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THE TRANSLATOR’S PREFACE

I. DESCRIPTION OF THE MS.

The anonymous1 geographical work called Hudūd al-'Ālam, i.e. “The Regions of the World”,2 was compiled in 372/982-3 and dedicated to the Amīr Abul-Hārith Muhammad b. Ahmad, of the local Farīghūnid dynasty which ruled in Guzgānān in what is now northern Afghānistān (see notes to § 1 and § 23, 46.). The unique manuscript was copied in 656/1258 by Abul-Mu'ayyad 'Abd al-Qayyūm ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn 'Ali al-Fārisī (v.i., p. 166). The same half-erased name appears on the title-page: sāhibuhu3 kātibuhu al-'abdu maurad al-mudhnīb al-muṣṭaj ilā rahmati'llāhi ta'ālā Abul-Mu ... 'Abd al- ... um ibn ... yn ibn 'Ali al-Fārisi ... .

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 khānbāliq 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 Hudūd al-'Ālam forms only one part of a bound volume of which all the folios are of the same size (28 × 18 cm.). It contains:

a. The geographical treatise Jihān-nāma (ff. 1b–27a) by Muḥammad ibn Najīb Bakrān4, copied by 'Ibād allāh Mas'ūd ibn Muḥammad ibn-Mas'ūd al-Kirmānī on 28 Ramadān 663 (14 July 1267).

1 On the author cf. p. xii; he was a sunni, cf. pp. 375, 392.
2 v.i., p. 30. The word hudūd (properly ‘boundaries’) in our case evidently refers to the ‘regions within definite boundaries’ into which the world is divided in the H.-Ā., the author indicating with special care the frontiers of each one of these areas, v.i., p. 30. [As I use the word “region” mostly for nāhiyat it would have been better, perhaps, to translate Hudūd al-'Ālam 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 Fāmi’ al-'ulim, v.i., p. viii.
availed himself of the occasional visits to Bukhārā of the learned Bahā‘ī of Samarqand Mīrzā Abul-Faḍl 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 treats of Music, and is short; the fourth is the Jāmi‘ al-‘ulūm of Imām Fakhr-i Rāżī.” When, in 1893, Toumansky joined Mīrzā Abul-Faḍl 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 H.-‘Ā., gave its description (date, colophon, dedication to the Farighūnīd ruler Abul-Ḥārith, 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, was unfortunately unable to carry out his intention during his lifetime.


1 On Mīrzā Abul Fadl see E. G. Browne’s Tārīkh-i jadīd, Index.

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
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c. Ḥudūd al-ʿĀlam (see above).

d. The well known encyclopedia ʿJāmiʿ al-ʿUlūm (ff. 1–50)1 by Fakhr al-dīn al-Rāzī (d. 606/1209) with the colophon: waqāʾa al-firāgh min tahririhi yaum al-jumʿa lil-sādis wal-ʾishrin min jumādā al-ūlā sana thamānī wa khamsin wa sitta-miʿaʿ ala yadi. Adʿafuʾ ibād allāh wa ahqaruhum Abul-Muʿayyad ʿAbd al-Qayyūm b. al-Ḥusayn(?) b. ʿAlī. Consequently this work, too, was copied by the scribe of the Ḥudūd al-ʿĀlam on Friday, 26 Jumādā al-ūlā 658 (Thursday1 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 Persia!3

2. DISCOVERY AND PUBLICATION OF THE Ḥ.-ʿĀ.

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

The Russian orientalist, Captain (later Major-General) A. G. Toumansky, was a great friend of the Bahāʾīs whom he first met in Askhabad in 1890. He eagerly studied their religious literature4 and rendered some signal services to the thriving Bahāʾī colony established in the Russian Transcaspian province, for example at the time when the first temple of the new religion (mashriq al-adhkār) 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 arbaʿa and made a search for it through his Persian friends. The importance of Bukhārā 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 jumʿa 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, SPb. 1899 (Mémoires de l’Académie des
Some time later we had the satisfaction of hearing that the publication of the \textit{H.-'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 \textit{Preface} and 11 pages of \textit{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 \textit{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: \textit{Xynyn an-'ājieM. PyKonucb TyMaHCKaro. C BeneHHeM a yKa3aTe}JieM B. Bap-rojibna. JleHHHrpan 1930.

3. THE TRANSLATOR’S TASK

In the concluding words of his \textit{Preface} (\textit{v.i.} 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.\textsuperscript{1} 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 \textit{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

\textsuperscript{1} Lately Sayyid Jalāl al-dīn Tehrānī has, more or less successfully, printed the text of the \textit{H.-'Ā.}, together with that of Part III of the \textit{Tārīkh-i jihān-gushā}, as an annex (!) to his Calendar (\textit{gāh-nāma}) for the Persian year 1314 (= A.H. 1353-4 = A.D. 1935), Tehran 1352. The \textit{H.-'Ā.} occupies pages 1-114 and on pp. 115-49 Barthold’s Index is reproduced.
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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 Toumansky very liberally allowed other Russian scholars to make use of single passages having special interest to them. V. A. Zhukovskiy 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.-‘Ā 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 Toumansky’s death he published the fragment on Tibet (see notes to § 11) and summarized the contents of the chapter on Gilān (see notes to § 32, 35.).

Nevertheless, in Western Europe very little was known about the H.-‘Ā, and J. Marquart who had access only to the quotations found in Toumansky’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 Bahā‘ī community ‘Abbās Efendi (d. in Haifa, 28 November 1921). In it I mentioned both E. G. Browne’s and A. G. Toumansky’s close connexion with the representatives of the faith preached by the Bāb and the Bahā’-allāh. My article happened to be read in Constantinople by Madame Toumansky 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.-‘Ā. was among them, and soon after the precious MS. was on my desk in Paris. Madame Toumansky fully realized the intense interest taken in Russia in the H.-‘Ā 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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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.
2. A complete translation of the Persian text of the Ḥudūd al-Ālam.
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 Ḥ.-ʿĀ., &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 Ḥ.-ʿĀ. (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 Ḥ.-ʿĀ. in T'oung-Pao, 1931, No. 1, p. 133, writes: "Puisque l'ouvrage est enfin accessible il faut espérer qu'un iraniste 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 *H.-ʿĀ.* (§§ 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 *H.-ʿĀ.* 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 *H.-ʿĀ.*) and Māḥmūd 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*¹ 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 \(H.-'Ā.\) 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 Barthold\(^2\) 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 \(H.-'Ā.\)

The second object of the commentary has been to ascertain the sources of the \(H.-'Ā.\). 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, \textit{viz.} books,\(^4\) and any other information coming under the rubrics of \textit{yādhkird-i hakimān} “memories of the sages” (f. 2a\(_2\)),\(^5\) \textit{akhbār} “information [heard]” (cf. f. 13b\(_2\): \textit{ba-akhbār-hā ba-shanidim}), or simply \textit{dhikr} “mention” (f. 12a\(_2\)). There is no indication in the text as to which particular details were derived from non-literary sources, unless we carried out, on the initiative of G. Ferrand, by a group of French Arabists, will see the light before long.

\(^1\) Comprising works in Russian, very insufficiently known in Western Europe. [On the as yet unedited sources cf. p. 480.]


\(^4\) \textit{Kitāb-hā-ypishinagān “books of the predecessors”,} folios 2a\(_1\) and 13b\(_3\); or simply “books”, folios 4a\(_8\), 9a\(_9\) (concerning the Kuchā river). Under 11b\(_{18}\) \textit{kitāb-hā va akhbār-hā} are clearly distinguished.

\(^5\) I see that the reading \textit{yādhkird} has been accepted also in the text of the \(H.-'Ā.\) printed in Tehran, p. 4 (contrary to Barthold, \textit{v.i.}, p. 31, note 1).
include in this category the above-mentioned details regarding Güzgânān and Gilān.

Abul-Fadl Gulpāyagānī (v.s., p. ix) made an interesting suggestion in taking the H.-'Ā for "a Preface to a Map". In several passages, in fact (folios 5b11, 8b10, 25b13, 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 Multān (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 Balkhī’s book may have been only an explanation of Abū Ja’far al-Khāzin’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 Hudūd 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 Khorāsān 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. Iṣṭ., 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 Gardīzi’s parallels, v.i. p. 229, 260; cf. also pp. 251, 289, 293, 363, 380, 382, 391. [Cf. Index E: Map.]
3 By Iṣṭakhrī, at least in such regions as Fārs? Cf. I.H., 236 [V.i. p. 381, l. 16.]
4 Cf. Index E: bearings.
5 Reinaud, Géographie d’Abulféda, 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 Qurʾān, lv, 16, where the "two Orients" and "two Occidents" are mentioned. [V.i. p. 285, l. 4: mashriq-i sayfī.]
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 Mīrvāt 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., 4a20, 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 Sūdān (§ 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 Sūdān 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 Rūmiya. Has Sardinia been confused with Sicily?

2 Cf. also § 13, 1, § 15, 12.–13.

3 Cf. also § 8, 5. “the Greeks”.

Some unknown work which was also utilized by I. Rusta, Bakrī, Gardīzī, 'Aufī, &c., and which is usually identified with Abū 'Abdillāh Muḥammad b. Aḥmad Jayhānī’s lost Kitāb al-mamālik wal-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.n.d.r and Mirvāt figure only in the H.-'Ā. and Gardīzī. The rare reports quoted by name in I. Rusta (e.g. Abū ‘Abdillāh b. Ishāq on India, v.i., pp. 235 and 241, and Hārūn b. Yaḥyā 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. Aḥmad he became vazīr (in 301/913–14) “he wrote letters to all the countries of the world and he requested that the customs of every court and dvān should be written down and brought to him, such (as existed in) the Byzantine empire, Turkistān, Hindūstān, 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 Gardīzī–M. Nāżim, 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-Masālik wal-mamālik’. Is it to be found at Mashhad? in BSOS, v/i, 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 Fihrist, 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. 399–413, Pelliot cast doubt on the authenticity of Sulaymān’s travels.
tional items on Transoxiana, &c. existed in the original Iṣṭ. and were
preserved both by I.Ḥ and the Ḥ.-ʿĀ. 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 pas-
sages in Balkhī > Iṣṭ., which were also available in our author’s copy.

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 else­
where 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.

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 *Jazīrat 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*?

6. LOYALTIES

My thanks go first to the Trustees of the Gibb Memorial who in
1931 accepted my work for inclusion in their series, Sir E. D. Ross,
with his usual kindness, acting as my sponsor. To the latter, as well
as to my friends Prof. R. A. Nicholson, Prof. H. A. R. Gibb, Dr. A. S.
Tritton, and Dr. (now Prof.) H. W. Bailey I am deeply obliged for
their great help in checking my copy. Dr. W. Simon has kindly tried
to unify my transcription of Chinese names though he certainly is not
responsible for any eventual mistakes in cases where the Chinese
original was not available. I hope my memory has not played me false
in thanking in the text the numerous scholars of many lands who
readily answered my queries on matters within their competence.

My dedication confirms the debt of gratitude which I have
contracted towards the great Persian scholar who during the fifteen
years of our friendship has been lavish in his aid to me in hundreds
of my perplexities. My long, frequent and always instructive con­
vversations with him constitute one of the very pleasant recollections
of my life.

¹ See de Goeje in *BGA*, iv, p. vi: Maq. himself, p. 8, dates his preface
A.H. 375/985 but certain passages point to the years 377 and even 387/997
(p. 288r).
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 climes¹ 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 East³ 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 Tūrgish, 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) İŞTAKHİRİ (<Balkhī) is without doubt the source most systematically utilized in the H.-Ā. The chapters on the countries between the Indus and the Mediterranean are practically a mere abridgement of Išt., 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 form⁴ one would infer that Išt. was used in a Persian translation. Several points in Central Asia have parallels only in Ibn Ḥauqal (BGA, ii) and Maqdisī (BGA, iii). However, our author could not have utilized I.H., as otherwise we should find in the H.-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.
## CONTENTS

**THE TRANSLATOR’S PREFACE** . . . . . vii

**V. V. BARTHOLD’S PREFACE** . . . . . i

**TRANSLATION OF THE ḤUḌŪḌ AL-ĀLAM** . . . 45

**COMMENTARY ON THE ḤUḌŪḌ AL-ĀLAM** . . . 167

**APPENDIX: A. MARGINAL NOTES IN THE ḤUḌŪḌ AL-ĀLAM** . . . 479

**B. ADDITIONAL NOTES** . . . . . 481

**INDEX: A. GEOGRAPHICAL NAMES** . . . . . 483

**B. PERSONAL NAMES AND TITLES** . . . . . 511

**C. AUTHORITIES** . . . . . 514

**D. LOCAL PRODUCTS AND SPECIALITIES** . . . . . 520

**E. SELECTION OF CATCH-WORDS** . . . . . 523

### LIST OF MAPS

1. The principal mountain ranges . . . . . 197
2. Black Sea lands according to Idrīṣī . . . . . 219
3. Western China . . . . . 231
4. Khotan-Kashmīr-Pamir . . . . . 261
5. Turkish territories round the Issik-kul . . . . . 279
6. The Chu-Ili watershed . . . . . 299
7. Kimāk-Ghūz territory . . . . . 307
8. Gü zgān and Ghūr . . . . . 329
9. The lands on the Upper Oxus . . . . . 339
10. Gilān and Daylam . . . . . 389
11. Daghestān and Shīrvān . . . . . 399
12. Eastern Europe . . . . . 435
My commentary would never have been written without the extensive use of the treasures of the British Museum, the Bibliothèque Nationale, the School of Oriental Studies, and the École des Langues Orientales. The latter's librarian Mlle Renié (now Mme Meuvré) very kindly allowed me to keep for long periods great numbers of books not found elsewhere.

I must thank Dr. John Johnson, Printer to the University of Oxford, and his staff and collaborators who have so successfully overcome the difficulties of a text bristling with difficult names, references and quotations.

My wife helped me with the translation of Barthold's *Preface*, prepared about 4,500 cards of the Index and several times typed out the revised text of my manuscript (some of the chapters four and five times!).

The printing of my book has extended over a period of three years, during which time many more sources have been consulted by me, and many more materials collected. Even Barthold's *Vorlesungen*, in Prof. Menzel's excellent edition, became available only when the whole text had been set up. Wherever possible I have introduced the requisite additions, but it must be borne in mind that the date of my Preface is not that of my text. By the end of June 1936 my commentary was in page proofs and no further important alterations were possible. Some additional notes will be found in Appendix B.

V. MINORSKY
10 December 1936.
PART ONE

V. V. BARTHOLD’S PREFACE

TRANSLATED FROM THE RUSSIAN
V. V. BARTHOLOD’S PREFACE

THE present edition is intended to discharge an obligation under P3 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 Bukhārā 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-Nadīm composed his *Fihris*; 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 Vostochnago 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 Yāqūt’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‘bān = 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, 297 (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 wazir Maghribī who continued al-Nadīm, see *Irshād*, vi, 467, has not reached us. On the wazir Maghribī 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-Hārith Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad, prince of the province of Güzgān or Güzgānān (in Arabic garb  fūzjān, or fūzjānān), which lies in the north-western part of the present-day Afghānistān. It is quite natural that the author allows more space (ff. 2ob–2ia) to this province than would have been expected from its comparative unimportance, even though at that time Güzgān was experiencing, under the Farīghūnid dynasty, a period of political and cultural prosperity.

On Güzgān and the Farīghūnids Toumansky's article gives only a fragment from Rashīd al-dīn's  Jāmi' al-tawārikh, almost literally copied, as is the whole of the corresponding part of this work, from  'Utbi's history in its Persian | translation by Abul-Sharaf 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 amir of Samarqand, Nūḥ ibn-Manṣūr (A.D. 976–97), had accepted ties of relationship with the head of the Farīghūnids. This fact belongs to the beginning of the reign of Nūḥ (who ascended the throne at the age of thirteen). The prince of Güzgān in the Gardīzī text, as in that of our author, bears the name of Abul-Ḥārith Muḥammad ibn-Aḥmad (in  'Utbi: Aḥmad ibn-Muḥammad).4

Both our author and other geographers of the tenth century describe the Güzgān of the Farīghūnids 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., Fāryāb (on the site of the town of Daulatābād, or that of the village of Khayrābād) 6 was not reckoned as in Güzgān, the western frontier of the latter, as attested by Ibn Khurdādhbih's itinerary, passing between

1 V. Barthold, Ulugh-bek, Petrograd, 1918, p. 113 and sq. (in Russian).
2 ZVO, x, 128 and sq.
5 e.g. Balādhurī, p. 406 below.
Fāryāb and Shabūrqān (or Shubūrqān; in our author: Ushbūrqān or Ashbūrqān, now Shibarghān), at an equal distance (9 farsakhs) from both. According to Ya’qūbī, Fāryāb was “the old town”; the second most important town at that time, and the residence of the Arab governor (‘āmil) of Fāryāb, was the town of Yahūdān (in Iṣṭakhrī 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 (malīk) of Gūzgān, whereas the Arab governors of Gūzgān resided in Anbār (according to our author: Anbīr), on the site of the present town Sar-i-Pul. In Iṣṭakhrī’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 (qasaba, the same term is used by Bīrūnī, in whose work we also find the form Anbīr).

Our author assigns to the rulers of Gūzgān the first place among the vassal princes (mulūk-i atrāf) 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 Gharchistān and Ghūr. A part of Gharchistān was called “Gharchistān of Gūzgān” and was administered directly by the prince of Gūzgān, whose frontier towns were those of Tālaqān, on the site of Qal’a-Walī, and Rabāt-i Karvān on the upper Harīrud. On the upper Murghāb Gūzgān had a common frontier with that of the prince of Bust (on the Hilmand). 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 Ghūrshāh, vassal of the amīr of Gūzgān. To the latter tribute was assigned...
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, 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 Gūzgān, the Gūzgān-khudāts. The name of the dynasty had some relation to a locality in the extreme north of the province; Maqdisī mentions a Rabāṭ Afrīghūn, one day’s march from Andkhoy and two from Karkī. According to Narshakhī, Ahmad ibn-Farīghūn was already amīr of Gūzgān in the last years of the ninth century, at the time when the relations between the Saffārid ʿAmr ibn-Laith and the Sāmānid Ismāʿīl ibn-Aḥmad were broken off. Since ʿIṣṭakhrī mentions an Abū ʿḤārith ibn-Farīghūn, apparently the same Abū ʿḤārith Muḥammad ibn-Aḥmad who was a contemporary of our author, this ruler must have lived unusually long. 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, belongs without doubt to ʿIṣṭakhrī and not to Balkhī, though ʿIṣṭakhrī 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 Hudūd al-ʿālam. ʿIṣṭakhrī mentions also a secretary or minister (kātib) of the amīr of Gūzgān, Jaʿfar ibn-Sahl ibn-Marzubān, of the family of Marzubān ibn-Zādiya, who was a native of Shīrāz. This Jaʿfar 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; Ibn Hauqal was acquainted with him and speaks of

1 There is no foundation for reading Afrīghūn instead of Afrīdhūn, as Toumansky proposes, ZVO, x, 130.
2 J. Marquart (Markwart), Erānsahr, p. 80.
3 BGA, iii, 347.
4 Σχεφέρ, p. 85.
5 BGA, i, 148.
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 (ʿUtbi-Manīnī, i, 316); the account of the battle of Charkhiyān (4 January 1008; cf. my Turkestan, ii, 287) names, as the ruler of Gūzgān, his son and successor Abū-ʿNaṣr (ʿUtbi-Manīnī, ii, 84), who died in 401 (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 Sāmānid amīr contemporary with himself Ibn Hauqal names Manṣūr ibn-Nūh (961–76), BGA, i, 3414. In 358 (968–9) this author was on the Gurgān (ibid., p. 282), in the same year “for the last time” in Mosul, ibid., p. 146a, 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-Ḥauqal never encountered any one who had an unfavourable opinion of Jaʿfar 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 rabāṭs and assigned revenues of his estates for their maintenance; in every rabāt 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 Jaʿfar ibn-Sahl patronized Ibn-Ḥauqal’s work.

Whether the author of the Ḥudūd al-ʿālam 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. P 6

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-Āthār al-ulwiya) 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, viz. 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-Khāliyaṭ). From Ptolemy was derived the information

1 ZVO, x, 132.
2 Text in Nallino, Al-Battānī sive Albatenii opera astronomica, 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, 8415, and Kharaqī, in agreement with the text of Ptolemy (vii, 4, 11–13), the islands were nineteen. In Nallino’s opinion Battānī read ḥā, instead of ḥa, 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 Südān and from towns of Sūs al-ʿAqsā 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 (Rūm) 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 Arwād 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.

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 Djalgrāfiyā, 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.

¹ BGa, vii, 8513. Ibn Rusta; Battāni-Nallino, i, 18.
² Kunik-Rosen, Izvestiya al-Bekri, &c., i, 80; Peschel-Ruge, Geschichte der Erkunde, p. 90; Nallino, Al-Hutcāriz-mī, 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 JRAIS, 1929, 209 and sq.) much space is allotted to geographical science “from Hecataeus to Birūnī”. It is stated there that Greek
⁵ [Seybold, Edrisiana, I.], ZDMG, lxiii, 596.
⁶ [See now its Supplement. V.M.]
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-Jaʿfar 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 Khuwārizmī and Arabian geographical science in general, in his extensive Latin work on the astronomer Battānī (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 Bīrunī 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’Aboulfeda, t. i, Introduction générale à la géographie des orientaux.
4 C. A. Nallino, Al-Battānī sive Albatenii 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 Bīrunī, Chronologie, ed. Sachau, p. 85, the list of kings begins with Bel, father of Nimus.
7 Berlin MS. Ahlw. 5667, f. 34a: طوطالوس — في أيامه فتحت البيزن وهو (sic!) أطرابلس ثم بعد حصار عشر سنين ل_OBS:

استناد فيروس اسمها بعض المعلوم
cf. Chronologie, p. 86.
Already in Muḥammad Khuwārizmī’s *Sūrat al-ard* we find a new version of Ptolemy, partly corrected and completed, partly distorted. According to Nallino¹ Khuwārizmī’s *rifacimento* 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.²

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-Qutrubbult* 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 Aḥmad ibn-Abī-Tāhir Ṭayfūr;³ in Tabarī the earliest reference to Khuwārizmī’s work deals with the death of the caliph Mahdī (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 H. As the latest

---

¹ *Al-Huwārizmī*, p. 53.
² Enc. of Islam.
⁴ Ṭabarī, iii, 55112.
⁹ Nallino, *ibid.*, p. 22.
date, 210 (A.D. 826–7) is proposed, but no explicit reason for its adoption is advanced. In reality the work of Khuwārizmī in its present form cannot be placed in the reign of Ma'mūn, as it mentions the new capital Surra-man-ra'ā (Sāmarrā),1 the construction of which began in 211 (A.D. 836)2 under the caliph Mu'tašim (A.D. 833–42). The terminus post quern must therefore be advanced by twenty years; as terminus ante quern could be taken the date of Khuwārizmī's death, if that date were known to us; the last time Khuwārizmī’s name seems to be mentioned is on the occasion of the caliph Wāthiql’s death in A.D. 847.3

In Khuwārizmī’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 Khuwārizmī 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 Alāns; both Scythias, respectively, with the land of the Turks in general and that of the Turks of the extreme east, the Toghuuzghuz; Serika, with Sinistān, i.e. China.5 The last example shows that for comparison with Greek terms Persian geographical names were utilized as well.6 For the exact title of Ptolemy’s book Γεωγραφική 'Υφήγησις, “Geography” or in the Arabic version Jaghrāfiyā 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 Khuwārizmī’s book. The author of the Fihrist7 knew that Ptolemy’s work consisted of eight books or sections (in Greek βιβλίον, in Arabic maqāla). The first translation, an unsatisfactory one, was made for a younger contemporary of Khuwārizmī, Abū-Yūsuf Ya’qūb al-KINDĪ, tutor and familiar of Ahmad, son of the caliph Mu’tašim. 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 Mzik’s edition, No. 301.
2 Tabari, iii, 1180; BGA, viii, 357a.
3 Tabari, iii, 1364b.
4 Li-tajāwul-li-zamān, Yaqūt, i, 7a.
5 Mzik’s edition, p. 105 (Nos. 1593, 1596, 1600, 1601, 1602).
6 e.g. Yaqūt, i, 7b, also H. Khalifa, ii, 601. In Mas‘ūdī, BGA, viii, 331a, the translation is qat’ al-ard (the crossing of the earth).
7 Fihrist, p. 268; ZDMG, i, 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.
by Mas'ūdī.1 A pupil of Kindī, Ahmad ibn-Muḥammad ibn-alm-Tayyib Sarakhsī (d. in A.D. 899),2 was also author of a geographical work; the title “Book of Routes and Kingdoms” (Kitāb al-masālik wal-mamālik),3 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 Abūl-Ḥasan 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 Nallino4 explains the tendency of Battānī, who also belonged to the pagan (Ṣabian) milieu of Harrān, to revert in some cases from Khūwarizmi to Ptolemy, though it constituted a step backwards (unvero regresso).

From the geographical works of such mathematicians and astronomers as Khūwarizmi, 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, 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 Fihrist5 the author of the first work on “Routes and Kingdoms” was Abū-‘Abbās Ja’far ibn-Abd al-Mawazı; his work remained unfinished; after his death in Ahwāz his books were taken to Baghdād and there sold in 274 (A.D. 887–8). These data might lead to the belief that the composition of Marwāzī’s work belongs approximately to the same time, and this renders doubtful Marwāzī’s priority. Another work of the same title was also written by a ninth-century geographer, Abūl-Qāsim ‘Ubaydullāh ibn-‘Abdillāh ibn Khurdādhbih. This work is likewise mentioned in the Fihrist, with no historical details except that the author was a familiar of the caliph Mu’tamīd (A.D. 870–92).6 Ibn Khurdādhbih dedicated his work to some member of the ʿAbbāsid 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 Goeje7 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 Mu’tamīd. 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).  
5 Fihrist, 150; GMS, vi, 2, p. 400.  
6 Fihrist, 149.  
7 BGA, vi, p. xx.
Kingdoms” by Ibn Khurdādhbih appeared in its first version long before the work of Marwazī, and the mistake of al-Nadīm 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, who sought to prove that there was only one edition of Ibn Khurdādhbih’s work, terminated not earlier than 272. Marquart attributes a decisive importance to the fact that already in that version of Ibn Khurdādhbih’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 Khurdādhbih from the traveller Tamīm ibn Baḥr al-Muṭṭawwī, who visited the Toghuzghuz in a region which the Uyghurs, according to Chinese sources, conquered only in A.D. 866. Yet in another passage Marquart himself quotes (though with a wrong interpretation) the text of Jāhiz, 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. 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 Khurdādhbih could speak about the caliph Wāthiq 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 Khurdādhbih had reached us.

Unlike the work of Marwazī, forgotten at an early date, that of Ibn Khurdādhbih 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 Khurdādhbih’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, only in an abridged form. In quotations from Ibn Khurdādhbih 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 Khurdādhbih’s work; many statements of such authors as Ibn al-Faqīh,1 Ya’qūbi, Ibn Rusta,2 and others are founded on Ibn Khurdādhbih. Besides the “Book of Routes and Kingdoms” Ibn Khurdādhbih 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 Khurdādhbih 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 Khurdādhbih’s data were derived.

Ibn Khurdāadhbih says in his Preface that he translated Ptolemy’s Geography3 from a foreign language (it is not said whether from Greek or Syriac); this translation is not mentioned in Arabic literature. According to Nallino,4 the translation of Ptolemy’s Geography was made by Ibn Khurdāadhbih 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.5 In Ptolemy there is no such estimate of towns.

In spite of his study of Ptolemy, Ibn Khurdāadhbih 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’ūdi,6 with some contempt, calls geography, as understood by Ibn Khurdāadhbih, 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 Nedorosl). 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’ Σταθμοί Παρθικοί, 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-Huwārizmī 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 Khurdādhbih, 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 Khurdādhbih, 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 Baghdād, 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-Hauqal which have reached us. In it he quotes biographical data on Balkhī found in the biographical dictionary of Șafadī, Al-Wāfī bil-wafāyāt.3 It is clear now that Șafadī borrowed this information from Yāqūt,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-Muhammad al-Wazīrī who personally knew Abū Zayd Balkhī and had studied under him.5

The most important addition to de Goeje’s data is Yāqūt’s testimony according to which Balkhī died (in Dhul-qā’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 (Yāqūt8 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 Fihrist, p. 261, according to which the wazir 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 Mu’tadid, Ibn Ḥamdūn, recorded by Yāqūt, GMS, vi, 1, 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 Kindi, who died soon after 870 (see above). Balkhī spent eight years in 'Iraq 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.¹ The eight years spent in 'Iraq 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, Balkhī’s comments, quoted in the Fihrist,² about his relations with the general Ḥusayn ibn-‘Alī al-Marwazī (or Marwarrūdhi) and also with the wazīr Abū-‘Abdillāh Muḥammad ibn-‘Aḥmad Jayhānī. Balkhī received from Ḥusayn and his brother Muḥammad Ṣu‘lūk³ regular material assistance, but forfeited this subsidy in consequence of having composed a religious treatise, which later was highly appreciated in orthodox circles. Yāqūt⁴ quotes an opinion according to which Balkhī’s work was ranked with the most useful, from the Muslim point of view, that had ever been written. (Ḥusayn was an Ismā‘īlī heretic; Balkhī, too, in his youth held Shi‘ite views, which he later abandoned.) The wazīr Jayhānī used to send to Balkhī presents of female slaves, but later deprived him of this attention because of Balkhī’s treatise on sacrifices (al-Qarābin wa-l-Dhabā’ih), which he disliked. The wazīr Jayhānī 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.⁵

So far as is known, Balkhī 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.⁶ ‘Aḥmad was at the head of the Sāmānid troops who quelled the revolt of Ḥusayn Marwarrūdhi, and took the latter prisoner. Subsequently, while in Nīshāpur, ‘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

of zealous Iranian patriots; his brothers fell victims to the national fanaticism (ta'ассub) of the Arabs; there lived with Ahmad in Marv a certain Sarv, to whom Firdausi refers when recounting the lays of Rustam. At that time Abū 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 'Ali 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 Aḥmad ibn-Sahl try to communicate with him when he arrived in Balkh (there is no other information on Ahmad ibn-Sahl's stay in Balkh). When Balkhī declined the office of wazīr offered him by Aḥmad ibn-Sahl, there was appointed to this position a friend and countryman of his, Abul-Qāsim 'Abdullāḥ ibn-Aḥmad ibn-Maḥmūd Ka‘bī, who also wrote treatises of a religious nature, though even farther removed from orthodoxy. In Sam'ānī he is called head of the Muʿtaṣilites. Balkhī took a post as secretary under Ka‘bī with an allowance of 500 dīnārs a month. Abul-Qāsim was entitled to a sum of 1,000 dīnārs, 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. At that happy time Balkhī, thanks to the generosity both of the amīr and the wazīr, acquired some property in his native village of Shāmistiyān, on the Gharbangī canal (one of the twelve canals irrigating the environs of Balkh), and this property was inherited by his descendants.

After the fall of Aḥmad ibn-Sahl, Balkhī, apparently, lived as a private person on his own lands. Without indication of date it is reported that a Sāmānid amīr (probably Naṣr) invited him to come to Bukhārā, 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 Chagāniyān (later vicerois of Khorāsān), Abū-Bakr Muḥammad and his son Abū-‘Alī Aḥmad, 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.  
5 GMS, vi, p. 147.  
6 Only in Maqdisi, BGA, iii, 4. De Goeje, ZDMG, xxv, 55, refers to Maqdisi and Ṣafadī, but the reference of Yaqūt, GMS, vi, 1, p. 152, to Maqdisi shows that Ṣafadī borrowed this information through Yaqūt from the same Maqdisi.
1 The number of Balkhī's compositions, according to his grandson,1 was sixty. The geographical treatise of Balkhī, which in all probability (reports are somewhat contradictory)2 bore the title Ṣuwar-al-aqlūm (“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.3 As a matter of fact in the list4 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” (tafṣīr al-ṣuwar). 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.5

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. Maqdisī6 saw only three copies of this work, one—in Rayy,7 another—in Nishāpūr, and the third—in Bukhārā. In the first case, the authorship [of the maps? yunsab ilā Abī Zayd bil-ashkāl. 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-Muḥawwālī 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-Numr al-Ḥarbī, muḥtasib of the town of Bukhārā.8 The putative authorship of Karkhī is mentioned

1 V. V. Barthold’s Preface

2 ZDMG, xxv, 57.

3 According to Maqdisī, BGA, iii, 410.

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, 138, Yāqūt, GMS, vi, 1, p. 142,5; a full stop may have wrongly cut into two the unique title Kitāb tafsīr ṣuwar kitāb al-samāʾ wal-ālam li Abī Ja’far al-Khāzin “Book of Interpretation of the Maps of Abū Ja’far al-Khāzin’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-Khāzin is often mentioned in Arabic literature, e.g. in Biruni, see Sachau’s Index to his edition of the Chronology.]

6 BGA, iii, 5a.

7 On the library of the minister Iṣmā’il ibn-Abbād in that town see ibid., p. 391.

8 Ibid., p. 136,2.
again in the chapter on Sind; but in the references and quotations Maqdisī names only Balkhī and Iṣṭakhrī. According to de Goeje all the quotations in which Balkhī is named correspond entirely to Iṣṭakhrī’s text. Nevertheless de Goeje thinks it possible that Maqdisī might have had in his hands, besides the text of Iṣṭakhrī, 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 Iṣṭakhrī, 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 Iṣṭakhrī only once, with regard to the distance between Jedda and ‘Aden; the corresponding words are of course to be found also in Iṣṭakhrī. In all the other cases Iṣṭakhrī 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 Maqdisī: with regard to three out of the twenty climes mentioned, viz. the last three: Khorāsān, Sīstān, and Mā-warā’ al-nahr, Balkhī is preferentially quoted; while in three others, Fārs, Kirmān, and Sind, preference is given to Iṣṭakhrī. In de Goeje’s opinion the work of Iṣṭakhrī 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 Iṣṭakhrī’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 Iṣṭakhrī’s meeting with Ibn Ḥauqal at the same date. The meeting is confirmed by Ibn Ḥauqal himself, who, with Iṣṭakhrī’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.

3 Ibid., p. 52.

4 Ibid., p. 46.

5 Yāqūt, ii, 4177.

6 BGA, i, 27 above.

7 Yāqūt, ii, 285; Iṣṭakhrī, 273.

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 Iṣṭakhrī 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 Iṣṭakhrī, is represented on the same map as Armenia and Arrān. [Cf. our § 35.]
of his travels,¹ but never carried out his intention; the only definite
date given is that of his departure as a young man from Baghdād
(Thursday, Ramadān 7, 331, i.e. in May, A.D. 943);² 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).³ During
such a lapse of time Ibn Hauqal could evidently visit the same towns
several times; thus in 358 (A.D. 968–9) he was in Mosul for the last
time.⁴ He wrote his work as a subject of the Fātimid 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.⁵ 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 Isṭakhrī was translated into Persian; the manu-
script which Sir W. Ouseley took for a copy of the translation of
Ibn Hauqal and edited as such was found to be an abridged version
of Isṭakhrī’s book.⁶ The acquisition by the library of Shāhrukh in
the fifteenth century of a copy of the Arabic original of Isṭakhrī
gave an impulse to the composition in Persian of the geographical
work of Ḥāfīz-i Abrū.⁷

¹ BGA, ii, 236v–g.
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 *baqīna*, the date would be 1 June, 943, but such a supposition would be untenable. Ibn Hauqal adds that on the same day the Ham-dānid Nāṣir al-daula left Baghdād, fleeing from the Turks. Nāṣir al-daula became chief amir of Baghdād (*amīr al-umarā*) on Sha’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 Hauqal; 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 iv.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 (viii, 298), Tuzūn received from the caliph the title of *amīr al-umarā* 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 Ziyāhid ruler of Yemen, (Lane-Poole, The Muhammadan Dynasties, Russian transl., p. 72; Zambaur, p. 115), in the name of the Fātimid 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 Khazarjl’s *History of Yemen* (GMS, iii, 1, p. 11) says that when in 377 (A.D. 987) “the Hiwāliyy ruler of Ṣan‘ā’ took Zabīd, he suppressed the khutba in the name of the Fātimids. Reinaud (*Géographie d’Aboulfeda, Introdc.,* p. lxxiii), without proofs, places the termination of Ibn Hauqal’s work in 366 (A.D. 976) [evidently after Uylenbroek, *Specimen*, p. 157].
⁴ BGA, ii, 146v; see above.
⁵ Ibid., 22v–16v.
⁶ Rieu, Pers. MSS., p. 416.
⁷ *Al-Muṣaffariya* (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 Balkhī or of Iṣṭakhrī. 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 Iṣṭakhrī’s text, p. 62:

The text of Iṣṭakhrī is sometimes not very exactly rendered; our author calls Mārida “the greatest town of Andalus” (36b), while Iṣṭakhrī, p. 43, speaks of it as “(one) of the greatest towns of Andalus”. A quotation from Iṣṭakhrī, p. 68 and sq., not exactly understood, accounts for what our author says of Athens. South and west of Constantinople Iṣṭakhrī distinguishes the Athenian and the Roman shores, but the words “Athens” (Athīnās) and “Rome” (Rūmiya) 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” (yūnānīyūn). 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 “Athīnās” only as the name of a locality where in ancient times there stood a town Yūnāniyān, and, as he says, “all the wise men and philosophers rose from this region (nāhiyat) of Athīnās”.

Historical facts are likewise now and then borrowed from Iṣṭakhrī (or Balkhī). In the chapter on mountains (f. 7b), as in Iṣṭakhrī’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 Iṣṭakhrī, it is said that the locality was conquered by the Qarmāṭīan 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 qadīm, 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 Ḥauqal than Iṣṭakhrī. In the chapter on ‘Irāq (f. 31b) Qaṣr ibn-Hubayra is called the largest town between Baghdād and Kūfā; 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 Qarmāṭīan Muḥammad ibn-al-Faḍl, apparently, the brother of the Qarmāṭīan ‘Adī ibn-al-Faḍl, who sacked Zabīd according to Lane-Poole, The Muhammadan Dynasties, 1894, p. 90, shortly after 292/904, and according to Zambaur, Manuel, p. 115, in 303 H.
that our author utilized Ibn Hauqal’s original; in this case, as in many others, Nöldeke is right in saying that Ibn Hauqal’s relation to Iṣṭakhrī cannot be determined by a simple comparison of the two texts of BGA, i and BGA, ii. The missing words of Iṣṭakhrī’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 Iṣṭakhrī.

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

Did our author have before him Balkhī’s work in its primitive form, or in Iṣṭakhrī’s version? Some passages apparently show the influence of those chapters of BGA, i, which are principally attributed to Iṣṭakhrī, e.g. the chapters on Sind and especially the description of Manṣūra (f. 26a), cf. Iṣṭakhrī’s text, p. 173. But this passage may also have stood in Balkhī. The dependence on Balkhī–Iṣṭakhrī is still more noticeable in the chapters of the Hudūd al-ʿālam 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. Iṣṭakhrī, p. 265); the description of Būshang (ibid., cf. Iṣṭakhrī, p. 270); the account of the river Murghāb, which crosses the village Diza (f. 20a, cf. Iṣṭakhrī, p. 270); the account of the three Buttām (or Butmān) mountain chains (f. 23b, cf. Iṣṭakhrī, p. 333); the account of the outposts at Osh (f. 24a, cf. Iṣṭakhrī, p. 333); and the account of Khatlām or Khaylām as being the birthplace of the amīr Naṣr (ibid., cf. Iṣṭakhrī, p. 334). In two instances, namely in the accounts of the market in Marsmanda (f. 23b, cf. Ibn Hauqal, p. 3842) and of sixty villages near Sokh (f. 24a, Ibn Hauqal, p. 3962), our author’s words can be compared only with the text of BGA, ii, because in BGA, i, the corresponding passages of the Balkhī–Iṣṭakhrī text have

1 ZDMG, lvi, 433.
3 Yāqūt, ii, 404 and sq. The text in Yāqūt, as de Goeje points out in a footnote, BGA, ii, 393, is clearly corrupt, especially 405, where instead of fa yamtaddu ‘alā al-atrāk al-Ghuzzīya one must read fa yamtaddu ilā al-qaryat al-haditha.
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 Iṣṭakhrī bei Ibn Hauqal und in den Anmerkungen dazu zu finden ist.”
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 Aḥmad Zakī bey³ and the “Balḥīkodex mit schönen Karten”, acquired in Baghdād for the Hamburg library:⁴ the necessary evidence as to the extent to which their texts differ from that of BGA⁵ is still to be given.

IV

A geographical work, under the same current title of “Book of Routes and Kingdoms”, was written by the Sāmānid wazīr Abū 'Abdillāh 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 Hauqal⁶ and Maqdisī. It can be seen from the latter’s⁷ comments that Ibn Khurdādhbih’s work formed the basis of that of Jayhānī. Occasionally the same MS., if it did not contain an indication of the author’s name, was attributed by some to Ibn Khurdādhbih, 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.
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 Samarqand (BGA, i, 318), which could not belong to Balkhī, who, according to the direct evidence of Maqdisī (BGA, iii, 411), never crossed the Oxus.
⁶ BGA, ii, 236a, with an unfavourable mention both of Jayhānī’s work and of that of Ibn Khurdādhbih.
⁷ Cf. my Turkestan, p. 12 and sq.
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 Maqdisī, 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 Maqdisī 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 Hudūd al-ālam are also quoted by an author of the eleventh century, Gardīzī, who gives the distances between the towns and the itineraries, i.e. precisely the information missing in the Hudūd al-ālam. Gardīzī states that he borrowed these data from Ibn Khurdādhbih, Jayhānī, and a third anonymous work under the title Tawādu' al-dunyā. At one place Gardīzī'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 Kháqān; 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 Gardīzī, 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 چین). Evidently mountain sickness is

1 *BGA*, iii, 346 (345b).
2 South of Tashkent, on the river Āhangarān (in Russian: Angren). But it is possible that instead of Tūnkat one should read Navikat, the town of Navākat or Navikat being the starting-point of several routes to China, V. Barthold, *Report*, p. 114, note 1.
4 *Ibid.*, p. 103 (text) and p. 126 (transl.). [Barthold translates Tawādu' by "Insignificance", "Frailty", which is rather a strange name for a geographical treatise. It is more probable that the book bore the name Rab' al-dunyā, "Habitable part of the World", as indicated by a variant, see M. Nāzim'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 Toghuzghuz 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 everyone entering Tibet) is clearly borrowed from Ibn Khurdādbhīh.⁵ The data on the Tibetan towns are apparently derived from various sources; two names, Lhāsā and Krsāng,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–Iṣṭakhrī,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-Sābur; the spelling of the Toumansky MS. approximates very closely to the pronunciation Vandēw-Shāpur proposed by Nöldeke.⁹ In the data borrowed from Balkhī–Iṣṭakhrī the author sometimes substitutes a local Persian form for the literary

¹ Kornilov, Kashgariya (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.); Tadrīf and Rasīya, mentioned there, figure in the Toumansky MS. among the towns which formerly belonged to China, and “now” belong to Tibet.
⁴ Cf. the title ‘Āzīm al-Khotan in a twelfth-century author, Turkestan, i, 202.
⁵ BGA, vi, 1709.
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 Balkhi–Iṣṭakhrī (p. 265), he writes Hari instead of Harāt.

The similarities of the Hudūd al-ʾālam and Gardīzī, 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 Baghshūr and Sangalākh, occur in both authors as names of localities between Turfan and Khami and between Sha-chou and Su-chou. Gardīzī gives itineraries which are not to be found in the Hudūd al-ʾālam, 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 Gardīzī does it in reversed order. There is no complete correspondence between the text of the anonym and that of Gardīzī; the former (f. 14a) mentions a “stone tower” (burj-i sangīn), which seems to be the only trace of influence of Ptolemy’s geography in this locality (i, 12, 9, λιθωσ πύργος, cf. Qudāma, burj al-ḥijāra); in Gardīzī no such name occurs. On the other hand, the Hudūd al-ʾālam contains no mention of Qamul or Khami, which is found in Gardīzī. From this we may conclude that at this place Gardīzī reflects a later stage of geographical knowledge; and it is possible that here our author depends on Ibn Khurdādhbih, and Gardīzī 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 (Khāmchu, f. 13b and sq.; same in Gardīzī): “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 Khurdādhbih, or in those of him whose work was his source, the traveller Tamīm ibn-Bahr al-Muttawwi’ī; but during the whole of the tenth century Kan-chou was an Uygūr principality.

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

1 Ḥudūd al-ʾālam, f. 13b and f. 14a; Gardīzī in Barthold, Report, p. 92 (text) and p. 117 (transl.).
2 Cf. e.g. the itinerary in Gardīzī, text p. 91, transl. p. 116, and the order in which the towns are enumerated in the Hudūd al-ʾālam, f. 17a.
4 Report, p. 92 (text) and p. 117 (transl.). [But see note to § 12, 9.]
5 [Barthold translates: sultaḥ, but in the tenth century this word meant more probably “government”. V.M.]
6 Yāqūt, i, 840, above; Barthold, Report, p. 34.
7 Cf. Bretschneider, Medieval Researches, i, 241 and sq.
other early Arabian geographers was in this case provided by the work of the traveller Abū 'Abdillāh Muḥammad ibn-Ishaq, who lived two years in Khmer (Qimār), i.e. Cambodia;\(^1\) he it was who originated the passage (f. 14b) on the strict forbiddance of adultery in that country,\(^2\) as well as the story of the woman who ruled Orissa. The name Orissa occurs in two forms: Ūrsfīn\(^3\) and Ūrshfīn (in the story of the queen).\(^4\) The work of Balkhī–Iṣṭakhrī was utilized for instance in the passage dealing with the Arab rulers of Multān and with the town Bābī (in Iṣṭakhrī, Bāniya). According to Iṣṭakhrī\(^5\) the khūṭba in Multān was read in the name of the caliph; according to Ibn Ḥauqal\(^6\) 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.\(^7\) Our anonym (f. 15a) says that the khūṭba was read in the name of Muʾizzī (bar Muʾizzī); but it is not clear whether we have to do here with a clerical error, the possibilities being Muʾizz (the Fāṭimid caliph who ruled from 953 till 975), and “Muʾizzī” which might designate the son and successor of Muʾizz, 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 Shiʿite 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;\(^8\) 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 (Bnjūl), Wen-su of the Chinese sources, was situated probably on the site of the present-day | Uch-Turfan,\(^9\) as confirmed by the Chinese source in which it was stated that this town bore the name of Yū-chou. Gardizi

---

1. BGA, vii, 132.
2. Ibid., and vi, 66 and sq.
3. Together with Smādr, as in Ibn Khurdādhbih, p. 642, who gives Ūrnsīn. [But see my note, p. 243. V.M.]
4. As in Ibn Rusta, p. 1341, 3.
5. BGA, i, 175.
6. Ibid. ii, 2304.
7. Ibid. iii, 4853.
8. On this 'Utbī-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 Bnchūl,¹ but not Ūj; Mahmūd Kāshgharī (eleventh century)² gives Ūj but not Bnchūl, whereas our author (18a) names Bnchūl and Ūj separately, with the additional remark, absent in other sources, that Bnchūl “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 Toghuzghuz, 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 Kharaqī, 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 Yāqūt, 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 'Aḍud 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, Constantinople ed., i, 38; he several times (i, 335, 381; ii, 121) cites words from the dialect of its inhabitants.
⁴ Gardīzī attributes to Issik-kul a still greater size, viz. of 7 days’ journey, see Barthold, Report, p. 89 (text), p. 114 (transl.).
⁶ Battānī, i, 172 and 175. [But Battānī, p. 169, quotes al-Jayhānī, tāw ghayraw-hum al-‘ulamā. V.M.]
⁷ Ibn al-Athīr, ix, 13; Zambaur, Manuel, 202.
⁸ BGA, iii, 489s.
⁹ Ibn Ḥauqal (BGA, ii, 221₂) speaks only of the victory which 'Aḍud al-daula, with the help of the Balūches, won over the Kūfic; one must suppose that the rupture with the Balūches occurred later. [It is doubtful that 'Aḍud al-daula assumed the title of shāhānshāh. As to the crushing defeat of the Balūches by 'Aḍud al-daula, it took place in 361 January 972, see Ibn Misakawaih, The Eclipse, ii, 299–301. V.M.]
In the description of the town of Qum (f. 29a) it is said that the secretary (dābir) Bul-Faḍl, the son of ʿAmīd, was a native of that place. The person here meant is the famous Buṭrid minister Abul-Faḍl ibn al-ʿAmīd,1 who died in Hamadān on the night of Thursday,2 6 Ṣafar 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 Bārdāʾa where “the camp of the Russians (Rūš) stood, at the time when they seized Bārdāʾa”, 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 southeastern shore of the Caspian; especially worthy of attention is the fact, apparently not mentioned in other sources, that two languages were spoken in Astarābād (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 Ṭūs, traversing the confines of Ustuvā and Jarmukān,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 V. V. Barthold’s Preface

---

1 Cf. his biography by Amedroz (from Ibn-Miskawaih) in Der Islam, iii, 323 and sq.
2 Ibid., p. 346; in the translation, p. 339, by mistake Wednesday. The correct translation (night of Thursday) in The Eclipse of the ʿAbbasid Khilafate, v, 293.
3 Cf. Yakubovsky in Vizantiishy Vremennik, xxiv, 63–92; the Ḥudūd al-ʿālam quoted, ibid., p. 91.
5 Jrm.kān, f. 11a and f. 19b, BGA, iii, 360 below and 320 Jrm.ukān; on its site, ibid., p. 352, where Jrm.qān 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 'Utbī¹ was considered the oldest author mentioning this ethnographical term (al-Afghāniya). Particularly little information is given on that part of Afghanistan 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 “Ghaznin”, 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 Islam 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 hudūd al-‘ālam 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 hudūd 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-ḥudūd, 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 hadd-ha) of Khorāsān there are kings, who are called margraves (mulūk-i atrāf).”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

---

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 Hudūd al-ʾālam,
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 Bistarāb;2 its length is
one farsakh, its width half a farsakh. There are similar lakes in the
mountains of Ṭūs and in the mountains of Ṭabaristān; 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 (batīha-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 ĥakimān [I read:
yādkird-i ĥakimān, “memories of the
sages”, V.M.] correspond on f. 13b the
words: ba-akhbār-hā šanidān.

2 On the district Mānishān see also
the description of Gūzgān, f. 20b,
the town B.st.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 (daryā-yi akhḍar or daryā-yi sabz, in Arabic al-bahr al-akhḍar) to the Eastern Ocean, and the term Great Sea (al-bahr al-a’zam) to the Indian Ocean, while in Muḥammad ibn-Mūsā al-Khuwārizmī1 both terms are applied to the Indian Ocean (the Great Sea—al-bahr al-kabīr), and the Caspian Sea2 is called Khuwārizmian.3 The Black Sea is called “Sea of the Georgians” (daryā-yi Gurziyān), a term which does not seem to occur anywhere else. But even in our MS. the Georgians are not4 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 daryā-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 daryā-yi Gurziyān support this supposition, though Westberg at another place endeavours to explain the name of Kerch by that of a people called Garsh6.

---

1 Ed. Mžik, p. 74. 2 Ibid., p. 80. 3 Cf. Enc. of Islam, i, under Bahır al-Khazar. As stated there, this early terminology of the Arab geographers may account for the Russian designation of the Caspian: Khvalinskoye, or Khvalimskoye more. 4 [But see § 42, 15. V.M.] 5 Izvestiya Akad. Nauk, 1899, p. 214. 6 “Die Garschen”, 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 by him to 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 i, and p. 446, note 2. V.M.]
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 (nāhiyat) in all, of which five are situated
south of the Equator, one (the Sūdān) is astride it and forty-five lie
north of it. The number of the provinces is very near to that given
by Khuvārizmī, viz. fifty-six, but the names of the provinces in
Khuvārizmī 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 Zābā (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), Ḥabasha
(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, Ḥabasha, 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
gеographers, who sometimes confuse the names Jāba (Java) and

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

2 Ed. Mžik, pp. 101–5, Nos. 1548–
1603.

3 Cf. articles "'Abābde", "Bedja",
and "Bishārīn" in Enc. of Islam.
Zābaj; but in any case the term Zābaj always refers to the Malay coast or archipelago. The data of the Ḥudūd al-ʿālam on the islands of the Indian Ocean are borrowed from Ibn Khurdādhbih. 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 Khurdādhbih. A certain influence of Balkhī is also felt in that our author, similarly to ʿĪṣākhrī, p. 11, places the country of the Zanj opposite Fārs and Kirmān, evidently on the assumption that the African coast extended much farther to the east than it does in reality. 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 Rīn, the residence of the commander-in-chief. In other works we find entirely different names. 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). 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 Toghuzghuz (the western neighbours of the Tibetans) follow their western neighbours, the people Yaghmā; 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; 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. 103 above, the islands Zābaj are nearer to China than to India.
3 BGA, vi, 66s: mamlakat Jābatal-Hindi [referring to the maritime Jāba. V.M.]
4 Our author places Zanj as well opposite Sind, and so does ʿĪṣākhrī; at another place ʿĪṣākhrī, p. 36, places Zanj opposite some parts of Hind. [This seems to be a misunderstanding, as ʿĪṣākhrī, p. 36, refers to the Indian Ocean and not to the ard 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, Yghmiyā, 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 ʿĪṣākhrī, p. 9 below, also speaks of the Ocean (al-bahr al-muḥīt) as the frontier of the Khirkhīz.
and describes the Khallukh (Qarluq) whose province on the east adjoined Tibet¹ 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 Tukhsī.² Again passing to the north the author speaks of the Kīmāk, living to the west of the Khirkhīz and to the north of the Irtīsh, 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 desert³ 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 [with the Ghūz are mentioned.⁴ After this come the Turkish Pecheneg, living to the west of the Ghūz, and the Khīfjākh (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 Khīfjākh separated from the Kīmāk, from which one might deduce that these latter had once been the eastern neighbours of the Khīfjākh. After the Khīfjākh 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 Khīfjākh, 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 Gardīzī⁶ (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 Ḥudūd 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 Khurdādhbih) 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 “Takhsī”; but in the MS. of Mahmūd of Kāshghar, judging by the printed edition (i, 28, 85, 342; ii, 243), everywhere stands Tukhsī. [In the Ḥudūd al-ʿālam: Tukhs, probably formed from Tukhsīyān, on a false analogy with Ghūzīyān < Ghūz. V.M.] ³ The expression biyābān-i Ghūz corresponds to the expression mafāzat al-Ghuzzīya, in Balkhī–Iṣṭakhri (BGA, i, 217 and sq.). ⁴ According to Iṣṭakhri, p. 222, the frontier between the countries of the Kīmāk and the Ghuzz was formed by the river Itil (Itil), 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-Istakhrī.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, Damghān, and Simnān. Rayy, with Khwār and Qazvin, is included in the Jībāl, and not, as in Balkhī-Istakhrī,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-Istakhrī, 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 prosperous province of the Muslim world, Baghdād the most prosperous town, and Wāsit the most pleasant town in 'Irāq (f. 31a). The most pleasant countries in Islam were Ādharbayjān, 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 'Omnān, Šoḥār (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 prosperity is greater than in any of the neighbouring provinces (f. 28b). Egypt is the richest country of the Muslim world; Fustāt (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 dhīrā').

Sometimes the author mentions an edifice as having an exceptional significance for the whole world, whereas in his source (Balkhī–Iṣṭakhrī) this remark is made only with regard to the Muslim world. In the passages on the Christian church in Edessa (Ruhā, 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 va kam-mardum. [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 'Omnān.

3 In the text bisyār-ni'mat-tar. In the Hudūd al-ālam the terms ni'mat and khwāsta are often juxtaposed but not as synonyms. That ni'mat and khwāsta are not one and the same thing, may be seen from the fact that in a country there may be little ni'mat and much khwāsta (f. 16b) and contrariwise (f. 37a). Apparently the word ni'mat refers to the general level of prosperity and wealth, and khwāsta, to the separate sources of prosperity or income, as for instance cattle: cf. f. 16b above, on the inhabitants of a Tibetan province: “their khwāsta 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.]
andar hama jihān correspond to Iṣṭakhri’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” (jāy-i bāzar-gānān [present-day pronunciation bazurgān, V.M.] or jāyagāh-i bāzar-gānān);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 jāy is substituted the word ma’dan), and the port of Abaskūn (f. 29b) on the Caspian Sea at the mouth of the Gurgān. 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 Gurgānj (f. 25b) in Khuwārizm. The capital of Khuwārizm, Kāth (spelt: Kāzh) 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 Şabrān, or Şaurān, was “the place of the Ghūz merchants” (ibid.). The situation of Karmīna, Dabusiya, and Rabinjan on the way (from Bukhārā) to Samarqand is specially mentioned (ff. 22b–23a). The small town Bāsand⁵ in Chaghāniyān was “the

¹ p. 62 (the bridge) and p. 76 (the church).
² [See Index D.]
³ Or sometimes bāzargānān bisyār, meaning that at a given place there are numerous merchants.
⁴ The Khorāsān pilgrims went via Baghdad; this may account for the mention of Qādisiya “on the way of the pilgrims” (f. 31b).
⁵ On it see my Turkestān, 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 Iskalkand\(^1\) in
the mountains of Hindukūsh (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 Hindukūsh
(f. 22b). To Andarāb near the Hindukūsh was brought the silver
from the mines of Panjhir and Jāriyāba and here dirhams 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. 25b). 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,
Vakhanians (Vakhī), and Muslims (ibid.); here, too, is described
Bolor (Kāfiristān), 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 Bahman-
ābād and Mazīnān and the road to Gurgān through Jājarm; Jājarm
was the store-house of Gurgān (f. 19b). Several industrial and com-
mmercial towns are mentioned in the Caspian provinces; an interesting
description is given of Pirīm (or Firīm), principal town of the moun-
tain province Qārin.\(^3\) In the detailed and precise description of the
Caspian provinces is to be found a striking absurdity: the words of
the Qor‘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 Iṣṭakhrī,\(^4\) refers to the dynasty of
the Jalandids, but Iṣṭakhrī 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.

\(^2\) Narshakhī, 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.

\(^5\) See Salīl ibn Razīk, History of the
Imams and Seyyids of Oman, transl. by
G. P. Badger, I. 1871, quoted by Bar-
thold in the Russian translation of Lane-
Poole's Muhammadan Dynasties, p. 284;
E. de Zambaur, Manuel, p. 125. [See
my explanation in the Notes. V.M.]
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 Qur'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 ʿIrāq (f. 13b), where it is said that the construction of the small towns of Karkh and Dūr (in the text by mistake Down), near Sāmarrā was begun by Muʿtasim (833–42), and completed by Maʾmūn (a.D. 813–33).

Store-places were: in Kirmān, Hurmuz (f. 26b); in Fārs, Sīrāf, and Māhīrubān (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 Istakhrī: enough to say that the town of Zabīd, which according to our author occupied the second place after Ṣanʿā, is not mentioned at all\(^2\) in Istakhrī.

The westernmost town ["land", V.M.] of the inhabited world was "Sūs-the-Distant" (Sūs al-aqsā, 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 Khurdādhbih. 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-Khurdādhbih\(^3\) says that Thrace (Trāqiya) is situated "beyond Constantinople, on the side of the country of the Burjāns" (Danube Bulgars); in our author the name B.rqiya, i.e. Trāqiya, is given to the town\(^4\) of

---

\(^1\) On this town see BGA, i, 29c; Yāqūt, iv, 699.
\(^2\) According to Maqdisī, Zabīd was "the Baghdād 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 (Bulghari), 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.\(^1\) 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 Iṣṭakhrī.\(^2\) 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–Iṣṭakhrī’s report\(^3\) 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 Toumansky, give little that is new.\(^4\) 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 Faḍlān. 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 Toumansky,\(^5\) but the Don.\(^6\) The next people after the Rūs are “the Inner Bulgars”, in whom Marquart\(^7\) sees the Danube Bulgars, and Westberg\(^8\) 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 Toumansky, ZVO, x, 132; translation and notes, 134. Under the influence of the record on an aqueduct coming, BGA, vii, 126, “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 Toumansky 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 mrvvt of the text (va andar gurūhī az ʾishān mruvvvat-ast) is probably the translation of the Arabic rujla (BGA, vii, 146,14). \(^5\) ZVO, x, 137, note. \(^6\) BGA, ii, 27b. \(^7\) J. Marquart, Osteuropäische und ostasiatische Streifzüge, Leipzig, 1903, p. 517. \(^8\) Journal of the Ministry of Public Instruction (JMNPI), 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 Sarīr (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 Sarīr lived the Alāns whose land adjoined Byzantium and not the Muslim possessions; to the north the Alān 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 Alāns, 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 Sarīr and the Khazars, as far as the beginning of Alān 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 Rūs (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 Khurdāb² 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 Mirvāt (the Khazarian Pechenegs were for them partly eastern, partly southern neighbours); on the west, too, the Mirvāt adjoined the Black Sea. To the north-west of the Mirvāt 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 Rūs; 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 Rūs country, which to the south extended down to the Danube, on which stood the capital of the Slavs, Khurdāb.

¹ Cf. Enc. of Islam, Barthold, Da­ghestān.
² On this town, cf. the equally un-founded hypotheses of Marquart, Streif­­züge, p. 471, and Westberg, JMNP, l.c., p. 12.
³ [Cf. § 6, 45. V.M.]
On the other hand, on its north-east 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 Tūlās and Lūghar, but their situation is not indicated; according to Ibn Rusta thus were called the peoples living on one of the outskirts of the Khazar country, near the high mountains which stretch to Tiflis. Marquart endeavours to prove that Ibn Rusta's Tūlās correspond to the Nandars (or Vanandars) of both the Toumansky MS. and Gardīzī, and likewise that the Lūghar correspond to the Mirvāt, the name Lūghar itself being a distortion of Aughas, or (with the article) al-Aughāz, by which are meant the Abkhāz. Meanwhile he (Marquart) thinks that in the source common to the Ḫudūd al-ʿālam and Gardīzī 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. 

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, and north of the Burṭās and the Barādhās lived the Turkish Pechenegs, while north of the Vanandar were the Magyars. Gardīzī adds 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 Streifzüge, 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 Rūṭā, ZVO, x, 135, note 11. On the different names of the Danube in Arabic literature, cf. BGA, viii, 67, note o.
6 [Instead of Burṭās (§51) read: Bulghār, as suggested by Barthold in an additional note. V.i., p. 450.]
V. V. Barthold's Preface

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 (Khirkhiz), whose neighbours on the west were the Kımāk, who in their turn had as neighbours the Qipchaq (Khifjākh, 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 Ghūz; to the south, the Burtās¹ and the Barādhās; 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 Rūtā, or Rūthā (f. 19a).² 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.³

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: Bulghār. 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.]
PART TWO

ḤUDŪD al-‘ĀLAM

"THE REGIONS OF THE WORLD"

TRANSLATED FROM THE PERSIAN
IN THE NAME OF GOD, THE MERCIFUL AND
BOUNTIFUL

List of the chapters of the book

§ 1. Preface (gushāyish-i kitāb) F. 1b¹
§ 2. The disposition (nihādh) of the Earth; the amount of (its) cultivation and lack of cultivation (miqdār-i ābādānī va vīrānī) and its countries (nāhiyat-hā)
§ 3. The Seas F. 2a
§ 4. The Islands F. 2b
§ 5. The Mountains F. 4a
§ 6. The Rivers F. 5b
§ 7. The Deserts F. 12a
§ 8. The countries (nāhiyat-hā) of the World F. 13a
§ 9. The country (nāhiyat) of Chīnistān F. 13b
10. The country of Hindūstān F. 14a
11. The country of Tibet F. 16a
12. The country of the Toghużghuz and Tätār F. 16b
13. The country of the Yaghmā F. 17a
14. The country of the Khirkhīz F. 17b
15. The country of the Khallukh F. 17b
16. The country of the Chigil F. 18a
17. The country of the Tukhs F. 18a
18. The country of the Kīmāk F. 18b
19. The country of the Ghūz F. 18b
20. The country of the Pechenegs F. 18b
21. The country of the Khifjākh F. 19a
22. The country of the Majgharī F. 19a
23. The country of Khurāsān F. 19a
24. The country of the Marches (hudūd) of Khurāsān F. 21a
25. The country of Transoxiana F. 21b
26. The country of the Marches of Transoxiana F. 22a
27. The country of Sind F. 25a
28. The country of Kirmān F. 26a
29. The country of Fārs F. 27a
30. The country of Khūzistān F. 28a
31. The country of Jībāl F. 28b
32. The country of Daylamān F. 29b
33. The country of 'Irāq F. 31a
34. The country of Jazīra F. 31b
§ 35. The country of Ādharbādhağān F. 32a

¹ On the contents of f. 1a see Appendix A.
§ 36. The country of Armīniya and Arrān
§ 37. The country of the Arabs
§ 38. The country of Syria (Shām)
§ 39. The country of Egypt
§ 40. The country of Magrib
§ 41. The country of Spain (Andalus)
§ 42. The country of Byzantium (Rūm)
§ 43. The country of the Slavs (Ṣaqlāb)
§ 44. The country of the Rūs
§ 45. The country of the Inner Bulghār
§ 46. The country of the Mirvāt
§ 47. The country of the Khazarian Pechenegs
§ 48. The country of the Alān
§ 49. The country of the Sarīr
§ 50. The country of the Khazar
§ 51. The country of the Burṭās [read: Bulghār]
§ 52. The country of the Barādhās
§ 53. The country of the V.n.nd.r
§ 54. Southern Inhabited Lands
§ 55. The country of Zangistān
§ 56. The country of Zābaj
§ 57. The country of Abyssinia
§ 58. The country of Buja
§ 59. The country of Nubia
§ 60. The country of the Sūdān
§ 61. Epilogue of the book
WITH bliss and happiness (bil-yumn wal-sa‘āda)! Thanks (sipās) be to God, the Almighty (tuwānā), Eternal (jāvidh), Creator of the World, Opener of difficulties (gushāyanda-yi kār-hā), guiding his slaves and manifesting himself (khwish-numā) through different sciences; and ample praises (durūd) upon Muḥammad and prophets all!

Owing to the glory, victory, and auspiciousness (nik-akhtari) of the Prince Lord Malik the Just Abul-Hārith Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad, client of 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 ṣifat-i zamin) in the year 372 from the Prophet’s emigration, on him be God’s blessings. In it we have brought to light (paydhā kardlm) the properties of the Earth and its disposition (nihādh), and the amount of its cultivation and its lack of cultivation. We have also brought to light all the countries and kingdoms (spelt: pādshāy-hā) of the Earth, so far (ānchī) 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 (pishinagān) and in the memories (*yādhkird?)*1 of the sages, with particulars of that land as regards its greatness or smallness, its deficiency or abundance of amenities (ni‘mat), wealth (khvāsta), and populations, and its cultivation or lack of the same; also, the disposition (nihādh) 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 (nihādh) of the seas all through the world, their broad and narrow (khurd va buzurg) places and the lagoons (murdāb), which are called gulfs (khalij), with each thing coming forth from that sea.

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

We have also brought to light all the principal (ašlī) 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,2 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 (gudhashtan); (and we have mentioned only the great rivers) because (az ān-k) of the small rivers the number is not known (padhīdh).

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 (nihādh) of the Earth with regard (az) to its cultivation or lack of cultivation

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

2. If on any sphere (har gū’i ki bāshadh) you trace two large circles (dāyira) intersecting one another at right angles (zāwiya-yi qā’ima), 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 (dā’irat al-āfāq) and the other Equator (khatt al-istiwā). As regards the Horizon, it starts from the eastern parts (nāhiyat), passes by the limit of the inhabited lands (ābādhānī) of the Earth, which (is) at the South Pole; then it passes by the western parts until it reaches again the East (bāz mashriq rasadh). And this circle is the one which separates this visible (zāhir) inhabited (ābādhān) half of the Earth from the other hidden (pūshidha) half which is beneath us. The Equator is a circle which starts from the eastern limit (hadd) 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 (ābādhānī) 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 (darāznā), because (az ān-k) the largest (mihtarīn) circle traceable round the Earth (gird-i zamin bar gardadh) is of 360 degrees. The measure of the inhabited lands lying in the southern parts (nāhiyat) is somewhat over 17 degrees by 180 degrees. The measure of the area (masāha) of these two (har du) forms one-ninth of the whole of the Earth (nuh bahr-i hama-yi zamin). 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.
4. In the eastern region (nāḥiyat) the farthest lying city is the capital (qaṣaba) 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 (tāziyān) the Green Sea (bahr al-akhdār). And so Aristotle says in the book Āthār-i 'Ulwi ("Meteorologica") that this sea surrounds the Earth like the Horizon and ships cannot work in this sea | and nobody has crossed it (burūdha) and it is unknown where it ends. And on the whole stretch of the inhabited zone (har chand ki ābādhānī-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 (nāḥiyat) is called Sūs-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 (nāḥiyat), 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 (qiyās) 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 (nīmā).

5. As regards the Equator, it passes through the said half (in its) largest extension (ʔ) (in nīma-yi bishtarīn) 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 digar sakht garmā-st) and the people of those regions are more removed from the character of humanity (ṭab'-i mardī). 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. Assistance (taufiq) is from God!

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

1. The first is the GREEN SEA, which we have named the EASTERN OCEAN. Its extension (ḥadd), so far as it is known, is from the extreme

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

2. The other sea is the western ocean. Its extension, so far (ān-k) as it is known, is from the extreme limit of the countries of the Südān, 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 (Baḥr al-A'zam). Its eastern limit adjoins the sea (called) the Eastern Ocean, and about one-third (miqdār-i si-yaki) of the Equator stretches across this sea. Its northern limit starts from China (Chīn), skirts the countries of Hindūstān and Sind, and the boundaries (huḍūd) of Kirkūn, Fārs, Khūzistān and Ṣaymara [sic]. The southern limit of this sea begins at the Jabal al-Ṭā’in, skirts the country (nāhiyat) of Zābaj and reaches that of Zangistān 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 Südān it is called the Barbari gulf. (b) Another gulf (which) adjoins it, takes a northern direction ([ba] nāhiyat-i shamāl furūd āyadh) up to the confines (huḍūd) of Egypt, growing narrow till (tā ānjā-kī) its breadth becomes one mile (mil); it is called the Arabian gulf (khalij-i 'Arabi), or the gulf of Ayla (spelt: Īla), or Qulzum. (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 (manzil) on swift camels (bar jammāza); it is called the Gulf of 'Irāq. 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 Pārs which starts from the limit (ḥadd) of Pārs, where it has a small breadth, and extends to the frontiers of Sind. (e) The fifth | gulf starts from the country of Hindūstān and becomes a gulf while taking a northern direction; it is called the 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. (chūnān-k) the sea of Pārs, the sea of Basra, the sea of 'Omān (spelt: 'Ommān), the sea of Zangistān, 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.
varies in each place. In this sea, from the limit of Qulzum 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 (bartar), 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-yi Rūmiyān) in the western parts. The form of that sea is conical (sinaubar). 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 (khallj) of Constantinople is 4 miles, and the narrowest (bārlk-tarin) part of the western strait (khalīj) is 10 farsakhs and from the one shore the other is visible.

5. Another sea is the sea of the Khazars. Its eastern1 side (nāhiyat) is a desert adjoining the Ghūz and Khwārazm. Its northern side (adjoins) the Ghūz and some of the Khazars. Its western side adjoins the towns of the Khazars and of Ādharbādhagān. Its southern side adjoins the towns of Gilān, Daylamān, Ṭabaristān, and Gurgān. This sea has no straits (khali). 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,1 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 Khwārazm which is situated at a distance of 40 farsangs in the north-western direction from (the town of) Khwārazm. 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 (daryāyak), sweet (fresh) and bitter (salt?).

1 The word written twice.
The lakes which are salt (šūr) are eleven: the first is 8. MAEOITIS (Māwts, “the Azov sea”) at the extreme limit of the Saqlābs towards the North. Its length is 100 farsangs with a breadth of 30 farsangs. From the Sea of the Georgians a strait (khalij) joins it. And from this same sea a strait joins the Western Ocean.2 Round it (i.e., Maeotis) lie desolate places (vīrāni). 9. The second is the lake KABŪDHĀN 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 (šūri) 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 (albatta) 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 NAWYTA (*Fāriţa?) in Rūm. Its length is three days’ journey and its breadth two days’ journey. Round it lie inhabited lands (ābādhān) and it has plenty of fish. 12. The fifth is the lake MYMĀTY (Smāty?), 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 (manāfī). 14. The seventh is the lake BĀSFĀHI (*Bāsafūya) in Pārs near Shīrāz, 8 farsangs long and 7 farsangs broad. Round it lie inhabited lands (but) it has little utility (kam-manfa‘at). 15. The eighth is the lake J.NKHĀN 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: Bakhtagān] 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 Dārāgard and it continues (hamī-rawadh) until it reaches the sea. 17. The tenth is *TUZ-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 Toghuzghuz. 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 (bahri) 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.i., p. 181.
2 Cf. § 4, 25.
into it. This lake in summer is fresh, but in winter when (the water) of the Nile is low (rūdh-i Nil andakī buvadh) it grows salt. In the middle of this lake are two towns, the one Tinnīs (spelt: Tinais) and the other Dimyāṭ. 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 (Tabariya) is in Syria. It is 12 farsangs long and 7 farsangs broad. 21. The lake of NICAEA (spelt: T-niya, <*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 (*Arzhan) 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 Sistān. Round it are inhabited lands and villages, except on the side which adjoins the desert (ba biyābān bāz 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 hadd) of Surūshana 4a (spelt: Subrubushna) 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-hā) which are known and which are mentioned in the information (akhbār) contained in the books [or: in the akhbār and books?].

And outside these (birūn az in), small lakes are numerous, such as the lakes, 26. one of which lies in the mountains of Guzgān in Mānshān close to Bastarāb and is 1 farsang long and half a farsang broad, and 27. such as there are in the mountains of Țūs and Țabaristān. 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 ma’rūf ast) are nine: 28–30. three among them (lie in) the desolate lands of the south (si andar vay virānī-yi junūb-ast) beyond Nubia (Nūba) close to Jabal al-Qamar, from which rise ten rivers. From each five of them one marsh is formed (batiha 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 (yakī batīha) is formed. Then from

1 mar ā-rā andar kitāb-hā [*va] akhbār yādh karda-ast?
2 Cf. § 6, 62.
this swamp rises the river Nile which passes between Nubia and the lands of Egypt until it empties itself (uftadh) into the lake Tinnīs. 31.–32. The two other swamps are those of Baṣra, round which there are many inhabited lands, villages, and boroughs. 33. The (sixth) one is the marsh of Kūfa round which there are many inhabited lands, with many amenities (bā ni‘mat-i bisyār). 34. The seventh is the swamp of Bukhārā which is called Āvāz-ī Paykand and is situated in the desert. 35. The eighth is at the upper end (a‘āli) of Chīnistān, in the region (ḥudūd) of the town Khumdān. 36. The ninth is in the North of Chīnistān.

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 i n) 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,¹ is called island.

A. In the Eastern Ocean there is a (well)-known island called 1. silver-island (jazīrat al-fidā) 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 jazīra) and empty themselves into that sea. On the island there is a great and well-known city, which is considered as belonging to Chīnistān (az shumār-i Chīnistān) 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 nāhiyat-i junūbi āyadh) and protrudes into this sea; the other stretches (biravadh) 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 (dhahabiya); its periphery is of 300 farsangs and it possesses gold-mines and many cultivated lands (ābādhāni), and its inhabitants are called Wāqwāqian Zangi (Zangiyān-i Wāqwāqī). 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.
to the inhabitants for gold, using signs and without saying a word to each other. | 4. Another island in this sea is called TABARNĀ (*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 as many rivers and mountains. It possesses mines of corundum (yāqūt) of all colours. This island lies off the frontier (sarhadd) separating Chīnistān 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-Rāmi) 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 (murvārīd). 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 az hama zahr-hā). 6. The fourth island is ʂ.ŘIH (*Zābaj?*), west[?] of Sarandīb. In it grow camphor trees, the people there are wild and snakes numerous. 7. The fifth is called JĀBA and SALĀHĪT (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 hindī), bananas (mauz), and sugar-cane (nay-shakar). 9. The seventh, south of Bālūs, is called KALA, and it is the kingdom of the Indian Jāba. Between Bālūs and Kala the distance is a two days' journey. In it (Kala) grow numerous bamboos (khayzūrān), and it possesses tin (arsīz) 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 āmlzand) 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: "مملكة جاية: هندوس.

الهندی."
(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 (sīj va rasad), as well as the positions of planets (kavākib-i sayyāra) and fixed stars (thābitāt), were calculated in the ancient tables (sīj) with regard to this island (badhln jazīra rāst kardand). This island is called “equinoctial” (istiwā 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 manzil) for ships. 15. The thirteenth, called Khāarak, lies south of Baṣra at a distance of 50 farsangs. It possesses a large and prosperous town called Khāarak. 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 Saqitrā [sic] khwānand) 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 Jūbaylāt. 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 (az vay) six lying off the Land of the Sūdān are called 18. Al-Jazā’ir Al-Khāliya and possess gold-mines. Once a year people from the region (nāhiyat) of the Sūdān and the towns of Sūs-the-Distant go to fetch gold from the mines but nobody can settle down there (kas 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 (bīgushāyadh) a large spring of water. The mouth of the strait opens into the Rūm Sea (dahna-yi khaliq 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 (raṣad-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 (az bahr-i tavālud 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 (nāhiyat-i shamāl-i in daryā) there are twelve islands called 24. BRITĀNIYA, 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. TUVAS (or Ĭūs) and situated north of the islands of BRITĀNIYA. It is 100 farsangs long and from it comes a large water (āb-i buzurg) which overflows the dry land (bar khushk rizadhi) and flows straight to the sea of Maeotis (spelt: Marṣ) situated north of the Šaqlāb, as we have mentioned. The twenty-fifth is the island 26. THULI (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 (muzvāzi spelt: mawāzi) 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-ṬARIQ (Gibraltar). One of its extremities (sar) 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 (dāru) usual in that land, e.g., gentian (jintiyānā) and the like. The other mountain is 28. JABAL AL-QILĀL near the Roman land (shahr-i Rumiya?); 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 (dahanj). It lies off Qaysāriya, 'Akka and Tyre (Ṣūr). The second island, lying north of Cyprus, is 30. QURNUS (spelt: Qrys), 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: Šaqliya), near the Roman country (Rūmiya); a high mountain encircles it. | In the days of old, Roman treasure used

---

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 (ustuvāri). Its length is 7 post stages (manzil) and its breadth 5 stages. The fifth island is called 33. SARDINIA (spelt: Surdāniya). It lies south of the Roman country (Rūmiya); its periphery is 300 miles. The sixth is 34. CRETE (spelt: Iqriṭas), situated off Aṭrābulus, (and) north of it. Its periphery is 300 miles.

