.k.d.r?) 73, 105, 328
Barámula 370
Barbar town 179
Barbara 179
Barbarí Gulf 52, 81, 164, 222
Barchúla t. 162, 461
Barchuq, cf. J.m.r. 281
Bardá’a (Bardha’a) 29, 66, 143, 144
Bardangán 129
Bardsaf 125
Bardíj (Bardej) 77, 144, 218, 403
Bardúj see Bardúquia
Barfak (Fárák?) 338, 340
Barfán 137, 390
Bárturús, cf. Mámátür 386
Barghar (Balghar), in Sughd 115, 354
Bárgín-i Faríkch 183
Bargrí 143
Barf 249
Bariha (B.rija, B.rikha) near Khotan 70, 92-3, 206, 202
Bárjíjan (Bárizán) mt. 65, 125, 201
Bárumá 66, 202
Báriz t., in Kírmán 373
Barkul l. 266
Bártúgh 94, 272, 273
Bármán, cf. Agráqr.r. 295, 296, 482
Baroda 245
Barqgil p. 365, 369
Barós (Balús) 37, 187, 228, 241
Barqa 81, 153
Bar-qa’id 140
Barqúch (Abrqúch) 129
Bársárágh, cf. Básárán, K.br.s.rág, 120, 359, 361
Barsarkán (?) 128
Barshíliya, cf. Bashlí 453
Barskuan valley 293
Barskhan (Barsghán), Upper 28, 54, 98, 116, 269, 273, 276, 287, 289, 291-3, 296, 298, 482; Lower 269
Bártang 208, 360
Bartúj see Artúj
Barv (Burj?) 131
Barzand 142, 403
Barzanj (?) 403
Bássáfúya (Bássáfúya) l. 54, 183
Básand 38, 114
Bássáfír or Básáfíya
Básárán (Bás.á), see Bársárágh
Báshín (Absín) 64, 73, 106, 327
Bashlí 449
Bashm see Pashm
Báshí 201
Básilion l. 184
Başinnay see Başunay
Básiyán 74, 75, 130, 214, 381
Básjírt al-dákkit (‘Inner B.’) 319
Báshghurd, Bashghurt, Bashqurd, cf. Básjírt 312, 318-20, 322, 469
Báskunas, see Basques
Basmad 246
Basmil t. 264, 266, 272, 285
Basques 158, 424
Bastra 58, 76, 81, 137-9, 146; sea of Bastra 52; swamps 56, 76; desert 137
Bastra (Básayra), in Morocco 154, 417
Dihistan-Sur 60, 193, 386
Dilmân (cf. Daylam) 64
Dimyat 55, 151
Dinâr (Dhanabâd) mt. 212
Dinârrûdch r. 136, 388
Dinâr-Zari 64, 200
Dinâvar 132
Distra see Silistria
Divrûch 212
Divshârân, 482
Diyâlâ r. 218
Diyârbakr see Âmid
Diyâr-Qaum-Lût 415
Diyâr-Rabi'a 141
Diz-, cf. Qu'l-
Diz-i Ahmâf (Diz-i Hinaf) 73, 105
Diz-i Mahdi (Dar-i Mahdi) 130
Diz-i Pisâr-i 'Umâra (Hîshn b. 'Umâra) 126, 377
Diza 22, 64, 105
Dizak, in Sind 123; in Transoxania 115
Diz-ii Alanân 193
Diz-ii Navâzak, cf. Ävâza 186
D.khs-As (Rukhs-As?), Alan t. 445, 458
Dnepr r. 342, 471
Dniester r. 431
Don (Tanais) r. 41, 181, 216, 322, 429, 433, 462
Dora r. 365
Dorylaion see Darawliya
Dösh r. 299, 340, 341, 342
Draguiqâna 192
D.rân 113
D.krân 350
D.stûya (Rastûya) 93
Dûbâ see Danube 321, 441
Dubays canal 76
Dûlûb 137, 391
Dûnâ see Danube
Dunbâvand mt. in Tabaristan 135, in Kirmân 375
Dunpûr 63, 72, 92, 209, 252
Dunqula ("Old Dongola") 475
Dür 40, 140
Durghush (Darghush) 73, 111, 211, 345
Du-Shanba (= Stalinabad) 353
Duvin (Dubil) 142
Dvali, cf. Twâls 457, cf. Tûlâs
Dynwr see Dunpûr

Earth 50, 51
Ecîja (Isinja) 155
Edessa 37
Egypt 36-8, 52-6, 68, 78, 81-3, 148-55, 165, 415
Egypt, Upper (Sa'id) 10, 68, 165
Egyptian Desert 149, 151
Elbrus mt. 445
Eliseni 400, 402
Embs (Jam) r. 215, 312
Epheusus see Rustâ-yi Awâs, Arabissos 68, 204
Equator 43-4, 50-2, 58-9, 82-3

Equius see Iki-ögüz
Er(i)-chou (Liang-chou) 230
Eritrea 473
Erz'a t. 434, 436, 463, 464
Erzerum see Qalîqâla
Eski-Shehir 220
Euphrates (Furât) r. 37, 79, 76-7, 81, 84, 140-1, 148-9, 218
Europe (Urîfi?) 33, 83

Faghl-khât 115
Fayd 67, 148
Falghar see Barghar
Fallâhiya 213, 214
Fam al-Šîh 138
Farbar see Pâmîr
Fanzûr (Sumatra) 87, 228, 236, 240
Fàrâb see Fârâb
Farâh 110
Farâh-rûd 343
Faramâ 151
Fârân see Târân
Fârôr 80, 133, 386
Fardfaz (Fârîfâk?), cf. Barfak 338
Farghana 38, 115-6, 293, 358
Fârghânâ (?), in Tukhâristân 330, 338
Fârghân (Fârghân), on the Oxus 208
Fargird 104
Farinkath 113, 117, 352
Fârîta 183
Farkhâr, in Tâlaqân 330, 340
Farkhâr, Great, in Tibet 94, 263
Farnul (or Parnul), cf. Saul 251
Fârô 418
Fâs (Pârs) 6, 19, 25, 34, 36, 49, 52-5, 58, 65-6, 74, 80, 83, 123, 125-31, 163, 212; desert 126; gulf 52; sea 52
Farsâna (Qalshâna?) 153
Farûnkath 119, 358
Farvâb 74; r. 74, 213
Fârvâf, in Kâbul(?) 338
Fâryâb, see Fâryâb
Fâs 154
Fath 76
Faydâbâd in Badakhshân 350; in Chaghâniyân 353; on the Oxus 360
Fayûm 68, 78, 152, 205
Fazârâ t. 146
Fazzân, cf. H.tân(?) 416, 474, 477
Fêlân t., in Daghestan, cf. Lupenii 454
Finns 191, 433
Firâb (Fîrâbr) 113
Firîm see Pirîm
Fîrûzâbâd 377
Fîrûz-kûh, cf. Gharchistân 327
Fîrûzqand 345
F mâ (N mâ) 89
F.nîkî (Q.nîkî?) 123
"Four Garrisons", in China 280
F.raj.kli 70, 84, 207, 228
F.râkhîya (Qarajiya?) 99, 303
Franks 53, 155, 158, 191, 418, 424
Fraxinetum (Frainet) 192
Isfinaqân see Sibinakân
Isfizâr see Aspuzâr
Isgil (Ishgil) see Asgil
Ishbihhû 357
Ishim r., cf. Asus 202, 215, 305, 306
Ishkâmish (Ishkimish, Sîkîmishâ) 109, 340-1
Ishkâshîm (Sîkâshîm) 121, 248, 351, 364-6
Ishkolkan 113, 352
Istaklaland, Iskân, Iskâr see Sakalkand
Iskandar-kul l. 211
Iskandariya see Alexandria
Iskandarûna 149
Iskîtul 351
Islâns of the Blest see Khâliya
Ispâhan (Sîpâhân) 65-6, 74, 126, 129, 131
Issik-kul l. 28, 54, 62, 71, 98, 183, 195, 208, 293, 298, 300
Istahbânât 129
Istakhâr 111, 347
Istakhâr 74, 126, 129, 376
İst t. (Ves') 437
İtil (Atîl) r. 43, 75, 80, 99, 100, 161-3, 216, 305, 321
İtuwkh (? 117, 356
Jâba is. (Sumatra?), cf. Salâtîh 33-4, 57, 186-7
Jâba, Continental, cf. Champâ 34, 63, 188, 198, 249 (cf. N.jâba)
Jâba, Indian, King of Palembang (?), cf. Chan-pei 57, 187
Jabal al-Qamar 55, 69, 78, 205
Jabal al-Qîlîl 59, 191
Jabal al-salâb 194
Jabal al-Tâ’in fil-bahr 52, 61, 79, 80, 193
Jabal-Ṭâriq 59
Jabal al-Ṭâriq 148
Jâbalân see Aja' and Salmâ 203
Jabbul 138
Jabghukath 117, 357
Jâb.r.s.r (? 89, 246
Jâbrâqûn (Jabr.vûn) in Ădharbayjân 143, 394
Jâca see Ghâlijâskush
Idghal see Chadghhal
Iaen (Jayyân) 155
Jâgin r. in Balûchistan 374
Jahrum 110, 129
Jâhûdûn, in Gûzgân 5, 64, 107, 334; in Ispâhan 131
Jâhuk 129
Jâjarm 39, 102
Jalâdajân 212
Jalâlabd 252
Jalâliqa (Gallicians in Spain) 424
Jalavvat (Jalût) 72, 91, 253
Jâlîhandar 90, 247
Jalûlîl 139
Jâm, in Fârs 127

Jâm (Embâ) r. 215, 312
Jamagird, Jamakût, Yamakoû 183, 377
Jambalîq 272
Jambî 188
Jâmgir (Chámghar?) 94, 98, 273, 287, 393
Jâmî 39, 40, 140
Jarumû (Jambû), Índian state 250
Jâmshidgird 189
Janart p. see Muzart p.
Jand 72, 81, 122, 222, 371
Jandrûs see Chandror
Jânzûrûd 125
Japan 228
Jâr 81, 148
Jâramî al-Ḫabash (Garâmê, spelt Rasun) 34, 164, 473-4
Jarâshân 104
Jar-i Kulbâd 346
Jâriyânà (Jâribâya, Gârpâya?) 39, 64, 100, 341-2
Jarjârâyâ 138
Jârmagân (Jarmaqân, Jarmûkân) 29, 103, 259, 325
Jârmagân (Charmangân?), in Tibet 93, 259
Jârmî see Jaramî
Jârâḥî r. see Tâb
Jâryâb r. see Kharmâb
Jassân (?) t. 146
Jaulân, cf. Khâlûân 412
Java see Jâba
Jâvâd, on the Kurr 398
Jâvâr (Khâvârâ?) r. 72, 81, 122, 222
Jâvâkân 361
Jâxtarûs (Khâshart, Sîr-daryâ, Sayûtûn) r. 22, 73, 116-8, 149, 202, 210-11, 306, 308
Jâyâhûn (Oxus) r. 67, 71-2, 80-1, 102, 199, 209, 249; "a large river" 321
Jâzûrûa, in Mesopotamia 36, 66, 83, 137, 140-3, 148-50, 392; cf. Thughûr al-Jâzûrûa; in Spain see Algeciras
Jâzûrûa, bani Kâwûn (or Barkâyûn) 190
Jâzûrûa bani Zaghânâ (Algiers) 154
Jâzûrûa ibn 'Omar 141, 203
Jâzûrûa-ye Rûynûs 193
Jâzîrat al-Bâb 60, 193
Jâzîrat al-Fi’dâ (Silver island) cf. Argyrê 56, 186
Jâzîrat Istiwâl al-Layl wal-Nahâr 188
Jaz-Moriyân 1. 201
Jeddâ (Jidda, spelt: Ḥûdâ) 19, 81, 148
Jehol 317
Jerm, in Bâdakhshân 349-50, 365
Jerusalem (Bayt al-Muqaddas) 151
J.f.r (Chigil, Châqir, Majghar?) 319, 347
Jîbâl al-Shurât 415
Jidghil see Chatqâl
Jîfâr sands 68, 81, 151
Index A

Jigili (Chigili), a Khallukh t. 287
Jil-ariq, on the Chu 292
Jil-i-kul plateau 360
Jînânjkath see Chînânjkath
Jôra, in Fârs 127, 377; in Africa 474
Jîr mi see Jerm
Jûrût 65, 73, 124, 125, 201, 374
Jsl-Manbij 14
J.mlkat 95, 306
J.mlkat (J.ml-kath), 94, 272, 273
J.nkân i 54
J.n.kh-kâth 93
Jîbâl (Media) 36, 65, 74-5, 83, 129, 131-3, 136-7, 150, 382-4
Jou-Jan t. 447
J.rm.q (Barchuq?) 281, 295
Jubaylât is. 58, 190
Jubbay (Jubba, Jubbê?) 74, 130
Jûbin see Chûbin
Jûdânjanâ 136, 388
Jûda see Jedda
Jûdi mt. 66, 203
Jumul t. 275, 285
Jûnavidh 326
Junday-Sûbûr see Gundê-Shâpûr
Jurash 146
Jûrân see Gurgân (p. 180 *Gurgân?)
Jûrût 123
Jur (Yûtîva) t., in Kîrmân 373
Jûrgân 131
Jûdân see Khyzân
Jûyûm see Gûyum