These six islands are cultivated (ābādhān) and have many amenities (ni‘mat). They have many towns and districts (rustā), a numerous population, many merchants, troops, and much wealth (khwāsta). These islands of the Rūm Sea are more cultivated than any islands of the world.

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

F. In the Caspian Sea (daryā-yi Khazarān) there are two islands. The one lies off the Khazarian Darband and is called 36. JAZĪRAT AL-BĀB. It produces rūyan (madder, rūnās) exported to all the world and used by the dyers. The other island is 37. SIYĀH-KŪH; a horde (gurūh) of Ghūz Turks who have settled there loot (dūzdī) on land and sea. There is another island on the sea, but one of its corners is joined to the land off Dihistān; it is called 38. DIHISTĀNĀN-SUR, and on it are found a few people (andakī mardum): hunters of falcons and pelicans (ṣayyādān-i bāz va ḥawāsil), 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 (ṣūrat kardīm) 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 (nihādh) of the mountains is twofold. Some are real (ašli) mountains, stretching from one region (nāḥiyat) into another, growing now thin and now thick (sītabr), going, now straight and now curved, till the place where they finish (bi-buradh); these are called ridges of mountains (‘amūd-i kūh). The other (kind) are the ramifications (shākh) of the mountains which branch off (bar giradh) from the ridge of the mountain and also go on till the place where they end; they are called branches (shākh), just as a tree has numerous branches. And it may happen that those branches also have branches. Such is the likeness (mithāl) of the mountains. The mountains of which the ridge passes through (andar miyān) countries and districts
(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-ṭā’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 (qāqula), nutmeg (jauz-i bavā) 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 zabād) 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 Chīnistān. It is called Mānisā. 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 (Chin) up to the farthest limit of Rāng-rong (?) belonging to Tibet. Then (ān-gah) it turns (ʻatf) 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) Tūs.mt and the confines (va miyān-i hudūd) of China¹ to the farthest limit (ākhir) of the desert situated at the extreme end (ākhir) of Chīnistān; (then stretches) between (miyān) the towns of Transoxiana and the towns of Turkistān up to the confines (hudūd) of Țarāz and Shiljī, and there the ridge of the mountain disappears (ānjā ‘in ‘amūd biburradh).

4. And at the end of Hindūstān and the beginning of Tibet a branch (of the Mānisā range) shoots off (bar giradh) eastwards into Chīnistān (ba Chīnistān 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 (nawāhi) of Chīnīstān 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 Taqān.

7. And also in the neighbourhood of Taqān, in the Toghuzghuz country (nāhiyat), a mountain shoots off (bar gīradh) 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 Khūlandgūn this mountain is called Ighrāj-art, and each part of this mountain (har yākī 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 (ya ān-i ān shahr) which is nearest to it.

8. Another mountain shoots off (bar gīradh) from the beginning of the Toghuzghuz frontier (hadd) in the neighbourhood of the lake Issi-kūl (spelt: Iskūk). It continues till the end of the Tukhs (Tukhs-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 Tūlas 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 Hinduvān) up to the limits (hudūd) of Hitāl (sic). Then this mountain splits into two branches (ba du shākh gardadh).

---

1 Turns back? Cf. under 17. [See p. 286, n. 1].
2 Indistinctly written: صُور، صُور؟
9 A. One branch going northwards enters (furūdh āyadh) the confines (hudūd) of Tīthāl (?) and Nītāl (*Nēpāl?), and passes between (miyāna) the farthest limit of India and Tibet, going north of the confines (hudūd) of Bolōr, Samarqandāq, Shaknān [sic], and Vakhān (spelt: Khān), and south of the desert; then, on the confines (hudūd) of Zhāsht (*Rāsht?), it takes (furūdh āyadh) a north-western direction and passes through the confines of Buttamān belonging to Transoxiana, until it reaches (bar āyadh) the confines of Surūshna (spelt: Sarūshana). This mountain has numberless (bisīyār va bi-'adad) ramifications in the districts (az hudūd) Shaknān, Vakhān, and Zhāsht.

9 Aa. From the interior (miyān) of Vakhān and Zhāsht start many mountains (which) spread out (parāganadh) inside the limits (andar hudūd) of Khuttalān, and mines of gold and silver are found there. Of the branches of Khuttalān, one branch separates (bar dāradh) and becomes one with another (coming) from the district (hudūd) of Buttamān. From them separate numerous branches directing themselves (uftadh) into the district of Chaghāniyān, where they scatter. And where the said original ridge of the mountain ('amūd-i āšli) comes near Buttamān, (the chain) splits into two, but when (these two branches) come to the confines (hudūd) of Surūshana (spelt: Shurūshna) they unite again. From the confines (hudūd) of Buttamān a branch shoots off (bar giradh) which passes between the Buttamān-of-Daryāzha and Chaghāniyān (andar miyān-i Buttamān-i Daryāzha va miyān-i Ch.) and skirts the confines (bar hudūd) of Samarqand 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 Hibtāl [sic] it traverses (az miyān) Hindūstān, follows the confines (hudūd) of Qinnauj (Kanauj) and passes between the country of the continental (?) Jāba (mamlakat-i Jāba-yi khushk)\(^1\) and the kingdom of Lhrz\(^2\) where it is called the mountain of q.\(\ldots\)k.\(\ldots\)k(?), and so it runs north (andar shamāl) of the confines of Qashmīr, Vayhind (spelt: Vbhnd), Dunpūr, and Lamghān, and south of Bolōr, Shakhnān, Vakhān, and Badhakhshān, passing south (bar junūb) of the districts (rustā-hā) of Khuttalān. Then it enters (uftadh) the limits (hudūd) of Tukhāristān, stretches between (miyān) Tāraqān, Sakalkand, Khulm (and) Simin-gān, and south of Balkh, and enters the confines of Sān and Chāryak belonging to Gūzgān.

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

1 Khushk, “dry land”, cf. § 4, 25. 2 Small erasure, but the text is complete.
Herat (Hare), Būshang, and Nishāpur. Then between Nishāpur and Sabzavār (spelt: Sqrvār ←*Safsavār), it takes the direction of the road (following the latter) on its northern side (ba rāh furūdh āyadh az sīy-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 ‘atf kunad) (reaches) the frontier (andar hadd) of Madr belonging to Ṭukhāristān, so many small and large branches spread out of it (bar dāradh) in those districts (navāhi) that only God knows their number. And from each of its branches many (other) spurs shoot off which spread (parāganadadh) in the region (andar hudūd) of Ṭukhāristān, Andarāb, Panjhīr, Jāriyāna (spelt: Khāriyāna), Bámiyān, Bust, Rukhada, Zamāndāvar, 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 āyadhī) 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 parāganadadh) in the districts (rustā) of Aspuzār (Isbszār).

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

9 bb. On reaching the locality of Sān and Chahāryak belonging 7 a to Gu zgān, this ridge of mountains splits into two: | the one branch is that which we have described (padhidh); the other one goes north of it taking a western direction between Kundarm and Anbīr. It passes between Gurzivān and Jahūdhān, between Bashīn and Diza, between *Marrūdh and Baghshūr and south of Sarakhs. Then it takes a northern direction and goes to the limits (hudūd) of Ṭūs, Bāvard, and Nasā until it reaches the limits (hudūd) of Gurgān. Then comes a valley, three days long but narrow, which is called DĪNĀR-ZĀRĪ. And the mountain, which (stretches?) on the other side of the valley, takes a direction through the limits of Sibarāyin (**Siparāyin > Isfarāyin) 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 (hami ravadh) south of Āmol and the towns

1 Jārbāya? 2 This sentence ought to come under 9 ba. 3 See above, 9 ba.
of Ṭabaristān down to the limits (hudūd) of the town Rayy. Then it joins the other chain (ʼamūd) which we have described (ṣifat). The two chains united go up to the end of the province of Gīlān, as we have explained. From the limits of Hindūstān where this mountain begins till the limits of Gīlān where it ends this mountain is called “Belt of the Earth” (kamar-i zamin), or in Arabic “Miṣṭaqat al-ʾArḍ”.

10. Other mountains are in the province of Kirmān. They are separate (burdīha) from each other, (but jointly) are called the mountains of Kirmān. One of them called the KŪFIJ MOUNTAIN is in the midst of the desert. It stretches from the sea to the limits (hudūd) of Jīruft and consists of seven mountains joined to one another. Each of them has a chief (har kūhi rā . . . mihtarī dāradh) and the representatives of the government (ʾāmil-i sultān) do not go (nashavadh) to those mountains, and those chiefs (ān mihtarīn) every year collect and send in the amount of tribute-money (muqātaʾa gird kunand). These seven mountains do not obey each other, and the people of these mountains are called Kūfijiyān. They have a special language. It is a place of great amenity (niʿmat) and great strength (ustuvār) and cannot be conquered by armies and war. Between Jīruft and this mountain there are hills (šākhak-hā-yi kūh) and the locality is called BU GHĀNIMʾS KŪHISTĀN. Another mountain is BĀRIJĀN. It runs along (darazā) from the frontier of Jīruft to the frontier of Bam, possesses mines of lead (surb), copper, and lodestone (sang-i maghnātis), and has two villages: Kaftar and Dihak. Another mountain of Jīruft 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 Jīruft and possesses silver-mines.

11. Another mountain in the province Pārs begins (bar giradh) between Pasā and Dārāgird and stretches eastwards till the frontier (sarhadd) of Kirmān. Then it takes a northern direction till (it reaches) the frontier of Tās (Unās ?) and Raudhān (*Rūdān). Then it turns westwards and runs on to the frontier between Pārs and Khūzistān. Then it takes a northern direction, passes (furūdh āyadh) between Bū-Dulaf’s Kara (i.e., Karaj) and Sipāhān, and enters the lands of the Jībāl (ba shahr-hā-yi j. furūdh āyadh) until it reaches the confines (hudūd) of Hamadān. Then it passes south of Hamadān, following a north-western direction until it reaches the confines of Marāgha, belonging to Ādharbādḥagān, and then stops (biburradh). This mountain in the districts (kuwar) of the Jībāl | sends out so 7b many offshoots that there remains no town but possesses near it a spur of this mountain.
Likewise in the province of Pārs this mountain has many ramifications and (other) mountains lie there, both joined (to one another) and separate (burīḍha), so that in the neighbourhood of each city of Pārs there is a mountain. This mountain has also ramifications near Sipāhān, which spread out (parāganadh) in Khūzistān. Near Sipāhān this mountain is called Kūh-jīlū.

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 (ābādhānī) of the world finishes in the north. In the northern region this mountain is called by the Kīmāk, K.NDĀV.R-BĀGHĪ (*Kundāvar, Kandā'ur-taghi).

13. Another small [?] mountain situated in the province (nāhiyat) of Ādharbādhagān near Ardabīl, is called sabalān (spelt: Sabilān?).

14. Another mountain lies in the districts of Armenia. It starts from Takrīt in 'Irāq, where it is called KūH-I*BĀRĪMMĀ, and so it goes between the frontiers (bar miyān-i hadd) of Armenia and Ādharbādhagān until it reaches the limits of Barda'.

15. In the same region (nāhiyat) are two other mountains separate from each other. The higher one is called ḤĀRĪTH (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 ḤUWAYRĪTH, is similar to Ḥārīth but smaller than it.

16. In the province of Jazīra there are two separate mountains. The one, called JŪDI, is the mountain on which Noah’s ark (kashti) came aground (biīstādh). The other, called the MOUNTAIN OF MĀRDĪN, is situated near Niṣībīn (spelt: Naṣībīn).

17. In the Arab country there are many small mountains; thirteen of them are called TĪHĀMA. One mountain is near Mekka and is called GHAZWĀN. Another called SHĪBĀM (spelt: Shiyām) is near Ṣan‘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 (chahār sī andar gird) of 20 farsangs, lies at the end of the mountains of Tīhāma. Its summit is flat (hāmūn) and has villages (ābādhānī), agriculture (kisht), and running waters. In the days of old, Muhammad ibn Faḍl al-Qarmaṭi conquered it. Another hill (kūhak) called RĀDWĀ stands near Madīna; the Mekkan whetstones (sang-i fasān) 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 Tih 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 (hudūd) of Zughar (spelt: Za’r), and farther (hamchinin) to the limits of Damascus, Ba’albakk, Hīmṣ, 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 (az) 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 (bargardadh) 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 nāhiyat-i Bachanāk-i Khazar biburradh) and separates the Inner Bulghars from the Rūs (miyān-i Bulghār-i dākhil [*va] Urūs [sic] biburradh) as far as the limits of the Šaqlāb. Then it takes a northern direction, traverses (andar miyān) the Šaqlāb (country) and skirts that town of the Šaqlāb which is called Khurdāb, after which it reaches the end of the Šaqlāb and there stops (biburradh).

From the Tur Sīnā to Zughar (spelt: Za’ur) they call this mountain MOUNTAIN OF THE KHĀRIJITES (shurāt, spelt: sh.rāh) and on it are many villages (ābādhāni) and near it all the people are Khārijites (khārijīyān). From *Zughar to the limits of Damascus they call it BALQĀ. From Damascus to Hīmṣ, LUBNĀN; from Hīmṣ to the limits of Baghrās, [the Mountain of the] Bahrā (spelt: Dahrā) and TANŪKH; from the limits (hudūd) of Baghrās to the beginning of the Sarīr frontier, LUKKĀM; from there, until having curved in the above-mentioned way (tā ān ’atf-hā bikunadh) it reaches the beginning of the Alāns, it is called QABQ; after this, until finally (tā ākhīr ki) it disappears (munqat), each place is called after the town and the district which adjoins it, as is the case with the other mountains.

18A. When it reaches the end of Syria and the beginning of Armenia a large branch separates from it and enters the region (nāhiyat) 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 (Gurziyān).
18 c. And when it reaches the middle of the Sarīr a huge ('ażīm) branch shoots off from it and thus it runs on eastwards (az sūy-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 (bāra) 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 Alāns a very great (sakht 'ażīm) branch separates (from it) which goes in a western direction as far as the Alān Gate and there, on the summit of this mountain, stands a town, which is the most flourishing of the Alān towns. There this branch ends.

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

20. In the country (andar hadd) of Rūm there is a mountain in the province called Rustā-yi Awās (Ephesus?) and therein is a large and frightful cavern (shikaft . . . bā ḫaul) which is said to have been the place of the “Companions of the Cavern” (i.e., the Seven Sleepers).

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

22. Another mountain stands near the Georgian mountain (Kūh-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 sūy-i mashriq az rūdhi Nil). From the frontier of Uswān and the beginning of the frontier of Nubia (Nūba) it runs straight north and enters Upper Egypt (Ṣa‘īd al-a’lā). It skirts the limits (ḥudūd) of Būsīr (spelt: Taوṣīr) and Fuṣṭāṭ, which is the capital (qaṣaba) of Egypt, until it reaches Ḥauf [al-Sharqi: “eastern bank”] (spelt: Khauf) and the place where the Jīfār (spelt: Jīfāra) sands are situated, and there it ends. In that mountain mines of silver and gold are found and it is (called) MUQAT TAM (spelt: Mu’azzam).

24. The other mountain is on the western side of the river Nile. It also starts (bar giradḥ) just (rāst) from the beginning of the Nubian frontier and takes a northern direction until in the region (ḥudūd) of Fayyūm it reaches Ibrīq (*Abwaiṭ†?).⁴ Then a small branch shoots off (bāz kashadh) westwards and disappears. In this mountain there are mines of garnets (bijādha), emeralds (zumurrud), and chrysolites (zabarjad). And on this mountain wild asses (khar-i wahshī) are found striped (mulamma’) with black and yellow, but if you take

1 This detail ought to come under 18 d., cf. § 48, 3. ⁴ 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 āyadh) the province of Lerida (Lārida); 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 (dāru).

28. Another mountain stands in (andar hudūd) Western Rūm and is called BULGHARĪ. It is an inhabited mountain with many amenities (ni‘mat).

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 far-sangs.

30. The other eight mountains vary in longitude, latitude, and extension (tūl va ‘ard va masāfat); 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 (sinā‘i). The latter are those of which the beds (rūdhkadha) have been dug out and the water brought (therein) for the benefit (ābādhāni) of a town or for the agriculture (kisht-u-barz) 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-barz), and for the meadows (giyā-khwār); the number of these canals cannot be fixed (na-mahdūd) 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 (farākh) and now narrow, and continually flow (hami ravadh) until they reach a sea, or a marsh. Some of these natural rivers are not very large and are used (ba kār shavadh) for the benefit (ābādhāni) 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 dāradh) and utilized while the original stream (ān 'amūd-i rūdh) goes down to a sea, or marsh, as is the case of the Euphrates.

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

2. Another river called Kīsau [sic] rises from the east of the mountain Mānisā and reaches the place situated in the centre of Tibet (badh-ān jāy ki ba-miyāna-yi ḥudūd-i Tubat). And it flows on, following that mountain (badh-in kūh), among mountains and cultivated lands, until it comes opposite the Tibeto-Indian frontier (tā barābar-i ḥadd-i miyān-i Tubbat va Hindūstān rasadh). Then it cuts through many mountains and traverses them down to the limits of Kujān and Bughshūr [sic]; then it passes between the Chinese provinces (nāhiyat) of Ir.sh and Khūr.sh and flows out into the Eastern Ocean. This river, after it has entered the limits of Bughshūr (B.ghsūz?), is called Ghiyān (spelt: 'Inān).

3. Another river, called Wajākh (Betajākh?), rises on the eastern side of the said mountain Mānisā at the extreme limit (ākhir-i hadd) of the desert. It skirts (karān) the towns (districts?) of Thajākh [sic], Barīha, and Kūskān, flows on through the province of Khotan, and while passing through the region of Sha-chou (chūn az nāhiyat-i Sāju andar gudharadh) forms a swamp. Thence it flows down to the limits of Kuchā, then passes through (andar miyān) the province (nāhiyat) of Kūr.sh (?) and the province of F.rāj.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 bahārān) 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 crossed¹ (va hargiz pahnā-yi in āb naburrand?). 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 nazdiki), (but) nearer to Transoxiana, come out three rivers, of which the one is called s.māy.nd-ghūn, the second khrāy.nd (Khwāy.nd?)-ghūn, and the third kuḥl.nd (Khūk.nd?)-ghūn. Between Gh.zā and K.ībān k all the three rivers flow into the river of Thajākh [sic].

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

5. Another river is called ĪLĀ. It comes from the mountain Irghāj-ārt [sic], takes a northern direction, and falls into the lake Issī-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 Bolōr and those of Shaknān, (which is) of Vakhān,² down to the limits of Khuttalān, Ṭukhāristān, 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 KHARNAĪB; 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 dūtar ravadh).

8. Another river flows behind (az ān sīy) Buttamān for a distance of 60 farsangs; it flows from the mountains which stretch from north to south (az nāḥiyat-i shamāl 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 kūmījīs (Kumijīyān), flows through their mountains, passes through (bar miyān) Nū-diz, and flows into the Jayhūn near Qavādiyān.

11. Another river is CHAGHĀN-RŪDĪ, which rises from Chaghāniyān and falls into the Jayhūn near Tarmīd [sic]. These four rivers (8.-11.) flow from north to south.

12. Two other rivers, of which the larger is called RŪDĪ DARGHĀM

¹ So in view of § 2,4. Less probably: “cannot be dammed in”.
Another river rises from the mountains on the confines of Lamghān and Danpūr [sic] and passes south [north?] of *Ninhār (bar ḥadd-i bīgudharad az sūy-i jūnūb). It is called the River of Lamghān. It flows past the region (bar ḥudūd) of Mūltān (spelt: Mūliyān) and the towns *Rūr (spelt Divin), Sadūsān, Bulrī, Mansūra, and Manjabrī, and near Kūlī empties itself into the Great Sea.

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

Another river (called) ḤĪVĀN, comes from the mountain Ḥīvān, passes between Jalavvat, Balavvat, and Bīrūza (spelt بَرُو)، 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 MIHRĀN.

It is said that from the summit of the Mountain of Ice, which is Qasak, a water springs up like a fountain (bar damadh čīn 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-rūdgh, which afterwards becomes the Mihrān.

Another river is the LESSER MIHRĀN which rises in the Indian mountain (Kūh-i Hinduvān) 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‘nīn and Nu’nīn; it skirts (bar hudūd) Qandahār, reaches the limits of Kūlī, and flows into the Great Sea.

Another river is ÜZGAND which rises from behind the mountain of the Khallukh and skirts Üzgand, the town of Bāb, Akhsīkat, Khūjand, and Banākat, down to the limits of Chāch (spelt: Chāj). Then it skirts S.tkand, Pārāb, and numerous boroughs down to the limit (tā bi-ḥadd) of Jand and Javāra (Khavāra?), and flows into (bā sic) the sea of Khwārazm.

Another river is KHURSĀB (spelt: Khirsāb) which rises from the extreme limit (ākhir-i ḥadd) of Buttamān on the northern side of the mountain, and near the town of Khursāb joins the river Üzgand.

Another river is ŌSH, which rises in the same mountain, passes between (bar miyān) Ōsh and Ūrasht (Ūrast) and joins the Üzgand.
20. Another river is *qubā* which rises in the same mountain and joins the Ûzgand 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 Ûzgand 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 Ûzkand.

When all these rivers have united, their joint course is called the *chāch* river and the Arabs (*Tāziyān*) call it Sayhūn.

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 (*batīha*) called Daryāzha; 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 *Avāza* of Paykand.

24. Another river is that of *balkh* which rises in the region (*hudūd*) 10a 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 (*hadd*) of Guzgānān. In the neighbourhood of Ghūr it flows past (*bar*) Durghush [sic], Til, and Bust and makes a sweep round the region of Sīstān (*az gird-i Sīstān 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 Ghar-chistān, 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 Hinaf [sic], Lōgar, B.r.kd.r (*Barakdiz?*) and Gīrang, reaches Marv where it is used up in the fields.

27. Another river is that of *herat* (*Hari < Harē*) which rises at the limits (*hudūd*) of Ghūr and is used in the fields of Herat. Herat possesses also other considerable (*buzurg*) 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 Pars which rises in the mountains and the district (rustā) of Ruyagān; changing its direction it flows round the town Kavar (az girdi Kavar andar gardadh) and between Najiram and Sirāf joins the Great Sea.

30. Another river is khūyadhān rising from the district (nāhiyat) of Khūyadhān in Pars. It passes east of Tavaj and joins the Great Sea between Ganāfa and Najiram.

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

32. Another river is sīrīn (Shīrīn?) which comes from the mountain Dhanbādh (Dīnār?) in the district of Bāzranj. It passes between Vāyagān and Lārandān; on the confines (bar hudud) of Arragān it passes through the town [ba-shahr read: *ba Rīshahr “through Rīshahr”] 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 (az) Pars. It flows in an easterly direction until it has passed south of Istakhr (hand tā ba-Istakhr bigudharadh) and joined the lake *Bijagān [now: Bakhtagān].

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

35. Another river is tāb, which rises in the Kūh-Jīlū, situated on the confines (ba hudud) of Sipāhān, follows the frontier between Khūzistān and Fārs (ba hadd-i miyān-i Khūzistān va Pars) and falls into the Great Sea. The town Māhibrūbān stands in the sea between (two branches of) this river (andar miyān-i in ābast bayn-i daryā).1

36. The river sardan rises also in the Kūh-Jīlū and falls into the river Tāb (ba rūdh-i Tāb andar uftadh). The town Sardan (spelt: Surdan) is between these two rivers.

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

---

1 On the position of this town, cf. § 29, 15.
2 On the margin: al-juz’ 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. uftad) 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 fields1 of Bāsiyān, Khān Mur-dūna [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 Jibāl mountains and it flows to irrigate the countryside (savād) of Shūshtar [?] and Shūsh. It passes between Shūsh and B.dhūshāvar [?], but before reaching the limit of Basunay 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 Kīmāk and the Khirkhīz, 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 (shīrīn). It flows between the Ghūz and the Kīmāk until it reaches the village Jūbīn (*Chūbīn) in the Kīmāk 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 Kīmāk country (andar miyāna-yi Kīrnākiyān) down to the village Jūbīn (*Chūbīn); then it flows westwards along the frontier between the Ghūz and the Kīmāk 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 Atil 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, Š.lāb, and Kūyāfa, which are the towns of the Rūs, and the confines of Khīsfākh. 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 kashtihā.
² V. i., p. 463.
45. Another river is the ṛūtā (?) which rises from a mountain situated on the frontier (sarḥadd) between the Pechenegs, the Majghari, and the Rūs. Then it enters the Rūs limits (andar miyāna-yi ḥadd-i Rūs) and flows to the Saqlāb. Then it reaches the town Khurdāb belonging to the Saqlāb and is used in their fields and meadows.

46. Another river is the Tigris which rises in the mountains of Diyārbakr (Āmid; spelt: ḫmidh), flows past (bar) Balad, Mauṣil, Takrīt, and Sāmarra, cuts into two both Baghdād and Wāṣīt (miyāna-yi B. biburradh), and finally reaches Madhār, Bula (*Ubulla), and the limits of Baṣra; then it empties itself into the Great Sea. Near Fath a river separates from the Tigris, which is called canal of Ma’qil and flows to Baṣra. 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 Baṣra it joins the Ma’qil canal. Then it passes through (az) Baṣra, where it is called Dubays-canal. Finally it once more (bāz) joins the Tigris near ‘Abbādān. Between Wāṣīt and Madhār a canal separates from the Tigris, and forms two swamps called Baṣra 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 Hadītha and Sinn.

48. Of the other two rivers, the one called sās (Ṣābus ?) rises in the Armenian mountains and is utilized in the fields; when it reaches the town ‘Ukbara (spelt: ‘Akbura) nothing remains of it. The other river, rising in the same mountain and called NAHRRAWĀN, 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 Ḫulayq (‘Aliq ?) and flows through the Rūm country, cutting the mountain Lukkām (az miyān . . . biburradh). It arrives at the limits (ḥudūd) of *Malatya (spelt: Malāṭiya) and thus (hamchinīn), turning southwards, skirts Shumayshāt, Sanja, and Bālas (*Bālus ?). Then it takes a north-easterly [read: south-westerly!] direction until it has skirted Raqqa, Qarqīsiya, Raḥba, ‘Āna, Hīt, and Anbār. Then again it changes its direction and flows towards the south-[east] (miyān-i junūb [*was mashriq]), 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-kashtl ravandh) this canal from the Euphrates to the Tigris. Lower down (az zīr-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-Šaršar, 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 (ḥudūd) of Karbalā. It is called Nahr-Sūrā and flows until it too [i.e., like the Euphrates] empties itself into the Wāsit swamp. The town Jāmiʿaʿyn is between these two rivers, i.e., the chief stream (ʿamūd) of the Euphrates and the Sūrā canal.

50. Another river in the province (ḥudūd) of Khorāsān is called Hirand. It rises from the mountain of Tūs and skirts the region of Ustuvā (spelt: Āsatavū) 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 Tīzhinrūdh. It rises in the Qārin mountain in the neighbourhood of Pirrim, 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 harhaẓ, rises in the mountains of Rayy and Lārijān on the frontier (az 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-rūdh, rises in the mountain Huwayrith in Armenia, flows westwards [read: eastwards], traverses (miyān) Gilān, and empties itself into the Khazar sea.

55. Another river, called aras (spelt: Arus), 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 Ādharbāḏagān, Armenia, and Arrān, it joins the Khazar sea.

56. Another river called kurr rises in the province Ṭabaristān in the mountain lying between Arrān and the Sarīr. Taking an easterly direction it flows down to the limits of Shakī and Qabala (spelt: Qibla) and skirts Bardīj (*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 country is Bayḥān (spelt: Mijān) It rises from the farthest end (ākhir-i ḥudūd) of the Tihāma mountains, i.e., from the easternmost part of it (ānk ba mashriq nasdiktar-ast), skirts the town of the Wādī Bayḥān (spelt: Mijān), Shabwa (spelt: Saywa), and the towns of Ḥaḍramūt, (then) traverses the Ahqāf sands, and flows into the Great Sea.

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

58. Another river, called Nahr al-Karūm (*Kurūm?), rises in the province ('amal) 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 (Išākhūniya) in Rūm, skirts the town of Ṭanābri (*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. ndāq.lus (?) and Dīdūn (B.d.ndūn, N. dydu?) to flow into the *Nīqiya (spelt: Tanqiya) lake in Rūm.

61. Another river also rises here (idhar) and follows the frontier (bar miyān-i ḥadd) between the theme of Anatolicon (*Natliq spelt: Batiq) and the Buccellariote theme (Buqallār). Then it turns southwards, flowing between Khāk (Ḫāk) and *Nīqiya, and empties itself into the *Nīqiya 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 (batihā bandadh); then from each of the swamps come out three rivers. From all these six rivers a swamp is formed (yakā batihā bandadh) outside the limits of Nubia towards the south (birūn as hudūd-i Nūba andar junūb). 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 (bāz gardadh) eastwards until it has skirted (bar taraf) the Mountain of the Oases (Kūh-i al-Wāhāt) and flowed past (bar) Uswān (Assuan). Then it flows straight northwards and crosses all the province of Egypt. It skirts Akhmīm, Fayyum, and Fuṣṭāt, and empties itself into the lake Tinnīs.

63. And from the sands which lie between the districts (nāwāhi) of Egypt and the Qulzum Sea rises a great river which flows westwards and crosses Nubia in its breadth (miyān-i Nūba biburradh ba pahnā). At the place where the town of Kābil 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 Дан.2

64. From the Nile a large canal separates near Fuṣṭāt and is constantly utilized (ba kār hamī shavadh) in the fields until it reaches Alexandria; the remainder of the water flows again (bāz)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 . . . bāz “towards”, cf. p. 50, l. 20.
to the region (nāhiyat) of Sūs-the-Distant there are no great and important (kull) rivers, except such as (magar chunānk) serve for drinking (khurd) and (the irrigation of) the fields.

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

66. Another river rises in the west of the country Rūm, from the mountain Bulgharī, and follows (hami ravadh) 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 nāhiyat-i Burchān [sic] bigudharadh) it skirts the theme (bar 'amal) of Thrace (spelt: Burāqiya), and in this (reach?) traverses the town Qusṭantiniya (andar in [miyān?] miyān-i Q. bigudharadh), while the remainder (of the water) flows out into the strait. This river is called Bulgharī.

67. The river tagus (*Tāju) rising in the mountains of Spain near Toledo, flows round the town of Toledo (az gird-i shahr-i Tulaytula andar āyadh), following a westerly direction, then turns eastwards, (then) again westwards. And it flows on till the limits of *Merida (spelt: Hārda) and Santarem (Shantarīn). 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 except those which we have mentioned. As regards the southern parts (nāhiyat) 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 (Hābasha). God is omniscient and there is no might but in God!

§ 7. Discourse on the Deserts and Sands

Every land (zamin) where there are sands (rig), or salt marshes (shūra), 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 (ābādhāni) of the world.

1. In the southern part of the country Chīnistān, 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-Ṭā‘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 چین?). East of it lies the Eastern Ocean; south of it, the provinces (nawāḥi) of China (چین); west of it, the river of Kuchchā; and north of it, the Toghużghuz and Khirkhiz.

3. In the country of Chīnistān there are sands, three days' journey (manzil) wide, situated between two Chinese (اژ چین) towns Khatham 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 (چین?).

4. Another desert is (that) east of which lie the limits of Tibet; south of it, the country of Hind (bilād-i Hind); west of it, the limits of Transoxiana; and north of it, the Khallukh country. It is a hard (sa'b) 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 (hadd) of Sarandib up to the beginning of Dahum’s kingdom (mamlakat); yet this desert is intersected (buridha) 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 Kūfij 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 ( hudud, basin?) of the river Mihrān, and of which the southern (part) skirts (bar hudūd . . . biravadh) Sind, Kirmān, and Pārs; west of it are the limits of Rayy, Qum, and Qāshān, and its north skirts (bar . . . bigudharadh) Khorāsān with its Marches ( hudūd) 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 which surround Sīstān (az gird bar āyadh) | and are called the Sīstān sands.

8. Another desert is the one of which the east skirts the confines of Marv (bar hudūd Marv bigudharadh) down to the Jayhūn. 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 Jayhūn, 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.
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 (mansils).

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 Hajjar to those of Bahrayn and Baṣra; (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 ʿArab hama), the limits of the Ayla [read: *Barbarī] Gulf, the Great Sea, the districts (nawāhi) of Ḥadramūt and Yemen; its west marches with the regions of Jīdā, Jār, Madyan, and *Ayla; its north, with the regions of Muʿān (spelt: Maghān), Salamiya, Tadmur and Khunāṣira 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 (mansils), 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 ʿIrāq route must cross this sand-plain (rig).

11. Other sands lie on the sea-shore south of this [i.e. 10.] desert and surround (az gird bar āyad) the towns of Ḥadramūt. They are called the AHQĀF-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 Qulzum 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 (Habasha); 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 ʿAsqālān to the Dead Sea (Buḥayrat al-mayita); both south and west of them (junūb va maghrib-i vay har du) lies the province of Fustāt; their northern side stretches from the Tinnīs lake to ʿAsqālān. They are called the SANDS OF JIFĀR.

15. In the country of Maghrib (nāhiyat-i M.), from Egypt, the Mountain of al-Wāḥāt, Barqa and Ṭarābulus down to the province of Sūs-the-Distant, (the land) is mostly desert (bīshatar-i hama biyābān-ast).
16. In the country of Maghrib there are extensive sands in the province Sijilmāsa, called raml al-maḍan. Much gold is found there.

17. The region lying south of the Equator is mostly desert (bishtar-i hama biyābān-ast). Their inhabited places (ābādhānī) 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 kāfiri), except those of the Turks (juz az 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 (ruy). First, by the difference of water, air, soil, and temperature (garmā-va-sarmā). Secondly, by the difference of religion, law (shari'at), and beliefs (kish). Thirdly, by the difference of words (lughāt) and languages. Fourthly, by the difference of kingdoms (padhshāl-hā). The frontiers of a country are separated from those of another country by three things: first, by mountains, 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 (ābādhānī) of the world form three parts. The one is that which, on the east, has the Eastern Ocean and the (farthest) limits of the Toghuzghuz and Khirkhīz; 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 (Āsiyā 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 Südān; 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 (Urūfi, spelt: Azwīfī), and forms one-quarter of all the cultivated lands of the world.

5. As regards the cultivated lands lying to the south, the Greeks call them the “Inhabited Lands of the South”.

6. The Inhabited Lands of the world (“oecumene”) 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 Südān, 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 ābādhān), 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), Jazīra, Ḍaharbādḥagān, Syria, Egypt, Maghrib, Spain, Rūm, the Sarīr, the Alān, the Khazar, the Saqlāb, the Khazarian Pechenegs, the M.rvāt, the Inner Bulghār, the Rūs, the Majgharī, the N. nd. r (*V. n. nd. r), the Turkish Pechenegs, the B. rādas [sic], the Burṭās, the Khifjāq, the Ghuz, the Kīmāk, the Chigil, the Tukhs, the Khallukh, the Yaghmā, the Toghuzghuz, and the Khirkhīz. Each of these countries is divided into provinces (a’māl), and in each of the latter there are numerous towns. In another section (faṣl) we shall explain (padhidh kunim) the size (miqdār) of each country and town, its nature and climate, the wonders and marvels coming from each town; all the kingdoms (pādhshāḥi-hā) and towns of each country; their customs and manners and the religion of their inhabitants, so far as (badhān miqdār kī) we could find (these details) in the books of (our) predecessors (pīshinagān) or hear reports about them (ba-akhbār-hā shundilm), for (zirāk-ki) nobody can know all the particulars (ahwāl) about the world, except God, the Exalted. There is no power but in God!

§ 9. Discourse on the properties of the country of Chīnistān
East of the country of Chīnistān is the Eastern Ocean; south of it, the confines of Wāq-Wāq, the Sarandib mountain, and the Great Sea;

1 Persian ābadhānī corresponds here to Greek ὄλκουμενη and Arabic al-ma’mūra.
west of it, Hindūstān and Tibet; north of it, Tibet and the countries of the Toghuzghuz and Khirkhīz. This is a country with many amenities (ni’mat) and running waters. In it are found numerous gold-mines, mountains, deserts, lakes, and sands. Its king is called Faghfur-i Chīn and is said to be a descendant of Farīdhun. 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 Māni), but their king is a Buddhist1 (shamanī?). From this country comes much gold, silk (harir va parand), Chinese khāvkhlr (?), brocades (dibā), china (ghadāra), cinnamon (dār-śīnī), khutū-horns from which knife-handles (dasta-hā-yi kār [read: kārd] kunand) are fabricated, and all sorts of wonderful objects (kār-hā-yi badi’). 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 (surū-i karg). The people are black and naked. (Wāq-Wāq) belongs to the hot zone and has no amenity (ni’mat). Its capital is M.qys, which is a small town (where) merchants of various classes (günāgün) stay.

2. Besides Wāq-Wāq, China has nine large provinces (nāhiyat) on the coast of the Eastern Ocean: (a) Īr.sh; (b) Khūr.sh; (c) F.Rāj.klī; (d) Thāy; (e) Kh.sānī; (f) T.nkūy; (g) Būnūghnī; (h) Qūrī; (i) Anf.s.

All nine have various subdivisions (nāhiyat) which all differ (mukhālif) in religion (spelt: badhin!), appearance, and habits, and in them (vay) there are numerous towns, but the government (sultān) of all these provinces is on behalf (az dast “from the hand”) of the Faghfur-i Chīn.

3. Khumdān (Ch’ang-an-fu) is the capital of Chīnistān. It is a great town and serves as residence to Faghfur. It possesses numerous trees, habitations (ābādhānī), and amenities (ni’mat), and is situated on the sea-coast.2 Khumdān produces pearls. The inhabitants are round-faced and broad-nosed. They dress in brocade (dibā) 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’i bisyār-ni’mat-ast).

1 “Shamanist” would be impossible here.
2 Cf. § 2, 4. but a swamp is mentioned near Khumdān under § 3, 34.
§ 9.

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

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

7. KHĀMCHU (Kan-chou), half of which (nīma-yi ā) is owned by the Chinese and the other half (nīma'i az 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 (ghizghāv) are found.

9. SAKHCHŪ is like Saukjū,¹ but larger (mīh). Its government's seat is Saukjū.

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

11. KUGHMAR 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 SANGIN ("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 (ābādhāni-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 (kamni'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 vahshi mardum-khwāra). The commodities (khivāsta) of the inhabitants are mostly raw silk (qaz). The king of Khotan lives in great state (hay’at) and calls himself “Lord of the Turks and Tibetans” (‘azīm al-Turk wal-Tubbat). He lives on the boundary of China and Tibet. This king of Khotan has eunuchs (khişiyān) 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 (Khatm, Jutm?) is desolate; only a flourishing idol-temple is found there (andar vay yak but-khâna ābâdhân bas).
21. SĀVNİK, a village, round (az gird) which there are sands.
22. BŪRKHĪMŪ and NAVĪKATH (?), two towns of China on the sea-coast (bar karân-i daryā), 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 Chīnistān, on the sea-coast (bar karân-i daryā). It possesses numerous districts and running waters. In its rivers diamonds (almās) are found. From Sarandīb come different kinds of corundum (yāqūt). Its king is independent (ba sar-i khevīsh).
24. 'AZR (Gh.zr?), a small town near Sarandīb which serves as residence to the king of Sarandīb.

§ 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 Shaknān 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 (ṭib-hā) come from it, musk, aloes-wood ('ūd), ambergris, camphor, various precious things (gauhar), pearls (murvārid), corundum (yāqūt), 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.ril[birds?], parrots (ṭūṭak), Indian cuckoos (shārak), and the like. This is the largest country in the northern oecumene. All through Hindūstān wine (nabīdh) is held to be unlawful and adultery (zinā) 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 tar).
2. ŞANF (Champa?), large land (shahr) of the Qāmarūn kingdom. The Şanfī-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. **Fanşūr**, a large town and a merchants’ resort. From it comes much camphor. It is a maritime emporium (bārgah-i daryā). The king of Fanşūr is called S.tūhā. He has a separate kingdom (mamlakati judhā). In the kingdom of Fanşūr there are ten kings, all on behalf of (az dast) S.tūhā.

5. **H.D.D. Njīra**, a town with a market 1 farsang long. Its king is Sāţūhā. 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 Qimāri-aloes.

7. **N. Myās, Harkand, Urshīn, S.M. N. D. R., Andrās**—these five large towns (lands?) are situated on the sea-coast, and the royal power (pādshāhi) in them belongs to Dahum. Dahum does not consider any one (hich-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 (margar pādshāyi [sic] Q. va D.). These countries produce in large quantities good cotton which (grows) on trees yielding their produce (bar dihadh) during many years. The product (māl) of this country is the white conch (sapid muhra) which is blown like a trumpet (būq) and is called *shank* (spelt: sanbak). In this country there are numerous elephants (pil).

8. **Tuṣūl**, 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 Tuṣūl. 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 (Chiniyān) 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. **Ur. Shfīn**, a town with a district (nāhiyat) protruding into the sea like an island. Its air is bad. That sea is called there the Sea of Gulfs (bahr al-aghbāb). The royal power belongs to a woman who is called “rāyina” (pādshāhi az ān-i zanī buvadh rāyina khwānand).

---

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

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

14. SAMŪR (صُمُر), SINDĀN, SūBĀRA (spelt: Sūyāra), KANBĀYA, four towns on the coast, in which live Muslims and Hindus (Hinduwān). In that locality (andar-ū?) is a Friday-mosque (mazgiti ādhīna) and an idol-temple. The people of these towns have long hair (mūy-i furū-hishta) and at all seasons wear only an izār (yak-izār bāshand ba har vaqtī). The climate (of these parts) is hot. The government (pādshāhi) there belongs to Ballah-rāy. Near these (towns) there is a mountain on which grows much bamboo (khaizurān), rotang (nayza, spelt: nīra), pepper, and coco-nut. In Kanbāya shoes (na’lain: “sandals”?) are produced which are exported to all the countries of the world.

15. QĀMH.L (*Qāmuhul), 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. QANDAHĀR, 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 (nāhiyat-i khaṣsa).

18. H.SINĀKRA (J.sināgra?), a pleasant locality with numerous districts.

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

20. KUNS.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 (rūsipī-khāna) in it.

22. B.KSAN, 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 ‘Irāq. It produces much musk.

1 Cf. § 5, 9.
25. **Bind (?),** a populous town where stuff for Indian turbans (jāma-yi 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. ma?),** a small town where great quantities of precious things (gauhar) are brought (uftadh).

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

28. **Bīra, a large and pleasant town.**

29. **Qinnauj**, 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 harb bar-nishīnand).²

30. **Burlī, Qalūrī, 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 (jihāz) is brought (uftadh) to these little towns. Rūr possesses two strong walls (bar-tū du bāra muḥkam). This place is full of dampness and humidity (tar-u-namnāk).

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-hajj) to visit this idol whose name is Mūltān [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 khutba in the name of the “Western One” (bar maghrībi).³

33. **Jandruz (Chandrūr),** a small town near Mūltān [sic].

34. **Jāb. Rūs. Rī (?),** a populous and very pleasant village. In it great quantities of tamarind (khurmā-yi hindī) and cassia fistularis (khīyar-i shanbar) are found.

35. **Bahrāyīj was a large town but at present is desolate, and little (andak jā’i) 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 jalghūsa-trees,⁴

---

¹ Such is the Arabic vocalization, once clearly indicated in our text too. ³ The Fāṭimid caliph is meant here.

² After this paragraph ought to come 38. 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 (Rāmayān?), 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 (jihāz-i Hindūstān) are brought there (uftadh). The local government is on behalf of the amir 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 (sī zan-and ki 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 (sārdsīr) and producing great quantities of velvets and stuffs (jāma), plain and figured (sādha va munaggash). Between Rāmiyān and Jālhandar there is a distance of five days, and all this road is planted with trees (producing) myrobalan (halīla), terminalia belerica (balīla), embilica officinalis (ātnula), and (other) drugs (dāru), exported to all the world. This town belongs to the dominions (hudūd) of the raja (rāy) of Qinnauj.

39. S.lābur (S.lāpur?), a large town with markets, merchants, and commodities (khwāsta). 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, shabānī, kabuhra, kīmavān, and kūrā, each of them having a different weight. S.lābur has numerous idol-temples. Their sages (dānishmand) are Brahmans. Sugar, candy-sugar (pānīdh), honey, coco-nuts, cows, sheep, and camels abound there.

40. Brīhūn (?), a town like a fortified camp (ribāt). Four days in the year a lively (ītis) 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 (mihtar) dies, all the inferiors (kihtar) living under his shadow kill themselves. The king of their town sits on a throne and wherever he travels (kā rā vādā) many men (basī 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 (mubāriz). The government at Haytāl (pādshāhi)

1 This paragraph ought to follow on 29.
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 (saʿb) over which the inhabitants transport (bigudārand<bigudharānand) loads tied to their backs. It is a place with few amenities (kam-ni mat).

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

44. TĀFI (*Tāqi), a country with populous towns and ample amenities (miʿmat-i farākh). Its people are dark and white.

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

46. AL-JURZ (spelt: Ṭhrz),1 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-nishīnad) together with (the king). And of all the three kings (mentioned)2 this one is the most valiant. From this country come much aloes and sandal-wood.

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 Afghāns. And as you go thence to Ḥusaynān 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. ḤUSAYNĀN, a town in the hot zone lying by a steppe (bar sahrā).

50. *NINHĀR,3 a place of which the king makes show of Islam (musalmānī numāyadh), and has many wives, (namely) over thirty Muslim, Afghān, and Hindū (wives). The rest (va digar mardum) of the people are idolaters. In (Ninhār) 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,4 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 Tāqi, Salūqi, 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 H.) 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 rūdīh). It is the emporium (bārgāh) of Hindūstān and a residence of merchants and it possesses idol-temples.

55. DYNWNR (supra: Dūmpūr), 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 H. bishtar badhīn nāhiyat uftadh az mushk va gauhar va jāma-hā-yi bā-qimat).

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.


East of it are some parts of Chīnistān; south of it, Hindūstān; west of it, some of the Marches (hudūd) of Transoxiana and some of the Khallukh country (hudūd); north of it, some parts of the Khallukh and Toghuzghuz. This country is cultivated and populous, but has few commodities (ābādhān va bisyār-mardum va kam-khwāsta). All the people are idolaters. Some of the country belongs to the hot zone and some to the cold one (sardasīr). 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-nī-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. RĀNG-RONG, a province (nāhiyat) of Tibet adjacent to Hindūstān 16b and Chīnistān. In Tibet there is no province poorer (darvishtar) than this. The people live in tents and their wealth (khwāsta) is sheep. The Tubbat-khāqān levies from them poll-taxes (sar-gazīt) 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.1 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 (twangar) 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 Muyūl [sic]. It is a place of few amenities (kam-ni'mat) but has numerous commodities (khwāsta), such as gold, furs (mūy), 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 (mazgīt). In it live a few Muslims.

6. ZAVA, a small village within the limits (hudūd) of Twsmt.2

7. *AJĀYUL (?-احل), 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 JR.M.N.GĀN (Charhangān ?), two towns on the edge of the desert. It is a place of few amenities and few commodities (andak khwāsta). The people (mardum) are hunters3 (sayyādī kunand).

9. TWSTM (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 (az ān-i T.-kh.).

10. BĀLS, II. K.RYĀN (?), 12. V.J.KHYĀN (?), 13. B.RIKHA, 14. J.N.KHKATH, 15. KUNKRĀ, 16. RĀYKÜTIYA, 17. B.RNIYA, 18. N.DRUF, 19. D.STÜYA, 20. M.TH, small towns (lands?) which formerly belonged to China, but now are held by the Tibetans. In them the Toghuzghuz (mardumān-i Toghuzghuzi) are numerous. They are places possessing commodities (khwāsta), amenities (nī'mat), and cultivation (ābādhām). Between 15. Künkra and 16. Rāykütiya huge fortress is situated to the right (of the road) on a high mountain, and the treasure (khasīna-hā) of the Tubbat-khāqān is placed there.

21. GH.ZÄ, the very beginning (nukhustin ḥadd) of Tibet from the Toghuzghuz side, near the river Kuchā.

22. BĪNĀ and *K.L.BĀNK (?), two small towns belonging to Tibet with numerous troops, warriors, and arms (ba lashkar va mardumāni [sic] jangi va bā silāh).

23. K.RSĀNG (*Ūsāng) 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 hudūd-i ā birāvadh). This country is the largest of the Turkish countries and originally (dar asl) 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 (mardumāni jangi) possessing great numbers of arms. In summer and winter (dimistān) they wander from place to place along the grazing grounds (giyā-khwar) in the climates which (happen to be) the best (khushtar buvadh). 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 (ghizhghāv). 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 Tātār too are a race (jinsi) of the Toghuzghuz.

1. JĪNĀNJKATH (*Chīnānjkath, “Chinese town”), capital (qasaba) of the Toghuzghuz. It is a middle-sized (miyāna) town. It is the seat of the government and adjoins the limits (hudūd) 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: KŪZĀR.K, J.M.LKATH, *PANJĪKATH, BĀRLUGH, JĀMGHAR. The king of the Toghuzghuz in summer lives in this village of Panjīkath. North of the Toghuzghuz is a steppe (sahrā) stretching between them and the Khirkhīz up to (tā) the country of the Kīmāk.

3. K.MŚIGHIYĀ, 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.
6. K.Rährkhün (K.várkhün?), a village amid sands, possessing few amenities (andak ni’mat) but many people.

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

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

9. Kh.mūd (Khumūl, Qumūl ?), a locality with meadows (margha-zār) and grazing grounds (giyā-khwār), with tents and felt-huts of the Toghuizghuz. The people own sheep (khudāvandān-i gāspand).

10. J.mlīkath, a large village of which the chief is called Yabghū (spelt: Baighū). They [now?] settle (nishānand) there the subjects of Yabghū (Baighū’tyān), (as) the Kīmāk (Kīmākiyān), Khallukh, and Yaghmā used constantly to plunder (ghārat kardandī) this village.

11. T.nzāgh-art, an earthen mountain (kūhi-st az khāk) and a stage (manzil) for the merchants.

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

13. B.lkh.mkān (?), a stage where formerly lived the Toghuizghuz and which is now desolate.

14. S.d.nk (?), a stage at which it snows and rains constantly.

15. *muh—art, a stage.

16. Īrgūzgūkath (?), a stage with pasture lands (charā-gāh) and springs.

17. *ɪghrāj-art, 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 Toghuizghuz 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 (nist 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-kun), and have plenty of arms. Their king

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

2 *Topragh-art which in Turkish exactly means “earthen pass”.

3 Spelt: Yaghmiyā.
is from the family of the Toghuzghuz kings. These Yaghmā (Yaghmā'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 Toghuzghuz, and in their region¹ there are a few villages (dih-hā-st andakt).

1. Kāshghar | belongs to Chīnistan 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 Ighrāj-art traverses (andar miyān) the Yaghmā country (nāhiyat-i Yaghmiyā [sic]).

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

3. Khīrm.Kī (Khīrakli?), a large village. (The people) are *Artūjians (spelt: Bartūji). In the village are three kinds of Turks: Yaghmā, Khallukh, and Toghuzghuz.

§ 14. Discourse on the Khirkhīz Country

East of it is the country of China and the Eastern Ocean; south of it, the Toghuzghuz borders and some parts of the Khallukh; west of it, (parts) of the Kīmāk country; [north of it, parts] of the Uninhabited Lands of the North (virānī-yī shamād). In the [outlying] part of their country (andar nāhiyat az vay) there is no population (hīch ābādānī nist), 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'-i dādakān) and have rough faces (durusht-surat) and scanty hair. They are lawless (bidādakār) and merciless, (but) good fighters (mubāriz) 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-yī Khirkhīz), sheep, cows, and horses. They wander (mi-gardand) along rivers, grass, (good) climates, and meadows (marghazār). They venerate (buzurg dārand) the Fire and burn the dead. They are owners (khudāvandān) of tents and felt-huts, and are hunters and game-killers (nakhtchir-zan).

1 Andar-ū, perhaps, in the Yaghmā country in general.
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 (mardum-khwār) and merciless. The other Khirkhīz do not know their language (zafān-i ıshān digar Kh. nadānand) and they are like savages (va chūn wahshiyyand).

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

3. K.SAYM, name of a clan (qaum) of the Khirkhīz who with their felt-huts have established themselves on the slopes of the mountains (babarākūh). They hunt for furs (mū), musk, khutū-[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 Toghuizghuz; south of it, some parts of the Yaghmā and the country (nāhiyat) of Transoxiana; west of it, the borders of the Ghūz; north of it, the borders of the Tukhs, Chigil, and Toghuizghuz. This is a prosperous (ābādhān) country, the most pleasant of the Turkish lands. It possesses running waters and a moderate climate. From it come different furs (mūy-hā). The Khallukh are near to (civilized) people (mardumānī-and ba-mardum nazdik), pleasant tempered (khush-khu) and sociable (amizanda). In the days of old, the kings of the Khallukh were called Jabghūy, and also Yabghū. 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 (tākhtan baranda).

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

2. MIRKI, a village inhabited by the Khallukh and also visited by merchants. Between these two villages [scil., Kūlān and Mirki] there are three Khallukh tribes | called: Bistān, Khaym, and B.rīsh.

3. NŪN-KAT (* Navī-kat ?) was a town near the mountain Ūrūn-'Arj (Ghārch ?), 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. Tūzūn-Bulagh, a village with fields (*kisht-u-barz*), running waters, and amenities. It lies on the frontier between the Khallukh and the Yaghmā.

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

7. Kūkyāl (*Kök-yal?*), Atlāligh (*Otlāligh?*), Lūl.gh (*Ul.gh?*) are three prosperous and pleasant villages, situated on the slope of a mountain (*babarākūh*); their princes (*diḥqān*) were Yabghū’s brothers.

8. Įzkath and M.İjkath (*Malék?*), two villages situated on the slope of a mountain (*barākūh*), prosperous and pleasant, which belong to Jabghū’s kingdom (*va pādshāy [*pādshā’ī-yi*] Jabghūy). Kirmīnkath, 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. Barskhān, a town on the bank of the lake (*daryā*),1 prosperous and pleasant. Its prince (*diḥqān*) is a Khallukh, but the (inhabitants) are devoted to the Toghuzghuz (*havā-yi T. khwāhand*).

12. Jāmgh.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 (*pādshāhi*) is on behalf of the king of the Toghuzghuz. In it live some 200 tribes of men (*divist qabila mardum*), and to it belongs a separate district.

13. *B.njul* (*Banjük?*) 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 Khirkhız.

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

15. Üj lies on a mountain (*bar sar-i kūh*). 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 (*nāhiyati-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 *Nāhiyat-ast va ašl-i ü [?] az Khallukh-ast va läkin &c. [See Annex B.]
§ 16-18

"The Regions of the World"

§ 16. Discourse on the Khirkhīz Country and its Towns

East of it, the Khirkhīz country. And whatever comes (uftad) from the Khallukh and Khirkhīz countries is also produced (khizad) in (that of) the Chigil. The latter possess great riches. They own tents and felt-huts (but) possess few (andak) 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 (nazdik ba musalmānī). 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 (nāhiyatī-st bisyār-nī matītār) 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 (dimistān!) and summer they wander along pasture-lands, grazing-grounds, and meadows (charāgāh-va-giyā-khwār-va-mar-ghazār).

1. Lāzina (?) and F.Rākhiya (?), two clans (qaum) of Tukhs, each of which possesses a small country, and there are two villages called after these two tribes.

2. Sūyāb, a large village from which 20,000 men come forth.

3. Bīglīligh ("home of the Beg's men"), a large village, called in Soghdian S.m.knā. Its prince (dihkān [sic]) is called Y.nālb.rr.kīn (*Yināl-beg-tegin). 3,000 men take the field with him (bā ū . . . bar mishinānd).

4. Úrkath, situated between two villages of the Tukhs. Few people live in it but (the place) is pleasant and the inhabitants rich (tuvangar).

§ 18. Discourse on the Kīmāk Country and its Towns

East of this country lives a race (jinsi) of Khirkhīz; south of it are the rivers Artush [sic] and Ātil; west of it, some of the Khifchākh and some of the Northern Uninhabited Lands (vīrānī-yi shamāl); its north lies in those northern parts where men cannot live. In this country there is only one town but many tribes (qabila). Its people live in felt-huts and both in summer and winter wander along the grazing-grounds (giyā-khwār), waters, and meadows (marghazār). Their commodities are sable-martens (samūr) and sheep. Their food in
summer is milk, and in winter preserved meat (gūsht-i qadīd). 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’mal) are given by heritage to the children of the lieutenants.

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

2. Q.RO.RKHĀN, another district of the Kīmāk, of which the inhabitants have the customs of the Khirkhzī.

3. Y.GHSÜN YĀSŪ, another district of the Kīmāk, between the rivers Ātil and Irtish [sic], which has more pleasant people and more settled conditions (mardumānī bishtar bā-nī’mat 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 (ba-shītāb).

5. DIH-I CHĪB, 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 (sītiza-kār), malicious (badh-rag), and malevolent (hasūd). Both in summer and winter they wander along the pasture-lands and grazing-grounds (charāgāh-va-giyā-khīchar). 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 ishān har chizi-rā ki nikū bwad va ’ajab bwad namūz barand). (The Ghūz) greatly esteem the physicians (tabībān) and, whenever they see them, venerate them (namūz barand), and these doctors (pijīshkān) 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 (sīlāh 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 Khifchākh”?].
Islām), whatever place be on the way (ba har jā’ī uftadh), and (then) strike (bar-kūbānd), plunder, and retreat as quickly as possible. Each of their tribes has a (separate) chief on account of their discords (nāfāźandagi) 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 rū hadd-i junūbash ba-Bajanāk dāradlı), 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-khūṭtar) 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, a tribe of Christians (tarsāyān) called V.n.nd.r; west and north of (the Majghari) are the districts (nawāḥt) of the Rūs. This country has some 20,000 men who take the field with their king (bā malikashān bar-nishinand). The king of this country is called *Jula (خَلَف read: خَلَف). 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 zindagānl gudharānadh). They are very rich people but base3 (mardumāni bisyār-khwāsta-and va-sufla?). This country possesses many trees and running waters. The (people) are good-looking and awe-inspiring (bāhaybat). The Majghāri 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; south of it, some of its own Marches (hudūd) and some parts of the desert of Kargaskūh; west of it, the districts of Gurgān and the limits of the Ghūz; north of it, the river Jayhūn. This is a vast country with much wealth and abundant amenities (bā . . . ni'natī 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, turquoises, 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. nishinad); he is from the Sāmān family (āl-i Sāmān) and from Bahrām Chūbīn’s descendants. These (princes) are called Maliks of the East and have lieutenants (’ummāl) in all Khorāsān, while on the frontiers (hadd-hā) of Khorāsān there are kings (pādhshāhān) called “margraves” (mulūk-i atrāf).

1. Nishāpūr is the largest and richest town in Khorāsān (buzurg-tarin shahri-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 (quhandiz), a suburb (rabad), and a city (shahristān). Most of its water is from the springs and has been conducted (bi-āvarda-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 (shahraki-st khurd) on the road to Rayy and the chief place of a district (qašaba-yi rustā'iyal).


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

5. Azādhvār, a pleasant 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 (bārkadha-y Gurgān-ast va in-i [sic] K. va N.).

7. Siparāyin (spelt: Sabarāyin), a prosperous and pleasant town.

1 Or: “kingdom”, *pādhshā‘ī.
8. JARMAGĀN, SIBĪNĀKĀN, 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 TAVARĀN, NAUQĀN, BUZDIGHŪR (spelt: BRUGHĀN), 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 (dik-i sangin), whet-stones (sang-i fasān), trouser-cords (shāl-vār-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-Rashid. (Nauqān) produces stone kettles.

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

13. TURSHĪZ, KUNDUR, B. NĀBID, KURĪ, boroughs belonging (az hudūd) to Kūhistān and Nishāpūr, with numerous fields.

14. QĀ'IN, chief town (qaṣaba) of Kūhistān, is surrounded by a moat (khandaq) and possesses a citadel (quhandiz) and a cathedral mosque (mazgit-i jāmī'). The government palace (sarāy-i sulṭān) is in the citadel. This place belongs to the cold zone.

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

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

17. TABAS-I MĀŠĪNĀN lies between the mountains and the desert and is a pleasant place.

18. KHŪR (spelt: Khuwar, *Khur?) and KHUSB, 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. BŪZHAGĀN, KHAYMAND, SANGĀN, SALŪMIDH, 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 (Har < *Harē), a large town with a very strong shahrstān, 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 (ābdhântar-i mazgit-hâ-st ba-mardum az hama-yi Kh.). The town lies at the foot of a mountain and is a very pleasant place. Many Arabs (Tâziyan) live there. It has a large river which comes from the frontier region between Ghûr and Gûzgânân and is utilized in the districts of Herat. It produces cotton stuffs, manna (shirkhisht), and grape-syrup (dushâb).

21. Bushang is about half (the size of) Herat (chand nima‘î az H.) and is surrounded by a moat and has a strong fortress (hisâr). In it ‘ar‘ar-trees (juniperus polycarpus?) are found and a plant (giyâhi) 20a of which the juice (shîr) is an antidote (tiryâk) against the venom of snakes and scorpions.

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

23. Fargird, a small borough; the inhabitants own cattle (khudâ-vandân-i chahâr-pây-and).

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

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

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

27. Kûh-i Sîm, a borough on the slope of a mountain (babarâkûh) with a silver-mine; the latter has been abandoned on account of the lack of fuel (bi-hizsumî).

28. Mâlin belongs to Herat; from it come good Tâ‘ifî raisins (mavîz).

29. Asbuzar (*Abspuzâr) has four towns: Kavâzhân (?), Araskan, Kûzhd (?), Jarâshân, all four within the distance of 6 farsangs; the locality is pleasant and the inhabitants are Khârijites, and warlike. In this district there are numerous and difficult mountains.

30. Sarakhs, a town lying on the road amid a steppe (andar miyân-i biyâbân). A dry river-bed (khushkrûdh) passes through the market; the water flows in it only at the time of floods (âb-khîz). It is a place with much cultivation, and its people are strongly built (qâwi-tarkîb) and warlike. Camels are their wealth.

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

32. Kîf, also a small borough like Baun.

33. Baghshûr lies on the steppe (biyâbân) and has water from wells.

---

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

35. **Shūrmīn**, a borough of Herat.

36. **Gharchistān**, a district of which the chief place is **Bashīn**. 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 (*salīm*) and rather good (*nē badh* "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*).


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

41. **Gīrang**, a small town.

42. **Marv**, a large town. In the days of old the residence of the mir of Khorāsān was there but now he lives in Bukhārā. It is a pleasant and flourishing place with a citadel built by Tahmūrath; in it there are numerous castles (*kūshk*). It was the abode of the (Sasanian) kings (*khusrawān*). 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 (*qazzīn*) and of *mulham* silk.

43. **Shing-I Ābbādī**, a town with numerous districts, prosperous and pleasant.

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

45. **Kushmīhan** (*Kushmēhan*), **Musfarī**, **Māshān**, **Sūsanaqān**, **Shābirīnjī (?), 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 Ṭukhrāristān 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 (mulūk-i atrāf). In Khorāsān he is called "malik of Gūzgānān". 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 (dūstdāri) of knowledge. This country produces numerous horses, felts, saddle-bags (haqība), saddle-girths (tang-i asp), zilū, and palās. In it is found the khinj 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 (Rīvshārān ?), a large and very pleasant district. (The inhabitants) are warlike. The district belongs to the Ghar-chistān of Gūzgānān. 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 Gūzgānān (az mih-tarān-i atrāf-i G.) and they pay their annual tribute-money (muqātaa) to the malik of Gūzgānān.

48. D.RM.Shān (Dar-i M.shān ?) consists of two regions; the one is of Bust, and the other of Gūzgānān. 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 Darmashī-shāh (Dar-i Mashī-shāh ?).

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

50. SĀRVĀN, a mountainous district. The inhabitants look arrogant (shēkh-rūy) and are warlike. They are professional thieves (dudzpisha) and quarrelsome (sitiza-kār), faithless (bi-vafā), and blood-thirsty (khūn-khwāra); and clan animosity ('asabiyat) 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-banda. Actually a deputy governor (kārdār) goes there from the capital (hadrat) of the malik of Gūzgānān.

1 Persice: khurjīn (?). 2 "white". 3 Spelt in the text jljLiy j'jLijjj . ^}h u . ,  ' j'

52. L.N. Hadd (pādshāhī or pādshāhīān) is the name of the sovereign of the whole province.

53. L.N. Shāhīd (shāhīd or shāhīdān) is the name of the sovereign of the whole province.

54. L.N. Khor (shāhīdān or shāhīd) is the name of the sovereign of the whole province.

55. L.N. Nāzīr (shāhīdān or shāhīd) is the name of the sovereign of the whole province.

56. L.N. Dārā (shāhīdān or shāhīd) is the name of the sovereign of the whole province.

57. L.N. Shāhīd (shāhīdān or shāhīd) is the name of the sovereign of the whole province.

58. L.N. Nāzīr (shāhīdān or shāhīd) is the name of the sovereign of the whole province.

59. L.N. Dārā (shāhīdān or shāhīd) is the name of the sovereign of the whole province.
All these districts are very agricultural and abound in amenities. Their chiefs are (appointed) on behalf of the malik of Güzgānān and pay him annual tribute-money (muqāta‘a). The inhabitants are mostly simple-hearted (sādha-dīl) and own great numbers of cattle, (namely) of cows and sheep. In this kingdom (pādshāhī) small districts are very numerous. In it (i.e., Güzgānān) grows a tree of which whips (tāziyana) are made.1 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. ṬALAQĀN lies on the frontier of Güzgānān and belongs to its king. It is a very pleasant town which produces much wine (nabidh) 21a and felt.

53. JAHŪDHĀN, a prosperous and pleasant town at the foot of a mountain. It is the residence of the malik of Güzgānān 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 andara 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 (hadd-i ū du farsang-ast?).

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

57. K.N.D.RM, a pleasant borough producing good wine (nabidh) in great quantity.

58. ANBĪR (*Anbēr), capital (gasaba) of Güzgānān 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 Güzgān leather (pūst-i gūzgānī) exported all over the world.

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

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

61. ANTKHUDH,2 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 Güzgānān. In its mountains gold-mines are found.

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

65. azīv, a town at the end of the province ('amal) of Guzgānān.

All the towns which we have enumerated belong to the kingdom of the Guzgānān 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 (ḥadrat) of the malik of Guzgānān, 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. ḥaush, a large village, flourishing and prosperous, situated in the desert. It belongs to this sovereign (in pādhshāh, i.e., of Guzgān) and the Arabs just mentioned mostly stay here in summer.

This province (nāhiyat) has many districts and large sub-divisions (rustā-hā va nāhiyat-hā-yi buzurg), 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: Khisrauān, [sic]). In it are found buildings of the Sasanian kings with paintings (naqsha) and wonderful works (kārkird), (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-kadha) 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-nāranj), sugar-cane (nay-shakar), and water-lilies (nilūfar “lotus”). Balkh has a shahrīstān surrounded by a mighty wall. In its suburb there are numerous marshes.

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

69. tukhāristān, a pleasant province consisting mostly of mountains. In its steppes (šahrā) live the Khallukh1 Turks. It produces horses, sheep, much grain, and various fruits.

70. simingān, a town lying in the mountains. There are in it mountains of white stone similar to marble (rukhām) 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).
idol-temples, and horse-stables, with all the implements (ālāt) appertaining to pavilions. On it various figures are painted in the fashion of Indians (az kirdār-i H.). 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. VALVĀLIJ, a flourishing town and the capital (qaşaba) of Ţukhāristān. It possesses numerous amenities and running waters. Its people are sociable (āmizanda).

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

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

76. TĀYAQĀN, a town on the frontier between Ťukhāristān 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 (*salēr?).

78. BĀMIYĀN, a land on the frontier between Gūzgānān and the Marches (hudūd) of Khorāsān. It has much cultivation. Its king is called Shīr (*sher?). 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, MUY, two small towns within the limits of Andarāb (andal miyān az hudūd-i A.).

§ 24. Discourse on the Region of Khorāsānian Marches

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 Ťukhāristān. Some parts of this region belong to the hot zone and some to the cold. From its mountains the Ghūr-slaves (barda-yi ghūri) are brought (uftadh) to

---

1 Kushk, usually "castle".
2 i.e., on the rock.
3 Or: "bearing likeness to Indians".
4 nāhiyat-i hudūd-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 (shikastagī-hā). It has a king called Ghūr-shāh. He draws his strength from the mīr of Guzgānān. In the days of old this province of Ghūr was pagan (kafir); 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 (asmar).

2. SĪSTĀN, a province of which the chief place is called ZARANG. The town has a fortress (hisār), with a moat round (pirāmūn) it, of which the water comes from (the fortress) itself (ābash ham az vay bar-āyadh). 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 (tabari), silū-rugs similar to those of Jahrum (jahrumi), dried dates and asafoetida (anguzad).

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 Hīdhmand.

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 Layth who appropriated the royal power were from Qarnī.

8. KHUVAŚH (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 Hīdhmand and possessing many districts (hā nāhiyatī 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 Šaffārīds.
12. ZAMĪN-DĀVAR, a prosperous district on the frontier between Ghūr and Bust. To it belong two towns TIL and DURGHUSH which both are frontier forts (thāghr) against (bar rūy) Ghūr. In Durghush grows much saffron. It⁴ is adjacent to the district Darmashān (*Varmashān ?) of Bust.

13. BAGHNĪ, a town near Ghūr in which live Muslims.

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

15. KHUVĀNĪN (Khwānīn) belongs to Ghūr and has a population of some 3,000 people.

16. RUKHUDH (Rukhkhudh), a very prosperous and pleasant district (nāhiyat), to which belongs a special district (ū rā nāhiyati-st judhā which forms a separate unit ?). The chief place of Rukhudh is PANJVĀY (spelt: Fijuvānī).²

17. KUHAK and RŪDHĀN 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’I, KŪSHK, SĪV, of which Kūshk is the residence of the amīr.

19. *GHAZNĪN (spelt: Ghazaq), a town situated on the slope of a mountain (babarākhū), 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 Qinnauj [?] 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 *SUḌĀVAND, two small boroughs at the foot of the mountains. Sukāvand possesses a strong fortress and much cultivation.

22. In Ghaznīn and in the limits (hudūd) of the boroughs which we have enumerated, live the *KHALAJ³ Turks who possess many sheep. 22 b They wander along climates (gardanda bar havā), grazing grounds and pasture-lands (marā’ī). These *Khalaj Turks are also numerous in the provinces (hudūd) of Balkh, Ṭukhāristān,⁵ Bust, and Gūzgānān.⁶

---
¹ It is more probable that Zamīn-dāvar and not Durghush is meant here.
² Here belongs { } in § 26, 20.
³ Read: Khalaj instead of Khallukh, \( x.i \), p. 347.
⁴ Along places with favourable climate?
⁵ Cf. § 23, 69: Khallukh.
⁶ On the margin a note by Abul-Faḍl Gulpāyagānī. See Appendix A.
Ghaznīn and the districts adjacent to it are all called **Zābulistān**.

23. **Parvān** (spelt: *Barvān*), a pleasant town and a resort of merchants. It is the Gate of Hindūstān.

24. **Badhakhshān**, a very pleasant country (**shahr**) and a resort of merchants. It has mines of silver, gold, garnets (**bijādha**), and lapis lazuli. Musk is imported there from Tibet.

25. **Dar-i Tāziyān** ("The Gate of the Arabs"), a place lying in a defile (**darband**) between two mountains. There stands a gate through which the caravans go out. The caliph Ma'mūn made that barrier (**band**).

26. **Dīh-i S.N.K.s** (*Sangas?*), a large and pleasant village in which live Muslims. Near it is a pass called 'Āqaba-yi S.N.K.s.

27. **S.Qliya** (*Sulaj?*), a large village.

§ 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 gudāzanda**), 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 (**naushādhur**).

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 (**hudūd**) of Bukhārā is 12 farsangs by 12 farsangs, and a wall has been built round the whole of it, without any interruption (**divār**... **ba-yak pārā**), and all the ribāts and villages are within this wall (**az andarūn-i in dwār**).

2. **M.Ghkān, Khujādak, Zandana** (spelt: *Dandīna*), **Būmkath** (*?), **Madyāmijkath, Kharghānkath** (spelt: *J.sgh.nkath*), boroughs with pulpits (**minbar**) within the area of Bukhārā; they are very prosperous places with much cultivation.
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3. FIRAB (Firabr), a borough on the bank of the Jayhūn. The Lord of the River (mir-i rūdh, "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† (gunbadh-i gūrkhāna-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 23a prosperous 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.NJIKATH (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 (shahrīstān), a citadel, and a suburb. On the roof of their market a stream of water flows in a leaden (conduit) (yakī jūy-i āb ravān ast az arzīz). In Samarqand stands the monastery of the Manichaens (khānagāh-i Mānaviyān) who are called nīghūshāk ("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.NJIKATH, two boroughs of Samarqand, lying on the Bukhārā river. In this Varaghsar stands (the weir) distributing the waters (qismatgāh-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-gabīn), and red salt, which are exported everywhere.

† 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.

19. **Sakīfaghn**, a town with cultivation.

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-bīzan*).

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

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

25. **Chaghāniyān**, a desolate region. It is a large tract with extensive cultivation (*bisyrār kisht-u-barz*), but it has lazy peasants (*barzigarānī kāhil*) and is a place of poor people (*darvishān*); (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 (*gavāranda*). 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. **Dārzangī** (spelt: *Dārzanlī*), a borough surrounded by a moat and belonging to Chaghāniyān. It produces puttees (*pāy-tāba*), different sorts of tapestry-woven carpets (*gilmīnā*), 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. **Nauzhan** (*Būrāb?*), a borough with a very strong fortress.

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

32. **Hamvārān**, a borough near the river Kasavān, with sparse population.
33. SHŪMĀN, 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. AFRĪDHĀN, a town with sparse population, situated amid mountains.

35. VAYSHAGIRT (*Vēshagirt), a strong town situated between the mountains and the steppe, on the frontier between Chaghāniyān and Khuttalān. Wind blows there constantly, and there lies the tomb (turbat) of Shaqlq Balkhi, God’s mercy upon him. This place produces much saffron.

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

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

38. CHARQĀN (Kharqāna?), a prosperous borough also belonging to Surūshna.

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

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

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

42. BUTTAMĀN, a region lying amidst mountains and broken country (kūh-hā va shikastagi-hā), and belonging to Surūshna. It has three tracts (zones, hadd): Inner, Middle, and Outer Buttamān. This is a region with much cultivation but with a poor population (darvishān). It has many villages and districts (rustā) and in its mountains numerous mines of ammoniac (naushādhur) are found.

43. BARGHAR, a district of Middle Buttamān. In it lies the Daryāzha (lake) which collects the waters of the Middle Buttamān, and whence rises the Bukhārā river.

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

45. FARGHĀNA, a prosperous, large, and very pleasant region. It has many mountains, plains, running waters, and towns. It is the Gate of Turkistān. 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), ammonia, quicksilver (simāb), combustible schists (chirāgh-sang?), bezoar stone (sang-i pāy-zahr), lodestone (sang-i maghnātis), 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. CHADHGHAL,1 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. 24

47. AKHSIKATH, 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 (nabīdh-khwāra).

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

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

50. TAMĀKHS, NĀMKĀKHS [sic], two boroughs situated on the slope of a mountain.

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

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

53. BAGHASKĀN (?) belongs to Āvāl.

54. KHUVĀKAND, RISHTĀN, ZANDARĀMISH, densely populated (anbūth) boroughs with much cultivation.

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

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

57. ĪRASHT, KHURSĀB, two boroughs with running waters, spaciousness (gushādhagī), many amenities, and a good climate.

58. ĪZGAND, a town on the frontier between Farghāna and the Turks. Two rivers pass its outskirts (karāna), of which the one called T.BĀGH.R (*Yabāghū) 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 Khorāsān.

1 Vide infra under 63. "Jadghal", now Chatqal.
60. Kashūkath, Pāb, two prosperous boroughs, with much cultivation.

All these are the towns of Farghāna.

61. Busht, K.L.Skān, Yūkand, Kūkath, Khushkāb (?), boroughs situated near to each other, with much cultivation but with poor people.

62. Sh.Lāt, a frontier post (thaghr) situated towards the Turks.

63. Īlāq, 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” (sapid jāmagān). The people are warlike and arrogant-looking (shūkh-rū). In its mountains are mines of gold and silver. Its frontiers march with Farghāna, Jadghal [sic], Chāch, and the river Khashart. The chiefs of this province are called Dīhqān-i Īlāq. Formerly the dīhqāns in this province were counted among the margraves (dīhqān in nāḥiyat rā az mulūk-i aṭrāf būdandi).

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

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

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


68. Sāmi S. Brak, a flourishing and populous borough.

69. حنج, 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, Ardālānkath, S.T. Bgh. Vā, | 24b, are boroughs situated near one another, populous, with much cultivation and running waters. Ardālānkath is the chief place of these boroughs.

73. K. Rāl, Gh. Zk, Khīvāl, Vardhul, K. Briya, B. Ghūrānk (?), small boroughs, very agricultural, producing horses, and lying close to one another.

74. ارذکی, 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.

77. *Tunkat-i B.Khārnān*, a chief place with several districts situated between Īlāq, Jadghal, and Chāch. It has running waters and is a resort of merchants.

78. *Yālāpān*, a borough from which the bank of the river Parak is 1 farsang distant. There stands a dirham-mint (sarāy-i diram zadan).

79. *Chāch* (spelt: *Chāj*), a large and prosperous district. The inhabitants are active fighters for the faith, warlike (jang-kun), and wealthy (tuvangar). (The locality) is very pleasant. It produces great quantities of khālanj-wood, and of bows and arrows made of khadang-wood. Its kings formerly belonged to the class of margraves (mulūk-i vay . . . az mulūk-i aṭrāf būdandī).

80. *Binkath* (spelt: *Bikath*), capital of Chāch (spelt: *Jāj*). This large town, prosperous and flourishing, is the seat of the government.

81. *Nūjakath*, a borough from which come the boatmen (kashti-bānān) working on the rivers Parak and Khashart.

82. *K.Rjākath (?), Tarkūs,1 Khātunkath*, two [sic] small but prosperous boroughs which are the store-places (bārgāh) of Sughd and Samarqand, as well as of Farghāna and Īlāq (va ān-i F. va Ī. ast).

83. *Banākath*, a flourishing and prosperous borough on the bank of the river Khashart. حرجک, ش.تُركک, ش.تُركک, S.Bkath (Bis-kath?), b⟩ hurkak (?), K.K.Rāl, boroughs of Chāch producing the chāchī-bows. The locality is flourishing, very pleasant, and prosperous.

84. *Isbījāb*, a region on the frontier between the Muslims and the Infidels. It is an extensive and pleasant locality on the frontier of Turkistān, and whatever is produced in any place of Turkistān is brought here. It possesses many towns, provinces, and districts, and produces felt and sheep. The chief place is called Isbījāb. 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. *Sānīkath*, a flourishing, pleasant, and wealthy (tuvangar) town.

86. *s.sh., 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 āshtī). From their tribes many have turned Muslims.

88. *Pārāb*, 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.*
89. Between Isbījāb and the bank of the river is the grazing-ground (giyā-khwār) of all Isbījāb 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. SHİLİ, ȚARĂZ (spelt: Ț.ără), (Takābkath?), FARŪNKATH, MIRKI, 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], Mirki, 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: Khatulān), 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 Jayḥūn. Its district extends to the confines of Badhakhshān and is called Rustā Bīk. (Nuchārā) is a town on one side of which is the Jayḥūn and on the other a mountain. It is a very pleasant locality, and the emporium of Khuttalān.

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

1 nāhiyat-i hudūd-i Mā varā’ al-nahr.  
2 *Vakhshāb? See Notes.
5. **Bārsāragh, Munk, T. Mliyāt** (ملات), 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. **Līvkand** (*Lēvkand*) belongs to Vakhsh, and from it come the *vakhshi*-sheep.

9. **Zhāsht** (*Rāsht*?), a district lying amid mountains and broken country (*andar kūh-hā va shikastagi-hā*), between Buttamān and Khuttalān, with many divisions (*rustā*) and fields. The chiefs of this district are called Dihqān-i Zāsht [sic].

10. Within the limits of Khuttalān and Chaghāniyān there is a tribe (*gurūh*) called Kūmījīyān. 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* (*Sēlākān*) situated between Shūmān and Bishgird (*Vēshgird*?). 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 firman-i amir-i nāhiyat-i khwāsh-and*), and the amīrs of Khuttalān and Chaghāniyān, when they have need, solicit their help (*va amirān-i Khuttalān va Chaghāniyān-rā chūn bāyad az ishān yāri khwāhand*).

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-shikari*) and look arrogant (*shukh-ruy*). In their predatory expeditions they behave gallantly (*andar ān duzdi javānmard-pisha*). They go for looting to a distance of 40 and 50 farsangs from the periphery (*gardān*) of their district. They show attachment (*payvastagl numāyand*) to the amīr of Khuttalān and that of Chaghāniyān.

12. **Dar-ī 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.


14. SIKĀSHIM (Ishkāshim), a town and the chief place of the region of Vakhān (gāsaba-yi nāhiyat-i ā (? ) Vakhān-āst). 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 vakhi arrows.

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

16. S.NGLNJ (Sanglīch ?), lies at the foot of a mountain. The mine of the Badhakhshī garnets (bijādha) and of rubies (la’l) lies in that mountain. Near the mine is a hot spring in a pool (ab-i garm va istādha), 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 (S.nglnj) is a region called RŪSTA *B.LJ.M (M.lj.m ? ) (va az ānjā bigudhari nāhiyati āyadh ā-rā rūsta [ لمحم ] 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 (ākhir-i hudūd) of Transoxiana.

19. BOLOR (Bulūr) is a vast country (nāhiyati-st 'āzim) with a king who declares that he is the Son of the Sun (mā farzand-i āftāb-im). 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 (? dwza rāh < *du rūza rāh ?). The houses which are (seen) on the Map (sūrat) between Rukhudh and Mūltān are all villages and stations of caravans. (They lie) in the desert, and are places devoid of amenity and poor in grass (tang ‘alaf).)

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.-i 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 mulāh-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 mukhadda), quilted garments (gashāgand), cotton stuffs (karbās), felt, snow (barf), and rukhbin.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 āhanin?), running waters, and many inhabitants.

25. Gurgānj, a borough which formerly belonged to the Khwāразm-shāh, but now its government (pādhshahiyash) is separate and its king (pādhshāy) is called mīr of Gurgānj. 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. K.rdnāzkhās (Kurdarānkhās?), B.dhmīniya, Dih-i Qaratīgīn, three boroughs sparsely populated (but) having cultivation.

26a 27. Kurdar, a borough with cultivation, very populous. Great numbers of lambskins (pūst-i barra) come from there.

28. Khīva (spelt: Khīv), a small borough with a wall, belonging to Gurgānj.


§ 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 (davanda). They are all Muslims. The region has few amenities (kam-nimat), but numerous merchants (are found in it). The country produces skins (pūst), leather (charm), red abānk (?),1 shoes (na’lain), dates (khurma), and sugar-candy (pānldh).

1. Mānṣūra, a great (‘azīm) 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. Manjābrī, Sadūsān, two prosperous towns of the country of Sind, situated on the bank of the river Mihrān.

3. *Bīrūn2 (spelt: وزوز), Masvāhī, two towns in the limits of Sind. (The inhabitants) are the people carrying on the sea-trade (mardumānī-and ki bāzungāni-yi daryā kunand). These places have few amenities.

1 the word jāl is unknown.

2 Or: *Nīrun?
4. DAYBUL, a town of Sind on the coast of the Great Sea. It is the abode (jāygāh) of the merchants. Products (ālat-hā) of Hindūstān and the sea are brought there in large quantities.

5. F.NIKI (*Q.nb.li?), *ARMĀBĪL, two towns of Mukrān (az 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 (az hudūd-i S.), situated on the coast of the Great Sea. It is not an interesting place (kam sayr?).

7. KĪZ, KUSHK-I QAND, BIH (?), BIND (渎), DIZAK (spelt: Drk), ASKF—all these towns belong to Mukrān. Most of the sugar-candy exported everywhere (andar jihān) comes from these boroughs. The king of Mukrān 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. MUSHKI (spelt: Ḥushki), a borough in the steppe (biyābān).

10. PANJBŪR (spelt: Banjpūr), the largest of the towns of Sind on this side of the river Mihrān.

11. PUHLPARA (spelt: Buhlbara), a town belonging to the district of Jurūj. It has few amenities (kam-ni mat).

12. M.HĀLĪ (?), QUSDĀR (spelt: Qusdhān), KĪJKĀNĀN, SHŪRA, TOWNS OF THE REGION OF TŪRĀN. It is a pleasant locality with much cattle. In it live many Muslims and heathens (gabrakān, Zoroastrians?). The seat of the king of Tūrān is in Kījkānān.

13. ABL (?), a town of the BUD-HA (ウェ) region, prosperous and extremely pleasant; its inhabitants are Muslims.

14. QANDABĪL, 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 Sīstān. 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 (zīra), dates, indigo, 26 b 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 Sistan, 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 ناحیة که بسوی دریای جامبای کرسید است
durust); here (too) lie numerous mountains with mines of gold, silver, copper, lead, and lodestone (maghnāṭis).

1. Sīrgān, the capital of Kirmān 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 bina-hā-shān izaja).

2. Bāft and Khīr (?), 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. Mizhān, 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 (gāvars, 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 (darvishān).

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 Mukrān is a desert. Between Jīruft and Manūgān is a mountainous country, very prosperous and pleasant, called Kūhistān-i abū ghānim. West of this mountainous tract is a district (rustā) Rūdbār, altogether woods, trees, and meadows (marghzār).

8. Hurmūz, within half a farsang of the Great Sea. This very hot place is the emporium of Kirmān.


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. KĀHŪN, KHUSHNĀBĀDH, two small towns on the road to Pārs.
12. KAFFAR, DIHAK, two boroughs on the mountain Bārijān, and whatever comes (uftadh) from the mountain Bārijān is brought (uftadh) to these towns.
13. DIH-I GŌZ (spelt: Kūr), DĀRCHĪN (spelt: Dārjīn), two boroughs between Bam and Jīruft, prosperous and very pleasant. From it (Dārchīn ?) comes cinnamon (dārchīnī).
14. KHWĀSH and RĪQĀN, two boroughs situated in the desert between Sind and Kirmān.
15. SHĀMĀT, | ...GHĀR (Bahār ?), ḪAN (Khannāb ?), GHUBAIRĀ, KŪCHŪN, RĀYĪN (?), SARVISTĀN, DĀRCHĪN, towns between Sīrgān 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 Jīruft and possesses three cathedral mosques (mazgit-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. NARMĀSHĪR, 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. SĪBIH, a town in the desert, between Nahla (*Pahra) and Sistān. It belongs to Kirmān (az 'amal-i K.).
20. F.RDĪR (?), MĀHĀN, KHABĪṢ, very pleasant towns with a salubrious (durust) climate. Some of them are situated in the mountains and some in the steppe (biyābān).
21. BARDĀSĪR, JANZARŪDH, two boroughs on the road to Herat and Kūhistān, very favoured by nature (bā ni'mat-i bisyār), but with a sparse population.
22. KŪTMĪDHAN, K.RDAGĀN, ANĀR are (āyand, read: -and) very pleasant boroughs on the road from Pārs to Rūdhān.
23. Between Sīrgān and Bardāsīr lies a mountainous tract (kūhistān), 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 kashti bitavānad raftan). In its mountains there are long-living (darāz-zindagānī) 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 Tāb which separates Pārs from Khūzistān, and some borders (ḥudūd) of Sipāhān (Isfahan); 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 (tuvangar) province with manifold resources (ni’mat-hā-yi gūnāgūn). It is a resort of merchants and has mountains and rivers. It was the seat of the Sasanian kings (khusravān). 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), zīlu-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: *gabrānl) 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: sūṣ) -i nargis, of which the leaves (petals?) are like those of a lily (sūsan), and the middle (miyāna) like the narcissus.

2. Iṣṭakhr, a large and ancient town, which had been the seat of the Sasanian kings. | In it ancient buildings, images (naqsh), and figures (ṣūrat) are found. Iṣṭakhr has many districts (nawāhī), and (some) wonderful buildings called Solomon’s Mosque (mazgit-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 Pīsar-i ʿUmāra, “The castle of ʿUmāra’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 (manzil) of merchants.

¹ Something fallen out: jbbjjb [jl"[je —>y • uj0' c0' ]
4. Sīrāf, a large town in the hot zone. It has a salubrious (durust) climate, and is the merchants’ haunt and the emporium of Pars.

5. Jam, Kurān, Khurmuk (حمرك‌؟), 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 (sakht) spring of water.

7. Bajīrbagān, *jīra (جیرا‌؟), 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. Sa’āda, Bahlavān (?), two flourishing boroughs, prosperous and situated close to the sea.

10. Ganāwa (کاناء [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 (کاناء [sic]) there is a pearl bank (ma’dan-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-Qarmatī was the son of Ibn Bū Sa’īd.

11. Tavaz, a town situated between two rivers. Its inhabitants are numerous and rich (tuwangar). 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. Sīnīz, a town on the sea-shore, very pleasant and with a salubrious (durust) climate. All the sinīzī 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 Pars.

16. Arragān (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 zarfi-yi ān ba-hama jihān matavānand 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 Arragān, abounding in amenities and enjoying a pleasant climate.
18. NAUBANDAGĀN, a flourishing town, very pleasant and having much wealth (khwāsta).

19. [BISHĀVUR]¹, a wealthy (tuvangar) town with a wall round it, built by Shāpūr Khusrau. 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 (pish az vay) are represented (nigāshta) 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-yi ān dūdhiparadh) is burned and falls down.

20. VĀYAGĀN, KIMĀRĪJ, two boroughs of Bishāvur, flourishing and prosperous.

21. JŪYUM, a flourishing and pleasant borough of Shīrāz.

22. [GŪYUM?], a borough where the weir distributing the water of Shīrāz stands (bakhsh-gāh-i āb-i Shīrāz az ānjā-st).

23. BARSARKĀN (?), KUVARISTĀN (*Kauris tān?), two prosperous and pleasant boroughs of (az) Shīrāz.

24. [BAYDĀ], a prosperous borough. Hallāj who laid claim to divinity (da’vā-yi khudhā’i kard) was from here.

25. HAZĀR, ZARQĀN, KHĪR, boroughs . . . [flourishing],² prosperous, and pleasant.

26. PASĀ, a large and flourishing town with a citadel and a suburb. It is a resort of merchants and has much wealth (khwāsta).

27. TAMISTĀN, BUSTUGĀN, AZBARĀ, DĀRAKĀN, MAZĪRĀKĀN (Murayzagān?), SANĀN, prosperous boroughs between Pasā and [Dārā]gird.

28. DĀRĀGIRD, a flourishing and prosperous town, with much wealth (khwāsta) but with a bad climate. It produces mūmiyā’i (bitumen) which is not found anywhere else in the world. In its region (nazcāhi) 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 Dārāgird 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. KĀRIYĀN, a borough of Dārāgird within (. . . nār?)³ an inaccessible (sa’b) and strong fortress (hiṣār). A venerated fire-temple is found in it.

32. SAMĪRĀN, IRAJ, RŪFTA, MĀDHAVĀN (spelt: Madhāran), GŪYUM, boroughs of Dārāgird, prosperous and pleasant.

¹ Supplied from 20. ² Fol. 28 slightly damaged. ³ Cf. § 36, 15.
33. Jahrum, a flourishing town producing zilā-rugs and good prayer-carpet.

34. Kīzh, a town with a strong fortress (hisār) in it.

35. Khīr, Kurdiyān, two prosperous boroughs having much cultivation and belonging to Pasā.

36. Ij, Istahbānāt, Khīyār, Māshkānāt, boroughs situated on the slope of a mountain, sparsely populated, but having much cultivation, and much favoured by nature.

37. Abās, Bardangān, Jāhuk, boroughs between Istakhr and Kirmān. They are caravan-stages, much favoured by nature.

38. Kamin, Sarvāb, Mārakān (?), Shahr-i Bābak (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: Bajja), Kīlīd (spelt: Kilind), Shamagān, Surma, Arjīnān, boroughs lying amidst the mountains of the cold zone. The locality is prosperous, cultivated, very pleasant, and populous.

40. Barquh (Abarquh), an extremely pleasant town; in its neighbourhood there are large mounds of ashes.

41. [Nāyīn],2 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, KSBā, Māyīn, prosperous boroughs between Pārs and Ispāhān.

44. Rūdhan, 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 (hadd); west of it, some of the borders (hudūd) of 'Irāq, and of the countryside (sawād) of Baghdad and Wāsit; north of it, the lands (shahr-hā) of the province of Jībāl. 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 (shalvārband), fragrant citrons (turanj-i shammāma), and dates. The people of this province are gain-loving and avaricious.

1. DIZ-I MAHDĪ (spelt: Dar-i M.), a flourishing and prosperous town situated on the river between 'Irāq 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 [Khaṭarijītes] (spelt: Raqiyān) took place there.

5. JUBBAY (ٖٔ Jubbā, Jubbē?), a borough on the bank of the Shushtar river, flourishing and very pleasant. The well-known Abū 'Alī Jubbā'ī was from this town.

6. SŪQ AL-ARBA'A, 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 tībī [spelt: tīyy] ki ānjā bari) loses its scent on account of the climate. In its mountains there are vipers (mār-i shikanj, spelt: shtknj).

8. UZAM (?), a small borough, very pleasant.

9. RĀMHUR ([sic], Rāmhiz?), 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. MASRUQĀN, a flourishing and pleasant borough. In it extremely good fresh dates are found.

12. RĀM ĀRDIMIZD, 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. ĪDHA [read: Tustar], a town with a very flourishing countryside

1 The sense is clear but the word is incomplete ...
(sawād), prosperous, very pleasant, and possessing much wealth. It
lies on the bank of a river. It produces great quantities of brocades
dibā). There also the brocade of the cover for the Mecca (sanctuary)
(parda-yi Makka) is made.

15. V. NDUHĀVAR, a prosperous and very pleasant town. The tomb
of Ya‘qūb (ibn) Layth is situated there.

16. SHĪSH, 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 (tābut) of the prophet Daniel was discovered
here.

17. MANŪB (Manūf, read: Mattūth), BIRDŪN, two agricultural
boroughs . . ., prosperous and very pleasant.

18. BAṢUNNAY (Ba-Sunnā, Ba-Ṣunnē), a flourishing wealthy town.
It produces good curtains (parḍa), 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
īuzangird textiles.

§ 31. Discourse on the Jibāl 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;
wes t of it, some parts of ‘Irāq and of Ādharbādhagān; north of it, the
mountains of Daylamān. This province has much cultivation and is
prosperous. It is the place of clerks and litterati (dablrān va adibān).
It is very pleasant and produces cotton stuffs (karbās), textiles of
(silk ?) . . .,¹ and saffron.

1. SIPĀHĀN, a great town consisting of two parts: the one is called
Jahūdhān and the other Shahristān. In both there are minbars.
Between them there is a distance of *half a farsang [read nīm “half”
instead of nuh “nine”]. It is a flourishing town, much favoured by
mature. . . . in Jibāl. It has a river called Zarīn-rūdh which is
utilized in its fields. It produces . . . silk textiles of different kinds,
such as hulla (“cloaks” ?), “tabby” (‘attābī, coarse watered silk), and
“siglaton” (siqlātūn).

2. KHĀN LANJĀN, a flourishing and very pleasant borough . . .

3. JŪYGĀN, a flourishing but sparsely inhabited borough.

4. BARV (read: Burj?), 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: Karkhī).

6. Burūqird, 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 Rūdhrāvar?], a large town, prosperous, pleasant, and very populous. It is a resort of merchants. It produces much saffron and cheese (?) . . ., exported everywhere.

9. Rūdhrāvar, 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. Līshṭar, a borough with a good climate and many fields. From it hazel-nuts (bunduq) are exported.

12. Shābūrkhašt (spelt: Sārjīst), a place . . .

13. Asābād (Asadābād?), Kirmānshāhān, Marj, boroughs on the road of the pilgrims (hūjjāy), densely populated (anbūh), prosperous, . . . and pleasant.

14. Şaymara, Sīrvān, two prosperous and flourishing boroughs, producing dates.


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. Qazvīn . . ., 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 (pādshāh-i Jī.) . . . The water is from underground canals. It produces cotton stuffs (karbās), cloaks (burd), cotton, china (ghadāra), oil (raughan), and wine (nabīdhi). From its districts come good woollen taylasān (scarfs worn on the head). Muḥammad Zakariyyā the Doctor (bijishk) is (buried) there. The tombs (turbat) of Muḥammad ibn
al-Hasan the Lawyer (al-faqih), Kisā’ī the Reader (al-muqri), and Fazārī the Astronomer are also there.

22. Sāva, Āva, Būsanana (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. Qūm, a large town, (now) lying in ruins, with many fields. The inhabitants are Shi’ites, and Bul-Faḍl | ibn ‘Amīd the Minister (dabīr) was from there. From it comes saffron.

24. Kāshān, a very pleasant town. [Among its inhabitants?] are numerous Arabs. From it come many clerks and litterati. In it scorpions (kazdum) 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 (nāhiyati bisyār-ast bā zabān-hā va ṣūrat-hā-yi mukhtalif ki ba-nāhiyat-i Dayālim bāz khvānand).

East of this province is Khorāsān; south of it, the Jībāl lands; west of it, the limits of Ādharbādhagān; 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 (zūpīn). 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, harir, 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-ṣūrat), are warlike, cleanly clad, chivalrous (bā muruvvat), and hospitable. The town consists of two halves: Shahristān and Bakrābād. The river Hirand coming from Tūs passes between these two quarters. Gurgān is the seat of the king of Ṭabaristān [read: King of Gurgān]. It produces black silk textiles, viqāya (long veils), brocade (dībā), and raw silk textiles (qazīn).

2. Dihištān, a district possessing a ribāṭ with a minbar. It is very well cultivated place with extensive countryside (sawādī bisyār). This is a frontier post (ṭaghr) against (bar rūy) the Ghūz. The tomb of ‘Alī b. Sukkarī (Sagzī ?) 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.
Ghuz. Within the ribât there is a spring of water sufficient for drinking purposes (chandânk khurd râ ba-kâr shavadh). The inhabitants have no fields, and bring grain from Nasâ and Dihistan.

4. Astarâbâdh, 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 ketrâ (?) of Astarâbâdh, and the other is the Persian of Gurgân. From it come many silk textiles, such as mubram and sa'fûrî of different kinds.

5. Abaskun, 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. Tabaristân is a large (division) of this country of Daylamân. Its frontier (hadd) is from Châlûs to Tamîsha. 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 (sufâl) on account of the frequency of rain both in summer and in winter.

7. Tamîsha, a small borough round which there is a wall. It is a very pleasant place, lying (nihâda-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. Limräsk, a flourishing borough at the foot of the mountains. Within a distance of 1 farsang from it | there is a salt-mine (namaki-stân) which supplies salt to Gurgân and Tabaristân.

9. Sârî, a prosperous and pleasant town with many inhabitants and merchants. It produces silk tissues (jâma-yi harîr va parîniyân), khâvkhir (?), as well as saffron-water (mâ [sic] za'farân), sandal-wood water (mâ sandal), and perfumed water (mâ khalûq), which are exported everywhere.

10. Mâmatîr, a borough with running waters. It produces thick mats (haşiri sitabr) of very good quality, which they use (ba-kâr dârand) in summer.

11. Turjî, a prosperous borough, the most ancient in Tabaristân.

12. Mîla, a small borough producing much sugar-cane.

13. Âmol, a great town and the capital of Tabaristân. The city (shahrîstân) has a moat but no walls. Round the city lies the suburb. (Âmol) is the seat of the kings of Tabaristân (mulûk-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 (dastâr-i khîsh),
tabari-rugs (farsh), tabari-mats, and box-wood (chüb-i shimshād) which is found nowhere else. It also produces citrons (turunj) and sour oranges (nāranj), white Kūmish-gilims with gold thread (zarbāft), various kerchiefs shot with gold thread (dastārcha-yi zarbāft), shagreen (kimukhta), and wooden implements (ālat-hā-yi chūbi), like ladles (kafcha), combs, handles for the plough (shāna-yi nīyān?), scales (tarāzū-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. NĀTIL, CHĀLŪS [sic], RŪDHĀN, KALĀR, boroughs lying among mountains and broken country. (These towns form) a district of Tabaristān, but the kingdom is separate and the king is called Ustun-dār. Its limits stretch from Rayy down to the sea. Kalār and Chālūs are on the frontier between Daylamān proper (khāssa) and Tabaristān. This Chālūs is on the sea-coast, while Kalār is in the mountains. From Rūdhān comes the red woollen cloth, from which rain-cloaks (bārāni) are made, which are exported everywhere, as well as blue gilims which they use in Tabaristān itself (ki ham der T. ba-kār dārand).

16. KŪMISH, 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.nis(?)-textiles, and fruit, of which there is no like in the world; they are exported to Gurgān and Tabaristān.

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 (dastār-hā-yi sharāb bā 'alam-hā-yi nīku).

18. BISTĀM, 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 (hudūd) of the mountain Dunbāvand (spelt: Dnyāvand). Both in summer and winter it is very cold there. From this mountain iron is extracted (uftadh).

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 Báv.

22. PIRRĪM is the chief place of this district, while the seat of the

1 Indistinct: gilim-i safid-i Kūmish, or gilim-i safid-gūsh?
sipahbadhs is at the military camp (lashkargāh) situated half a farsang from the town. In (Pirrīm ?) live Muslims, mostly strangers, [namely], artisans (pishavar) and merchants, because (zīrāk) 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 (mizāh kunand), organize games (bāzi 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 (bifiribadh), carries her away, and for three days does with her as he likes (bidāradh har chūn ki khwāhad). 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 (nabidh), music, songs, and dances (pāy küftan). There they pray God for their needs (hājat-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 (nāhiyat), producing much iron, antimony, and lead (surb).

24. DAYLAMĀN, the district of the Daylam proper (Daylam-i khāṣṣa) who come from it. It is situated between Tabaristān, the Jibāl, 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: L.TRĀ, VĀRPUVĀ, LANGĀ, M.RD, CHĀLKRUDH, GURGRUDH (?), DĪNARRUDH, JUDĀHANJĀN, Salon Roźbair, 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 (barzigārī kunand). They have no towns with minbars; their towns are Kalār and Chālus.

25. GĪLĀN, a separate district between Daylamān, the Jibāl, Ādharbādhagān, and the Khazar sea. This district lies in the open land (bar sahrā nihādha), between the sea and the mountains of the Jibāl. Gīlān has many running waters; one of them is a great river

1 Read: ārāsta instead of the incomprehensible ārāsta. The expression ārāsta is indeed found a few lines higher up. A marginal note is found here on a source in Dāmghān. See Appendix A.

2 Qotūni Qāmean Bāzī ṣamān bā vaqtī-ki-shān bibāyadh. Cf. p. 120, n. 1.
called Sapīdh-rūdh, which crosses Gilān and flows out into the Khazar sea. There are two classes (gurūh) of these Gīl-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: Lāfjān, Myālfjān (?), Kushkajān (?), Barfjān, Dākhil, Tījin, Ch.MA. That of the other side of the river occupies eleven large districts: Nanak, Ḥānakjāl, Kūtum, Sarāvān, Paylamān-shahr, Rasht, Tūlim, Dūlāb, Kuhan-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 (ḥadd) 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 (‘aṣabiyyat).

And the animosity and fighting persist until [the men] have left those places on military service (ba-lashkari 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 (nabidh), or commits other offences, they give him forty or eighty strokes of the stick (chihil chub bizand). The (Gīl-s) possess boroughs with minbars, such as Gilābdih, 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 digar hama ma’rūfgar-and). The food in all this province is litr (?), rice, and fish. From Gilān come brooms, mats, prayer-carpets, 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 Jibāl; 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 Ādhārbādhagān. This country is situated near to the centre of the world, and is the most prosperous (ābādhāntarin) 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
2DIGAR seems to stand here in the events”, &c.
scholars. It is the seat of the great kings (pādhshāhān-i buzurg).\footnote{Evidently the Buyids.}
It belongs to the hot zone, and from it come dates which are exported everywhere (ki ba-hama jihān bi-barand), as well as various textiles (jāma), and most of the implements (bishtar-i ālāt) becoming kings (mulūk rā shāyad).

1. **BAGHDĀD**, a great town, which is the capital (qašaba) of 'Irāq and the seat of the caliphs.\footnote{So much only about the caliphs!} 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? biguzaradh); 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 (ābglna-yi makhrūt), glaze-ware (ālāt-hā-yi mad-hūn), as well as [various] oils (unguents?), potions (šarāb), and electuaries (ma’jūn), exported everywhere.

2. **MADĀ’IN**, a borough lying east of the Tigris. It was the seat of the Sasanian kings of yore (ān khusrauvān). There stands an edifice called Ayvān-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 DAYR ‘ĀQUL east of it. These two towns are prosperous.

4. **JABBUL** (spelt: Ḥbl) is not a populous borough (kam-ābādhāni). Most of its inhabitants are Kurds.

5. **JARJARĀYÄ** (spelt: Ḟjrāy), east of the Tigris, FAM AL-ŠILH, east of the Tigris, SĀBUS (spelt: Sābas), west of the Tigris—these are prosperous and pleasant boroughs.

6. WĀSIT, a large town consisting of two parts. The Tigris flows through it (ba-miyān-i vay hand ravadh), and upon it there is a bridge. In each of the two parts (of the town) there is a minbar built by Hajjāj ibn Yūsuf. The town has an equable (durust) climate and is the most pleasant town in 'Irāq. From it come gilims, trouser-cords, and dyed wool (pashm-hā-yi rangīn).

7. ‘ABDÁSĪ, NĪM-RŪDHĪ, two populous boroughs. In them (andar vay) dates are found in great quantities.

8. **MAFTAḤ**, a populous borough east of the Tigris; the canal Ma’qil starts from there (az vay bar-giradh).

9. **UBULLA**, a strong town surrounded by water, and lying west of the Tigris. From it come the bullī kerchiefs and turbans (dastār va ‘amāma-yi bullī).

10. **BĀṢRA**, a great town possessing twelve wards; each one of
these is of the size of a town (chand shahri) and they are separated (gusista) from each other. Baṣra is said to possess 124,000 canals. It was founded by ‘Omar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb, God be pleased with him. Baṣra is the only country of tithes (‘ushri) in ‘Irāq. The ‘Alawī Burqa’ī rose from there. There lie the tombs of Ṭalḥa, Anas ibn Mālik, Shaykh Ḥasan Baṣrī, and the Son of Sirīn. It produces good shoes (na’layn) and aprons (fūṭa), as well as linen-and-cotton stuffs of high quality (jāma-hā-yi katān-va-khīsh-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 Baṣra and Wāsit.

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. NAHRRAWĀN, 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 (khusrāvān).

17. JALŪLĀ, KHĀNIQĪN, two flourishing boroughs. Through Khāniqīn flows a large river.

18. QAṢR-I SHĪRĪN, a large village with a stone wall. In it there is a portico coated with marble stones (yakī ayvān az sang-i marmar gustarda).

19. ḤULWĀN, 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. BĀBĪL, the most ancient borough in ‘Irāq, which was the seat of the kings of the Canaanites (Kan’āniyān [sic]).

22. ȘARŞAR, a prosperous and very pleasant borough through which flows the river Șarșar.

23. NAHR AL-MALIK, a prosperous and pleasant borough.

24. QAṢR IBN HUBAYRA, the largest (mihtarīn, bihtarīn?) town between Baghdād and Kūfa, prosperous, pleasant, and populous (bisyār-mardum).

\[\text{§33} \quad \text{The Regions of the World}\]
25. Jāmī‘ayn, a borough situated between the principal course of the Euphrates ('amūd va Furāṭ, read: 'amūd-i F.) and the canal Surā. From all sides the access to it is only by water.

26. Kūfa, a borough on the bank of the Euphrates, founded by Sa‘d ibn Abī Waqqās, and there lies the sepulchre (raūda) of the Prince of the Faithful 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib, may God exalt his face.

27. Hīra (spelt: ḥīra), a borough on the edge of the steppe, possessing a better climate than Kūfa.

28. Qādisiya, a borough on the pilgrims’ road, on the edge of the steppe.

29. Baradān, 'Ukbara, two boroughs to the north of Baghdad 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, Dūr (spelt: Dūn), two boroughs founded by Mu‘tasim and finished by Ma‘mūn [sic],1 prosperous and pleasant.

32. Takrit, 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 (khurrami). In it there are many people belonging to the Rabī‘a tribe, and many Khārijites.

1. Mausil, a large town, with an equable climate and with some amenity (nī‘mat-i andak).

2. Balad, a town on the bank of the Tigris, having some running waters besides (ba-juz az) the Tigris.

3. Bar-Qa‘īd, Adrama (read: Adhrama), two flourishing and populous boroughs.

4. Niṣībīn, 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 (kazdum) 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. KAFARTUTHĀ, 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-RABĪ’Ā (spelt: Diyār Ra’īnay), a very pleasant land (shahr).

9. RAQQĀ, RĀFIQĀ (spelt: Ra’īqa), two large and flourishing towns joined with one another and situated on the bank of the Euphrates. The battle of Šīffīn took place in their neighbourhood (andar hadd-i ī) on the other side of the river.

10. QARQISIYĀ, a flourishing and pleasant borough; all its countryside is always green.

11. RAḤBA, a flourishing town with abundant water and trees.

12. DĀLIYA (spelt: Wāliya), a small town, densely populated (anbūḥ) and pleasant.

13. ĀNĀ, a flourishing borough situated amidst the waters of the Euphrates.

14. HĪT, a prosperous and pleasant town within a solid wall. ‘Abdallah ibn al-Mubārak’s tomb (turbat) is there.

15. ANBĀR, a flourishing, prosperous, pleasant town with a numerous population. The seat of the Prince of the Faithful Abul ‘Abbās was there.

All these towns, from Raqqā to Anbār, are situated on the bank of the Euphrates.

16. BĀLIS (spelt: Tālis), JISR-MANBIJ (spelt: جسر عنج), SUMAYSĀT (spelt: Shumaishāt), boroughs situated on the bank of the Euphrates and adjacent to Syria.

17. ḤARRĀN, a town with little water (ābashān andak). In it live numerous Šābians (Šābiyān).

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 (ābadhāntar), 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. SINN, 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 countrysides enter into each other (ba yak-digar 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: Ghazarān). These places are the most pleasant (bisyār-nī matterīn) among the Islamic lands. The region is very prosperous and pleasant, with running waters and good fruit. It is the abode (jāygāh) of merchants, fighters for the faith (ghāziyān), and strangers coming from all parts. It produces crimson (kermes), trouser-cords (shalvār-band), woollen stuffs, madder (? rūdīna), cotton, fish, honey, and wax. There (too) Greek, Armenian, Pecheneg, Khazar, and Slav (ṣaqlābi) slaves are brought.

1. ARDAVĪL, the capital (qašaba) of Ādharbādhagān, and a great town within a wall. It was a strong (sakht) and very pleasant town, but now is less so (aknūn kamtar-ast). It is the seat of the kings of Ādharbādhagān. It produces striped stuffs (? jāma-yī burd), and stuffs of various colours (jāma-yī rangīn).

2. ASNA (*Ushnah > Ushnū), SARĀV, MIYĀNA, KHŪNA, JĀBRŪQĀN, small but pleasant, prosperous and populous boroughs.

3. TABRĪZ, a small borough, pleasant and prosperous, within a wall constructed by 'Alā ibn Aḥmad.

4. MARĀGHA, 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 qatīfa-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 (rūdhina), grain for food (dāngū-hā-yi khurdani), sacks (juvāl), 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 (Dwn), a great town and the capital of Armenia, encircled by a wall. In it live numerous Christians. It is a very

1 Arab. tikak. 2 Stuffs with long pile; actually bath-towels are called qatīfa.
pleasant town with great riches, men, and merchants. To it belongs a vast countryside (sawād-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. URMĪYA (spelt: Armana), a large town, very prosperous and very pleasant.

11. SALAMĀS (now: Salmās), a flourishing and populous borough producing good trouser-cords.

12. KHŌY, BARGRĪ, ARJĪJ, AKHLĀṬ, NAKHCHUVĀN, BIDLĪS (spelt: Budlais)—these are all boroughs, small or large, flourishing, pleasant, populous, having riches and merchants. They produce large quantities of zilū-carpets (? zilū-hā-yī qālī), trouser-cords, and wood (?).1

13. MALĀZGIRD, a frontier post (thagh ēr) against the people of Rūm (Rūmiyān). The people are warlike and the place pleasant.

14. QĀLĪQALA (usually Qālīqala, 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. MAYYĀFĀRĪQĪN (spelt: Miyafāriqīn), a town inside [sic] a fortress (hişār), 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 | of the family of Julandā bul K.rk.r, the 33a one who “omnes naves vi capiebat” [Qur’ān, xviii, 78].2

19. S.NGĀN (Sungān ?), a town with a large district, belonging to the kingdom of Sunbāṭ.

All these boroughs which we have enumerated belong to Armenia.

20. QABĀN, a flourishing town, producing much cotton of good quality.

21. BARDĀ’, 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-balūt), and caraway (karaviyā).

22. BAYLAQĀN, a very pleasant borough, producing striped textiles (burd-hā) in great numbers, horse-rugs (jul), veils (burqa’), and nāṭif-sweets.

23. BĀZHGĀH (“Toll-house”), a borough on the bank of the river Aras (Araxes), producing fish.

24. GANJA, SHAMKŪR, 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. VARDŪQIYA (Bardūj ?), a small and sparsely populated town in Khunān.

27. QAL‘A, 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 (thaghr) against the infidels (bar rūy-i kāfirān). The river Kur passes through it (andar miyān-i vay). Tiflīs possesses a spring of water, extremely hot; above it hot baths (garmābā) have been built which are always hot without any fire (to heat them).

29. SHAKKĪ, a district of Armenia, prosperous and pleasant. Its length is some 70 farsangs. The inhabitants are Muslims and infidels (kāfirān).

30. MUBĀRAKĪ, a large village at the gate of Barda’. There the camp of the Russians (Rūsiyān) stood when they came and seized (bisitadand) Barda’. This Mubāarakī is at the head of the frontier (avval-i hadd) 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 hadd-i Sh.), with a strong fortress (hiṣār). These two (last-named) towns are prosperous.

33. ŞANĀR, a region 20 farsangs long and situated between Shakkī and Tiflīs. 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 (シュルバン), 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 lashkargāhī, spelt: laskkarhāhī) at a farsang’s distance from Shammikhī. In the region (hudūd) 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 Shirvān,
adjacent to the mountain Qabk (Caucasus). | It produces woollen
stuffs, and all the different kinds of mahfūrī which are found in the
world are from the said three districts.

38. KURDIVĀN, a prosperous and pleasant borough.

39. SHĀVARĀN, 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-ī 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 (bādiyā) of Kūfa 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 (padidh) 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
Khaulān (spelt: Jaulān) and the province of Haḍramūt, 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 ašlī) 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 ānk) who live in the
towns of this country. This country produces dates of different
kinds, skins (adīm), Mekkan sand (rig-i makkī), whet-stones, pilgrim
shoes (na’lāin-i mash’ar), and parti-coloured (mulamma’) shoes. In
it live various strange animals.
The districts of this region are as follows: Yemen, Hijāz, Tiḥāma, Yamāma, Nizwain (*Bahrayn?)—where the tents are found of the tribes, such as Tamīm (Tamīmiyān), Muḍar (spelt: Miṣriyān), Asad, Jassān (?), Kalb, Fazāra (Fazāriyān), and the like. We have marked (padldh) 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 stone2 (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 (*aziz 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 Madina come whet-stones which are exported everywhere.

3. Tā’if, a small borough lying at the foot of the mountains. It produces skins (adim).

34a 4. Najrān is a prosperous borough in which lives the tribe Hamdān. From it come brigands (duzd) who rifle the region of Yemen (ba-ḥudūd-i Yaman rāh burand).

5. Jurash, a flourishing and populous borough of Yemen.

6. ʿṢaʿda, 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 (adim) and the yemeni-shoes for pilgrims (na’lain-i yamani-yi mash’ar).

7. Samdān (*Hamdān?), a district in Yemen, between ʿṢaʿda and Ṣanʿā. It possesses three boroughs in which live the sons of Himyar (farzandān-i Ḥimyar) who have fields, pasture grounds (marāṭi), and vines (raż).

8. Ṣanʿā, 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 *Zurayn v.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. DHIMĀR (spelt: Dimār), a populous town with markets belonging to the district ('amal) of Ṣanʿā. It is a very pleasant place. Their current money (bāzurgani) is something (chizi) similar to the qanda-hāri-coins; eight of (their coins) weigh a dirham.

10. SHIBĀM (spelt: Siyām), 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 Ṣanʿā 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 sīy ki dar rāvī rāvī kūh bibāyadh burīdan). The frontier of this place marches with that of Ḥaḍramūt.

13. ṢUḤAYB (spelt: Sahīb), 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-dānagān) 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 (mukhālafatl kunadh ba-madhhab išān).

16. MIKHĀF 'AKK (spelt: 'Āli), a large and pleasant village.

17. 'ATHTHAR, a prosperous and pleasant village.

18. MAHJARA (spelt: Mahjar), a large town within a wall and a moat. The (inhabitants') clothes consist of izār and chādhur.

19. SIRRAYN (spelt: Sarīr), a flourishing and prosperous town. The inhabitants sow sorghum and barley. Their current money is silver washed over with quicksilver (muzabbaq). 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: Judda), a town belonging to Mekka and situated on the sea-coast, prosperous and flourishing.

21. SABA’ (spelt: Sabā), ’UQĀB (?), WĀDI *BAYHĀN (? spelt: Wādī Bayhān), 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. ’OMĀN (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 (tuwangartar) than here, and all the commodities 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 minbar in it.

29. FUR’ (spelt: F.rgh), a small borough.

30. TABŪK, WĀDI 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. MADIYAN (spelt: Midyan), 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 Quzlum; 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 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. MANȘÜR, QŪRUS, two prosperous but sparsely populated boroughs.

5. MALATYA (spelt: Malatıya), the largest frontier post (thaghr) on this side of the mountain Lukkām. Its fruit is all given free (mubāh) and has no owners.

6. MAR'AŠH, ḤADATH (spelt: Ḥadhab), two flourishing and prosperous boroughs, small, but having many fields and running waters.

7. HĀRŪNĪ, a borough built by Hārūn al-Rashīd and lying on a mountain.

8. BAYĀS (Payas), a flourishing and very pleasant borough in which dates abound.

9. KANĪS, a small borough at the foot of the mountain.

10. KAFARBAYYA (spelt: Kamarīnā), MĀSİṢA, two flourishing and prosperous boroughs divided by the river Jayḥūn. If one mounts (chūn . . . bar ravi) on the bridge spanning that river the sea is visible, though the distance between them is 4 farsangs (va miyānashān chahār farsang-ast). (Their) population is numerous.

11. 'AYN-ZARBA, a town with fruit and well cultivated fields (kisht-hā-yi ārāsta).

12. ADHANA, a town with a flourishing market, situated on the bank of the river Sayḥūn.

13. TARSŪS, a large, prosperous, and pleasant town within a double stone wall. The inhabitants are warlike and courageous.

14. AULĀS (Eleusa), the last town of Islam on the coast of the Rūm Sea. In it are two places which the Byzantines (Rūmiyān) venerate and to which they go on pilgrimage.

These are all the frontier posts called Thughūr-al-Jazīra.

15. ISKANDARŪNA, ŠUḤBA, LĀDHIQIYA, ANȚARȚŪS, AṬRĀBULUS, BAYRŪT, ŞAYDĀ (Sidon), ŞŪR (Tyre), 'AKKA, QAYSĀRIYA, YĀFĀ (spelt: ʿal),² 'ASQALĀN, towns of Syria on the coast of the Rūm Sea, inhabited by Muslims. They are very pleasant towns, with extensive fields and great riches.

16. BĀLĪS, a town of Syria situated on the bank of the Euphrates.

17. KHUNĀŠIRA, TADMUR, SALAMIYA, MUʿĀN (spelt: Maḡān, now: Maʿān), boroughs | on the edge of the Syrian steppe. The people of Salamiya are all Hāshimites, and those of Muʿān, Omayyads.

18. AYLA (spelt: Ḯla), a borough on the coast of the Qulzum Sea, on the frontier between the steppe of Egypt and Syria.

¹ Cf. under Jazīra, § 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 (*mithāni*) in the said building.

21. **Ma‘arra Mašrin**, a flourishing borough with rain-water.

22. **Qinnasrin**, a flourishing and prosperous town.

23. **Hims** (spelt: *Himiṣ*), 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 (*mīrūy*). Snakes and scorpions abound in it.

24. **Kafr-Tāb** (spelt: *Bqr-Tāb*), **Shayzar**, **Hamat**, prosperous, pleasant, and very flourishing towns.

25. **Ba‘albakk**, a very pleasant town lying on the slope of the mountain (*bar bar-ī kūh*).

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 (*turanj*) [or yellow rice, *birinj*?].

27. **Raqqah**, a flourishing borough with few inhabitants.¹

28. **Ruwāt** (spelt: *Ruwāb*), a borough lying close to the mountains. It is the chief place of the Jībāl (*Kūhistān*) district.

29. **Adhrūh** (spelt: *Adhrūkh*), a flourishing and pleasant borough, inhabited by the Khārījītes.²

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** (*Filasṭin*), 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-lahm*), a borough where the Prophet Jesus, on Him be God’s blessings and protection, was born (*mauluḏ*).

36. **Masjid Ibrāhīm**, a borough on the frontier between Egypt and Syria. The sepulchre (*rauda*) of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, on them be God’s blessings, is there.

¹ Cf. in Jazira, § 34, 9.

² Iṣṭ., 58: *al-shurāt.*
37. NĀBULUS, RĪHĀ (Jericho, spelt: Ṛḵhā), two small boroughs, little favoured by nature (kam-ni’mat).

38. JERUSALEM (Bayt al-muqaddas), 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 Lūt), a desolate district, sparsely populated, and without amenity.

40. ZUGHAR (spelt: Z’r), a town of the Home (diyār) 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 Wāḥāt (oases); north of it, the Sea of Rūm. This is the wealthiest (tuvangartarin) country of Islām and in it lie numerous towns, all prosperous, flourishing, wealthy, and extremely favoured by nature in many respects (bāmmat-hā-yi bisyār-i gīnāgun). 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 ?] khazz.¹

And in this country | good asses are found of great price (kharān-i 35 bnik uftadh bā-qimat).

1. FUSTĀT (spelt: Fastāt), 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 Shāfi’ī, God’s mercy on him, is there.

2. DHAMĪRA, DANQARĀ (Dabqū?), 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 Tinnīs, amidst the sands of Jifār. The tomb of Galen (Jālinūs) is there.

4. TINNĪS, DIMYĀT, two towns situated on two islands in the lake of Tinnīs. 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 Fusṭāt; 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 bud), 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. BŪŠIR (spelt: Tūṣir), a town lying to the east of the Nile. The magicians (musha’bidhān) who were with Pharaoh and who worked sorceries (jādhu’i), 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 natavānad 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), AKBHĪM, 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-Wāḥāt (oases region), mines of emeralds and chrysolites (zumurrud va zabarjad) are found, and in all the world they are found nowhere else. In the mountains of al-Wāḥāt 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.”
§ 39. "The Regions of the World"

§ 40. Discourse on the Country of Maghrib and its Towns

East of this country is the country of Egypt; south of it, a desert which the farther end adjoins the country of the Sudân (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 swarthy. 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 (bāsurgānī)² are mostly in gold (ba-zarr).³

1. Aṭrābulus, the first town of Ifrīqiya. 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. Mahdiya, 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 (az fāyhā) are numerous in it.

3. Barqa, 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 Sudân. In its neighbourhood and in its district live many Berbers. In the deserts (biyāhān-hā) of Maghrib these Berbers are what the Arabs are in (their) steppe (bādiya). They own cattle (khudāvandān-i chahār-pāy) and much gold (zar), but the Arabs are wealthier (tuvangartar) 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. Farsāna (Qalshāna?), a flourishing town, very pleasant. The people are sociable (āmizanda) and possess great wealth. The town lies near Qayruwān.

8. Sāṭīf (spelt: Sāṣīf), a large town, with many inhabitants and much gold (zar), but little favoured by nature.

9. Ṭabarqa, 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 BANĪ ZAGHANNĀ (spelt: Raʿnā), a town surrounded on its three sides (si karān) by the sea. In its region (ḥawālti) live many Berbers.

12. NĀKŪR, a town like Tanas.

13. TĀHART, a great town with a special district (nāhiyatjūdā) belonging to the province (ʿamal) of Ifrīqiya. It possesses great wealth.

14. SIJILMĀSA (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-niʿmat) but has much gold.

15. BUṢAYRA (?), a town on the sea-coast opposite Gibraltar (Jabal Ṭāriq). It is a very prosperous place.

16. AZAYLA (spelt: Uzila), a large town within an extremely solid wall. It is the very last (bāzpas-tarin) town (of Africa) from which (travellers) go to Spain.

17. FĀS, a great town which is the capital of Tangiers (Ṭanja), and the seat of the kings. It is a place of great wealth. | 36

18. SŪS AL-ĀQSĀ, a land (shahr) situated on the coast of the Western Ocean which is the last land of the oecumene (ābādḥāni-yi ʿālam) towards the west. It is a great land and its people have extraordinary (bī-andināza) quantities of gold. The people are somewhat far (dūrtar) from the characteristics of humanity (ṭabd-i mardi). 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 (arziz), and the like. Their houses are of stone. The people are white-skinned and blue-eyed.

1. CORDOBA (spelt: Qrtna), 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 Amaviyān-rā-st). The houses (of the town) are of stone.

2. TOLEDO (Tulaytula), 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 (Tājh, read: Tāju) encircles it.

3. TUDELA (Tutayla, spelt: B.tila), a town situated near the mountains. In it an extraordinary (bī andāza) number of sable-martens (samūr) is found; (their skins) are exported to different places (ba-jāy-hā).

4. LERIDA (Lārida), SARAGOSSA (Sarqūs, usually: Saraqusṭa), SHANTARIYA, * REGIO (? * Rayyu), ÉCIJA (Isinja, spelt: Istinja), JAEN (Jayyān, spelt: Khyān), MORÓN (Maurūr, spelt: Maurūd), CARMONA (Qarmūna), 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 (Qūriya), 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 (Ṭurtūsha), a prosperous town on the coast of the Rūm Sea, adjacent to the limits of gh.L.J.S.K.s (the people of Jacá?) and IFRANJA (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 (khaliṣ) 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 (Jazira), a borough on the coast of the straits. At the beginning of the Islamization (musalmānī) Spain was conquered from this town (az in shahr bigushādhand).

13. MEDINA SIDONIA (Sadūna), SEVILLA (Ishbiliya), 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 ashhāb) in great quantities.

Within the limits of Maghrib [sic] there is no other place.

§ 42. Discourse on the Country of Rūm, its Provinces and Towns

East of this country lie Armenia, the Sarīr, and the Alān (al-Lān); south of it, some parts of Syria, of the Rūm Sea, and of Spain; west of it, the Western Ocean; north of it, some Uninhabited Lands 37a (vīrānī) of the North, some parts | of the countries of the Saqlāb and Burjā(n) (ba'dī hudūd-i Saqlāb va ba'dī nāhiyat-i Barjā-st [sic]), and some parts of the Khazar Sea (daryā-yi Khazarān). This country is extremely vast; it abounds in amenities beyond description (bi andāza), 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 (daryāyak-hā), mountains, and very numerous fortresses (ḥišār) and castles (gal'a) are found. It produces in great quantities brocades (jāma-yi dibā), sundus-textiles (of silk), maysānī-(textiles ?), carpets (tanfasa), stockings, and valuable trousercords.

The provinces of Rūm are fourteen; three lie behind (az 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 Ṭabīlān in which Constantinople is situated. The latter is the seat of the kings of Rūm and a place of great wealth.
2. The other is MACEDONIA (Maqadūmiya). Alexander of Rūm was a native of it. It lies by the Rūm Sea.
3. The third is Thrace (Thrāqiya, spelt: Brāqiya) which lies by the Georgian Sea (daryā-yi Gurz).

As regards the other eleven provinces which lie eastwards of the straits of Constantinople, they bear the following names: 4. THRACESION (spelt: Brqsis); 5. OPSIKION (spelt: Absyq); 6. OPTIMATON (spelt: Aftmāt); 7. SELEUCIA (Salūqiya); 8. ANATOLICON (Nāṭliq); 9. BUCCELLARION (spelt: Bqlār); 10. PAPHLAGONIA (Aflakhūniya); 11. CAPPADOCIA (Qabādhag, spelt: Fyādq); 12. CHARSIANON (Khārsiana?); 13. ARMENIACON (Arminyāq); 14. CHALDIA (Khāldiya).

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 nāhiyat rā).

In the days of old cities were numerous in Rūm (andar Rūm shahr-i qadim andar bisyār būdh, 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 hisārl sakht bisyār ustuvār), on account of the frequency of the raids (tākhtan) which the fighters for the faith (ghāziyān) 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 (surat).

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 (khurram va bisyār-ni’mat va kam-khwāsta). Taking it altogether it is steppe and cultivated lands (va digar hama shahrā-st va kisht-u-barz). 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-Šaqāliba al-mutanāsira), a province of Rūm, in which live the Slavs who have become Christians (Šaqlābi-yi tarsā gashta). 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 Bulghari nishinand) to the north-west of Rūm. They are infidels (kāfir). They too are Rūm, but are

---

1 Ki andar gurīkhtan . . . Something omitted by the scribe: *ba-ānjā panā-hand.  
2 The text is awkward: the words "villages" and "towns" ought to come in inverted order.  
perpetually at war with the other Rūmīs. These Bulghāris are mountaineers, 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 (sīy) marches 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 (ābādhānī) 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 (Bariṭṭiniya), 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 Aṭhīnās).

23. YŪNĀN (Greece) was in the days of old a town of this Athens¹ 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 (khunb-i nabidh) are made of wood, and there are people (mard buvadh 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 mūza tā ba ka'b). All of them are fire-worshippers. They possess string instruments (ālāt-hā-yi rūdh) unknown in the Islamic

¹ Shahrī bud az in Aṭhīnās. Perhaps: *Shahr būd “was the country (belonging) to this (town) of Athens.”
countries (andar musalmānī), on which they play. Their arms are shields, javelins (zūpin), and lances. The Șaqlāb king is called S.mūt-swyt (or Bsmūt-swyt). The food of their kings is milk. They spend the winter in huts and underground dwellings (kāz-hā va zir-zamin-hā). They possess numerous castles and fortresses. They dress mostly in linen stuffs. They think it their religious duty (vājib andar din) to serve the king. They possess two towns.

1. VĀBNĪT is the first town on the east of the Șaqlāb 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 (?); west of it, the Șaqlābs; north of it, the Uninhabited Lands of the North. This is a vast country, and the inhabitants are evil-tempered (badh ̲ tab’), intractable (badh-rag va mā-sāzanda), arrogant-looking (shūkh-rūy), quarrelsome (sitiza-kār), and warlike (harb-kun). They war with all the infidels (kafir) 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 (tabbān rā bazurg dārand). They annually pay the tithe on their booty and commercial profits (ghanīmat va bazurgāni) to the government (sultān). Among them lives a group of Slavs who serve them. Out of 100 cubits (gaz) of cotton fabric (karbās), more or less, they sew trousers which they put on (andar pūshand), tucking them up above the knee (bar sar-i zānu gird karda dārand). They wear woollen bonnets (ba sar bar nihādha dārand) with tails let down behind their necks (dum az pas-i qafā furū hishta). They bury the dead with all their belongings (bā har chi bā khwistān dārand), | clothes, and ornaments (pirāya). They (also) place in the grave, with the dead, food and drinks (taām va sharāb).

1. Kūyāba (? 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. S. Lāba (? Mullābeh), a pleasant town from which, whenever peace reigns, they go for trade (? bā bazurgānī ̲ āyand) to the districts of Bulghār.

3. Urtāb (? ārtāb), a town where strangers are killed whenever they visit it. It produces very valuable blades and swords which can be bent in two (ū rā du tāh tavān 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 Saqlābs; north of it, the Rūs mountain. It is a country without towns. The people are courageous, warlike, and terror-inspiring (ba' haybat). 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 (bāzurgānlz kunand) 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 (Bachanāk-i Khazar); south of it, some of the Khazarian Pechenegs and the Gurz Sea; west of it, some parts of the latter (ba'di daryā-yi Gurz), and the Inner Bulghārs; north of it, some of the latter and the V.n.nd.r mountains. They are Christians and speak two languages: Arabic (tāzi!) and Rūmī (Byzantine Greek?). They dress like the Arabs. They are on friendly terms (yāri kunand) 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 (Turkān-i Bachanāki); they came here, took the country by conquest (ba'ghalaba in nāhiyat 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 (uftadh) to the Islamic lands (musalmānī) are mostly from here.

These three (last) named countries are little favoured by nature (kam-m mat).

§ 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 shikastagi-hā va kūh-hā) and is favoured by

1 Bulghār-i andarūnī.  
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. **KĀSAK**, 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. **KHAYLĀN (?)**, 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.

§ 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 kabkā*). 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 (*shikārl-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 (*sakht ‘azīm*) castle on the summit of a mountain. The seat (*nishast*) of the King is in that fort, and he is said to possess an extremely grand throne (*takhti sakht ‘azīm*) of red gold.

2. **KHANDĀN** (Khaydān ?) is the town serving as a residence for the generals (*sipāh-sālārān*) of that king.

3. **BKH. S** (*R.nj.s?*), two very prosperous towns.

From both these countries (*nāhiyat*) numerous slaves are brought to the Islamic countries.

§ 50. Discourse on the Country of the Khazars

East of it is a wall stretching between the mountains and the sea, and for the rest (*digar*) 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 Ṭarkhān 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'āti) when a more important litigation arises (chūn dāvarī buzzurgtar uftadh), they ask the king for instructions (dastūr), or inform him of the decision (taken) on that litigation.

2. Sāmāndar, a town on the sea-coast. It is a pleasant place, with markets and merchants.

3. *KHAMLĪKH (حملخ), *BALANJAR (بانجار), BAYḍA, SĀVGHAR (?), KH.TL.GH, L.KN, SWR, MS.Ṭ (M.s.q.?), 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, Lūgh.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 (khāssa) language. The king is called Mus (?). They own tents and felt-tents and are divided into three hordes (gurūh): *BARCHULA (spelt: B.hdwla), 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 ṭā'at-i Khazariyān). Their wealth is in weasel-furs (pūst-i dala). They have two kings who keep separate from each other (nayāmīzand).

§ 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 Majgharī. They are cowards (badh-dil), weak, poor (darvish), and possess few goods (khwāsta).

1 Immediately after this must follow wrongly placed between §§ 53 and 54. the paragraph on the Bulghār towns,
All these [countries] which we have enumerated are all countries, both of Islamic and Infidel dominions (Musalman va Kāfiri), situated in the northern part of the oecumene (nāhiyat-i shimāl az ābādhāni-yi jahān).

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 bisyār) 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 (amnā nāhiyat-hā-yi jumūb-rā mardumān-ash siyāh-and) on account of the heat of their climate. Most of them (go) naked. In all their lands (zamin) and provinces (nawāhi) gold is found. They are people distant from the standards of humanity (az i'tidāl-i mardi dūr).

§ 55. **Discourse on the Country of Zangistān and its Towns**

It is the largest (mihtarln) 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 Pars, Kirmān, and Sind. The people are full-faced (tamām-surat), with large bones, and curly hair (ja’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.ljmān** (M.ljmān?), a town of the Zang on the sea-coast (bar rūmāna-yi daryā). It is the haunt of the merchants visiting those parts.

2. **Sufāla**, the seat of the Zang king.

3. **Hwfl** (حفل), the town which in this country is by far the richest in goods (bisyār-khwāstatarln).

§ 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 ḏīgar hama biyābān-i junūb-ast). This country and its inhabitants are all like the Zang, but they are somewhat (lakhti) nearer to humanity (mardumi). Their king is called M.nḥ.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.

1. M.NJ.RĪ, a town on the sea-coast, possessing much gold.
2. M.LḤ.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 'Omān, Hijāz, and Bahrayn come here.

1. RĀSUN (*Jaramī), 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 Kābil and they . . . | a place of Raml al-Ma’dan is 20 farsangs.

TĀRĪ (Tahī?), a small province lying in the desert between the limits of Nubia and the Sudan; in it lie two remote (?) monasteries belonging to the Christians (du șaunmā’a-st b’d [*ba’id?] az 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 bu’d nor ba’d nor bi-add make any good sense.
(mard-i rāhib), and whenever one of them disappears (kam shavadh) from Nubia, one of the Christians of Upper Egypt (Ṣaʿīd) goes there.

§ 60. Discourse on Sūdān and its Towns

Its east and south are contiguous with the Southern Uninhabited Lands (ba biyābān-i junūb bāz dāradh); west of it is the Western Ocean; north of it is the desert separating the Sudanese (īshān) 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 (khādimān) mostly come. Their soil is entirely auriferous (hama maʿdan-i zar). Their king is the best man from among these negroes and they call the king Rāʾī b. Rāʾī (rāʾī) and he pretends during each three days to drink only three cups of wine (va chinān numāyadh ki man ba-har si rūz si qadah nabīd khuram, va hamsang-i hamsang-i zar). From Sūdān 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 nhất). 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 (bārīk-zan), thick-lipped (sitabr-lab), long-fingered, and large-faced (buzurg-ṣīrat). Most of them go about naked. Egyptian merchants carry there salt, glass (ābgīna), and lead (arsīz), 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 (bisīyār-mardumtar) country than this. The merchants steal their children and bring them (with them). Then they castrate (hiṣī) 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. H.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 (rish 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 bisīyār-zar-and).

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 (nasdiktar) of the limits of Nubia. The people are thieves (duzd), poor (darvīsh), naked, and the most despicable (madhmūm) of all this country.

1 Malik Rāʿūn, Rāʿūn Khwānand
§ 61. Epilogue\(^1\) of the book

The inhabited (ābādhān) 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 āvardim) 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 (rašad) . . . and it was not very much. Therefore each town [which Ptolemy ??] . . . and other astronomers who were after him . . .

[Colophon] . . . the poor 'Abd al-Qayyum ibn al-Ḥusain ibn 'Alī al-Fārisī . . . in the year 656, and praises be to God, Lord of the Worlds.

\(^1\) Andar khatmat (?).
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§ 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 Qur'an 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 Farighunids

1. THE AUTHOR’S PATRON. Our book is dedicated to Abul-Ḥārith Muḥammad b. Aḥmad, ruler of Gūzgānān (cf. § 23, 26.). The author goes no further in his patron’s genealogy and even omits to mention anywhere the name of Farighūn, usually considered as the eponym of the dynasty to which Abul-Ḥārith belonged.


3. THE NAME FARIGHūN. The eponym’s name is clearly associated with the lore of the Oxus basin. Nāṣir-i Khusrau in his Divān, Tehrān, 1307, pp. 329, 355, and 474 thrice mentions a Fazhlghun (Fāzhlghun *Farighūn) referring to some tyrant who may be identical with the king of Khwārazm Afrīgh quoted in Bīrūnī, 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. Khusrau. 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 Bīrunī and Nāṣir-i-Khusrau’s characterization of Farīgh/Farīghūn, the name Afrīghūn was popular in Transoxiana: a traditionalist who lived about 438/1046–7 bore the name of Afrīghūn. As another example of a name, repulsive in tradition but used in Eastern Iran, may be mentioned Zahāk, or Zuhāk (Iran, azdahāk), in Arabic garb: the kings of Ghūr considered themselves descendants of the famous tyrant, see Ṭabaqāt-i Nāširi, Raverty’s transl., p. 302, and 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 Ḍāḥāk, though the latter was known among the Khārijītes, § 10, 47.

4. The Ma’mūnids Wrongly Called Farīghūnids. It is noteworthy that Ghaffārī, in his jahān-ārā, written about 972/1564–5 (Br. Mus., Or. 141, f. 86a) under salātīn-i āl-i Farīghūn ki mulaqqab ba Khwārazmshāh būdand speaks of the short-lived Khwārazmian dynasty founded by the amir Abul-ʿAbbās Ma’mūn b. Muḥammad, who in A.D. 996 usurped the power of the ancient Khwārazmshāhs (descendants of Afrīgh). Ghaffārī’s blunder passed into Browne’s Lit. Hist. of Persia, ii. 230, 237, but was denounced by Muḥammad khān 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 Ghaffārī’s mistake.

5. Afrīdhūn, as the Ancestor 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. Toumansky has already made a suggestion for the emendation of 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 EL.), 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 Khwārazmian Afrīgh, they would probably have proclaimed as their ancestor the Kayānid Siyāvush (cf. Bīrunī, l.c.) rather than the Pīshdādian Farīdhūn. However, in the popular opinion the
6. THE ORIGINS OF THE FARĪGHĪNIDS. As Barthold has noticed, v.s., p. 6, we know nothing on the connexion of our Farīghīnīds (4th/10th cent.) with the earlier rulers of Gūzgānān whom I. Kh., p. 40, calls Gūzgānhūdāh and on whom Tabārī, ii, 1206, 1560, 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 Farīghīnīds, writes only, ii, 101–2: “The province of Gūzgān belonged to the Farīghūn family in the days of the Sāmānīds (qad kānēt vilāyat al-jūzjān li-āli Farīghūn ayyāma Sāmān) and they (i.e. the Farīghīnīds) 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 Sāmānīds (3rd/9th cent.).

THE CHART OF THE FARĪGHĪNĪDS. The number of the ruling members of the family was certainly very limited. ‘Utbi, ii, 101–5, mentions by name only two Farīghīnīds, Abū-Ḥārīth and Abū Naṣr, whereas Gardizī, p. 48, gives the genealogy of the former as Abū-Ḥārīth Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Farīghūn.

The genealogical tree of the family may be reconstructed as follows:

\[\begin{align*}
& a. \text{Farīghūn} \\
& b. \text{Aḥmad} \\
& c. \text{Abū-Ḥārīth Muḥammad} \\
& d. \text{Farīghūn [?]} \\
& e. \text{Abū Naṣr} \\
& \quad \text{Aḥmad, married to Sabuktagin’s daughter} \\
& f. \text{Ḥasan [?]}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
& \text{daughter, wife of} \\
& \quad \text{Nūḥ b.} \\
& \quad \text{Masūr} \\
& \text{daughter, wife of} \\
& \quad \text{Sulṭān} \\
& \quad \text{Maḥmūd} \\
& \text{wife of} \\
& \text{Abū Aḥmad} \\
& \text{Muḥammad, son of} \\
& \text{Sulṭān Maḥmūd}
\end{align*}\]

The name of \textit{a. Farīghūn} is known to us only from the patronymic of his son (\textit{v.i.}) whom Narshakhī and Gardizī call Aḥmad ibn Farīghūn, and the \textit{Qābūs-nāma}: 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 Sāmānīds in the 3rd/9th cent. and the Rabāṭ Afrīghūn, v.s., p. 6, may have been associated with his activities.

\[\begin{align*}
& b. \text{The amīr Aḥmad b. Farīghūn is mentioned for the first time towards}
\end{align*}\]
287/900 as a prince of some importance. During the struggle of the Sāmānid Ismā'īl with the Ṣaffārid '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 Narshakhī, p. 85, cf. Barthold, Turkestan, p. 224 [differently in T.-Sīstān, p. 251]. In a story of the Qābūsnāma, ch. xxv, p. 90, Aḥmad-i Farīghūn appears as the owner of a large herd of mares (who foaled to him 1,000 blue-eyed colts in one day).

c. ABUL-ḤĀRITH MUḤAMMAD B. AḤMAD is the name transmitted to us in the Hudūd al-ʿĀlam and Gardīzī. However, 'Utbi, i, 166 (Persian translation p. 114 incomplete) and ii, 101 (Persian translation pp. 305–6) speaks of Abul-Ḥārith Ahmad [sic] b. Muḥammad who was father of Abū-Naṣr Aḥmad b. Muḥammad [sic]. And the latter form: Abū Naṣr Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Farīghūnī, also occurs l.c. ii, 84. There is therefore no doubt that Marquart and Barthold are right in accepting the name of Abul-Ḥārith as Muḥammad b. Aḥmad and of his son as Abū Naṣr Aḥmad b. Muḥammad, whereas Muḥammad Nāẓim is wrong in interpolating an "Abul-Ḥārith Aḥmad" between our c. Abul-Ḥārith Muḥammad and d. Abū Naṣr Aḥmad, 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-Ḥārith Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Farīghūnī” and Abul-Muzaffar Muḥammad b. Aḥmad. Their names were so similar that the Persian translator wrongly added to the latter the qualification “al-Farīghūnī” which is an evident mistake (v.i.). 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-Athīr, ix, 69 and 159, who followed 'Utbi.

Abul-Ḥārith Muḥammad b. Aḥmad’s reign marks the heyday of the Farīghūnīd power. The earliest mention of Abul-Ḥārith “b. Farīghūn” (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-Ḥārith gave his daughter to the youthful Sāmānid Nūḥ b. Maṇṣūr, Gardīzī, 48. In 372/982–4 the Hudūd al-ʿĀlam was dedicated to him. After 380/990, ‘Utbi, i, 165–6, he was requested by Nūḥ b. Maṇṣūr to march against the rebellious amīr Fāʾiq, but was defeated by the latter; cf. Ibn al-Athīr under 383 Ḥ. In 383/992 Nūḥ on his way to Khorāsān arrived at Gūzgān and was joined by Abul-Ḥārith al-Farīghūnī, ‘Utbi, i, 184; cf. Barthold, Turkestan, 261. In 385/995 during the struggle of Sabuktagan with Fāʾiq, the former sent for Abul-Ḥārith al-Farīghūnī, ‘Utbi, i, 209, Gardīzī, 56; cf. Barthold, ibid. 262. Probably about that time of rapprochement with Sabuktagan Abul-Ḥārith gave his daughter to Maḥmūd b. Sabuktagan and took a daughter of Sabuktagan’s for his son Abū Naṣr, ‘Utbi, ii, 101. When Sabuktagan died (387/997) Abul-Ḥārith first mediated between Maḥmūd and his brother Ismāʿīl, ‘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 Ismāʿīl to Abul-Ḥārith’s care, ibid. i, 316; cf. Barthold, ibid. 271. This is the last mention of Abul-Ḥārith.
d. In 394 or 395 (A.D. 1004-5) 'Utbī, i, 343, mentions some Farīghūn b. Muhammad who with 40 generals (qā'id) was dispatched by Maḥmūd from Balkh against the last Sāmānid Muntasīr. The latter at that time was roaming in the region of Andkhudh (v.i., § 23, 61.) and Pul-i Zāghūl (near Marwarrūdhd), and it is likely, therefore, that this Farīghūn belonged to the Farīghūnid family and was sent as a person acquainted with the territory of Guzgānān. We can only suppose that he was a son of Abul-Hārith Muḥammad, but we have no means by which to ascertain whether his appearance towards 1004-5 indicates some sort of interregnum between Abul-Hārith and Abū Naṣr.

e. Abū Naṣr Ahmad b. Muhammad is mentioned for the first time as “wālī of Guzgānān” in 398/January 1008 when in the battle near the bridge of Charkhiyān in which the Qara-Khānīds were defeated, he, together with Maḥmūd’s brother, was in command of the centre of Maḥmūd’s army, 'Utbī, ii, 84; cf. Gardīzī, 69 and Barthold, Turkestan, 273. In 399/1009 he accompanied Maḥmūd when the latter entered the fortress of Bhīm Nagar in India, 'Utbī, 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 Mas’ūd and Muḥammad, both 14 years old, were living in Zamin-dāvar while their father Maḥmūd was warring in Ghūr, mentions as their companion “Ḥasan, son of amīr Farīghūn, amīr of Guzgānān”. We know that exactly in 401 A.H. the last known Farīghūnid ruler died, and we may imagine that Ḥasan was the youthful candidate to the throne of Guzgānān kept, during his minority, with his Ghaznavid cousins. Whose son was this Ḥasan? If we keep literally to Bayhaqī’s text: حسن . . . پسر امیر فریغون امیر گوزگان حasan’s father may have been d. Farīghūn b. Muḥammad. But probably “amīr Farīghūn” stands here only for “Farīghūnid ruler”, in which case Ḥasan may have been the son of the last Farīghūnid amīr Abū Naṣr Ahmad. On the other hand, we know that Sultān Maḥmūd having married his son Abū Ahmād Muḥammad to a daughter of the amīr Abū Naṣr al-Farīghūnī gave him Guzgān as a fief (‘aqada lahu ‘ala a’māl al-Jūsţān) and appointed Abū Muḥammad [b.] Ḥasan b. Mihrān to act as his adviser. The young prince inaugurated in Guzgān a new era (wa baraza ilayhā burūs al-sayf min yad al-sāqīl), and displayed much solicitude for the population’s welfare, ‘Utbī, 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 Guzgān into a Ghaznavid fief took place in 408/1017-18 and Nāṣir-i Khusrau in his Dīvān, ed. Tehrān, 1307, refers to the event in the following verse, p. 818:

کجاست آنکه فریغون ز هیبہ او ز دست خوشی بادند کرکانازا

“Where is he [i.e. Maḥmūd] for fear of whom the Farīghūnids let slip Guzgān 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 Chaghāniyān (v.i., § 25, 27.) Abul-Muzaffar Muḥammad b. Aḥmad, who has been wrongly supposed to be a Farīghūnid; cf. Barthold, *Turkestan*, p. 254, and more decisively Saʿīd Nafīsī, *o.c.*, p. 258. The appellation “Farīghūnī” has been only by mistake appended to the name of this Abul-Muzaffar in the Persian translation of *ʿUtbi*, p. 114, and is absent in the Arabic original, i, 167. This Abul-Muzaffar was dispossessed by his relative Tāhir b. Fāḍl, but evidently was reinstated after the latter’s death. *ʿUtbi*, 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 Farīghūnids see § 23, 46–66. and Barthold’s *Preface*, pp. 5–6.

**Writers patronized by the Farīghūnids.** Among the men of letters patronized by the Farīghūnids ‘ʿUtbi, ii, 102–5, names Abul-Faḍl Aḥmad b. Husain Badiʿ al-zamān Hamadhānī (the poem quoted will be found in the latter’s *Divān*, Cairo, 1321, p. 33) and the poet Abul-Faṭḥ Bustī. Münejjim-bashi adds to their number Khuwārizmī, “author of the *Mafātīh al-ʿulūm*”.1 Finally our *Hudūd al-ʿĀlam* is a tangible proof of Abul Ḥārith Muḥammad’s literary and scientific tastes.2

---

1 The connexion of the author of the *Mafātīh* with the Farīghūnids is probable, as he dedicated his book to the wazīr of the Sāmānid Nūḥ b. Maṣṣūr [976–97] who was son-in-law of the Farīghūnid Abul-Ḥārith Muḥammad. However, the name of the author of the *Mafātīh* was Abū ‘Abdillāh Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Yūsuf. Münejjim-bashi by an evident slip calls him Abū Bahr, which is the *kunya* of a different Khuwārizmī, namely of Muḥammad b. ʿAbbās, author of the *Divān Rasāʿil*, who died in 383/993 in Nīshāpur; cf. Ibn Khalilikān, Paris, 1842, i, 736 [transl. iii, 108].

2 E. G. Browne, *A Lit. Hist. of Persia*, i, 453, mentions among the Farīghūnid clients the poets Daqīqī and Manjik, though he does not quote his authority [Ethé?]. No such statement is found in *ʿAufī, Daulatshāh*, or the *Majmaʿ al-fuṣahā*. According to *ʿAufī’s Lubāb al-albāb*, ii, 13–14, Manjik was the panegyrist of the amir of Chaghāniyān [v.i., § 25, 25.] Abul-Muzaffar Tāhir b. al-Faḍl b. Muḥammad b. al-Muzaffar, and Daqīqī, *ibid.*, ii, 11, that of the amirs of Chaghāniyān [particularly of Abū Saʿīd Muḥammad Muẓaffar Muḥtāj] and of the Sāmānid Maṣṣūr (b. Nūḥ b.) Naṣr b. Aḥmad. Farrukhī in his famous *qasīda* dedicated to Abul-Muzaffar Chaghānī says: tā tarafzanday (sic) madīh-i tu Daqīqī dar gudhasht, z-afarin-i tu dilāganda chinnān k-az dāna nār, see *Chahār maqāla*, p. 165. The explanation of the error may be the fact that the said amir Abul-Muzaffar Muḥammad had been wrongly taken for a Farīghūnid, v.s., line 3.
3. The inhabited part of the earth is supposed to occupy the whole width of the visible part of it, i.e. 180°, while in latitude it occupies 63° in the northern part of it and 17° 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° beyond the Equator, i.e. southern lat. 24°. Prof. C. A. Nallino kindly writes to me (Rome, 5. xi. 1932): "Je pense que les chiffres 63° et 17° sont tout simplement l'application de l'idée que l'oi̇kouμένη (برع المسور) est la quatrième partie de la surface [scil. visible V.M.] du globe terrestre; 63° étant la limite boréale des habitations humaines, et 90° la largeur de l'habitable (sur 180° de longueur), on a fait 90−63 = 17."

5. See § 4, 13. on the island Nāra (*Bāra) lying on the Equator.

§ 3. The Seas and the Gulfs

The word khalīj 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 Khuwārizmi’s, p. 32, “Sea of Darkness” al-bahr al-muzlim, and to al-bahr al-akhdar of Ibn Rusta and Mas‘ūdī; cf. Mžik, 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 Khuwārizmi, p. 74, calls bahr al-Qulzum, al-bahr al-akhdar, bahr al-Sīn, and bahr al-Basra. 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-khalīj al- Barbarā in Mas‘ūdī, Murūj, 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 § 3a the name Barbarī is given to the gulf off the Südān 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 Südān”), 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
(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 'Irāq. 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 Khazarān* as applied to the Black Sea see § 49, 17.

6. (§§ 42 and 45–7: دروای کرژ) is here clearly identified with the Pontos (پنسل). This double designation of the Black Sea indicates the variety of sources used by our author. The Ptolemaic “Pontos” and “Maeotis” do not appear in the description of separate countries (§ 8 and sqq.). On the strange and abusive use of the term Gurz see notes to § 3, 8, and § 42, 15.

7. 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, 1902).