Kâba 37, 412
Kabûdhân l. and is. 54, 60, 143, 192
Kâibul 111, 346; Kâbul r. 209
Kâdînâkh (Katak?), near the Lob-nor 85, 233-4
Kadîr, on the Jaxartes 118, 358
Kafarbâyâ 149
Kafartûthâ 141
Kâfiristan 367, 369, cf. Bolor
Kâfrînhân r. 353, 360, 362, 363
Kâr-Tâb 150
Kâftar 65, 125
Kah 342
Kâhûn 125
K’â-Fêng 226
Kakhþita, cf. Tsanar 402
Kakhťâ r. 414
Kala (Kalâh-bâr, Kra), in Indo-China 57, 187, 473
Kalâr, Kalâr-dasht 135-6, 388
Kalb t. 146
Kâdâniyân (Chaldœans) 392
Kalvûn (Kâtûn) 104, 326-7
Kâm see Yenissei
Kama r. 41, 216
Kâ-mard 342
Kâmarûpa see Qâmarûn

Kâmîčk t. 362, cf. Kumîjî
Kâmîn 129
al-Kâmîn (al-Ârmîn), in India 237
Kamsîghyâ 94, 273
Kânâniyân see Kaldâniyân
Kânâbîya 65, 88, 244, 245, 372
Kân-chou see Khâmchû
Kûndûr-taghi see Kûndûvar
Kang-diz 189, 224
Kângir 308, 324
Kangri (Gangra in Asia Minor) 220
Kânis 149
Kânjîk t. near Kâshghar 280, 281
Kân-su 226
Kao-ch’ang see Chînânjkath
Kapa see Qabân
Karajî Abû-Dulaf 65, 132, 201, 383
Karajî Rûdhîrvî 132
Karakorum mt. 196, 199
Karas-kûh see Kargas-kûh
Kârbalâ 77, 392
Kârbang (Kîrbanj) 359-60
Kargas-kûh mt. and desert 36, 80, 83, 102, 126, 131, 222
Kârîyân 128, 379
Kârkh 40, 140
Kârkhâ r. 75
Kîrd (Kîrkûh) 6, 332
Karrân see Kurân in Badakhshân
Kûrûkh 105
Kûrân r. see Shûshtar r.
Kârvân, in Fârs 74
Kârzin 128, 379
Kâsak (Kashak) see Cherkes
Kâsân 341
Kasavân, cf. Abân Kasavân
Kasba 114
Kasbân 124
Kâshân (Qâshân) 80, 133
al-Kâshbîn, in India 242
Kâshghar (Ordû-kand, Khargâh) 25, 34, 96, 225, 234, 255, 260, 280-1, 349; r. 206
Kâshkûl (?) 206
Kâshmir (Qâshmîr) 63, 92, 121, 198, 199, 238, 254, 363, 364, 370; Inner and Outer K. 254
Kâshkuthâ 117
Kâskân (Barsarkân?) 379
Kâsh-kûs see Qochqar-bashi
Kâstek p. 195, 290, 298, 301
Kâth (spelt: Kâth), in Khwârizm 38, 121, 370, 371
Katha (Yazd) 129, 380
Kâtûn (Kalvûn) 104, 326-7
Kavar 74, 219, 379
Kavâzhân (?) 104
Kâw see Kiev
Kazalinsk 308
Kâzan 315
Kâzûrûn 54, 127
Kâbîl, on the Chu r. 289
Kâriya 117
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K.b.r.na 357
Kchi-Surkhâb see Kulâb r.
Kebin, Great, r. 300, 303
Kend mt. 308
Kerch (K.rj, Karch?) 32, 182, 321
Kergâna-rûd 391
Keykân r., cf. Quyâs 298
Khabîs 125
Khabr 374
Khabrûqân 124
Khab see Khâs
Khâbûr r. 141
Khâchen r. 400
Khada-lik, near Khotân 234
Khafân (? in the Sudân 165, 477
Khâjû see Kua-chou
Khâk (Hişn al-qhabrâ) 78, 220
Khâlaj t. 108, 111, 286, 311, 338, 346-8
Khâlb, k 85, 232
Khâlîn (Jâlîn) 82
Khâliya (Khâliât, Islands of the Blest) 7, 8, 58, 190
Khalkâl 301
Khâlîukh Turks 108, 111
Khallukh Gate 119
Khallukh mt. 62, 72, 73, 211
Khâmûchâ 26, 85, 227, 229, 232, 265
Khâmdâdâ (Khandûd) 121, 364, 366
Khâmi see Qomul
Khâmîlik (Khâmîli) 162, 429, 452, 454
Khânâbâd (Aresh) 400
Khân-Bali (Bila-suvar?) 137, 391
Khâmdûd see Khandûd
Khan-fu (Canton) 224, 227
Khângâjâl 390
Khân-i Qâzân 139
Khân Lanjân 131, 383
Khân Margûn (Khân Margâwîyâh) 75, 130, 214, 386
Khân Ravân, cf. Râvâni 326
Khânû 201, 374
Khârâk is. 58, 190
Kharama, in Asia Minor 204
Khargâh see Kâshghar 280-1
Khârgân-khâth 112
Khàrrîjîtes, Mountain of the, (Kul-i shurîd?) 67
Khârîlûk see Khallukh
Khârnâb r. (Oxus) 71-2, 119, 208, 360
Khârôgh (Khorogh) 367
Khârsâna see Charsianon
Khûrn 359
Khâs (Khabs) 117
Khásâni t. in China 229
Khâsav-yurt 453
Khâshart see Jaxartes
Khatûm see Khuthum
Khâtâm see Khaylâm
Khatr (Khabrî?) 65
Khatûnkâth 118
Khâulân 145, 412
Khâvâk p. 341
Khâvât see Jâvârâ
Khâyâm (Khâtâm), now Narin r. 22, 73, 109, 194, 211, 278, 289, 355
Khâyân (?), in Alania 161, 446
Khaym 97
Khâymand 103
Khâyribâd (Fâryâb?) 4
Khâzar 38, 42-3, 53, 67, 75, 82-3, 121, 142, 166-2, 183, 284, 321, 411, 439, 450, 457; mt. 42, 131, 160, 203
Khâzar see see Caspian; but 419 = Black Sea
Khâzri (Khazarî) 455
Khîr (?), in Pârs 128, 379; near Pasâ 129; in Kîrmân 124, 374
Khîrîkhâz (Qîrghîz) 28, 34-5, 44, 52, 62, 66, 75, 80, 82-4, 94, 96-100, 179, 195, 202, 264-5, 270, 282, 297, 316, 319, 347
Khîrmî.Bl, cf. J.r.m.q (?i) 96, 281
Khîtâ (Qitây), China since Liao dynasty 282, 284.
Khîva, cf. Khwârzâm 122
Khîvâl 117
Khiyûr 129
Khîšî, near Bâkû 449
Kh.m.b.rk 117
Khîmer (Qimâr) 27, 87, 205, 236-7, 240-1
Kh.mûd (Khamûl? Qamûl?) 95, 279
Khîlov see Kharâj 347
Khorâsân 6-7, 10, 15-17, 19, 22, 30-1, 36, 38-9, 71, 78, 80, 83, 88, 92, 102, 104-6, 108, 110, 112, 131, 133, 135
Khorâsân (Kargas-kûh) desert 36
Khoràsân Marches 30, 80, 83, 109-12, 119, 122, 342-51
Khoor-Mûsâ 213, 378
Khòst t. 341
Khotan 44-5, 61, 70, 85-6, 194, 206, 255, 259-60, 270, 280
Khoy 143
Kh.rây.n-d-gûh (Khîwây.n-d-gûh) r. 71, 206
Kh.r.j.wân 289
Kh.rûj 373
Kh.sânî t. 84
Kh.shm 391
Khûjadak 112
Khûjân (Qûchân), cf. Ustûvâ 103
Khûjand (Khujenda) 72, 115, 116, 355
Khûjistan 104
Khûlûd [Khûkand?] -gûh r. 62, 71, 94-5, 195, 206-7, 273-4, 278
Khulûn 63, 72, 108, 337
Khûmdân (Ch'ang-an-fu) 51, 56, 70, 79, 84, 206, 224-5, 229; cf. Index E.
Index A

Khumdān r., cf. Huang-ho and Wei-ho 70, 80, 206
Khumrak, in Ilīq 357
Khūna (Khūnāj) 142
Khunān (Hunarākert) 144, 398
Khunāsira 81, 149
Khzna 448
Khūr (Khuvār?) 103
Khurād (?), a Rās town 42, 67, 76, 159, 217, 430
Khurmuk (Khurmuj) 127, 377
Khurra 129
Khurramābād (Shāpūrkhāst) 383
Khuršāb (Khurshāb), in Farghānā 72, 116, 211, 355
Khurshān, t., in Daghستان, cf. Lakz 144-5, 411, 455
Khūrsh, in China, cf. Kūr-ish 70, 84, 228
Khurvāt-in (Croat) 441
Khus 103
Khuskāb (?), in Transoxiana 117
Khuskarūd 388
Khusmīthan 121
Khusnābād 125
Khusruā-gīrd 102
Kuthum (Huutm) 80, 86, 234
Kutlugh, cf. Khamlīk 162, 454
Kh.s.n (Kh.nin) 282
Kuṭtal (Khuttalān), 63, 71, 109, 114-5, 119-20, 198, 341, 359
Kuṭukbai (Ku-t'a-bal) 272
Khūvākand (Khwākand, Kokand) 116, 355
Khvānīn (Khvānīn), in Ghūr 111, 346
Khvār (Khwār) 36, 132
Khvāsh (Khvāsh), in Sīstān 110
Khvāyādān (Khvayājān?) 74
Khuṣār (Gūzār) 352
Khużistān 25, 36, 40, 52, 65-6, 74-5, 83, 126, 128-31, 137, 212, 380
Kh.vāra see Jāvāra
Khvārazm 38, 53, 71, 121-2, 370, 463; desert 81; see Aral sea, cf. Arvāniyān
Khvāsh 125, 375
Khvāsl cf. Khalaj 347
Kh.nān (Jyān, Khydān, Khyzān, Qaytaq?) 161, 448-9
Kh.za, near Khotan, cf. Khadalik 86, 234
Kiang see Yang-tse
Kiang-su province 221
Kie-tan, sacred mt. near Kastek 290, 303
Kif 104
Kij (Kēj, Kikānān, Kiz), in Balūchistān, cf. Qīqān 123, 373
Kilān 262
Kilidh (Iqlid) 129, 380
Kīnāk t. 35, 44, 66, 68, 75, 81, 83, 94-101, 180, 202, 204, 214, 216, 222, 283, 301, 304-5, 312, 316-7, 437
Kimāk-Yīghūr see Yughūr
Kimārij (Kumārij, Kamārij) 128, 379
Kin-sha-kiang see Kīsāu
Kin-shan see Altau
Kīrnān 19, 34, 36, 40, 52, 55, 65, 73-4, 80, 83, 109, 122, 123-6, 128-9, 163, 373; desert 109
Kīrmānshāhān (Qarmāsīn) 132, 383
Kīrmīnkath (Kūmb.rkāt, &c.) 98, 289, 292, 297-8
Kīrrind r., in Tabaristan 386
Kīs 129
Kīsāu r. 70-1, 206, 229
Kīsh (Kīshh), in Bukhārā 113, 200
Kīshm r. 331
Kīshīm, cf. Ting-ling 286
Kīstnā r. 241
Kītān see Qītay
Kīzh, in Fārs 129
Kīža 229, 255
Kīžūn, in Ghūr 343
K.k.rāl 118
Kīrur, in Gūzgān 107, 335
Kīlān, in Tibet 71, 94, 207, 256
K.l.shj.k 117, 357
K.l.skān 117
Klukhor p., in the Caucasus 445
K.mīf (K.mīf), cf. Kūmīs 282
K.m.jkath (Mi-ti-chih-t'o) 97, 286
K.mūrūd 363
K.msighiyyā 94, 293
K.njkath (G.njkath) 113
Ko-fu-ch'a 284
Koh-i bābā 199
Kōhmārī mt. 232
Kokand see Khvākand
Kokcha r. 209, 341, 349
Koko-nor l. 194, 258
Kok-sha-Shal-tau mt. 296
Kōmēdai see Kumijī 363
Konkan (Kumkam) 238, 246
Kop r. 303
Kopal 287
Kotyaq (Quṭyaq, Kūtheho) 220
K.rāl 117
K.rākhtūn (K.rākhtūn) 95
Krasnovodsk 205
K.rdāgān 125
K.rrāzākhās (Kurdārāzākhās) 122
K.rrjākh (?.) 118
K.rk (K.rk, K.rts, Kerch?) xvii, 32, 182, 321
K.rkūducation 387
K.rsāng see Usāng
K.r.yān (?) 93
K.sān, in China 85, 233
K.sayym, cf. Kīshīm 97, 286
K.shā 129
K.shubah 355
Kua-chou 85, 233
Kuang-(chou)-fu 224
Kuchā (An-hsi, Chiu-tzü, Kusan), cf. Kuchchehā(?) 70, 85, 227, 232, 270, 205
Kuchā (Kuchchehā) r. [Tarim and Huang-ho] 71, 80, 94-5, 207
Kuchān (Kuchchehā, K. jā, Kūshān?) 70, 85, 227, 230
Kuchchehā (Kuchān, K. jā), cf. also Kuchā 71, 80, 85, 207, 221, 229-30
Kuchaspān 390
Kūfā 21, 81, 139-40, 145; swamp 56, 76, 137
Kūfīch (Kofich, Quṣṭ) t., in Kirmān 28, 65, 124, 336, 362, 373-4; mt. 65, 80, 124, 201
Kūh-mnr 85, 232
Kūhān 125
Kūh-i Bashākīrt 201
Kūh-gīlt (Kūh-jīfū) mt. 66, 74, 201, 213-4, 380
Kūh-i Gurz, cf. Gurz 68, 422
Kūh-i Lā'ī 367
Kūh-i sīm, in Kirmān 65; in Khorāsān 104; cf. Kūhsaym
Kūh-i sharāh (shurāt?) 67
Kūh-i yukh see Qasāk
Kūh-i zahr in Tibet 255
Kuhak 111, 346
Kuhan-rūdh (Kargānā-rūd?) 137, 391
Kuhdum see Kūtaīm; cf. Gūrāb-i Kuhdum
Kūhīstān, in Khorāsān 64, 103, 125, 326; in Syria (Jībāl) 150
Kūhīstān-i Abū Ghānīm 65, 124, 374
Khrūn 201
Kūhsaym (Kūh-i sīm?) 117
Kūkāth 117
Kūkān (Kökān) mt. 196, 282
Kūkūyāl (Kēk-yul?) 98
Kulāb see Hūlbuk; Kulāb r. (Khi- Surkhāb) 208
Kūlān (Tartt) 97, 289, 354, 358
Ku-li t., cf. Qūrī 284
Kūlt, near Kanbāya 62, 196
Kūlt, estuary of the Indus 72, 196
Ku-li-kan, cf. Qūrī 284
Kūnmārij see Kīmarīj
Kūmb.rkt see Kirmānkath
Kumēdh, in Khuttāl 361, 363
Kumji (Kōmēdāi?) t., in Khuttāl 71, 120, 361, 363
Kūmnī 124
Kūmnīs (Kūmn.s, Kümīs) [-art] 95, 274-5
Kūmnīsh (Kūmnīs), in Daylam 36, 64, 102, 135, 387
Kūmīn-talas 274
al-Kumkam see Konkan
Ku-mo 294
Kūrn.s-art see Kumīs
Kūn, cf. Comans 316
Kundārm 64, 107, 335
Kundāvar (Kāndūr, Kandavur?) -daghī mt., in Kimakia 66, 202, 308, 324
Kundar 103
Kūnges r. 275
Kūngy-al-tau 195, 299
Kunjīdā (Kunjīda) 119, 358
Kūn-lun mt. 194
Kūnkuñ (?) 93
Kūns.r, cf. Nuʿnīn, Ujjayn 88
Kū-p’il-ko 294
Kur (Kurr) r. (in Arrān) 77, 144, 218, 391, 448
Kūrān, in Fārs 127; in Badakhshān 365, 368
Kūrd in Khwārazm 122
Kurdjar (Qurday) p. 298, 301, 303
Kurdivān 144, 145, 407
Kurdiyān 129
Kurds 138, 336, 377, 392, (in Kāriyān) 410 (Mukri)
Kūr 103
Kurkāth (Cyropolis?) 115, 354
Kurr, in Transcaucasia see Kur; in Fārs 74
Kūr.sh, in China, cf. Khūr.sh 70, 207, 228
Kusan, cf. Kuchā 232
Kūsīqū 273
Kūshān (Kuchān, Kuei-shun?) 230-2
Kūshānī, in Soghd 113
Kūshk 111 [in the H.-Ā., Persian kūshk usually stands for Arabic qāy] Kuskakān (?) 137, 388
Kūshk-i Khānā 336
Kūshk-i Qand 123
Kūshmān, Kūshmāhan 105
Kūskān 70, 206
Ku-t’a-ba see Khutukbāi
Kūthay-rabbā 139
Kūtmāhdīhan (Kūtmāmand?) 125, 376
Kūtn (Kuhdum) 137, 390
Kūturqur t. 430
Kauristān in Tibet, cf. Ādhir 255
Kuvaristān (Kauristān?), in Fārs 128, 379
Kuvekāt, near Tarāz 306, 310
Kuwait 180
Kuwarā l. in Abyssinia 476
Kūyāba (Kuyāfa), cf. Kiev
Kūzir.k 94, 272
Kūzhd (?) 104
K.vālin t. 287
Kyk.t (Kingūt? hardly Qara-shar) 276
Lāba, cf. Zaghsāwā 165, 477
Labān (albān?) t. 98, 292
Laccadives 188, 241, 244
Ladak (Bolorian Tibet) 258
Lādhiqīya (Laodicea) 149
Ladoga 433; l. 181
Lāfjān see Lāhījān
Lāft is. 57, 188, 190
Lāhīj, in Shīrvān, cf. Lāyzān 404, 407-10
Lāhījān, in Gilān 137, 384, 388, 410
Lahögar (Lögar), near Kābul 347–8
Lahör (Lohāvar, Lohāvar), on the Rāvī 89, 246–7; cf. Lohart
Lak t., in Dagestan see Quzi-qumuq
Lakz (Lazgī) t., cf. Khuršān 162, 407, 408, 411, 454
Lambarān 398
Lamgān (Laghmān, Lamqān) 39, 63, 72, 92, 209, 251, 252; r. 72
al-Lān see Alān
Lan-chou, cf. Kuchar 207, 230
Langā 136, 387
Lank see Ceylon
Lanka town 188
Lankabālus (Alankabālus, Lanjabālus), Nicobar is. 57, 187, 188
Lankurān (Lankorān) 193
Larān, on the Oxus 364
Lārāndān 74, 127, 212, 213, 379
Lārījān (Lārīz), in Daylam 77, 410
Lātār 136, 387
Lāyāzān (Layān, Lūyzān), cf. Lāhīj 144, 402, 404–6
Lāzinā (?), cf. Az 99, 302
L.b.n, cf. Filān, Lupenii
Lebedia 313, 320, 459
Lena r. 285
Lerida (Lārīda) 69, 155
Lhāsā 25, 93, 205, 256, 258
Lḥrīz see Jurz (India)
Ljakhvi r. 457
Liāng-chou (Eri-chu) 230
Libya 33, 83, 477
Limārān 134, 386
Lip’in-k see Lūpenii
Lishtar (Alishār) 132, 383
Liūkand (Lēvkand) 120, 359, 361
Liyyārāstān (Liyālāssān), in Gīlān 410
L.K.n see Lakz
Loango 477
Lob-nor 186, 206, 207, 221
Lōgar (Laukar), near Mār 73, 328
Lohāra (Lohāwar), in Kashmīr 247, 249
Lohrānī 372
Lombarōds (al-Ankubarda) 191, 192, 336, 424
Lou-Lan 235, 259, cf. B.rwān
Lo-yang 226
Lubnān (Lebanon) 67
Lūgh.r see Abkhaz
Lukchun 274
Lūkkām mt. 67, 76, 149, 204
Lūl.gl (Ulūh?) 98
Lum-t’ai see Urgūmchi (earlier, Būgūr)
Lupenii 454
Lūqn (Lung-pien), in China 244
Luristan 201, 383
Łūt (Lot) see The Home of L.’s people
Lyūzān cf. Lūyāzān
Ma’arra Maṣrīn (Ma’arra Qinnasrin) 150, 415; Ma’arra Nu’mān 415
Ma’b.nj J.rābās (i), cf. Yafīnj 95, 276–7
Macedonia 156, 423
Madagascar (Jazīrāt al-Qumr) 205, 472
Madāʾīn (Ctesiphon) 138
Mādarīyā 139
Madhār 76, 218
Mādhavān 128
Madina 66, 146, 148
Madīr (Madīr) 64, 73, 109, 211, 336, 342
Madura 244
Madyāmikāth 112
Madyān, in Arabia 81, 148
Maeotis see Azov sea
Mafṭaḥ 138
Maghās, in Alānia 448
Maghrib 36, 38, 52, 81–3 148, 151, 153, 155–6, 165
Magna Bulgaria, Magna Hungaria 319
Māhālūya (Māhrālī) l., cf. Jankān 183
Māhān 125
Māhīya 153
Māhjār 147
Māhirūbān (Māhrūbān, Mahrūyak) 40, 74, 127, 213, 378
Mājr, Majghīr see Magyar
Māk valley 334
Mālagā (Māliqa) 69, 155
Mālāmīr (Idhāj) 381
Mālat 388
Mālatyya 21, 76, 149
Malay archipelago 34
Malay (Malayabar, Malabar) 57, 88, 238, 241, 243–4
Malāgīrīd 143, 395
Mālīn 104
Mallahān 212
Mallorca 193
Mālāwā 245
Māmātīr (Māmātīr, Bārfurūsh) 77, 134, 386
Mānak (Māyd, Mānī), in Burma 87, 243
Mānas, in the T’ien-shan 272, 293
Mānas r., in India 240
Mānbīj, cf. Jsr Mānbīj 149
Mānāb,klū (Mātīklā) mts. (Altai?) 196, 282
Mānd (Qara-aghach) r., cf. Saktān 74, 212, 377
Mandal, in India (?) 87, 236, 240
Mandāl p. 367
Mandaum peninsula, cf. Ur.shīʿīn 243
Mandīsh, in Ghūr 343
Mandū, in Mālāwā 245
Mandūrī-pattan 244
Mangīshlaq peninsula see Siyāh-kūh
Mānisā (?) mts. 61–2, 70, 73, 194–5, 206, 208, 211
Manjābī 72, 122
Mankath 147, 413
Mānkīr (Manyakheṭa) 238, 246
Mānśhān (Mānīshān) 31, 55, 106, 332, 334
Manšūr, in Syria 149
Manšūra, in Sind, cf. Brahmanābād, M.nha 22, 72, 88, 122, 239, 246, 372; in Armenia 400
Manūb see Mattūth
Manūgān 124, 374
Māqal canal 76, 138, 392
Maqys (M.qys), in Wāqwaq 84, 228; in the Sūdān 165, 477
Marāgha 63, 142
Marl-Bashi, cf. Barchuq 281
Mārān (Arrajān) r. 213
Marand 143
Mar.ash 149, 201
Mārdīn 66, 203
Margelan, in Farghana 355
Marīsa r. 221
Mariyya in Spain 417
Marj 332
Marqa, cf. Qūn, Qurṭa 84–5, 317; Markakul l. 285; Markha 285
Marrādī (Marrodh) see Marvarūd
Marsamanda (Marmanda) 22, 115, 354
Marūchāq 328
Mārāst (Abārāst), in Tabaristān 386
Marv 16–17, 73, 80, 104, 105, 106, 328; r. see Murghāb
Marvarūd (Bālā-Murghāb), cf. Marūchāq 9, 64, 73, 105, 328
Māsabdhān 203
Māsand 359
Māshān, in Marv 105
Mashkāl r. cf. Mushkī 373
Māshkanāt 129
Mashkōl 373
Masīn (Misin), in Fārs 213–4, 380
Masāja 149
Masījūs see Mārdīn mts. 203
Masjīd Ibrāhīm, in Syria 150
Masjid-i Sulaymān (Masgīl-i S.), in Iṣṭakhr 126
Masqūt (Maskūt’, Mushkūr), in Dağhestān 161–2, 454–5
Masruqān 75, 130, 214
Masvāhī 122
Mattūth (Manūb, Manūf) 131, 382
Mausil (Mossuł) 6, 76, 140
Mā-warā’ al-Nahr see Transoxiana
Maybūdah 129
Mayhana 103
Mā-yīn, cf. Vay-hind (?) 252
Mayīn 129
Maymāna (Jahūdhān) 335
Mayūl (M.yūl) 93, 257
Mayyāfarīqīn 143, 397
Māzandarān see Tabaristān 200, 218
Māzīnān 39, 102
Māzirākān 128
Māzrūqān, in Kirmān 124
Māz-rūmat, cf. Tūsmat 259
M.dū, in Tibet 259
Medina Sidonia (Sadīnā) 155
Mediterranean see Rūm sea
Mekka 37–8, 66, 131, 146, 148, 412
Men, Isle of 8, 58, 59
Merida (Mārida, spelt: Hārida) 21, 79, 155, 221
Mešēra t. 464
Mesopotamia see ’Irāq, Jazīrā 19, 37, 38
M.ghānā 112
M.hālij (?) 123
Mīhrāb 127
Mīhrān r. see Indus; Lesser (Second)
Mīhrān (Mīhrān al-thānī) see Narbada
Mīklāf ‘Akk 147
Milā, in Tabaristān 134, 386
Milwat (Bilwat) 253
Mīmadh 143, 395
Mīnāo 374
Mī-no t. in Yūn-nan 242–3
Mīntaqat al-Ayar see Belt of the Earth and Spine of the Earth
Minusinsk 283
Mīrī 97, 119, 289–90, 358
Miyāna 142
Mī-t-chīh-t’o see K.m.jkath 286
Miyālafjan (Niyālafjan?) 137, 388
Mīyān-rūdhnā, in Farghana 356
Mīzhān 124
M.ks (M.n.k.s), in Alania 446
M.lh.mān (M.jān?) in Zābaj 164, 473
M.ljān (M.lndi), in Zanj 163, 472
M.ljāth see Panjikath on the Chu 98
M.nha (Ṭhātha’?), cf. Lohrānī and Manšūra 372
M.nj.f 164
Mnkw r. 202; Mnkw-oghlī, Qipchaq t. 202
Moksha (Moxel) t. 446, 453–4
Mombasa 472
Mongols, cf. Tātār 94, 270, 316; desert 221
Moravia 431, 441–2
Morīs (Mordia’?), cf. Erz’a, Moksha 313, 434, 462–3
Mor‘-shiburhān (Kal’a-yi Maur), cf. Baghsūr, near Marv 327
Morōn (Maurūn) 155, 205
M.qys see Macys
M.rī, in Daylam 136
M.Khshmīnāth’ūr, near the T’ien-shan 273
M.th, cf. Tūsmat 93
Mt’juli 401
Mu’ān (Ma’an) 81, 149
Mubān kābād 380
Mubānādī, near Bardha’ 29, 144, 400
Muṭlar t. 146
Nökhb.k (Nûkhik) 282
Nu'â (Nûhâ) 343
Obi (Yumar) r. 275, 285, 305
Ocean, Eastern (Uqiyyânis-i Mashriqi),
Oceano, Encircling (Mubît) 216
Ocean, Western (Uqiyyânis-i maghribi)
Oka r. 217, 434, 438, 462
Oçonaba (Ukshshunaba) 155, 418
Oghor, cf. Uyghur, Avars (Pseudo-) 448
Oghuz, cf. Toghuzhguz, Ghuz 311, 313, 469
Ogoln (*Onglon) see Bujaq 467, 470
Ogind see Vâyhind
Oichardès (Tarîm?) 206
Oka r. 217, 434, 438, 462
Omân 39, 58, 148, 164, 396; sea 52, 145
Omayyad t. 149
Onoghundur see Vanandar 467, 470
On-Uyghur see Uyghur
Opiskon (Ubsîq) 78, 156
Optimaton (Ultîmat) 156
Ordu-kand see Kishghar
Orissa, Urshîn 27, 87, 241
Oşh 22, 72, 116, 335
Osset see Alân, As 318, 456
Ostiaks 309, 318; Yenisei Ostiaks 302
Otrar, cf. Turâr 358
Oxus (Amû-darya) 5, 17, 198-9, 208
Pâb (Pâp) 72-3, 117, 355
Pai-ma-ho 204
Palembang 188
Palestine (Filastîn) 150, 151
Pa-ju-kia 294
Pamir (Fâmîr) 196, 361-2
Panj r. see Amû-darya, Vakhân r. 198
Panjâb (Hind?) 89
Panjîber (Panjîber) 123, 373
Panjîr 39, 64, 109, 325, 341; r. 348
Panjikâth (Bish-Baliq), cf. Pei-Tîng
Panwijâ (Panwijâ) 311, 332, 345-6
Pannonia 431
Paphlagonia, cf. Afrakhân 78, 156, 204
Pârâb (Fârâb), on the Jaxartes 72, 118-9, 123, 284, 306, 312
Parak r. 73, 118, 211, 289
Pârghar (Pârghar, Bârghar) in Khuttal
Pasâ (Pasâ) 65, 128, 129
Pashm (Bashm), different from Pazhm? 388
Pavlovsk 308
Pei Chih-li 228
Pei-Tîng 227, 266, 272
Perovsk 308, 371
Persian Gulf (Khâlîj-i 'Irâq) 52, 180
Perta, cf. Nâwyţâ
P'iao see Puyu
Pîr-i Alamdîr, in Damghân 387
Prîrîm (Prîrîm, Fîrîrîm) 39, 77, 135, 136, 387
Podandon see Budhandûn
Pohuân 294, 297
Poland 433
Polovtsi see Khîfchaq 315
Ponto see Black sea 182
Po-tân see Bedel p.
Prîkant see Parînkath 352
Przhevalskî (Qara-qol) 293
Puhîpara 123
Pu-ku-chen (Black Irtish?) 286
Pul-i Zâghûl 177
Pul-i see Bolor
Pulvâr r. see Farvâb 213
Purdas see Burîsâ 462
Pûyû, t. in Burma 242
Pazhm, west of Somâm? 136 see Map X
Qabala 77, 144, 402, 407
Qabâ (Kapân) 143, 398
Qabq mt., cf. Caucasus 67, 145, 201, 203, 409, 411
Qâdîsiya 38, 81, 140
Qaghan-Stupa, in Bish-baliq 269
Qâhtân t. 412, 449
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Râml al-Mâ’dan 81–2, 164; r. 78
Râng-Rong (?) 61, 92, 194, 256–7
Raqqâ 76, 141, 150
Râs (?), cf. Asos, Ishim, Artush 75, 215, 283, 395, 308
Râ’s al’-Ayn 141
Râtîh, in Ghilan 137, 361, 362, 390
Râsh see Zhâshht
Râsk 123
Râsûkh t. 373
Râsun see Jarmî
Râtîn r. 212, 377
Râvî r. 246
Râvin in Kârmân 124
Râvînî (Rivand) 103, 326
Râyâgân 103
Râyîn (?) 125
Râyûtîya (Raykûyand?) 93
Râyâ 18, 36, 39–45, 80, 102, 132, 135, 354; mt. 77
Râyû (Régio?) 155
Rîzân, in Russia 436
R-bind (?) 89
R.bkh.s (R.n.s) see Râbâs 161, 449
Red sea (Khatîf-i ‘arabî) 52, 180, 222
Regar 353
Rhôdes (Rhudas) 8, 158, 190
Rhynakos (Rundhâa) 220
Ribât Aflîghân 6, 175, 331; R. al-apurr 386; R.-Fa’dîl 349–50; R.-Hads 386, R.-i karvân (spelt kirkân) 5, 73, 106–7, 211, 330, 334, 336
Rîf, in Egypt; cf. Ibrîq 204
Rîhâ (Jericho) 151
Rîqân 125, 375
Rîshahrî, in Khûzîzîstân 74, 127, 212, 213, 378; in Fârs (Reshîr) 378