[A curious caption is found in Bīrūnī’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: *Jurjāniya =* Gurgānj, § 26, 25.].” Bīrūnī’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 اوران (أوران), with all the Qifchaq tribe, adding that he sent to him his son Firān < Pirān (cf. *infra* p. 295, note 2) with a number of Yūghūr-zādagān (v.i. §§ 18, 3.). Bīrūnī’s term اوراشان *Arvāniyān, Urāniyān, Uzāniyān* (?) 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. *ماوئس* stands undoubtedly for *Maeotis* as the Greeks called the Azov

¹ On the *baḥr al-aghbāb* 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,\(^1\) are rightly indicated, it is placed north of the Saqlāb 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 Ṭuwas (*Tūliya = Thule) in the extreme north flows into the Maeotis.\(^2\) 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.\(^3\) 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, Ṭūs 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 Bīrunī’s cosmographical work *al-Tafhīm*,\(^4\) where it is said that *al-Bahr al-Muhīt* (= our Western Ocean), beyond Tangier and Andalus (Spain), “stretches northwards along the land of the Ṣaqlābiba, and from it a large gulf separates north of the Ṣaqlābiba 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. Societāt zu Erlangen*, Band 44 (1912), p. 4, and Abul-Fidā, text, p. 35, transl., p. 42, where it is stated that the said *Bahr-Warank* is found only in Bīrunī’s works and in Naṣīr al-dīn (Ṭūsī)’s *Tadhkira*. The real Maeotis, *i.e.* the Azov Sea, was named by the Muslims equally after the Normans. Masʿūdi, *Muriţ*, ii, 15, says that “in the upper reaches of the Khazar river [i.e. the Volga] there is an outflow (*fi aʿāli nahr al-khazar mašabb*) 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”.\(^6\) Most probably the passage refers to the Azov Sea, and this is confirmed by the later Idrīsī, who makes the *Nahr-al-Rūstīya*, as he calls the Tanais (Don), flow into the *Bahr al-
Rūsiya, 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 Rūs 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 Warang. Graphically such a substitution is quite imaginable, if for instance, the final was written somewhat above the line and the top bar of ḫ happened to be drawn near the initial ḳ.

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 = Rūs, 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 compilor merged the Azov Sea into the Black Sea.

[Additional note. The alternative explanation of the strange term would be to connect it with K.rj 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. K.rkh can be easily restored as K.rj of which would be a tentative iranization. Instead of K.rj I. Faqīh, 281, mentions read: S.mk.rsh. The Khazar king’s letter (version B) ed. Kokovtsov, p. 31, mentions on the western frontier of the Khazar kingdom Sh.rkīl Zapi, S.mk.rts and K.rts, of which the two latter evidently retranscribe the names quoted by I.Faqīh 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 K.rj from read as (cf. Hebrew K.rts < K.rj). As K.rj is most probably Kerch [the alternance in Arabic of sh/j is in favour of the original j], 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‘ūdi, Murāj, ii, 272, Tanbih, 67, Pontos and Maeotis are one sea, cf. Marquart, Streifzüge, 161.
3 S.mk.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.
of Muslim al-Jarmi) is called خزر Khazar and جرز Jurz are 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 خزر جرز and as our author everywhere substitutes Iranian Gurz for Arabic Jurz, the Black Sea could under this name (Gurz > Gurziyān) 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. 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 سماطی with 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 Archeilais. 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 x 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 Bwr, Lwr, Bwn, Bwdh, Twz, Mwz, but actually the lake is called Famür, which confirms the reading Mür in the older Fārs-nāma, ed. Le Strange, GMS, 154.

14. Išt., 122, Bāsfahuya, I.H., 123, Bāshafuya, &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, praises its utility.

15. Išt., 122, also gives Jankān (*Janagān), while the older Fārs-nāma, 153, has Māhaluya, nowadays turkicized into Mahārlu.

16. *Bijagān, cf. also § 6, 33., is now called Bakhtagān but Hasan Fasā'ī on his detailed map of Fārs (note to § 29) gives the alternative Bichagān. The river of Dārāgird (Rūd-i Shūr flowing into the Persian Gulf, north of the island Qishm) rises from a source situated some 35 Km. 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 Dārāgird and to outflow into the sea". Chardin, ed. Langlès, viii, 235, 499, who crossed the Rūd-i Shūr on his way from Lār to Bandar-i Abbāsi, took it for a continuation of the Band-i-mīr river (i.e. of the Kur). Tomaschek, Nearch, p. 44, calls it Āb-i Kurr (without quoting his authority) and identifies it with the Coros mentioned by P. Mela and Kōpios found in Ptolemy, vi, cap. 8; cf. Schwarz, Iran, p. 8.
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 Tughuzghuz 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-‘Ārj, § 15, 5.–6., of which the former is mentioned on the frontier of the Yaghmā, i.e. on the south-western border of the Khallukh. Finally, though Gardīzī calls the Issik-kul shūr “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, Turkestaniskiy 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 Barskhān, § 15, 11., the Khallukh influence was weak). Therefore I am personally more inclined to identify the Tuz-kul with the Shūr-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 Kāshghar, 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 Shūr-kul “is a sheet of salt rather than of water . . . The salt is collected by the people and is carried as far as Kāshghar; 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-Ālam.

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. رِیاُس Riyas 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 رَسِ بحيرة البابليون i.e. the locality “at the head of the lake of Basilion”. In I. Kh.’s passage the word رِیاُس could have been misspelt into رَسِ in which case our author having interpreted it as “Riyas, lake of Bāsiliyun” may have retained the name and dropped the explanation. Le Strange, The Lands, p. 135, identifies the lake Bāsiliyun with that of the Forty Martyrs, i.e. the Akshehir-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 Iṣṭ.].

23. Iṣṭ., 122, buḥayrat bi-Dasht-Arzan, situated west of Shīrāz, on the
road to Kāzrūn.

24. The usual pronunciation of Zarah is Zirih, 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
Zaribār, 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.

26. Bastarāb 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 Tūs lies in the mountain separating Tūs from Nīshāpūr.
Bīrūnī, Chronology, p. 264, calls the lake Sabzārād and gives various ex-
planations of its situation on a height. In the Nuzhat al-gulūb, GMS, p.
241, it is called Buhayra-yi chashma-yi sabz and identified with the legendary
lake from which came out the horse that killed Yezdegird the Sinner.
According to the Shāh-nāma, ed. Mohl, v, 519–23, the event took place
near the Lake Shahd and the source Sau; cf. Minorsky, Tūs in EI.1 Following
Sir P. Sykes, A sixth journey, in GJ., Jan. 1911, p. 3, the Chashma
Sabz lies under the Lūk Shīrbād peak (between Nīshāpūr and Tūs) 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 Sāmjan [sām- according to Marquart, Wehrot,
29, means “black”] and Bārgin-i farākh; see Barthold, Turkestan, 117, and
Barthold, Irrigation, 124. In our text the word ۳۵۱ 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 āvāza is metrically
attested in the Shāh-nāma, ed. Mohl, vi, 630, 651, 654. In Firdausi, 507,
Āvāza is the castle which Bahrām Chūbīn takes after a siege during his
campaign against the “Turkish” king Shāba and his son Parmūdha.

1 Marquart, Wehrot, p. 7, thinks that ۳۵۱ in Firdausi is an error for ۳۵۱ *Sind,
as the lower course of the Herat river
was probably called after a village which
existed in the neighbourhood of Nasā
and Abīvārd (§ 23, 9., 10. and 30.), see
Yāqūt, iii, 167.

2 The maps show an Āvāza on the
western side of the spit covering from
the west the bay of Krasnovodsk.
Instead of Āvāza Thaʿālibī, 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 Āvāza and Paykand. Cf. also his Catalogue, 34–6, where the equation is established of Dīzh-i Nāvāzak = Dīzh-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 Chryse 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-fidda (Khuwārizmī) represents Ptolemy’s Ιαββαδίον *Yāvadvipa (Sumatra, or Java) the capital of which was called Αργυρη (Ptolemy, vii, 2, 29). However, the situation is complicated by the fact that Ptolemy mentions in the Transgangangetic India (vii, 2, 17) two countries bearing respectively the names of Αργυρη and Χρυση (cf. Coedes, Index). In Khuwārizmī’s arrangement of Ptolemy, Jazīrat al-fidda 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: Αργυρη.

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 Σατύρων ἄκρον), between which, in the country of the Sinai (<dynasty of Ch’in), stretches the gulf Θηριώδης, 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-Wāqwāq in I.Kh., 69, as confirmed by the appellation of its inhabitants “Wāqwāqian Zangīs”. For a second time the same place is mentioned in § 9, 1., as a dependency of China under the name of Wāq-Wāq. Cf. also §§ 55, 3. and 56.

4. Tabarnā is Ṭapropbāvī, cf. I. 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. Khuwārizmī, p. 4, places in the Sarandīb island”. Our author distinguishes Tabarnā from Sarandīb; see § 9, 23., cf. Ferrand, Relations, p. 205, note 2. The name of the town Muvas is a puzzle unless it stands for v. i. 10. and § 10, 13. From Sarandīb Malay lies certainly “towards Hindūstān”. From the graphical point of view has a parallel in v. i. 25. Less probable would be the supposition that Muvas somehow represents the name of the Suwās river, v.s., note 101. [On the position v.i., p. 235, n.i.]

5. Rāmī < Rāmnī 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 Sarandīb stands evidently for the details (camphor-trees, snakes) correspond to those quoted under § 56.

7. Jāba and Shalāhit are treated as a single island (Sumatra; cf. above, 5). I.Kh., 66, uses the singular for جزيرة جابة وشلاته وهرلج, cf. [Ībrāhīm b. Waṣīf-shāh] L’Abrégé des Merveilles, tr. by Carra de Vaux, 1898, p. 58: “the island of Jāba contains the town of Shalāhit”. I.Kh., 66, does not mention ambergris and cubeb among the products of Shalāhit, but they are mentioned in I. Rusta, 138.

8. Bālus is the port lying on the south-western coast of Sumatra. Ferrand, Relations, p. 27, note 5, and Ferrand, Wak-Wak in EI. “The said Jāba” refers to the preceding 7. I.Kh., 66, places Kala at 2 days’ distance from Bālus (this sentence in our text comes under 9.) and from the latter counts 2 farsaks to Jāba, Shalāhit, 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 Bālus” Kala ought to be located north (north-east) of it. Sulaymān says that after *Lanjabālus the ships call at Kalāh-bār,1 which is (a part) of the Zābaj. The name of tin in Arabic al-rīšās al-qal’ī, or simply qal’ī (<kali), is a derivative from Kala. The “Indian (or Brah­manic?) Jāba” (I. Kh., 66), in contradistinction from the other Jāba (I. Kh.,

1 Sulaymān rightly explains Persian -bār as “a country, or coast”.

67), whom our author calls “Continental Jāba”, see § 5, 9. B and § 10, 45.; cf. Barthold’s Preface, p. 34, note 3.1

10. Bankālus stands for I.Kh.’s, 66, Al.n.k.bālūs “the Nicobar islands”. Ferrand, Relations, p. 26, takes as the right form *Lankabālus. Our author exactly translates I.Kh.’s: I.Kh. counts 10–15 days from Al.n.k.bālūs to Sarandīb, and, moreover, mentions the distances Malay–B.līn, 2 days, B.līn–*Bāpattan, 2 days, and B.līn–Sarandīb, 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 Bankālus and Malay.

11. One would perhaps expect, v.s., note to 7., that H.r.nj (هَرْج) following the group of islands situated east of India stands for H.r.l. j (هَرْج) which I.Kh., 66, associates with Sumatra. I.R., 138, says that “Harlaj 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.wārān. However, our author clearly places H.r.nj in proximity to Sindān (§ 10, 14.) and lets 12. Lāft (in the Persian Gulf) follow it in the enumeration. One must perhaps look for the explanation of our هَرْج in Sulaymān’s (p. 5) name for the sea off the south-western coast of India: هَرْج. In, and round, this H.rk.nd Sea Sulayman mentions 1,900 islands (dībājāt < ssk. dvīpa “island”) corresponding to the Laccadives, &c.2 Our H.r.nj island may refer to the latter. The name هَرْج 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 -هَرْج: (1) the sea near the Laccadives, (2) Bengal, and (3) some part of Sumatra.

12. Lāft, v.i. under 14.

13. The name هَرْج, Birūnī, India, 157: هَرْج must be read *هَرْج meaning in Persian “moenia et munimentum castri vel urbis”, Vullers, i, 170. This legendary island marking the 0° of longitude and latitude has given rise to much discussion and confusion.3 A mention of the Equinoctial, or Equatorial, Island is found in I.R., 83: جَزِيرَةِ ٱلْيَلْوَى ٱلْمَيْرَى ٱلْمُحْيَى, 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-foo-ts’i, 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 Jāba. 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, Črīvidjaya, 16–17, 166.

2 It is possible that Sulaymān’s H.rk.nd 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 Lānḵā inaccessible to men, while Lānḵā is also the name of Ceylon; cf. Kirfel, Die Kosmographie der Inder, Leipzig, 1920, p. 111.
for 1,900 miles. Biruni is the principal authority on Bāra. In his *al-Qānun* al-Mas'ūdī he says:

"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-majhūlāt)". 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 *Tafhīm*, 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: "Yamakoṭī ( Também) 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 *koṭī* means castle and *Yama* (M) is the Angel of Death, the word reminds me of Kangdīz, 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 Kangdīz, as the 0° of longitude, or first meridian." Reinaud, o.c., cxxii, cxxix, &c., who first commented on this passage, showed how this Yamakoṭī (= Jamshīdgird) (1) has got confused with the "Cupola of the Earth" (مَرَضَة الإِرْضِ) which in India was identified with the site of the town of Ujjain, "Oc'hyn, azin 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 Māzik 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 Mānṣūr [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. ccxlv and the maps of al-Battānī and Mas’ūdī, ibid., ad p. cclxxxii.

Our author places the island at long. 90° and mentions it after H.r.nj 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 Ist., 107, where it is said that the island was also called Jazīra bani 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 Ibādite sectarians. It corresponds to the large island Qishm, on the northern promontory of which there is a village called Lāft; see Tomaschek, 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 Ist., 32.


17. Ist., 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., 11, spells تاران. 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 سقطری. The Greek name is Πάδεισα, Ptolemy, i, 3, Punic Gaddir (“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. Arwādh, small island off Tarţūs in Syria, now Ruwād. The name cannot be directly derived from Ptolemy’s, Ἀπάδος (Geog., v, 14). It is not found in any other ancient Muslim sources, except Ṭabarî, ii, 163.
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22. 23. Khuwārizmī, 89 [= Nallino, 50] mentions the islands (Amazons) of which the first is inhabited by the men and the second by the women. Nallino suggests the emendation of *Amazons into *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. Idrisi, ii, 433, Idrisi-Tallgren, 34, 77, 140: Tallgren says that the island Nargen (off Reval = Tallinn) is called *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. Ya‘qūb [circa 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 *Rūtanā (as in Qudāma, 231), hails evidently from a source different from that of *Rudānī 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 Maeotis, 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 Išt., 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 Išt. 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 Alankaburda (Lombards) says that their country is vast and is situated half-way (bayni) between Constantinople and Spain: “it begins from a side of the Mediterranean (bahr al-khalij, cf. Yāqūt, ii, 465) opposite the Jabal al-qilal and stretches opposite the Maghrib coast until it reaches the lands of Calabria (Qalawiya)”. 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,
Rome, Pentapolis, Naples, and the southernmost parts of Calabria and Apulia. Juynboll, the editor of the *Marāsid al-Iṭṭila* [an abridgement of Yāqūt’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, *Bibl. 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.-’Ā.* 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 southwest 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 Lombards reproduced in Yāqūt.1

29. Ist and I.H. give no dimensions of Cyprus. In I. Rusta, 85, its periphery is evaluated at 300 miles, but Qudāma and al-Battānī (quoted by de Goeje, *ibid.*, 85 i) reckon its circuit as being 350 miles, as in our author.

30. قرس stands certainly for قرنس, *Kūโปรs*, 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-Battānī (*ibid.*, 85 d). The position of Corsica is confused by our author with that of Crete.

31. يابس (var. يابس) in Qudāma, 231, which is Yabis “*Εθυσσος*, now Ibiza, one of the Balearic islands. [Not to be confused with *جافحة* which I.H., 136, places between Sicily and Crete.]

32. Ist., 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. Our author evidently confuses Sardinia with Sicily for he places Sardinia *south* of Rumiya, whereas the Imperial treasure is mentioned in Sicily.

33. سردنیا is mentioned in I. Kh., 109 (there lives the patrician governor of all the islands), in Qudāma, 231 (under a different form سرانتیا) 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 Rumiya, whereas the Imperial treasure is mentioned in Sicily.

34. Crete (usually *Iqrītish*, I. Kh., 112, Ist., 70) has the same periphery in I. Rusta, 75 (where the name has the form *Iqrītiya*). The position of this island is confused with that of Cyprus.

35. The name *كابذدحان* “the blue one” belongs certainly to the lake itself called in Strabo, xi, 13, 2, *λυμνη την Σπαϊταν*, read: *Καπαϊταν*, 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.]
Persian kapauta, cf. Marquart, Erânsahr, 143. [The word is now attested in kāsaka hya 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 Shâhû, Tabari, iii, 1171, Shâhi, is understood here. See Minorsky, Marâgha, Marand, Tabriz, and Urmiya, in EI.

f. The island fāzīrat al-Bāb according to the description is the “Madder island” fāzīra-yi Rūynās which is mentioned in Khāqānī’s well-known ode referring to a Russian raid in Shîrvān towards A.D. 1175. Cf. also Dimashqī, ed. Mehrren, 147, and Nuzhat al-qułūb, GMS, 239. There are no islands in the immediate neighbourhood of Darband. Khanikoff, in Mélanges Asiatiques, iii, 131, identifies the Madder Island with the Sāra Island off Lankurān, while Westberg, Jour. Min. Narod. Prosv., 1908, xiv, 7, thinks that the peninsula of Apsheron (Ābshārān), on which Bâkū stands, is meant here.

37. Siyāh-kūh, on the north-eastern coast of the Caspian, is now known under the Turkish name Manghislaq, on which see Barthold in EI. lšt., 219, says that the Turks “recently” seized Siyāh-kūh.

38. The MS. vocalizes Dīhistānān-sūr [in which -sūr is hardly connected with the name of the local prince صَوْر *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 Ḥasan-qli by the estuary of the Atrak, near the district of Dīhistān, “the country of the ancient people Ḥāa, Dahae”; cf. Hoffmann, Auszüge aus syrischen Akten, Leipzig, 1880, 277–81, and Minorsky, Meşhad-i Mestoriyān in EI. On the other hand, Dīhistānān-sūr (or -sēr) very probably is the place where Firdausī, ed. Vullers, i, 115, places the Dizh-i Alānān, cf. Marquart, Komanen, 109, Minorsky, Tūrān, in EI. On the falcons caught on the islands lying opposite the Jurjān coast, see Mas‘ūdī, Mūrij, i, 423.

§ 5. The Mountains

This chapter is particularly important as reflecting the author’s conception of the surface of the Earth, see Map i.

1. The Arabic name of al-Tā’infil-bahr most probably means only “protruding into the sea”; cf. Bīrunī, Canon, 3rd climate: al-Mahdiya ‘alâ anfīn tā’in fil-bahr. If eventually tā’in 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 (bahr al-zulumât) 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. Mžik, Parageographische Elemente, who similarly explains Khuwārizmī’s al-Qal’at al-mudī’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‘id (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. Sarandīb = Ceylon is regarded as belonging to China, § 9, 23. Khuwārizmī, 40, calls the mountain of Ceylon (Adam’s peak) Ruhūn [Ssk. *rōhanā “ascent” and, as a proper name, “Adam’s Peak”]. The mention of the first clime, 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‘ib al-makhluqāt*, 112.

3. It is difficult to see how the Mānisā¹ range is connected with a “corner” of Ceylon but under § 6, 1. it is again called the Sarandīb 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 (*Twsmt*) from China “up to the end of the desert (forming) the extremity of China” must be the Altin-tagh and K’un-lun separating northern Tibet from the Taklamakan desert. Possibly instead of “between Tūsmat and China” (spelt چین) we must read “between Tūsamt and Khotan” (خین)² On a similar confusion in writing of چین with خین 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 Išt., 281). This stretch must correspond to the westernmost T‘ien-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 T‘ien-shan,

---
¹ This is the vocalization indicated in the text. The origin of the name remains obscure. In Tibetan Dr. Unkrig suggests *smad gnis sa*, pronounced *mañisa* 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 *Chinistān*. 
The Mountains

res. its central and eastern parts, is only mentioned as “joined” to the Mānisā (cf. infra, 7. Ighrāj-art and 6. Tafqān).

Consequently the Mānisā 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 Mānisā, 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 Alexandrovy range.

5. This statement presupposes the existence in our author’s source of some detailed list of the mountains of China.

6. is perhaps a mis-spelling for Turfān. The mountains must be the eastern T’ien-shan (Boghdo)—separating Turfān (in the south) from Dzungaria (in the north). The capital of the Toghu uzghuz Chīnānj-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 Kuchā, Aq-su, &c. The reading of the name Ighrāj-art, in Turkish “the col of Ighrāj”, is not certain but as under § 6, 5. it is vocalized Irghāj (with metathesis) the form Ighrāj has been adopted. The mountain (and the pass) of Ighrāj-art, situated “in the neighbourhood” of the river Khūland-ghūn (§ 6, 3.) is either the Muz-art, or the lower1 and more western Bedel-pass.

More likely the Ighrāj-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 Ilī river is said to rise from it (§ 6, 5). The stage of Ighrāj-art (§ 12, 17.) lay on the Toghu uzghuz territory, but the mountain of Ighrāj-art traversed the Yaghmā territory (§ 13, 1.) as well. It is difficult to say whether (under § 6, 5.: 7-lj) is responsible for the second part of (§ 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 Toghu uzghuz territory, north of the Issik-kul, and consequently corresponds to the Kūngay-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 Ilī and Chu, and on it are situated such passes as Kastek (7780 f.) &c.3 This “Ilī-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 Tūls (*Tūlās?) given in the text to the range is known.

1 Alt. 14,000 feet.
2 More exactly, of the “Trans-Ilī Alatau” which is a parallel range running to the north of the Kūngay 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 (qāqum) 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 Gardžī, who certainly utilized much the same sources as our author, we shall find a locality Mānb.klū, abounding in “sable-martens, grey squirrels and musk-deer”, on the road leading (in a northerly direction) from the Toghuqghuz territory to that of the Khirkhīz. The distances in Gardžī are vague (see note to § 14), but the Mānb.klū mountain seems to stand at four days’ distance south (or south-west) of the Kūḵmān (*Kōkmān) mentioned also in the Orkhon inscriptions and identified with the mountains of the Upper Yenisei, cf. Barthold, Report, p. 110. In this case Mānb.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 Ist. 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 (9A) comprises the Himalaya, Karakorum, Pamir, and the ranges north of the Oxus, while its inner ramification (9B) 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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[ad § 5]
India. Šamūr, or Šawur (indistinctly written), can hardly have anything to do with the coastal Šamūr mentioned in § 10, 14. Geographically it would be tempting to identify our Šamūr (s = c?) 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 Tithāl and Nitāl, 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 Daryāsha and Chaghāniyān is that of Hisār, which forms the southern watershed of the Zarafshān in the basin of which both Samarqand and Bukhārā 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 (Hitāl) 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.) 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.
watershed between the sources of the Indus and the Oxus and the Hindū-kush.¹ The latter is then linked up with the ranges of northern Persia, but the Elburz range is not continued beyond Gilān. 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 Lāhr (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 Khurnāb, see note to §6, 14.). The name *Qasak* is curious. Ptolemy, vi, 15, mentions a locality called Ḫaʿsiḵā Ḫārpa in the Scythia-outside-the-IMAOS, i.e. east of the range separating the Pamir plateau from Kāshgharia. In §6, 14. the Qasak “is also called Kūh-i yakh (i.e. Mountain of Ice)”, which looks like a Persian translation of the native term.² 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, northwest of Kuchā. 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.

9b a. 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 Sān-va-Chāryak (now Sangchārak), lying on the Ābi-Safīd upstream 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 Aspuzār (İsfizār) lies north of it]; he further connects it with the mountains of southern Khorāsān and follows them up to the region of Nīshāpūr and Sabzavār between which towns the line of the hills passes to the north of the great Khorāsān road. [More correctly, this passage takes place between Mashhād and Nīshāpūr.] See Map viii.

9b b. Here our author describes the central part of the knot of the Hindū-kush and Kūh-i Bābā mountains with their southward ramifications towards the headwaters of the Kābul river and the Hilmand. The valley near Ghūr resembling a finger-ring must be Dasht-i Nāvur (some 50 km. west of Ghazni) which has no outlet. [Nāvur (nor) in Mongolian means “lake”.

9b c describes the northern branch of the mountains (Band-i Turkistān) starting from near Sān-va-Chāryak. On the localities mentioned see notes to §23, 53. &c.³ In the west the Band-i Turkistān is linked with the outer

² In reality the Hindūkush continues the Kara-korum range, which according to our author belongs to 9a and not 9b.

³ The language to which the name [as well as -ghūn, 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 Cauca­sica, fasc. 6, t. Teil, 1930, p. 31. For the second element of the name cf. also the Greek forms Kāuκασος, Kāuκανς.

³ In this description miyān does not seem to mean that the range separates the points mentioned but simply that it stretches along them. Cf. p. 63, line 37.
Commentary

§ 5

(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. Išt., 217, gives the following itinerary from Jurjān to Khorāsān: from Jurjān to Dīnār-zārī one marhala; thence to Amlūtlū (> Armūt'-Ali?) ditto; thence to Ajugh (?) ditto; thence to Sībdāst ditto; thence to Isfarāʾīn ditto.¹ In the Tārīkh-i Bayhaqī (Morley), p. 255, Dīnār-zārī is described as a gorge (sar-darra) on the way from Nīshāpūr to Gurgān; Zahīr al-dīn, Tārīkh-i Ṭabaristān (ed. Dorn), p. 19, describes Dīnār-chārī as the eastern frontier of Tabaristān. Nowadays the gorge is called Dahana-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 Isfarāʾīn (in the south). Farther to the west it is continued by the Māzandarān mountains. The author still distinguishes the two ranges: his 9b is the range of Māzandarān as seen from the south (from Simnān, Rayy, &c.) while his 9bc 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 Māzandarān highlands. Such a view can be explained by the intricate character of the Māzandarān 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 Māzandarān.

I have not found elsewhere the mention of the Arabic term Minṭaqat al-ʿArd in the sense in which our author uses it.² But a similar conception is found in I.Ḥ. who, pp. 109–11, gives an account of the mountain stretching along "the spine of the earth" (jabalʿalā zahr al-ʿard) which "begins in the East in China, (where) it comes out from the Ocean, and (directs itself) to Vakhkhān. It traverses Tibet, in its western parts and not its centre, and the eastern parts of the Kharāk land, until it penetrates into Farghāna which is within the Islamic limits. The ridge (ṣadr) 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 Nasaf and the region of Zamm. Then it crosses the Jayhūn and . . . goes westwards to Jūzjān . . . and over Tālaqān to Marw ar-rūdḥ and Ţūs . . . leaving Nīsābūr to the east [cf. supra 9b a]. Then it stretches to Rayy . . . while the mountains of Jurjān, Ṭabaristān, Gīlān and Daylam branch off from it. Then it joins the

¹ Napier, The northern frontier of Khorāsān, GJ., 1876, shows on his map "Dasht-i Armūt-Alī" between the northern source of the Gurgān and the pass of Simalghān.

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, 2244 in number, "have grown out of Alburz".
mountains of Ādharbāyjān.” It stretches on the right of the road from Rayy to Ḥulwān, then turns north towards Takrit and Āmid 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.H. 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.

10. The Kūfij mountains, according to our author, occupied an extensive area between Jīruft and the sea, cf. Iṣṭ., 164. They correspond *grosso modo* to the ranges which separate the closed basin of Jaz-Morīyān 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 Jīruft 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 Khānu (Kūh-i Dasht-girld?). The silver mountain west of Jīruft towards Khabr is probably the Siyāh Kūh. See 1:2,000,000 Map of Persia.

11. South-east of the Nīrīz lake 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 Fasā 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 Rūdhān (on the road from Kirmān to Yazd) has been examined by Le Strange, o.c., 286, where Rūdhān is placed near Gulnābād. Tās (?) in our text corresponds to Unās which is identified with Bahramābād, but the reading of the names ānasa Tās, &c., is not certain, cf. Iṣṭ., 102 d. Abū Dulaf’s Karaj lay on the road from Isfahān to Hamadān near the present-day Sultānābād, cf. § 31, 5. The Sahand mountain (between Marāgha and Tabriz) 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-Gīlu (*Gēloya*) mountains are usually reckoned to Fārs. The present day Kūh-Gīlu is reduced to the territory between Bāsht and Behbehan, cf. Minorsky, Luristān, in EI.
12. The mountain stretching between the Kimāk (cf. § 18) and Khirkhīz (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.nāv.r mountain must be sought. Barthold reads this name Kāndir (?) 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.nāv.r with the mountain described by Birnū, 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 Kimāk in a mountain called مکور 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 Ghuzzi Turks worship those traces when they see them.”

Marquart’s restoration, Komanen, 101, of Mkwr as *min köl “thousand lakes” is inadequate from the point of view of Birnū’s description. One can assume that in Gardīzī K.nāv.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 کندور would look very much like مکور. But even supposing that the two names are identical it is not easy to decide which form must be given preference. For Mkwr we have the parallel of a Qipchaq clan مکور اغا 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.nāy.r (*k.nāyūr) 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 Kāngir mentioned in the note to § 18.

As regards the location of the mountain we must consider the possibility of the road to the Kimāk (§ 18) having in the course of time changed its direction. If K.nāv.r was found on the original route of which the starting point was near Tārāz (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 Sari-su and Tārs-aqan, 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 (Gardīzī, 83) it would be necessary to look for the K.nāv.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 Gardīzī’s route was imagined to run northwards (towards some other, or some later, part of the Kimāk territory) the K.nāv.r could be identified with the Mugojar mountains (see note to § 18). [On the name v.i., p. 308, note 1.]

13. The Savalān, 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
the present-day Ḥamrīn where the Tigris cuts the latter south of the estuary of the Lesser Zāb and north of Takrīt. The Ḥamrīn is a long range of reddish hills following on the west the border range of the Persian plateau. Iṣṭ., 75, vaguely says that “in the east” it stretches to the limits of Kirmān; and that “it is (also) the mountain of Māsabadhān”. From this it is evident that the Bārimma was confused with the southern part of the western outer range of Persia (on the inner range see above i1.). Our author is entirely wrong when he takes the “Bārimmā” 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 ‘Irāq and Turkey on the other). In the north the connexion of the Ararat with the Qara-bāgh (highlands west of Barda’a) is imaginary.

16. The Jūdī stands in Bohtān, north of the Tigris and north-east of Jazīra-ibn-‘Omar. On its association with Noah’s ἀποβατήριον see Streck, Djudī, 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 Ἰζαλας. See Minorsky, Mārdīn, in EI.

17. Tihāma is the low coastal region along the Red Sea overlooked by a long range of mountains. Ghazwān is the mountain on which Ṭā’īf is situated, Iṣṭ., 19. The Shibām mountain is situated at 2 days distance towards the south-west of San‘ā, see Grohmann, Shibām I, in EI. The mountain “at the end of Tihāma” is Mudhaikhira, see Iṣṭ., 24, where both its length of 20 fars. and its conquest by Muḥammad b. Faḍl are mentioned; cf. I. Kh., 106, v.s. 21. The two mountains of the Ṭayy territory, in Central Arabia, have nothing to do with Tihāma. Their names are Aja’ and Salmā, see Yāqūt, 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 “Qabq” 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 Darijal 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 “Khazar 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.n.nd.r who were divided by the Carpathians. This latter
range was then imagined to stand somewhere in Eastern Russia near the Volga!

On the Lukām cf. Iṣṭ., 14 and 56, who also mentions the tribes Bahrā and Tanūkh. [*al-Ukkām < Syr. ukkāma “black”, Marquart, Streifzüge, 347.]

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 castles the first (18 C) is perhaps that mentioned under § 49, 1., 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, Ašhāb 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 Qurra. Another Muslim tradition places the cave in Afsūs. This latter name has been interpreted either as the Ephesus of the Christian tradition, or as Arabissos (Arab. Absus, Turk. Yarpus) situated at the foot of the Kūrd-daghi. Cf. Ḫāqūt, i, 91: “Absus, ruined town near Ablastayn [now Albistān]; from it were the Companions of the Cave”, Khuwārizmī, 128, calls Ephesus افسس and Birūnī in his Canon ابستس.

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. ٍ looks like a mis-spelling of ابريط on which see Buwāʿit in EI. I am obliged to Mr. R. Guest for this suggestion and for a quotation from Ibn Duqmaq, iii, p. 3, who remarks that Abwait is situated في رأس الجبل الذي يصعد منه إلى اليوم, i.e. “on the top of the bank (of the Nile) whence
the road goes up to Fayyum”. [The difficulty is that in our author's
two principal sources (I.Kh. and Išt.) Abwayt (or Buwayt) is not found. I
now see that Prince Youssouf Kamal (v.i., § 39), p. 665, restores as
*تَأْرِيف. The translation must accordingly run: “(this mountain) also starts
straight from the Nubian frontier and follows a northerly direction down to
the Fayyum region, until it reaches the Rif” (i.e. the fertile region near the
delta). This seems to be a satisfactory reading. On the name تأْرِيف see
note to § 6, 49.]

25. If the author means here the Seleucia (now Selefke) situated north­
west of the Gulf (khalij) 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 water­
shed 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
Turjāla (Truxillo) situated south of the Tagus on the slope of the Sierra
de Guadalupe (which continues towards the south the line of the mountains
of Toledo), is entirely out of place. Morón (Maurún) 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, Balkhān,
in El. Cf. note to § 3, 5.

29. The reading of جِبَل الْقَمْر “Moon Mountain” cor­
responds exactly to Ptolemy’s Τό τῆς Σελήνης ὄρος ἀ’ ὁ ὑπὸδέχονται τὰς χίονας
α’ τοῦ Νείλου λίμναι. However the reading of القرم in the later geographical
literature of the Arabs has given rise to some controversy, see Ferrand,
Relations, p. 330. Ibn Sa’īd (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 been 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.mr, 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”.

5–6  The Mountains 205
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 northeastern 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, v.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 Khuwārizmī. The latter, p. 125, mentions the river سطروس rising from the mountain of the river and then flowing through a swamp (batīha),¹ after which the river crosses the City of China (madinat al-Ṣīn) and disemboages into the sea.² Our author substitutes for this vague “City of China” (= Σήραμης, 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 Kisau (كيصو), if emended into *كنو 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 (kiang “The River”, as the Yangtze is usually called) is confirmed by Gardžī’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 بريكه or بريه يى or بريه يي بريكه يى (برنجاك) presents some resemblance to the col of Brinjak (?) in the mountains south of Khotan (evidently understood under the Mānisā, v.s. note to § 5, 3d.).³

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”,⁴ 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 (v.i. 5. and 7. and §§ 12, 5. and 13.) with Aq-su.⁵ 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 Khuwārizmī adds that another river rising also from the “mountain of the river سطروس” falls into the same swamp.
² Perse: Oιχάρδης, Ptolemy, vi, 16.
³ A remote parallel of the name كياسکان could be that of the Kashkul glacier situated above the locality of Nisa [south of Khotan].
⁴ The names of the rivers Gunt [*Ghund], in the Pamir, and Tazghun (?), south of Kāshghar, may be recalled here as parallels. [Or ghūn = Pers. گون “colour”?]
⁵ On the earlier names of Aq-su see note to § 15, 15.
pass situated above the sources of the Aq-su, *v.* *i.*, p. 296. On the other hand, the town of Ark (الر) belonging to the Toghuzghuz (§12, 5.) is said to be situated near Khûland-ghûn. In the itinerary quoted by Gardîzî, 91, ل (probably corresponding to our ل) is placed to the east of Kuchâ, see note to §12, 5. These considerations suggest for Khûland-ghûn an easterly position in the neighbourhood of the Muz-art pass, though here again we are confronted by some difficulty for neither the Kuchâ nor any other river in this region now reaches the Tarim, whatever may have been the case in the past.

If the Khûland-ghûn 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.zâ and K.lbânk between which the affluents join the *Wajâkh river. Under §11, 21., Gh.zâ is placed “at the very beginning of Tibet from the Toghuzghuz side, near the river of Kuchâ”, 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”, Hsüan-Tsang, *Life* (Beal), p. 199, less clearly in Hsüan-Tsang, *Life* (Julien), p. 273, cf. Richthofen, *China*, i, 318 and Chavannes, in *T’oung-Pao*, i, p. 168, note 4. Consequently the sentence: “thence [from Lob-nor] it flows (down) to the limits of Kuchâh, then passes through the province of Kûr.sh and the province of F.rând.klî 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 Kuchâh (sic)” where the Tarim received the name of “Kuchâh river” lie downstream (i.e., E. or S.) of the swamp of *Sha-chou* 1 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 Kuchâ (§9, 10.) which lies on a river of its own 2 rising from the western T’ien-shan and losing itself (at present!) short of the Tarim. Thus we are led to admit that by Kuchâh our author may mean a different locality, namely Kuchân كيوان (see note to §9, 5.3) which most likely is to be sought on the real course of the Huang-ho, near Lan­chou-fu. If so “the river of Kuchâh” must refer not to the Tarim, but to the Huang-ho (cf. §7, 2.), 4 and Ghazâ 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 Idrîsî, i, 502, says about the lake

---

1 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 Khumdân” though this is geographically inexact.

3 In this case the *tashdid* over the first form may be a simple mis-spelling of the final ن of the second form.

4 Under §7, 3. the Lob-Nor is called *بَحْرَةُ رَوْدَةُ كِتَاب* but it remains a moot point whether the “swamp” is called after the
of which he places somewhere in the Toghuzghuz 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.rsāng 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 Mānisā, 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. Ilī) 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 (Ilā) 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. i; Le Strange, The Lands, ch. xxxi; Barthold, Irrigation, pp. 71-102; Barthold, Amū-daryā, in E.I.; Tājīkistān (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 (خرباب) 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). Ist., 296, confuses the two headwaters: “the principal stream (‘amūd) of the Jayhūn is called Jaryāb (ت-ایر) and rises in Vakhkhān”. See Map iv.

8. The Kulāb river (Kehī Surkhāb) is composed of two branches: Yakh-su (<Iranian Akhshū, cf. Ist., 296, Akhshuvā) and Qizil-su. The village Pārkhar still exists. Munk = Baljuvān, on the Qizil-su, Hulbuk=Hulbag, 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 Ist., 296, presents Fārghar as a separate stream. On the contrary, our author forgets the following river Andījārāgh, on which see § 26, 3. I.R., 93, speaking of the course of the Vakhshāb and the Vakhkh-āb (=the Vakhān river, Oxus) mentions south of the latter a rustāq of the Upper Tukhāristān called jejl. De Goeje restored this name as جالِه, i.e. Pārghar and this form led astray Marquart, Erānsahr, 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 جالِه, cf. Ist., 275, 339. Arhan river forming it, or the river coming out of it. In a route to Tibet, of which the starting-point is Kāshghar, Gardīzi, 88 26, mentions “the stream of Kujā (کوی کیا) which flows towards Kujā”. The distinction between this stream and a river (رو) 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, Iṣṭ., 296. On Ārhan see Barthold, *Turkestan*, 69, note 7 and cf. note to § 26, 1.

9. Vakhshāb, now Vakhsh (called in the upper course Surkhāb), a powerful river coming from the Alai valley (Vakhsh mountains). In Greek οξος < *Vakshsh has become the name for the whole of the Amū-daryā.

10. This river undoubtedly is the Kāfir-Nihān 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-Nihān¹ lying on its upper course. On the Kumijis see § 26, 10. Nūdiz (nau-diz “The New Fort”) lay probably on the lower course of the Kāfir-Nihān, see note to § 26, 5.

11. On Chaghāniyān see § 25, 25. The river is now called Surkhān, Barthold, *Turkestan*, 72-5. Under § 25, 31., كجر (*Regar*) is placed on the Nihān river, which is also mentioned in I.R., 93 (but wrongly considered as a source of the Kāfir-Nihān). The middle one of the Surkhān’s headwaters is still called Dara-yi Nihām. On the easternmost of the Surkhān headwaters lay probably Hamvārān (§ 25, 32.) which Marquart, *Wehrot*, 62, identifies with Qara-tagh, whereas Kasavān (v.i. note to § 25, 32.) must have belonged to the Kāfir-Nihān basin.

12. The form ضرام guarantees that the Arabic spelling درگام in I.Kh., 33, and I.R., 93, is based only on a popular etymology (“the Lion river”). Marquart, *Erānsahr*, 230, has shown its identity with Ptolemy’s Δἀγγοῦδος. Valvālij (§ 23, 73.) has been long identified with Qunduz, which lies between the rivers Dōshi (Surkh-āb), coming from the south-west, and the Šaqlān river, coming from the south-east. The latter, according to I.R., 93 and Maq., 303, was composed of two sources راب بال and حلال. The names (several variants) may mean “Lower river” (*jīl-āb, cf. Persian zīr “below”) and “Upper river” (bar-āb), and the rivers correspond respectively to the Varsaj and the Ishkāmish 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 م رام with the Kokcha is wrong.

13.-15.: Rivers of India, among which the Ganges (Khuwārizmī, 133, and Mas’ūdī, *Murūj*, i, 214: *Janjis*) has been entirely overlooked, though I.R., 89, who uses mostly the same sources as the Ḥ.-Ā., mentions the م رام *Gang*. The Ganges is disregarded to such an extent that the Vindhya mountains are supposed to join the Himalaya (§ 5, 9.).

13.-15.: System of the Ḥ-indus.

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 Dunpūr (§ 10, 54.-55); on Nihār < *Nagarahār = Jalālābād see § 10, 50.

¹ Nihān may be related to Nihām, though the latter is the name of one of the Surkhān’s headwaters. However, the upper courses of the Kāfir-Nihān and Surkhān form one single stretch of highlands, which fact may also explain I.R.’s (p. 93) confusion of the two rivers, Barthold, *l.c.*, and Marquart, *l.c.*
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 كری 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.\(^1\) 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 Birūza 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. Khuwārizmī, 131-3, gives an elaborate description of this river which unfortunately remains obscure until the editor’s commentary becomes available.

16. Khuwārizmī, 131, 12, mentions a Mihrān al-thānī 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 Kūli is very misleading for its form is identical with the كری just mentioned as the estuary of the Indus (13.). Under § 5, 9., our author distinctively refers to the district of Kūli 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 Kūlinar of the Mohīt and Qulinar, *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 Sir-Daryā (Jaxartes), on which see Barthold, *Turkestan*, 155–65; Le Strange, *The Lands*, ch. xxxiv; 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 Ἰαξάρτης as yaxša-arta “wahre edle Perle” (cf. Barthold’s criticism in *Irrigation*, 130), then interpreted it as Soghdian Yaxšart < Ṭṣa-arta (?), *Skizzen z. hist.*

---

1 وَنَّرُ الْسَّدْنَةِ هُوَ شَعَبَ نَهَرٍ جَيْحُو، More detail in the confused additional paragraph *ibid.*, 178.
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, T'āgh-r. and Barskhān, see § 25, 58. and § 15, 11. تاغ ر is the river flowing from the Kāshghar mountains past Üzjand in Farghāna". Yabāghū was a Turkish tribe which according to Kāshgharī, i.e. 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 Gardizi, 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 (= Mānisā, v.s. note to § 5, 3c), 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 Khallukh mountains mentioned here must be the hills separating the Narin from the basin of the Chirchik, i.e. Chatkal (Arab. Jīdghil) mountains. Banākat lay near the point where the more southern Ĥanagarān (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 Sughd 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 Ḥišār. The lake Daryāzha is now called Iskandar-kul and the āvāza of Paykand is the Qara-kul, cf. § 3, 34.
24. The river of Balkh 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 Madar 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 Hilmand rise south of the Kūh-i Bābā in the immediate neighbourhood of the sources of the Harāt river. As Ist., 265, places the latter “in the neighbourhood of Ribāt-i Karvān” (§ 23, 63.), there is no wonder that the sources of the Hilmand were also located in the region of the same ultima Thule of the Guzgān 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.
29.-36.: RIVERS OF FARS. Even after the studies of Le Strange, The Lands, Schwarz, Iran, and Herzfeld, Pasargadae, Inaugural Dissertation, 1907, there remain numerous doubtful points regarding their identification.

29. See Minorsky, Mānd, in EI; now called Qara-aghach. Rūyāgan corresponds to Išt., 120, Ruwayjān (read: Rūyajān). Kavar, now Kavār.

30. jljy- corresponds to خویدان in Išt., 120; the river bearing this latter name watered the districts of Khūbadān and Anbūrān of the Sābur province (Išt., 110) and then that of Jalādājan of the Arrajān province (Išt., 113), consequently it flowed from east to west. The Fārs-nāma, 151, identifies نهر خویدان with the Naubanjān river, flowing into the Nahr-i Shirin (v.i. 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-Sābur, probably for Išt.’s Ratīn. The Nahr-Sābur, now called Rūd-i Hilla (left out in our text!), flowed past Tavvaj. The error may have resulted from the fact that in Išt., 99 and 120, the rivers Khūbadān and Ratīn follow one another in the enumeration.

31. According to Išt., 119, Shādhagān rose in Bāzranj (province of Arrajān) and flowed to the sea through Tambūk-i Mūristān (province of Sābur) and Dasht-i Dastagān (the town of which was § 29, 9.). Shādhagān 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 Ganāfa. In point of fact recent English maps show a considerable river Rūd-i Shūr of which the estuary is located 12 miles north of that of the Rūd-i Hilla (= Shāpur), and south of Bandar-Rīg. The course of this little known river can be traced for some 60 miles northwards up to the parallel 30°. This must be the Shādhakān.

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.

| A |
|---|---|---|
| Išt. | Fārs-nāma | H.-’Ā. |
| name sources | Shirīn | Shirīn | Sirīn |
| Mt. Dinār | limits of Bāzran | Mt. Dhanbādh, |
| in Bāzranj | Bāzrang | in Bāzranj | ? |
| affluents course | ? | Khwābdān river | between Vāyagān |
| ? | Gunbadh, | and Lārandān, |
| | Mallaghān | Arrajān, *Rīshahr |
| course | F.rz.k, Jalādāgan | between Sinīz and Janābā | between Sinīz and Ganāfa |
| estuary in the sea | towards Jannāba | | |
The following questions arise with regard to this table:

a. The estuary of the “Shīrīn” 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 Sīnīz (§ 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 Jarraḥi, 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 Jarraḥi joined the Kārun,1 though the mention of *Rishahr (§ 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 Sīnīz and Ganāva, in which case it would have flowed across the basin of the Hindiyān river.2 In our text, Māhīrubān, lying west of Sīnīz, comes nearer to the point, though there are good reasons in favour of the location of Māhīrubān in the region of Hindiyān, i.e. on the Shīrīn 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 Shīrīn3 with the middle course of the Tāb; therefore his Shīrīn rising near Mt. Dhanbādh4 flows past Arrajān and Rīshahr!5

1 And this might account for the mention of Tustar in Iṣṭ’s original text, for the Kārun was rightly called “Tustar [= Shūstar] river”, cf. § 6, 37. Then Iṣṭ.’s text should be read م بِعْفُ في البحيرة عَدَد [ ] “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 Sīrīn flowed in a north to south direction.

3 Vāyagān and Lārandān named near its course are mentioned under § 29, 17. together with B.rz.k, which undoubtedly is identical with Iṣṭ.’s F.rz.k, see the table p. 212.

4 Iṣṭ. دنار [var. دنار]. The mountain meant is surely the lofty Kūh-i Dinā [17,000–18,000 ft.] though on the latter’s western side rise in fact only the headwaters of the Khrsān, the south-easternmost affluent of the Kārun, see C. Haussknecht, Routen im Orient, iv [map edited by Kiepert] and the English 1 : 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 Īšt., 119, and Fārs-nāma, 152. This headwater of the Tāb rose, according to Īšt., from the limits of Iṣfahān and came out (yāzhur) in Sardan. The Fārs-nāma more precisely locates its sources in the mountains of Sumayram and Sīmtakht (*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 Shūṣhtar 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 EL. [Cf. A. Kasravī, Tārīkh-i pānsad-sāla-yi Khūzistān, Tehrān, 1934, pp. 77–88: on the old course of the Kārūn.]

37. The enumeration of localities is probably borrowed from Īšt., 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 Būyid ‘Adud 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 Shūṣtar.

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 Duraq) is watered both by a canal coming from the Jarrāḥī 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 Jarrāḥī canal are taken down to the sea by the Duraq 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 Jarrāḥī, of which one branch comes from Rām-Hurmuz and the other from Arrajān-Bebehān (note to 35.). Schwarz, Iran, 373, identifies Duraq with Fallāhiya. In a westerly direction Īšt., 95, gives the distances: Duraq–Khān–Mardawaih (var. &c.)–1 marhāla; thence to Bāsiyān (where the river splits off into two)–1 marhāla; thence to Hisn-Mahdī–2 marhalas; thence to Bayān (on the Tigris)–1 marhāla. [Consequently Bāsiyān cannot be Buziya, situated 6–7 Km. east of Fallāhiya.]

40. The river of Susa (Daniel, viii, 2: Ulai) is now called Shāʿūr (< Shāvūr). If we are to interpret B.dhūshāvur as Gundē-Shāpur the situation is geographically inexact. Perhaps the text could be improved into: *miyān-i Shūsh va-Bidh va-Shāvur (?)*. Īšt., 89, mentions a place Bidhān belonging to Shūsh, and the existence of a Shāvur could be postulated from the present name of the river.
Turks beyond the Balkh river [i.e. Oxus]. On these two rivers live the Turkish Ghuzz.” Cf. also Mas’ūdī, Tanbīh, 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 Gardīzī’s (p. 83) and thought that what Mas’ūdī had in view were the rivers Yayiq and Emba (c.s. note to 41.). Our author clearly uses the same source as Gardīzī 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 Khirkhīz and flows between the Kimāk and Ghuzz forming the boundary between them; then it takes a western direction behind (‘alā Ḿahr) 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 < Etil) is given to the Kama rising from the Ural mountains (§ 5, 19.) and joining the Volga below Kazan. Cf. Map ii (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 Ithil (Tanais?), the river of the Șaqlīiba” 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 (shu’ba) 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 Khifjakh (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 Țānîs come from the Maeotis. Contrary to our author for whom the Rūs river is an affluent of the Volga, I.R. treats the Țānîs 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

---

1 Cf. also Mas’ūdī quoted under § 3, 8. The idea of this junction is already found in Ptolemy, v., 5, though according to Marquart Streifzügen, 153, the right reading is επιστροφή (not ἐκβολή).

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.i., p. 436.
Volga better than the Don. Consequently, even admitting that I.Kh.'s "river of the Ṣaqāliba" 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 Rutā we are right in the centre of the confusion. The name یی in Arabic script looks very much like Gardīzī's یییی, which most probably refers to the Danube (*جولا), see notes to §§ 22 and 53. However, our description of its course is extremely puzzling. It apparently flows westwards, from the Rūs to the Saqlāb (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, Majgharī, 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 Rutā 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 *Burṭās (§ 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 *Burṭās, must have occupied a part of the Volga's right rank. As the southern boundary of the Rūs (living along the upper course of the Volga) was the Rutā, and the northern boundary of the Turkish Pechenegs was the Rūthā (یییی) it is clear that the river Rutā, or Rūthā, divided the Rūs from the Pechenegs. To the south-west of the Volga and north of the Burṭās only the Oka could be taken into consideration in this connexion. From the point of view of the script یی or یی greatly resemble *عکا, and it is not excessive to imagine that the Oka was known to the informer originally responsible for the description of the Rūs territory [Iṣ.'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 contemporary 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 Khurdāb (see notes to § 43, 1.) on the Rutā does not know what more to do with the Rutā. 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 (*یور and *یور); 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, 1.). [Cf. 'Aufī's spelling یی, 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 Qumānia a lake غتون (Gh.nin) forming the outflow of eight rivers, of which the more important is شروی (Sh.rwī). 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
Volga and *Nahr al-Rūsiya*! It is interesting that Idrīsī's *Sh.rwī* (according to K. Miller *Sh.lwī*) flows westwards similarly to our Rūtā. 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 *Rūtā*(r) which our author gives to it is due to some confusion with *rūd*, *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, *Didjla*, in *El*; Marquart, *Südarmenien*, 232–452: an extremely detailed analysis of the descriptions of the Tigris by Kisrawī, Maq., Mašʿūdi, 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). Thē Nahr Sābus, Iṣṭ., 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 Kirkūk, in Southern Kurdistān. By the Nahra-vān river the Diyālā (Sīrvān) is meant, rising in Persian Kurdistān, 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 علیَق *Abrīq*, Greek *Tephrıkē* or *Aphrikē*, see *Divrīgī*, in *El*, but Khwārizmī, 139, calls the mountain whence the Euphrates comes جبل اودخس. Cf. Ṭabarī, iii, 1434, where a Byzantine expedition is said to march من ناحية ابريق قرية قرايس.


54. Grave misunderstanding: the SAFĪD-RŪDH rises, not from the Lesser Ararat (*Huwayrith*) but from Persian Kurdistān. I.Kh., 175, and I.R., 89, rightly state that it comes min bābi Sīsar, see Minorsky, *Senna* and *Sīsar*, in *El*.

55. 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 Bardīj see § 36, 35.


---

1 The latter is evidently the Don and its course is shown as separate from the imaginary "Volga branch" flowing to the Black sea (*o.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.
58. *Nahr al-kurūm*, “river of the vineyards”. I.Kh., 108, among the towns of Buqallār, names Anqara and Samāluh (?). This river [which has nothing to do with the place الكرم or الكرم, next station west of Budhandūn = Podandon = Bozanti] is most probably the Halys (Qizil-Irmaq) flowing east of Anqara to the Black Sea. [Samāluh = Σημαλοίδες κάστρον.]

59. All depends on the name. It cannot be I.Kh.’s, 101, Santabar, which Ramsay, *o.c.*, 445, places on a source of the Sangarios. If we restore it as *Κανγρι*, 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. Rhynャdakos, I.Kh., 103, *Rundhāq*, though this latter flows into the lake Artyrias). The solution depends on the phrase بر شهر بنِدافْلس وَبِدْونِ بَكْرَة. The first element of بنِدافْلس can be Greek βάρδα “banner, district” (in Arabic usually band, plur. bunūd, I.Kh., 109, but the form bandā could survive in *status constructus*) and the sentence would mean “skirts the town of the district فَلس”. This last element [usual confusion of final س with ِ] could then stand for قَطْف Kotyaeion (now Kūtahye), a well-known fortress on the Tembris, I.Kh., 103. As regards budhom, it seems to have been copied from Budhandūn which is out of place on the Tembris. The most celebrated place on the latter was Dorylaion, in Arabic دروْلِيا 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 بَدْرُوْلِية could be more easily confused in script with بَدْدُوْن.

61. This river is Sangarios which exactly flows north of Amorion (‘Amūriya, placed by I.Kh., 107, in Nātūlūs) and west of Anqara (placed by I.Kh., 108, in Buqallār). I.Kh., 110, calls the river Sāghari 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 خاك is khāk “earth”; it is a Persian translation of Arabic، غرا for I.Kh., 102, precisely mentions an “Earthen Fort” حصن الغَرَاء, and adds that it stands opposite Nicaea (وَقَعَتَ بَيْنَ غَرَاء، العبراء). Cf. Marquart, *Streifzüge*, 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.” 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 LKh.'s work, now lost. In the abridged version, I.Kh., 176, says only that the Nile forms two lakes beyond the Equator. Idrīsl's map, reproduced in Reinaud's Introduction, strictly follows the same tradition (10 rivers, 2 lakes, then again 6 rivers).1 As regards Sukar I.H., 103, mentions Askar between Fayyūm and Fustāṭ; Yāqūt, iii, 107, says: “Sukar... to the east of Upper Egypt (Ṣaʾīd); between it and Cairo (Miṣr) two days’ distance.”

63. The river is more likely the Blue Nile than the 'Atbara (Ptolemy, iv, 7, 'Aorâbas). Kābīl is the title of the king of Nubia, see § 59. His capital lay most probably in the province of 'Alwa, near Khartūm (ruins of Sōba). 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 Maritsa 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 Shantarlin (Santarem) cf. § 41, 14.

68. Perhaps the Barka flowing northwards in Eritrea, or the Okwa.

§ 7. The Deserts and Sands

The terms biyābān and rīg correspond respectively to Arabic ṣahrā and raml. The first term does not naturally mean a waterless and uninhabited land. As the text shows, biyābān, as opposed to rīg, 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 “Kuchchā river” (sic) is the Lob-nor, these sands must be those separating Turfan from Kan-su. The distance indicated is too short. Between Qumul 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 Maqrizī, 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 Makrân.

7. Kargas-kûh “the Vulture mountain” is the name of a mountain near Kâshân, Le Strange, o.l., 208. It is unexpected to see the name applied to the whole of the Central Persian desert (Kavîr, Lût) but Maq., 487, 490, also describes the Kargas-kûh 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.vâra (Khwâra?) are situated on the Jaxartes, § 26, 27. The situation of the steppe depends on the identification of the river beyond which lived the Kimâk (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 (daryâ-yi 'Arab) must be followed by the Barbarî 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 bâdiya are clearly distinguished from the latter. The pilgrims from 'Irâq had to cross these Habîr sands. The term Habîr is not found in Ist. or Maq., but I.H., 30 and 104, in his detailed account of the deserts mentions al-raml al-ma’ruf bil-Habîr. 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 'Omân, down to Shîhr and Mahra . . .”. Originally al-Habîr must designate the desert al-Dahnâ “the red one”, uniting Great Nufûd with al-Rub’ al-khâli, 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 ahqâf in Southern Arabia is a synonym of the northern nufûd; 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 (v.s. 10. and note to § 3, 3a.).

13. The Nubian desert following 12. immediately to the south. According
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12. its name appears to be "the Buja Desert", while the "country of Buja" lay south of it. Under Habasha seems to be understood the coastal line (Eritrea, &c.) considerably to the north of the present-day Abyssinia.

15. The Sahārā. Sijilmāsa in Southern Marocco is usually mentioned as the limit of the cultivated zone, cf. Išt., 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. Chinistān

Reinaud, Relation des voyages; Reinaud, Introduction, pp. ccccii–cccclxxvii; Yule, Cathay and the Way Thither, 1866 (2nd edition by Cordier, Hakluyt Society, 4 vols., 1913–16)—a complete survey of the early travellers to China; V. Grigoriev, O puteshestvennikh Abu-Dulefe, in Zhurnal Minist. Narod. Pros., 1872, part 163, pp. 1–45; Sprenger, Postrouten, 50–8; Marquart, Streifzüge, 74–95 (analysis of Abū Dulaf Mis’ar’s report, cf. Barthold, Sandābil, in EI); Chavannes, Documents sur les Tou-Kiue, SPb. 1903; Chavannes, Notes additionnelles sur les Tou-Kiue occidentaux, in T’oung-Pao, série II, v, 1904, pp. 1–110; Bretschneider, Mediaeval Researches, L. 1910, 2 vols.; F. Hirth and W. W. Rockhill, Chau Ju-kua, his Work on the Chinese and Arab Trade in the Xliith and Xliith Centuries, SPb., 1911 (cf. Barthold’s review Zap., 1913, xxi/4, pp. 0161–0169); M. Hartmann, China, and Barthold, Kan-su, both in EI. Very complete materials on the historical cartography of Western China are found in A. Herrmann’s extensive contributions to S. Hedin’s Southern Tibet, Stockholm 1922, vol. viii, pp. 91–456.

Timurid times, see the well-known report of Ghiyāth al-dīn Naqqāsh, one of the members of Baysunqur’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-Sā’dayn (a more complete text found in Hāfiz-i Abrū’s Zubdat al-tawārīkh, 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 *Amin Ahmad [sic] Rāżī’s Haft Iqlīm (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 Ju-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 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). Maš’ūdī, Murūj, i, 307-12, mentions a merchant from Samarqand who travelled from Sirāf to Canton (خانو متن), and from there visited the capital called Anmwā (?); (variants: "اثر ما وأ هي دار الملك.").3 A rich Quraishite Ibn al-Wahhāb, a descendant of Habbār b. Aswad, 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 Muhammad Sīrāfī, 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 Maš’ūdī, who in 303/915 met Abū Zayd in Başra, wrote down the same record, Murūj, i, 321-4.


3 I now see that several times occurring in Maš’ūdi’s text is but a misreading of خمدان. Cf. the parallel passages in the Murūj, i, 309, and Sulaymān, 103; the latter has: Khumdān wa hawa balad al-mulk al-habīr. In Murūj, ii, 131, Anmwā is identified with the legendary *Kang-dīz which Kay-Khusrau built in China. خمدان< *انموا is entirely distinct from مد (Murūj, i, 305)= بندو (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 (v.i. 1., 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 Toghuzghuz. Qudāma, 264, in a legendary report on Alexander the Great's campaign, only mentions Khudmān and ʃasː; the latter name has been restored as ʃarː ʃarag = Kāshghar, or better as ʃarag = 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 ʃ to render the sound g 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. Muḥalḥil’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 Yāqūt, iii, 445, cf. Grigoriev, 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-Faqīh, first described by A. Z. Validi, o.c., p. 215 and Appendix B.]

Mas'ūdī, 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 (*jībāl al-nūshādir*). Mas'ūdī himself (?) saw these mountains from a distance of 100 farsaks: 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’ūdi’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 Jayhānī’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.-Ā and Gardīzī 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 Gardīzī the places are arranged into itineraries; our author simply enumerates them but the order of enumeration closely follows Gardīzī’s system which certainly belongs to the original source (Jayhānī?).

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. Khālb.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 Khumdān (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 Gardīzī, 92, speaks of “many kings in China, of whom the greatest is the Faghfur”, 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 Manichaens, 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 Kan-chou, proclaimed himself khāqān. In A.D. 924 an Uyghur khāqān was

1 The Wei-shu, quoted by S. Lévi, Jour. As., Sept. 1913, 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 [*Aq-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’e-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 k’in (*ch’in) being easily confused].
still residing in Kan-chou. The king “of China”, called Qalīn b. Sh.khīr (*Chakhīr†), to whose court the Sāmānid 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 Kuchā but it is possible that the question is not of the T'ien-shan Uyghurs but still of the Western Tu-ch'ueh, v.i., p. 267, because Kuchā (v.i. 10.) and Khotan (v.i. 18.) [cf. also Kāshghar, § 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 (= Kuchā) 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 Farīdhūn is certainly explainable by the tradition according to which Farīdhūn’s son Tūr became the master of the Turk and Chin and was accordingly called Tūrān-shāh or Shāh-i Chin, see Shāh-nāma, cf. Minorsky, Tūrān, in El. More directly our author’s source may be I.Kh., p. 16, who says that *baghpūr is a descendant of Afarīdhūn. 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.-‘Ā. China is called Chinistān and Chin. 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 Chin.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 Chin is derived from the name of the dynasty Ch’in which ruled in China 221-206 B.C.
³ It is curious not to find mentioned in the H.-‘Ā. the well-known ports of Khānfū (= Canton, v.s.) and Zaytūn (Ts’ūian-chou, near Amoy). About the 9th cent. a portion of the sea trade was diverted to the latter, Chau jũ-kua, p. 17. Abul-Fidā, 363, calls it “Shinjū, known in our time as Zaytūn”.

1 V.i., p. 300.
2 Persian Chin is derived from the name of the dynasty Ch’in which ruled in China 221–206 B.C.
3 It is curious not to find mentioned in the H.-‘Ā. the well-known ports of Khānfū (= Canton, v.s.) and Zaytūn (Ts’ūian-chou, near Amoy). About the 9th cent. a portion of the sea trade was diverted to the latter, Chau jũ-kua, p. 17. Abul-Fidā, 363, calls it “Shinjū, known in our time as Zaytūn”.

Chinistān
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 Wāqwāq 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 Wāqwāqs 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, Fansūr, Bālūs). In our text (§ 4, B 3.) the Gold-island (= Sumatra) is inhabited by the Wāqwāqians, and the latter are confused with the homonymous Wāqwāq of the Zanj country. This entails a further complication: the Wāqwāq disappear from the immediate neighbourhood of Zangistān but the latter (§ 55) becomes a neighbour of Zābaj (= Sumatra = Chinese Wāqwāq = Gold-island, § 4, 3.). The detail about gold collars used in Wāqwāq is also found in I.Kh., 69. The town 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 Qubilay’s empire as quoted in Rashīd al-dīn, ed. Blochet, GMS, pp. 484–98. Ir.sh (إيرش) and Khūr.sh (خورش) are the provinces between which the Yangtze-kiang passes before disemboiguing into the sea (§ 6, 2.). On the other hand, the localities similarly divided by the Huang-ho are Kūr.sh (كورش) and F.r.jākli (فرجاكلي) (§ 6, 3.). The absence of Kūr. in the present enumeration could be best explained by the identity of Kūr.sh 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. To take (f) for Tangut (Wasāf, ed. Hammer, p. 22: تانک) would be an anachronism. (h) فریر can hardly stand for Corea: in earlier sources (I.Kh., 70, I.R., 82) this country is called Shilā or Shilā whereas Rashīd al-dīn, p. 486, gives a different transcription: کوری. As on principle we must prefer the explanations consistent with the attested Muslim tradition it is more probable that فریر

1 Nor does Tai in Shansi [Dr. P. Fitzgerald] suit our case.
2 Shilā < Sin-lo, the native kingdom comprising the central and eastern part of Corea. The Corea proper (Ko-kye) 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’Extreme Orient, 1929, p. 290.
refers to the people mentioned under § 14, 1., for the Khirkhiz were supposed to extend to the coast; in this case might also be considered as a mis-spelling for تانى. Khasāni, Būnūghnī and (perhaps) Anš (perhaps انپس) are obscure.

3.-9., 13.-15. are to be located along the following itinerary found in Gardīzī, 92: from Chīnistān in the Toghuzghuz 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-lākh—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 manzīls (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 Kīsau, 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 كجم 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.i. 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, Χουμαδάν (or Χουβδάν), see Coedes, o.c., 141. Marquart, Komaren, 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 *taniira “funnel” semantically very close to Khumdān. Could not the capital of China be called “stupa [town]”? On another Khumdān see the Index.
4. *Baghshūr (spelt: Bughshūr and B.ghsūz) is very probably an Iranian name. A homonymous place (§ 23, 33.) lay between Herat and the Murghāb, 1st., 269. The name is explained in the Burhān-i Qāṭī' as "a pool of salt water". Baghshūr 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 Baghshūr and Khumdān must represent a special route, not directly belonging to the road Chīnānjkat–Khumdān. According to the China Year Book the Yangtze receives the name of Kiang in the neighbourhood of Yang-chou, in the Hu-peh province; but one would rather look for Bughshūr 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 Tzu-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'uan. The mention under § 6, 2. of the Yangtze as flowing towards "the limits of Kujān (sic) and Bughshūr" is rather vague and means perhaps only that the river approaches the road leading from Kuchān to Bughshūr. Gardīzī calls the place كچان 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-ch'ang 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 Kuchčā". This latter form كچان very probably stands for Kuchān كچان. 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 Kāshghārī's Map, south of the Tarim, the following places stretch W. to E. in one line: Yārkand, Khotan, Jarjān (Cherchen), then behind a mountain (Shan-chou, probably *Sha-chou) and towards the south-east ارض کليم and كچان (sic). This Kushān may be another spelling for our Kuchān (or for 16. K.sān).

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'uan; Tzŭ-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 *أَرْجَحِ, may stand for Er(i)-chou, a Mongol name for Liang-chou, cf. Zhamtsarano in the Fest-schrift to S. F. Oldenburg (in Russian), Leningrad 1934, p. 194.

3 In the old Soghdian 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 looks especially non-Chinese. Some likeness to سندل as Mis'ar 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 EI under this name. As Khâlb.k (said to be a large town) is not mentioned in Gardîzî it must have passed into the H.-'Ā. from some additional source, perhaps Mis'ar b. Muhalhil.

7. Khâmchû is Kan-chou, cf. Rashîd al-dîn, 497, "فخور, one of the towns of Tangâqût".

8. سوكح is Su-chou, old pronunciation Suk-chou. Turkish Yôgurs of this region still pronounce Suk-chû, see Potanin, Tangut.-tibet. okraina, 1893, ii, 435. The Mongols say Tsugchi.

9. S.khchû (?), ditto in Gardîzî, at three days’ distance from 7. Khâmchû. As Gardîzî does not mention سوكح 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. سوكح and 9. سوكح (Sukh-chou(?)) equally referring to Su-chou. It is true that our author distinguishes سوكح from S.kh-chou but he connects them administratively. [In the Turkish document written in Orkhon script سوكح seems to refer to Su-chou, see Thomsen in J.R.A.S., 1912, p. 186.]

10.-12. seem to disturb the order of enumeration.

10. Kuchā (Кя) is the well-known town lying north of the Tarim (in Chinese 科爾蘇 or Ч'улт, French trans. K’iueou-tse or K'iue-tse). On the long history of this Aryan (later Turkicized) principality see S. Lévi, Le ‘tokharian 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 Kuchā to China, and leaves it out in the enumeration of the Toghuzghuz possessions (§ 12) though the Toghuzghuz are said to raid it constantly (v.s., p. 227). In Kâshgharî i, 332, Kusan (کزن) is given as "the name of a town called Kujâ (کوی) which is the frontier of the Uyghurs". The form کیسیân is also found in the "Secret history of the Mongols", cf. Pelliot, Notes sur les noms anciens de Kucâ &c., in T’oung-Pao, 1926, p. 126.

11. Kughm.r 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 Kohmârî hill which Sir A. Stein, Ancient Khotan, 1907, pp. 185–90, and Serindia, 1921, i, 93–5, identifies with Hsüian-tsaṅ’s Mount Gośrungs “Cow’s horn”. However, the passage of کيسیان into کيسمار (so according to Sir A. Stein's transcription!) is not at all obvious, to say nothing of the mention of Kughm.r in our text after Kuchā and before the "Stone-tower". (the eastern T'ien-shan?). [I now see that A. Herrmann in his commentary on Kâshgharî's map (1935) tentatively identifies Kûshān with Kuei-shun, 张掖, Ning-hsia. Phonetically this identification presents some difficulty.]
12. It is difficult to say which of the "Stone Towers" this Burj-i Sangīn represents. Is it Tash-qurghan in Sarikol (east of the Pamir), or simply a reminiscence of Ptolemy's ᾠδῶν πυργός, as supposed by Barthold, Preface, v.s., p. 26. Bīrūnī, by popular etymology, identified the "Stone Tower" with Tashkent, cf. § 25, 80., but judging by the description of the silk-route in Ptolemy, i, 12, 7–9, the tower must be placed at Daraut-qurghan at the western end of the Alai plain, see Marquart, Wehrot, 63, and Sir Aurel Stein, Innermost Asia, ii, 849, and On Ancient Tracks past the Pamirs, in The Himalayan Journal, iv, 1932, p. 22. [Perhaps some tower of the Chinese Limes, near An-hsi, cf. Sir A. Stein, Serinda, Maps 78 and 81.]

13. – 15. again in Kan-su. The mention of Manichaens 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. Khāju = 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, Serinda, p. 1040.

15. *Sha-chou, "Town of the sands", mentioned in Gardizī as the first Chinese town on the road from Qomūl, 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. Sanglākh with its Buddhist (?) associations. It is true that Gardizī places Sanglākh 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 Gardizī, the place of Sanglākh (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 Sanglākh, "The Stony Place", would accord with the natural characteristics of the Ch’ien-fo-tung. However, Sanglākh 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.¹ See also note to 5.

17. Kādākh? The Tibetan documents from the Lob region (8th century) frequently mention the city named Ka-dag, which must be sought somewhere near Charkhlik, cf. F. W. Thomas, Tibetan Documents, iii: The Lob Region, JRAS, July 1928, pp. 555 and 565. The Tārīkh-i Rashidi, p. 67, in connexion with the same region, says: "The khan used

¹ A town called Kushai or Gushai lies to the west of Lan-chou between the Yellow river and the Hsi-ning-ho, cf. Potanin, Tangut.-tibetskaya okraina, 1893, i, 196–8, 332. In Arabic characters the name would look *کوشائی.
to go hunting wild camels in the country round Turfān, Tārim, Lob, and Katak\(^1\). Even now the memory of a *Shar-i-Katak* lives in the region, cf. Barthold, *Tarim in EJ*.

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 ‘āzīm (which is not a very high title), appears as an autonomous ruler over a population consisting of Turks and Tibetans.\(^1\) 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 Tarim was suspended. However, “there is nothing to indicate that Khotan had lost its local dynasty during the period of Tibetan ascendency", 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 ‘āzīm mentioned in our text is the king Li Sheng-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 Kāshghar, and, some thirty years after, Khotan succumbed in the struggle and was occupied by the Muslim Qara-khānid Turks of Kāshghar, cf. Barthold, *Turkestan*, p. 281, and notes to § 13. Gardizî, 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.za 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 *Sāvnîk* 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 Charchan of which the latter must have been reckoned to Tibet (cf. § 11, 8.). [V.i., p. 485: *Brwān*.]

22. The meaning of bar karān-i daryā is dubious. Perhaps the mention of Būrkhiμū and Nəvijkath just before 23. Sarandib is accounted for by the interpretation of daryā as “the sea”. But Nəvijkath looks distinctly Iranian (Soghdian): “the New Town”. Therefore the two localities seem

---

1 The *Mujmal al-tawārīkh* also calls this king ‘azīm 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 karān-i daryā* as “on the bank of the river”,
or perhaps “in the riverine region”, *i.e.* of the Tarim. Less probably
*N.vikath “the New Village” could be compared with Yangi-baliq (“the
New Town”) which Kâshgharî, 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 moun-
tains (cf. § 6, 1. and § 9, introduction), and it is possible that it was some-
times looked upon as a continuation of Indo-China.¹ Under the name of
Taprobana (Ṭabarṇā), and perhaps (?) of Nāra, 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
*Mohîṭ*, and on the Portuguese maps, *Mohîṭ*, Maps XVII and XVIII.

*§ 10. India*

Yule, *Cathay and the Way Thither* [1866], re-edited by Cordier, 1913–16
(Hakluyt Society); Elliot-Dowson, *The History of India*; Yule and Burnell,
*Hobson-Jobson*, 1886; [Turkish Admiral Sidi 'Ali Ra'îs], *Die topographischen
Capitel des indischen Seespiegels Mohîṭ*,² übersetzt von Dr. M. Bittner, mit
einer Einleitung sowie mit 30 Tafeln versehen von Dr. W. Tomaschek,
Wien 1897; *The Imperial Gazetteer of India*, Oxford 1909 (Atlas in vol. xxvi);
1924; Nundolal Dey, *Geographical Dictionary of Ancient and Mediaeval
India* (2nd ed.), as Annex to *The Indian Antiquary*, xlviii (1919)–liii (1924)
(last name Śravasti); H. Ch. Ray, *The Dynastic History of Northern India,
Early Mediaeval Period*, i, Calcutta 1931. See also below under respective
paragraphs.

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 (pervoiotochnik) of I.Kh. and other early Arab geographers
was Abū 'Abdillâh Muhammad b. Ishâq”. 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 *Mohîṭ* see G. Ferrand’s detailed articles *Shihâb
al-dîn Ahmad b. Madjid* (Vasco de
Gama’s pilote) and *Sulaimân al-Mahri
in EI and his edition of these two
pilots’ works, Paris, 1921–2 and 1921–3.
sources on India. Abū 'Abdillāh, 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, 135.20, 136.14, 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 Mas‘ūdi. [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 Bīrunī. 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 Ṣanf and Mandal, that of Fansūr (Sumatra) called S. tūhā(?) and that of Qimār (Khmer), see 1.-6. To the same group belong the three countries 8.-10. lying on the Chinese frontier, (evidently west of Yün-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 رهمي. He places him in the immediate neighbourhood of the Ballah-rā (v.i.) and the kings of Gujra and Tāqin (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, yak-tails), cowrie-money, and spotted rhinoceroses. [H. A. R. Gibb suggests that the sentence وبقال أن قصار عسكره نحو من عشرة ألف إلى خمس عشر ألف لفة must mean:
clear), says: “and after [the Ballah-rā] (comes) the king Jurz who has ṭāṭrī-dirhams; after him Ghāba; after him R.hmī (دهمی, variant: دهمی), 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 Qāmarūn, whose kingdom adjoins China. . . .” Ya’qūbī, Historiae, i, 106, mentions between Dānq (دائنق, perhaps: جرز؟) and the Ballah-rā and considers him the most important of the kings ruling over a most extensive country which lay by some sea and produced gold. Mas’ūdī, Murūj, i, 384, says that R.hmay’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.hmay’s possessions comprise both land and sea. 1 Beyond him lives the king of the καλμεν in whose possession there is no sea and whose people are white and have pierced ears. The latter kingdom evidently corresponds to al-amenção, which I.R., 133, mentions after Qimār (good-looking people, boys married at a tender age). 2

Yule-Cordier, i, 243, suggested the identification of *Ruhmī, &c., with Pegu, called in Burma Rahmaniya [Ssk. Rāmany-a-desa], 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. Mas’ūdī].” This cautious suggestion 3 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 رهم دهمی رهم دهم, 4 but it is still to be seen whether our author has not transferred to the original Ruhmi/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 Chandāl family which ruled in the province of Jejakabhukti, i.e. the present-day Bundelkhand lying between the Jumna and Narbada. The Chandāls, 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 frontier1 between Dahum and Kanauj may refer to Dhaṅga, 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 *Ruhmī/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 (*rāniya*) [12. and perhaps 11.].