Rîshân 116
Rivand see Râvînî 326
Rîvashârân (R.bushârân?) 106, 108, 332, 336, 482
Riyas (?) 55, 184
R.kht.jab see Zaybâk 120, 364, 481
R.nj.s see R.bkh.s
Rome see Rûmiya
R.simpleya 255, 256
Râbâs r., cf. R.bkh.s 450
Rû’d-i A’là (Gûpûl) r. 381; R.-i Hilla 212, 377; R.-i shûr 183, 212
Rûdbâr, in Kârmân 124
Rûdha, in Jîbâl 133, 384
Rûdžîn (Rûdžîn), in Agáfnîstân 111, 346; between Kârmân and Yazd 65, 125, 201; between Fârs and Kârmân 129; in Daylam (Rûyân) 135, 387
Rûdhrâvar (Rûdhrâvar) 132, 383
Rûdîsar 438
Rûf in Ghûr 343
Rûfta 128
Ruhâ (Edessa) 37, 141
Ruhûn (Adam’s peak) 134
Rukhudh (Rukkhudh, Rulkhbaj, Arachosia) xv, 64, 111, 121, 346
Rûm (Byzantine Empire) 8, 40–1, 52–5, 58, 67–9, 76–9, 82–3, 142–3, 148, 153–8, 160–1, 321, 439; Western 69, cf. Rûmîya
Rûm sea (Mediterranean) 32, 52–4, 58–9, 60, 82–3, 148–9, 151, 153–6, 158, 191, 320, 459
Rûmî strait 52
Rûmîya (Rome, Roman land) 21, 59, 60, 158, 192
Rûmîyân see Byzantines, cf. Greeks
Rûnâ see Dûnâ (Danube)
Ruotsi, cf. Rûs 432
Rûr (Rohri, Rûr) 72, 89, 246, 372
Rûstâ Bîk 119, 359–60; R. B.lj.m (M.lj.m?) see Munjan 121; R.Rustâm (?) 128; R.-yi Awâs (Ephesus?) 68
Rûstâq 359
Rûtâ (Rûthâ) r. cf. Dûnâ 43–4, 76, 101, 159, 217–8, 315–6, 430, 437
Ruvât 150
Rûy (Ru’b) 338
Rûyâgân (Ruyâyân) 74, 212, 379
Rûyân see Rûdhrân, in Daylam
Ryn, in Abyssinia (Zayla’) 34, 164, 474; in the Südân 165, 477
Sa’îda 127
Saba’ (Sab’a) 148
Sabalân (Sâbalân) mt. 66, 202
Sâbât 115, 354
Sâbir t. cf. Swr 455
Sâbrân (Sâbrân, spelt: Sahrân) 119, 306, 308, 338
Sâbûr, Bishâpûr 212
Sâbus cf. Sâs (Shabû) 76, 138, 218
Sâbzavâr 64, 102
Sa’da 146
Sâdûsân, in Sind 72, 122
Safid-Rûd (Sapidh-rudh) 77, 137, 218, 390
Sâghûr (Bâlû-Saghûn?) on the Chû 291
Sahand mt. 201
Sahârâ 223
Sâhbân, in Sind 372
Sâhuk see Châhuk
Sa’îd see Egypt, Upper
Sâji see Sha-chou
Sakâh-Haumavrgah 368
Sâkala (Siáktot), cf. Tâqî 249
Sâklând (Iskâlând) 39, 63, 109, 338–40
Sâkân (Mând) r. 74
Sâkhehû (Sukhehû), cf. Saukû 85, 232
Sâkh-in, Czechs 441
Sâkhtasâr 388
Sâlkâfân 114
Sâlahît see Shâlahît
Sâlamâs (Sâlmûs) 143
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Salamiya 81, 149
Šalaqán see Chálakán
Suler peak, in India 196
Sühlári 90
Salma mt. 203
Samánán, cf. Sámání 139
Salmán-i Pák 392
Salonica 423
Salor (Salghur?) 336, 466
Salómihd 103
Samálub 230
Samandar, in Daghestan 162, 452, 454
Sámár (Sahmar) 136, 387
Samara, in Russia 310
Samargand 4, 23, 38-9, 55, 63, 73, 113-14, 118, 332
Samargandqā, cf. Sarhadd 39, 63, 121, 364, 369
Sámarrá (Sámara) 11, 40, 76, 140
Sambatas cf. Kiev 431
Sambil (Bázar-i S., Súq-Sambil) 130, 381
Şamândan (*Hamdán?) 146
Şamrán, in Fär's 128
Sámí-s.brak (SámsíIk) 117, 357
Şamjan, cf. Ayaza 185
Samundar (Samudra), in India 27, 87, 241
şamur r. in Daghestán 408, 455-6
Şamur (Sawur?) in India 62, 198; cf. Şaymur
Şán see Sangcháárak
Şân 20, 37, 49, 66, 146, 147, 411
Sanán 128
Şanár (Tsanár) 144, 400
Şandábili (Kan-chou?) 232
Şanf (Champa, Annam) 86, 236, 240
Şan-fo-tâ'i, cf. Şrivijaya, Palembang 188, 241
Sangalák (Sangálák) 26, 85, 229, 233
Sangán, in Khorásán 103
Sangarios r. 220
Sangcháárak (Sán-chá-vayrak) 63-4, 107, 190, 336
Sanglinj (*Sanglich), cf. S.n.k.s 112, 121, 350, 364, 367-8
Sang-Túda see Livkand 361
Sânkath 118
Şanj 76, 149
Sanju, near Khotan 207, 260
Santarém (Shantarín) 79, 156, 221, 418
Şaqálıba, Şaqálab see Slavs
al-Şaqálıba al-Mutannaşıra see Slavs, Christianized
Saşqín, cf. Şarîgh-sh.n 453
Sarag, Saragh, Sharagh, in China 225
Saragossa (spelt: Saragís) 155
Saraksah 64, 104
Sărâmíd, cf. Ceylon 57, 61, 80, 86-7, 104, 234-5, 244; m. (connected with Indo-China see Map 1), cf. Mânisá 61, 70, 83, 206, 235
Sărâv (Sarab, Sarât) 142, 394
Sărâván 137
Sărây 360
Sarbáz r. 373
Sardâbrûd 388
Sardon, in Fârs 74, 129, 379, 380; r. 74, 213-4
Sardánia (Surdánia) xvi, 60, 192
Sarhad, cf. Samargandqaq 369
Sârî (Sâriya) 77, 134, 284, 315, 317, 386, 444
Sârî-Yughur see Yughur
Sârîgh, near the Chu, cf. Yâr 284-5, 289
Sârîgh-sh.n, in Khazaria, cf. Sâvghar 453-4
Sârikol (K'ie-p'an-t'o) 370
Sar-i Pul (Anbûr in Gûzgân) 5, 199
Sârî 42-3, 67-8, 77, 83, 142, 156, 160-1, 204, 422, 446-7, 452, 454
Sâri-Yughur see Yughur, Sârî-
Sârke 182, 313, 453, 459
Sarmatia 11, 401
Sâr msâlbkâth 255
Sârșar 76, 139; r. 139
Sârûj 141
Sârvâb 129
Sârvân (Servan, Shârvân), in Gûzgân 106, 334
Sârvân, in Afghanîstân 110, 344
Sarvîstân 125
Sâs (Shâsh, Šâbus?) r. 76, 138, 218
Sâtîf (spelt: Sàtîf) 153
Sâukjû see Su-chou
Saul, cf. Pârmul 91, 251
Sâîva 133, 384
Sâvghar (Sârhîgh-sh.n?) 162, 453-4
Sâvitra 183
Sâvnik (Šànik) 80, 86, 234
Sawur (?) see Şamur
Sayan mt. 282
Saydâ (Sidon) 149
Sayhûn see Jaxartes, Châch r. 73, 149
Saylâkân (Sélâkân) 120, 362
Saymara 52, 132
Saymûr (Chaymûr, Chaul), on the west coast of India 88 (?), 244-6, cf. Şamûr
Sayram 358
S. bkâth 118
Scythia 11, 401
S.dnk, cf. Sidhing-kul 95, 276
Sea of Darkness 179, 193
Sea of Aghbâb 87
Selenga r. 265
Seleucia (Selefke) 69, 156, 205
Setnirechéye (Jetti-su) 306
Senna 218
Serbs, cf. Kh.rwat-in, White Croats 423-4
Seretâr 1. 466
Serila (Sfînîstân) see China 11
Seven Sleepers' Cave 204
Sevilla 155
S.f.njâ'î (Isînjâî) 111, 346
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Shābirinji (?) 105
Shabūrān, &c. see Ushbūrqān
Shabwa 77
Sha-chou 26, 70, 85, 207, 229, 230–r., 233, 235
Shādāgān (Shādāhān) r. 74, 212, 377
Shah-Mehbād’s Fortress 126
Shabd i, cf. Sind, Tūs i. 185
Shahra-zhūr (Shah-rasūr, Siyārazūr) 134, 383
Shahr-i Bābak (Pāpak) 129, 380
Shahrīstān, in Gurgān 133, 385; in Isphān 131
Shāriyār-Kūh see Qārin 387
Shahruvā 124
Shāh-Sevān t. 304
Shāhī peninsula 103
Shāhī (?)-dara r. 367
Shāki (Shakkū) 77, 144, 398
Shāl 137
Shālahīt see Sumatra 57, 187
Shulanba 135
Sha-lā see Kāshghar
Shamagān 129
Shamākhī (Shammākhīya) 144, 403
Shānāt 125
Shāmistiān 17
Shānkūr (Shamkhor) 144, 398
Shān-chou, cf. Sha-chou, 230
Shan-shan 258
Shantarīn see Santarem
Shantarīyā (read Shantabriya; Cento-briga) 69, 155, 205, 417–8
Shantung 221
Shāpūr 376 see Bishāpūr
Shāpurkāst, cf. Khurramābād 132, 383
Shāristān, near Nasā 325
Sharja 148
Sharkhiyān (Charkhiyān) 6
Shā-to t. 266, 267, 270
Shātūr (Shātūr) r., cf Shūsh 214
Shāvārān (Shābārān) 145, 404, 408
Shāvghar 454
Shayzar 150
Shetland is. 191
Sh.gh.īl. 306
Shibām (spelt: Shīyām) 66, 147, 203
Shīhr 148
Shīhā, Shīlā see Corea
Shīlā (Shalī) 61, 119, 194, 358
Shimshāt (Arsamosata) 393
Shindān, in Daghestān (?) 411
Shing-bun (?) see S. ng-bun
Shing-i ‘Abbādī 105
Shinjū see Zaytun
Shīr, in Gilān 136
Shīrāz 6, 54–5, 126, 128
Shīrūzān 367
Shīrīn (Sirīn) r. see Hindīyān 74, 212–3, 378
Shīrīn-Tagāb 335
Shīrjān (Shirriz) 410
Shīrūz-Hazār 410
Shīrvān (Shirvan) 144–5, 193, 403–4, 410, 445, 454
Shīkāb (Shikakāth) 118, 357
Shīlāt (Sīlāt) 117, 356
Shorak p. 343
Shīrī rat. 217
Shūr-kath 118
Shūghārān (Shakīn, Shakīnān, Shākīnān, Siyāzār?) 63, 71, 86, 112, 349–50, 363–4, 366, 368
Shūr-lā see Kūshghar
Shūmān 115, 120, 337
Shūmaysbāt (Sumaysat, Samosata) 76, 148, 303
Shūrā, in Sind 123
Shūr-kul, cf. Tūz-kul 184, 290
Shūrīn 105, 327
Shūsh (Susa) 40, 75, 131, 214
Shūsha, in Transcaucasia 308
Shūshtar (Tustar) town and r. 74, 130, 213–4
Silkot 249
Siao-shih 294
Sibdāst 200
Sibī (Shibī), in Kirmān 125, 375
Sibinakān (Iṣfaṇaqān) 103, 325
Si-chou see Yar-khoto
Sicily (Sīqīliya) 26, 59, 192
Sīf bani Ṣafarr 377
Ṣīrfin 141
Ṣijilmāsa 82, 154, 223
Sikand (Shīkand), cf. Yar-khoto 273
Sīḵāshim see Lāḵāshim
Sīḵmīšt see Ishāmīšt
Sīkul, on the Issik-kul 99, 299
Silistria (Distra) 313
Silver island see Jazīrat al-fīḍḍa
Simhapura (Seng-ho-pu-lo) see S. lābūr
Simingān 63, 108, 109
Simnān 36, 64, 135
Sinai see Ţūr-Sīnā; S. desert see Tīḥ
Sīnd 19, 34, 36, 52, 64, 80, 83, 89, 109, 122–3, 125, 163, 371; desert 109; village near Nasā 185
Sīnd-rūd, cf. Indus 72, 327
Sīndān, port in India 57, 88, 244–5
Sīnān 74, 127, 212, 377
Sīnīn 76, 141
Sīpāhān see Isphāhān
Sīpurīyān see Isfārīyān
Surāf 40, 74, 127, 224
Sir-daryā see Jaxartes
Sīrgān (Surīgān) 124–5, 374
Sîrīn see Shīrīn (Hindīyān) r.
Sîrma (Srem) 441
Sīrurray 147
Sirvān, near Šaymān 132, 218
Sīsār 218
Sīstān 19, 36, 55, 73, 80, 110, 125; desert 80, 123
Siyāh-kūh (Mangdishlaq) 60, 193
Sīvī, in Baluchistān 111, 146
Sīyāhkal 388, 390
Tabghach (Taughast, China under Wei dynasty) 284, 448
Tablán (Ṭaflān, Ṭaylān) 156, 421
Tährís 142
Tabük 148
Tadmur 81, 149
Ta‘īi see Taqi
Ṭaqān (Turṭān?) mt. 62, 94, 194, 271, 293
Taḥdumbash-Pamir 370
Tahā, in Egypt 476
Ṭahart 154
Ṭahī see Tari
Ṭa‘īf 146
Ṭa‘īn fil-bahr see Jabal-T.
Ṭa‘īr-su, cf. Andichāragh 360
Ṭajikistan 253
Ṭagus (Ṭaju) r. 79, 155, 205
Ṭaḵka-Desa, cf. Ṭaqī 239, 249-50
Takrit 66, 76, 140, 201
Ṭalas see Taḵrāz, cf. Kūm-Talas
Ṭalaqān, near Ṭaqīn 132; in Gūzgān 157, 107, 200, 333, 335; in Ṭukhrāstān (Ṭāraqān, Ṭayaqān) 63, 109, 330, 340-1, 349
Ṭa‘īlish (Ṭaylāsīh?) 391
Ṭālkh. 98
Ṭalvār see Munk r.
Ṭarnakhā 116
Ṭamtrakha (Ṭaman, Tmutarakhan) 181, 422
Ṭamzān 106, 334, 336
Ṭambāl-i Mūristān 212
Ṭaṁm t. 146
Ṭamlsha 134, 386
Ṭamīstān 128
Ṭamliyat (Namlīyat) 120, 360
Ṭərnān 106, 334, 336
Ṭānā (Ṭānā), near Bombay 238
Ṭanas 154
Ṭangier (Ṭanja) 53, 78, 154
Ṭangut 228
Ṭānis (Ṭanais), cf. Don 216
Ṭanu-ola mt. 283
Ṭānūkh 67, 204
Ṭapti r. 196, 198
Ṭāq 110
Ṭaqī (Ṭaqīn), cf. Ṭakka-desa 91, 239, 249, 251
Ṭarābulus, in Syria 9, 81
Ṭarān 58, 190
Ṭarāz (Ṭalas, Ulugh Talas) 61, 100, 119, 194, 202, 269, 274, 292, 303, 306, 308, 357; r. 286, 358
Ṭarbaghatāi range, cf. To-ta 274, 278, 283, 286
Ṭari (Ṭahi), in Nubia 164, 475, 482
Ṭarīm (Kuchā, Wajākh) r. 70, 206-7, 222, 235
Ṭarqu (Ṭarquhu), cf. Samandrā 452
Ṭarkūs (Ṭarkūsh) 118
Ṭarmidh (Ṭirmidh, Termez) 71, 114
Ṭarnūt 221
Ṭars-aqan r. see Ishim 202
Ṭarsūs 149
Ṭarum, in Fārs 128
Ṭas (Ṭanās?) 65
Ṭasāwaw, in N. Africa 474
Ṭa-ših, cf. Wen-su 294
Ṭashkent see Chich
Ṭash-Qurghan, in Sārikol 233, 369
Ṭasht (Bakhtagan) l. 183
Ṭat t., in Shīrāz 408, 456
Ṭatabi t. 284
Ṭatar, a Turkish t. 285; Volga T. 460
Ṭatār, cf. Mongols 94, 270
Ṭatār, a branch of Kīmāk 304, 309, 317
Ṭaurus 204; Cilician 205
Ṭa‘ūs fortress, cf. Tūlās 460
Ṭaushqan (spelt: T.f.skhan, Ṭaghus Khan, or, if spelt Ṭawush Khan), cf. Aq-su 278, 296
Ṭavarān, near Tūs 103
Ṭavāvis 113
Ṭavaj 74, 212, or Tavaz 127, 377
Ṭaylasān (Ṭālīsh) 180, 391
Ṭaymā 148
Ṭavy mts., cf. Jabālān 67, 203, 221
Ṭ.bāgh r., read Yabāghu
Ṭekke r. 275
Ṭeknābād 345
Ṭephrīkē see Ābrīq
Ṭerek r., cf. Armn 204, 457
Ṭerter (Thrathūr, Bardha’a) r. 400
Ṭhājak (?) t. and r., near Khotan, cf. Wajakh 70-1
Ṭhātha, cf. Maṇḍura and Lohāri 372
Ṭhāy (Qīy) 84, 229
Ṭhrace (Thrāqiyā) 32, 40-1, 79, 156-7
Ṭhrasecion 156
Ṭhughūr al-Jazīra see Jazīra
Ṭhule is. (Ṭūlī, Tūliya, Shetland is.) 52, 59, 181, 191
Ṭib, in Khūzistān 131
Ṭibet (Ṭubbat, Ṭublūt) 24-5, 34-5, 39, 61, 63, 70, 86, 83-6, 90, 92-4, 96, 97, 112, 116, 119, 121, 233, 254-63, 284, 349, 482; Bolorian T. (Balkistān) 93, 258; Gate of T. 39, 120, 385; Inner T. 369; Outer T. 248
Ṭibetans 39, 85, 93, 121, 227, 234, 256, 267
Tro-ko ch‘eng, cf. Lou-lan 335
Ṭišīn 43, 144, 447, 456, 458
Ṭigris 10, 76, 138-41, 218
Ṭīh bani Ṭisrā’il (Sinai desert) 67
Ṭiḥāna 146, 293; mts. 66, 77, 145
Ṭījaspi 391
Ṭījin, in Gilan 137, 390
Ṭījn see Tizhīn
Ṭiļ (Ṭill), on the Hilmand 73, 111, 211, 345
Ṭimbuktu 477
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Tüniş 153
Tünkät see Nükath 24, 117, 356
Tünkät-i B.khārānī 118
Tünk-i, cf. Tünkät 289
Turä, in Egypt 476
Turān, in Baluchistān 123, 372
Turār-Zarākah, on the Jaxartes, cf. Otrar 358
Turfan (cf. Taqfan) 26, 195, 229, 271
Turghay r. 308
Türkis 264, 268, 278, 285, 287–8, 291, 298, 300, 302, 347; Black T. 301–3;
Yellow T. 301–2, 317
Tūrjī (?) 134
Turks 11, 20, 32, 36, 38, 44, 82, 85, 94 (Toghuğhzuz), 96, 101, 115–9, 121, 160, 456 and passim; Tork, i.e. Ghuz in Russia 316; Turk-Magyar 469; Balqar T. 445; K.njina T. 120, 361
Turkistan, ‘Turkish lands’ 38, 61, 94, 102, 118, 121, 351; Eastern T. 24;
Gates of T. 38, 102, 112, 115, 122
Türkman (Ghuz) 311, 317
Turshiz 103
Tūr-Sinā (Sinai) 67
Tūs 29, 55, 64, 77, 103, 133, 185;
1. (Chashma-yi sabz, Shahd) 55, 185
Tūsmāt (?), in Tibet 61, 93, 194, 259
Tustar see Shūsttar
Tuwas, see Thule is. 59
Tuwaysha 378
Tuyugh-ghun, cf. Ajyul 258
Tuz-cholii, in Asia Minor 183
Tuz-kul, cf. Issik-kul, Boro-dabasun, Shur-kul 28, 54, 98, 184, 290
Tuzūn-anj (hardly Usun-aghacli), near the l. Tūz-kul 98, 184, 195, 290
Tuzūn-bulagh 98, 184, 290
Tusmat see Tūsmat
Tūshār 93, 91, 198, 239, 248
Ubulla (Bula) 76, 138
Uch-qurīgan 284
Ugra r. 323
Új (Uch-Turfan) 28, 98, 293–5
Uijnayn, cf. Nūn’īn 189, 245, 336
‘Ukbarā 76, 140, 218
Úk-tagh mt. 305
‘Ulayq (‘Aliq?), mt. in Armenia 76
Ulu-tau, cf. Kundāvar mt. 202, 308
Uninhabited Lands, of the North 42,
96, 99, 101, 156, 158–9, 316; of the South 69, 83, 163, 165
‘Uqāb (?), in Arabia 148, 413
Ural mts. 204, 306, 443; r. see Yayiq
Úrasht (Uraż) 72, 116; r. 355
Urdun (Jordan) r. 150
Urgūn (?), cf. Farmul 251
Úrkath (Uzkath?) 99, 304
Urmiya 143, 183; l. (Kabudhān) 379
Úrshfin, cf. Mandūr-pattan, Mandam 27, 87, 243
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Yahūdhan see Jahūdhan
Yahūdīlīq 117
Yakh-su (Akhshū), cf. Kulāb r. 208
Yakh, Kūh-i yakh see Qasak
Yakutsk 285
Yalama r. 456
Yālāpān (?) 118
Yamāk (Yīmāk), cf. Kimāk, Namakīya 305, 316
Yamakoṭi see Jamagird 189
Yamāmā 146
Yamgān, Y.nb.qān see Yungān
Yamkert see Jamagird
Yangi-Bailj, in the T'ien-shan 235, 272
Yängi-Kand see Dīh-i nau
Yang-tse kiang 105, 206, 208, 228, 230
Yār, near the Issik-kul [perhaps = Sārīgh] 292, 297-8
Yarkhoto (Si-chou) 265
Yārīm, in Arabia 413
Yārkand 248; r. 206
Yasi p. 292-3, 310
Yasin-Gilgit r. 210
Yavadvipa (Ibadjīu, Jāzīrat al-fidda) 186
Yayik (Ural) r. 215, 309, 313-4
Yazd (Katha) 129, 380
Yazdāshir, in Kirmān 375
Yazidiyā, in Shīrvān 404
Yemen 20-1, 40, 66, 81, 146-7
Yen-ch'i see Qarasar 275
Yenisey r. 196, 283, 286, 362
Yevlakh, on the Kurr 400
Y.ghsūn-Yāstī, in Kimakīa 100, 309
Yīghur see Yughur
Yīghur of Turkīstān 309
Yūmār see Obi
Y.ra r., near Khotān 255
Yū-chou, cf. Uj, Wen-su 27, 294
Yugria, “Southern” (?) 318
Yūkand 117
Yūghūr (Yīghūr, Kimak-Yīghūr), a t. near the Aral sea 180, 215, 319, 312
Yu-kud, in the T’ien-shan 275-6
Yungān 367-8
Yūn (f) kingdom, in Tūkhārīstān 109, 340, 349
Yūn (Bwr, Mwr ?) l., in Fārs 54, 127, 183
Yūnān see Greek 158
Yūngū see Aq-su 296
Yūn-nan 236, 240
Yūn.s mt. see Tūlas 287
Yūrā (Yūghrah), t. 309-10, 437
Zāb, Greater and Lesser 76
Zabīd 20-1, 40, 147
Zābul (Jābulistān) 112, 346
Zaghāwā (spelt: Lābā) 165, 477
Zagros 383
Zakatali (according to A. Genko, *Zakaratāl “Zacharia’s plot”) 410

Zāmīn 115
Zamīn-dāvar 64, 111, 177, 344-5
Zamūr 290
Zamr-i Ātash-parast 366
Zandana 112
Zandarāmīsh 116
Zangān 132
Zangi, “East-Africans” 51, 163-4; Wāq-wāqian Z. 56
Zangistān (Zangībār, Zanj) 33-4, 52, 83, 163-4, 179, 228, 471-2; sea 52
Zangūya 262
Zarafshān r. see Soghd r.; range see Buttamān 211
Zarah 55, 73, 185
Zāri-i Murgh mt., in Ghūr 343
Zarīn-rūd (Zāyanda-rūd) 131, 383
Zarmān (spelt: Armān) 113, 352
Zarq, in Marv 105
Zarqūn, in Fārs 128, 379
Zava, near Khotan 93, 259
Zawīla, in Fazzān 153, 416, 477
Zaybāk, cf. R.ḥkt.j.b 120, 364-5, 367
Zaydān 380
Zayla’ (spelt: Ryn) 474
Zaytūn, in China 227
Zhāhsīt (Jaḥš, Raḥshīt) 63, 120, 361, 363
Zīna-āb 353
Zinvar 114
Zīrīgān, in Daghestān 450
Zīrkhān 365
Z.kat see Uzkath 291
Zūghar (Zo’ar) 67, 151, 415
Zūzān (Zūzan) 103