On the west coast the king Balharay, or better BALLAH-RĀ [in our text several times *Ballahrāy*; Persian *rāy* = raja], is represented as paramount. His name probably reproduces the Indian title *Vallabha-rāja*, which several times occurs in the Rāṣṭrakūṭa dynasty, cf. Ray, *o.c.*, 577, and Sir T. W. Arnold’s article *Balhara*, in *EI*. Even apart from the title of Ballah-rā, the kings so called who, according to the Arabs, were powerful opponents (from the south) of the rulers of Qinnauj, can only be the Rāṣṭrakūṭas of the Deccan (A.D. 743–974). Sulaymān, p. 28, says that the Ballah-rā’s kingdom starts2 from the coast called *al-Kumkam*, *i.e.* Konkan, the region stretching along the sea between Bombay and Goa.3 Masʿūdī, i, 162, 177, and Iṣṭ., 173, definitely mention, as the Ballah-rā’s residence, Mānkīr, *i.e.* Manyakheta, now Malkhed, south of Gulbarga (Haydarābād). The Muslims living in great numbers in the Ballah-rā’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 Malabar by our author in the dominions of the Ballah-rā. In the north 15. Qāmuhul (v.i.), situated at 4 days’ distance from Kanbāya, belonged to the Ballah-rā. Cf. also Idrīsī (Jaubert), pp. 176–7: “la ville de Nahrvāra [Bīrūnī: *Anhilvāra* < Anhalwāta, 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 QINNAJ (such is the Arabic spelling, in Indian *Kanyākubhya* > 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, 9–16.). Our author includes in his possessions 38. Jālhandar (though this latter had princes of its own, Ray, *o.c.*, 138) and even considers as his vassals the Shāhī kings of Gandhāra (56. Vayhind) and those of 75. Qashmīr (but v.i. 57.).

Sulaymān does not mention Qinnauj but speaks, p. 28, trans. Ferrand, 48, of the jurz king who possessed the best cavalry in India, was at war both with Ballah-rā 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 Masʿūdī, *Murūj*, i, 383, have somewhat misunderstood Sulaymān in saying that Kum- kam was the name of Ballah-rā’s country.
and reigned over a “tongue” of territory (wa huwa 'alā lisānin min al-ard). Yet Sulaymān’s continuator Abū Zayd, p. 127 (Ferrand, 123), mentions Qinnauj as “a great city in the Jurz kingdom”. Mas’ūdi, on the one hand, speaks of the king of Qinnauj called BA‘URA (v.i. under 53. Birūza) 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, Ėrānšahr, 263–4. On the other hand, he, o.c., i, 383, separately speaks of the king Juzr (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-Pratīhāra dynasty (8th century—A.D. 1037) and the name *Jurz (< 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. Ţyṭhāl, and 43. Bytāl (Nepal?) lay in the region of Nepal (v.i.), whereas 44. Ťaqī (Ţakka-desa?) and 45. Saluqī (Chambā?) must be looked for in the neighbourhood of Kashmir. The S.luqī king was particularly famous for his nobility (v.i. 45.).

As regards MUSLIM possessions (see now Ray, o.c., p. 24) Mansūra belonged to the descendants of ‘Omar b. ‘Abdil-‘Azīz, a native of Bāniya, descended from the Quraishite Habbār b. Aswad, Iṣṭ., 173, cf. § 27, 1. and v.i. 16., whereas the ancestor of the amīrs of Multān was the Quraishite Sāma b. Lu’ayy. The dynasty of Mansūra recognized the ‘Abbāsid caliphs, whereas that of Multān, the Fātimid caliphs of Egypt, Maq., 485, (v.i. 32). The amīrs 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. Birūza (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 some other branch of the Gurjarā tribe. On the Gujrat of the Panjāb, v.i. 46.
on the Chinese frontier (west of Yün-nan); 11.-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 Narbadā 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 Panjāb; 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, Şanf and Qimār ought to be named side by side but by some mistake Şanf is placed under Assam!).

1. Qāmarūn (*Qāmarūb), I.Kh., 13, is Kāmarūpa, modern Assam. The dynastic history of Assam is little known. From circa A.D. 800-circa 1000, the Prālambha dynasty ruled in Assam, Ray, o.c., 241, 268.

2. Şanf 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: Şanf at 3 days’ distance from Qimār (v.i. 6.). There seems to have existed a Muslim colony in Champa as shown by P. Ravaisse, *Deux inscriptions coufiques du Çampa*, in *Jour. As.*, Oct. 1922, pp. 247-89; one of the documents is a tumular inscription of some Aḥmad b. Abī Ibrāhīm b. ‘Arrāda al-rahdār 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 Şanf being a part of Qāmarūn is not a mere mistake, the name in our case stands for some different place. The names of the type Chamba, Champa, &c., 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 Kāmarūpa.1

3. Mandal by its meaning (*mandal* “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 Mandarī (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. *Vyāghratati Mandala* in the Ganges Delta?). [But Mandalay is a late name.]

4. 5. Fansur<Panchur, celebrated camphor port, lay on the western

1 In modern Persian *champā*, or *champa*, is applied to (1) a white flower resembling a *zambaq* (and also called *gul-i champi*) and (2) a kind of rice; according to the *Burhān-i qāti’* both “came to Êrān from Hindūstān”. The name of the flower *< Sanskrit champaka*, is already attested in Pahlavi *chambak*; the name of the rice *birinj-i champā* may reflect a geographical name, but which exactly?
coast of Sumatra immediately south of Baros (§ 4, B 8.), see I.R., 138, and Möhít, Maps XXV–XXVI. Cf. Ferrand, Çrïvidjaya, pp. 55, 95, who, moreover, p. 72, admits the existence of a second *Panchir, an island off the eastern coast of Sumatra. The town H.dd.njira (?) and the king S.tühā are unknown unless مطره stands either for Šailendra, "lord of the mountains", title of the Šrīvijaya dynasty, or for the later (15th–16th century) or مطر of Sumatra, cf. Ferrand, ibid., pp. 80 and 86. 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. Qimār = 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 Qimār to Șanf 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 Abū Abdillāh 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 Kūdāfarīd (Godavari) 2 days to Kaylkān (Portuguese: Calingam?), al-Lavā (?) and K.nja (= Ganjam); thence to Samundar <Samudra (north of Ganjam, south of the Rio de Paluro = Baruva, Möhít, Map I), 10 farsaks; thence to *Crishin (spelt: أورينش = Orissa) 12 farsaks; thence to ابنة 4 days. Our Ur.shīn and S.mnd.r are the firm points of comparison. According to the order of enumeration Andrās would lie south of Orissa, somewhere towards the Godavari. The name اندراس Andrās (or perhaps Andrā'īya, Andrāniya, Andrāliya?) recalls Āndhra, as the region between the Godavari and Kistna is called. H.rk.nd and N.myās must be sought north of Orissa. In the Preface to the second edition (1906) of Maq., de Goeje quotes Marquart's emendation: Harkand <*Harikel (spelt: هرکل < هرک) or هرک). 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 Chandradvīpa (which is still the administrative name of the districts of Bakergunj, Khulna, and Farīdpur, 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 هرک which seems to stand for several similar but different local names (v.s., note to § 4, 11.). In Sulaymān, pp. 5–9 (and Abū-Zayd, ibid., 123), the Harkand sea comprises the waters between the Laccadives and Malabār, as well as those round Ceylon, and stretches even as far as Ramnī, i.e. Sumatra (§ 4, 5.)! Our N.myās, according to its place in the enumeration, seems to lie still farther east. It must be identical with N.yars which Ibn Iyās, 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 aloes "carried in fresh water" to

¹ The state of Shumutra (?) on the NE. coast of the island is mentioned by Ibn Baṭṭūta, 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.nd.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. Idrīsī, trans. Jaubert, p. 180: “On apporte [à Samundar] du bois d’aloës 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?). *šank (read: Shank) is Ssk. šankha. The text suggests perhaps that the šankha is the peculiar trait of this country, but the conchs were usually employed as insignia of the kings, cf. Sulaymān, p. 7, Ray, o.c., i, 456 and Yule, Hobson-Jobson (1903), p. 184b: chank, chunk.

8.-10., located on the frontier of China, come as an intermezzo in the description of the Indian coast.

Ya’qūbī, 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 Ṭ.sūl (Ya’qūbī: Ṭ.rsūl; 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-chu. 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 Mranma (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 (*myie-nāk) and Mi-ch’ēn


2 Sulaymān and Masʿūdī give here a name which looks entirely different from our *Tirsūl: Sulaymān, p. 32, says that Qir.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 Masʿūdī, Murūj, i, 388, F.r.nj lay on a peninsula.
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 Mānak and Mūja 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.

11.–14. continue the description of the coast towards the south (in opposite direction to the enumeration under 7).

11. corresponds to I.Kh., 63, j_.l “from which the inhabitants of Sarandīb receive their provisions”. De Goeje, following Yule, reads Bāpattan (?). Whatever the proper reading of the first element of this name, the place certainly lay south of the Coromandel coast.

12. corresponds to I.R., 134, places in the bilād al-aghbāb adding that its queen is called Rābiya and that the tallest elephants are found there. De Goeje took for arfīn 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 Rāniya (rānī) and Dahum. He describes 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 Urshfīn is bahr al-aghbāb. This name, omitted in § 3, is usually applied to the sea near the southern extremity of India. Abū Zayd (in Sulaymān, p. 123) says: “opposite (Sarandīb) vast aghbāb are found. The meaning of ghubb is a huge river [or valley, ṣwādī] extremely long and wide which disembogues (masabb) into the sea”. On the strength of our passage S. Lévi (d. 6.xi.1935) suggested for Urshfin the Mandam peninsula continued towards Ceylon by the Ramesvāram island. Instead of our I.Kh., 63, mentions where the maritime route for eastbound ships bifurcated: one branch followed the east coast of India while the other went to Ceylon and China.

1 The name resembles that of the Mo-so tribes in south-western China, but its alternative suggests that their common original contained a ch sound: *Mīcha, or *Mocha.

2 On Tomaschek’s Map I, Mohīt, the kingdom “Ruhmi” occupies the estuary of the Ganges; al-Mūja occupies the coastal region of Burma; al-Arman is located in Pegu (near Rangoon) and al-Māyad (compared with Moi) is shown round the Bay of Tonkin.

3 Dozy, Supplément aux dict. arabes: “golfe, appartient au dialecte de Yémen, Edrisi, Climat I, sect. 6, Jaubert, i, 394, has an interesting

4 Dr. Barnett suggests for B.Illīn “Baliapatam, more correctly Valapataṇam, a few miles NW. of Cannanore in Cirakkal Taluk, Malabar District, which is Ptolemy’s ByTexte (ed. Renou, 1925, vii, ch.i, § 6: ByTexte). This would indicate for B.Illīn a much more westerly position than Ursh.fin. However, it must be remembered that I.Kh. places B.Illīn at 2 days’ distance to the south (or SE.) of Malay (Malabar) and at 1 day’s distance from Ceylon.
passage in which immediately after the king of Sarandīb is mentioned the
king of *Mandūrfīn (variants and *Mandūrī) "which is a country opposite the Sarandīb island, as well as opposite Qimār . . . [text out of order] . . . and every king[^1] ruling the country of M.ndūrfin is called al-Qayday" [the last element perhaps -ray instead of -day].[^2] Birūnī, *Canon*, describes *Mandūrī-pattan* (as "the harbour and embarkation point (ma'bar "ferry") for Sarandīb, lying in the ghubb").[^3] Idrīsī (Jaubert), pp. 185–7, describes *Mandūrī* 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 *shāhik*. From *Mandūrī* (in the direction of China) the distance is of 3 days.[^4] Abul-Fidā, p. 355, mentions a town Manīfattan on the Ma’bar coast, identified by Yule with Malipatan 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 Manīfattan is only a mis-spelling of *Mandūrī-fattan, found by Abul-Fidā in some other source of his]. The *Mohīt*, Map XVII, mentions in the same region a locality 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. 11.]*, 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: التيار (التياض: Ṭalīyār)) could hardly be under the direct rule of the Ballah-rāy. In I.Kh., 64, whose enumeration runs from west to east, Malay comes immediately before B.llīn, v.s. 12.

14. Ist. (whom our author follows in the opposite direction) gives the distances, pp. 172, 179: Kanbāya to Sūbāra 4 marhalas; thence to Sindān 5 marhalas; thence to Šaymūr 5 marhalas; thence to Sarandīb 15 marhalas. Mas’ūdī, *Murūj*, i, 330, who visited the Ballah-rāy’s possessions in 303/915, gives a somewhat different enumeration: Šaymūr, Sūbāra, Tāna, Sindān,

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.-Ā*. In Sulaymān, p. 6, a queen is mentioned in the *Dibājāt, i.e. the Laccadive, &c., islands. ^[2] Ferrand, *Črividjaya*, p. 62, explains the name as “Mandūrapatan, la capitale de Madura”, but the city of Madura lies far inland.

[^1]: Abul-Fidā, p. 353, in his quotation from the *Canon* seems to have misread *-pattan* into بين “between”.
and Kanbāya; like our author he, too, praises the sandals of Kanbāya. in our text\(^1\) is a mis-spelling for Išt., 170, Maq., 477: and Bīrūnī, *India*, 102, *Chaymūr* which was identified by Yule with Ptolemy’s, vii, i, 6, Σημύλα, modern Chaul in the Kolaba district of Bombay. Sindān, *Sanjam* of Portuguese maps and St. John of English ones, lay south of Daman in the Thana district of Bombay; Sūbāra = *Σουπνάρα* (cf. Mas’ūdi, i, 253, Sufāra) also in Thana; Kanbāya = Cambay in Gujarat. On the Kūli of Cambay v.s., § 6, 16.

15. Išt., 176, 179, places Qāmuhul at 4 marhalas from Kanbāya at the beginning of the frontier of Hind (i.e. the frontier of the Ballah-ray’s possessions with Sind).

16. Išt., 175, spells Bāniya adding that the said ‘Omar was the grandfather (*jadd*) of the conquerors of Manṣūra.

17. This Qandāhar (Indian *Ghandhār*) is totally different from its Muslim namesakes in Afghānistān and the Panjab, v.i. 56. Some light on its position is thrown by § 6, 16. Idrīsī counts from it to Naharvāra (Anhilvara) 5 days in a cart. It stood in the eastern corner of the gulf of Cambay, see Ibn Bawṭūṭa, iv, 58, cf. Marquart, *Erānsahr*, pp. 266-8. Both the *Mohīt*, Map XIII (Bandar-i Ghandārī), 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 Narbadā, for in the description of that river (§ 6, 16.) our 21., 23., 24. (with the addition of Nu’nīn) are mentioned in the opposite direction, i.e. following the course of the river, whereas the enumeration in § 10 starts with 17. Qandāhar, situated near the estuary of the river, and then goes eastwards up the Narbadā river. This must be the clue for the future identification of the localities, of which the names are disfigured. The additional نوْن must correspond to one of the towns 18., 19., 20., or 22., and more probably to كنسر which not only is mentioned immediately before Nūnūn (cf. the order in § 6, 16.) but in Arabic cursive has some resemblance to نوْن. It would be tempting further to consider both these forms as corruptions of اوْجین, *i.e.* Ujjain, a place of great fame, through which Indian geographers drew their ° of longitude, v.s. note to § 4, 13.; Greek *’Οζήν*; I.R., 22: *Birūnī*, *Canon*: اوْجین جال ف قلعه الأرض و عاصمة الهند; Birūnī, *India*, p. 159: اوْجین or اوْجین. Ujjain does not lie on the Narbadā, but the terms of § 6, 16. cannot be interpreted too strictly. As regards the important Nūnūn (نوْن) one would tentatively identify it with the capital of Mālwā: *Mandū* (*مندو* or perhaps ماندو in Arabic script) situated to the north of the Narbadā 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 Qandāhar with Khandār (60 miles inland of Kathiawar) and Kanthkot, or Kanthgar, in Kachh (cf. Ibn al-Athīr, ix, 243: مندان), see Burgess in Elliot-Dowson, *o.c.*, viii, Geogr. Index, p. xl.

24. It is not known whether B.lhāri has anything to do with the king Ballah-ray whose capital Mankir = Manyakhet lays some 350 miles south of the Nārbadā. Birūni, *India*, 102, mentions a locality called Vallabha, but places it south of Jymwr (*Chaymur > 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 *Kanyākubja > 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 Qallari, Annari, Būrī, and Rūr in Sind. The two first lay far to the east of the Indus on the road from Mānsūra to Mūltān. The situation of Annari is uncertain. Būrī lay to the west of the Indus, where a branch (*khaliy*) separated from the river beyond Mānsūra. A Būrī 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 Mūltān, and formed the limit of [the possessions of] Mānsūra. The ruins of al-Rūr (Arūr, Alor), the ancient capital of Sind, are situated near Rohri, see H. Cousens, *o.l.*, 76–9, and Minorsky, *Les Tsiganes Lūlī*, in *Jour. As.*, April 1931, p. 286.

31. Ist., 175, places Basmad at 1 farsakh to the east of the river, at 2 marḥalas from Mūltān, and at 3 marḥalas from Rūr.

32. I.R., 135–7, Ist., 173–5. According to I.R., 135, the amīr of Mūltān did not obey the lord of Mānsūra, but read the *khutba* in the name of the caliph (*amīr al-mu‘minīn*). By his term “Maghrībi” our author means1 that the *khutba* in Mūltān was read for the Fātimid caliph, and this fact is confirmed by Maq., 485: لَا يَأْتَى… وَإِنَّمَا يُهْلِكُونَ إِلَى الفَتَّاَلِمِ. The term *maghrībi* is found in Maq., 195b (Cod. Constantinopolitanus), where it is said of Crete that وَالْكَهْذا لَمَّا تَجَرَّبَهُمْ وَأَنْطَهَتْهُمْ “the Western One (*i.e.* the Fātimid caliph) delivered it from (the Byzantines)”.

33. According to Ist., 175, *Chandror* was the military camp of the amīr.

34. Jab.rs.ī unknown. 35. Bahrāyīj. The amīr of Mūltān could not possibly control the town and district of Bahrāich, situated north of Gogra, some 125 miles to the north-east of Qinnauj; consequently some different place is meant here.

36. must be Lahore on the Ṛavī (Ssk. *Lavapura*, modern *Lāhaur*),

1 Contrary to Barthold, v.s., p. 27.
though its name is spelt in Bīrunī, *Rāmayān* must correspond to *Rāmādaṇ* as mentioned 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.


39. No parallel could be found for S.lābūr, unless it is related to *Simhapura* (Sengha-pu-lo) which Hsüan-Tsang, *Life*, St. Julien, p. 89, Beal, p. 67, and *S-yu-ki*, St. Julien, i, 172, Beal, i, 143, mentions on the way from Takhsīla to Kashmir (and further to Jālandhara, *v.s. 38*). Seng-ha-pu-lo lay at 700 li = *circa* 403 Km. to the south-east of Takhsīla, 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. 45, identified Simhapura with Ketās (Κατάσ, *Katāksha*), lying on the northern side of the Salt Range (which stretches along the right bank of the Jhelam), but Watters in his commentary on Hsüen-Tsang, i, 248, ii, 273, thinks that the Chinese traveller, rightly or wrongly, thought of Simhapura as lying north (or north-east) of Takhsīla, 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 *Primūn*) must be identical with *Primūna* (Prīmūna) which Maq., 78, mentions as a dependency of Qinnauj. The detail about the sacred water makes one think of Benares (Varānasi, Birūnī, *Canon: Bānārsī*) 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 are meant. The name, apparently disfigured, has some outward resemblance to Budā'un (بَدَاوٰن) 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. About *Hītal* (or *Hītal*, § 5, 9 B.) we know that it was the nearest of the three to Qinnauj from which it was separated by a high mountain. Beyond Hītal

---

1 This detail is repeated in the *T'ang-shu*, Chavannes, *Documents*, 167.

2 The names of the coins were un-
the range of mountains crossing India from west to east split into two branches. Hitāl possessed a ruler who was hostile to the raja of Qinnauj. 42. Ṭithāl is the wild mountainous country separating Hitāl from Baytāl (Nītāl) described as a commercial centre from which (Tibetan?) musk was imported. Two of our names also occur in Birūnī’s *Canon* at the end of the third climate (the text unfortunately without dots):

the region which is the observation point between (?) . . . (المحجد) long. 104° 35', lat. 30° 10'.

the region 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 *Naypāl, ie. 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 Budā’ūn (?) the continuation of the line Qinnauj–Budā’ūn may indicate the direction in which Hitāl ought to be sought, but the identity of 40. is not certain. Hitāl 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 Hitāl (Birūnī: سال) one may quote Nainītāl (نیتال) 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. As regards 42. it must be sought in the neighbourhood of Dhauaṣiri, to the west of the central part of Nepal.

The route from Qinnauj to Nepal quoted in Birūnī’s *India*, 98 (transl., 201) ran eastwards along the foot of the mountains and did not touch our 41. and 42. From Qinnauj to Bārī, 10 farsakhs; thence to Dūgum, 45 fas.; thence to the Sh.lhat kingdom (ملکہ شلمب), 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 (تلت) and the inhabitants Tarū, people of very black colour and flat-nosed like the Turks. Thence you come to the mountains of Qāmrū, which stretch away as far as the sea. To the left [i.e. to the north of T.lwt] is the realm of Naypāl." Some informer of Birūnī’s travelled that way: "when in T.nwt (تنوت), he left the easterly direction and turned to the left. He marched to Naypāl, a distance of 20 farsakhs, most of which was up-hill country."

---

1 Perhaps “Outer Tibet” is here meant for Birūnī, *ibid.*, places Inner Tibet in the fourth climate at long. 94° 0’ lat. 36° 0’ [perhaps 37° 0’?]. For comparison’s sake one may quote the position of Yārkand long. 95° 35’ lat. 43° 40’
Sikāshim long. 96° 20’ lat. 37° 0’
Abul-Fidā, 361 (quoting Ibn Sa’id and al-Atwāl), mentions among the towns (مُدٌم “lands”? ) of Qinnauj Outer and Inner Tibet, of which the latter lay at 7 marhalas from Qinnauj. On the Outer Tibet cf. § 11, 9.

2 In the region of Nainītāl there are several names ending in *tāl* “lake” (< Ssk. *talla*).

3 The identification of the route must

In any case it cannot be confronted with I.R.’s (Mas‘ūdi, i, 394: (القدیم: مسعودی, i, 394: لحبار) which belongs to the southern group of rulers enumerated by I.R., p. 133 (as it seems) on the authority of Abu ’ Abdillāh Muḥammad b. Ishāq).

44. On Ṭāqi (or Ṭaqin) see Sulaymān, 27, I.Kh., 13, I.R., 130. It is the country Ṭakka-desa, or Ṭakka-visaya mentioned in the Rājataranginī, ed. by M. A. Stein, 1900, i, 205 et passim, Hsūan-Tsang, Si-yu-ki (Beal), i, 165, calls it Tseh-kia and describes it as bordering in the east on the Vipāsa (Biās) and in the west on the Indus. Its capital lay circa 15 li ( = 8-6 Kilometres) to the north-east of Shē-kie-lo (Ṣākala, Sialkot). Cf. S. Lévi, Notes chinoises sur l’Inde, in BEFEO, v, 1905, p. 300, and Ray, o.c., 119, and Map 3, where Ṭakka-desa is shown south of Kashmir 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 Kashmir Birūnī, India, 102 and 206, mentions jointly كتاب و لُهاوُر, of which *Lohāwar is certainly Lohāra, valley of the Upper Tohi on the western approaches of Kashmir (and not the town of Lahore!) while Ṭākeshar (Ṭakka-desa) 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.luqiycin (Arabic gen. plur.) shows that the name S.luqi has been found in an Arabic source. I.R., 135, says: “and after [the king of Ṭaqin], (comes) a king called N.jāba (* ḫāba) who enjoys an honourable position among (the kings), and the king Ballah-rā takes wives from among them, and they are S.luqi, and on account of their pride (sharaf) take wives only from among themselves. The well-known S.luqi-hounds [wind-hounds, Saluki] 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 ḫāba, and clearly distinguishes this جاها from his namesake Jāba (see § 4, 9.) whom he calls “Jāba the Indian” جاها. Our author furnishes a further proof of the homonymous character of the two names, for at another place (§ 5, 9 b.) he calls the S.luqi king جاها الكبدر “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 Kashmir) separates Jāba’s country from that of Lḥrz (v.i. 46.). It would be the region between Nepal and Mithila inhabited by the forest people Ṭhāru (our ِزانو ِTarū). Going farther east towards the Jamuna the road would enter Assam (Kāmarupa, our قامرو). T.lwt and T.mwt evidently represent the same name corresponding to modern Tirhut كتبه. The country T.lwt would
be tempting to identify Jāba's kingdom with Chambā, on the head-waters of the Rāvī, north-east of the Ṭakka-deśa, see J. Ph. Vogel, *Antiquities of Chambā*, in *Archeological 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. 700¹ 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.luqī may somehow reflect this Solar.² Prof. Vogel himself (letter of 4.i.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 *Durgara* (mentioned in two title-deeds of the eleventh century); the Rājatarangīṇī does not know either *Durgara* 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, follows immediately on Jāba and there is no doubt that our (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 range⁴ of the Himalaya can really be said to divide al-Jurz (= Qinnauj) from Chambā must be distinguished and that the Solanki-Chaulukya dynasty of Rājpūt origin could not as yet be traced much farther north than 25°.

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.luqī corresponds best to Chaulukya. Moreover, according to V. Smith, *o.c.*, 440, "there is some reason for believing that the Chalukyas or Solankīs were connected with the Chāpās, and so with the foreign Gurjara tribe of which the Chāpās were a branch". This combination of Chaulukya with Chāpa would be a curious parallel to our pair of S.luqī and Jāba (<*Chāpa*)! However, I hear from Dr. Barnett that Chaulukya and Chalukya must be distinguished and that the Solanki-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 Ṭāqin, 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 Afgānistān. 47. Gardīz (Gardēz), the birthplace of the well-known author of the Zayn al-akhbār, is situated 34 miles to the east of Ghaznī (§ 24, 19.), in the plain of Zurmat. Maq., 349, gives an itinerary: Ghaznīn to Gardīz, 1 marhala, thence to Ügh, *ditto*; thence to L.jān (?), *ditto*; thence to Vayhind—the whole stretch being of 17 stages (*mansil*). 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 Gándhāra (region of Peshāwar). Our author distinctly speaks of a road from 48. Saul (lying in a very mountainous and turbulent region) to 49. Husaynān (lying near the plain). Therefore our 48. and 49. following immediately on 47. Gardīz, may respectively correspond to Maqdisi's Ügh and L.jān. Birūnī in his Canon, mentions on the road "from Ghaznī to Mūltān" (immediately after Gardīz) *Farmul*, or *Parmul*. This district, named after the [Tājik?] tribe inhabiting it, lies precisely on the road from Ghaznī to Bānnū, *i.e.* towards the Indus region.1 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 Bānnū 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 عَرْجُ، سُور، وَمِل refer to the same locality, *i.e.* Farmul. The direct road from Ghaznī to Farmul seems to leave Gardīz to the north; but in the 10th-11th century travellers from Ghaznī could have reasons for making a circuit in order to pass through Gardīz, situated at the junction of the roads from Ghaznī, Kābul, and Bānnū. 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. *Ninnār. The exact situation of the town of 54. Lamghān (Laghmān), Ptolemy, vii, 1, 42, Λαμβάγας (Ssk. Lampāka, Birūnī, Canon, ليك) is not indicated on the maps, but as regards the district of Lamghān (Lamghānāt) the Emperor Bābur says that originally it consisted of Alangār, 'Alī-shang, and Mandrāvar, situated on the left side affluent of the Kābul river, which flows from Kāfrīstān (to the NW. of the Kunār basin). Alangār is the eastern valley and 'Alī-shang the western one; their waters join below Mandrāvar and form the

---

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, 1.

According to the description lay over against Lamghān, consequently on the right bank of the Kābul river.1 Birūnī in his Canon gives the positions:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>long.</td>
<td>lat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamghān</td>
<td>96° 10'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynwār</td>
<td>96° 25'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the latter being placed to the south-east (*south-west ?) of the former (corrected latitude in Birūnī, India, 167). Anyway, Dynwār must correspond to دینور mentioned in the Bābur-nāma, ed. Ilminsky, p. 161, GMS., fol. 131b; Mrs. Beveridge’s translation, pp. 207–9: “in the east of the country of Kābul are the Lamghānāt [of which 5 tumans and 2 buluks are enumerated]. . . . The largest of these is Ningnahār [in the wider sense of the term] . . . its darogha’s residence is in Adīnapūr, some 13 yighaches [i.e. farsakhs] east of Kābul2 by a very bad road. . . . Surkh-rūd flows along south of Adīnapūr. The fort stands on a height having a straight fall to the river of some 40–50 qārī [130 feet] and isolated from the mountain behind it on the north. . . . That mountain runs between Ningnahār and Lamghān.” Consequently Adīnapūr, 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 *دینور is said to reflect Ssk. Udyānapūra3 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 Afghānistān. As Barthold, Preface, p. 30, remarks, this seems to be the earliest contemporary record of the name, although Ibn al-Athīr (13th cent.) mentions the Afghāns under the year 366/976–7.

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 Ningralahr, or Nungnihar, 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 Minuchîrî, ed. Vullers, i, 144: “The whole of Kābul and D.nbr 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-Purshāvur 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 (Ilminsky), p. 161, gives both نینهار (Ningnahār) and the more correct نگاره (Nagarahār), cf. also A. S. Beveridge’s translation, ii, Appendix, pp. xvii–xxviii. The mention in our text of the three idols of *Nīnhār 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 Jalālābād. See J. Barthoux, Les Fouilles de Hadda, i, 1933, pp. 1–12 (geographical account).

51.–3. according to § 6, 17., are situated on one of the Panjāb rivers, perhaps the Sutlej. Light on 53. Birūza is obtained from Mas’ūdi, Murūj, i, 206–7, who says: “The king of Qinnauj, one of the kings of Sind, is (called) B.rūza بُروز and &c. This is the title of the king of Qinnauj, and here (too) stands a town called B.ruza (named) after the title of the king. It is now the territory of Islām forming a district of Multān. From the town comes one of the rivers which form the Mihrān of Sind.” The spelling Birūza (perhaps influenced by a popular etymology) is very near بروز which Marquart, Ėrānsahr, 264, has restored after the Leiden codex. [Less satisfactory seems to be a later surmise by Marquart, Komanen, 100, according to which Mas’ūdi erroneously made a title of the king of Qinnauj out of the name of his town بروز which should be interpreted as Mahodaya?.] If we keep to our texts, Birūza lay in Panjāb, and Ray, o.c., p. 16 and Map I, places it, with some probability, in the neighbourhood of the Sutlej, for the Panjāb river flowing past Birūza 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 بَلْوَت) and J.lwt جَلْوَت) lying upstream from Birūza have been identified. The reading of the two last names is uncertain. Under § 6, 15. they are spelt B.l.vt and J.l.vt, but they may possibly be B.lūt, B.lvt, j.lıt, j.lvt, &c. A fort of Bilwat is mentioned in Ni’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 Tuzuk-i Bāburi, ibid., v, 248: moving from Kalanur (situated half-way between the Rāvi and Biyāh) Bābur crossed the Biyāh (opposite Kamvāhīn). 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 تَلْوَت) mentioned in Birūnī, v.s., 43., is an entirely different place.]

54.–5. v.s. after 47.–50.

56. Vayhind,1 Indian Udabhānda >Ohind, lay between the Indus and 1 Firdausī’s ماي هند, Shāh-nāma (Vullers), i, 144, and 154 seems to refer to Vayhind, v.s., p. 252, note 1.
the Kabul river, just above their confluence. Maq., 477, 479, mentions Vayhind as a provincial capital (qasaba) and enumerates its towns: V.dhhān, Bit.r, Nūj, Lvār, S.mān, Qūj. Vayhind was the capital of the kingdoms of Gandhāra (Bīrūnī, India, 101: Qandahār, cf. Marquart, Ėrānsahr, 271), which was ruled by the Hindushāhi dynasty. The latter was founded in the second half of the ninth century by the Brahman Lalliya, who had deposed his former master, the Turkish ruler of Kabul. According to Muḥammad Naẓim, Sultān Maḥmūd, p. 194, the possessions of the masters of Vayhind stretched from Lamghān 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 Sultān Maḥmūd, 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 Bīrūnī, who personally visited the country, see his India, p. 101, and Canon, where he calls Srinagar Addishtān<sск. Adhisthāna “the residence”. 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. 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 (abweb) 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’ūdī, it possessed 108,000 villages. This looks like an interpolation in the text which is obviously out of order, and Mehren, 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 Kayānides, 1932, p. 53. See Map iv.

§ 11. Tibet

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. Only the western marches of Kashmir could depend on Qinnauj, v.s., p. 239.

2 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.
Mīrzā Ḥaydar's Tārīkh-i Rashīdī, 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. 1830-9 and translated into Russian by the late Prof. V. Vasilyev, 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 (أذر)\(^1\) which is 40 farsangs long and consists of mountains, plains (read: سهل instead of سهل), 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.māsbkhath and then to Alishūr (الشور) after which it follows the stream of K.jā (کجا) on which, in the direction of the desert, lies the village of حمان (or حمام) 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 which is the first village of Khotan; "and at this stretch (اندر في مييان) comes the river Y.ra (یرا)"; thence [from R.ștūya or Y.șa] to the village of S.mywb.m, then to the "barren hills belonging to the Muslims" (گورستان مسلمانان),\(^3\) then to a stream (جرو) coming from China (جهج), or *Khotan (ختن?), then to the town of Khotan; at 15 days' journey from Khotan lies the large town of Kay (کی), perhaps *K.ĵa (کیا) which is within the limits of China but is occupied by the Toghuzghuz;\(^4\)

(c) from Khotan on, the road (b) is continued to the south: it goes to the  Çünkü 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 ādir means "low foot-hills", cf. Tajikistan (by several authors), Tashkent 1925, p. 47. Radloff, Wörterbuch, quotes ādir (in Qirghiz and Qara-Qirghiz dialects) in the sense of "broken, mountainous country". Very probably the Persian correspondence of ādir 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: gūristān "cemetry".

\(^4\) 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 khāqān of Tibet".1

Our author says nothing on the first two roads but incorporates the names of the road (b) down to R.stūya (see notes to 10.–20.). The rest of the places of the present chapter is not in Gardḻī; of them 1., 3., 9., 21., 22. (K.lbānk) are also mentioned in the chapters on the mountains and rivers (§§ 5, 3. and 6, 3.); one rare name (9.) is also found in Bīrūnī; one name 23.) has a parallel in the Tārīkh-i Rashīdī; the names 5., 6., 7., 8., and 22. (Bīnā) 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 Gardīzī refer to the times of Tibetan expansion in the heyday of which the Tibetan influence was felt even in the neighbourhood of the T”ien-shan where the Tibetans came into contact with the Arabs.2 It is for the Tibetan scholars to see whether our chapter contains any details3 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 [Sarī]-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 Tibetans4 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-khāqān) was

1 This road, also mentioned in Bīrūnī, v.s., p. 24, evidently led across the K’un-lun range to the Tibet proper. From Khotan it must have followed one of the head-waters of the Khotan river. The Tārīkh-i Rashīdī, 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, 207 (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, Documents, 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 Kashghar 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 situation in the 8th–9th cent. is reflected in such notices as Qudāma, 208: Aṭbāš (in the Narin basin) “situated between Farghāna, Tibet, and Barsḵhān”, 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. Gardīzī’s remark on Ādh.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 جاحل, among whom the chiefs (vice-roys) were recruited, may be explained as *Akhā-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-khāqān) whose troops occupied 9. Tüsmat (evidently lying in the neighbourhood of Khotan), and whose treasure was kept in a fortress, south of the road leading from Kashghar 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-khāqān 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 [! V. M.] and eager to see foreigners.”

1. The second element of رانک راک 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 Hindūstān and Chinistān; must be looked for in the south-east and east of Tibet, cf. the description of the Mānisā range (§ 5, 3.) which crosses Rāng-rong from the neighbourhood of India to a northern point where Tibet borders only on China (perhaps in Ssū Ch’uan, see note to § 5, 3c.). Prof. F. W. Thomas suggests the possibility of Rāng-rong standing for “Sgān-Ron, i.e. the Sgañ and the Ron, 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 Akha in Mongol “elder brother, elderly, respectable person” + yul in Tibetan “country, land”. If the possibility of such compounds be admitted, cf. dalai + lama, the first element أجا أجا may eventually be interpreted as āchā [with Arabic āmâla: ā for ā > e] and explained as Mongol eche “father”. In the region now occupied by the Sari-Yögurs 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 \textit{(Pu-lu of the Chinese sources, Chavannes, Documents, 149), i.e. Baltistān, as opposed to the Lesser Bolor (Gilgit, \&c.) on which see § 26, 19. See Map iv.}

3. N.zvān (\textit{T.rvān, T.zdān?}) 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 \textit{Mayūl} as “mother country” or “the mother’s country”, \textit{v.s.}, p. 257. It apparently has nothing to do with \textit{Mar-yul} “the low country” which in the \textit{Tārīkh-i Rashīdī}, pp. 410, 456, is applied to Ladak.

4. \textit{J.ṛ-J.i} may correspond to Gardīzī’s \textit{Mayūl} which (\textit{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: جرچان) on which \textit{v.i.}, 8.

5. It is extraordinary to find the name of Lhasa so perfectly transcribed in Arabic characters \textit{LlfJ}. The report about a mosque in Lhasa is quite unexpected and M. Bacot doubts its truth. \textit{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. \textit{A-za} admits of very different readings. M. Bacot suggests \textit{*Ajā-yul, “the Ājā Country”}. The name transcribed in Tibetan characters \textit{Ha-za} [French transcription ’\textit{A-za}] belongs to the people whom the Chinese call T’u-yū-hun and of which the original form is restored as \textit{*Tu’u-yun}, or \textit{*Tuuy-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 ’\textit{A-za} still survived as shown by the Tun-huang documents. According to the Chinese sources (\textit{Sung-shu}) “the T’u-yū-hun or Barbarian A-ch’ai [Tibetan: \textit{Ha-za}] were the Sien-pi of Liao-tung”; as regards the name \textit{A-ch’ai} it was that given to the T’u-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 \textit{*Tuuy-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, \textit{Note sur les T’ou-yu-houen et les Sou-p’i}, in \textit{T’oung-Pao}, xx, 1920, pp. 323-31. Prof. F. W. Thomas, \textit{Tibetan Documents}, v, in J\textit{RAS}, Oct. 1931, p. 831, states that “the Tibetans (who speak of a \textit{Ha-za} kingdom long after the overthrow of Tu-yū-hun) understood by the term \textit{Ha-za} the people of the Shan-shan \textit{(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 \textit{*Ajā-yul} has a chance of being located to the south of the Lob-nor. On the other hand, Dr. Unkrig’s suggestion of a curious popular etymology (\textit{v.s.}, p. 257), supported by his interpretation of the name \textit{Ma-yūl}, is very
interesting. Muslim sources on far-away countries could readily draw on popular lore as explained to them by interpreters and intermediaries.

8. J.r.m.ngān, quoted between § ii and Tusmat, has a twofold outward 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 1,000 li = 576 Km. to the south-west of Lou-lan, Hsüan-Tsang, *Si-yu-ki* (St. Julien), ii, 247, and *ditto* (Beal), ii, 325, mentions a Ché-mo-t'o-na “which is the same as the country called Ni-mo”. Sir A. Stein, *o.c.* i, 311, note 7, identifies it with Chalmadana mentioned in Kharoṣṭhi documents, and states that “it manifestly corresponds to the present Charchan”. The situation of our J.r.m.ngān “on the edge of the desert” better fits the region of Cherchen, and in this case the occupation of the inhabitants—sāyyādī—was perhaps “fishery” in the swamps of the lower course of the Tarim and Cherchen. Cf. Kozlov, *Lob-Nor*, in *Izv. Russ. Geogr. Obsh.*, 1898, xxxiv.

9. Twsmt, vocalized Tūsmat, 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 Tusmat 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 Tusmat from China (Khotan? § 5, 3.). It is curious that in the enumeration of the places lying between Kāshghar and Khotan (v. i. 10.–20.) our author at the last place mentions some M.dū instead of Gardižī’s Khotan. This name looks like a trace of the indistinctly written توسمت, 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 Gardižī immediately before Khotan. Prof. F. W. Thomas draws my attention to the likeness of the name Tūsmat to Tibetan ‘Mdo-smat’ “Lower Mdo”, south of the Koko-nor region. Has our author misunderstood the situation of Tūsmat? In Birūnī’s *Canon* (the fifth climate) I now read توسمت (indistinctly written without dots); it is placed in “Outer

---

1 Abū Zayd (= Sulaymān, 64) in the story of the revolt of Huang-Ch’ao says that the emperor fled to مدينة مدعو مأودة لبلاد البت. *Ibid.*, p. 109, a locality of M.dū (al-maudi’ al-maʿārif bi-M.dū) is mentioned on the Tibetan frontier, and it is said that its inhabitants are constantly at war with the Tibetans. In the parallel passage Masʿūdī, *Murūj*, i, 305 and 297, gives مدو. Already Reinaud, note 134 to Sulaymān’s text, compared M.dhau with Mdo (Amdo). In any case, the tradition of Twsmt in the H.-ʿĀ and Birūnī is different from Sulaymān- Masʿūdī’s *Amdo.*
Tibet” and mentioned along with Chinānjkath (§ 12, 1.).

Tūsmat long. 110° 0‘ lat. 39° 10‘
Chīnānjkath long. 111° 20‘ lat. 42° 0‘

This position of Tūsmat is certainly very remote from Khotan of which the centre (qasaba) according to Bīrunī was

 долг. (? ) 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 Kūnkrā and Rāy-kūtiya”1 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>ہ. ʿĀ.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kāshghar</td>
<td>بلس</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ياش</td>
<td>10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>كرمان</td>
<td>11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>خجمان</td>
<td>12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>غرا</td>
<td>[غرا 21. ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(يونجه (يونجه)</td>
<td>21.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>خچک</td>
<td>13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>كدلور</td>
<td>14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>راکوئن</td>
<td>15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ره 2]</td>
<td>16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ندروف</td>
<td>17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>رستويه</td>
<td>18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>سپیومیم تری کرمان مسلمانان</td>
<td>19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ختند</td>
<td>20.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 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 Kāshghar to Khotan must have followed, as at present, the belt of cultivated lands on the border of the mountains. Our author excludes from Gardīzī's series 21. Ghazā (v.i.), which he evidently places lower down on the Khotan river (§ 5, 3.). But is then Gardīzī'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 Kāshghar, whereas some eight names would separate it from Khotan lying nearer. 13. B.rikha 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 Tiznaf river but the latter flows too far west (immediately east of the Yārkand-daryā). Perhaps only 19. could stand a comparison with Zanguya (*ذتنکر) situated between the Sanju and Qara-qash rivers, nearer to the former. Its situation would suit Gardīzī's remark that it was the first village on the road belonging to Khotan. In this case 15. might be Gundalik or Gunduluk (کندلولک), now Gunduluk-Langar. In a Chinese itinerary quoted by I. Bichurin, Opisaniye . . . Vost. Turkestana, SPb., 1829, i, 236, the distances are: Ilchi (= Khotan) to Kialma (Pialma), 110 li (circa 68 Km.); from Kialma to Gundalik, 90 li (circa 52 Km.). According to P'evtsov, Putesh. po Vost. Turkestamu, SPb., 1892, p. 107, Gunduluk lies among reeds at some 10 Km. to the north-west of Zangūya, 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.bānk. 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 Yārkand and Kāshghar rivers. However, the particulars on Ghazā contained in the present paragraph do not facilitate this identification (cf. note to § 6, 3.). K.l.bānk is obscure and Bīnā is not found elsewhere.

23. Barthold, v.s., p. 25, has recognized the identity of our کرسانک (ësâng?), which name in Mirzā Haydar's Tārikh-i Rashidi refers to Lhasa. Haydar, p. 130, calls Ursâng "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 Ursâng. Elias in his commentary on the Tārikh-i Rashidi, p. 136, explains that Ursâng is a probable corruption of the names of the two central provinces of Tibet, Wu and Tsang, which in speech are usually coupled together. Vasilyev, 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 Kāshghar to Khotan. Zangūya is the turning point for the travellers going from Khotan to Sanju.
its capital. The form ल्हसा in our author may have arisen from the vowel sign (damma) \( \text{द्वां} \). The second name of the place, “Great Farkhār”, i.e., in usual interpretation, “Great Vihāra”, suits Lhasa quite well. A vague report on Farkhār is found in the Nuzhat al-qulub, 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.

§§ 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 “Toghuzghur” 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 Kül-tegin and Bilgā-qaghan) and his later translation (1922) into Danish (inclusive of Tonyuquq’s inscription) rendered into German by H. H. Schaeder, ZDMG, 1924, pp. 121–75; Radloff (fourth version) in Die alttürkisch. Inschriften, Neue Folge (Kül-tegin, Bilgā), SPb., 1897 and ditto, Zweite Folge (Tonyuquq), SPb., 1899; P. Melioransky, Pamiatnik v chest’ Kül-Tegina, in Zap., xii (1899), 1–144. 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; Streifzüge, 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, Toghuzghuz, Turfān, 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.]

§ 12. The Toghuzghuz

Even though the reading تۆخۇزغۇز (and not Toghuzghur as formerly supposed) and its interpretation as Toqoz-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 मक'र bZaṅ (→ 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 (बयृव्र) is not connected with Indian vihāra, and is an Iranian word < *\( \text{परुङ्ग} \)wātra, “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.\footnote{1} The founders of this new empire for the first time assumed the name Türk (or Türk“ 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\footnote{2} in speaking of the first Turkish empire. From the very beginning\footnote{3} 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 Semirechye.\footnote{4} Both kingdoms at different times had to recognize Chinese sovereignty. In A.D. 742 a coalition of the Uyghur, Qarluq (Khallukh), 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 qaghans (khāqān) 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 qaghans. The Indian summer of the Western T’u-chüeh is connected with the rise of the Türgish 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 Türgish 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 Türgish 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, \textit{o.c.}, 4, 43, 79, 85, and \textit{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, \textit{i.e.} circa A.D. 1020.\footnote{5} Towards A.D. 860 a second

\footnote{1} Soon after A.D. 572 Turkish troops cooperated with the Utigurs during the siege of the Cimmerian Bosphorus (= Kerch, at the entrance of the Azov Sea). In Hsüan-tsang’s time the dominions of the western qaghan reached the Indus, Chavannes, \textit{o.c.}, 241, 256.

\footnote{2} To the English transcription \textit{T’u-chüeh} corresponds the French transcription \textit{Tou-kiue}. The Chinese presumably had in view not the singular Türk but its Mongol plural Türküt (Pelliot).

\footnote{3} Officially since A.D. 582, Chavannes, \textit{o.c.}, 219.

\footnote{4} Hsüan-tsang in A.D. 630 found the khan of the Western Turks at his encampment on the Chu river.

\footnote{5} \textit{V.s.}, notes to § 9. According to the \textit{T’ang-shu}, transl. by I. Bichurin, i, 419, after the catastrophe of 840 the minister of the former Uyghur khan called Sich’i P’ang-t’ê-lê led 15 aymaqs from
The Toghuazghuz

The kingdom was founded by the Uyghurs in the eastern T'ien-shan which preserved its independence till Mongol times.

The above-mentioned term Toghuzghuz found in Muslim authors applies more usually to the later Uyghur kingdom situated in eastern T'ien-shan, cf. Qudāma, 262, Mas'ūdi, Murūj, i, 288, Isṭ., 10, Gardīzī, 90–2, as well as our author. Kāshgharī, who personally knew the region, quietly substitutes Uyghur for the antiquated Toghuazghuz 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.2

On the other hand, the Uyghurs are separately mentioned in the same inscriptions. The account of Bilgā-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 eltābir 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, where-as 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 Sari-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, Tangut.-tibet. okraina Kitaya, SPb., 1893, i, 440, ii, 410, 435, Mannerheim, A visit to the Sarō and Shera Yôgurs in Jour. Soc. Finlande-ou-rienne, xxvii, 1911, pp. 1–27 [reviewed by S. E. Malov in Zhivaya Starina, 1912, pp. 214–20]; S. E. Malov, Ostatki shamanstva u zholtikh Uyghurov, 1912, pp. 61–74; W. Kotwicz, Quelques documents sur les relations entre les Mongols et les Ouïghours in Rocznik Orientalystyczny, ii, 1925, pp. 240–7, and L. Ligeti, Les Pérégrinations de Csmoa 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-ku-ts'un attacked the Tibetans from Pei-t'ing and took from them Si-chou (Yarkhoto) 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 Bilgā-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.
Toquz-Oghuz ("Nine Oghuz") are separately quoted side by side, see G. Ramstedt, *Zwei uigurische Runeninschriften*, in *Jour. Soc. Finn.-Ougr.*, xxx/3, p. 12. [Theophylactus Simokatta, book vii, 7–9, definitely speaks of the conquest of 'Oywp 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 Tōlās or Tölös, v. supra, p. 196). 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 مور as Toghuzghur was in favour of its further interpretation as Toquz-Oghur, 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 Toghuzghuz 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 Uyyur 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 Türkten haben, in der Gegend des Selengasflusses. Die meisten dieser Stämme scheinen zu dieser Zeit zu einer anderen grossen Konföderation von Stämmen, die in den Inschriften Oγυς 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 Toghus-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-chieh, 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 Ch'ē-le (> T'ieh-lé), among whom the first place is occupied by the Yüan-ho (Uyghurs). To judge by Chavannes's analysis these tribes occupied by far a more limited territory than what Hirth, *Nachworte z. Inschrift des Tonjukuk*, p. 37, says of the "Tölös im weiteren Sinn (sic) . . . deren Stämme vom Schwarzen Meere ostwärts . . . bis zum Amurgebiet hie und da zerstreut lebten!" Cf. also Chavannes, *o.c.*, 221, and Barthold's critical remarks in *Zap.*, xv, 0172–3. [Is the reading T'ieh-lé correct?]
dislodged by the Tibetans in 808. The principal argument in support of this theory is that Abū Zayd, the continuator of Sulaymān's work, pp. 62–6, speaking of the revolt of Huang Ch’ao (黄巢) 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. 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’ūdi, *Muruj*, i, 305, speaking of the same events of A.D. 881 calls the emperor’s ally “king of the Turks ارخان”, as he also calls, i, 288, the king of Kushān (v.1. 1.). In both cases the name is undoubtedly to be restored as يرغان *Uyghur-khan*, as both Birūnī, *Canon*, and Kāshgharī, i, 28, spell the name Uyghur. This fact would suffice to show that there was no great consistency in Arab terminology regarding such remote regions. Other passages quoted by Barthold in his *Vorlesungen*, 53 (Ṭabarî, iii, 1044; Ibn al-Athīr, xi, 117; Maqrīzī, *Khitat*, i, 313a3) 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 Jāḥiz (died circa A.D. 868) quoted by Marquart, *Streifsüge*, 91–3. Jāḥiz ascribes to the effeminating influence of Manichaeism 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-baliq does not seem to have belonged to the Sha-t’o, v.1. under 2.

2 According to Pelliot, *T’oung-Pao* xxi, 1922, p. 409, the Arabic form must be *Bānshwā* (Bansho?) which gives an equivalence of the southern pronunciation of Huang Cao, “mot à ancienne gutturale initiale laquelle s’est complète-

ment amuie 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 *Toghuṣghuz* 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 Qirghız in the events of 840. It is more likely, however, that Jáḥīz (with some confusion in the details, cf. p. 290, n. 2) had in mind the subjugation of the Tūrghish (Western T’u-chüeh) by the Qarluq towards 766.

The earliest visit to the Toghuṣghuz country recorded by the Muslims seems to have been the journey of Tamīm b. Bahr called al-Muṭṭawwi‘ī, *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 Yaqūt, 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>Tamīm (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 Manichaeans</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the town has 12 iron gates</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distance to China 300 farsakhs</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</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 Kimāk</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>D</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 Tamīm’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 Barskhān to the khāqān's town, *viz.* 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 sīkka per day. Consequently I.Kh. must have converted Tamīm's 40 [Qudāma: 45] days into more quiet stages.¹ Yāqūt omits to mention the starting-point of Tamīm's journey, but it could certainly not be *Barskhān al-a‘lā*, as I.Kh.'s text has it, but (as Qudāma, 262–3, clearly implies) the *Lower* Barskhān which lay in the neighbourhood of Ṭarāz (see note to § 15, 11.). 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 very 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-fo-t‘u*, Chavannes, *o.c.*, 12 and 305). The Arabs call it *khaima* "tent" but Fakhr ad-dīn Mubārakhshāhī, ed. Sir E. D. Ross, p. 39, uses for it the curious Persian term *tamūrā* "funnel" [not = the Arabic *tannur*].²

The traces of Tamīm’s tradition are also found in Idrīsī, i, 491, who says that the capital of the Toghuzghuz (Bish-baligh), has twelve iron gates, the inhabitants are Zoroastrians and some are Magians and fire-worshippers. From a different source Idrīsī, i, 502, has the name of the "principal city of the Toghuzghuz" خَرْخَاک separated from the khāqān's town [perhaps Yar-khoto?] by a distance of one light day's march. From it to lying on the bank of the lake there is a distance of 4 days. The name of the first town corresponds most probably to Panjīkath (v.i. 2.), i.e. the Iranian name of the same Bish-baliq. The detail about the lake would suit Bish-baliq,³ and the distance of 4 days between the "khāqān's town" and Panjīkath would be approximately right in view of Idrīsī’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‘ing (Bish-baliq) which roughly corresponds to 4 days' journey.

There are no indications of a direct dependence of our § 12 on Tamīm's report.⁴ More probably, in common with Gardīzī, 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. Qudāma, 262: "to the capital of the Toghuzghuz [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 (Yāqūt, i, 840) concerning the religion of the Toghuzghuz ("most of them are fire-worshippers of the Magian religion, and among them are found sindiqs of Mānī’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 Jayhānī, who certainly had numerous opportunities for completing the data on the Turks from direct sources. The Sāmānids at whose court he lived must have keenly watched the rivalry of the Uyghurs and the Khallukh 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 Khallukh lived north-west of the Toghuzghuz (and not south of them). In § 13 the Yaghmā are said to have the Toghuzghuz on the east, but, to say nothing of Kuchā reckoned to China, the Khallukh (§ 15) also intervened between the Yaghmā and the Toghuzghuz. On some Khirkhīz 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 Kāshghar to Khotan (§ 11, 10.). The real frontier of the Toghuzghuz towards the north-east seems to have lain near the Tarbaghatai (v.i. 8.), but under § 3, 1. the Eastern ocean is said to adjoin the extreme eastern limits of the Toghuzghuz and Khirkhīz. This statement, due to some earlier source and not tallying with § 12, may contain a vague reference to the times of the Orkhon empires. Very curious is also the tradition according to which the Toghuzghuz were once the kings of the whole “Turkistān”, 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–Tātār (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 Tātār”. 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’ō (v.s., p. 266) at the eastern extremity of the T’ien-shan could also be called Turk.

*nirān* in the loose sense of “heathens”? A Manichaean minority could certainly exist in Bish-Baliq even in the times of Western T’u-chüeh. Had Tamīm 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 Tamīm’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 Idrīsī, i, 491.

2 Even in Mongol times the Uyghurs kept up their national traditions, Juvaynī, i, 39–45.

3 Gardīzī mentions the Tatār (*sic*) only as one of the Kimāk tribes (§ 18). But the item referring to a definite clan has nothing to do with our author’s statement about the relationship of the Tatār and Toghuzghuz.

4 Tamīm, 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’ō.
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 Kuchā. 7.–8. and 10.–17. are the northern possessions of the Toghuzghuz in the region stretching across the T’ien-shan down into the Ili basin and perhaps farther east. See Maps iii and v.

1. Chīnānjkath, "the Chinese town", is the well-known place lying circa 45 Km. east of Turfan and called in Chinese: Kao-ch’ang (later: Huochou) 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, &c., in Four. As., May 1912, p. 590. Biruni, Canon, f. 103a, quotes "Chīnānjkath which is Qocho, the residence of the Uyghur-khān". Kāshghari, iii, 165, calls the town Qocho (on his Kūshān see note to § 9, 5.; on his Kusan see note to § 9, 10.). Juwaynî, i, 32, spells (with a popular etymology) Qara-Khwāja and the Masālik al-absār, transl. by Quatremère, Notices et extraits, xiii, 224: Qarā-Khwājā. The ruins of Qocho, now known as Idiqut-shahri, were first described by the Russian expedition of 1898, see D. Klemenz in Nachrichten über die von der Kaiserl. Akademie d. Wissensch. im Jahre 1898 ausgerüstete Expedition nach Turfan, i, SPb., 1899. On the remarkable discoveries of the German expeditions see especially A. von Lecocq, Chotscho, Berlin, 1913. The latest description is found in Sir A. Stein, Innermost Asia, Oxford, 1928, pp. 566–609.

2. The mountain Tafqān, separating Chīnānjkath from Panjīkath, cf. § 5, 6., is certainly Eastern T’ien-shan (Boghdo, highest peak 12,680 f.). The name, otherwise unknown, looks like a mis-spelling of Turfān (the name of the town Tturpamni-kamtha occurs in the Saka document, written probably in the latter part of the eighth century). See Barthold, Turfān, in EI.

The “Five Villages” lying behind the mountain did not form one close group. The village called Panjīkath was only one of them. The Turkish equivalent of this Iranian (Soghdian?) name is Bish-baliq, both meaning

---

1 The name Chīnānjkath “the Chinese town” was also borne by a town of Shāsh, Išt., 323. The name is distinctly Soghdian, the element -ānj being a feminine suffix to suit the word -kath, cf. also Gurgānj in Khwārazm and perhaps Kabūdhanj-kath “the Blue (?) Village” in Soghd, Išt., 322. Cf. Benveniste, Essai de grammaire sogdienne, ii, 1929, pp. 87–8, and Four. As., Oct. 1930, p. 292.

2 Idiqut was the official title of the Uyghur rulers probably inherited by them from their Basmil predecessors.

3 Gardizi’s تفستان 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 pnzknbyy kwd’y, “the lord of Panjkānd”, is found together with cyn’ncknbyy kwd’y, cf. F. W. K. Müller, Ein Doppelblatt aus einem manichäischen Hymnenbuch, in Abh. PAW, 1913, pp. 45 and 55. In our case P.njyk.th (with y) is written clearly. In the Saka document quoted above, o.c., p. 131, lines 20–1, stands misti kamtha Panji-kamtha “the great town of P.”. On another place called Panjikath 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 Kültegin'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.*, 305. The town is the one visited by Tamīm b. Bahr (*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-té, see S. Julien in *Jour. As.*, 1847, ix, pp. 50–66; Chavannes, *Documents*, p. 11; Barthold, *Bishbalik in El*, Sir A. Stein, *Innermost Asia*, 1928, p. 582 sq. On the mention of Bish-baliq in Idrīsī, *v.s.*, p. 260. The ruins of Bish-Baliq lie some 47 Km west of Guchen near Jimsar. They were first visited in 1908 by B. Dolbezhev and described by him in *Izvestiya Russ. Komiteta dl'a izucheniya 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, Sulmī (founded by Alexander the Great!);^1^ Qocho (= our 1. Chīnānjkath), Jambaliq, Bish-baliq (= 2. Panjīkath), Yangi-baliq. Bretschneider, *Mediaeval Researches*, ii, 27–33, quoting the *Yiian-shi* 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;^2^ Jambaliq shown west of Bish-baliq and east of Manas; Khutukbai (*Ku-t'a-ba*) west of Jambaliq; and Yangi-baliq (the Yangi-balghasun station between Khutukbai and Manas).^3^ If our author, as is his habit, enumerates the five places east to west, Kūzar.k and J.m.lkath must be placed east of Panjīkath (Bish-baliq), and Bārlughand Jāmgh.r west of it.^4^ This surmise is corroborated by the fact that the

---

1 Birūnī, *Canon*, mentions *S.lm.n* 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 *Ūč-Solmī* in an Uyghur colophon) see Pelliot 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. Birūnī, *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* and *Panjīkath*, *Yirrumcimni kamtha* is probably Urumchi and *Cammaidī Badaiki nāmma kamtha* [read: *Jamal-balig*?] may stand for our J.m.l-kath = Jam-balig, or (less probably) for our 10. J.m.l-kath.

4 *Kozar* has some outward resemblance to the lake of *Kār* which according to Idrīsī lay probably near Bish-baliq (cf. p. 269, note 3) though on Idrīsī'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, صامغار, and in Maq., 341, صامغر (with Arabic $ for چ). On the name of f.m.lkat (cf. the present-day Jimisar?), v.i., note to 10.

3.-5. belong to the itinerary given in Gardīzī, 91: Barskhān²–B.nchul (?)-Kujā–الژ–Sikat–M.k.shmighnāthūr–Chīnānjkat. Our author quotes them in inverted order (reckoning Kuchā to China, and B.nchul and Barskhān to Khallukh). The same itinerary is mentioned by Raverty in his translation of the Tabaqāt-i Nāshirī, p. 961: Barskhān–کشماور–سکت–بحلل–چینانکت (read: جینانکت?). Raverty, with his exasperating vagueness about references, pretends to quote from I.Kh., but all the details of the passage coincide with Gardīzī, of whose work Raverty must have had a defective copy.

3. The strange $ع$ corresponds to Gardīzī’s مکشماور and Raverty’s کشماور in which the element چور is perhaps an additional name or term, for Gardīzī’s text runs: “from Sikat to M.k.shmighnāthūr, and from Thiir to Chīnānjkath”. 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 Rashīd al-dīn, ed. Berezin, Trudi V.O., vii, 100–1, xiii, 237: گوسفروجرکه with numerous variants. This place lay near the region of (کوشان) “on the frontiers” of China (or Khotan?) and Kāshghar. Whether *Kūshān (K.sân) refers to Kao-ch’ang (v.s. 1.) or to Kuchā (§ 9, 10.)³ the place described by Rashīd al-dīn geographically suits our K.msīghiyā. Pelliot, in jour. As., April 1920, p. 183, quotes a parallel Chinese name: ہائی-سینکیو-تچ’ی-وی-کو-سس-مان [in English transcription: Ch’i-си-чжэ-эр-ко-сэ-ман]. The first three syllables seem to run parallel to our Kmsīghiyā and Rashīd-al-dīn’s کساق (؟).

4. Gardīzī’s Sikand <Si-kand or Shī-kand is a better name for a group of 3 villages (cf. Soghdian ىي “three”). It must be also remembered that the Chinese called Si the district of Yar-khoto, situated at 12 km. to the west of Turfan.

5. iljl lying near the Khuland-ghun river (§ 6, 3.) corresponds to Gardīzī’s الجز and Raverty’s الجز. 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.

³ The latter is the opinion of Tomashchek, SBWA, Bd. cxvi, p. 738, and Pelliot, jour. As., April 1920, p. 180.

⁴ P. 91: بازر ba-Az.אֶל.
of this name to the west of Kuchā, whereas Gardīzī 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 Gardīzī, 90:2; speaking of the strife between a former khāqān of the Toghuzghuz and his brother Kūr [Kūr]-tegin he says that the capital (ḥadrat) of the Khāqān “was” [at that time?] in Azal (*Aral?). The nearest place of importance to the east of Kuchā is Būgīr (on the western bank of the Qizīl river). Kāshgharī, i, 301, says: “Būgīr is a fort (qal’ā) between Kuchā and Uyghur lying on a height (ʻalā shāhīq) and it is a frontier-post (ṭḥagr)”. From a palaeographic point of view a confusion of *j̣j̣ and *ḳṛ [ḳṛ] is not impossible (cf. note to § 15, 15. on Azār <*B.d.l>). Some complication in the way of this identification lies, however, in the fact that it is difficult to take Qizīl-su for the important Khūland-ghūn (cf. § 6, 3. and § 13). [The latter probably corresponds to the Muzart river which flows west of the Kuchā-river and before reaching the Tarim turns off eastwards. Its course, parallel to Tarim, can be traced almost down to the Lobnor region. See Map of Kuchā studied by A. Herrmann in S. Hedin, *Southern Tibet*, 1922, viii, p. 431.]

6. Kūmas is obscure. In Idrīsī’s confused text, i, 495, a mention is found of a middle-sized town دارحون (var. كها) and it is probable that the last-named place situated in “Outer China” is *كها Kuchā.

7. These five villages belonging to a beg-tegin and inhabited by Soghdians must be distinguished from the village of somewhat similar description mentioned under § 17, 3. Barthold in his article *K voprosu o yazikhakh sogdiiyskom i tokharskom*, 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. Kūmas (Kūmis?)-art has some likeness to K.mīz-[art?]4 which Gardīzī, 86, mentions on the road from Toghuzghuz to Khirkhīz (see note to § 14). The route is very vague and only tentatively would one place K.mīz-art (after which a mountainous tract succeeds to the plains) somewhere to the south of the Tarbaghatai, say near Chuguchak. On the other hand, Kāshgharī, i, 306, and iii, 177, speaks of a كمیتالاس Kūmī-Talas (or Talas-yūz)5 forming the frontier (ṭḥagr) of the Uyghur; on his Map he shows it between the upper courses of the Ili and Irtish, south of a mountain (Tarbaghatai?). At 1,500 ḷi 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 Kumi-Talas, though the connexion of the latter with Kūmas-art6 is still problematic.

---

1 On Grum-Grzhimailo’s map this Aral lies circa 90 Km. west of Kuchā and 11 Km. east of Bai.
2 See p. 273, n. 4.
3 [Ark may be the generic Persian word “citadel” = Kāshghari’s qal’ā.]
4 Cambridge MS., fol. 182a: K.mrās.
5 To be distinguished from the Ulugh-Talas (v.i., § 25, 93.).
6 In script Kūms and Kmy can be easily confused. Kāshgharī’s orthography is different, for he expressed the vowels by ḥarakāt while the Persian authors use in Turkish names matres lectionis.
Both the name of Küm.s-ar/ and the detail about its inhabitants being hunters point to a mountainous locality. The alternative tentative explanation would be to connect the name *Kümās 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 njm is not unknown in Turkish (qoňshu > qomshu).

9. The obvious restoration of would be *Khumūd for Qumūl which Gardīzī, 92, places on the road from Chīnānjkath to Sha-chou (see note to § 9, 3.). The fluctuation of δ/l would not make difficulties in Eastern Persian; in the Soghdian letters published by Reichelt Qumūl is called K.myū. Our author having split the itinerary into political areas could, of course, insert Qumūl 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.mūd is mentioned among the places lying in the north-western corner of the Toghuuzghuz possessions, immediately before J.mli̇kath, and its description would suit the upper valleys of the Qarashar drainage area (the two Yulduz valleys). [Eventually could be improved into *Khādū, but this latter name of the Qarashar river seems to be of later Mongol origin!]

10. According to the description of must be different from mentioned above under 2. but their names have a striking likeness and it is possible that both are composed of the same elements: jml or jmyl + kat or kath. As a parallel one would quote the name of the tribe Jumul to which Kāshgharī, i, 28, assigns the following place in his north-to-south enumeration (al-qabā’il al-mutawassīta bayn al-janīb wal-shimāl): Chigil, Tukhsi, 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 Toghuuzghuz, 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-chiieh (i.e. Tūrgish) federation towards A.D. 766 (see notes to §§ 15 and 17) it says: “when this people was destroyed there was a certain T’e-p’ang-lē who settled in the town of Yen-ch’ī (= Qarashar) and took the title of shē-hu (= yabghū).” One could then take our yabghū for a descendant of T’e-p’ang-lē and his residence for Qarashar. It would be strange indeed if this

1 Cf. our Panjy-kath (§ 12, 2.) = Panj-kath in Gardīzī, 90, note 8.

2 On Kāshghari’s Map the Jumul (or a section of them?) appear much farther to the east on the Obi upstream from the Qāy, v.i., p. 285.

3 In the T’ang times Qarashar was usually under the Western T’u-chiieh until A.D. 719 it was included in the number of the “Four Garrisons”, occupied by Chinese troops, Chavannes, o.c., 110-14.
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 Youlouchou,1 puis traversant la passe Narat pour arriver sur le Kounses et dans la vallée d’Ilî. 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 Ilî valley could account for the variety of tribes which raided J.milikth from the north. By his very origins this yabghū must have been opposed to the Khallukh encroachments, and this may explain the state of tension round the neighbouring Barskhân, at which our source hints under § 15, 11. On the Yabghū-pass see note to § 15, 5.

11.–17. called “stages” (manzil) must belong to the routes in the northern region of the Toghuzghuz possessions, partly in the T’ien-shan and partly in the Ilî basin. The order of enumeration is obscure. See Maps i and v.

11. Our probably *topragh “earth” to suit the explanation that the mountain was “earthen”. Situation uncertain except that the “stage” lay by a pass.

12. Our situated by a large river very likely corresponds to Kâshgharî’s (iii, 277) Yafînji, “a town situated near the Ilî”. Juvaynî, GMS, ii, 88, records the limits of the Qara-Khitay empire as stretching from Taraz to Yafîm (or Aham), which must represent the same name. On Kâshgharî’s Map the name Yafînj is inscribed south of the Ilî. However, at another place (i, 58) he says that the town of Iki-Ögûz (v.i. 16.) is situated between the rivers Ilî and Yafînj and the name of this Iki-Ögûz is inscribed north of the Ilî. It is not clear whether Yafînj is an independent river or an affluent of the Ilî but for the reasons quoted below one might take Yafînj for the Qara-tal flowing to the Balkhash lake north of the Ilî. [On Idrisi’s Map, Bib. Nat. Paris, MS. arabe 2221, f. 178v., a is shown on the right bank of the river (Sh.‘mâkh?) flowing to the lake B.rvân.]

14. A name parallel to our Sîînk-kul is according to Kâshgharî, iii, 99 and 273, a lake was called near Qochingar-bashi (>Qoch-qar-bashi) 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. [Sîînk < sîd “to urinate” may refer to the climate of our 14., v.s., p. 95.]

16. In view of 12. the name most probably represents (with adjunction of -kat “town”) Kâshgharî’s frontier place (baldatun bil-thaghr) Iki-ögûz, i.e. “(situated between) the two rivers”, namely the Ilî and Yafînj. Near Iki-ögûz lay the township of Qamlançhu, ibid., 184.

1 Kâshgharî, iii, 99, mentions a lake Yuldz-kül, situated on the frontier (thaghr) between Kuchā, Kyk.t, and Uyghur. The name Kyk.t is suspect and may be identical with Kingût mentioned on the Uyghur frontier, iii, 268.
As mentioned above, Iki-ogiiz appears on the Map to the east (north) of the Ili, and to the west (south) of Kiimi-Talas. 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 quondam bonam villam qui dictur Equius, in qua erant Saraceni Iloquentes persicum. Longissime tamen erant a Perside. Sequenti (sic) die, transgressis illis alpibus 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 quendam lacum qui durat XXV dietas in circuitu (sic). Et illa planicies tota irrigatur ad libitum aquis descendidentibus de montibus que (sic) omnes recipiuntur in illud mare. In estate redimimus ad latus aquilonare illius maris ubi similiter erant magni montes. . . . Invenimus ibi unam magnam villam nomine Cailac (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 Cailac (*Qayaliq) 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 Yafinj) can without much exaggeration be said to correspond to Kâshghari’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 Kâshghari’s text.¹ See Map v.

17. Ighrâj-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 Kâshghari only the name Ighrâq, v.s. 10., approaches our Ighrâj. Cf. also the mysterious لايب عراق where according to Gardizi, 849, the Kimâk used to take their horses in winter. But then the *Ighrâq (instead of ’Irâq) comprised some warm valleys!

§ 13. The Yaghmâ

Gardizi, 84, recording some older traditions² says that a party of Toghu­ghuz having separated from their tribe joined the Khallukh who by that time had succeeded in establishing friendly relations with the Haytâl of

¹ I now see that the explanation of Equius by Iki-öğüz 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.
The Turk-khāqān [of the Tūrgish] felt some uneasiness at this combination and directed the above-mentioned Toghuzghuz 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 Toghuzghuz 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 (Yaghmiyā) living astride of the Ighraj-art (Central and Western T'ien-shan) and occupying both the region south of the Khatlām 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, 1. suggests a previous struggle between the Chinese, the Khallukh, and the Yaghmā. From the fact that Kāshghari, i, 85, mentions on the river Ilā (Ili) the tribes of Yaghmā and Tukhsī 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 *Mujmal al-tawārīkh*, Barthold, *Turkestan*, i, 20, definitely says that "the king of the Yaghmā is called Boghrā-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-khans, Qara-khanids (see Barthold, *Ilek-khans in EI*). Our source insists on the esteem enjoyed by

---

1 Possibly referring to the infiltration of the Khallukh into Upper Tukharistan (see note to § 23, 69.). Under A.H. 119 Tābarī, ii, 1412, line 9, mentions the jabghiya al-Tukhārī and ibid., line 16, calls him jabghiya al-Khurlukhī.

2 The region "between" the Khallukh and the Kimāk would lie somewhere near the Sari-su (cf. § 18). This would render possible a contact between the Toghuzghuz and the Altai 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.mwji* restored by Marquart as *samir-i chītiī*), 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 Khūland-ghūn (§ 6, 3. and § 12, 5.) as the southern frontier of the Yaghmā. Does Khūland-ghūn stand here for the Aq-su and its western tributaries (Taushqan)? The name *Taghusshkhan* or *Tawushkhan* is found in Gardīzī (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 11) 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, *Gurcanis Bericht über die Bekehrung der Uiguren*, in *Sitz. Berl. Akad.*, 1912, xxvii, 491, has shown that Abū Dulaf Mis'ar b. Muhalhil (cf. note to § 9) while speaking of the shī'a tribe *būrāj* refers to the dynasty of Boghrā-khān, *v.i.*
the Yaghmā kings among their subjects. The composition of the Qara-khanid army may be still a moot question, cf. Barthold, *Turkestan*, 254, but there is hardly any doubt that the ruling dynasty arose from the Yaghmā group (a branch of the Toghuzghuz). In our source we find the Yaghmā at their beginnings before they spread north into the Chu and Jaxartes basins. According to Niżām al-mulk, *Siyāsat 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 quern* 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 Toghuzghuz (= Yaghmā?) on the road from Kāshghar to Khotan (§ 11, 20.) may be a portent of the final absorption of the latter place toward A.D. 1000.

1. On Kāshghar (in Chinese *Shu-lé*, *Sha-lé*, 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 Kāshghar in A.D. 715*, in *Bull.SOS*, ii, part iii, 467–74 [the author doubts the fact of the invasion], Barthold, *Ilek-khan* and *Kāshghar* in *EI*. At the time of the earlier Chinese dominion Kāshghar was one of the “Four Garrisons” (cf. § 9) though it possessed a dynasty of its own. Towards A.D. 676–8 it was subjugated by the Tibetans. In 728 China again entered into relations with the “king” of Kāshghar. After a new struggle in which the Chinese, the Tibetans, the Turks, and the Arabs took part, Kāshghar, 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 Yaghmā kingdom twice over: once under the name Bughrāj, and a second time under that of Khargāh, “the tent” (?), corresponding to the Turkish *Ordu-kand*, “the Army cantonments”. Bīrunī in his *Canon* (6th climate) clearly says that “*Ordu-kand* is Kāshghar”. Khargāh as the name of a country lying somewhere near India

1 Cf. the mention of a multitude of clans composing the Yaghmā federation. As regards the B.lāq (Y.lāq?), Kāshgharī, i, 317, mentions a tribe Alkā (sic) Bulāq (ا‌کا بلاق) 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 *Alqaböyük.*] As a mere guess, could one take the B.lāq “mixed with the Toghuzghuz” for the group of the Yaghmā living on the Ili where they could be in touch with the Toghuzghuz?

2 So Barthold, *Semirechye*, 21, but later, *Vorlesungen*, 77, he expressed himself in favour of the Kharlukh origin of the dynasty.

3 Kāshgharī, i, 9 and 31, says that in the districts of Kāshghar a non-Turkish language was spoken, called kānjāki. In the town itself the *khāqāni* Turkish was used. [In later times a place called *Knj.k* is often mentioned in the neighbourhood of Talas, cf. Waṣṣāf, *Ṭāriḵh*, ed. Hammer, i, 22. It may have been a colony of the same tribe.]

§ 13
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 Manuchihr had freed from the Tūrānians but which was again seized by the latter under Kay-Ka'ūs:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Mar ān marz Khargāh khwānad ba-nām} \\
\text{Jahān-dida dihqān-i gustarda-nām.} \\
\text{Za-yak nīma bar Sind dārad gusar} \\
\text{Ba Qīnmauj-u Kashmir-u ān būm bar;} \\
\text{Dīgar nīma rāhash su-yi marz-i Chin} \\
\text{Bi-payvast bā marz-i Tūrān-zamīn.}
\end{align*}
\]

Kay-Khusrau sends Rustam for the deliverance of:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Zamīnī-ki payvasta-yi marz-i tu-st:} \\
\text{Za Khargāh tā būm-i Hindūsītān} \\
\text{Za Kashmir tā marz-i Jādūsītān.}
\end{align*}
\]

2. Instead of *Bartuj* one must read *Artūj*. Kāshgharī, i, 87, mentions two villages of the name *Artūj* in the Kāshghar region. Both (now called *Artish*) are still extant beyond the hills north of Kāshghar. The Upper Artish lies some 35 Km. to the north-west of Kāshghar and the Lower Artish 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 Bohgра-han lies buried in Artish, see Jamāl Qarashī, *Mulḥaqāt al-Šurāḥ* in Barthold, *Turkestan*, i (texts), 132: māta Satuq Bughrā khan al-ghāzī fi sanat 344 wa mashhadihu bi-Artūj min qurā Kāshghar, wa [huwa] al-yaum ma'мир 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 Bohgра-han'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 *Khirmkī* 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 حرمكُ 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.r.m.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* (Kāshgharī, i, 318: بَرْخ). In a similar way our خرمکی 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 Kāshgharī, i, 9 and 31, says about the kānjākī (v.s., p. 280, note 3).