The following names could not be transliterated in Latin characters:

تقویم, in Transoxiana 117
اوردکی, mt. in Armenia 218
أردکی, 229
تقویم، (اوردکی) east of the Aral sea 306, 315, 317
نانوجس, in Transoxiana 118
سکان, in Toghuqzghuz 95
بی‌سیحول, in Khallukh 98
دژ, in Fārs 17, 95
نیلان (Nylan?), in Gilan 136
سکان, in Transoxiana 118
بی‌سیاحون (جهانی), in Transoxiana 117, 357
دژ, in Transoxiana 118
بی‌سیکسون, in Transoxiana 117
دژ (نیلان), in Farghana 116
سکان (M.škan?), in Transoxiana 116, 355
بی‌سیکسون, in Transoxiana 119
نیلان (M.škan?), in the Hindūkush 121
لحم, in Sīstān 345
Chasdai ben Shafriot 470
Chaulukya dynasty 250
chorepiscopos (korikos) 402

Dahum (Ruhibi, &c.), king in India 62, 72, 80, 87, 236–8.
Daniel, prophet 131, 382.
Dān-sānkū, see B.dān-sānkū
Daqiqi, poet 178
Dārā (Darius) 129
Dārmashī-shāh (Varmēshān), in Gūz-gān 106, 333
Dhāṅga, Chandāl king 237
Dib-baqūy 357
Dīhqān-i Ḫāqān 117, 356
Dīhqān-i Shāhāt 120
Dula, Alan prince 457
Daqqāq, Ḥasan Abū Sa‘īd 127, 377
elṭābīr, Turkish title 265
Erān-shāh (?), see Layzān-shāh 407
Faḍl b. Sahl 350
Faḍl b. Yahyā, Barmakid 350, 361
Faghūr-i Chūn 84
Fāʾl, amīr 176
Fānā-Khusrāw, see Panā-Khusrāw
Fardūn (Afraidhān, Faridhān) 6, 84, 106, 174, 227
Farīghūnids 4–7, 173–8, 336, 344
Fāṭimids, cf. Maghrībīt 20, 27, 89, 239, 246, 415
Fazārī, astronomer 133, 189, 384
Fazīghūn, cf. Afrīgh 173
Filān-shāh 454

Galen (Jīlūn) 151
Ghāba, king in India, cf. Ḫāba 237
Ghadā’irī, poet 384
Ghaznavids 30, 177, 343–4, 346
Ghūr-shāh 1, 5, 110
Gog and Magog (absent in the text) 439, 451
Gurjara-Pratihāra dynasty 198, 239, 246, 249
Gūz-gān-khudāh 175

Habbār b. al-Aswad 372
Ḥaǧjāb b. Yūsuf 138
Hallāj 23, 128, 379
Ḥarīmānīids 20
al-Harīb, Abū Nāṣr 18
Ḥārūn al-Rashīd 103, 149
Ḥasan Baṣrī 139
Ḥāshim b. Bānjūr 353
Ḥātim b. Dā’ūd, of Khuttalān 361
Ḥekmat, A. A. khān 376
Hermer 37, 152
Ḥiwāl, rulers of Ṣan‘a’ 20
Ḥsi Tsung, emperor 267
Ḥsian Tsung, emperor 265
Huang-Ch‘ao 259, 267

Ibrahim Darbandi, ruler of Shīrīn 405

Idīqut, king of Bish-balīq 271
Idrīsids 417
Ikhshid, kings of Farghānā 355
Īlmāli, a.n.-jaḥīya 288
Ilyāsid dynasty 374
Issa 150
Ismā‘il ibn-‘Abbād, minister 18
Ismā‘il ibn-Ḥamadh, Sāmānīd 6, 176
I Tṣung 265

Iṣbā ‘the Indian’, king of Sumatra (?) 57, 249
Iṣbā-yi khushk, “Continental” Iṣba 63, 249
jaḥīya see yahgūh
jaḥīya 208
Jacob 150
Ja‘far b. Sahl b. Marzbān 6–7
Jalāl al-dīn Khwārazm-shāh 348
Javānshīr b. Grigor 396
Jaypāl of Vayhind 92, 237, 254
Jebu-Khākan 304
Jesus 150
Jubbā‘ī, Abū ‘Alī 130
jula, Magyar title 101, 320, 333
Julandā būl-K.ār. 143
Julandīds 39, 40, 390

Kābil, king of Nubia 78, 164, 475
Kābul-shāh 350
Kabārang 379
Kasrānid dynasty 404, 406
Kaykā‘ūs 189
Khādīu 275
Khāqān Rūṣ see Rūṣ-khāqān
Khāqān of Tibet 85
Khazar-khāqān 451
Khikhāz-khāqān 96, 97
Khumār-bīk 349, 394
Khusrūn-shāh 144, 404, 455
Khūr-tegin 355
Khtogān 288
Khvārazm-shāh 121–2, 174, 180, 309–10, 348, 371
Kimāk-khāqān 100; Kimāk-yahgūh 310

King of the East, see Sāmānīds 112
Kisāʾ the Reader 133, 384
k.nda, Magyar title 320, 323
k.n.d., title 323–4
Kobrat 467, 470
kūdārkīn, title 312
Kūl-tegin 302
Kūr-stul (Kūl-chur) 301

Layth, Saffārid 110
Lbān-shāh, cf. albān 454
Li-k‘o-yung 267
Layzān-shāh (Lāyrān, &c.) 144, 404–11
Lohara dynasty 250
Long-tegin see P‘ang-t‘ē-lē 226
mir-i rudd 113
Louis the Pious, emperor 433
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Maghribi, cf. Fātimids 3, 246
al-maharaj of Zabaj 473
Mahdi, caliph 10, 311
Maḥmūd Ghaznavid 6, 27, 176, 327, 336, 346
Mahoyada, cf. Ba’ūra 253
Ma’mūn, caliph 10–11, 40, 112, 140, 220, 350
Ma’mūnids of Khwārazm 174, 371
manaf (?) 293
Mānī 25, 84–5, 130, 269
Maniach, a Soghdian 293
Manjik, poet 178
Mansūr, caliph 138
Mansūr (b.) Nūh, Sāmānid 6
Marwān, Omayyad 452, 455, 476
al-Marwazi, Ḥusayn b. ‘Alī, a general 16
al-Marwazi, Muhammad Su’luk 16
Marzbān b. Zādiya 6
Marzubān b. Muḥammad, Musafirids 396–7, 406, 409
Mas‘ūd Ghaznavid 177, 334, 336, 343
Mazyadids 404
Māzūr, 387
Mīlān dynasty 397
Mīnhāb (Fanjab, puigawa?), king of Zabaj 164
Moses 148, 449
Muḥammad b. Aḥmad, Abūl-Muẓaffar, of Chaghāniyān 178
Muḥammad b. Ahmad, Abūl-Hārith, Farīghūnī vii, 4, 6, 49, 173, 175–6
Muḥammad b. Faḍl Qarmati 21, 66, 203
Muḥammad b. Hasan the Lawyer 133, 384
Muḥammad b. Yazīd, Šīrāz-shāh 406, 455
Muḥammad Ghaznavid 177
Muḥammad Khwārajshāh 309
Muḥammad Nādir khan, king of Afghanistan 337
Muḥammad b. Zakariyyā Rāzī 132, 384
Muḥtaf family of Chaghāniyān 353
Mu‘izz, Paṭīdīm 27
Muntāṣir, Sāmānid 177
al-Muquanna‘ 311, 356
Muqṭādir, caliph 352, 460
Musafirids 394, 396
Muṭaqūd, caliph 15
Muṭa‘amid, caliph 12–13
Muṭaṣīm, caliph 11, 40, 140
Mutawakkil, caliph 140
Naṣir al-Daula, Ḥamdānī 20
Naṣīr al-dīn Shāh 390
Naṣr b. Ahmad, Sāmānid 116
Naṣr II 16–17, 22
Nayzak [Nizāk?] 332
Nayzak Tarkhān 327, 338, 340
Nimrūd 139
Nizām al-mulk 377
N. jāba, cf. Jāba 249, 251

Noah 66, 412
Nūḥ b. ʿAsād, Sāmānid 358
Nūḥ b. Mansūr, Sāmānid 4, 176, 178
Oldenburg, S. F. x
Oleg 433
‘Omar b. ‘Abd al-ʿAzīz, in Manṣūra 88
‘Omar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb 139
Omayyads 155, 417
Pāḥkh (?), prince in Ṭukhāristān 109
Panā-Khusraw, Bāyid 28, 124
Pāng-t’ē-le 226, 264
Parvūda, son of Shāba 185
Pārān 205
Prālambha dynasty 240
P. rvān-żābhūn 482
Pu-ku-ts’un, Uyghur chief 265
Qadīr-khan Qangli 309
Qalin b. Sh. khūr, in Kan-su (?) 227
Qara-Khānids (Al-i Afrāsīyāb) 234, 278, 280, 287, 295, 299, 355
Qara-Khitay (Liao) dynasty 276
qinna, Russian title 429
Qubilay 228
Qut-ṭegīn (Qutegin), ruler of the Labān t. 292, 301
Qutayba b. Muslim 338, 340
Rā‘ī b. Rā‘ī (Za‘ī b. Zā‘ī) 165, 476
Rās-Ṭarkhan 451
Rāstrakūta dynasty 238
Rāvshār, see Rvshār 332
Ibn Rawwād 143, 395
rāy, Indian rajah 62, 72, 238; cf. Ballabāy
rāyina [*rāniya?], Indian queen 87, 238, 243
R-.hmā, see Dahum 237
R‘urik 433
Rūs-khāqān 159, 433, 436, 438
Rustam 17, 280
Rusudan, queen of Georgia 397
Rutbil, see Zunbil
Sabuktagin 30, 176, 342, 344
Sa‘d ibn Abī Waqqās 140
Ṣaffārids 6, 176
ṣaghūn, title 291
Ṣailendras (Srīvijaya) dynasty 241
Ṣalmān al-Fārisī 453
Ṣalūqīyūn dynasty 91, 239, 249
Ṣām (Ṣāma b. Lu‘ayy), ruler of Multān 89, 239
Sāmānids 5–6, 16, 30, 102, 175–7, 227, 270, 352, 357
Sanjar, sultān 311
Sarv, known to Firdausī 17
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Satuq Bughra-khan 278, 281
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Simchowitsch, J. N. 450
Simon de Keza 352
Sīyast-nāma, by Nizām al-mulk 280, 337, 349
Sköld, Hannes 318, 367
Smirnov, I. N. 402-4
Smirnov, P. 427, 432, 438
Smith, V. 235, 250
Spitsin, A. A. 427
Sprenger 223, 355, 366, 411
Stackelberg, R. von 330
Stahl, A. F. 200, 385, 387, 410
Stark, Freya 388
Stigland, Capt. H. 471
Storbeck, F. 471
Strabo 192
Streck 392, 395
Sudais 421
Sulaymān al-Māhrī 235
Sulaymān-the-Merchant xvii, 236, 238, 242, 249, 473
Suter 189
Sykes, Sir Mark 398
Sykes, Sir P. 185
Syriac Map, see Mingana
Tabqat-i Naṣīrī 273, 309, 327, 332, 342-3, 348
Ṭabarī 10-11, 267 (iii, 1044), 288 (ii, 1604), 290, 300 (ii, 1593), 301 (i, 1613), 332 (iii, 1875), 335 (ii, 1206), 337 (ii, 1180), 338 (ii, 1612), 359 (ii, 1492), 384, 396 (ii, 1049), 404 (iii, 645), 406 (iii, 650), 410 (i, 2658, iii, 1015)
al-Tadmūrī 418
Taḏjkistān volume 367
Tallgren 170, 191
Tamūm b. Bahr al-Muṭṭawwī’i 13, 26, 268-70, 272, 481
Tang-shu 264-5, 275, 286, 288, 301, 303, 311, 334, 366
Taqi-zadeh, E. H. X
Tārkhi-i Ālam-dīr 391
Tārkhi-i Armiṇī 407
Tārkhi-i Khānī 388
Tārkhi-i Nādirī 326-7
Tārkhi-i Rashīdī 25, 233, 255-6, 258, 262, 369
Tārkhi-i Sīstān 344
Tārkhi al-Sūdān ed. Houdas 476
Tārkhi-i Ulightlya 384, 390
Tārkhi-i Yamūnī 4, 6, 27, 30, 173, 175-7, 327, 344
Tate, G. P. 344
Táuberler 444
Tha’lībī, Ābū Mansūr Ḥusayn 186, 295, 330
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Theophylactus Simokatta 229, 266, 448
Thomas, F. W. 233, 238; and Sten Konov 271, 292
Thomas Arstorms 447
Thomsen, V. 232, 263, 302, 433-4, 436
Tiesenhauen, baron V. G. 427
Tkatsch 432
Toumansky, A. G. viii-x, 3-4, 6-7, 19, 30-1, 41, 44, 174, 324, 427, 432, 466
Trogus Pompeius 445
Trubetskov, Prince N. S. 455
Ṭūrāḵ-i Bābūrī 253
Ulugh-beg viii, 3
Unbegau, B. 432
Urnianko, I. I. 355
Unkrig, Dr. W. A. 194, 256, 258, 263
‘Utbi, see Tārkhi-i Yamūnī
Vakhshust, Prince 398, 457
D. LOCAL PRODUCTS AND SPECIALITIES

**Ambergris**—Hindūstān, Rāmī, Sāntārem

**Animals:** *Civet Cats*—Sarandib; *Elephants*—Andrāś, &c., China, Qīmār, U.r.shīfīn, Ursīhīn; *Game*—Ararat, Gūzī, Jāba-al-Qīlāf, Yaghmā; *Harts*—Ighrājlīt; *Monkeys*—Yemen; *Muscles*—Sarandib, Sākūjī, Tūlās; *Rhinoceros*—Qāmarūn, Rāmī, Sarandib, Wāq-wāq; *Wild Asses*—mt. of the Oases, region between Egypt and Nubia; *Wild Sheep*—mt. of the Oases

**Antidotes**—Rāmī, Būshāng

**Armour, Arms, Coats of Mail**—Ghūr; *Arrows*—Chāch, Sīlāshīm; * Blades*—Uṛtāb; *Bow*—Chāch; “Solomontian Sword”—Rūs (p. 437)

**Asa Foetida**—Merv, Sāntān

**Birds:** ‘Akha—on the Tarim; *Faucons and Pelnicans*—Dihistanān-sur; *Indian Cuckoos*—K.rūrī, *Parrots and Peacocks*—India

**Brooms**—Gīlān

**Caraway**—Barda

**Cardamum**—Sarandib

**Carpets**—Fārs, Rūm (tānfās); *Prayer*—Gīlān, Jahrum, Mūqān; *Wooden*—Bukhārā, Dārzāngī; *Zilā*—Akhlāt

**Arjūj, Bargrī, Bidrīs, Guzgān, Jahrum, Khoy, Mūqān, Nākhehuvtān, Fārs, Sāntān; Rug*—Āmol, Fārs; *Palās-rugs*—Chaghānīyān, Gūzgān, Mūqān; *Stuff used as Carpets*—Sāntān, Tabaristān; cf. Gīlām

**Cattle**—Bulghārī, Hāshumkīrīt, Khazarīan Pecheneg, Khūr, Kīkānān, Maghrīb, Tūrān; *Asses*—Egypt; *Camels*—Sārakhīs, Shīb, Sīlābūr; *Cows*—Balūt, Chīglī, Ghūz, Gūzgān, Jalūt, Khazar, Khīrkūz, Sīlābūr, Tibet, Toghuẓghēz; *Horses*—Chadhghal, Chaghānīyān, Chīglī, Ghūz, Gūzgān, Kārūn, Khallukh, Khīrkūz, Khuttālān, K.rūl, &c., Tibet, Tukhs, Toghuẓghēz, Tukhārīstān, Yaghmā; *Mules*—Barda, Kīsh, *Sheep*—Balūt, Chadghhal, Chīglī, Ghūz, Gūzgān, Hāshumkīrīt, Inner Bulghār, Isbildāb, Jalūt, Khallukh, Khazar, Khazarīan Pecheneg, Khīrkūz, Kh.mūd, Kīmāk, N.zvān, Rang-Rong, Shāylākūn, Sān, Sāqālīb, Sīlābūr, Tibet, Toghuẓghēz, Tukhs, Tukhārīstān, Yaghmā, Zābulīstān; *Vakhshī Sheep*—Livkand; *Swine*—Sāqālīb; *Yaks*—Sākūjī
Index D

Sirrayn; Mīllet—Ṣaqlāb, Kirmān; Rice—Daylamān; Sorghum—Mughān, &c., Sirrayn; Wheat—Ṣanā'
Cheese (?)—Karaj-i Rūdhrāvar; Rukh-bīn—Kāth
China (ghadārā)—China, Rayy
Gimmamon—China, Dārchin
Clothing: Aprons—Baṣra; Cloaks—Ispahān, Rayy; Handkerchiefs—Egypt; Kerchiefs—Amol, Bulī Kerchefs—Ubullā, Gold Shot—Amol; Puttees—Dārzangi; Quilted Garments—Kāth; Robes—Egypt; Stockings—Rūm, Ģūs; Trouser-cords—Akhlaṭ, &c., Duvin, Khūzistān, Ṣīm, Šalamās, Ṣīb, Ģūs, Wāṣīt; Turbans—Bam, Shūsh, Bulī Turbans—Ubullā, Stuff for Turbans—Khalīkhīn, R. bind; Woolen Tāylasān—Rayy; Veils—Baylaqān, Viqāya Veils—Guzgān
Clothes—Jāba, Salāḥīt, Sarandīb
Condiments—Marv
Coral—Hindūstān, Ṭabarqa
Cords—Hemp—Samarqand
Cotton—Dāhum's country, Marv, Ni-shāptūr, Qabāb, Rayy
Crimson—Duvin
Cumin—Bahrūgān, Kūmīn, &c.
Curtains—Bāsunay
Cushions, Covers for—Kāth
Drinks (potions?)—Baghdād
Drugs—Farghāna, Khalīkhīn, Khurāsān, Kish, Transoxiana, mt. between Coria and Truxillo; Cassia Fistulosa and Tamarind—Lab.rs.ri; Cubeb—Jāba, Salāḥīt; Emblica Officinalis, Myrobolan, Terminalia Belerica—road between Rāmīyān and Jalhadār; Gentian—Gīrbatīr; Tīryāk (antidote) plant—Būshāng
Electuaries—Baghdād
Fans—Tirmīdīch
Felts—Guzgān, Iṣbājāb, Kāth, Ṭalaqān (Guzgān)
Fish—Abaskūn, Arzan 1., Bankālūs, Bāzhgān, Caspian sea, Daylamān, Mymāṭy 1., Majgharī; Māha fish—Gīfān
Frankincense—Shihr
Fruit—Arkt, 'Ayn-Zarba, Barda', Bokhārā, Burūgīrīd, Dīza, Farah, Kumīsh, Malatīya, Marūd, Mīzhān, Nihāvand, Palestīn, Qazvīn, Sīmīn-gān, Simmān, Tukhrāsān; Dried—Bust; Almonds—Lahore; Apples—Īṣṭakhr; Bansān—Bālzās, Bankālūs; Chestnuts—Barda'; Citrons—Amol, Bālk; Fragrant citrons—Shūsh; Yellow Citrons—Damascus; Coco-nuts—Bālūs, Bankālūs, Kanbāya mt. La-

hore, Sarandīb, Sīlābūr; Dates—'Abdāsī, Alīn, Arabīa, Bam, Bayās, Farah, Bahrūgān, &c., Nahrawān, Nim-Rūdī, Qandābī; Dried dates—Sīstān; Fīgs—Hulwān; Grapes—Hamdān (p. 146), Mirvāt (p. 321); Hazel-nuts—Lishtar; Jalghuza—Lahore; Mulberry—Barda'; Oranges—sour—Amol, Balkh; Pomegranates—Khujand; Raisins—Karūkḫ, Mālin (Ṭā'īfī)
Fuel—Ararat, Jābal al-Qīlāl, Mīzhān
Furs—Khallūkh, Khirkhīz, Kuyāba, N.zūn, Tūkhs, Yaghmā; Beaver—Qabala; Ermine—Tibet; Foxes, Black—Tibet, Toghuzehzuh; Striped and Red—Toghuzehzuh; Grey Squirrels—Tibet, Tūlas; Lamskins—Kurdar; Safari (?)—Toghuzehzuh; Sable Martens—Kīmāk, Tibet, Tudela, Tūlas (cf. pp. 196, 278); Weasel—Barāḍīhās, Tibet
Gülims (Tapestry Woven Carpets)—Dārzangi, Pāz, Wāṣīt; Blue—Rūdīhān; Kūmīsh Gülims—Amol
Glass—see Niṣībīn and p. 165
Glace-decor—Baghdād, Rayy (?)
Grape-syrup—Araghān, Baun, Herat
Honey—Ādharbayjān, Armenia, Arrān, Saqlāb, Sīlābūr
Insects and Reptiles: Crocodiles—Būṣr; Flies (carnivorous)—Sirr; Mosquitoes (pashsha)—Nīh, Tamīsha; Scorpions—Kāshān, Niṣībīn, Ḫīms, Ṭabarqa; Snakes—Aḥwāz, Ārtūj, Ḫīms, Niṣībīn
Khōkīrī, Chinese—China
Khūtī-Horn—China, Khirkhīz, Tibet
Leather—Anbīr, Sind
Mahfūrī [Plates?]—Khursān
Mamma (shirhīshīt)—Herat (cf. p. 343) (tarangabin)—Kish
Mats—'Abbadān, Amol, Gīlān, Māmṭīr; Green—Tirmīdīch
Metals: Copper—Bārjān mt., Cyprus, Farghāna, Georgīan mts., Guzgān, Kīrmand, Sardān, Spain, Tūs; Gold—Abyssinia, Akhsīkāt, Badhakshān, China, Chinese mts., Farghāna, Gold is., Guzgān, Ḫāq, Jābal al-Qamar, al-Jazā'īr al-Kh̄alīya, Khurāsān, Kuttālān, Kīrmand, Mughātam mt., N.zūn, Pāz, Qāmarān, Ribāt-i Karvān, Rang-Rang, Rūshāhān, between Rūm and Armenia, Sands of the Mines, Sārīr, Šatīf, Sījīl-māsā, Spain, the Sudān, Sūs-the-Distant, Transoxiana, Wāq-Wāq,
Zâbaj, Zangistān, Zawila; |auriferous sands—|Jiruf, Sijilmāsa; |Iron—Ban-
kālūs (?), Dunbāvand, Gûzgân, Iṣṭakhr mt., Sâmâr, Surūshā; |Lead—Bâr-i-
Farghâna, Gûzgân, Kirmān, Sâmâr, Sarîf, Spain, Transoxiana, Tûs; |Quicksilver—Farghâna, Sokh (? § 25, 40.); |Silver—Akhšikâth, And-
dârāb, Georgian mts., Gûzgân, Ilaq, Jabal al-Qamar, Jârîyâna, Khorâsân, Khuṭtafân, Kîrmān, Kûh-i Sîm, Kûhsaym, Muqṭâṭm, Nâyîn, Panîhîr, Pârs, Sardan mt., Silver is., Transox-
iana; |Tim—Kala [cf. p. 187]