1 He says that *artūj* means "juniper-tree" (i.e. probably the tree called in Turkestan *archa* "Juniperus polycarpus".

§ 13 The Yaghmā 281
§ 14. The Khirkhīz

Marquart, *Komanen*, 65–8; Barthold, *Kirghiz* in *EI*, and *Kirgizi, istoricheskii 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 (Qiryiz), 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, 1. and p. 94, l. 11.]

Gardizī, 86, describes a road from the Toghuzghuz to the Khirkhīz which may be divided into four sections: (a) From Chīnānjkath to Kh.s.n, thence to Nūkḥb.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 Mānb.klū;³ 2 days among hills, after which begins the region of forests; then come steppes, springs, and hunting grounds until the high Mānb.klū mountain is reached, which is wooded and abounds in sable-martens, grey squirrels, musk-deer, and game. (c) From Mānb.klū to Kūkmān (Kök màn), by a road along which grazing grounds, pleasant streams, and abundant game are found; in 4 days the traveller reaches the Kūkmān mountain which is high and very wooded; here the road grows narrow. (d) From Kök màn to the Khirkhīz encampment (hāyīta): 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 Khirkhīz 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: *Qirqun* corresponding to the plural *Qirqiz*, 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-iz* for an old Turkish plural of *qirq* “forty”.

² Gardizī, 85, reports a legend according to which the founder of the Khirkhīz tribe was a Slav(!): “the signs of Slav origin are still apparent in the Khirkhīz, namely their red hair and white skin”.

³ In the Camb. MS., fol. 182a, these four last names have respectively the forms: مِن سَح سَح بن نکب (؟); Nūkhīk; K.mrāz and K.mīz; Mān.nkbū and Mātīklū.
K.mīz-art may lie on the southern skirts of the Tarbaghatai range. Mānb.klū would *grosso modo* correspond to the Altai mountains. Kökmān, 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 khāqān’s residence must have lain on the upper Yenisei, in the Minusinsk region known for its excellent climate and picturesque nature. See Map 1.

Gardīzl mentions three roads from the Khirkhz territory: (a) following a north-to-south direction (just described in the opposite direction); (b) a western road leading to the Kimāk and Khallukh; (c) a road leading eastwards to the great tribe of Fūrī (*v.i.* 1.)

In our source the Khirkhz 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 Kimāk (§ 5, 12. and § 18). As the Kimāk lived on the Irtish the mountain must be the Altai (= Mānb.klū, *v.s.*). In § 6, 41. it is said that the “Ras” river rises from the same mountain [or its continuation?]. The *Tūlas* (*Töläs, Tölös*) mountain where the Khirkhz were also found (§ 5, 8.) may be another name for the Altai, borrowed from a different source and wrongly placed north-west of the Iissik-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 Kāshghar (§ 13, 1.) and more definitely in B.njūl (§ 15, 12.) which, to believe our author, formed a Khirkhz enclave in the Khallukh territory.³

¹ Gardīzl, 86, gives much more information on the Fūrī. The eastern road from the Khirkhz, says he, has two variants of which the one runs in the desert and 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 Khirkhz 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, Tölís, Tölós*, in Chinese *T’ieh-lé*, Thomsen, *Inscriptions*, 61, Chavannes, *Documents*, 87) to which the Uyghur originally belonged. At a later date, Eltārish qaghan (Bilga qaghan’s father) organized the *Töläs* 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.njūl group could be only a colony of the tribe.

⁴ Gardīzl, 84, read: āb-gīr as two lines down!

---
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way to the Furi, but then it would be strange that Gardizi gives no separate description of the latter "great tribe". According to our author the Furi were exactly the wild men in question. The Furi must be located near the Baikal. Rashid al-din, ed. Bérézine, in Trudi VORAO, vii, 168, mentions in the neighbourhood of this lake the tribes: Quri (قیرى, cf. our قورى!), Burghut, Tümät, Bäylük "which are some of the Mongol tribes".1 Barthold, Kirgizi, 23, identifies the Quri with the Ku-li-kan whom the T'ang-shu reckons to the Tölös federation of Turkish tribes (to which the Uyghurs also belonged, §9, v.s., pp. 196, 266, n. 1) placing them north of the Han-hai and south of the Baikal lake.2 In the Orkhon inscriptions the name of Quriqan twice follows on that of Qurqiz.3 This identification is somewhat complicated by the existence in some Muslim sources of the tribal name قورى. The chief authority for it seems to be Biruni, see Tafhim, ed. Wright, p. 145: "the Sixth Climate begins from the territory of the Eastern Turks, such as Qay, Qun, Khirkhiz, Kimak (spelt Kumak), and Toghuuzghuz, and (in it lie) the Turkoman country, Farab, the country of the Khazar, and the northern (part) of their sea".4 The Syriac map described by A. Mingana (v.s., p. 182) also mentions at the eastern extremity of the Sixth Climate: "Qarqir (*Qurqiz); Qai and Qun; the country of the Turks and Mongols".5 'Aufi (who wrote after 620/1231) mentions a Turkish tribe مة, also called قورى, whom the scarcity of grazing grounds forced to leave the country of Khitā. Then they were attacked by another tribe Qay and went to the land of Sārī.6 Thereby further movements were occasioned: the people of Sārī

1 Not "die zum Teil Mongolstämmes sind", as Marquart translates in Komanen, 135.

2 See T'ang-shu, transl. by I. Bichurin, i, 439, cf. Chavannes, Documents, 87–8. According to Barthold in the later Yüan-shi a people Ku-li is placed near the Angara river (flowing out of the Baikal). Cf. also Breischneider, Mediaeval Researches, i, 24, where Yeh-lü Ch'u ts'ai's report is quoted (towards A.D. 1224) saying that the land Ko-fu-ch'a was called Ku-li-kan under the T'ang. Breischneider thinks that Ko-fu-ch'a refers to the Dasht-i Qipchaq (?) but the ideas of Chingiz-khan's minister about Ko-fu-ch'a (lying north of Yin-du = Hindustan!) have hardly been transmitted accurately. [Marquart, Arktische Länder, 281, places the Qurigan to the east of the Baikal.]

3 Thomsen, Inscriptions, 98: "Tabghach, Tüpu, Apar, Apurim, Qurqiz, Üch-Qurigan, Otuz-Tatar, Qitay, Tatabi"; ibid., 102: "Qurqiz, Qurigan, Otuz-Tatar, Qitay, Tatabi", cf. Thomsen, ZDMG, 1924, p. 147. On these names see now Schaeder, Iranica, 1934, p. 39. [In the Oghuz-nāma the word qurigan, or *qorighan seems to have the meaning of "tent", see Pelliot in T'oung-Pao, 1930, p. 290. One can hardly say whether this word is connected with the tribal name so long as we are not sure of the pronunciation of the first vowel u/o. For the abbreviated form *Quri (< Qurigan) the testimony of the Yüan-shi is interesting.]

4 The same text, evidently borrowed from Tafhim, stands in Yaqut, i, 33. Cf. Wiedemann, Geographisches von al-Biruni, in Sitzungsb. d. Physikalisch-medic. Societät zu Erlangen, Band 44 (1912), p. 18. It is, however, noteworthy that the names Qun and Qay do not occur in the description of the "Climates" in Biruni's Canon.

5 Perhaps the Sārī-su basin is meant, in the region between the Irtish and Jaxartes. v.i., § 18. I.Kh., 29, and Qudāma, 206, mention a village of Sārīgh 4 farsaks west of the town of the Türgish-khaqan, i.e. probably west of the Chū. As is known the Türgish
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 'Auffi mentions the Khirkhiz who lived between the "aestival east" (mashriq-i sayfī) and the Kimāk (living north of the Khirkhiz). There is no doubt that and refer to the same people, and Barthold in his edition of 'Auffi's text quotes the variants: Qūn (Br. Mus. Or. 2676) and Qūn. Marquart adopts the reading Qūn and boldly makes it the starting-point of a series of far-fetched hypotheses having in view to prove the identity of the Qūn with the later Qoman (in Hungarian Kún), see Komanen, 7730. Linguistically Qūn cannot account for Qoman which still awaits an explanation. Consequently the reading Qūrī, as found in the older source from which both the H.-ʾĀ. and Gardīzī 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 'Auffi the name Qūn is coupled with the name of another people (Yāqūt: قانو) 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, Yīmāk, Bashghirt, Basmil, 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 Basmil 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 (Tōlōs, Türk, Uyghur). In Kāshgharī's time the Qāy seem to have shifted to the west, perhaps subsequently to the displacement of the Qūrī/Qūn of whom no trace is found in the Dīwān 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: (§ 9, 2d) and (§ 9, 2h). It is tempting to identify the first of them with (as located in Biruni) and take the latter as a mere repetition

were divided into "Black" and "Yellow" (in Turkish sarigh>sari) clans. Both Sari-su and Sārīgh may be connected with the latter appellation, the village being probably but a colony of the "Yellow" clans, of whom greater numbers occupied the Sari-su valley(?)

1 As regards the other appellation of the Qūn/Qūrī in 'Auffi, namely semblies "a people") which is not found in other sources, one may keep in mind two villages on the Lena (south and north of Yakutsk) called Markha and the lake Marka [Marqa-?] kul (35 × 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 Qayigh (i, 56), the latter being one of the 22 clans of the Oghuz. This distinction was insisted upon by M. F. Köprülü-zade, Ilk mutasavvıfler, Istanbul, 1919, p. 146. The names have been often confused, and even Yāqūt's (i, 33) reflects *Qayî(gh) rather than Qāy.
Commentary §§ 14-15

§ 14. The Khalluk

The T’ang-shu translated by Bichurin, Sobraniye svedeniy, i, 437, and by Chavannes, Documents, 85; Tomaschek’s review of de Goeje’s De Muur van Gog en Magog, in WZKM, 1889, iii, 103-8; Barthold, Semirechye, pp. 14-20; Barthold, Ḫūrūk, Karluq, 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 Qarluq and Khallukh of which the latter (خَلْعُ) is very easily confused with Khalaj (خَلَجَ) , 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 (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.
and joined the Arabs thereby securing the latter's victory, Chavannes, Documents, 143, 297. Towards 766 the Qarluq occupied Sūyāb (§ 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. It is very possible that to this initial expansion of the Qarluq refer the two curious passages in Jāhiz (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-Kharlukhiyya wa-in kānū fil’ adad ad’āfahum."

In Muslim literature two curious reports are found on the earlier events in the Khallukh history. The one by Gardīzī, 84, suggesting some contacts between the Khallukh and Yabāghū is still obscure (v.i., p. 288). The other by ‘Aufī (Barthold, Turkestan, i, 99-100, and Marquart, Komanen, 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: Tūrgishān?] and some of them came (even) to the lands of Islām. There are nine clans (of them): three Jigilt, three H.skī, one N.dā (B.dvā), one K.vālin and one T.khstn.” The name of the mountain یوسس must stand for *تولس, i.e. exactly Altai (Kin-shan) on which see note to § 5, 8.

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 Jāmghar (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 Yaghmā for the possession of Kāsh-ghar. Finally (towards A.D. 943) the Qara-khanid lords of Kāshghar (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 ‘Aufī’s term Toghuqghuz most probably refers to the Western T’u-chüeh (= Tūrgish). Qu-dāma, 262, speaking of the people of Upper Barskhān (who undoubtedly had belonged to the T’uchüeh), 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, Ḋarluk in EI. [Cf. p. 94, l. 21.]
the Oxus in Upper Tukharistan, Tabari, ii, 1604. Gardizi’s record of the friendly relations between the Khallukh and the “Hayṭal of Tukharistan” (see note to § 13) may echo the penetration of the Khallukh into that province; quite possibly the Khallukh themselves established in Tukharistan are understood under the name of their Hephtalite predecessors (in Arabic Hayṭal). Our source (§ 23, 69.) confirms the presence of the Khallukh in Tukharistan, and even now the name Qarluq survives in one of the Uzbek clans of Northern Afghānistān, cf. Barthold, Turks in El and Kūshkakī [see note to § 24, iva], p. 200 (Shahr-i Buzurg) and p. 203 (Rustāq).

The item on the title of the Khallukh ruler (jabghū or yabghū, often mis-spelt $yabghu$) may have been borrowed from I.Kh., 16, who says that the kings of the Turks, Tibetans, and Khazars are styled khāqān, “with the exception of the Kharlukh king (who is) called jabghīya”. According to Kāshgharī, iii, 24, yabghū was a title two degrees lower than khāqān.¹

The title yabghū (Kāshgharī, iii, 24: $yabghu < yabghū$) 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 Gardizi’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 Toghuzghuz. The khāqān 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 Turkistan (*Türgishān?) and was settled by the khāqān of the latter who gave them a jabūty (<jabūya?).³ Finally the people of Turkistan (*Türgishān?) rose against the khāqān* Khutoghlan (حَلَان) who was killed and whose kingdom passed to (the) Chūmpān (clan?) of the Khallukh.⁴ The first Khallukh ruler who sat on the throne was īlmālm.s.n *jabuya (جابیا) جابیا. 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 Üzgand river “rising from behind the mountain of the Khallukh” (§ 6, 17.) is called *Yabāghū (§ 25, 58.), and Kāshgharī, iii, 27, confirms this name: Yabāghū-suvi. 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 Chiu T’ang-shu the Tu-chieh used to give the title shē-hu and t’e-lē (which Chavannes, Documents, 21, identifies respectively with jabghū and tekin) to the sons, younger brother, and relatives of the khāqān. However, at another place I.Kh., 40, merges the two titles into one: jabghīya-khāqān, probably referring to the earlier times, for according to Chavannes, Documents, 38, note 5, the kings of the Western T’u-chieh were called jabghū-qaghan.

² Yabāqii according to Kāshgharī, iii, 27, means “felted wool” (al-qaraḍa min al-sūf).

³ It is possible that the slightly simplified form jabūya contained some particular shade of meaning. Cf. Persian pādshāh > Turkish pāshā.

⁴ Cf. infra pp. 300-1.
§ 15  

The Khallukh  

("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 most of the Chu basin, both north and south of the Alexandrovsky range, 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 Toghuzghuz (§ 12, 5. 4. 3. 1.). 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 Tarti, 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 *Busvēyn* in the Stambul MS. of Maq."

3. After Mirkī we find here Nūn-kat, whereas under § 25, 93. Mirkī is followed by N.vīkat. I.Kh., 29, gives the following itinerary: Kūlān, 4 farsakhs to B.rkī (= Mirkī); thence 4 f. to Asbara (*Ashpara*); thence 8 f. to Nūzikat (var. *Nūnakat*); 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 Tūrgish khāqān; thence 4 f. to Navākat; thence 3 f. to K.bāl (var. *K.nād*); thence 15 days to *Barshān*. So Nūnakat must be distinguished from Navākat, the former lying west of the Chu and the latter apparently east of it. According to Gardīzī, 89, from a place called Tūnakat (*Tumkat*) 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.vīkat started a road leaving the basin of the lake to the right (i.e. south). Barthold, *Report*, p. 114, simply substitutes the reading تومک for تومک (*Tumkat*) and, *ibid., 32*, identifies N.vīkat with Kök-muynaq, but in view of the facts just quoted this is surely a mistake and one must distinguish between تومک (*I.Kh. Nūnakat*)

---

1. Sūyāb is quoted under § 17, 2.
2. Meant under the "Khallukh mountain" from behind which the Parak river (= Chirchik) is said to rise (§ 6, 22.). On the other "Khallukh mountain" (Yasi pass), *v.i. note to 11.*
3. More rightly from the more easterly Kūmbrkat. Tomasek, *WZKM*, 1889, although he did not know Gardīzī, already restored the name of Nūnakat as *Tūnakat* or *Tūmak* in view of the Chinese name of the stage lying 50 li (= 28.8 Km.) east of A-shih-pu-lai (*Ashpara*), namely Tun-kien, cf. Chavannes, *Documents*, 10.
Our author (who did certainly use I.Kh.) says that Nünkät “was a town”. But both I.Kh. and Qudāma call Nünkät simply “large village” (qaryatun 'aşimatun), while Navākat is styled by Qudāma, 206: “a large town (madīnatun kābiratun), from which a road leads to Barskhān”. As in our § 25, 93. Mirki is followed by Navīkat, we may suppose that in the present paragraph Nünkät has been given the characteristics of Navīkat. Our author, evidently mistaken by the similarity of the two names, simply skipped from Mirki to Navīkat leaving out the places lying to the west of the Chu. If such is the case, the mountain Ûrûn-'Ārj must correspond to the range forming the watershed between the Chu and Ilī. 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 (أوزون أجاج “the long farsakh, or stage”) which provides a very satisfactory correction for the impossible ajrān عرج. Gardīzī’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. Tabarī, ii, 1593 (year 119/737) confirms that the khāqān possessed near Navīkat a mountain and a meadow which formed a forbidden zone reserved for commissariat purposes in case of expeditions. See Map vi.

4. غكسي 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 Khalluk bordered on the Yaghmā in the south-west (v.s., p. 278, n. 3), 5. Tûzûn-bulaq must be looked for near the Western T’ien-shan. If the Tûz-kûl corresponds to the Shûr-kul (§ 3, 17.) Tûzûn-‘ārj lay in its neighbourhood. All three names: Tûzûn-bulaq, Tûzûn-‘ārj, and Tûz-kûl may contain the same Turkish element tuz “salt”, whereas a similar element -'ārj under 3. has been restored by us as *aghach. In spite of the outward likeness of اورون عارج and توزون عارج it is impossible to identify them in view of the geographical details. The element aghach (yighach)“farsakh, stage” is common in Turkish names. Kāshgharī, i, 77: Alay-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 ę and l, the latter to be read with imāla: ā. [Tûmkat=Toqmaq?]

2 The importance of the Navīkat results from the facts that it was the seat of a Nestorian bishop, Assemâni, Bibli. orientalis, ii, 458 (Kâshghar [Kâshghar?] and Navakath) and iii/2, p. 630 (Chasimgarah and Nuachet), cf. Yule, Cathay, p. 179 (2nd ed. ii, 24) and that Manicheans were particularly numerous in it, Fihrist, i, 338: Nûnkath, 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 Manicheans 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-chüeh) has the habit of making appointments of the chiefs.” Hirth, Nachworte, 73, seems to give a better sense: “Hier ist der Ort, wo der Kakhan der zehn Stāmme zum Führer erhoben zu werden pflegt.”

4 I admit that grammatically the form tus-un from tus is not easy to explain. However see Kâshghari, i, 92, tolu “full” and i, 336, tolun ay “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. *Navīkat 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. Gardīzī, 102, describes a route from Navīkat to the “Chigil and Tūrgishī”, i.e. running from the Chu basin north of the Issik-kul. Gardīzī says that following this road one must travel from Navīkat towards Panjīkat, close to which lies the village *Sūyāb. To the left (north?) of this village three other villages are situated: (a) *Sūyāb (the text is not quite in order), (b) *Horokkal and (c) *Dawūzj from 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 (‘aqaba) over the mountain venerated by the Turks.

Gardīzī’s text is closely connected with Qudāma, 206. Both are in a very sad state but they mutually complete one another. Qudāma (much more complete than I.Kh., 29, v.s., p. 289) says that the road Navākat–Barshān goes (first) to B.njīkat (2 farsakhs), close to which (at a distance of 1 farsakhs) lies the village called *Sūyāb.3 At 2 farsakhs from B.njīkat lies Sūyāb to which [cf. the variant read: *Sūyāb] belong two villages *Kal and *Sāgūrjal,4 and from the latter the road continues to Barshān. It is obvious that Sūyāb with its two villages corresponds to Gardīzī’s three villages lying “to the left” of Panjīkat. These preliminaries facilitate the explanation of our text, which starts in the north with the village called in Qudāma *Sāgūrjal and corresponding to Gardīzī’s *Horokkal (and *Horokkal of the Mujmal al-tavārīkh, Barthold, Turkestan, i, 20). One of the remaining three villages mentioned together with Kūkyał (? ) ought to be Sūyāb but our author quotes the latter as belonging to the Tukhs (§17, 2.). Therefore it is not impossible that both لغ and Plugged لغ may be two different readings of the same difficult name which Gardīzī transcribes دووُر. (The Mujmal, l.c., mentions a village *Dawūzj but the title of its prince suggests its identity with §17, 3.). See Map vi.

8. جَرَن and جَرَن stand for جَرَن (v.s.). In Gardīzī’s text, 102 (lines 16 and 17), the word جَرَن is found twice; the second of these جَرَن is superfluous and may belong to *Dawūzj (ibid., line 15) though it seems to be an old form for it stands in Qudāma’s received text, v.s. 7.

9. As Navīkat had already been mentioned by our author in his west-to-

---

1 This route is quoted separately from that starting from Tūmkat and running south of the lake, Gardīzī, 89.
2 Entirely different from §12, 2.
3 Gardīzī enables us to check de Goeje’s edition: جَرَن does not refer to the road to Bārshān but to the village near B.njīkat. Read: جَرَن. Qudāma’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 —Sāghūr—with the latter Balā-Sāghūn. According to Kāshghārī, i, 337, Sāghūn was the title of the Qarluq nobles. Cf. Barthold, Balāsāghūn in EI, and his Vorlesungen, 81.
east enumeration, Kirmīn-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 Gardīzī traces the road running from Tūmkat to the south of the Issik-kul. It is probable that the two roads leading from Talās to Barskhān separated at this point (see notes to § 16). The name of the tribe L.bān, as pointed out by Barthold, looks non-Turkish, but Mujmal, i.e., gives the title of the “king of L.bān” Q.tkīn-i L.bān, probably *Out-tegin which is good Turkish.¹ [A possible restoration of the name لبان would be *آنَ (cf. similar mis-spellings in § 10, 46. and § 17, 1.) albān, in Mongol “tribute, service”. Rashid al-dīn, ed. Bérézine, v, 259, mentions a tribe called Albāt (in Mongol albāt is a plural of albān). Another derivative of the same word is alpāghūt or alpā’ūt “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 imjuwa and adapahttutti should be respectively read *inju (“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 Gardīzī on his southern road. Our author drops out the two stages: Jīl [explained as “narrow” = Jīl-ariq at the entrance of the Buam² defile] and Yār, which Gardīzī mentions between Kūmb.rkat (?) and Tūng. Barthold, Report, 56, 114, has identified تویک 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, Barskhān, and Īlāq as enumerated in the Mujmal al-tavārīkh, Tabāqāt-i Nāsiri, tr. Raverty, 872, and Abul-Ghāzī, ed. Desmaisons, 9 (quoted in Barthold, Turkestan, i, 19).

11. This Upper (i.e. farther distant) Barskhān³ is to be distinguished from the Lower (i.e. nearer) Barskhān which, according to I.Kh., 28, lay at 3 farsaks east of Ţarāz (Maq., 275: only at 3 šīha, each equal to half a farsakh). The situation of the Upper Barskhān 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 Barskhān from the Chu valley. Gardīzī and the H.-‘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 Barskhān to the South over the T’ien-shan, v.i. under 15. According to

¹ See it used as a personal name in Gardīzī, 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 Barskhān (and not Nūshjān) was already clear from the Mujmal (v.s. 10.) which after Tūng (*Tong) names another son of Turk: Barskhān. The name is confirmed by Kāshghari, iii, 308: Barsghān (sic).
⁴ Qubā–Osh–Uzgand, then 1 day to the ‘aqaba (Yasi pass leading into the Narin valley); thence 1 day to Atbash (At-bashi, in the Narin basin); thence 6 days to Barskhān.
⁵ V.s., p. 286, l. 25.
Qudāma, 262, the Upper Barskhān (or rather its district) consisted of 4 large towns and 5 small ones.\(^1\) 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. Tomaszek placed Barskhān in the Barskaun valley drained by a river which flows south-west into the Narin. However, both Qudāma and the H.-Ā. are positive in placing the town in the basin of the Issik-kul, i.e. north of the Barskaun watershed, most probably near the present-day Przhevalsk (Qara-qol). As the Barskaun 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-'aqaba) which forms the watershed between Üzgand and the Narin valley. On the other Üzgand river (*Yabāghū), 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. Gardžī, 90, gives him the title of \(\text{M.n.gh}\) which Barthold compares with the name of the Turkish [Soghdian!] ambassador Mavāχ found in Menander, see Fragm. histor. graec., iv, 225, but this seems doubtful. One would rather think of the title \(\text{manaf} (\text{منف})\) common among the Qirghiz. The Mujmal calls the king of Barskhān \(\text{tabīn}\). [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 Bārskhān 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 Toghu-ghuz frontier, our author seems to return to Barskhān from the south-east by the road starting from the Toghu-ghuz country. Following his habit he splits that road into political sections and quotes K.msīghāya, S.tkath, and Ark under the Toghu-ghuz (§ 12, 3.–5.), and Kucha under China (§ 9, 10.). Skipping all these stages he now starts with B.nchūl (which Gardžī, see note to § 12, 3., mentions between Kuchā and Barskhān) and then mentions Aq.rāq.r and Új (of which Kāshgharī, i, 329, says that the Badal-art, i.e. Bedel pass, separated it from Barsgān). 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 Toghu-ghuz and that at the moment to which our source refers it was occupied by some Khirkhīz. On the other

\(^{1}\) See Idrīsi, 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.qrāq.r and 15. Új being still in Khallukh possession. This evidence leads to the conclusion that the author has in view the following sequence of stages: Kuchā-B.nchul-A.qrāq.r-Új-Badal-art-Barskhān, 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'ī-lo was entered and after another 120 li the town of Kū-p'ī-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 northwestern 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 *Yü-chou; thence 60 li to "Ta-shih also called Yü-chou, or also district of Wen-su"; thence 30 li north-west to Su-lou-fêng; thence 40 li to the Po-ta-ling, i.e. Bedel pass.

So far as the distances go Chavannes's first identification of Yü-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, the Hu-lu for the Taushqan river, and Yü-chou [so instead of the impossible Yü-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 Hsüan-Tsang, Po-huan of the T'ang epoch and Idrisi's (sixth century), Wen-su (Han period), and Yü-chou (T'ang period), and seems to connect the names Wen-su (<Ürsük, Ürchük) with Yü-chou (<Üchük, 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-sjuk with final k). This consideration makes, however, no insuperable difficulty for the form Bākhuwān in the H.-Ā. and Gardīzī may stand for *Nūrābād B.nchūk (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 Yü-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 Yāqūt, i, 397, also confirms that Új belonged to the Khallukh.

2 Cf. also Pelliot, La Ville de Bakhouan dans la Géographie d'Idrīsī, in T'oung-Pao, 1906, pp. 553-6, but the origin of the form Bākhucān is still somewhat mysterious, v.i., pp. 295, 297.

3 From Uch-Turfan to Aghacha-qul where the ascent only begins there are 78 versts (= 83 km.), see Kuropatkin, Kashghariya, 1879, p. 366. [On a similar uncertainty of distances in the Chinese itinerary from Aq-su to Kāshghar see Sir A. Stein, Innermost Asia, p. 839.]
Then, so far as the text of the *T'ang-shu is available in Chavannes's translation, *o.c., 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. Jäh, which, if read *aqar-aqar, could mean in Turkish something like "watershed" (usually: *aqar-baqar) and refer to a divide between the Khallukh and their neighbours. More probably the name is distorted. Following on Üzgand, Balāsāghūn, Qochqar-bashi, Barskhān, At-bashi, Ordū (= Kāshghar), and Yārkand, Birūnī, *Canon*, quotes at the very end of the 6th climate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Long.</th>
<th>Lat.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Új</td>
<td>99°20'</td>
<td>45°0'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahme</td>
<td>100°40'</td>
<td>43°30'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yarān</td>
<td>101°40'</td>
<td>44°15'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khanān</td>
<td>102°20'</td>
<td>44°50'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of these the second (and the southernmost) is said to be the *qasaba* of Khotan and the fourth must refer to Kucha. In any case *Bārmān* must be placed to the south-east of Új. Kāshghārī, iii, 272, says: "*يَنجُو* (Yüngü?) is the name of a large river flowing past the township (bulaila*) of Bārmān built by Afrāsiyāb's son² on its bank." In view of these two authorities it is not impossible that in Idrīsī’s usually inaccurate text *Bārmān* stands simply for *Bāmān*. 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 khâqân 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 bâtie sur les bords d'une rivière qui coule vers l'orient. ... De Bakhwan à *f rm.q* 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'êng, i.e. former Uch-Turfan.

² The person in question is certainly Bārmān, brother of Pīrān, son of Visa (*Ṭabarí: Vēsaghān*). The two brothers were only commanders in Afrāsiyāb's army. Pīrān was the prince of Khotan. See *Shāh-nāma*, ed. Mohl, i, 338, ii, 58, iii, 564, 573, 584, Ṭabarí, i, 600 and 610, and *Tha‘ālībī, Ghurar akhbār mulūk al-Furs*, ed. Zotenberg, p. 206.

³ MS. arabe 2222 of the Bib. Nat. in Paris, fol. 120v. reads at this place: *يسنع بهاء من الجديد (الحريد) كلَّ غربة من جميع الصنائع من اتباع المود وب* (و) (التجار) ؛ وغير ذلك. Consequently the specialities of *Bākhwān* were objects in iron and wood. The former were exported as far as Tibet and China. Idrīsī 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 Idrīsī are usually too short.
J.rm.q à Barskhan la supérieure 10 journées.” I presume that our B.njul and Bārmān and Bākhwān 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” (Yāngi-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 Kāshghari’s Yāngi. 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-üstang of which the name strongly reminds one of our Bārmān [local Turks drop r before a consonant, e.g., apa<arpa, see G. Jarring, Studien zu einer Osttürkischen 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-üstang) 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.nchul (B.nchuk?) and its origin cannot yet be finally settled, though, in view of the considerations presented above, the possibility of *B.nchuk<Wen-su(k) cannot be discarded. Gardizī does not mention our 14. and it must have been borrowed by our author from another source which can be traced also in Bīrunī (cf. § 10, 41., § 11, 9., &c.). Kāshghari relied of course on his personal information.

With regard to this section of the road connecting Barskhān with Aq-su, Kuchā, and Chinānjkath, Gardizī, 91, infra, one must also consider Gardizī’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.shkhān 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 it.” Kāshghari, 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 Kāshghari separately speaks of Bādāl-art and Yafghū-art one must conclude to the identity of Azār with بادل (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 Ili basin) connects the Issik-kul with Chinese Turkestan. The name of the river تاغخان 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!
*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 ایوازی ایوانارī most probably stands for ایوانارī attested in two independent authorities (Birūnī and Kāshghari) and confirmed by the present-day name of Pāman-ūstāng. 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 ایوانارī got into Idrīsī’s compilation. Does it attempt to reproduce the Chinese form, perhaps on the authority of the mysterious Jānākh b. Kháqān al-Kīmāki whom Idrīsī 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 ایوانارī may be a mere mis-spelling of ایوانارī (the group -یارan- having been wrongly transcribed as -حوا- if the original ر was written too closely under یا). [See also Appendix B.]

As regards the exact relation between Wen-su (= our *B.ńčük) and Yū-chou (= our Üj) 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 جکل appears from the Persian popular etymology (in chi gil?) quoted in Kāshghari, 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 Chin-u-Chigil nīst bu-yigul 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 Toghuuzghuz.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 Tūls mountains (§ 5, 8.).

Gardźī has two passages on the Chigil. P. 89: “The road⁴ to (Upper) Barskhān from Tūmkat goes to Kūmb.ɾkat (which lies) on the Chigili road; thence to Jīl which is a mountain and the explanation (tafsīr) of jīl is “narrow” [Buan defile through which the Chu flows]; thence 12 farsakhs to Yār which is a village turning out 3,000 men and in it are found the tents of the Taksīn’s Chigil⁵ among whom there are no villages (ābādānī). To

¹ I have finally given up my first idea that T.f.skhān reflected the name of the Tekes river (left affluent of the Ili flowing to the east of the Issik-kul.)

² Cf. Kāshghari, 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. جکل مکسن, restored by Barthold as جکل تکسن which means “the Chigil of the taksīn” rather than “the taksīn of the Chigil” (cf. taksīn-i ʃiɡil, as the Mujmal al-tavārikh calls the king

⁵ For the beginning of the passage v.s. note to § 15, 3.
the left of the road lies the lake of Īsigh-kul &c.” This text ought to be immediately followed by the description of the “road to the Chigil and Tūrgish” 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 Barskhān” passing south of the lake and the other “to the Chigil and Tūrgish” 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>Gardīzl</th>
<th>Navīkat</th>
<th>Gardīzl’s</th>
<th>Mujmal</th>
<th>Kūlb.qār</th>
<th>M.ghlīgha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.njīkat</td>
<td>Z.kāt</td>
<td>Suyāb</td>
<td>Khūtkiylā</td>
<td>Kūlb.qār</td>
<td>M.ghlīgha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.njīkat</td>
<td>Z.kāt</td>
<td>Suyāb</td>
<td>Khūtkiylā</td>
<td>Kūlb.qār</td>
<td>M.ghlīgha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.njīkat</td>
<td>Z.kāt</td>
<td>Suyāb</td>
<td>Khūtkiylā</td>
<td>Kūlb.qār</td>
<td>M.ghlīgha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.njīkat</td>
<td>Z.kāt</td>
<td>Suyāb</td>
<td>Khūtkiylā</td>
<td>Kūlb.qār</td>
<td>M.ghlīgha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The situation behind the mountain, i.e. east of the Kastek pass, is described by Gardīzl as follows: “When you have crossed the pass, to the left of it (i.e. the road?) lies the country of Turkestan (*of the Tūrgish) consisting of the Tukhs and *Az. There lies a village turning out 1,000 men. Close by lies a village Bīglīgh where the *jabūya’s brother lives. . . . Five hundred men mount with him, and if necessary 1,000 men. In the neighbourhood lies a village whose dihqān of local origin (o~~bW>T) is called B.dān-Sānku (or Dān-Sānku); (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 Tūrgish (§ 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 Khallukh 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-croisées 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 كورما ( = Gardīzl’s 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 Ṭarāz (Talas), cf. Maq., 274,¹ 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 Kāshgharī, i, 330, says that the Ghuz used to call “Chigil” all the Turks between the Oxus and Upper China.

¹ Kāshgharī records a legend claiming that originally the name Chigil belonged to this town.
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, Semirechye, 16-18; Otchet, 31; Die alttürkischen Inschriften, 18; Türk, in EI.

Gardzī 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 Khirkhisīyan < Khirkhīz, 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’yč *Tukhsīch in which the ending -īch, or -ch must represent the Iranian suffix of origin. The text, Reichelt, Die sogd. Handschriften, Heidelberg, 1931, ii, 53 and 59, refers to Txs’yč bntk, i.e. to a slave whose personal name was T.khsīch 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 Khirkhīz (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-k’i-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-lè 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 khāqān of the Türgish, ibid., 44, 81-6. The Arabs nicknamed this doughty opponent of theirs Abū Muzāhim, Tabari, ii, 1593, Barthold, Turkestan, p. 187, Gibb, Arab conquests, pp. 60-85.

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 Almaata (Verniy), see Prince Masalsky, Turkestan, p. 777. These lakes (called by the Qirghiz Jasıl “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 Türgish called Kül-chur (Tabari, ii, passim: Kür-şül). After a period of troubles the Qarluq (towards 766) extended their power to the Chu valley and subjected both the Black and Yellow Türgish, 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 Türgish federation could not be destroyed; some of them migrated westwards (§ 19), but some maintained their more remote haunts and probably even enjoyed some autonomy. I.Kh., 31, still knows the Türgish tribe and, p. 29 (= Qudāma, 206), places the town of the [former? Türgish khāqān at 4 farsakhs to the west of Navākat. In the tradition going up to Balkhī (i.e. in Išt. and I. H.) the Türgish 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 Jayhānī (i.e. in the H.-'Ā. and Gardīzī) include some additional details on the destinies of the Türgish. As suggested by Barthold and Marquart, in several passages in Gardīzī (8125, 8416, 10223) one must read Tūrgishān instead of Turkistān. The paragraph on the Khallukh (see notes to § 15) contains the story of how the Khallukh came to live on the territory of the Türgish khāqān and how the power finally passed to them. In the paragraph on the Yaghmā (see notes to § 13) Gardīzī tells how the latter were exploited by the khāqān (of the Türgish) as an offset against the Khallukh, Haytāl, and Kimāk. Finally, in the description of the route to the “Chigil and Türgish” (see notes to § 16) Gardīzī mentions in the Chu valley two (?) dihqāns of Türgish origin and says that to the east of the [Kastek or Kurdai] pass lies the country of “the Türgish (who consist) of Tukhsī and ... إلآران”. A parallel of the second of these names is found only in the H.-'Ā. (v. i. 1) while the first (Tukhsī) is known to the H.-'Ā. (the whole § 17 is devoted to them), to the Mujmal al-tavārīkh (the king of *Tukhsī (?) is called Qütegin, cf. supra, p. 202), to 'Aufī (who includes them together with Chigil, &c. in the Khallukh federation, v.s., § 15), as well as to Kāshghāri. It is curious that the H.-'Ā. and Gardīzī who know very little about the Ili (§ 6, 5.) speak of the Türgish and Tukhsī only in the neighbourhood of the Chu, whereas Kāshghāri, whose ideas of the Chu (iii, 305, 307: Shū) are vague, mentions, i, 85 and 342, the Tukhsī tribe (qabila) on the Ili, where according to him it lived together with the Yaghmā tribe and a clan (tā'īfa) of the Chigil.

1 On the fate of Kür-şül the Arabs and Chinese give different reports, see H. A. R. Gibb, o.c., 91. [Cf. supra, p. 288.]
2 According to the T'ang-shu, Chavannes, o.c., 85-6, apart from the tribes subjected by the Qarluq some tribes joined the Uyghurs; a certain Tê-p'ang-lê became yabghu 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 خاقان التركمی (var. التركمی). یاقین تُرگیش (among others) (in the text). Tabari, ii, 1613, strangely transcribes the name with q ترگشی. Perhaps this place is identical with Sui-shih = Toqmaq (?).
4 See also ibid., i, 28 (in a north-to-south enumeration: Chigil, Tukhsī, Yaghmā); iii, 129: Quyās (*Quyash?) is
1. East of the watershed range Gardīzī mentions “the Türgish (consisting) of Tukhsiyān and أرمان), Our author evidently takes the Tukhs for the successors of the Türgish and the latters’ name no more occurs in the H.-Ä. Of the أرمان (الزر) who are mentioned as the clans of the Tukhs the first most likely represents the same name as أرمان (as well as its companion أرمان) reflects an Arabic form (*بُع) while *بُع Aziyān gives the name in Persian garb (cf. Tukhsiyān, Khallukhiyān, &c.). A name beginning with an l is unlikely in Turkish; therefore *بُع must be further improved into *أرمان al-Aziyya.¹ Already in his earlier Semirechye, 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” (I, E29) and “the people of Az”, as is particularly clear in the following passage (I, N2): az budun yaghī qaldi; qara-koltā sīnūsdīmiz . . . Kūlt-tein . . . az-eltābārig tutdi; az budun anda yag qaldi. “the Az people proved to be in revolt; we fought at the Qara-kūl lake . . . Kūlt-tein captured the eltābār 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 (I, E19) and refers to the revolt of the Türgish qaghan and its repression; immediately after it stands an unfinished sentence in which Bilgā qaghan says: “in order that our ancestors’ land should not remain lordless [I] organized the Az people (az budunigh itip yaratip)”. 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 scissure could be more complicated! Our أرمان might perhaps have a connexion with A-li-shih in which case Gardīzī’s Aziyān would be due to the wrong treatment of initial al- (as in al-Lān<Alān) taken for the Arabic article. This supposition is, however, less probable.

the country of the Tukhsī and Chigil; to it belong three castles: Sābligh Q., Urung Q., and Qara Q.

¹ Cf. § 10, 46. ² Thomsen, ZDMG, 1924, 148, seems to hesitate here between “Az people” and “small people” but the former is better as preparing I, 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 Kirgizen erwähnt werden” with the “Yenisei Ostiaks” 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 I, E38 mentioning a dignitary called az tutuq 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 Qarajiya or Qaraja or Qaraji. In the Orkhon inscriptions (i, E38) the Qara-Türkish are specially mentioned.

2. In Ṭabarî, ii, 1594, Sûyâb is quoted as the starting-point of the expedition of the khâqân Abu Muzâhim (i.e. the Tûrkish Su-lu), and connected with Navâkat and the sacred mountain situated near the latter. According to Gardîzî (see note to § 15, 7.) Sûyâb belonged to the group of three villages of which one (Khûtkiylâl) is distinctly said to have a Tûrkish lord (va û Tûrkish-st). With regard to the dihqân of Sûyâb Gardîzî’s text is out of order unless the passage be restored as: va dihqân-i û barâdar-i *yabghû bâshad *va û Tûrkish-st. The last four words would then run exactly as in the case of Khûtkiylâl, and this would be further confirmed by the inclusion of Sûyâb in our § 17 dealing with the Tûkhs (regarded as the remnants of the Tûrkish). Bayghû as a personal name is possible but here the reference is rather to a rank and bayghû in Arabic script is a constant mis-spelling for yabghû. It must be remembered, however, that this title is usually associated with the Khallukh (cf. § 15) and not with the Tûrkish (cf. also infra 3.). The number of warriors in Sûyâb (20,000) greatly exceeds that given in Gardîzî (500), and possibly our author roughly sums up the forces of all the villages enumerated by Gardîzî on the way to the Chigil (25,300).

According to Gardîzî the Sûyâb group of settlements lay to the left (i.e. north) of Navâkat, evidently on the right bank of the Chu. This Muslim Sûyâb cannot be identical with the Chinese Sui-shih which the T’ang-shu, &c. mentions on the road from the present-day Chinese Turkestan to Tarâz (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, o.c., 10, identifies this town grosso modo with Toqmaq. Cf. also Barthold, Otchet, 31 and Christentum, 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 Gardîzî 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 Kurdai pass. The details can be tabulated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H.-’A.</th>
<th>Gardîzî</th>
<th>Mujîmal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>name</td>
<td>Biglîg</td>
<td>Biglîgh</td>
<td>Athlîgh (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prince</td>
<td>*Yinal-beg-tegin</td>
<td>brother of the j.nûba</td>
<td>Yinal-tegin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forces</td>
<td>3,000</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 Jil-ariq this position does not suit Gardîzî’s indication (“to the left” of the road). I should suggest for Sûyâb a position in the direction of the Kurdai (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 Sughati station.] [As yâb < ab means “water”, Sû-yâb = “the Chu canal”?]
Gardīzī omits to give the title of the prince and only indicates his family relations to some ḥirān,1 as he also calls the lord of Sūyāb (v.s. 2.) bayghu’s brother. Both these forms may reflect the same title yabghū and indicate that Sūyāb and Biglīlīgh were under the control of the same family. In our source both places are quoted under Tukhs (= Tūrgīsh) and we are placed before an alternative: either the Tūrgīsh-Tukhs rulers enjoyed a title similar to yabghu/yabghu of the Khallukh, or Gardīzī introduces some later data suggesting the gradual absorption of the Tukhs by the Khallukh.2

The alternative Soghdian name of Biglīlīgh indicates the presence there of a Soghdian colony, cf. Barthold, On the Soghdian and Tokharian languages (in Russian) in Iran, 1926, i, 35. Our Biglīlīgh looks entirely different from the five villages also inhabited by Soghdians and also ruled by a Bektēgin, but mentioned (§ 12, 6.) under Toghuţghuzhuţ.

4. According to the order of enumeration this village ought to be the easternmost of the Tukhs possessions. Gardīzī speaks of a village lying in the neighbourhood of Biglīgh whose dihqan B.dān Sāngū 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 Īrkath for a repetition of Īzkat (§ 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 Kimāk


The legend quoted by Gardīzī, 82–3, shows that the Kimāk were supposed to have separated from the Tatār. The eponyms of the original seven clans were: Īmī, Imāk, Tatār, Bayāndur, Khīfchāq, *Nilqāz,3 and j.nūba (*jabbūya) stands in Gardīzī, 829, as the title of the first Khallukh chief who succeeded to the last (Tūrgīsh) khāqān. Just before, 829, the title given to the Khallukh ruler is spelt خربيري. On the different forms of yabghū see Marquart, Erānsahr, 247, Wehrōt, 143, Provincial capitals, 10: the Middle Persian text gives Yabbū(ī)-

1 The same form j.nūba (*jabbūya) stands in Gardīzī, 829, as the title of the first Khallukh chief who succeeded to the last (Tūrgīsh) khāqān. Just before, 829, the title given to the Khallukh ruler is spelt خربيري. On the different forms of yabghū see Marquart, Erānsahr, 247, Wehrōt, 143, Provincial capitals, 10: the Middle Persian text gives Yabbū(ī)-

khakān. Cf. also Armenian jebu-khak’an. [V.s. note to § 15.]

2 The latter assumption would contradict our emendation of the text *ca ū Turgiši-st.

3 So instead of Lniqāz; the clan Nilqaz is still known among the Shāh- sevān of Sāwa; see Minorsky, Sāwa in EI.
The Kimâk

Ajład (?). Our source seems to suggest that there were eleven divisions of the tribe. The name Kimâk (to be pronounced Kimâk), according to Marquart, is an abbreviation of Iki-Imâk “the two Imâk” (probably with reference to the first two clans of the federation). Kâshgharî no longer knows the Kimâk, but only the Yamâk (*Yimâk), of whom he says, iii, 22, that “with us they are (considered as) Qifchâq, but the Qifchâq Turks consider themselves as a different group (hîzb)”; this statement shows that the process of regrouping the remnants of the Kimâk federation had already been accomplished under the leadership of the new influential tribe, the Qipchaq (§ 21).

It is no easy task to locate the Kimâk 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 Gardîzlī 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 disemboguing into the north-eastern corner of the Caspian. Finally, it is possible that Gardîzlī who is our chief authority for the route to the Kimâk has amalgamated several variants of the itinerary.

As regards the frontiers our source says that the eastern neighbours of the Kimâk are the Khirkhîz (confirmed under § 14), whereas ‘Aufî (cf. note to § 14), locates the Kimâk north of the Khirkhîz. In fact, with the Kimâk, our author, too, launches on the description of the northernmost belt of Turkish tribes: Kimâk, Ghûz, Pecheneg, Khîfchakh, and Majgharî, and we shall see the important conclusions to be drawn from this arrangement with regard to the location of the Majgharî (§ 22). That the “Artush” and the “Ãtil” are placed south of the Kimâk only means that the Kimâk lived beyond these rivers. [Moreover لآ at this place may be a simple misunderstanding for نآملاس/رس.][2] The bearing of the Khîfchakh and the Northern lands, both located “to the west of the Kimâk”, must be taken as meaning north-west. All seems to indicate that the principal territory of the Kimâk lay in Western Siberia, north of the Irtish, say up to the Obi. Gardîzlī says that the land of the Kimâk is very cold and that in winter their horses are taken to the place òk-tagh in the country اراغ (perhaps اراغ, 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 Rûs frontier and the

1 Or twelve if the khâqân had a clan of his own.
2 See however note to § 6, 43. on the Volga rising from the Altai (!).
3 On Kâshgharî’s Map the rivers (from south to north)Ilâ, Art.sh, a nameless river, and Y.mâr are represented as emptying into a lake. The Y mâk (Yimâk, a clan of our Kimâk) are shown on the left bank of the Art.sh, and the J.m.l and Qây on the nameless river. *Yumâr = 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 Khifchākh 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.mlīkath, 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 Ṭarāz (§ 25, 93.) the starting point of the route to the residence of the Kimāk king. The position of the first stage on the road (کراکك, كریکك), and consequently the initial direction of the route, are still dark, but Qudāma, 20510 and 26216, distinctly says that to the left, i.e. north of the road Ṭarāz-Kūlān lies a sand desert which stretches up to the territory of the Kimāk. The fact that the traveller before setting out from *Kuvēkat 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 Ṭarāz 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 Gardīzī, 83. It started from an entirely different point (some 850 Km. to the north-west of Ṭarāz as the crow flies) and its successive stretches were as follows:

a. from Pārāb (spelt باره, اسقرق) to Dih-i Nau (§ 26, 29.);
b. a river and the sands called (سقوق) or (عوبق) are crossed;
c. the river (سقوق) 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 (سقوق) of which the waters are black and which flows from the east to the Ṭabaristān (Caspian) sea;
f. from the Asus to the following river (سقوق) where the Kimāk frontier begins. This river is large and its waters are black.

Marquart, Komanen, 205, takes سقوق for the Sari-su, which flows from
KİMÄK-GHÚZ TERRITORY
[ad § 18]
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 Ishim *Awash and finally traces the road to the Irtish in the direction of Pavlodar. This is a very ingenious suggestion. The identification of K.nāv.r (perhaps *Kānd-ūr for Kāndūr) 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 Sar-Is coming from this mountain: Sari-Kāngir and Qara-Kāngir have some remote likeness to *Kāndūr. However, we must bear in mind the fact that the starting-point of Gardīzī’s route is Dih-i Nau = Yāngi-kānd = Qaryat al-hadītha which lay near the present-day Kazalinsk, some 280 Km. downstream from Perovsk! To follow the Sar-Is there would have been no need to descend the Sir-darya to the neighbourhood of its estuary. If we accept Gardīzī’s initial point we must rather trace the route northwards of Kazalinsk, taking the first river \( b \) for the Irghiz, and the *Suquq \( c \) for the Turghay;\(^2\) 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 Irtish. 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 Gardīzī’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.\(^3\)

Until now we have proceeded on the supposition that Arsh stands for the Irtish, contrary to the description of the course of the Asus in Gardīzī, and of the Arsh in our author, where these rivers are represented as considerably increased.\(^1\)

\(^1\) V.s., note to § 5, 12. Near Qarqarali (§ 18, 2) stands the peak of Kand \( 4,644 \) 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 Kandāyur-08].

\(^2\) As in Abul-Ghāzī’s text (v.i. 3) which already Marquart interpreted as a Turkish word for “cold”. In this case the probability of my explanation of Gardīzī’s itinerary (as running along the Irgizh and Turghay rivers) is considerably increased.\(^3\)

\(^3\) Semenov, o.c., 354-5, mentions a road connecting Atbasar situated on the Upper Ishim (still at circa 450 Km. from the nearest point of the Irtish) with the Ulu-tau (circa 400 Kms.), and then running in a southern direction to the village of Suzak lying to the east of the Jaxartes, more or less in the direction of the ancient Tarāz (another 625 Km.). Some 50 Kms. to the south of the Ulu-tau are situated three tombs of the 19th-century Khans of the Qazaq (i.e. “Qirghiz” according to the terminology used before 1917). This Atbasar-Suzak road is a very interesting parallel to the “Kimāk road”, at least as described by the earlier geographers.
flowing westwards. In this latter case the two rivers would eventually be the Ilāk and the Yayiq (see notes to § 6, 41. and 42.) and the route should be imagined as running north-westwards.¹

1. 2. “Andar az Khifjāq” formed evidently the north-western march of the Kimāk territory, while Qarqarkhān (?) was the southern march of it. If the words about the Irtish flowing “between” the Kimāk and the Ghūz are not to be interpreted too strictly, one may think of Qarqarali, 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-Khifchaqia”, but if az replaces here an idāfat the term may mean “The inner (part) of Khifchaq”. [Cf. H-Ā, fol. 3a13a].

3. The location of Y.ghsūn-yāsū depends upon the identification of the two rivers. The real Irtish and Volga lie too wide apart. Moreover in § 18, 3.ジェル, through a graphic mistake, may stand for the river mentioned in § 6, 41.

[Additional note. The complex ينون ياسو to some extent resembles the names of the two northernmost peoples known to the Muslims respectively as "Ij,, (or Ij) and (or Ij), see references in Marquart, Arktische Länder. In Birūni’s Canon the two peoples are mentioned at the very end of the table of co-ordinates, after the 7th climate. (بلد السر (ثلا يسو has the caption: “the Bulghārī trade with them”, and the other people is described as follows: ghiyād Yūra wa hum mutawahhishūn yutā-jirūna mu’āyanatan” the forests of the Yūra, who are wild and trade by bartering the objects placed on sight”.

The Wisū are usually identified with the Finnish Ves’ (see note to § 44), and the Yūghra with the Ugrian Ostiaks and Voguls (v. i., § 22).

In the year A.D. 1216 Khwārazm-shāh Muhammad led an expedition against Qadir-khan, leader of the Qanqli.² Guzgānī, as available in Raverty’s translation, p. 267, says that he “penetrated as far as Yīghur of Turkistān, 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 Faḍlān’s report (Yāqūt, i, 755–6) were current among the Muslims.

Whether the Khwārazm-shāh really went so far north is another question. Of the authors speaking of the same campaign Nasawī, ed. Houdas, p. 9, mentions on this occasion مارغز "river Irghiz", and Juvaynī, i, 101, speaks of the Qara-qum occupied by the Qanqli (قراقيم ك موضوع) ¹

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) بی ساری *Qanqliyān-i Tatār būd. The Qanqli were closely associated with the Qipchaq, cf. Barthold, Vorlesungen, 114 and 116. The latter formerly belonged to the Kimāk federation which according to Gardīzi included a Tatār division (to be distinguished from the later Mongols!). Therefore the combination of names in Guzgānī is quite plausible. On the connexion of Qadir-khan with the “Yimāk” cf. Raverty, p. 1097.
and of two rivers Ірғиз cannot be one of the more northern Ірғиз rivers flowing to the Volga downstream from Samara; in Abul-Ghāzī, ed. Desmaisons, p. 10, Shiban's ulus, of which the western limits were the Yayiq and the Ṣīr-daryā, comprised both the Ірғиз-Ṣaqūq and the Qara-qūm which must respectively correspond to the names quoted by Nasawī and Juvaynī and refer to the same locality.

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 Khwārazm-shāh's chancery, Barthold, Turkestan, 370, (and texts i, 79) the Khwārazm-shāh records the submission of Alp-Qara with all the Qifchaq tribe, adding that he sent to the king's camp his eldest son with a large number of (var. یوجب راذگان). Very probably another reference to the name is found in Mas'ūdī, Murūj, 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 یوجب. Instead of Marquart's restoration *Kimāk-yāgbhuy (going counter to Gardīzī, 83, who calls the chief of the Kimāk shad-tutuq) I should restore this name as *Kimāk-Yighur (یوجب) and compare it with Guzgānī's یوجب and the just quoted.

According to Mas'ūdī's text this was the name of a Kimāk territory, or of a Kimāk division. The expression Yūghūr-zāda (= *banū Yūghūr) 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 Kimāk tribe had nothing to do with the northern Yūghra.

The fact that our is described as lying between the Ātil (*Asus?) and Irtish (Artush) is reminiscient of the natural conditions described in the Murūj, i, 213, and at least our § 6, 42. is identical with one of Mas'ūdī's rivers. The first element can very easily be improved into *ینور (the may have been mis-read from a longish joint between یوجب and یوجب). More difficult is یانب. As in Turkish yasl means "broad, wide", could it have stood here for "a plain"? The fact is that ینور is attested as the name of a town on the Yaxartes since at least the twelfth century, see Barthold, Vorlesungen, p. 141.]

very probably *ینور for the distance of 80 days see I.Kh., 28, who counts from Ţarāz to 7 farsakhs and thence 80 days to the residence (maudī) of the Kimāk king, ditto in Qudāma, 209, 262.

5. Dih-i Chūb (§ 6, 42. and 43. Dih-i Chūbin) "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-qūm sands lie to the south-west of the Chalqar lake into which the Ірғиз 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. 129b) and Add. 25. 785 (fol. 145a) stands یوجب one would think that the original had یوجب.
§ 19. The Ghuz


§§ 19–22 describe a special group of northern “Turkish” tribes adjoining the Ural region. See Map vii.

The Ghuz (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 Kāshghari, i, 56–8). The infiltration of Turkish (Oghuz) tribes in the direction of Transoxiana and Khorāsān 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 Şūl of Dihistān, cf. Mar­quart, *Erānsahr*, 73, Barthold, *Turkmeniya*, pp. 12–13); on a similar early migration of the Khalaj see note to § 24, 22. An important movement of the Ghuz (Oghuz) was caused by the Qarluq occupation of the territories previously possessed by Western Turks (Türgish), 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 Sulṭān Sanjar, Ibn al-Athīr, xi, 117 (year 548/1153), says: “Some historians of Khorāsān 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 Mahdi (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 Khāqānian 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 Ghuz were chiefly known under the name Türkman of which the most likely interpretation is that offered by Jean Deny, *Grammaire de la langue turque*, 1921, p. 326, according to which Türk-mān is formed with the “augmentative” suffix man/mān having in Turkish an intensifying or aggrandizing sense (*qoja-man* “huge”); according to this theory Türkman 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 (Ov£) the name Tork < Türk connected with the T’u-chüeh. Cf. Aristov, *Zametki*, 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 (Artush) down to the Wooden Village (§ 18, 5.) separated the Kimāk from the Ghūz, but he adds (§ 18) that in winter the Kimāk visited the Ghuz territory.¹ Gardlzī, 107, also places the Kimāk country beyond the Irtish but without any reference to the Ghūz. It is difficult to see how the Volga could constitute the frontier of the Ghūz 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 Masʿūdī, Murūj, 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 1st., 9, who places it between the Khazar, the Kimāk, the Kharlukh lands, the Bulghār, and the Islamic lands along the line Jurjān (Gurgān)–Fārāb–Ispījāb.

The historical situation in the steppes stretching between the Irtish and Volga is still insufficiently known. On the way from Gurgānj to the Pechenegs running west of the Aral Sea Gardīzī, 95, omits to mention the Ghuz but he does not mention any other tribe either. On the other hand, Ibn Ṣadīlān, who in the spring of A.D. 929 travelled approximately the same way from Khwārazm to Bulghār, found the Ghuzz in the region between the Üst-yurt (plateau between the Aral Sea and the Caspian) and the river Jām identified by A. Z. Validi, o.c., 246, with the Emba.² Beyond the Jām the traveller found the Bāshghurt patrols.

In § 19 the author says that the Ghūz 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 Ghūz king. The source of this latter passage may be common with that of I.H., 393. Ibn Ṣadīlān, see A. Z. Validi, o.c., 245, styles the king of the Ghuzz yabghū and his viceroy kūdarqin (?).

The source of the characteristics of the Ghūz is uncertain. Gardīzī, 81, who has no special chapter on the Ghūz, only mentions their eponym 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 Misʿār b. Muḥāhil, in Yāqūt, iii, 448, the rain-magnet (hijāra wa hiya maghnāfī al-matār) belonged to the Kimāk.

§ 20. The Turkish Pechenegs

V. G. Vasilyevsky, Byzantium and the Pechenegs (in Russian) in the author’s Trudi, SPb., 1908, i, 1–175; P. Golubovsky, The Pechenegs, Torks, Juvaynī, cf. printed edition, ii, 88 (where Ilak-Turkmān must be substituted for Ilak-Turkān); cf. also Gardīzī, ed. M. Nāẓim, p. 8519.¹

¹ In Masʿūdī, Murūj, i, 213, the Ghuzz are placed on the Black Irtish and the White Irtish, though the latter is described as the territory of the *Kimāk-Yīghūr (v.s., p. 310).

² Abul-Ghāzī, p. 92, has  for the Emba.

§§ 20 and 22, as well as 43–4 and 48–52, find close parallels in the respective chapters of I.R., Gardízí, Bakri, and 'Aufī 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 παρξανακίται were first between the Volga (\(\text{Ατήλα}\)) and Yayiq (\(\text{Ἐγκώ}\), the “Ural river”) where they had for neighbours the *Majars* (\(\text{Μαξάρους}\)) and the Oghuz (\(\text{Οὔζ}\)). Fifty-five years before the composition of the book (written a.d. 948) 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) 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 Distra 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 Bachanāk (Pecheneg) 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).

1 Cf. Ibn Faḍlān on the Bāshghurt = Majghār, v.s., p. 312, line 19.

2 In 889, according to Reginonis Abbatis Prumensis Chronicon. Cf. Németh, o.c., p. 48.

3 More precisely the region which Constantine calls Λεβδεία and which must be located somewhere north of the Azov sea, its river Χίδμασ alias Χιγγουλούσ 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.
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 'Aufti’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 (μεξοτι τοῦ νῦν) some of the Pechenegs (τυκεῖς εἰς 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 Gurganj (in Khwârazm) to the Pechenegs which touched the Khwârazmian 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 Qipchâq, towards the southwest (at 10 days’ distance) the Khazars, and to the west the Slavs (sic). This picture is entirely different from what Ibn Fadlan as an eye-witness found in 922. He met the Pechenegs to the south of the river ḡ (A. Z. Validi: *Jayikh = Yayiq) 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 Bulghâr 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 Barâdhâs are mentioned to the south of the Pechenegs. In § 19 the Atil (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 Urals down to the right (western) bank of the Volga? Still more embarrassing is § 6, 45.

¹ i.e. the Chink of the Úst-yurt. Bakrî, 42, places the mountain at 10 farsakhs from Gurgânî.
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.
according to which the enigmatic Rūtā river (flowing westwards!) rises from a mountain on the frontier between the Pechenegs, Majgharī, and Rūs. Such an involved idea would be comprehensible to some extent only if the author imagined that the Pechenegs and Majgharī, 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 Ghuz and Khazar. Gardīzī’s text (v. i.) is also clear in this respect.

§ 21. The Khifchākh (Qipchaq)

Marquart’s Komanen is a special study on the origin and destinies of the Komans-Qipchaqs; though containing a prodigious mass of rare materials and many valuable suggestions it remains in the author’s own words, p. 206, only spade-work (“Pionierarbeit”); cf. important critical remarks by Pelliot in Jour. As., avril 1920, pp. 125–86, and by Barthold, Russ. istor. zhurnal, vii, 1921, pp. 131–56. See also Barthold, Kipčak in EI, A. Bruce Boswell, The Kipchak Turks, in The Slavonic Review, vi, 1927, pp. 68–85 (popular article), and D. Rasovsky, Polovtsi, in Seminarium Kondakovianum, vii, 1935, pp. 1–18 (to be continued) with a very good European bibliography [part ii, ibid., viii, 1936, pp. 19–40].

The name Khifshākh < Khifchākh, Qipchaq is already attested in I.Kh., 31. The Russians called the Qipchaq Polocesti (from нёдовяй “yellowish, sallow”) to which name in western languages correspond the terms: Pallidi, Falones, Valani, Valwen, &c. This group of names has no correspondence in Muslim literature.² Another name under which the Qipchaq were known in the Byzantine empire and Western Europe is Kómaνον, Comani, Commanni, which is also found in Idrīsī, who (perhaps quoting from a European source)³ calls the Qipchaq قمانين and their land قمانية (Jaubert’s translation, ii, 395, 399, &c.). The identity of all these appellations is clear from Rubruquis (Paris, 1839, p. 247): “Commani qui dicuntur Capthat

¹ If the Pechenegs lived north of the Burtās (i.e. Bulghār) and Barādhās, how could they neighbour on the Ghūz along the Volga, unless under Ātil we have to understand the Kama? But this surmise would create new difficulties. According to Mas’ūdi, Tanbih, 160, the operation zone of the Pechenegs extended (at some time?) down to the Aral Sea.

² But v. i., p. 317, Barthold’s interpretation of Sāri.

³ One must, however, keep in mind the still insufficiently explained names (أوفونم، أووفونم) which Gardīzī quotes on the road to the Kimāk (see note to § 18) and (variants and فأئي) given by Rashid al-din, ed. Bérezine, Trud. V.O., vii, 162, as the name of the tenth tribe of the Uyghurs, cf. Marquart, Komanen, 91 and 58.
[*Qipchaq]; a Teutonicis vero dicuntur Valani [read: Falami] et provincia Valania [read: Falania].” The origin of the names Coman-/Qoman remains dark (cf. note to § 14, 1.). The name Qoman (still suspect!) to which Marquart attaches such an exceptional importance might explain the Magyar form Kün but it does not account for Qoman. Even without taking Qoman into consideration we can imagine the derivation of Magyar Kün from Qoman but there is no explanation for the expansion of an earlier *Qun into Qoman, simultaneously with its supposed survival (?) as Kün in Magyar.

Like the Khirkhīz, Kimāk, and Rūs the Khifchākh 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 Rūs river (Volga above its junction with Kama?) skirted the Khifchākh confines.² Were then the Qipchaq imagined to live down-stream from the Rūs 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 Gardīzī, who uses much the same materials, distinctly says that the Khifchāq 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.

Gardīzī, 82, mentions the Khifchākh as one of the seven tribes of the Kimāk. Our author seems to refer to a later stage of the Khifchākh emancipation: he admits the vassal dependence of their king upon the Kimāk but considers the Khifchākh as a special tribe, maybe separated from the Kimāk by the territory called Andar az Khifchākh. To what an extent the form of association of the Qipchaq with the Kimāk was changed towards the end of the eleventh century is witnessed by the quotation from Kāshghari (iii, 22), v.s., p. 305, which shows the Yimāk, i.e. presumably one of the two original clans of the Kimāk, as a kind of poor relatives of the Qipchaq. In A.D. 1318 al-Warrāq quotes the Yimāk 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 Ghūz 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 (= Ghūz) and the Polovtsi (= Qipchaq). The former were evidently fleeing under the pressure of the latter. Henceforth for 170 years up to the Mongol invasion only on the right bank of the Volga. [Or should we read eastern, instead of northern, boundary, cf. supra note 1.]

² On the other hand the northern boundary of the Turkish Pechenegs was the mysterious river Rūthā (§ 6, 45.) which is not mentioned in connexion with the Khifchākh. We may imagine then that, on our author's Map, the Rūthā divided the Rūs and Pechenegs east (or should we read western?) 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.]
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§ 21
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 Gardzī the original Kimāk separated from the Tatār (following Marquart, o.c., 95, in the seventh century); for a second time the Qūn, a clan of the Mongolian Marqa mentioned in 'Aufī (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 Yūan-shih: *Kin ch’a) 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 'Aufī’s much discussed passage the chain of moves among the nomadic tribes is opened by the invasion of the Qūn (Q.rī) into the Sārī land (samīn-i Sārī). The inhabitants of Sārī (ahl-i Sārī)1 press the Ghuz-Türkmāns and the latter move into the southern seats of the Pechenegs (§ 47). Barthold in his review of Marquart’s Komanen thinks that by Sārī 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 (Yāh Oưčot) and gave their own name (Dasht-i Khifchākh) to the steppes formerly associated with the name of the Ghuzz. Barthold even suggests that sārī<sari, 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’uchüeh, v.s., § 17.]

Against Barthold’s hypothesis is the fact that in ‘Aufī’s text ahl-i Sārī can only be interpreted as “people of [the territory called] Sārī”. However, the name of the Sārī-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 Sārī-su (notes to § 18) lay the sands called by the Turks اورونم (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 Sārī” were not different from the “Qomans” (= Qipchaq).

§ 22. The Majghari

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, Basdjird, in EI; J. Németh, Magna Hungaria, in Mžik, Beiträge, pp. 92–6; Németh Gyula,

1 The text as it stands does not suggest any leadership of the Qūn over the people of Sārī.
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 Magyar 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 Bashqir 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 Bildungsprocesses 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 Majgharī, Basjirt, and other similar names2 Arab and Persian authors speak of two distinct groups, *viz.* 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 Bulghārs 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 Ossets see now Hannes Skold, *Die ossetischen Lehntörter 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.]


3 Moravcsik, *o.c.*, 89, thinks that this migration took place simultaneously with the westward trek of the Onoghun-durs (§ 53) about the middle of the 7th century.

4 Németh explains it as *bāsh-ghur* “Five tribes” [?].
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. Kāshgharl 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 Bulghāra” (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 (Koutrouγερματου = Hung. Kūrt + Gyarmat = Bashq. Yurmatu; Γενάχ = Hung. Jenő = Bashq. Yeney). See Németh, Magna Hungaria.

The clearest and simplest presentation of the case in Muslim sources is found in Iṣṭ., 2253, who says: “there are two classes of Basjirt (سجزت). 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 (mashājīr); 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, Gardīzī, 98, and Bakrī, ed. Rosen, 45, who under the name Majgharī mechanically string together the information referring to two different territories and most probably derived from different sources (Muslim al-Jarmī, Hārun 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 Majgharī in the north

¹ In the curious legend on the formation of the Khirkhīz, Gardīzī, 85, says that their ancestor after having been obliged to leave the court of the Khazar-khāqān joined Bashjīrt 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) majzūr quoted in the series Toghuzghuz–Kharlukh–Kimāk–Ghuzz–f.f.r–Baja–nāk–Türkish stands for majzūr rather than for *majzīr supposed by de Goeje and Marquart to represent Chigil. The same consideration may apply to Mas'ūdī's (Murūj, i, 288): یسرات (majzūr). On other passages in Mas'ūdī relative to the Magyars see Marquart, Streifzüge, and our notes to § 53. In principle I. Kh. 31, could hardly mention the little-known Čaqīr, or render Čigil by *Čighir].

³ In another passage Iṣṭ., 227, reckons from the Pechenegs to the Inner Basjīrt 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 Basjīrt al-dākhīl is Bulghār al-dākhīl (i.e. the Danubian Bulghār) mentioned in Iṣṭ., 226 (v.i. § 45). In Mongol times the Magyars occupying their present seats in Hungary were still called باشجیرت, cf. Juwaynī, 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 Gardizī's text is given without the final sentences.
between the *Pecheneg [our "Turkish Pecheneg"] country and the Bulghär tribe of Asgil/Ashkil (see § 51). In a later part (B) they describe an extensive Majgharî territory reaching down to the Black Sea. However, in a more detailed description of this southern country the three authors disagree. I.R. and Gardîzî (B 1) place the Majgharî between two large rivers disemboguing into the Rûm Sea, and in connexion with this land Gardîzî particularly names the peoples *nd.r and *rât. On the other hand, Bakrî (B 2) says nothing about the rivers and as the neighbours of the Majgharî quotes the and undoubtedly connected with the Caucasus, cf. notes to § 50, 4. Contrary to Marquart¹ I am inclined to think that, even supposing that I.R. (B 1 a) has in view the Αβδδα home of the Magyars near the Azov see, Gardîzî (B 1 b) refers to the 'Ατελκου宵 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 Gardîzî and in the *-. 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. and Mirvût (§ 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. Abî Muslim al-Jarmî (see notes to § 42) and one particular detail is in favour of its association with the name of Hârûn b. Yahyâ (see note to § 42, 17.).]

The best introduction to our text is Gardîzî’s passage which is not only illustrative for the tradition (B1) but which also contains details (B 1 b) on the neighbours of the Majgharî found nowhere else except in the *-. 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 Bulkâr [read as in I.R. and Bakrî: *Pecheneg, cf. also § 6, 45.] country and that of the Asgil who are also of the Bulkâr lie the frontiers of the Majgharî.³ They are a class of 'Turks and their sâlar (has) 20,000 horse. They call this sâlar *nda and this is the name of their greater king, (whereas) the sâlar who makes the appointments (shughlîhî khwânad) is called *ula and the Majgharî do whatever he orders them. They possess a wide plain all covered with grass. Their country is 100 farsakh by 100 farsakh. Their country adjoins the Rûm Sea into which flow two large rivers [instead of read: جزوح and they live between these two streams (م‌ان] and when (C. *) winter comes those who had gone far from the river (jayhūn) come

¹ Cf. also Masˈudi, v.i., notes to § 53.
² Marquart’s attempt to identify these two pairs of names (Streifzüge, 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 Majgharî, 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 Saqlāb (country) there is a tribe of Rūm who are all Christians. They are called N.nd.r. They are more numerous than the Majgharī but weaker than they. And of these two jayhūns the one is called Atil (jīl) and the other Dūbah (jīb) and when the Majgharī are on the bank of the river they see the N.nd.rians. Above (zabar; C. zīr: ‘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 (razān; in C. the text is slightly disturbed). Their water flows on the surface and they have no underground canals (kāriz). 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 Majgharī flows to the Saqlāb and thence to the Khazar lands and that river is the largest of the two (va ān rūd az in har du rūd buzurgtār-ast). The country of the Majgharī is all trees and marshes (ābgīr ‘lakes’?) and the soil is damp. They always vanquish the Saqlāb and constantly impose tribute on them and treat them as their slaves. The Majgharī are fire-worshippers and raid the Saqlāb and Rūs and bring captives (barda) from them. They take them to Rūm for sale. These Majgharī are handsome and pleasant looking. They dress in satin (dībā). Their arms are embellished with silver and gold (instead of jīja).* They constantly go to sack the Saqlāb and from the Majgharī to the Saqlāb there is a distance of ten days.”

The crucial point is the identification of the two rivers which Gardīzī, 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 Majgharī, i.e. evidently on their west, because the peoples living beyond it lived in the direction of the Saqlāb, one of the westernmost peoples of Eastern Europe (§ 43). This makes it evident that the river ِدوُ (Dūnā, “Danube”) instead of ِدوُ. As regards the river flowing “to the

1 I.R., 143, mentions كَرْتش as the point where the Majgharī slave-traders were met by the Byzantine merchants. If this place (cf. § 3, 6. and 8. and § 42 15.) is كَرْتش (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 Magyar attacks only on the Slavs. Gardīzī’s variants may reflect an influence of his special “N.nd.r-M.rdāt” 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 رَوْنَاد/Đưnā
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, Streifzüge, 32, quotes the Hungarian chronicler Simon de Keza according to whom the Hungarians called the Don Etul.1 This may be a hint for the identification of Gardizī’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 Ἀτηλκοῦξοῦ explained as “(the land) between the rivers”, see Marquart, Streifzüge, 33. If the element κοῦξοῦ corresponds to Magyar köző, köse “terra intermedia”, the first element is undoubtedly atil taken in the sense of a river (cf. jayhūn).2 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 Gardizī’s Atil perhaps be an echo of the term Atelkuzu?3

Coming now to the H.-‘Ā. we see that its author with regard to the Majgharī territory followed exclusively the tradition A and entirely disregarded the tradition B. He places the Majgharī near the Ural mountains as the last territory in the series of the northern Turkish lands (§§ 18–22, east to west: Kimāk, Ghūz, Turkish Pechenegs, Khifchākh, Majgharī). 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: Saqlāb, Rūs, Inner Bulghārs, Mirvāt, Khazarian Pechenegs, Alān, Sarīr) 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, Burṭās, Barādhās, and V.n. nd.r. Cf. Map xii.

Our author undoubtedly represents the same tradition as I.R., Gardizī, and Bakrī, and in his sources certainly the two different Majgharī 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 Gardizī mentions the people N. nd.r screened by a mountain from another people M. rdāt. These peoples are also described in our text: the Majgharī to the Danube, cf. Kokovtsov, o.c., pp. 75 and 92, but this document is suspect.  

1 Cf. I.Kh., 54, on the Tanais, "the river of the Saqāliba" which the Rūs merchants follow before reaching the Khazar capital.

2 See in Volga-Turkish dialects, Yayiq-itili, Vātkā-itili, Ag-idil, &c. Cf. Marquart in Ungar. Jahrh., ix/1, 1929, p. 96. [The word is said to be of Chuvash (<Bulghār) origin.]

3 If Dūbā 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 *Dūnā 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 Jayhūn”, which gives a better sense. Cf. 'Aufī, v.i, p. 324.]
are the northern neighbours of the $V.n.n.d.r$ (§ 53) and the Mirvāt (§ 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 Majghāri, V.n.nd.r, and Mirvāt are disposed in a north-to-south direction, so that, instead of the Majghāri, the Mirvāt 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 “Majghāri” and as a matter of fact belonging mostly to the southern Magyars.

Population: 20,000, as in I.R. and Gardīzī.
Country: $150 \times 110$ farsakhs; Gardīzī and Bakrī: $100 \times 100$ farsakhs; I.R.: “extensive country”.
The King’s name: خل (read: چل). I.R. and Gardīzī, کنده principal king, but چل real administrative chief; Bakrī, title چل.
The Majghāri live on fish. Ditto in Gardīzī, but I.R. and Gardīzī 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 Majghāri?].
Trees and waters, as in I.R. and Gardīzī.
Good-looking, as in Gardīzī.
Victorious wars against “infidel” neighbours. I.R.: dominate over the Slavs (several details on slave trade); Gardīzī: raid the Slavs and Rūs.

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 خل is explained by the confusion of the final $i$ with $i$. The name is certainly چل $*Jula$, cf. Const. Porph., chap. 40, pp. 174-5: Υλάς and Hungarian Gyula. Our author omits the name of the chief of executive power کندā for which Const. Porph. strangely gives کارخاس (perhaps: کارخان-). 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: کند خاقان (“k.nd.r khāqān” or “the

¹ On its disturbing influence, cf. note to § 6, 45.
² It is true that the Rūs are mentioned as the western and northern neighbours of the Majghāri. In § 6, 45. the river Rūtā rises strangely from a mountain situated between the Majghāri, the Rūs, 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 (= Hungarianl). According to N. P. Barsov, Ocherk russkoy istoricheskoy geogr., Warsaw 1885, p. 241, Ugra lay on the road connecting the Dniep with the Volga.] See Map xii.
khāqān’s k nd.r”, Yāqūt, ii, 436–40 (after Ibn Faḍlān). Munkacsi, in Keleti Szemle, x, 1909, pp. 179–80, compares it with kündi/kündū which the Altai Turks in quite recent times used to give to their dignitary next in rank to their ruler (zaysan).1

[Additional note. In his Streifzüge, 161, 164, Marquart, misled by the idea that the two pairs of names “N.nd.r and M.rdāt” and “Ţwlās and *Aughas” were identical (cf. § 50, 4.) came to the conclusion that the river ҏوا was “Kuban”. In Komanen, 99, Marquart was less categorical and wrote with reference to our ړوا (which he found in Toumansky’s translation, Zap., x, 1897): “Auf die Frage, welcher Fluss unter dem ړوا 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 ‘Aufī und der Hudūd al-Ālam nicht veröffentlicht sind.”

We have commented on the identity of the names Dūbā/Rūtā/Rūthā (§ 6, 45.) as resulting from the comparison of the H.-‘Ā. with the other sources and may add that ‘Aufī does not contain any important new data on the subject. Here is the passage on the Magyars (mis-spelt مَهرو) according to Brit. Mus., Or. 2676, fol. 67v.). ‘Aufī first quotes the well-known data on the vastness of the Magyars’ country (100 x 100 farsakhs), on their 20,000 horse and on the ra’is called K nda, adding that the Magyars own tents (khargāh) and wander with their herds. Then he goes on: 

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 Jayhūn. 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

Tomaschek, Zur historischen Topographie von Persien, I: Die Strassenzüge der Tabula Peutingeriana, in Sitz. WAW, cii, Heft 1, 1883, pp. 213–89; Marquart, Ėrānsahr, pp. 47–94 (additions in the author’s Armenische Streifen in Huschardzan (Festschrift . . . der Meichtaristen-Kongregation),

1 In the Shāh-nāma, ed. Mohl, iii, 76, 179, 190, &c., K.nd.r is the name of a Saqlāb hero fighting in the Tūrānian army on the right hand of the khāqān. [The name of the mountain كندور تاغي (§ 5, 12.) may be connected with the same title. Under § 18 the name was tentatively restored as *Kandīr-taghi, in view of the name of the river Kāngīr. But should the analogy be sacrificed, the simplest restoration would be perhaps Kandā‘ūr, v.s., p. 308, n. 1.]

The influence of the Balkhī tradition (as represented by Iṣṭ.) 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 Iṣṭ., 253. By the former kings of Khorāsān (who unlike the Sāmānids did not rule over Transoxiana) the Tāhirids and Saffārids 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 Iṣṭ.

I. The province of Nīshāpur

1. Our author agrees with I.R., 171, who also counts in Nīshāpur 13 rustāqs and 4 “quarters” (*arbā’*), whereas Maq., 300, has 12 rustāqs and 4 *khāna* (*khānāt*).²

For 1.-5., 7. cf. Iṣṭ., 256-7. As regards 8. Iṣṭ. also gives Khujān but Jarmagān and Sibīnagān have a parallel only in Maq., 300l (MS. C) who under the dependencies of Nasā mentions “Isfīnaqān, Jarmaqān, Afrāva, and Shāristāna”. Under § 6, 50. Ustuvā (the district of Khujān > Quchān, ancient ‘Aστωνητή) and Jarmagān are mentioned on the Hirand (Atrak) river.³ Consequently Sibīnagān 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, Rāvini is probably identical with Khān Ravān (var. Rāvin?) which Iṣṭ., 257 and 284, mentions at one marhala from Nēshāpur on the road to Isfarā‘īn, and which must correspond to Maq., 300, Rīvand (*Rēvand) mentioned as one of the four khānāt of Abarshahr (= Nēshāpur). The famous fire temple of Būrzn-Mihr according to the Bundahishn, xii, 18, stood on the Rēvand mountain which in a larger sense may refer to the Bīnālūd range separating Nēshāpur 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 Bāgīr (Bājgīr?), west of ‘Ashqābād. Bāvard lay near the present villages of Abīvard, 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 razvalinam (“Along the ruined sites of Transcaspia”), Tashkent 1928, and Semenov and others, Drevnosti Abiverdskago rayona (“Antiquities of Abīvard”), Tashkent 1931; Minorsky, Nasā and Bāvard in EI. According to Isidore of Charax royal Parthian graves (Bασιλικαï ταφαï) lay in Nīsā. Recent excavations, southeast of Bāgīr, 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, Buzdighūr, and Nūqān. B.nvādha may be a dialectic form of Junāwidh (*Gunāvidh) which Maq., 300 l, mentions among the minbars of Tūs (cf. Persian gunjishk/bunjishk). This town is different from 13.

According to the Tārīkh-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 Nēshāpur, towards Sistān. See Le Strange, o.c., pp. 352–63 and Map viii. Administrative limits between Nēshāpur 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 Nēshāpur, p. 256, and of Bunābidh (Maq., 309: Junābid, var. MS. C., B.nābid, now Gunābād) and Kurī under Kūhistān, p. 273. In our text Kurī is repeated under 16. Instead of Tabasayn (under 15.) it would have been better to mention only one Tabas (the so-called Tabas al-Tamr, or Tabas-i Gilakī called after Gilaki b. Muḥammad, ra‘is of Tabas, 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. Tabas-i Masīnān (or Tabas al-‘unnāb). Under 19. are grouped
the places lying in the north-eastern part of Kūhīstān towards Harāt, cf. Iṣṭ., 256 (Buzajān, Jāymand, Salūmak, &c.). 14., 15., and 18. are described entirely after Iṣṭ., 274 (where the last name is spelt Khausb-< *Khōsp).

II. Province of Harāt.

20. Description of Harē (Harāt) chiefly based on Iṣṭ., 264–7. The expression which our author uses with regard to the mosque ābādhāntar ba-mardum az hama exactly corresponds to Iṣṭ.'s laysa masjidun a'maru bil-nās, &c. Among the products Maq., 324, does not mention manna. To Harāt belong 28. and 34. (details copied from Iṣṭ., 266).

21.–23. Būshanj as in Iṣṭ., 268 (who mentions 'ar'ar-trees, but not the antidote plant). Nūshagān is hardly a mis-spelling of 19. Būzaghān?

24.–27. Bādghīs, closely following Iṣṭ., 268–9 (Kābrūn [*Kālvun], Khujīstān, Jabal al-fiḍḍa). Kātūn (?) must be Kālvūn (Maq., 298 g: variants Kābrūn, Kālvūn, Kālyūn) which is often mentioned in the Tābaqāt-i Nāṣīrī, 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 Yāqūt, i, 461, calls Bādghīs dār mamlakat al-Hayāṭīla, see in great detail in Marquart, Wehrot, 39–43.

29. Iṣṭ., 267: Asfuzār with the towns Adraskar (also in Maq., 298, now Adraskand), Kavārān, Kūshk (var. Kūsd), and Kavāshān; the area of the district is 3 marhalas by 1 marhala; the Khārijites only in the Kāshkān ward.

30. Sarakhs as in Iṣṭ., 272. On the Khushkarūd see interesting details in I.R., 173, who says that it reaches a place called al-Ajma, lying towards Abivard (aįama “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 ṣ examines (see note to § 3, 27.).

31.–33. Ganj-rūstāq lay towards Marvarūd, cf. Iṣṭ., 269. 31. On Bāb, cf. Yāqūt, i, 764, who personally visited it and calls it Babna and Bābn. 33. Baghsūr, according to § 5, 9 b c, was separated from Marvarūd by a mountain. The detail on the wells may explain the name baghshūr 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 Waṣṣāf, in Mongol days the Khorāsānian Baghsūr was called Mori Shiburghān (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. Iṣṭ., 271: Gharj al-shār with two towns Bashūn (Armenian Geography: Abzhin) and Shūrmīn. Geographically Gharchistān corresponds to the present-day Firūz-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 H.-’Ā.) ‘Utbī, the author of the Tārīkh-i Yamīnī was sent to receive their oath of allegiance. He speaks favourably

1 Pūchagān (cf. Le Strange, o.c., 357), Sangān, &c. are mentioned in the Tārīkh-i Nādirī, in connexion with the operations of 1141 and 1143 H.
of the old shār Abū Naṣr b. Muhammad and of his son Shāh Muḥammad, but finally in 403/1012 Gharchistān was annexed by Maḥmūd, ʿUtbī-Manīnī, ii, 133 and 146 (Persian transl., 337-41). Cf. L. Dames, Gharchistān in EI, M. Nāzim, o.c., 60–2. A part of Gharchistān was in vassal dependence upon Gūzgān (v.i. 47).

III. Province of Marv.


40.–45. On Marv-i Shāhijān see in great detail V. A. Zhukovsky, o.c., where the H.-ʿĀ. is also quoted, p. 21. Our author follows ʿIṣṭ., 258–63, but adds some details (e.g. the products).

40. Barakdiz, according to Samʿānī, was the original name of the village of Qarīnayn (so surnamed on account of its being reckoned now to Marv and now to Marvarūd, Zhukovsky, o.c., 41.). Qarīnayn 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 Yaqūt, iv, 370. By Bih-ʿAfardī is evidently meant the followers of Bihāfarīd b. Māhfarvardīn, 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, Bihʿāfrīd, in WZKM, iii, 30–8; Barthold, Turkestan, 194, note 7. Qudāma, 209, also speaks of the majūs in Qarīnayn whom he calls پیگزی گون (Rag-i û ham-chu shāh-i āhu sakht, Bikhash az muḥkamū chu shāh-i di-rakht.)

41. Girang, ʿIṣṭ., 263, Jīranj, though a pun in Anvari’s satire presupposes the pronunciation kirang.1 43. ʿIṣṭ., 263, Sinj, but Maq., 299, 312, says that outside Dandānaqān stood a ribāt. 45. ʿIṣṭ., 263, mentions Kushmayhan, Bāshān (*Pāshān), Sausaqān, (Yaqūt, iii, 245: Shavashkān) and p. 261, Zarq (with a water-divide). M.sf.r.i is a popular name for Hurmuzfarra, Samʿānī in Zhukovsky, o.c., 42: Masfara. Shābirinji, a village at 3 farsakhs from Marv, ibid. 47, and Yaqūt, iii, 225: Shāhbirinj.

IIIa. Gūzgānān.

46.–71. Gūzgānān (in Arabic ʃūzjān). See Yaʿqūbī, BGA, vii, 287; ʿIṣṭ., 270–1; I.H., 321–2 (criticises the conservatism of the inhabitants of Pāryāb);
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; Ānbār and Ushburqān stood on the Āb-i Safīd. Moreover,
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 amir of Ghur 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 Ghur and marched with the boundary of Bust must refer only to some vague feudal suzerainty (based, perhaps, on the reception of presents from Ghur). 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 Güzgān (*Gozgān or Gōzagān) 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, Ėrānsahr, 9, 93, 138, corrected in Huschardzan, p. 31, and Wehrot, pp. 14-15] and to have connected it with the legend of the mighty Aryan archer Ārish (Avestan Æræša) who shot an arrow to fix the frontier between Irān and Turān.

The event is briefly alluded to in Yašt, 8, 6, where the shaft flies from the mountain Aryō-xšuva to the mountain Xvanvant, both still obscure. In Muslim times it was admitted that Ārish stood somewhere in Mazendarān (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 Tabari, i, 435-6, the arrow reached the river of Balkh. Tha’alibi, ed. Zotenberg, p. 133, reports that it was about to fall in Bādhghīs but an angel carried it on to a place near Khulm (§ 23, 68.) called which name Stackelberg restored as *Gōzbun. Bīrunī, Chronology, 220, places the goal3 at the farthest end of Khorāsān, between (پ) and (فراغان (f). The latter name was improved by Stackelberg as *تفرخانة but I should rather restore it as *شجارت لن (could have been mis-read into a longish ش, v.i., p. 340), and take the impossible فرخانه for which lies upstream from Tālaqān, whereas, between Tālaqān and Farkhār, a tributary joins the river from the east and along it lies the small district of Gulfagān 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 (Pātāq-Alvand), which, however, is contrary to all the later tradition.
3 “The root of a walnut-tree” (شجارت لن).
(Kishm flowing into the Kokcha). This is really the easternmost point of Tukhāristān (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 Tukhāristān (§ 23, 76.) and the other lying on the western threshold of Gūzgān (§ 23, 52.).

Finally Gurgānī in his Vis-u Rāmin, ed. M. Minovi, 1935, p. 366, and Zahīr al-din, ed. Dorn, p. 18, place the limit of Ārish’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, Gozbōn concludes the list of the districts of Khorāsān, which may merely reflect the general tendency of the legend. Secondly, in the free paraphrasis of Ptolemy’s chapter on "Apeia (vi, cap. 17) the author winds up by saying that the Persians call this region Khorāsān and reckon to it the provinces of Komš (Kūmish), Vrkan (Gurgān), Apršahr (Nishāpūr), Mrv (Marv), Mrot (Marvarūd), Hrev (Harāt), Kadṣan (cf. the present-day Kādis in Bādhghīs), "Gozkan, from where the kingly horses come", *Gozbon 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. And it is impassable in the sense that it has been rendered so for the . . . Persians and Indians in virtue of a treaty. [Follow Hrev with Vadgēs (Bādhghīs) and Tukharstan.] It seems that in that land of Kozakan (sic) the captive Jews were settled who according to the scriptures settled on the Gozan river.” It is curious that in this list, entirely based on Persian sources, the enumeration runs west to east in a straight line (from Kūmish to the Oxus), the last provinces (Harāt, Bādhghīs, and Tukhāristān) forming an additional south-eastern zone. So finally there is a probability that Gozbōn is to be placed between Gūzgān and the Oxus. As a parallel to the name Gozbun (١) and Tunakābun which Rabino, Māzandarān, 153, explains as “below Tunakā”), whatever the origin of the name Gōzgān (or Gōzagān), Gozbōn (١) 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 Afrīghūn mentioned by Maq., 347.

---

1 Cf. the story of the Qābūs-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 Manūchihr and Afrāṣyāb who made the decision depend on Ārish’s shot.
4 The forms found in Armenian writers are Gozbōn, Kasbōn, Gasbun. The form Gozbōn, suggesting in Persian

*Gōzbōn, may have been influenced by the name of the neighbouring Bābn, Bān > Bōn, the chief place of Gānj (§ 23, 31.) and later even of the whole of Bādghīs, Yāqūt, i, 461. [?] 5 Cf. the verse quoted as the first Persian rubā’i, in Shams-i Qays’s Mu’tjam, GMS, p. 39, ghaltān ghaltān hamī ravad tā bun-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 Karkū 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 Guzgān for Marquart, Ėrānsahr, 64, 70, has shown that the eastern frontier of the Sāsānian empire “with few fluctuations lay almost always near Tālaqān” (“fast immer bei Tālakān”), see our § 23, 52., and in point of fact Guzgān itself was reckoned to Ṭukhāristān, see I.Kh., 36.]

47. Following the description, R. būshārān (*Rēwshārān) 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 Guzgānān. As regards the name, I.Kh., 40, calls its ruler malik al-Rīvshārān (cf. Ṭabarī, iii, 1876), but has a variant R. būshārān.

One of the vazīrs of the Ghūrid Muḥammad b. Sām was Jalāl al-dīn *Rivshārī, Ṭabaqāt-i Nāsirī, transl., 390.

[Additional note. In the revenue list of 217 A.H. quoted by I.Kh., 36, Rivshārān stands between Siminjān (§ 23, 70.) and Bāmiyān (§ 23, 78.), and under 259 A.H. Ṭabarī mentions the ruler of Rivshārān alongside with that of Bāmiyān. These hints might favour Marquart’s surmise, Erānsahr, 218, that “Rēwšārān 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 Rivshārān. “It is a mountain bordering on Sind, Hind [the Panjāb?], and Kābul and from it flows a spring rising from the locality of عدمیس (var. عندمین عدمیس)”. The place referred to seems to lie much farther east than the sources of the BALK river for which Marquart, ibid., 219, 227, takes I. Faqīh’s “Jayhūn”. It is noteworthy that a place Andamin (now spelt آندمن) exists in the Lesser Pamir and comprises the lake Chīlāb (Turkish Chagmaqting). Kūshkāki, p. 163, particularly stresses the fact that the insignificant Andamin rivulet is the source of the mighty Oxus! Therefore Marquart’s interpretation of I. Faqīh seems doubtful. Finally in Bīrunī’s Canon Rivshārān 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>Place</th>
<th>Long.</th>
<th>Lat.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Panjwāy</td>
<td>93°30'</td>
<td>32°50'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Rivshārān</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 زوجان), acted Nizak with some of his generals (فی یام ایم ال -کووواد). Among the latter, Harthama “the Shār” and Ḥasan b. Ja’far “the Rāvshār (read: Reeshār)” were taken prisoners. No particular conclusion as to the respective position of their fiefs can be drawn from their association in an expeditionary force.
Consequently Bīrūnī's indication may as well refer to a different homonymous place. The indirect evidence of I.Kh. and Tabari could be confronted with our author's item on the extent of the Guzgānān dominions "down to the limits of Bāmiyān". Were we, however, to maintain his other statement that some of the Murghāb waters come from Rīvshārān, 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, Varmēshān?) 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 (mihtar) of its own, but our text, which is not very explicit, divides Darmashān into two "regions", the one depending on Guzgānān, and the other on Bust. The part of the Guzgānān 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 Tabaqāt-i Nāṣirī, transl., 312-16, there were two rival families in Ghūr, of which the one (that of *Shanasp<* = Vshnasp = 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 (pahlavānī). The later Ghūrīds, o.c., 300-420, descended from Shanasp and the author of the Tabaqāt 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 Tabaqāt 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.rh.shān) correspond to our درمان. As a parallel to the district Rīvshārān called after its king's title (or ancestor) Rīvshār, D.rm.shān would be the fief of the descendants of V.rm.sh/D.rm.sh. The important fortress of Ghūr called Āhangarān which was taken by Sultān Maḥmūd was situated on the Harī-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.
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 Māk 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 *Tabaqāt*, 319 (text, 39), places in Tamrān the highest of the peaks of Ghūr called اَمک (?). The most elevated points of the whole area are situated south of Bāmiyān in the Koh-i Bābā range (16,874 feet), but north of the sources of the Hari-rūd (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 Ghūrids, *Tabaqāt*, 390. “Abul-'Abbās Abul-Ḥasan Khalaf” 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 شیروان Bayhaqī, 127, probably refers to its chief. During his Ghūr campaign in 411/1020 Mas'ūd was joined by Abul-Ḥasan Khalaf (v.s.),“and following the latter came Shīrvān, who was another chief from the frontier of Ghūr and Gūzgānān. Mas'ūd had gained him to his side and he came with many horse and foot and brought numberless gifts and presents.” Amīr Muḥammad [Mas'ūd’s brother and governor of Gūzgānān, cf. note to § 1] in view of the fact that “this man was living close to Gūzgānān 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 Mas'ūd”. The twofold way of spelling شیروان and شاروان would suggest the reading *Sārvān* or *Shērvān* (cf. شار, انبار and شير).  

51. Mānshān is mentioned in the *Armenian Geography*, Marquart, Erānsahr, 17, 85, and Huschardzan, 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, مرسان, 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 Jahūdhān, 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 Māk valley, watered by the northernmost of the eastern sources of the Murghāb (Māk tagāb, or tagāo). 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
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 “Herdsman 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. Išt., 270, and Maq., 299, mention Tālaqān under Marvarūdh. This Tālaqān, which lay at three marhalas both from Marvarūdh and Pāryāb (Ya’qūbī, BGA, iv, 287, counts 4 marhalas from Tālaqān to Fāryāb) must not be confounded with the other Tālaqān in Tuhkāristān (v.i. 81.). The names of both places are sometimes spelt Tāyaqān. According to Marquart, Ėrānsahr, 80, the Tālaqān of Marvarūdh was the Sāsānian frontier-town towards the east. Le Strange, o.c., 423, places Tālaqān at Chachaktu, cf. Žafar-nāma, i, 806, whereas Barthold locates it at Qal’a-Vali.

53. Jahūdhān corresponds to Maymana (ancient *Nisāk-i miyānak, Marquart, o.c., 78). Birūnī, Canon: al-Maymana wa huwa (sic) Jahūdhān. 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 Fāryāb called ترسل (?), distinct from the ruler of Juzjān.

55. Naryān, mentioned in Yāqūt, iv, 775, may correspond to I.H., 322, حرسان (var. مرزان, &c.).

56. Gurzivān, Ya’qūbī, 287, Qurzumān, a district from which the Pāryāb and Andkhoy river (Shirin-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 Darzābva-Gurzivān.1

57. Kundarm, Ya’qūbī, 287, and I.H., 322, كندرم, Išt., 270, كندرم. It lay in the mountains at one marhala from Jahūdhān (and according to § 5, 9 B.C. to the east of Anbīr).

58. Anbīr<Anbēr, as in Birūnī, Canon; Ya’qūbī, 287, and Išt., 270: Anbār, now Sar-i pul (altitude 2,040 feet) on the eastern of the two rivers of Guzgān (Āb-i Safid). The Imām Yahyā b. Zayd b. Ḥasan b. ‘Alī b. Ḥasan b. ‘Alī b. Ābi Ṭālib was killed there, see Yāqūt, i, 370, under Anbīr. Under Anbār, 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-rūdh.” According to Ṭabarī, ii, 1773, the Imām Yahyā was captured in “a village of Jūzjān”.


60. Ushburqān, now Shibarghān,2 downstream of Anbīr (altitude 1,303 feet). As appears from Birūnī, Indīa, 158–9, some “undiscriminating

1 Very curious are the names in -ivān/ -īvān in Eastern Iran: Gurzivān, Shāhīvān (district above Farāh), Pārsivān (usual designation of Persians in Kābul), &c. Cf. also § 36, 38.

2 shāburaqān means “steel”.
Muslim astronomer" placed this town on the o° meridian passing also through Ujjayn (India), see note to § 10, 18.–24. An echo of this theory is found in Ya’qūbi, 287_11.

61. Ankhudh, now Andkhoy, on the lower course of the Āb-i Qaysār. According to Istī, 270, the town of the district of Ankhudh bore the name of Ushturj (Birūnī, Canon: أسحاب).

62. Under § 5, 9b 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’qūbi, 287, has أسان which Marquart, o.c., 86, suggests to read as أسان with Arabic š for Iranian ē. The Bābur-nāma, GMS, fol. 57a and 184b, gives أسان وچهارکل.

63. Of Ribāt-i *karvān (kirvān?) Istī, 265, says that the Harāt river rises "from its neighbourhood" (min qurb R.-K.), and further, 272, that it belongs to the province (‘amal) of Ibn Farīghūn (i.e. the king of Gūzgān) and lies on the frontier of Ghūr. Under 49. Tamrān and Tamāzān are placed near Ribāt-i karvān, and under § 6, 24. the Balkh river is said to skirt the confines of Madr and Ribāt-i karvān. Following Istī, one would place Ribāt-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 Ribāt-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 Ribāt-i karvān could be identified with Kushk-i khāna standing in the said valley. In Bayhaqī, 494–5, Ribāt-i karvān is mentioned as a dependency of Gūzgānān and a place of sheep-breeding; ibid., 791, 795, Mas’ūd, in his pathetic letter written from Ribāt-i karvān after the defeat at Dandānaqān (a.d. 1040) places it at a distance of 6–7 marhalas from Ghazna.

64.–65. Nothing is known of these two, but with S.ng-b.n (perhaps *Shing-bun to distinguish it from 43.) we are again near 47. Rivshārān. Coming as it is after Ribāt-i karvān which is the farthest point of the Gūzgān frontier towards the south-east it may, as an antithesis, mark the south-western extremity of the territory (towards Gharchistān). [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 Kūfīch of Kirmān (§ 28, 7.). The Arabs mentioned in Sulṭān Maḥmūd’s troops 1 I.R., 128, says that the Lombards Pavia, according to Marquart’s ingenious correction, Streifzüge, 249.)

1
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 Ya'qūbī, 288, Maṣʿūdi, Murūj, iv, 48, Yaqūt, i, 713, iv, 817–18 (after 'Omar b. Azraq al-Kirmānī). The products of Balkh are enumerated after Iṣṭ., 280. Ya’qūbī, 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-Qurghān.

IVa. Ṭukhāristān.

On Ṭukhāristān see Marquart’s penetrating chapter in Ėrānšahr, 190–248; Barthold, Turkestan, 66–8, and Tokhāristān in EI; Le Strange, The Lands, 427–8. Burhān al-dīn Kūshkākī, Rāh-numā-yi Qataghan va Badhakhshān (quoted: Kūshkākī), Russian trans. by A. Šemenov and others, Tashkent, 1926 [this valuable and detailed description of the north-eastern corner of Afghanīstān was compiled under the orders of the sipahsālār Muhammad Nādīr Khan who later became King of Afghanīstān].

The notion of Ṭukhāristān varies with different authors, Marquart, o.c., 229. Barthold in EI quotes Tabarī, ii, 1180, where Shūmān and Akhārūn belonging to Khuttal and lying north of the Oxus are reckoned to Ṭukhāristān, but usually only the region east of Balkh and south of the Oxus is understood by Ṭukhāristān. Neither Ya’qūbī, 292 (where Khuttal is distinguished from the Upper Ṭukhāristān) 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) Ṭukhāristān. Ya’qūbī, 290, places the beginning of the latter at Bāmiyān (v.i. 78). Yaqūt, ii, 518, is evidently wrong in locating the Lower T. to the east of the Upper T. Iṣṭ., 275, 279, has two short paragraphs on Ṭukhāristān. 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 z
Tukhāristān) and 70. north to south up the Khulm river; 71. (?)—73. south to north down the Darghām (Kunduz) river; 74.—76. west to east; 77.—79. in the south, in the neighbourhood of the Hindukush passes; 80. north-east of 79., more or less in the direction of 77. This arrangement clearly reflects the erratic reading off a map.

69. Khallukh standing in the text must be right in view of notes to § 15. .Tabari, ii, 1612, mentions a Khallukhian jabghuya whom he also, ii, 1604, calls Tukhārian jabghuya, cf. notes to § 15. However in § 24, 22. our author is certainly led astray by the similarity of the names Khallukh and Khalaj in Arabic script.

70. Simingān [so according to Yāqūt, iii, 142, but 'Abdul-Qādir Baghdādi's Lexicon Shanamiamum, ed. Salemann, p. 131, gives Samangān and this corresponds to the common use] and Ru'b (usually mentioned together with Simingān) correspond respectively to Haybak 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 Nushirvān and Dukhtar-i Nushirvān, 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.—76. situated in the basin of the Darghām river (Qunduz, cf. § 6, 12.) now form the district of Qataghan (so called after a Turkish tribe which, coming from Samarqand, occupied this region towards A.D. 1700), see Kushkaki, p. 9.

71. Sakalkand. In the enumeration of the localities of Tukhāristān, Ya'qūbi, 288, Išt., 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. Birūni, India, 149 (transl. 290) says that in the revenue books Sakalkand figured as Fārf.za. It is possible to identify Sakal-kand with Iskar (Kūshkaki: Iskan?) lying in a side-valley, at the entrance to the district of Barfak whose name could be an echo of Birūni's Fār entrepreneurs [this restoration seems preferable to Marquart's based on a suspect passage, v.s., § 6, 8.].

[Additional note. Some light on the situation of Sakalkand is thrown by Tabari's report, ii, 1218, of Qutayba's expedition against Nizak Tarkhān. The latter having taken up his position in Baghlān, near the source called ِبِيْرُن، 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 Akč (الكر). From Akč there was only one road of escape for Nizak but it proved too difficult for his horses. Here he

1 Cf. also § 5, 9 B. (Hindūkush).
2 I.Kh., 37, quotes a under Kābul (the latter being said to lie on the frontier of Tukhāristān). I quote the name merely as a parallel. (In his Das Reich Zābul, 269, Marquart repudiates his former hypothesis (Fārwāf = Qūzān) in Erânsahr, 256).
THE LANDS on the UPPER OXUS
[ad §§ 23-26]
was besieged by Qutayba’s brother and finally had to surrender. Most probably Nīzak sent his heavy loads along the usual Bāmiyān road up the Doshī 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 Doshī river of which the upper course is now called Barfak. This name must correspond to Bīrunī’s *رارق which mutilated in Ṭabari’s MSS. into ُفرغاته.¹ 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. Ṭabari distinctly says that the winter season was well on and Nīzak must have been blocked here by the snow. The name الكرز accepted in the printed text has several variants الكرر اللدن الكرن and it is quite possible that its ل has been misread from a written in a straight line, while the group رز may represent . With the form *الكند we decidedly approach the form Iskalkand, 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 Nīzak 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 Nīzak’s natural desire to rejoin his baggage train.

[However, Bīrunī’s Canon gives:

Baghlān long. 92°35′ lat. 35°40′
Sakalkand „ 92°50′ „ 35°50′
Tāyaqān „ 93°0′ „ 36°0′

and consequently the position of Sakalkand, between Baghlān and Tāyaqān (Tālaqān), if right, would be considerably to the north of Iskan.]

72. Baghlān, on the middle course of the Doshī river (formed by the Surkhāb (= Barfak) and Andarāb).

73. Valvālij corresponds to Qunduz (Kuhan-diz “the fortress”), situated at the junction of the Doshī river with that of Tālaqān. Bīrunī, Canon: “Valvālij, the capital of Țukhāristān, which in the days of old was the country of the Hayṭal (Hephthalites)”.

74. Maq., 303, Iskīmisht, now Ishkamish, on the western affluent of the Tālaqān river. Not to be confused with Ishkāshim, § 26, 14. Marquart, Wehrot, 86, identifies Ishkamish with the old Tokharian capital, in Chinese Kien shih (<*Kam ʪie) or Shēng Kien shih.

75. The small mountainous kingdom of Yūn (?) is perhaps identical with ٥َٰٰن which Ya’qūbī, 288, mentions between Tārakān and Badhakhshān. The Tālaqān river, formed by the streams of Gulfagān and Farkhār, receives from the left side an important affluent formed by the rivers of

¹ Different from فرغاته.<Farkhār, v.s., p. 330, line 39[?].
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 (خسخ) 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 Tālaqān as the easternmost town of Tukhāristān, 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 (Tālaqān, 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. Bīrunī, Canon, also gives Tāyaqān. On its position v.s., p. 330 ult.

77. Andarāb lies on the south-eastermost headwater of the Doshī river (v.s. 77.-79.). This important valley leads up to the Khāvak pass south of which Panjḥīr is situated. On the north-east Andarāb adjoins Khost. Išt., 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’ūdīds 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’ūdīds the dirhams of 264-78/877-91, 288/900, 290-4/902-6, and 310-13/922-5. According to Codrington’s Manual coins were struck in Andarāb also by the ’Abbāsīds, Sāmānīds, and Ghaznavīds. On the dynasty of Balkh, cf. note to § 24, 12.

78. The statement that Bāmiyān lay “between” Guzgānān and the marches of Khorāsān (§ 24) must be understood cum grano (v.s. 46.). The shēr of Bāmiyān is mentioned both in I.Kh., 39, and Išt., 280. On this dynasty see Marquart, o.c., 93. Yāqūt, i, 481, has the same Persian terms for the famous statues.

79. Išt., 286: Andarāba to Jārbāya 3 marhalas, thence to Panjḥīr one

---

1 Certainly not “lion” as Ya’qūbī, represents Old Persian xšaβriya, Marquart, Erānsahr, 79.
day, thence to Parvān (§ 24, 21.) 2 marhalas. Maq., 296, gives but, 346, *Gārpāya?.

Maq., 337, speaking of the “Eastern Clime”, says that over its whole extent the provinces and khutba belonged to the Sāmānid family; but the princes of Sijistān, Khwārazm, Gharj al-shār, Jūzjān, Bust, Ghaznīn, and Khuttal sent only presents (hadayā) and the Sāmānids were gratified with this substitution for the kharāj. “The (Sāmānid) commander of the army resides at Nishāpur; Sijistān is in the hands of the family of ‘Amr b. Layth, Gharj in those of the shār, Jūzjān in those of the Farighūn family and Ghaznīn and Bust are in the possession of the Turks.”

In spite of the introduction to § 23 where he mentions the muluk-i atrāf, our author seems to treat the subject of § 24 not so much from the political as the simply geographical point of view. Therefore Gūzgānān and Ghar-chistān, though enjoying a particular feudal status yet being hemmed in by the provinces of Harāt, 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 Tukhāristān [of which the frontier-points were Tāyaqān, Andarāb, Bāmiyān, and Panjhir, § 23, 76.–79.] and the southern dependencies of Khuttal (§ 26, 12.–20.).


I. Ghūr.

1. Although our author had, in Gūzgānān, 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 V.rm.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 Guzgānān and Bust. L. Dames, *Ghōr, Ghōrī* in *El*, 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 Ghōr. This locality is exactly within the area of our “Darmashān” and consequently for all practical purposes Darmashān looks identical with Ghūr. Îṣṭ., 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 karvān (§ 23, 63.), then to Ghar­chistān, then back to Harāt. In any case Ghūr comprised the upper part of the Hari-rūd for (Îṣṭ., 285) one entered Ghūr at  خشت situated to the east of Aufa (now Oba). The name خشت must undoubtedly be جشت, as in *Nuzhat al-gulūb*, 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 Mahmūd’s campaigns, see *Ṭabaqāt-i Nāširī*, p. 321, and Muḥammad Nāzīm, *Sulṭān Mahmūd*, pp. 70–3, as well as in Mongol times, *Nuzhat al-gulūb*, 150. As the latter source assigns to Āhangarān the position of long. 99° and lat. 35° (Guzgān 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 May­man = Yahūdhān) crosses the Hari-rūd (to the south of the Shorak pass).1 As the home of the ruling Shanaspīd dynasty very often is named *M.n.d.sh* or *M.ndysh* (probably *Mandēsh* 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.

Bayhaqī’s report on Masʿūd’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. Masʿūd reached the frontier of Ghūr in 6 stages by the road up the Hari-rūd described by Îṣṭ., 285, and Maq., 347 (cf. also Maq., 307). He entered Ghūr at Bāgh-i Vazīr, the first ribāt of Ghūr beyond خشت (*Bun-i Chisht?). Masʿūd was accompanied by two chiefs of Ghūr: Abūl Hasan Khalaf (*v.s.*, § 23, 49.) and Shīrvān (*v.s.*, § 23, 50.). After the conquest of the fortresses of BR and رزان (or رزان) Masʿūd marched to his chief goal ماندیش (*Mandēsh?) the residence of جرِوس ورمش بت (*Varmash-bat, Varmash-pat?) situated at 10 farsaks’ distance (from رزان?). Varmash-bat was subdued and had to surrender the fortresses of Ghar­chistān, which he had seized. See Bayhaqī, pp. 127–35 [Tehrān ed., 111: *Chisht, J.rws, V.rmysb-t.*], cf. *Ṭabaqāt*, 326.

Îṣṭ., 272, particularly insists upon Ghūr being a دār al-kufr and finds an

---

1 In Bīrūnī’s *Canon* two points are mentioned in Ghūr: کورزان *K.jūrān* lying in the mountains and Garf, capital of Āhangarān, also lying in the mountains:

K.jūrān long. 89° o’ lat. 33° o’
Rūf “ 89° o’ ” 33° 30’

Cf. the co-ordinates quoted under § 23, 47. In the description of Ghūr the author of the *Ṭabaqāt-i Nāširī* (Raverty, p. 319) places in the mountain of *V.r.ni* “the territories of Dāvar (?) and Vālisht [§ 24, 18.?], and the castle of K.jūrān”.
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excuse for mentioning it in the fact that it was surrounded by Islamic lands (cf. also *ibid.*, 281). Some people outwardly pretended to be Muslims on the eastern (sic) border of Ghūr [I.H., 323: on the border towards the Muslim territory]. Consequently our author’s assertion that the people of Ghūr were “mostly” Muslims looks exaggerated, and still more so in the light of Sulṭān Mahmūd’s campaigns against the heathens of Ghūr, cf. M. Nāzim, *l.c.* The stubborn resistance of the inhabitants to the famous conqueror makes it equally doubtful that, some forty years before, the Ghūr-shāh could, without demur, accept the suzerainty of the local ruler of Gūzgān. ‘Uṭbi-Manīnī, i, 185, distinctly mentions the Farīghūnid amir of Gūzgān and al-shār malik Ghūr [if only Ghūr is here not a mistake for Gharchistān]. On the genealogy of the Ghūrids see Ṭabaqāt-i Nāṣirī, p. 29, 49 (transl., p. 302, 312); cf. Justi, *Iran. Namenbuch*, p. 455, and Marquart, *Das Reich Zābul in Festschrift E. Sachau*, 1915, p. 289.

The language of Ghūr according to Iṣṭ. differed from that of the “Khorāsān people”, the latter expression suggesting some dialectical differences only.

II. Sīstān.


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 خردروی). The Turkish ruler whom Maq., 337 (writing in 375/985) mentions in Bust, is certainly Mahmūd’s father Sabuktegīn, who had seized Bust soon after 366/977, cf. M. Nāzim, *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 Iṣṭ., 252, is useful for the understanding of our text: “from Bust [via Fīruzqand] to Sarvān 2 marhalas along the road of Balad al-Dāwar; then the *Hīdhmand is crossed at a marhala beyond (miin) Sarvān and the traveller enters Till; thence a marhala to Darghash lying on the Hīdhmand on the same bank; from Till to Baghnīn 1 day in the *qibli* (western, or south-western?) direction; Bishlang lies in the southern direction of Baghnīn”, cf. Le Strange, *o.c.*, Map viii.

10. جبالستان. Iṣṭ., 248, spells Šālaqān (Zālaqān), Maq., 297: چالکان (jh = ē?). The place lay at one marhala from Bust.
11. On the road from Bust to Zamīn Dāvar (v.s. 9.) Iṣṭ., 248, mentions as the first stage Firūzqand (v.i. 17.) from which, Maq., 349, a road branched off towards Ghaznīn. In spite of some outward likeness to the site of Qandahār, cf. Iṣṭ., 251, and Gardizi, ed. M. Nāzim, 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 al-‘Askar (or some other name) which lay far too east beyond Panjvāy, perhaps on the site of Qandahār, cf. Iṣṭ., 251, and Gardizi, ed. M. Nāzim, p. 14, where Ya‘qūb b. Laith marches from Sīstān to Bust and then to Panjvāy, Tekīnābād, and Ghaznīn. In spite of some outward likeness it cannot be il‘clm which lay far too east beyond Panjvāy, perhaps on the site of Qandahār, cf. Iṣṭ., 251, and Gardizi, ed. M. Nāzim, p. 14, where Ya‘qūb b. Laith marches from Sīstān to Bust and then to Panjvāy, Tekīnābād, and Ghaznīn. In spite of some outward likeness it cannot be il‘clm which lay far too east beyond Panjvāy, perhaps on the site of Qandahār, cf. Iṣṭ., 251, and Gardizi, ed. M. Nāzim, p. 14, where Ya‘qūb b. Laith marches from Sīstān to Bust and then to Panjvāy, Tekīnābād, and Ghaznīn. In order to figure under 9. and not 10. Another suggestion is found in Ya‘qūbi’s, 281, interesting list of kūras of Sijistān: Bust, Juvayn, Rukkhaj, Khushshak, Khwāsh, Zaranj. Is al-‘ll = il‘cI? 1

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, Erānsahr, 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’ud b. Abī Dā’ud (b. ’Abbās of the Khuttalān family, § 26, 1.) against the king of Zābulistān Firūz. This expedition must have taken place before 258/872 when the Saffārid Ya‘qūb occupied Balkh where Dā’ud b. ’Abbās was ruling. See I.Kh., 180., Mas’ūdi, Murūj, viii, 42, Marquart, Erānsahr, 40, 302. In his description of the frontier of Ghur I.H., 323 (= Iṣṭ., 272) curiously enough replaces Iṣṭ.’s unexpected Baladay Dāwar, “the two districts of D.” (?), by Balad banū Dā’ud 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 Sabuktegin.

Till and Durghush (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 *Zūnbi (so instead of Rutbīl!), 1 and of whom a second sanctuary was known in Ubulla (§ 33, 9.), ibid., 285. Marquart thinks that Zamīn(-i) Dāvar means “the land of the Just One”, i.e. of Zūn (cf. TΣουνβδαδέερ and Zundaber of the Christian authors), cf. Minorsky, Zūn in EI. Bayhaqi, 125, says that peacocks were bred in Zamīn Dāvar in great numbers (khāna-zād-and dar Z.-D.) and adds, 123, that Mahmūd considered Zamīn Dāvar as “blest” (mubārak) “for it was the first governorship which Sabuktegin gave him”. It is not clear whether Zamīn Dāvar originally belonged to the region traditionally called Zābulistān, see Erānsahr, 37, 39. The term Zābulistān is very vague, see Nuzhat al-qulub.

1 The consonantal resemblance of Zābul and *Zūnbi looks merely fortuitous.
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-Dāwar iqlīmun khisbun wa huwa thaghrun lil-Ghur wa Baghnīn wa Khalaj wa Bishlank wa Khāsh (var. حاس) wa laysa ‘alayhā (?) sūrun wa laḥā qal’atun. Though the text is out of order (cf. Marquart’s tentative restoration, Erānšahr, 252) the mention of these places after, or under, Bilād al-Dāwar must be attributed to the latter’s situation on the frontier of Ghur. Baghnī and Bashling are still shown on the maps. Our خواین خواین certainly corresponds to Ist.’s حاس and must be distinguished from 8. خواش (lying on the left bank of the river Khwāsh and placed by Ist., 252, at 1 marhala from Qarnīn). Bayhaqi, 127, also describes خواین as “a province of Ghur adjoining Bust and Zamīn-Dāvar in which the unbelievers were filthier (پالیدتار) and stronger (than elsewhere)”. In 405/1015 Mahmūd led an expedition against it.

16. Rukhudh, Ist., 244, and I.H., 303, spell Rukkhajh, but Maq. has Rukhūd (according to Marquart, o.c., 225, *Rakhwad). It is the ancient Arachosia, i.e. the region of Qandahār watered by the Arghandāb and situated between 12. and 18. Qandahār is mentioned in I.Kh., 56, and Ya’qūbī, 281, but not in Ist., I.H., or Maq., who, like our author, name بنجوی Panjvāy as the chief place.

17. Kuhak, Ist., 244, belonged to Rukkhajh, while Rūdhān, Ist., 248 [= Balādhurī, 306, R.زِن؟], was situated in the neighbourhood of Firūz-qand (var. Firūzfand; v.s. 11.), to the left of the road leading to Rukkhajh, and its produce was salt.

18. فل as in Ist., 244 (var. Bālish). Maq. has both this form, 486, and Vālishtān, 297. 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 marhalas south of Isfinjāy. Our Kūshk, as usual, stands for Arabic Qasr. Ist., 239, gives Isfinjāy.

III. Ghaznī and Kābul.

19. Ghazaq غزاق, see Barthold, Preface, 30, is a clerical error for Ghaznīn غزین for lower down (22.) Ghaznīn 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 Sabuktегīn 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, malik] while our author makes the raja of Qinnauj receive his investiture in Kābul! Ist. speaks of Ghazna and Kābul under
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).


22. As regards Ťukhāristān the name خَلْج Khalullah standing in our text is right and confirms § 23, 69. On the contrary, with reference to Ghaznīn, Bust (and probably Güzgānān, cf. Mašʿūdī, Murūj, iii, 254, and v. i. quotation from the جاهان‌نامه) it must be taken for * خلج Khalaj. Like حَرَّر standing both for حَرَّر Khazar (§ 50) and حَرَّر Jurz (§ 42, 15.) the complex خلج 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-breeders (ahl al-naʿam) of Turkish appearance (khilaq), dress, and language.” Marquart, Ėrānsahr, 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 Khwlas (mentioned in a Syriac source under a.d. 554) and Χολάται (used by the ambassador Zemarchos in 569). This development (based chiefly on Mašʿūdī, Murūj, iii, 254, v, 302) still awaits further confirmation. I.Kh., 31, says: “The lands of the Turks are as follows: the Toghuzghuz whose country is the most extensive among the Turks and borders on China, Tibet, and Kharlukh (بیغرو). The Kīmāk, the Ghuzz, the Jurz, the Bajanāk, the *Tiirgish, the Adhkish, the Khifshākh, the Khirkhīz, where musk is found, the Kharlukh and the Khalaj, and these (latter) are on this side of the river.” In this statement the Khalaj are distinctly separated from the Kharlukh No. 1 (to whom the variant خلج belongs). In another passage, ibid., 28, I.Kh. seems to contradict himself: having placed the winter quarters of the Kharlukh near Kaṣrā-bās (in the neighbourhood of Ţarāz, § 25, 93.) he unexpectedly adds: “and near them are the winter (sic) quarters of the Khalaj (الخلج var. الخلج); the Kimāk, the Ghuzz, the J.f.r, the Bajanāk, the "Türğish, the Adhkish, the Khifshākh, the Khirkhīz, where musk is found, the Kharlukh and the Khalaj, and these (latter) are on this side of the river.” In this statement the Khalaj are distinctly separated from the Kharlukh No. 1 (to whom the variant خلج belongs). In another passage, ibid., 28, I.Kh. seems to contradict himself: having placed the winter quarters of the Kharlukh near Kaṣrā-bās (in the neighbourhood of Ţarāz, § 25, 93.) he unexpectedly adds: “and near them are the winter (sic) quarters of the Khalaj (الخلج var. "الخلج")”. 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 مَرَكُون wa 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 Körösi Csoma Archivum, ii/1-2, pp. 38–41.
Kharlukh and Khalaj in this passage are only two variants of the same name (*خَلْجَ), 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 Mas'ūdi, Murūj, iii, 254, and v, 302, where the Turks, the النوز و الخلج are mentioned in the region adjoining Sīstān and stretching towards *Gharch and Bust, it is possible that the term Ghūz 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”. Mas'ūdi could have in view only the language and the general appearance of the Khalaj and not their intertribal policy and relations. In this case Mas'ūdi's Kharlaj stands not for Khalaj (*Kholach) but simply for the Kharlukh who were not Oghuz but whose early penetration into Țukhāristān is a well-known fact. From Țukhāristān a group could easily push farther to the south?

The Khalaj Turks are the putative ancestors of the well-known Afghan tribe Ghalzay (Ghilzā'i, Ghiljā'i). This fact has been doubted by L. Dames in his article Ghalzay in EI, but reaffirmed by Barthold, Khaladj, and T. W. Haig, Khaldjl, in the same Encyclopaedia. In favour of the latter opinion may be quoted an interesting passage from the rare Jihān-nāma written circa A.D. 1200–20 by Muḥammad b. Najīb Bakrān (fol. 17 of the copy bound together with the H.-‘Ā. MS. and fol. 206 of Bibl. Nat., anc. fonds pers. 324):

"The Khalaj (Kh.l.j) are a tribe of Turks who from the Khallukh limits emigrated to Zābulistān. Among the districts of Ghazni 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 Khallukh Khalaj."

23. Parvān situated at the confluence of the Ghōrband and Panjhir rivers ought to come geographically after § 23, 79., but just between them must have passed the frontier of Țukhāristān and Kābul. Parvān is still shown on the maps to the north-east of Chārīkār. There may be possibly another Parvān in the upper Logar valley between Ghazni and Bamiyān, where Raverty, Tabaqāt, pp. 288, 1021, and 1042, places the battle between the Mongols and Jalāl al-din, cf. Barthold, Turkestan, 441, note 6. No such name, however, figures in the itinerary quoted in the note to 21.
IV. Badhakhshān.

24. The itineraries of Arab geographers to the east of Balkh usually stop at Tālaqān (§ 23, 76.). However, Ya‘qūbī, 288, in his enumeration of the towns of Balkh, and following on the towns of Tārakān (Talaqān), and Badhakhshān mentions “the town of Jirm (v.i. 25.) which is the last of the eastern towns following on Balkh, towards the country of Tibet (minmā yali Balkh ilā nāhiyati balad al-Tubbat)”. Here the territory of Badhakhshān is implicitly reckoned to Balkh. Coming another time from the north Ya‘qūbī, 292, winds up his description of the road Tirmidh–Chaghāniyān–Khuttal as follows: “and from Khuttal [the road goes] to Upper Ṭūkhāristān and the kingdom of *Khumar-bīg, king of Shiqinān,1 and Badhakhshān, and from it [i.e. Khuttal] the great river [Oxus stretches up] to Shiqinān, and this all is Upper Ṭūkhāristān.”

Iṣṭ., 279, speaks of Badhakhshān (or Balakhshān) and its products (garnets, lapis-lazuli, musk from Tibet and Vakhān) jointly with Khuttal, but a little above, 278, assigns to Badhakhshān a more special position: “it is a clime (iqllm) with rustāqs; its town is Badhakhshān; it is the kingdom of Abul-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 Badhakhshān under Balkh but outside the towns of Ṭūkhāristān, and adds, 303: “Badhakhshān which is con-terminous with the country of the Turks [Ya‘qūb’s Khumār-beg?] lies above Ṭūkhāristān; 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”. There (also) stands a wonderful fortress (built) by [Hārūn al-Rashīd’s wife] Zubayda,2 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 Badhakhshān and that silver is found in it. He solves the difficulty about the special position of Badhakhshān 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 Shih-ki‘-ni, Chavannes, Documents, 162; but starting from the present-day Shughnān one could read the name as *Shuqānā.

2 Mas‘ūdī, Tanbīh, 64, says that the Jayhūn rises beyond the ribāt of Badhakhshān 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. Nizām al-mulk, Siyāsat-nāma, 128, confirms the statement that Zubayda built “on the frontier of Kāshghar (sic) a mighty town which she called Badhakhshān, as well as several strong ribāts in the same region”. [Ayghān < possibly *Abghān, as I. Athir, xi, 108, 110, calls the Afghāns.]
could not escape the same suzerainty (see above Iṣṭ., 278, on the prince Abul-Faṭḥ).

25.–27. prima facie are unknown, but as they follow on Badhakhshān 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 Badhakhshān, south of its present capital Faydābād, see Kūshkāki, o.c., 120–34. The place of the gate would be between Jirm and Zaybāk (§ 26, 12.), e.g. at Bahārak or in the Zardīv 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 Badhakhshān, but in 196/811–12 he appointed Fadl b. Sahl, governor of the eastern provinces “from Hamadān to the mountain of Shiqīnān and Tibet”, Ṭabarī, iii, 841. Very probably Maq.’s Ribāṭ Fādīl (v.s.) stands for *Ribāṭ al-Fadl. However, if we leave aside Ma’mūn’s name it will be easier to suppose that the ribāṭ of Badhakhshān was, at an earlier date, built by the Barmakid Fadl b. Yaḥyā b. Khālid as a counterpart to the gate built by him in Rāṣht (see note to § 26, 9.). The advantage of this hypothesis would be that we know for certain (Ya’qūbī, 304) that Fadl b. Yaḥyā whom Hārūn al-Rashīd appointed governor of Khorāsān in 178/794 “conquered a number of kūras of Tukhāristān, of Kābulshāh, and of Shiqīnān”, i.e. exactly in the region interesting us. Ṭabarī, iii, 631, says of Fadl’s activities in Khorāsān: *wa banū biḥā al-masājid wal-ribāṭāt. Ya’qūbī, Historiae, ii, 492, mentions Fadl’s victory over the Turks near Ţalaqān.

26. The special mention of Muslims shows that S.n.g.s lay amid an infidel region. A pass called Sanglich quoted under § 26, 16.? It is possible that our author has twice over described the same locality, once as an extension of the Badhakhshān territory and another time as a branch of the road from Khuttal to Kashmir (§ 26, 12.–20.). In this case our Dar-i Tāziyān would be identical with Dar-i Tubbat (§ 26, 12.) and the pass of Shaqīnā (perhaps *Sanglich) which is a possible Arabic rendering of Sanglich) would be the Dora pass.

27. The simplest solution is to restore 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 Shaqīnā, 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 Turks1 called Shakīna” and Iṣṭ., 290, gives exactly Shaqīnā. 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” Shaqīnā at

1 See note to § 26, 1a: road from Khuttal.
this place would refer probably to Ishkāshim, see note to § 26, 14. A less satisfactory alternative would be to identify *S.qltta with Iskitul, a village lying 14 Km. south of Zaybāk and 22 Km. north of Sanglīch, see Vavilov, Agricultural Afghanistan, Leningrad, 1929, p. 519; (on the map of Morgenstierne, Report on a Linguistic Mission to NW. India, Oslo, 1932, the position of Iskitul is not quite exact).

§ 25. Transoxiana

Tomaschek, Sogdiana, in Sitz.WAW, 1877, Band 87, pp. 67–120; Barthold, Report, passim; Barthold, Turkestan, pp. 64–179 (and in much greater detail in Irrigation); Marquart, Erānsahr, pp. 226–37, and Wehrot, passim; Le Strange, The Lands, pp. 433–89; Kurakichi Shiratori, A Study on Su-t' e, or Sogdiana in Memoirs of the Research Department of the Toyo Bunko, No. 2, Tokyo, 1928, pp. 81–145 (only, ancient times). Many of the places mentioned in this chapter will be found on Le Strange's Maps IX and X, and on the Map at the end of Barthold's Turkestan.

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>H.-‘Ā.</th>
<th>Real bearing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tibet (v.i. 58.)</td>
<td>E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khorāsān</td>
<td>S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghūz and Khallukh (?)</td>
<td>W.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khallukh</td>
<td>N.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Išt., 286, shows a similar peculiarity of orientation while he quotes as the Transoxianian frontiers in the east (in a straight line): Pāmīr, Rāshīt, and the parts of Hind adjoining Khuttal; in the west [?] (in a semicircular line): the Ghuzz and Kharlukh from Ṭarāz to Fārāb, Bīskand, 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.

The term Turkistān, cf. Ya’qūbī, 295: トルク・アスタン is applied by our author to the lands beyond Transoxiana, cf. Minorsky, Tūrān in EI.
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.

corresponds to “wālī of Khorāsān from the family of Sāmān” in Ist., 306.
Among the products, saltpetre is not mentioned in Ist., 314-15. Būmkath
stands probably for Bamijkath but its form may have been influenced by
the old name of Bukhārā itself: *Nūmijkath, cf. Ist., 313 and 305, corrected
in Maq., 267b. Narshakhī, Histoire de Boukhara, p. 20, gives as the
ancient names of the town both نمیک and نمیک. A painstaking analysis of
these names is given in Marquart, Wehrot, pp. 161-4, cf. also Barthold,
Bukhārā in El. The details of 3. and 4. not in Ist. On Paykand see also
the market in 6. Ist., 313. 7. According to Ist., 313, Karmīna was reckoned
still to Bukhārā. Dabūsī is the present-day Ziaudin <Diyā al-din.

II. Province of Sughd.

9. Zarmān (numerous variants), Ist., 334, 343, between Rabinjan and
Samarqand at 1 farsakh’s distance from Ishtīkhan.
11. This Farinkath, now Prinkant, not mentioned in Ist., I.H., or Maq.,
but found in Yāqūt, iii, 885, is entirely different from 74. It lay north-west
of Samarqand towards Ishtīkhan, see Barthold, Turkestan, 96. Gānjkath
must lie in the same region.
12. J’jj probably jls, Vadhār, at 2 farsakhs’ distance from Samarqand,
Ist., 342.
13. Samarqand, cf. Ist., 316-21 (nahr min al-risās), 288 (paper from
Transoxiana). Our record on the Manichaean (Mānavi) is extremely
curious.
From the Fihrist, 337, we know that under Muqtadir (A.D. 907-32) the
Manichaean, 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 pro­
tection may account for the security which the Manichaean in Samarqand
enjoyed perhaps down to our author’s times.

III. Basin of the Kashka-daryā.

On 15.-21. see Ist., pp. 324-5, 343. On Nakhshab see particularly
L. Zimin, in the ‘IQd al-jumān (Festschrift to V. Barthold), Tashkent, 1927,
pp. 196-214, cf. Minorsky, Nakhshab in EI. Ist. does not mention mules
and red salt in Kish and spells Nasaf (cf. Nakhchuvān > I.Kh., 122,
Nasawe) and Nūqad Quraysh. Sübakh is the present-day Guzār (Khuzār).
IV. Basins of the Chaghān-rūd and Kāfirnīhān.


25.–35. Cf. Barthold, Čaghāniyān, in EI. Maq., pp. 283, 290, says that there were 16,000 villages and 10,000 warriors in Chaghāniyān, though economically it was inferior to Khuttal (§ 26, 1.). On the rulers of Chaghāniyān of the Āl-i Muḥtāj dynasty see Muḥammad khan Qazvinī in his edition of the Chahār-maqaṣāla, pp. 163–6. For the position of 27.–33. the following “route of Chaghāniyān” quoted in I.Kh., 33–4 (Qudāma, 211) is essential: Tirmidh to Sarmanjān (Charmangān) 6 farsakhs; thence to Dārzanjī 6 f.; thence to B branji 7 f.; thence to Ṣaghāniyān 5 f.; thence to Ṣaghāniyān 6 f.; thence (across a vādi which is 2–3 f. wide?) to Ṣmvārān 7 f.; thence to *Abān Kasavān 8 f.; thence to Shūmān 5 f.; thence to Vāshjirt 4 f.


32. Hamvārān is not in Iṣṭ. 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 Qaratag and *Abān-Kasavān with Ḵišār 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. Gardīzī, ed. M. Nāzim, p. 36, counts 12 farsakhs from Chaghāniyān to Shūmān, probably by a short cut.

34. mentioned between 33. and 35. corresponds to Ḵwāy (in Arabic: Ḵwāy or Ḵwāy) which Iṣṭ., 340, places between Shūmān and Vāshjirt at a distance of 1 day from each of them. This detail is in favour of its location at the present-day Kāfirnīhān. Cf. also Yaʿqūbī, 291: الإحالي.

35. (in Arabic: Ṭwshgird or Ṭwshagird is explained by Marquart, o.c., 227, as *Vēṣagird, i.e. the legendary town of Vaēsa, Fraṅrasiyan’s henchman, which Yasht, v, 57, places in the Xṣaθrō-suka defile, high up in Kaṇha (Sughd). Vēshgird must correspond to Faydābād.
on the īlāq, left affluent of the Kāfirnihān river. īlāq is mentioned in Iṣṭ., 340, as the next station situated at one day’s distance from Veshagird towards the east, but from Veshagird on the road may have followed this river. On Shaqīq Balkhī see ‘Aṭṭār, Tadhkirat al-awliyā, ed. R. A. Nicholson, i, 196–202. Ibn al-Athīr, sub 194/809, says: “in this year was killed the hermit (zāhid) Shaqīq Balkhī during a Muslim expedition (ghazāt) to Kūlān in the Turk country”, cf. § 15, 1.

The identification of 27., 32.–35. would roughly follow the distances indicated in Arabic sources, at the rate of 4 Km. to one fārsakh:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>fars.</th>
<th>Km. (circa)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Šaghāniyān</td>
<td>13 (2 days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamvārān</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abān Kasavān</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shūmān</td>
<td>one day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afdiyān (?)</td>
<td>one day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veshagird</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. Uṣrūshana.

The name has several readings. De Goeje in Iṣṭ., I.H., and Maq. gives the variant Ushrūsana but in I.Kh., 29, and Ya’qūbi, 293, Uṣrūshana. Consequently it is safer to render our سروشی as Surūshana though the frequent occurrence in Iranian of the group -sn- 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 afšīn, I.Kh., 40. The last afshin was the famous Khaydar (?) b. Kāvūs executed by Mu’tasim 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. Faghkath, Iṣṭ. spells Vaghkath (now Vagat, Barthold, Turkestān, 167). Sābāṭ means in Arabic “covered passage, awning”. Kurkath, 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.

Khujand (or Khujanda) belonged to Shāsh but lay on the frontier of Farghāna.


On the Jaxartes see note to § 6, 17.

Vāthkath, Ist., 346, places Vān-kath (?) at 7 farsakhs to the northeast of Akhsīkath on the frontier of Ḫlāq.

There is nothing corresponding to this paragraph in Ist., but I.H. (who, according to de Goeje, Preface, p. viii, has reproduced the "complete" text of Ist.'s description of Transoxiana) writes, p. 397: "quicksilver is produced in Sōkh (sic, cf. BGA, iv, 438) from its mountains". Our author took Sōkh for a special name (cf. variants in I.H., 395) and separately mentioned it almost immediately before Sōkh.

50. Ist., 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. Ist., 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. Sōkh must be which according to I.H., 396, was the town of the Naqād district (tāma, var. بان) mentioned immediately after Avāl.

54. All three in Ist., 335. Khwākand is the present-day Kokand (*.خوکند*).


57. The rivers of Khurshāb and Urasht are found in I.H., 392. Cf. § 6, 18. and 19. where the Ūsh-river (Barthold, o.c., 159) is said to flow between Urasht and Ūsh.

58. Ist., 334. Our author's data on the rivers are new, cf. notes to § 6, 17., § 15, 11. At the time of I.Kh., 30, Ūzgand had a chief called Khūrtegin (*Chūr-tegin). Soon after our author’s times Ūzgand became one of the residences of the Qara-khānids, see § 13, Barthold, Turkestan, 157, Cohn-Wiener, Turan, Berlin, 1930, pp. 17-20 and plates x-xvi (the Qara-khānid buildings), I. I. Umniakov, Arkhitet. pamiatniki Sredney Azii, Tashkent, 1929, pp. 27-9.

59. Ist., 334: Khaylām (this reading adopted in Barthold, o.c.). Its river is the present-day Narin (§ 6, 21.).

60. The name کشکونک appears in Idrīsī at one day's distance from Akhsīkath (towards the east?), Sprenger, Postrouten, 27. One must distinguish between Bāb-Akhsīkath "the Gate of A.", Ist., 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, Ist., 336, I.Kh., 30.
61., 62. In spite of the concluding formula following on 60., these places, too, must have lain in Farghāna. The only certain place is Sh.lāt, Išt., 346, S.lāt (with variants). According to I.H., 396, S.lāt and Biskant lay beyond Miyān-rūdhān, 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 Īlāq and Shāsh.

63.–83. Cf. Išt., 328–33. See Map in Barthold, Turkestan.

63. The province Īlāq 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 Farghāna, Barthold, o.c., 169. Some “dihqāns” struck coins in Īlāq even in 388 and 399 A.H., see Markov, Inventarniy Katalog, SPb., 1896, pp. 218–19, and Barthold, o.c., 307.

According to the Mafātīh al-ʿulūm, p. 28, the mubayyīda “wearers of white raiment” (in Persian safīd-jāmagān) 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 Muḥammad 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 Bīrunī’s Canon, f. 25, the Zoroastrians of Īrānshahr living to the west of the river of Balkh (i.e. Oxus) are distinguished from those who lived beyond that river and were called Mubayyīda or Isfandiyāriya, cf. Sachau, Zur Geschichte von Khwārizm, Sitz.WAW, 1873, lxiii, p. 485 (15). [In MS. Or. 1997, fol. 25a below, the name is spelt الإبعيس al-ʿisfīḥ-yāriya, cf. Sachau’s interpretation may refer to Isfandiyār’s exploits in Tūrān, but it is more likely that the reading is *al-ʾisfīḥ-yāriya (< al-ʾisfīḥ-dāriya, cf. *shahradār > shahriyār) of which al-mubayyīda is the exact Arabic rendering.]

64. Išt., 331, calls the provincial capital Tunkath (variant تونكوي), 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. Išt., 332, I.Kh., 28, maʿdīn al-fiḍḍa. The spelling saym would indicate the pronunciation *sēm instead of the usual sīm. The word is derived from (ἀργυρόποι) ἀργυροὺς, 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. Išt., 332, 345: Dakhkhath. The mention of arsenic gives more precision to Maq.’s mention (p. 326) of it (dhul-fār [sic]) in Īlāq.

67. Išt., 331: N.mudhlugh, *Arpalikh (Maq., 265); [Itlukh, “the Dog village” abest]; Banjkash (Maq., Bānkhash), cf. also under 75.

1 According to Melgunov, the aspen is called, in the Caspian provinces, both أسفِدار (“white tree”) and أصفَدار. 
71. Iṣṭ., 331: Tukkath; cf. 79.
74., 75. Iṣṭ., 330: Anūdkath, Baghunkath, Farankath, Jabghūkath, all in Shāsh. In view of several other Turkish names in the region Baghūykath could contain the Turkish name Baghūy; cf. Dib-Baquy (one of Oghuzkhan’s mythical ancestors). Abul-Ghāzi, ed. Desmaisons, i, 10, explains that dip means “the place of a throne” and baquy “the leader of a nation” (il-ulughī).
76. Iṣṭ., 331: Sh.kākath, Bānjikāsh (in Ilāq), cf. 67. 77. This Tunkath is decidedly different from 71.
78. Iṣṭ., 331: Bālāyān (in Ilāq). On the river see § 6, 22. The name is not found either in A. Markov’s Inventarniy Katalog, nor in the list of mints in Codrington’s Manual of Musalman Numismatics, 1904. The presence of the mint must probably be connected with the silver-mine of 65.
79. Chāch, Arabic Shāsh. On the trees khalang and khadang see BGA, iv, 222, 229. Khadang is mentioned in Transoxiana, Iṣṭ., 289a, but not khalang. [Cf. also notes to § 52.] On the Shāsh bows see Maq., 325.
80.–83. Iṣṭ., 328, 330, gives, in a different order, the following parallels: Binkath, Nūjakath, Barkush, Khätünkath, D.nf.ghānkath, Banākath, Kharashkath, Biskath, Najākath, K.nk.rāk (all with numerous variants).
80. Binkath is the present-day Tashkent. Birūnī in his Canon writes: “مک *Binkath, chief place of Shāsh; in Turkish and in Greek (called) Stone Tower (burj al-ḥijāra)”. The hint is at the popular Turkish etymology tash “stone” + kand “village” brought into relation with Ptolemaic ḥdrως πύργος, v.s., § 9, 12. However *Tāsh-kand most probably contains the name of the province Chāch (v.s. 79.): Chāch-kand or Shāsh-kand > Tāsh-kand, with a dissimilation similar to čabr-> Middle Persian tas-“four”; Shūstār>Arab. Tustar; *sarpūsh>Arab. ṭarbūsh [see s.v. Turban in El]. 81. Nūjakath near the Chirchik railway station, Barthold, o.c., 174. 83. شَرْجَاكprobably خرچانک which Iṣṭ., 332, places in Ilāq. Shutūrkath, Maq., 342, at a marhala from Binkath. On the rivers of 81. see § 6, 17. and 22., cf. Barthold, o.c., 163.

VII. Region of Ispījāb (*Ispēchāb).

The original part of the Ispījāb region occupied the basin of the Aris, a right affluent of the Jaxartes, downstream from Shāsh, 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. Ispījāb belonged to the Turks and, though subjugated in A.D. 840 by the Sāmānid
Nūḥ, still enjoyed great privileges. The town of Ispījāb is the present-day Sayram; on their identity cf. Kāshghari, i, 78.


85. For Sāṇīkath, 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 Ilāq.

87., 88. Pārāb (Fārāb) 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. Șabrān, Iṣṭ., 346, details in I.H., 391.

91. Dharnūk ish 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 تار is but another spelling for طار (v.i. 92.) and corresponds to طار Otrar where Timur died in 807/1405. It must be carefully distinguished from طار (v.i. 93.).

92. Sūnākh corresponds to “Sughnaq, town of the Ghuz”, in Kāshghari, i, 392; cf. Maq., 323k: طار و صناخ read: “طار و صناخ”, i.e. Otrar and Sighnakh. In Turkish sighnakh 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 Sighnak (in Russian) in the Soobshcheiya Gosudar. Akademii materialny kulturi, Leningrad, 1929, pp. 123–59. (It is open to doubt whether سوس in Iṣṭ., BGA, iv, 424, and Maq., 263q, mentioned under Ispījāb may conceal the name of Sūnākh).

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 Barshkān, 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. Ṭarāz (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 Ṭarāz, Barthold, Report, 14–17. P. P. Ivanov, K voprosu o drevnost'akh v verkhovyakh Talasa, in the Fest­schrift to S. F. Oldenburg, Leningrad, 1934, p. 241–51, identifies Shalji with the ruins of Aq-tapa (near the village Dmitriyevskoye) on the upper course of the Talas. Farūnkath (Afrūnkath) is not in the Arabic texts unless it is the ribāṭ افرعن Anfarun (?) which Iṣṭ., 336–7, places in the Qalās steppe, on the frontier between Shāsh and Isfījāb. Between Takābkath and Mirkī, Maq. mentions Kūlān; both Kūlān and Mirkī 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 Khuttalān and Khwārazm respectively.

As in §§ 23 and 24, the difference between Transoxiana and its marches is more geographical than political, for the amir of Chaghāniyān (§ 25, 27., to say nothing of 46. Farghāna, 63. Ilāq, and 79. Chāch) is mentioned in Transoxiana whereas his neighbour of Khuttalān ruling over the south-eastern wedge of the territory is included in § 26. See Map ix.

1. Khuttalān, Iṣṭ., 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, Iṣṭ., 297, 339, Maq., 283, 290. The pronunciation Khuttalān is confirmed by the popular song quoted in Īṭār, ii, 1492, 1494, which is considered as one of the earliest specimens of Modern Persian.¹ The princes of the Bānjūr family bore the title of Shēr-i Khuttalān, I.Kh., 40, Marquart, *Ērānsahr*, pp. 300–2 (genealogy),² Barthold, *Khuttal in EI*. 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 Māsand (§ 25, 27., 33., 28.) Ya’qūbī, 289, enumerates without any clear system ışt. (v.s., 37, 92, I.R., 339, v.s., § 6, 10.), Khuttalān (= Lēvkand), Halāvard, Kārbang, Andīshārāgh, Rustā Bīk, Hulbuk, and Munk. More useful are the distances quoted by Iṣṭ., 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. Iṣṭ. 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 = Hulbak (in the Soviet Tājikistān); the latter lay near Ḥadrat-Imām-Ṣāḥib, Marquart, o.c., 233, Barthold, o.c., 76. Iṣṭ.’s passage consists of several distinct items.

From the Badhakhshān ford (A) to Munk 6 marhalas, thence to the Stone Bridge (on the Vakhshāb) 2 ditto; thence to Lēvkand 2 ditto; (thence) downstream to Halāvard 1 ditto (both Lēvkand and Halāvard lying on the Vakhshāb).

From the Ārhan ford (B) to Halāvard 2 marhalas.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 Abu Dā’ūdī branch v.s., § 24, 12.
³ This sentence is probably an interpolation. To complete his east-to-west semicircular description Iṣṭ. would have better said: “and from Halāvard to the Ārhan ford”.

From “the” ford (al-ma‘bar)\(^1\) to Hulbuk 2 days; thence to Munk 2 days.

Kārbanj lies above the Ārhan ford, circa 1 farsakh.

Tamliyāt to the Stone Bridge 4 farsakhs (along the Munk road).\(^2\)

From the Badhakhshān [read: *Ārhan]\(^3\) ford to Rustāq Bik 2 marhalas; thence across the Andichārāgh river [= Ğā’ir-su] to Andichārāgh 1 marḥala; thence across the Pārghar river to Pārghar 1 day; (thence) across the Pārghar river [p. 296, I.H., 401, I.B., 1, 76, Tālvr = Munk river] to Hulbuk (distance left out).

2. At present Hulbag to the south of Kulab, cf. § 6, 8.

3. “Nuchārā” coupled with Rustā Bik certainly corresponds to Andichārāgh (the name has several variants and the alternating of ğ and š in them confirms the ğ of Nuchārā), see Ya‘qūbī, BGA, 279, Iṣṭ., 296, 339, Maq., 290 r. Misunderstandings in the available manuscripts and editions have complicated the identification of Andichārāgh,\(^4\) but Barthold, o.c., 69, is certainly right in placing it near the Ğā’ir-su (a small river between the Pārghar and Vakhshāb). In our text we must certainly assume that Nuchārā lay between “*Vakhshāb* (not خرناب Kharnāb) and Jayhūn”, for placing it between the Kharnāb (= Bārtang, § 6, 7.) and Jayhūn would upset Iṣṭ.’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 Jayhūn, and as regards the mountain mentioned in our text, the hills stretching east of the Ğā’ir-su (3,700 feet high) would fulfil this condition as well. Russian sources evaluate at 124 Km. the distance between Ayvaj (situated at the estuary of the Kāfirnihān river, cf. Maq., 292, and Saray lying upstream from it (opposite the Afghān settlement of Ḥadrat-Imām-Ṣāhib). Beyond the Qaraul-tūbe post (circa 97 Km. upstream from Ayvaj) the road “ascends the Jili-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 Sarāy plain, see Prince Masalsky, Turkestanskiy kray, SPb., 1913, p. 738. Therefore I should more exactly identify Nuchārā to Sarāy and Rustā-Bik to Jili-kul (lying to the east of the Vakhsh river). The Jili-kul pastures must still carry on the Rustā-Bik the Oxus in a SW. to NE. direction.

1 Marquart takes it for the just mentioned (B). I decidedly take it again for (A) in view of the distances: 6 marhalas 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 Tamliyāt 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 (v.s., § 23, 69.), placed it on the left bank of the Oxus. Le Strange, The Lands, 435, identified the Andichārāgh river with the Bārtang (= Aq-su, Murghāb, Sarız in the Pamir) having taken it for the *first* affluent of the Oxus, whereas Iṣṭ., 296 (= I.H., 347) and Maq., 22, assign to it only a fourth place.
traditions, now one thousand years old! Some coins struck in Andhārāgh have come down to us. See Markov, Invent. Katalog.

4. Now Pārghar, east of the river formed by the streams of Baljuvān and Kulāb, cf. note to § 6, 7.

5. Having mentioned separately the capital of Khuttal (2.) our author seems to carry his enumeration from the south-easterly corner of the province (3.), in a north-easterly direction (4.) to 5. Munk, thence to turn back southwards along the course of the Vakhshāb (Tamliyāt, Halāvard, and Līvkand). In this case Bārsāragh (not otherwise known) ought to be looked for somewhere between Pārghar and Munk on the Munk-Hulbuk river. If, however, we examine the outward form of the name the only parallels are and which Ya’qūbī, 289, names somewhere in the Kāfirnihān basin. I.Kh., 39, names Bās.rā between Ṣaghāniyān and Vāshjird. In I.R., 92, B.sār seems to be due only to de Goeje’s surmise, cf. Marquart, Ėrānsahr, 234. Bāsārān/Bās.rā lay outside the Khuttalān proper but it could be an acquired fief of a member of the Khuttalān family. Ya’qūbī names a Ḥātim b. Dā’ūd in which comes in the enumeration immediately after Qubādhiyān. It may correspond to our Nūdiz (§ 6, 10.) which in this case must be looked for on the lower course of the Kāfirnihān river.

As regards the other two names of our 5., according to Iṣṭ., 297, Munk (= Baljuvān) was larger than Hulbuk. Tamliyāt (in Iṣṭ., but not in Ya’qūbī) lay probably at Shīr-guzār near the loop of the Vakhsh.

6–8. Halāvard = Qurghan-tübe; Lēvkand = Sang-tūda, both on the Vakhsh, the latter upstream from the former. Cf. Barthold, o.c., 69.

9. Our source clearly spells ɒjæ ɒ, and so does Gardīzī, ed. M. Nāzim, p. 35. The usual reading is راشت (Rāšht) and a sukūn over چ which could be taken for the three dots over چ. More curious is the fact that Ya’qūbī, 290 e gives *Jāṣb < *Jāšt which is a good parallel for Zhāsht. Ya’qūt mentions separately, ii, 733: Rāšht and ii, 907: Zāsht, though he does not even explain where this latter locality (maudi’) was situated. I.Kh., 34, says that Rāšht is the farthest distant point of Khorāsān in the [north-eastern] direction; Rāšht lay between two mountains and the Turks used to penetrate through it on their raiding expeditions; therefore the Barmakid al-Fadl b. Yahyā b. Khālid constructed (’allaqa) there a gate. The thirteenth-century Spanish geographer Ibn-Sa’īd pretends that this Jabal bāb al-Fadl was connected with the well-known wall in the Qalās steppe, see Barthold, Ibn-Sa’īd, p. 239, and Turkestan, 175. According to I.R., 92, the Vakhshāb rising in the Kharlukh region flowed through the lands of Fāmir (Pāmir), Rāšht, and Kumēdh. Iṣṭ., 340, continues his route from Vāshjird (v.s., § 25, 35.) to Ḩlāq (the Faydābād river is still called Ḩlāk) 1 day; thence to Darband 1 day; thence to Jāvkān 1 day; thence to the fortress of Rāšht 2 days. Rāšht is certainly Garm (in Turkish Qara-tegin, see Barthold, Karategin in EI). Zhāsht had an amīr of its own, v.i., under 11.

10, 11. The Kumījī and the K.njina-Turks were evidently remnants of some earlier population or wave of invasion. Both our text and Bayhaqī,
611, 696, mention these two groups distinctly. Only the K.njīna-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, Bayhaqi, 696 († K.njīna), and the Mafāṭīḥ al-ʿulūm (written in 365 or 381 A.H.). The latter, p. 110, has a curious passage: “The Hayāṭila (Hephthalites) are a tribe of men who had enjoyed grandeur and possessed the country of ʿUkhrāristān; the Turks [called] Khallukh (cf. notes to § 15, § 23, 69., and § 24, 22.) and K.njīna († K.njīna) are their remnants.”

The use of the term “Turk” in early Muslim literature is loose and even the Tibetans are considered as Turks, see Biru, India, 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 tsagān “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) (var. as *Kamijīna in order to compare this name with that of the Kamičik Hephthalites whom the Armenian historian Moses Kalankatvats’i mentions in the Caucasus (i, ch. 27, Patkanian’s trans., p. 70). [Cf. also Marquart in Ungar. Jahrb., 1929, p. 98: “die hephthalitischen Kamičjān in Caghāniyān und Kamičik Hprt’alk’ im nördlichen Daghistan, die wohl nach ihrer Heimat am Kām (Jenissei) benannt sein werden.”]

The question of the K.mijī is still more complicated. Two earlier authors, Yaʿqūbī and I.R., refer to a locality of which the name may be restored as *Kumēdh. Yaʿqūbī, 290, says that Munk (§ 26, 5.) was the frontier “towards (ilā) the lands of the Turks, towards the locality called Rāsht, *Kumēd (Kām), 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. Nāzim, Index, and Bayhaqi, 499, 576, 611, 696, speak of the people K.mijī (K.mējī). Maq., 283, somewhat vaguely says that “neighbouring on Ṣagāniyān are the people called *K.mijī and the K.njīna Turks († K.njīna) Qum ʾyāl lam Kigājī, Kungājī), whereas our author not only clearly separates these two peoples but among the K.mijī distinguishes two groups, of which the one (that of Chaghāniyān) occupied the locality of Saylākān between Shūmān and Vēshgird (read: Woschird), v.s., § 25, 35., and the other (that of Khuttalān) lived between Tamlīyāt and Munk (on a distance hardly exceeding one marhala, v.s., Iṣṭ., 339). It is added in our § 6, 10. that the Kāfīrnihān river rises from the limits of the K.mijī. [Shaykh Muhammad khān Qazvīnī draws my attention to Nāsir-i Khusrāu’s Wajh-i din, ed. Berlin, p. 53, where the Kīchān of Khorāsān and the Küchān of Kirmān stand for barbarity, as they have no divine book. The first name is certainly *Kumājīyān.]