Minerals: Ammoniac—Buttāmân, Far-
ghâna, Transoxiana; |Antimony—
Gûzgân, Sâmâr, Tûs; |Arsenic—
Transoxiana, Dhakhkâth, Kuchâ [p. 226]; |Besoar Stone—Farghâna, |Bitumen—Dârâgird; |Crystal—Bagh-
dâd; |Emery—Qâmarûn, Sarandib mt.; |Glass Stone—Nisîbîn (cp. p. 393); |Lode Stone—Bârījân, Farghâna, Kirmân; |Marble-like Stone—Sîmîn-
gân; |Naphta—Bâkû; |Plasma—Cyp-
rus; |Salt—Abbadân, Dârâgird, Kash-
mîr, Kuhak, Lîmrâk, Rûdhân, Tuz-
kûl, Yûn; |Black and Yellow Salt—
Dârâgird; |Red Salt—Dârâgird, Kish; |Salt-petre—Bukhârâ; |Mekkan Sand—
Arab country; |Red Sand—Hâbîr; |Schists, Combustible (†)—Farghâna; |Sulphur—Transoxiana; |Vitriol—Gûz-
gân, Transoxiana

Muskh—Baytâl, Bîhârî, Mûsâ, Khîr-
kîhîz, Tibet, Toghuzguzh, Tukhs, Vayhind

Napkins, Dessert—Dânghân
Nutmeg—Sarandib

Oil—Baghdâd, Rayy (? see p. 384)

Paper—Samarqand
Pearls—‘Aden, Hindûstân, Ganâfâ
sea, Khârâk, Khumdân, Râmî, Saran-
dib

Pepper—Kânbâyâ mt., Malay, Urshîn
Perfumed Waters—Sârî; |Palm-blossom,
Rose and Santoline—Gûr; |Saffron and
Sandalwood—Sârî; |Violet—Pârs

Plants: |Indigo—Bahrûgân; |Madder—
Barda’, Jazârît al-Bâb, Mûgân; |Saff-
ron—Burûgird, Chaghâniyân, Dar-
band-i Khazarân, Durghush, Karaj-i Rûdhîrâvar, Nîhâvand, Qum, Shû-
mân, Vayshagîrî; |Sûsan-i Nargis
Flower—Shîrâz; |Tabârkhân—Farghâ-
na; |Water Lilies—Balkh

Precious Stones—F.m, Khurāsân, Vay-
hind; |Chrysolites—mt. of the Oases; |Corundum—Hindûstân, Sarandib, Ta-
barnâ; |Diamonds—Hindûstân, Saran-
dib mt., Sarandib rs.; |Emeralds—mt.
of the Oases; |Garnets—Badhakhshân, |mt. of the Oases; |jade—Khotan rs.; |Lapis Lazuli—Badhakhshân; Rubies—
S.nâûlî; |Turquoise—Tûs

Qaraz—Maghrib (p. 417)

Red Abûnkh (?)—Sind

Sacks—Mûqân
Saddle-bags—Gûzgân; |Saddle-cloths,
Covers for—Sîkâshim; |Saddle-girths—
Gûzgân; |Horse-rugs—Baylaqân

Shagreen—Abâskûn

Shank (“White Conch”)—Dahum’s
country

Shoes—Başra, Kanbâya, Sind; |Yemen—
—Sa’dâ

Silk—Barda’, China, Nishâpûr; |Mul-
hân—Egypt; |Raw—Gûzgân, Khoto-
ran, Marv; |Textiles—Astârâbâd, |Bagh-
dâd, Ispâhân (‘Attabi, Siqâltîn); |Nishâpûr, Rûm, Sârî; |Black—Gû-
gân; |Khazz—Egypt, cf. p. 382; |Sun-
dus—Rûm; |Zâfâri (?)—Astârâbâd

Skins—Sa’dâ, Sind, Ta’îf; |Leopard—
Berbers; |Lizard—Malaga; |Panther—
Sûs-the-Distant

Slaves—Allân country, Darband-i Khâ-
zarân, Farghâna, Ghr, Khazar, Khazarian Fecheneg, Rûmiyân, Say-
lâkân, Sarîr, Sudân [cf. Adharbayjân, p. 142]

Snaps—Kath, Mîzhân

Soap—Bust, Tirmîdî

Spices—Sarandib

Spikenard—Jâba, Salâhîh, Sarandib

Stone Kettles—Nauqân

String Instruments—Saqâlân country

Sugar—Khûzîstân, Sâlûbî; |Red and
Refined—‘Askar-i Mukram; |Candy—
Bahrûgân, &c., Kiz, &c.; |Cane—
Bahrûgân, &c., Balkh, Bûlos, Balût,
Jallût, Mila

Sweets—Fîlîtâ—Marv; |Nânîf—Bay-
laqân

Tents—Tukhs

Textiles—Ardâvî, Astârâbâd, Barzand, 
Baylaqân, Dimyât, Ganâwî, ‘Irâq, 
Ispahân, Jâlîhandar, Jîbâl, Khurâsân,
Khûzîstân, Kûrîsh, Nishâpûr, Pârs, 
Rûm, Shûsh, Sînîz, Tavaz; |Brocades—
China, Gûzgân, Ídha (Shûshtar?), 
Rûm; |Cotton Stuffs—Baghdâd, Bum, 
Başra, Bust, Buzhâgân, &c., Herat, 
Kath, Kûrî, Nishâpûr, Pârs, Rayy; |Linen Cloth—Âmol, Başra, Daniqara, 
Darband-i Khazarân, Dhamîra, Dimyât, Pârs, Saqlâb, Tinnîs; |Mayâni—
Rûm; |Precious Stuffs—Shûsh, Vay-
hind; |Sûzangird—Qurqûb; |Velvet—
Jalhandar, Khâlkîn; Woollen Stuffs—Abaskûn, Chaghâniyân, Dîmyât, Ganja, Khûrsân, Marand, Shâmkuhr, Pârs, Tinnis; Red Woollen Stuffs—Rûdân Touch-Stone (mitâhk)—Shâvûrân; Whet-Stone (fasân)—Arab country, Râdwâ mt., Thámâma, Tûs.

Trees: Aloe—Dahum’s country, al-Jurz, Mandal, Qâmarûn, Qîmâr, Şanû; ’Ar’ar—Bûshang; Bamboo—Kala, Kanbîya mt., Sarandîb; Boxwood—Amîl; Brazil Wood—Râmî, Sarandîb; Camphor—Bâlus, Haranj, India, S. rîb, Zâbaj; Cotton-Tree—Andràs; Ebony—Silver is., Ashmûnayn; Khadang and Khlan-ji—Châch, Khirkhîz, cf. p. 465; Khînji (“White tree”)—Gûzgân; Rotang—Kanbîya rmt., Malay, Ur.shîn; Sandal—Jâba, al-Jurz, Sal élât; Red Sandal—Sâlqîyin; Teak—Silver is.; Timber—Jabal al-Qilîl, Khoy, &c. (?)

Vinegar—Marv

Wax—Âdharbayjân, Armenia, Arrân

Wine—K. n.d. rm, Rayv, Șaqlâb, Simin-gân, Surûsna, Tâlaqân

Wooden Utensils—Amîl, Daylâmân; Wine Vessels—Sâqlâb

Wool, dyed—Wâsîf

E. SELECTION OF CATCHWORDS


akhûn, “information [heard?]” 55, 79, 83

âlbûn, al-pâghût 292


Arabic, misunderstood in the H.-Â. 184, 384, 412

’ar’ar, “juniperus polycarpa” 104; cf. artûj 281

ashes, mounds of 129, 139

astronomical observations 58–9, 166, 190–1, 245

Bahâ t viii, ix

band, bâbû 220

bâftha, “swarm” 55, 179

bâzargânî (bâzurgânî), “business transactions” 115, 153

bearings, wrong xv, 192, 222, 289, 300, 316, 325, 351, 372–4, 376, 380, 443, 445

Bîh-Afûrîdî, sect 105, 328

bijâyân “desert, plain” 79, 221

brothels 88

Brahmins 88

Buddhists 233, 337; (shamant) 84, (but-parast) 85

champâ, a flower and a sort of rice 240

clime (iqlim) xviii, 61, 349; cf. 94, 111

Christians (tarsd) 95, 101, 140–2, 149–50, 158, 160–1, 164, 475–6; (kafiran) 144, 157

coins and money 90, 147, 153, 237, 247

commerce: caravan stages (stations) 95, 97, 105, 121, 126, 129; markets 89, 113, 115, 136, 147, 149, 162; merchants 84, 93, 97, 100, 118, 121, 123, 132, 134, 136–7, 143, 146, 148, 153, 155, 160–2, 164–5; residences of merchants (abodes, haunts, resorts) 85, 88, 92, 98–9, 102, 107–8, 110–12, 118–19, 121–5, 127–8, 130–5, 137, 142, 153, 163; sea-trade 87, 122; stores (bârkhadrâ) 87, 102, 107–8, 119, 121, 127, 131, 148; trade-port (furda) 346

dd’ârat al-âfaj “Horizon” 50
dar’îshân, “poor people, paupers” 92, 109, 114–15, 117, 124, 162, 165
dîhqân “hereditary ruler” 98–9, 109, 116–17, 120
doctors and magicians 100, 152, 159
eunuchs 85, 165

farkhûr (vihâra) 263

fire-temples 126–9, 383

fire-worshippers: Khirkhîz 96; Majgâri 321; Rûs see Majûs; Slavs 158; cf. Zoroastrians

“gates” (dar) 38, 102, 112, 115, 120–2; Alan gate 68; Dar-i Andara 107, 334; Dar-i Tâzîyân, 112; Dar-i Tubbât 120, 256; cf. bâb 254, 304, 424

gauhar, “precious things” 52, 86, 89, 92, 102; jawhar, “substance” 112, 152, 154 (suggesting metals?)

ghaḍâra, “china” 384

hadd “frontier, extension” 51; sar-hadd “frontier” 57, &c.

hiyj at the Ka’ba 412

hudâli: “limits” 30, 64–5; “region [limited area]” vii, 57; “marches” 109, 119; “neighbourhood” 128; “territory” 112, 123, &c.

Hûrûfî sect 386

idols 109, 111, 121; idol-temples 86–88, 109, 118; idol-worshippers 161–2

Infidels (kâfr): Turks 116, 118; neighbours of the Rûs 159; evakî 369
Muslims in outlying lands 88, 90-1, 93
112, 119, 120-2, 136, 162
nāhiyat, “country” 47 and passim;
direction” 62; “district” 84; “parts”
66; “province” 123; “region” 123;
“side” 53, &c.
Nestorian 290
nightshák, “auditores” 113
mā’mat, “amenities”, passim; “re-
sources” 126; “well-being” 162; hā
mā’mat, “pleasant, favoured by na-
ture” [“well-endowed”] passim
Persian language of Gurgān 134
gurday, “pelican” 303
rustā, “district” 61, 74, 104, 119; Rūstā
[rī]-Rustām 128; Rūstā-Bljm 121
sābīl, “charitable gift” 398
Ṣābiyān, “Sābians” 12, 141; “Buddhists
(?)” 95
Sāhīfī, Muslims in Rāmiyān 90
Sapū-d-jamāgān 117; mudawwāda 356
The Seven Sleepers 204
shayān “fishermen” 60, 93 (124, 126;
“hunters” 60, 93, 95
shamāt, “Buddhist” 84
shank (šakha), conchs 242
siyāṣīfīn (śāṣkhī) 409
Soghdian language 99, 195, 229, 231,
271, 273, 300, 360
sources of the II.- A. xii-xvii, 25 ff.
Sultān “governor, government” 89, &c.
Sun-worship 99, 121
ṭaylasān, “gulf” 391
taxes: bar-dā 105, 108; bridge-toll 398;
dah-yah 159; gate-toll 120; kharāj
157; maritime customs 162; sar-gazīt
92; ʿushr 139, 392; cf. mash
ṭhāghr, “military frontier” 133, 143-4,
148-9, 152, 470
Tukharian language 304, 359, 369, 445
türk, “strength” 264
Turkān-i āštī, “trucial Turke” 118-19
vaulted buildings 124, 374
wind-mills 110
yabaqī, “felt-wool” 288
yāḏāhārd 49, 145
yāṣī, “broad”
yīḥah, “farsang” 290
Zoroastrian (gabrān, gabrakān) 95, 105,
121, 126, 269; Bihāfarīnī 105
Zūn (Zūn), Indian god 345