1 Here the Turkish K.njīna are mentioned distinctly from the tribe (qaum) called *K.mijī.
The term *Kumedh* undoubtedly corresponds to the mountainous tract (ὄρεων) which according to Ptolemy, vi. 12-13, was inhabited by the Saka tribe *Κωμηδαν*. More particularly ἡ τῶν Κωμηδῶν ὀρεων must be distinguished from ἡ φάραγξ (defile) τῶν Κωμηδῶν, of which the former comprised the region of the so-called Buttamān mountains (§ 5. 9.) and the latter might correspond to the upper Vakhshāb valley (Rāshīt) 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.mījī* can hardly be detached from *Kumedh*. The indications of the Ḥ.-ʿĀ. are particularly precious as showing that the K.mījī were scattered along the whole of the Comedian ὀρεων. Therefore the name *K.mījī* must be read *Kumejī*< *Kumed-jī* with the Iranian suffix of origin -jī, -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.mījī “Turks” which they probably would have done had the K.mījī been regarded as Hephthalites. In any case, pending a proof to the contrary, it is safer not to dissociate the *Kumejī* from the territory *Kumedh* which in its turn is connected with the Saka (i.e. Iranian) *Κωμηδαν*.¹ On the historical role of the Kumījīs see Barthold, *Turkestan*, Index. Very characteristic is the following passage in Gardīzī, ed. M. Nāzim, p. 36: *pas Abū ʿAlī (lord of Chaghāniyān) az amīr-i Khuttalān yārī khwāst va khud laskhar jam’ kard . . . pas madad andar rasīd Abū ʿAlī-rā az Kumijīyān va amīr-i Zhāsht*, which confirms our *yārī khwāstan* in the sense of “ask for aid”.

Ia. Road from Khuttal to Kashmīr.

This is the road the beginning of which is hinted at by Yaʿqūbī, 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 Shikinān 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 (ʿalā hādhā) every merchant takes his route travelling (al-rā’ih) towards China or Multān.” 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 Shikinān and “Shīkīna Turks” undoubtedly refer to the subjects²

---

¹ Less certain is their relation to the name of K.mrudh (*Kum-rūdh*?), as I.R., 93, calls one of the headwaters of the Chaghāniyān river (Surkhān). In any case, our author, § 6, 10., places the sources of the Kāfīrnīhan river in the territory of the K.mījī. The Kāfīrnīhan flows between the Vakhsh (coming from Zhāsht (9.) and the Surkhān.

² And rather to his Turks (camel-men!) than to the real Shīghnī Tājīks.
of the Turkish chief whom Ya‘qūbī, 292, calls *Khumār-bīk (v.s., § 24, 24.). Shikinān in a larger sense is applied here to the whole wedge of Afghan territory round which the Oxus sweeps to the north-west of the Pamir. Khumār-bīk’s possessions are mentioned in Ya‘qūbī separately from Badhakhshān, and the reason for the choice of a difficult ford\(^1\) 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 (Afghan) bank of the river representing a short cut between Khuttal and the Shughnān, properly so called.\(^2\) Once in Shughnān (usually merged in Vakhān) the merchants could follow up the stream\(^3\) 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,\(^4\) 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:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{§ 24, 24. Badhakhshān} & \quad \text{§ 26, 2. Hulmuk} \\
- 25. & \quad - 12. \text{Dar-i Tubbat} \\
- 26. & \quad - 13. \text{R.kht.jab} \\
- 27. & \quad - 14. \text{Sikāshim} \\
\quad & \quad - 15. \text{Khamdādh} \\
\quad & \quad - 16. \text{Sanglnj} \\
\quad & \quad - 17. \text{Bljm} \\
\quad & \quad - 18. \text{Samarqandāq} \\
\quad & \quad - 19. \text{Bolor} \\
\quad & \quad - 20. \text{Andrās} \\
\text{§ 10, 57. Kashmir} & \quad \text{§ 10, 57. Kashmir}
\end{align*}
\]

\(^1\) This ford undoubtedly lay considerably upstream from the Badhakhshān ford, v.s. 1., somewhere in Darvāz, for example near Larān (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 Afghan 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.
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 Baroghil pass) is represented by 12., 14., 15., 18.–20., whereas 13., 16., and 17. must refer to the branch going to Chitrāl (over the Dora pass). Some useful parallels to our names are found in Biruni’s Canon, where much 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 Jerm and Zaybāk (near Bahārak) and one between Zaybāk and Ishkāshim (near Zīrkhān, where now stands the ribāṭ Sirājiya?).

13. Biruni in his Canon (towards the end of the 4th climate) enumerates in a NW. to SE. direction:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</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>رحلā</td>
<td>96°00'</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 رحلā stands for زیباک Zaybāk 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 Hindūkush, and after having flowed past Sanglich, Zaybāk, Tīrgarān, 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 Chitrāl and the other (by an easy pass) leading in a SW. direction into the upper part of the Munjān valley. The Afghān scribes spell زیباک Zaybāk, see Kushkhālī, Rāhmumā, p. 138, which very closely resembles رحال, whereas Sir G. Grierson, Ishkāshīm, Zebbāk, and Yāzghulamī, London, 1920, spells throughout (see p. 4) Zebak, i.e. زیباک. There is hardly any doubt about our رحال being identical with Biruni’s رحال, but it may be a distortion of the slightly different arabicized form زیپق Zaybaq “quick silver” which a popular Arabic etymology might have easily substituted for the Iranian زیباک.

Much more thorny is the interpretation of the caption accompanying Biruni’s co-ordinates: (?) (?) ٤٦٥٩٦°. As regards the script the best restoration is that suggested to me by Shaykh Muḥammad khān Qazvīnī: *رجال بنخسان ٤٦٥٩٦° for سدحاى and *رجال بنخسان ٤٦٥٩٦° for سدحاى. I must a better reading ٤٦٥٩٦°. As Biruni’s tables are arranged in the order of increasing longitude “97” cannot precede “96”.

1 Called by Ya’qūbī, 288,5, the last town to the east of Badhakhshān before Tibet.
2 Or. 1994 gives as the longitude ٤٦٥٩٦°, but the Berlin MS. has صrena, i.e. ٤٦٥٩٦°. As Biruni’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 *Postrouten* the reading 

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 

Leaving aside the first letters the group 

strongly reminds one of *(Ba)*dhakhshān.¹ The tentative translation would consequently be: “*Raḥal* lies within the limits (or on the frontier) of the ruby mines and opposite it is Badhakhshān”. The mention of the ruby mines in connexion with Zaybāk can be explained² but the meaning of *Raḥal* is decidedly vague. In a caption where every word must have a clear sense, what would mean the indication that Badhakhshān (already mentioned before it) lies “opposite” it?³ In view of this vagueness I suggest the reading *Worōℏe Msdḥan* “and beyond it is Mundajān” which involves more alterations in the text but gives a more satisfactory reading. The form is attested in I.Kh., 37, and looking from the road Munjān would appear as lying “beyond” Zaybāk. 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 (= Vakhān) is also *Sai-kia-shen* (so instead of *Han-kia-shen*), Marquart, o.c., 224, Chavannes, o.c., 164, but in Bīrūnī, *Canon*, Sikāshim (now Ishkāshim) is distinctly called “capital of *Sh.knān*”. Under § 6, 6. and § 10 (introduction) our author seems to include “Shaknān” in Vakhān. Shaknān (sic in our text) has no separate description in the *H.-’Ā.* unless we take for it § 24, 27. (evidently borrowed from a different source). In the course of time the extent of the Shughnān territory considerably changed. Hsiian-tsang (seventh century) evaluates its circuit at 2,000 *li* (20 days). The basic territory of Shughnān lies on the Oxus downstream from Ghārān and upstream from Darvāz, see Minorsky, *Shughnān* in EI.

15. *Khamdādh* is undoubtedly *Khandūd*, a considerable village in Vakhān (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. Kushkakī, o.c., 165: *Qal’a-yi Sangī*; Sir A. Stein, *Innermost Asia*, 1928, pp. 402–3, and pl. 47: ruins of Zamr-i atash-parast near Yamchin, opposite Khandūd, on the

¹ It is strange though that, after having correctly spelt and dotted the name of Badhakhshān 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 Zaybāk is separated from Ishkāshim by a watershed, the whole Zaybāk-Ishkāshim tract forms one geographical area shut off by narrow gorges from Badakhshān, Vakhān, and the present-day Shughnān. The Ghārān district (“the caves”) lies in the defile through which the Oxus forces its way northwards to Shughnān, see Sir A. Stein, *Innermost Asia*, p. 873, and it is noteworthy that Kushkakī, 140 and 148, mentions Ghārān both under Zaybāk and Ishkāshim.]

³ Ghārān (v.i. 16.) lying on the banks of the upper Oxus outside the basin of the Badhakhshān river might perhaps be said to lie “opposite” Badhakhshān, but the exact wording of the caption is “and opposite it lies *Msdḥan*”. Why should the author in an enumeration going NW. to SE. have defined a point “backwards”, with reference to the already-mentioned Badhakhshān?
§ 26

Transoxanian Marches

Russian side. Hsüan-Tsang, Si-yü-kì, 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. *Sanglich or Sanglech (perhaps identical with § 24, 26.), lies to the south of Zaybāk (v.s. 13.) on the road to Chitrāl. A crucial test for S.ngL.nj = *Sanglich 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 < balakhsh, i.e. badhakhsh, with eastern-Iranian  for δ); 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-dara' and Ghund rivers (south of the Russian post of Khārogh). The inhabitants of the village of Ghārān (غاران, 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 Khārogh lies the village Kūh-i la'l where some garnets are still found, cf. Tājikistān, p. 261. As regards the Afghān side Kūshkakī, p. 148, says that the ruby mines "in Ghārān" were closed down as economically unprofitable. Ghārān lies entirely apart from Sanglich 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 Birunī'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 Yumgān. This valley (Nāsir-i Khusrāu'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, Kūshkakī, o.c., 134.

17. The rūstā or Hospital is most probably Munjān lying on the river of


2 As a rumour Kūshkakī, 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 Kāfiristān (Nūristān) to which also a road leads from Sanglich. [Kūshkakī, p. 235, mentions a road connecting Faydābād with Nūristān over a difficult pass called *Mundal (alt. 15,300 f.). The road, ibid.,
the same name upstream from Yumgān (v.s. 16.) and communicating with Sanglīch by an easy pass. This suits perfectly our text which after *Sanglīch (i.e. evidently continuing the road Zaybāk-Sanglīch) adds: \textit{va az ānjā bigudhari nāhiyatā āyadh ā-rā rūstā *M.lj.m khwānand}, “and when you are out of it (= beyond it) comes the district called *M.lj.m”.\footnote{\textit{Mandjan} “and beyond it is Mundajān”. That Bīrunī speaks of *Zaybāk and our source of *Sanglīch makes no difference: Bīrunī leaves out Sanglīch for which he has no co-ordinates but both Zaybāk and Sanglīch lie on the same road and in the same Vardoj valley. In Bīrunī’s copy the name *Mandjan may have been influenced by the better-known Badhakhshān, but the form \textit{Mandežān}. 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.\footnote{Marquart suggested the identification of Munjān with the land of the Sakāh-Haumavrgah (Σακαγραφαί), Markwart, \textit{Das erste Kapitel des Gāthā ustavatī}, p. 42; cf. now Morgenstierne, \textit{The name Munjān, &c. in Bulletin SOS}, vi/2, 1931, pp. 438-44.} 1 Marquart, \textit{Erānsahr}, 222, restored the first name as *Yanbaqān > Yumgān (better Yumgān), and the second one as Kurān (with a \textit{damma} for the \textit{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.

İšt., 297, says that the following districts neighbour (\textit{yutākhim}) on the Vakhsh (v.s., note to § 26, 1.): “al-Khuttal, Wakhkhān, *al-Sh.qīna, and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Tax (dirhams)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>al-M.mnd.jan</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vakhkhān</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shiqinān</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karrān (sic)</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-M.\textit{mnd}jan</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textit{al-M.\textit{mnd}jan} (var. \textit{al-M.\textit{nd}jan}) seems to run up through the Munjān villages Magnul, Takāb, and Vilav. The Mandal pass is very clearly shown on the map in Sir G. S. Robertson’s \textit{The Kāfirs of the Hindu-Kush}, 1896.]
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 Iṣṭ. seems to give to this term an extensive meaning covering the whole of the headwaters of the Yumgān-Jerm river.

The enumeration in our source may be confronted with Biruni's Canon in the following way:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>nāḥiya</th>
<th>K.rān</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R.kh.tj.b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sīkāshim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kh.mdād</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.ng.Inj</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.lj.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samarqandāq</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.lūr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As K.rān is located by Biruni to the south-west of ɾ̣al 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 Iṣṭ. uses it.

18. S.m.rq.ndāq looks like a derivative of Samarqand. A village of Samarqand existed in Western Mongolia at 7 days' distance from Bishbaliq, cf. Juvainī, GMS, xvi, 215, xviii, 250. Barthold, Die histor. Bedeutung, p. 4, note 2, and K voprosu o yazikakh 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 "Samarqandāq" could be explained in a similar way, particularly as the presence in it of a motley population suggests its commercial importance. Most probably Samarqandāq 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 Samarqandāq. [In the Russian translation of Kushkakī, p. 150, the name is spelt in Arabic characters سمرقالد. Is it a mis-print?]

19. Cf. Bolor in Marco Polo, 3rd ed. by Yule-Cordier, i, 172, 178–9. In the words of Muhammad Ḥaydar, Tārīkh-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 Badakhshān; 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 Kāfiristān", as well as some small states south of Gilgit and Yasin, but excludes from it Baltistān. 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 = Buhārā in Orkhon Turkish.
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-ssü) 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-pan-t’o as *Gharband “angustiae”.] Sir A. Stein identifies the peak of Hsüan-Tsang’s story with the Qiz-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 H.-Ā. has several points in common with Bīrunī’s Canon, one can postulate the identity of Andrās with Bīrunī’s (Bdr. or Ḥrān) (Andarkul) which is said to be “the Gate of Kashmir, situated in the direction of several of its roads” باب گمری ال بعض دروبہ. 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 Bārāmūla (circa 40 Km. to the north-west of Srinagar, on an important road to Gilgit, &c.) whereas Bīrunī, who describes the western approaches of Kashmir, gives the following co-ordinates:

B.rḥān (?) long. 98° 0’ lat. 33° 25’
Srinagar , , 98° 40’ , , 33° 20’

After all Andrās, Andarkūl, and B.rḥān may be different places. Sir A. Stein in an additional note to his Memoir on map . . . of Kasmīr, Calcutta 1899, p. 222, finally admits the identification of Bīrunī’s place “lying halfway between the rivers Sind and Jaylam” with Babarḥān, 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 Khwārazmshāhs descended from the legendary Siyāvush and from Afrīgh (said to have flourished towards A.D. 305) was living its last days. Abū 'Abdillāh, the 22nd and last of the shāhs, was killed in A.D. 995 by Ma'mūn b. Muhammad, the eponym of the Ma'mūnid dynasty, see Sachau, *Zur Geschichte von Khwārizm*, *Sitz.WAW*, 1873, lxxxiii, 500 (30). Cf. also M. Nāẓim, *Sulṭān Mahmūd*, pp. 56–60 and 184–5. In common with the detailed list of products in Maq., 325, our list has only rukhbin and, perhaps, qazhāgard (if the latter stands for durū “armour”).

23. Khushmithan (Ardakhusmithan), 24. Nūzbān (Nūzvār), and 25. Gurgānj (Arabic: jurjāniya) follow each other in Iṣṭ., 341. Maq., 287 and 289, has a variant Nūzābān and also speaks of the iron gate of this town. The description of Gurgānj in our author contains some original traits: double town, a separate amīr. The old rivalry (ta'assubī qadīm) between the dynasty of the Khwārazmshāhs of Kāth (on the right bank of the Oxus) and the amīrs of Gurgānj (on the left bank of the river) is an interesting portend of the events of A.D. 995, see Gardīzl, ed. M. Nāẓim, p. 57. Cf. notes to § 1. [On the ruins of Gurgānj see A. Yakubovsky, *Razvalini Urgencha* in *Izw. Akad. Mater. Kult.*, vi/2, 1930, 68 pp.]

26.–28. The form کرم خانس is nearer to Maq., 287: کرم خانس: than to Iṣṭ., کرم خانس: For یست and Maq. give (with variants) and for Qara-tagīn, B.rā (F.rā)-tagīn. The details of 27., 28. are new.

29. This paragraph exactly corresponds to I.H., 393. Neither Iṣṭ. 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 Km. west of Perovsk (now Turkestan). The “new Settlement” (in Arab. al-qaryat al-jadīda) = the ruins of Jankent, situated at 5–6 Km. south of the old Khivan fort Jan-qal’a (which latter stands at 22 Km. 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

By "Sind" (as distinguished from Hind, cf. § 10) Muslim geographers mean Baluchistan 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 Hakra 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 Ist., 170-80, but the region is better defined, inasmuch as the Indus is taken for its eastern frontier, while Ist., 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 (Baluchistan); 12. the Türkân district; 13.-14. the Budha district.

On the products of Sind our author has more details than Ist. Somewhat unexpectedly Maq., 481, mentions Kanbāya-shoes (al-ni‘āl *al-kanbā‘iya?) exported from Mansūra (sic).

1. According to Ist., 172, the local name of Mansūra was Brahmanābād (<Bahman-ābād). Birūnī, Canon: “منهْ (؟) or the Greater مَنْهَا [perhaps *نتَهْ ثَاَّثَا, v.i. 4.] is (called) Mansūra because its conqueror said: nasartu”. The ruins of Mansūra lie 47 miles to the north-east of Haydarābād, Cousens, o.c., 48-73, and plates iv–v. Ist., 173, calls the Quraishite king a descendant of Habbār b. al-Aswad. Cf. notes to § 10.

2. Manjābarī (?), Ist., 175, lay opposite Mansūra on the right bank of the Indus, and Sadūsān west of Manjābarī, perhaps between Sahbān (now Sahwan) and the Indus, cf. Elliot, i, 401, Marquart, o.c., 188, 190.

3. jyy stands evidently for jījī-i, Ist., 174, which lay half-way between Daybul and Mansūra, probably on the site of the present-day Haydarābād. On the various forms of the name (Ist. jījī-i) see Elliot-Dowson, i, 396-401, and Marquart, Erānsahr, 188. The form Birūn is attested in Ibn-Sa‘īd (610-673/1214-74) quoted in Abul-Fidā, 346-7: “al-Bīrun, to which belongs Abū Rayhān al-Birūnī”. This statement has a very relative value, for 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.vaihī (?) stood to the west of the Indus.

4. Daybul (Dēbūl). 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 Sidi ‘Ali (1556) speaks of the port of Tatta called دُلْوَّى سِند Bandar Lahori, situated on the site of the former (*Portuguese Dioli-Çindi), see Tomashchek, Nearch, p. 9, and Mohīt. Birūnī, Canon, immediately after Daybul mentions separately a place called مَنْهَا *Lohrānī “which is the Lesser مَنْهَا [*Thatha? v.s. 1.], situated at the place where the Indus disembogues into the sea”.
All the localities in Baluchistān are quoted after Iṣṭ. with a noticeable tendency to iranicize the names.

Iṣṭ. gives the following itineraries (which are from place to place and not in one line, see Marquart, l.c.):

1. Tīz (6.) to Kīz (7. Kīz and Kīj) circa 5 marhalas; thence to Fannāzbūr (10. Panjībūr)—2 m., thence to Dizak (7.)—3 m., thence to Rāsk (8.)—3 m., thence to Fuhlafahra (11. Puhlpara)—3 m.; thence to Isfaqa (7. Isk.f with metathesis)—2 light m.; thence to Bīh (7.)—1 m.; thence to Dizak (7.)—3 m., thence to Isfaqa (7. Isk.f with metathesis)—2 light m.; thence to Bind (7.)—1 m.; thence to Bīh (7.)—1 m.; thence to Qasrqand (7. Kūshk-i Qand)—1 m.; thence to Qanball (5. F.nīkī)—2 m.; thence to Daybul—4 m.; thence to Mansūra—6 m. Most of these places still exist in Baluchistān.

6. Tīz (Ptolemy vi, cap. 8, Tfjcra) is situated in the bay of Chahbār, a short distance to the west of the Chahbār village; 7. *Kech (Kīz, Kīj) is the name of a district east of the Nihang river. Kūshk-i Qand (Qasrqand, north of Chahbār), Bīh (Geh), Bint, and Dizak follow in good order, but Iskaf (now Ispaka, south of Bampūr) ought to precede Dizak (situated south-west of Jālk). 8. Rāsk lies on the middle course of the Sarbāz river, but the original Rāsk lay probably more to the north on the site of the town of Sarbāz. Its district in Iṣṭ. is called Kh.rūj (I.Kh., 55, Kharūn, read: Kharūz, as suggested by Marquart).

9. Jfil (Iṣṭ., 178, jHu) hardly corresponds to the Mashkai river. As, according to Iṣṭ., it lay near to Kirmān, it may be more likely identified with the important district of Mashkēl (also Mashkēdh). Iṣṭ. distinguishes Mashkay (a district stretching for 3 marhalas and possessing some palms) from Māsakān (belonging to the Khārijites and producing some sugar-candy). 10. Panjībūr, now the Panjīgūr district, south of Mashkēl. 11. Puhlpara (*pahra), “the bridge watch”, now Pahraj, east of Bampūr. Iṣṭ. says nothing about its belonging to Kh.rūj. Less clear are the names 5. Armābīl and Qanbalī (F.nīkī). According to Iṣṭ., 178, Armābīl lay at half a farsakh from the sea.

12. See Minorsky, Ṭūrān, in EI. Quzdār, now Khuzdar, 85 miles south of Kalāt, altitude 4,050 feet. Kīzkānān (= Qīqān, Balādhūrī, 432?) where the local ruler resided is probably identical with Kalāt. Shora-rūd is the name of the lower course of the Kalāt-river (off Quetta).

13., 14. The capital of the district belonging to the people called Bud-ha was Qandabil, now Gandāwa, 75 miles (120 Km.) north-west of Khozdar, north of the Indus, altitude 314 feet (102 m.). Ayl (Utl, &c.? ) was the district between Kīzkānān and Qandabil, named after its conqueror.

§ 28. Kirmān

Le Strange, The Lands, 299–321; Schwarz, Iran, 211–88. On the tribes of Kirmān see Marquart’s survey in Catalogue, pp. 74–81: Balūch, Kōfich, Bāriz, Muzāj, Rasūkh, Jut (ancient Yutiya, not Indian Zutt). To their number must be added the Indian adhgar settled in a district of Kirmān in
the direction of Sistān, see Balādhurī, 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
Iṣṭākhrī, 157–70. On the mountains of Kirmān see § 5, 10.

1. I.Kh., 49, says: “Jīruft is the largest of the towns of Kirmān, but the
wāll lives in Sīrjān”, although already Ya’qūbī, BGA, vii, 286, considers
Sīrjān as the greatest of the towns of Kirmān. Our author probably sub­
stitutes 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 Miskawaih, ed. Margoliouth, i, 350, 353, ii, 249, while speaking
of the seizure of Kirmān by Ibn Ilyās, already names Jīruft as the capital
and the fortress Bardāsīr 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 Iṣṭ., 167 (wells, houses with āzāj).
No special mention is found in the older geographers of the Qamādīn
suburb of Jīruft (Marco Polo’s Camadi) frequently mentioned in the
Kermān, in ZDMG, 1885, p. 380 and Houtum-Schindler, ḤRAS, 1898,
pp. 43–6.

2. Mentioned together in Iṣṭ., 160. Khīr is perhaps Khabr on the Fārs
frontier.

3. Iṣṭ., 166. On the river see § 6, 28.

Manūgān (Manūjān) lies south of Jīruft on the river Jāgin, cf. under 7. On
dates Iṣṭ., 167.

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, Balōcīstān in EI. One of the typical traits of Balūchī is the
initial gv corresponding to Persian initial b (cf. gvād/bād “wind”). Traces
of the same phenomenon in the dialects spoken in the central desert of
Persia and in Khorāsān toponymy (cf. Bākhārzd < Iṣṭ., 256: Gwākhārz) may
indicate the stages of Balūch migrations. Maq., 471, says that the Qufs
lived in terror of the Balūch whom ’Aḍud al-daula finally defeated. How­
ever, ’Aḍud al-daula also defeated the Kūfich and in the long run the Balūch
must have profited by the weakening of their neighbours.

7. On the Kūfich mountains see also § 5, 10. *Kūfich means in Persian
simply “mountaineer”; in Arabic transcription Qufs with š for ē. Iṣṭ., 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
Iṣṭ., 167. Maq. compares it (as well as Balūchī!) with Sindī. Very possibly
the Kūfich were of Brahō’ī origin. About our author’s times the power of
the Kūfich was crushed by ’Aḍud al-daula, v.s., p. 28. The details on the
Kūhistān-i Abū Ghānim not in Iṣṭ. Under this term our author seems to
understand the hills round Khānu to the east of the sources of the Minān
river (Rūdān, now Rūdbār). However, Iṣṭ., 162, places the Hauma Qūhidān Abī Ghānim in the neighbourhood of the Bāriz range.

9. Iṣṭ., 167: Shahrū, var. Shahruvā [Shahrō?].

10. All in the cold zone of Kirmān, Iṣṭ., 159: Jiruqān, K.shīstān, Rūbīn, Surqān, M.rz.qān with many variants.

11. Iṣṭ., 161, places Hasanābād and Kāhūn between Sīrjān and Dārābgird.

12. Cf. § 5, 10. Iṣṭ., 162g (Gothan Persian version) gives دهم و نفر. The name Dihaj also in I.H., 220.

13. Iṣṭ., 161, after enumerating the localities mentioned under our 15. (and ending with Dārjīn) goes on: “and between Jiruft and Bam the town of Hrmz (many variants) is situated known under the name of Qaryat al-jawz”. This last name (“the Walnut village”) is found in our text in the Persian form Dih-i goz. The name Dārjīn coupled with it has been erroneously repeated from the preceding paragraph instead of Hrmz. The cinnamon (dārchīnī) 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 Khwāsh) under Sistān; he himself places it on the frontier of Kirmān and immediately after it mentions Rīqān (now Rīgān) near the Bāriz mountains. The inhabitants of Khwāsh (الاخوان) were tent-dwellers and evidently belonged to the Bāriz tribes who, besides Persian, possessed another language, Iṣṭ., 167–8. Khwāsh probably lay in the neighbourhood of the Bazmān-kūh (= Dunbāvand in I. Faqīh, 106, this latter appellation hinting at some migrations from Māzandarān to Kirmān). Cf. Schwarz, o.c., 252.


16. In Iṣṭ., 166, madīna corresponds to our author’s shahrīstān and ahl al-jamā’a 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 Bam, 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.nij *S.bīj); the Balūches still give the name Ispī to the present-day Nuṣratābād, Le Strange, 325. Nhla seems to stand for *Fahla<Fahraj.

20.–21. Iṣṭ., 161, Firzīn, Māhān, Khabīs, Bardashīr, Janzūrdh on the road from Sīrjān to the desert. Bardasīr (*Bih-Ardashīr) is the present-day Kirmān. [Le Strange, 303, considers the form Yazdashīr, 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 Bardasīr. This can be a popular Arabic etymology of a name like *Yazdashīr.]

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. Tās in § 5, 11.).
The name Bīmand (Mīmand) is firmly attested in numerous Muslim writers; our كوت-میمند may be a compound *Kūṭ-Mīmand or *Kūh-Mīmand. Maq., 464, particularly speaks of the strong position of Mīmand.

23. The mountains between Sīrjān and Kirmān reach the height of 13,000–17,500 feet.

§ 29. Fārs

Le Strange, The Lands, 248–98, and Schwarz, Iran, 1–211, 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 Nāṣirī, by Hasan Fasā’ī, 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 Iran, A. A. khān Ḥekmat). 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 Pasargadæ, Berlin, 1907 (with a carefully prepared map), reprinted in Klio, viii, 1908.

The present chapter is a mere abridgement of Iṣṭ., or perhaps, of a Persian translation of the Arabic original (see below under 39.). The abundant toponymy of Fārs in Iṣṭ. 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 Shāpur, 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.; Shāpur (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. Iṣṭ., 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 Ḥ. Fasā’ī.
1. Shīrāz, 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. Hisn ibn ’Umāra, Iṣṭ., 105. This famous castle (cf. § 36, 18., Mar­quart, Erānsahr, 45) was the easternmost point belonging to Fārs on the coast, 160 farshaks distant from the westernmost 15., cf. Iṣṭ., 135.


6. Gūr, renamed Firūzābād 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 جرحیاکان (the Bundahishn places Yama’s castle Yamkert near the Chīmkān mountain in Fārs), cf. also Fārs-nāma, p. 139; to خرب (Khabr) تابع (i.e. the inland Nāband (Maq., 422 p) and not the one lying on the coast south of Tāhiri); and to سیمرَن (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 farshaks from Siriāf), Tomaschek, 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 var. صفارة in the Dasht-i Dastaqān (?) district crossed by the Shādhakān, see § 6, 31. Contrary to Le Strange, 259, note 1, it is impossible that this *Ṣufāra should have anything to do with the “shore” Sīf bani Ṣaffār (or Ṣaffāq) which bordered on the territory of the Kāriyān Kurds (this territory, Iṣṭ., 115, lying in Ardashīr-Khurra and extending eastwards towards Kirmān). Our پهلوان (indistinct) cannot be پَرْ (placed by Iṣṭ., 111, in D.) and stands perhaps for کرِجان (mentioned in Iṣṭ., 106, under B. soon after *Ṣufāra.

10. On the Qarmatian Hasan Abū Saʿīd, 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 Nizām al-mulk, Siyāsat-nāma, p. 195.

11. Tavaz or Tawwaj [Bīrunī, Canon, gives also the form Tava] lay on the river Ratīn (now Rūd-i Hilla), probably near the junction of its headwaters coming from Shāpur 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 Ḩusain. . . . 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. Ṭab must be read for Ṯab. According to Iṣṭ. the Ṭab river after having flowed past Arrajān yasqi rustāq Ṭab thumma yaqi’u fil-bahr. I think that here “rustaq of Ṭab” must be taken for what it stands and distinguished from the town belonging to it which according to Maq., 426, bore the name of Arrajān. This town, which is not explicitly mentioned on the Ṭab, may have lain to the south of it and nearer to the Shīrīn river. This may account for our author’s puzzling transfer of Ṭab 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 Ṭab was the seat of a Nestorian archbishop, Sachau, Vom Christentum in der Persis, Berlin, 1916, p. 9. The name of the town may be a derivative of “convent”?

15. In Iṣṭ., 113, Maq., 422, Mahrūbān, but I.R., 97, gives Māhrūbān. Iṣṭ., 135, fixes the western maritime frontier of Fārs at Mahrūbān. Maq., 453, counts from Arrajān to Ṭab 1 marhala, and thence to Mahrūbān 1 ditto, and further says: “and from Mahrūbān to Siniz, or to the river (al-nahr), 1 marhala, and from the river to Arrajān 1 ditto.” It is not impossible that in the second passage stands for or, that Ṭab lying near the Shīrīn river, the distance to Ṭab, 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 Mahrūbān was situated “in the sea between (the bends or branches of) the Ṭab river” (§ 6, 35.), but as explained in the notes the courses of the Ṭab and Shīrīn (§ 6, 32.) rivers have got confused in the text. The estuary of the river Ṭab (Jarrāhi), 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 Hindiyān 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 (Hindiyān) 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 “Ṭab 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 Ṭab is called Āb-i Arghūn (popular Mongolian etymology?). The town stood north of the present-day

---

1 This Ṭab must be clearly distinguished from Reshīr (on our maps Ṭab), situated south of Būbīr. See Marquart, Erānsahr, 147, who tentatively restores its name as Reshīr. 2 The Shīrīn (Hindiyān, Zuhra) river is still called “Ṭab” on our maps. Our author’s confusion of the names Ṭab and Shīrīn may point to an ancient origin of this ambiguous use.
Behbehān mostly on the southern bank of the Tāb (now Kurdistān, Jarrāhl) at about one farsakh’s distance from the gorge through which this river comes out into the plain. On the well near the Chāhuk village, Ist., 151. On dūshāb, Ist., 95.

17. As under 7., this residue of information on Arrajān is in a desperate state. Cf. Ist.’s lists of localities of Arrajān, pp. 112-13. Our یزک is پرک on the upper course of the Shīrīn, Ist., 119. رشهر یزک might be (?) a simple repetition of the mis-spelt یزک. Lārandān and Vāyagān are mentioned under § 6, 32. near the sources of the Shīrīn. Lūrdagān, the chief place of Sardan (the Lūrdagān lake is shown on Haussknecht’s Map between the two headwaters of the Kārun !). Vāyagān, though not impossible as a name (cf. Vāyghān in the north-eastern corner of the Urmiya lake), is not found in Ist., and stands perhaps for روکان, mentioned under § 6, 20. in a region where several rivers rise.

19. Bishāpur<Beih-Shāpūr, see Le Strange, o.c., 262. On the two fire temples, Ist., 118. On the images of kings, Ist., 150. On the well of Hindijān near Sābūr, from which smoke rises, Ist., 151; Schwarz, 34, places it near the oil-wells of Dālikī. 20. In Ist., 110, after Kumārij (sic) follows Hindijān but Vāyagān is perhaps a repetition of رُیاگان (cf. above under 17.).

21. Ist., 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 Jūyum, just mentioned under 21. Under 32. the name may have been repeated in the Persian garb of Gūyum.

23. B.rsarkān, B.rs.kān, perhaps Kāskān, Ist., 102. On the term kauri-stān see p. 255, note 1. The only Kauristān mentioned in the Fārs-nāma-yi Nāsiri 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 Kāvar, mentioned under § 6, 29. as lying on the river Sakān.


26., 27. All lying in E. (see under 27.) and found in Ist., 107-8, Schwarz, 101-5. On the tables (mawā'id) made of rock-salt see Ist., 155. On mūmiyā see Nuzhat al-qulub, p. 207.

28. Ramm [Shahriyār], Shaqq (or Suq) al-Rustāq, Furj, Tārm (now Tarom) in Ist., 109, but Maq., 428, gives a nearer form to ours: Rustāq al-Rustāq.


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 Kiz. Rufta is obscure.


36. Išt., 108–9, under E. Khiyār was the town of Nirīz. Išt. spells Ištahbahānt with š.

37. Abādhā belonged to E., Išt., 107, but B. rdangān (Išt., 101 p) and *Chāhuk (Išt., 102, Šāhuk) belonged to A.

38. All under A., Išt., 101–3, except Khurra, placed by Išt., 112, 118, under D. Išt., 102, also writes *شرفاك for Pāpak.


42. The district Sardan lay in the Kūh-gīlu mountains between the provinces A. and C. The details given under § 6, 36. show that the district belonged to the Tāb basin (cf. Išt., 119, on the two headwaters of the Tāb uniting near Misin), but it is possible that it included also the region of the headwaters of the Kārun. Išt., 103, calls Lurdagān 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 dhahab.

43. Išt., 102, under A. The form Abraj (not Iraj) is correct, Le Strange, o.c., 281. Instead of كی some of Išt. MSS., 102 k mention و (?).

44. Išt., 102, under A. Our D. rkān corresponds to al-akān.

45. Our clear Anār, for Išt., 102, یان is rather against Le Strange’s theory about Anār being an error for Unās, o.c., 266. The remaining four names are given by Išt., 100, in the Yazd district of Ištakhr (he spells Fahraj). 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 Mardawaih (1 ditto); thence

1 On the Lurdagān lake v.s., under 17.
to Bāsiyān (1 ditto); thence to Ḥiṣn Mahdī (2 ditto); thence to Bayān [cf. § 33, 11.] on the Tigris (1 ditto); thence to Baghdād.

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‘Ali, imām of the Muʿtazilites (d. in 303/916), see Djjubbāʾi in EI.

6. Iṣṭ. has nothing on the position of Sūq al-arbaʿā but our author derives his record from Iṣṭ.’s Map, cf. § 6, 37., where Sūq al-arbaʿā 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: أفاعي.


9. Iṣṭ., 93 (Mānī). The form of the name Ramh.z is half-way between the official form (cf. under 12.) and the popular pronunciation Rāmiz. The northern river of R.-H. (Rūd-i Aʿłā, or Gūpāl) is not mentioned under § 6. See Minorsky, Rām Hurmuz in EI.

10. Iṣṭ., 91 (sugar from Masruqān comes to ʿAskar Mukram). The specification of sugar not in Iṣṭ.

11. Masruqān is a locality, not a town, Iṣṭ., 90.

12. Rām ʿUrdmizd is probably a simple error for Urmizd, cf. § 6, 39.


14. Īdhaj, now Mālāmīr, is barely mentioned in Iṣṭ., 89, 90, 92. This paragraph in reality describes Shūshtar (Tustar), Iṣṭ., 9218. I.H., 175, explicitly says that at his time the cover for the Kaʿba was no more prepared at Tustar. Cf. § 6, 37.

15. V.ndū-shāvūr is an interesting form [cf. 12.] for Junday-sābūr, Iṣṭ., 93 (*Gundē-Shāpūr). The town founded by Shāpūr I, according to Ṭabarī, i, 826, was named Bih ᾣzd Andew Shāpur. Nöldeke considers this explanation (probably hailing from Ibn Muqaffa’) untenable. Marquart interpreted it first as “better than Antioch is (the town) of Shāpūr”, Erānsahr, 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 V.ndwey (or V.ndwg)-Shahpuhr which Marquart emendates into Vand<iy>og-Shahpuhr. But whatever the learned
etymologies of the original Sasanian name may have been, the fact is that Vndw exactly corresponds to the first part of the Byzantine Bevdoarabpov and to our Vindôy, which all agree in showing that the people simplified the name into a compound Vindôy-Shâpur. On the well-known name Vindôy see Justi, *Iranisches Namenbuch*, 370. Hübschmann, *Armenische Grammatik*, 85, explains the Armenian form Vndoy (borrowed from Middle Persian) as a pet-form of some name like the Old Persian Vindafarnah (*he who obtains glory*). Ibn al-Qifti, ed. Lippert, 133-4, confirms that the name of جنودي ساور (Jindj Shâpur (?)), a former master of the land, and Shâpur. For the explanation of مان شوش وندوشور in § 6, 40. see note to it. [However, a simpler restoration might be شوش [و] وندوشور.]


**§ 31. The Jibâl**

Le Strange, pp. 185-231, Schwarz, pp. 445-957 (an amazingly detailed analysis of Arabic sources).

This chapter, too, is based on Ist., 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 Ist.’s work which, as usual, contain many additions (cf. notes in *BGA*, i and iv). The description has been arranged according to Ist.’s itineraries (or his Map). 1. the capital; 2.-7. the road from Isfahân to Hamadān (the latter town forgotten!); 8.-12. ditto from Hamadān to Khūzistān; 13. ditto from Hamadān to Kirmânschâh; 14.-15. western localities; 16.-18. the road from Qazvîn to Tabriz; 19.-21. Rayy and its neighbourhood; 22. the road from Rayy to Hamadān; 23. ditto from Rayy to Isfahān.

1. Ist., 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. Ist., 199, speaks of al-attâbi wal-shasî al-saîir thiyyab al-harîr wal-qutun but the Gothan epitome (ed. Moeller) adds بالطلاطین and omits بالسقاطنيات. Our author omits وشي and incorporates the addition which is interesting, for no other writer seems to speak of siglatun being fabricated in Isfahân, see Schwarz, 888-90. This heavy figured silk stuff was chiefly produced in Armenia and Baghdād (where it was of blue colour), though Heyd, *Histoire du commerce du Levant*, ii, 700, admits that some of it came to Europe from Persia. See now G. S. Colin, *Latin “siglatun”*, &c., in *Romania*, 1930, lvi, 178-90 and
§ 31

The Jibāl

418. The Zarīnrūdh 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 Firdausi, 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 Firdausi 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 Dulaš's dynasty in Karaj.

7. No details on Rāmin in Iṣṭ. but I.H., 258, calls it معدن صالحة.

8., 9. This Karaj was the minbar of the Rūdrāvar rustāq, Iṣṭ., 199. The indistinctly written شر in view of the explanation seems to be بیر "cheese", but no other author mentions cheese in Rūdrāvar, Schwarz, 504. Perhaps the word was misread from تمر. 10. cf. Minorsky, Nihāwānd in EI.

11. Līshtar, 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 Nuzhat al-qulūb, p. 107, there stood (formerly) in Alishtar the fire temple of آدَرخَش, آدرخش, certainly Îdāvarkhsh, i.e. either ādharakhsh "a thunder-bolt", or ādhārkhuš "the 9th day of the Ādhar month". [Marquart, Erānsahr, 82, and Streifzüge, 347, restores Ādharkhuš in I.Kh., 120, &c., as Ādhar-jushnasf. He adds in Wehrot, 88: "der Hengst wešnasp 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 آدرخش.] 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 Dīnāvar, 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, Shehrizūr in EI) and the other between Hamadān and Zanjān. The spelling شهو زور (شهره زول) shows that the name was not considered as an idāfat construction. It rather confirms the etymology *Shah-razūr "the Kingly Forest", for Siyā-razār "the Black Forest", in view of the Byzantine το Σιαρσούρων, τόν Σιάζουρον, and the similar Pahlavī and Syriac forms, see Marquart, Südarmenien, 1929, p. 558, and Herzfeld, Mitt. aus Iran, ii, 2, 1930, pp. 73-4.

16.-18. Iṣṭ., 200-1. The popular form Auhar instead of Abhar is interesting, cf. note to § 49.
19. Tālaqān, district on the upper Shāh-rūd; not to be confounded with § 23, 52, and 76.

20. Iṣṭ., 208, under Daylam.


Of the produce of Rayy, our author borrows from Iṣṭ., 210: cotton and cloaks (abrand) and ibid., 208 o (in the Gothan epitome): cotton stuffs. Maq., 396, mentions precious taylasān-scarves, produced in Sudd near Rayy, and Ibn al-Faqīh, 253, glazed plates (al-atbāq al-mudahhana). It is curious that our author speaks of غضاو ورونش "china and oil (?)". Ghaḍāra means "greenish plastic clay", "big plate", and "china". The word رونش 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 Ghaḍā'irī who was a native of Rayy and died in a.d. 1034.

22. Iṣṭ., 214, places Sāva on the road from Rayy to Jibāl. Āva (usually coupled with Sāva) is mentioned several times in Maq., 386, 401. Rūdha and Būsna (?), Iṣṭ., 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. Balādhurī's and Ṭabarī's remarks, valuable as they are, have a fragmentary character. I.Kh. and Qudāma do not describe the Caspian provinces. Yaʿqūbī, 276–7, and even I.R., 149–51, are too brief. I. Faqīh, 101–14, chiefly follows Balādhurī and gives little purely geographical information. The oldest systematic accounts available until now were Iṣṭ., 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 Lāhījān 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 Gīlān found in 'Abdullāh Qāshānī's Tārīkh-i Uljāytū, Bib. Nat., supplément persan 1419, ff. 38b–45a (partly and inadequately edited in Schefer, Chrestomathie persane, ii,
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94–8). Cf. also the Nuzhat al-qulūb, 159–63 (Māzandarān, Qūmis, Tabaristān, Jīlān), and the Masālik al-abṣār, transl. by Quatremère in Notices et extraits, xii, 292–300 (on Qutlu-shāh’s unfortunate expedition into Gilān in Uljāytu’s reign). Of outstanding importance are the local histories of the Caspian provinces published by Dorn (in the series of the Russian Academy) as well as by E. G. Browne and H. L. Rabino (see bibliography in Minorsky, Māzandarān, in EI). Still very important are Melgunov, On the Southern Shore of the Caspian sea, SPb., 1863 (in Russian, German trans. by Zenker) and B. Dorn’s Caspia, SPb., 1875 (of which there exist a Russian and a German edition and which is a prodigious collection of fragmentary notes). Of the later European works on the region see especially the very useful map [H. L. Rabino and Capitaine Faure] Perse. Province du Guilan, published by the Société Lyonnaise séricole et des soies d’Extrême Orient, Lyon, 1914 [quoted: RFG]; Rabino, Le Guilan, in Revue du Monde Musulman, 1915–16, vol. xxxii (particularly valuable for giving detailed lists of villages) [quoted: RG]; A. F. Stahl, Die orographischen Verhältnisse des Elbursgebirges in Persien, in Petermann’s Mitteilungen, 1927, Heft 7/8, pp. 211–15, and Map 13 (the article sums up the previous works by this explorer of great merit); Rabino, Māzandarān and Astarābād GMS, N.S., vii [quoted: RM]; R. Vasmer, Die Eroberung Tabaristāns durch die Araber, in Islamica, iii/1, 1927, pp. 86–150, is a very detailed analysis of historical and geographical data; Minorsky, Māzandarān in EI (bibliography). See Map x (after RFG).

The tenth century a.d. is the period of the expansion of the Daylamite tribes whose original home lay in the mountainous districts between Gilān, Qazvin, 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 Sāmānid 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: Gurgān (1.–5.), Ţabaristān (6.–15.; 21.–23.), Kūmish (16.–19.), Daylam “proper” (24.), and Gilān (25.).

1. Gurgān. The seat of the king of Ţabaristān proper was Āmol, as rightly stated under 13. Gurgān 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.

2. Dihistān is the district on the Atrak, see Nuzhat al-qulūb, 212, cf. Barthold, Irrigation, 31–7, and Minorsky, Meshhad-i Miṣrīyān in EI.
Dihistān undoubtedly echoes the name of the ancient nomad people Dāai Dahae one of whose branches were the Aparnoi; from the latter arose the family of the future Parthian rulers, see Tomaschek, Daai in Pauly-Wissowa, Real-Encyclopādie, viii, 1945–6. I.Kh., 118, seems to quote a different Dihistān in Tabaristān; another Dihistān is mentioned by Išt., 268, in Bādhghīs (§ 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 Hurūfī 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 Σωκανάα 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 Gūrğān river (at Gūmūsh-tāpā), cf. Dorn, Caspia, pp. 67–8, 92, Barthold, Irrigation, 33; Le Strange, The Lands, 379. Ḥamdullāh Mustaufī, Nuzhat al-gulūb, 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 Išt., 216: Āmol to Mīlā 2 farsakhs; thence to B.rjī (?) 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 Ťamīsha 1 ditto; thence to Astarābādh 1 ditto; thence to Ribāḥ Ḥafṣ 1 ditto; thence to Jurjān 1 ditto. A detailed analysis of this route is found in Marquart, Untersuch. z. Gesch. von Eran, ii, Leipzig, 1905, pp. 58–60. According to I.R., 149–50, the eastern frontier of Tabaristān lay at ʿArāt al-āxur (*Ribāḥ al-ājurr “the burnt brick ribāḥ”) which probably is connected with the brick wall (ḥāʾīt . . . min ājurr) which stretched between the mountain and the sea and was attributed to Ānūshirvān, cf. also I. Faqīh, 303. In later times Shāh ʿAbbās built (or rebuilt?) the wall on the river Kirrind (cf. Ptolemy, vi, cap. 9, Xριῶδος) which was called jar-i Kulbād, 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. Māṁţīr = Bārfūrūsh.

14. Išt., 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 Māhmuḍābād, cf. Melgunov, Aḥm. Rūd.
15. Rudhān “copper (mines?)”, later Rūyān and *Ruyanj (so instead of Rūbanj in Išt., 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. Kūmish (*Kōmish*) is the region lying outside Tabaristān proper along the southern foot of the mountains, cf. Ptolemy, vi, cap. 5: ἡ μὲν παρὰ τῇ ὤρκαιναν Κομιστηνί. *James* standing in the text must be an error for *Ya'qubī, 276, says explicitly under Qūmis that the inhabitants of its capital Dāmghān, who are of Persian nationality (*'ajam*), are extremely skilful in production of woollen qūmīsī-textiles (آقص الصوف القموسة).

17. Dāmghān (now Dāmghān) is probably *Eκατόμπυλος βασιλείων* 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 'Alamdār* (here “beflagged” would be a more suitable interpretation).

20. On A. F. Stahl’s map *Umgegend 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 Pīrīm was probably situated on the western branch of the Tijīn river. Sāmār corresponds to Išt., 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 Pīrīm. 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), Zakariyā Qazwīnī, ii, 239, 270, and Ḥamdullāh, *Nuzhat al-qulūb*, 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 Ḥ.-‘Ā. and consequently must be added to the list of wonderful customs existing in the Caspian provinces, see Maq., 268–71, analysed by Inostrantsev in his *Études sāsānides* (in Russian), SPb., 1909, pp. 110–35.

24. Of the districts of Daylam proper (cf. Išt., 204, al-Daylam al-mahd) Latrā and Varfū [for the ending cf. *Laspu* south of Somām] are mentioned in Ibn Isfandiyār, p. 162, and Langā, home of the ‘Alid Abul Husain (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 ‘Abbāsābād and Aspichin, cf. Melgunov, *o.c.*, 182. M.rd is unknown. Chālkarūd river is some 65 Km. west of Chālūs, RM, 131. K.rkrūdh must correspond to Karkarūsar lying immediately east of the Chālūs, Melgunov, *o.c.*, 180, RM, 151.
and *Dīnār-rūdh to Dīnā-rūd, a narrow strip of coast mentioned in the *Tārīkh-i Khānī, ed. Dorn, Spb., 1857, p. 212, between Sakhtasar (eastern frontier of Gīlān) and Khushkarūd (in Rānikūh). Jūdāhanjān and *Dīnā-rūd have not been found.¹ Hausam, according to *RG, pp. 336–7, is identical with Rūdisar, which lies 13 Km. east of Langarūd. With regard to Hausam we have *Zahīr al-dīn’s indication (ed. Dorn, 1850, p. 19) that the western frontier of Ṭabaristān is Malāt “which village of the town of Hausam is now known as the port of Rūdisar”. It must be admitted, however, that such a position for Hausam 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 Ashkavār. Vastān, considering the order of enumeration, must be sought east of Somām on the southern frontier of Gīlān. 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 Kalārdasht (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 Kalār, in *GF, March 1934, pp. 211–17 (with a map).

25. Gīlān. The contents of this passage have been treated by Barthold in *Izvestiya Kavkaz. Istor.-Archeol. Instituta, 1927, vi, pp. 63–6, though without any explanation of the geographical terms. In the tenth century the Gil (Jīl), inhabitants of Gīlān, were a tribe usually distinguished from the Daylamites, see Minorsky, *La Domination des Dailamites, p. 23, note 28,² 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 (Gīlān) and Rūdisar (Daylam).


On “this side” of the river the districts (not yet towns! as pointed out by Barthold) were Lāfjān = Lāhījān [for f > h cf. *Nuyavanda > Nihavand]. Miyālafjān seems to be identical with Mālfjān, on the road from Lāhījān to Siyāhkal (Barfjān), *RG, 329.³ Kushkajān lies on the eastern bank of the

¹ If the second name is *Nylān-rūdbār it may be compared with the source of the Langarūd river rising near the village now called Leyl (*Neyl or Nēl ?). Cf. p. 410, l. 16.
³ Another restoration of this indistinctly written name may be *Niyālf-jān (?), cf. notes to § 36, 36.–41.
Safīd-rūd, *ibid.*, 327. Barfjān is the centre of the district Siyāh-kāl, south-east of Lāhijān, *ibid.* 278, 284. Dākhil, in Rāh-shāhī-pāyīn, north of Lāhijān, *ibid.* 322. Tijin, on the road going west from Lāhijān to Kūsūm, *ibid.*, 328. Ch.ma (reading uncertain) may be connected with Chomkhala, port of Langarūd, north-east of Lāhijān.

On "that side" of the river, Khāngajāl (reading uncertain: Jānkajāl, &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 Hāshim. This latter stands at the point where the highway from Qazvīn to Rasht following the left bank of the Safīd-rūd emerges from the Elburz mountains into the Gilān plain. 'Abdullāh Qāshānī in his *Tārīkh-i Uljāytu*, f. 39v, says: "On the western side of the Safīd-rūd the first province (*wilāyat*) is Kūtum, lying on the bank of the Sabīd-rūd (*sic*); i.e., south of it are the mountains, and east of it the Safīd-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 Kūchasfān [now: Kūchasfān] is situated north of Kūtum on the sea-coast. . . . Rasht is situated to the north-west of Kūtum."1 In later sources there is some confusion as to the location of Kūtum. Ḥamdullāh in the *Nuzhat al-qulub*, pp. 163, 217–18, places it on the shore of the Caspian near the estuary of the Safīd-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 Gūrab-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 Safīd-rūd). It must be remembered that the Safīd-rūd has several estuaries and it is possible that Ḥamdullāh had in view the port of Ḥasan-kīyā-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 *RFC*. 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 Safīd-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 *Tārīkh-i Uljāytu*, 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 Safīd-rūd.
in the *Nuzhat al-qulūb*, 163. The further rise of Rasht is connected with the dynasty of the amirs Tijaspi in 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 Tūlim) district lies north-west of Rasht and adjoins the Murdāb lagoon, *RG*, 190. The Dūlāb district adjoins the north-west corner of the Murdāb; its mountainous part is called Tālish-Dūlāb and that lying near the coast Gīl-Dūlāb, *ibid.*, 107–14. Kuhān-rūdh seems to refer to Kergān-rūd, the central part of Persian Tālish, *ibid.*, 89–100. Astarāb most probably is Astārā, cf. *Tārīkh-i 'Alam-ārā*, p. 742, Astārā. Khān-Balī (?) must be sought in the region of Mūghān, see Minorsky, *Mūkān* in *EI*. This part of enumeration has a pretty close parallel in Maq.’s route (pp. 372–3): Sālus (*Chālus*) to Isbīdrūd 1 marhala; thence to Qaryat al-Raṣād 1 ditto; thence to Kh.shm 1 ditto; thence to Baylamān 4 ditto; thence to al-Dūlāb 4 ditto (?); thence to Kuhān-rūd 3 ditto; thence to Mūghakān 2 ditto; thence to al-Kurr (Kur river) 2 ditto; thence to Hashādhar 2 ditto; thence to al-Shamākhiya 2 ditto. These distances are not exempt from suspicion and it is right that after Kuhān-rūd the H.-’Ā. should insert Astarāb. As our Khān-B.lī corresponds to Mūghakān, it is very likely identical with Bilasuvār, an important centre of Mūghān. [The name, probably *Pīla-swār* “great cavalier” is a familiar Daylamite name.]

The “boroughs” of Gīlān (Gīlābādh, Shāl, Dūlāb, and Paylamān-shahr) cannot yet be located. Maq., 355, mentions the towns in Daylam: B.rvān, V.lāmr, Sh.klr.z, Tāram (Tārom on the middle course of the Safid-rūd), Khasm; and in Gīlān: Dūlāb, Baylamān-shahr, and Kuhān-rūd, *ibid.*, 360.

Neither under Daylam (§ 32), nor Ādharbāyjān (§ 35) does our author mention by name the Tālish region extending along the coast between Gīlān and Muqān. In the earlier Arab writers two names occur frequently together الپر والطَلْسَان, see Marquart, *Streifzüge*, 280 (with numerous quotations). As regards Taylasān it is clear that it is an Arabic popular etymology for Persian Tālish-ān (whatever the real origin of the interesting Tālish people be). In Arabic *taylasān* means not only a sort of headdress 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 Tālish is situated. The only place remaining available for الپر is the mountainous tract lying west of Tālish between Ardabil and Zanjān, called Tārom (in Arabic الطم) and Khalkhāl, see Minorsky, *Tārom in EI*. Birunī in his *Canon* quotes الپر between al-Ṭarm and Zanjān. I feel sure that both الپر must be read *al-Hīr* (Her) 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-coasts. Cf. Renaud, *Abul-Fidā*, i, 19. Nallino, *Rifaci-

---

mento*, p. 16, explains Khuwārizmī’s *taylasān* as “una insenatura lunga e regolare, ma non molto profonda”.

---
§ 33. 'Irāq


Starting with the capital 1. Baghdād, the description follows the course of the Tigris down to 6. Wāsit; 7.–13. lie in the region of Baṣra; 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 'Iraq the Buyids are evidently meant.


8. Maftah mentioned by Išt., 81, and its position is indicated by the canal Ma’qil (§ 6, 46.).

10. Baṣra. Išt., 80 (= I.H., 159) mentions the same graves and states that Baṣra pays the ‘ushr instead of taxes based on the cadastre (mash), cf. I.Kh., 1413. To a different source belongs the item on the “veiled” (burqa’ī) ‘Alid, i.e. the leader of the rising of the black slaves in 255/868. On his supposed genealogy see Ṭabarī, iii, 1742, 1857; cf. Nöldeke, 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. Salmānān (?) not found. Salmān-i Pāk lying in the neighbourhood of Baghdād would be out of place here. Perhaps the sāmānī-mats mentioned under 13. are connected with Salmānān (?). 'Abbadān may belong to the same locality. 'Abbadān with its humble industries had to wait another thousand years before becoming the present-day bulwark of the Anglo-Persian Oil Co.

14. Mādharāyā (above Wāsit) 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 ’llāhu wajhahu, as applied to the caliph 'Ali, is sunnite. Very astonishing is the omission of Karbalā (Išt., 85) which would have been unthinkable for a shī‘ī, but see p. 177.

§ 34. Jazīra

I.Kh., 73–4, 93–9; Išt., 71–8; I.H., 137–57; Maq., 136–51 (iqlim aqūr). Le Strange, The Lands, 86–114 (most of the places will be found on Map

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 Balīkh 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 Niṣībīn all in Iṣṭ., 73. *Sang-i ābgīna* stands for *jawāhir al-zajāj* (I.H., 143: *jauhar lil-zajāj*), by which “silica, silicious earth” is evidently meant.

7. Abridged from Iṣṭ., 74.

8. Diyar-Rabī’a is precisely the province comprising 1.–7.


16. See Herzfeld, *Bālis*, in EI. Jisr Manbij is a different place from Manbij reckoned to Syria (§ 38, 1.). The spelling Shumaishāt, instead of Sumaisāt, is very common, and already Yāqūt, 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 less 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, 3.

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. *Ādharbād理想信念 [Arminya and Arrān]*

Münejjim-bashi's work and several rare Ottoman-Turkish sources); Schwarz, Iran, viii/1-8, ix/1 (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 Shirvān is undoubtedly based on the same source as Maš‘ūdi’s passage in the Murūj, but here, too, the H.-‘Ā. 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. Asna) to the north-easternmost point on the Araxes (7.). In Armenia first comes the capital (8.) followed by the points lying round the Urmiya lake 9.-12. (Khoy), 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 Daghestan (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 Musāfirid family. See Kasravl, o.c., Minorsky, La Domination des Dailamites, Paris, 1932, and Musāfirī in EL. However, the province had a number of local rulers as appears from I.H.’s enumeration of the Musāfīrī feudatories, BGA., ii, 254.

2. See Minorsky, Ushnū in EL. Sarāv, now Sarāb (I.Kh., 120: سرا). Jābrūqān corresponds to I.Kh.’s 119, 121, Jābrvān, which, together with Nirīz, belonged to Ḥālī b. Murr. Nirīz lay 14 farsakhs south-east of Urmiya, and Jābrvān 4 farsakhs farther south-east. The two places must be located south of the lake of Urmiya, probably in Sulduz, see Minorsky, Nirīz and Sulduz, in EL.

3. See Minorsky, Tabrīz, in EL. In the tenth century Tabrīz was an insignificant borough. ’Alā b. Ahmad al-Azdī towards 251/865 was the financial agent for Armenia (and Ādharbayjān) and in 260 rebelled against the new wālī of that province ’Omar b. Ḥālī b. Murr, see Tabarī, iii, 1584, 1668.

4. See Minorsky, Marāgha in EL. The son of Bu Sāj is Yūsuf b. Abul-Sāj Dīvdād. On the destruction of the walls [after 296/908] see Iṣṭ., 181.
5. Barzand, 6. Muqān, and 7. Vartān lie north of Ardabīl, 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 Kisra’s treasurer Nakhīrjān (?). It is curious that both Maq. 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, Urmīya and Salmās in EI.

12. The form Arjīj (perhaps influenced by the popular etymology arcīc>arzīz) is unusual instead of Arjish, in Armenian Archēsh (on the north-eastern bank of the Van lake).

13.-16. Malāzgird, Qāliqala (usually Qāliqalā, cf. Balādhurī, 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 Mantzikert, in Byzantion, ix/2, Brussels, 1934, pp. 613-42. Mayyāfārīqīn in the tenth century belonged successively to the Ḥamdānids, Būyids, and Kurdish Marvānids, see Minorsky, s.v., in EI.

16. See Minorsky, s.v., in EI.

17. Here begins the more original part of the chapter. Mīmadh (*Mēmadh)1 is found in Balādhurī, 207, and Maq., 51, but only the mention of 18. Ahar as its centre enables us to locate the district in southern Qara­dagh (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 Rawwādid dynasty which ruled intermittently in Tabriz and its neighbourhood from the beginning of the third century A.H. till the Seljuk times, see Balādhurī, 331, I.Kh., 119, cf. Minorsky Tabrīz, 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 مَمَد. I.Kh., 23, mentions a مَمَد in Kūmis and, 43, a مَمَد in Fārs (Iṣṭ., 104: Mā‘īn, town of the Mymaнд nāḥiya); a مَمَد, Iṣṭ., 161, lay between Sirjān (Kirmān) and Fārs and, according to Yāqūt, i, 799, was also called مَمَد. 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 Musāfirid Marzubān b. Muḥammad, cf. Kasravī, o.c., ii, 37. The earlier Rawwādids, mentioned with the nisba “al-Azdi”, evidently belonged to the Arab tribe which first occupied these parts of Ādharbayjān; the later Rawwādids have the nisba “al-Kurdī”, but there is no need to imagine that the later Rawwādids 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 Musāfirids, I.H., 254.

A most unexpected statement is that the said Ibn Rawwād belonged to the family of Julindī bul (more probably *ibn?*) K.r.k.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.), 1 is applied to a ruler in Northern Ādharbayjān. Iṣṭ. describes جلدی as an Azdite of Yemen and the first idea that occurs is that our author wanted to hint at the Azdite origins of the Rawwādids. However, such an admission would be of no help for the explanation of the patronymic بل كركر accompanying جلدی 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 بل كركر is given by the appellation جراغ كركران which the poet Qatrān uses with regard to the grandson of Abul-Hayjā mentioned above.

The question is only how to read كركران. 2 Our author obviously uses كركر as a man’s name and considering the local possibilities I venture to read the whole complex بل كركر as * جلدی بل كركر Javānshīr 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 كركر we must admit its likeness to the Armenian name of Grigor which was particularly frequent among the princes of Arrān (Caucasian Albania, in Armenian Mundart d. Mukrī-Kurden, Berlin, 1909, ii, 361 (the name surviving in Kurdish folk-lore may be a reminiscence of the Azdite tradition in Ādharbayjān).

1 He belonged to a branch of the Khārijite Julandids of ‘Oмān among whom the name Julandā seems to have been hereditary. ‘Abd and Jayfar, sons of a Julandā, are said to have been converted to Islam as early as 8/629, Balādhurī, 76; Ṭabarī, ii, 1949 (under 129 A.H.) mentions a Julandā b. Mas’ūd b. Jayfar b. Julandā al-Azdi, see ibid., iii, 77–9. Cf. G. P. Badger, History of the Imāms of ‘Oмān, 1871, pp. xi, 7–8; Zambaur, Manuel de généalogie, 1927, p. 125. In Persian the pronunciation seems to be Julindi, cf. O. Mann, Die

2 Kasravī, o.c., ii, 57, spells chirāgh-i gargariyān “lamp of the sovereigns” (?), from gargar “throne”. The former explanation by Riḍā-qu Hilān was “lamp of the Gargarians” from the little borough of Gargar on the Araxes near Julfā, though there are several other Gargars, cf. Hübschmann, 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 Javānshīr, 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’i the records of his exploits, real and legendary, occupy numerous chapters of Book II (Russian translation by Patkanian, SPb., 1861, pp. 137–84). Javānshīr ibn Grigor was certainly a local celebrity1 and the descent from him was a title of nobility. The last representative of the Mihrān line mentioned in Moses K’alankatvats’i 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 Kasravī, o.c., iii, 54, calls the Shaddādid Faḍlūn sham’-i āl-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 Rusudan. 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. Sīngān, 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: Sinjān (?). The only place I can think of is the present-day Sūngūn which lies in Qara-dāgh, 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.2 The term “Kingdom of Sunbāṭ” may refer to the Bagratunid Smbat I (a.d. 890–914). In 344/955 I.H. speaks of the tribute which some “Banū Sunbāṭ” paid to the Musāfirid Marzubān, and it is clear that our author, too, mentions Sunbāṭ 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-dāgh.

1 According to Vardan, tr. by Dulaurier, Jour. As., 1860, vol. xvi, p. 294, the Mongols on taking Mayyāfārīqīn 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 Javānshīr. [Russian trans. of Vardan by N. Emin, Moscow, 1861, p. 186.]

2 The syllable-an 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 Singān > Singūn > Sūngūn, and finally, in Turkish pronunciation, Sūngūn.
III. Arrān.


22. The ruins of Baylaqān called Mīl-i Baylaqān (Millār) are situated south-east of Shūsha, see Minorsky, *Mukān in EI*.

23. Bāzhgāh "tollhouse" is probably Javād, below the confluence of the Kur and Araxes [cf. Maq., 373: the station of al-Kurr], where the travellers used to cross the river, cf. Olearius, Book IV, chapter xxi; J. J. Lerch, *Reise nach Persien*, in Büsching's *Magazin*, 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.


26. Varduqiya must be a popular name for *Barduj*, 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 Iṣṭ., 193, locates at 12 farsakhs to the east of Tiflis. Marquart, o.c., 29, suggests the reading *Kordan* which would suit the Georgian district Gardaban, Vakhusht, o.c., p. 179 [to be distinguished from another Gardman, Balādhuri, 202, جرمان which lay farther east on a tributary of the Shamkhor river, cf. Hubschmann, o.c., 352]. *V.i.*, note to 33.


29. Shakki (in Armenian Shak'ē) is the province lying to the west of Shīrvān immediately south of the range dividing it from Daghestan. The extent of Shakki is considerably exaggerated. Cf. Minorsky, *Shekki in EI*.

DAGHESTAN
and
SHIRVAN
[ad §§ 36, 49 & 50]
cf. 31. Mubārakī is unknown. If we accept our author’s indication that it formed the beginning of the Shakkī frontier, it must be looked for in the north of Bardha’a, perhaps near Yevlakh, for Shakkī 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 Shakkī. 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 Khachen river, flowing south of the Bardha’a river (Terter, Arabic Tharthūr), in the direction of the Kur which it does not reach. Lambarān is almost certainly identical with “Mesopotamia”, which according to Iṣṭ., 182, lay at a distance less than a farsakh from Bardha’a and its gardens and, for a day’s distance in every direction, stretched between Karna (or Kurra), Laṣūb (*Lachūb?), and Yaqṭān (or Baqtān) none of which are now known.

31., 32. As the enumeration obviously proceeds in a northerly direction the Šuq 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’ilband-daghī) screening Shekkī from the Kur valley. The name Sunbāt-mān may have the meaning of “the house of Sunbāt”, but this gives us no clue, for Shakkī lay too far from the Bagratunid dominions, and according to Mas’ūdī, Murūj, ii, 68, the king of Shakkī towards 332 A.H. was an Adarnarsa. I.Kh., 122 (= Qudāma, 227), counts 8 stages (sīkak) from Varthān to Bardha’a and thence 4 stages to "the Armenian Mansūra" 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. Ṣanār are the Sanaa’a, Ptolemy, viii, ch. 8, § 13, in Armenian Tsanar-k’, a spirited Christian people who lived north of the Alazan to the north-west of Shakkī and were probably related to the peoples of northern Daghestan. Iṣṭ., 193 a (MS. C.), between Shakkī and the ārār, (read: Sanārīya) mentions which may correspond to the valley called in Georgian Eliseni and in Turkish Elisu, cf. Minorsky, Transcaucasica, p. 102. The name might then be restored as *Elīsu, v.i. 34.

[The identity of the Tsanar (in Georgian Tš’anar with ejaculative ts’) does not clearly appear from the sources of which the principal are enu-

1 Unless is a mis-reading of "Sunday market" (kuraki > Armenian kiurake > kiurarke) which lay in Bardha’a near the “Kurdish Gate” (bāb al-akrād) see Iṣṭ., 183.

2 As shown by Marquart, Wehrot, 6, the river is mentioned in the Bundahishn, § 24, under the name *Tort-rōt.

"in the same mountain [i.e. the Caucasus] after the Ardozians [an Alan tribe] live the Dajan, then the Dual, then the Tsakhoy, 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 Khuz, the anthropophagous Kist, the Dzlavat, the Gudamakar, the Durtuk, 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 Khorsvan [§ 36, 37.] down to Khorsvem (?). The other branch having let out the river Arm which flows northwards into the At'il [Atil], runs in a north-easterly direction. In it live the T'avaspar, the Hechmatak, the Izmakh, the P'askh, the P'uskh, the P'wk'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 Šanār 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, *Streifzüge*, 412), Bughā was attacked in Ch'artalet' by the Mt'iduli ("mountaineers"), the latter name usually referring to the highlanders speaking dialects akin to Georgian (Pshav, 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 *Elišen*, i.e. in Kakhetia (and perhaps more especially in its northern,

---

1 Only the preceding part of the text is available in Marquart's translation, *Streifzüge*, 170. Marquart was not aware of the existence of Patkanov's article and the valuable suggestions contained therein.

2 At 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).

3 From here to the end Marquart, *Streifzüge*, 58 and 492.

4 According to the ancient history of Christianization of Georgia, the chief appointed by the Sāsānians in the defile was the head of the garrisons of the region.
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 κ'ορεψικόπος/κορίκος (χωρεπισκόπος), 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 Kakhs (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, Izv. 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 K'avalak'. 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, Iz istorii severn. Azerbeijana, in the Festschrift to S. F. Oldenburg (in Russian), Leningrad, 1934, pp. 289-305. Towards 332/943 Mas'ūdi, Muruj, ii, 68, mentions the King of Qabala "the one-eyed Lion (*Leo?)" and Išt., 1931a, seems to refer to the same king in a passage which is found only in the Constantinople codex:

وَبِئَنَّ الْلِّكْرِ وَشِرْحَانَ حُدُّ وَبِئَنَّ شَرْوانَ وَالْلِّيْزَانَ حُدُّ مَتَّاخ وَبِئَنَّ الْلِّيْزَانَ وَالْمُقْعَانِيَةَ حُدُّ

وَكَذَلِكَ بَلْدَةَ الْبُسْبِةَ وَهِيَ كَوْرَةَ لِسَتَّ كُبْرَةَ الْفَرْيَ فِيهَا قَلْعَةٌ حَصِينَةٌ ظَهْرَهَا مَا لِبَلْدَةَ الْلِّكْرِ إِلَّا جَالْبَةَ وَهُمْ يُحَمَّلُونَ عَلَيْهَا لِسَبِيلَ صَاحِبَ الْبُسْبِةَ الْيَهِيمَ وَحَسَنَ جَوَارِهِ آَلَهُمَّ

"the Lakz have a common frontier with Shirvān, and so has Shirvān with *al-Lyzān, and so has al-Lyzān with al-Muqāniya as well as with the land of al-'Absiya (*Anbasā?); 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 *Iṣīya (<Eliseni), then the *Sanāriya, then Tiflis.”

It is true that the *Iṣīya would be more easily restored as Eliseni (v.s.), but the description shows that it lay to the east of Shekkī. Therefore *Iṣīya (v.s.).

1 More exactly some Khaldian (v.i., p. 420) emigrants backed by the Gardamanians, see Vardan (transl. by Emin), p. 126.
or perhaps *Anbasa's family.

35. In de Goeje’s edition of Išt, 187, the names *Barzanj and *Bardej have been accepted as independent names though they are undoubtedly mixed in the MSS. According to I.R., 891, the Araxes flows past Warthān towards the town of *Barzanj and beyond it (iddā jāwasa-hā) joins the Kurr. On the other hand, Mas‘ūdi, *Murūj, ii, 75, says that the Kurr flows at 3 miles’ distance from Bardha’ā, then past Bardāj [Bardej] with imāla must be identical with *Bardej which is “one of the districts of Bardha’ā”, and finally joins the Araxes near the village al-Ṣanāra. In the description of roads Išt., 192, gives the following distances: “from Bardha’ā to (variant *Bardej) 18 farsakhs; thence to the ford on the Kurr and (?) to Shamākhiya 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 marhala from Bardha’ā to Bardīj and thence 2 marhalas to Shamākhiya, we are led to conclude that the name of the place where the Kurr was forded (cf. also I.H., 251) was Bardīj (*Bardej) and that it lay much nearer to Bardha’ā than is indicated in Išt., 192 (I.H., 251). There are reasons for locating Bardīj on the right bank of the Kur, 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 Bardha’ā is circa 34 Km., and from Shamākhi circa 100 Km., which roughly corresponds to one light stage and two heavy ones. Our may be a mistake for *Bardej. In any case, Mas‘ūdi’s *Bardej is in favour of a form without n. Much less certain is the situation and even existence of *Bardej 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. Shirvān.

36.-41. On Shirvān see Dorn, Versuch einer Geschichte der Schirwanschache, in Mémos. Acad. des Sciences, SPb, 1840, iv, pp. 523–602; Pakhomov, Kratkiy kurs istorii Aserbayjana, Baku 1923; Barthold, Derbend, Shirvān, and Shirvānshāh in EI; A. Z. Validi, o.c. On the localities neighbouring on Shirvān see under § 50. See Map xi.

The history and historical geography of the region still raise numerous
questions and for the better understanding of our text we shall have to examine the following points:

The old centres of Shīrvān.
The dynasties of Shīrvān-shāhs.
The Mazyadid dynasty
Kh.rsān-shāh.

THE OLD CENTRES. The earlier transmitted form of the name Shīrvān is Shīrvān (شیروان). It does not seem to be connected with the name of its ancient capital 39. Shāvarān (Iṣṭ., 187: Shābarān) 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).1 The Arabic history of Darband, see A. Z. Validi, o.c., p. 41, says that the earlier (Mazyadid) rulers of Shīrvān were buried in Shābarān, and that Shābarān 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 *Layzān 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 Shīrvān towards A.D. 796-9, see Ṭabarī, iii, 645, Balādhurī, 210, cf. Marquart, Streifzüge, 455. This place rose to notoriety under the name of Yazidiya2 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 Shammākhiya (>Shamākhī) survived. Iṣṭ., 192, counts from Shammākhiya to Shīrvān (= Shābarān!) 3 days.

THE DYNASTIES. Four dynasties of Shirvān-shāhs are known.3

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 Ādharbayjān) a *Shīrvān shāh 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 Kasrānid 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 Steinhauffen, ver- heerten 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 Yaqūt, iv, 147, identifies Yazidiya with Shamākhī it is possible that more exactly Yazidiya corresponds to the *lashkar-gāh where according to our text the king resided and which lay at 1 farsakh’s distance from Shamākhī.

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, Kratkiy kurs, p. 28, and a personal letter dated Baku, 19.xii.1932.

IV. In 784/1382 Shaykh Ibrahim Darbandī founded the last dynasty of Shīrvān-shāhs which lasted till the occupation of Shīrvān by Shāh Tahmāsp in 957/1550.

THE MAZYADIDS. Our knowledge of the chart of this dynasty is chiefly based on the work of Aḥmad b. Luṭfullah Mūnejjim-bashi. This author (d. in 1113/1702) wrote his Jāmi’ al-duwal in Arabic but it is accessible only in a Turkish abridged translation printed in Istanbul in 1885/1868 under the name of Ṣahā’if al-akhbār. Mūnejjim-bashi uses very good sources and among them an old Arabic Ta’rlkh Bāb al-Abwāb (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 Jāmi’ al-duwal.

The following is the Mazyadids’ chart based on the Ṣahā’if al-akhbār, iii, 172-5 (cf. Dorn, o.c., pp. 341-50, Sachau, Ein Verzeichnis Muhamm. Dynastien, Berlin, 1923, No. 18, and Zambaur, Manuel, 181-2).

1. Yazīd b. Mazyad b. Zā’īda

2. Khālid

3. Muḥammad (i)

4. Muḥammad (ii)

5. Haytham (independent in 247)

6. Muḥammad (iii)

7. Haytham (ii)

Fulān

8. ‘Alī (i) (circa 300)

9. Abū Ṭāhir Yazīd (ii) (305-37)

10. Muḥammad (iv) (337-45)

11. Aḥmad (345-70)

12. Muḥammad (v) (370-81)

13. Yazīd (iii) (381-418)

14. Manuchihr


16. Qubād (425-35)

17. Bukhtannāṣr (435-40)

18. Sālār (440-55)

19. Farīburz

20. Faridūn
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 Kasrānid 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 Yazīd died in 185/801 and Khālid in 230/844-5. [Ṭabarī, iii, 650, says that Yazīd died in Bardha’a in 175/791.]

Several important dates are found in Masʿūdi 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 ʿAli b. Haytham which fully agrees with Mūnejjim-bashi. Masʿūdi adds, ii, 4 and 69, that ʿAli b. Haytham having perished in a war with the Khazars, &c., as we learn from Mūnejjim-bashi, iii, 174], the power, about the time of the composition of the Murūj, was seized (taghullub) by Muḥammad b. Yazīd who (previously?) killed his uncles. As Masʿūdi wrote in 332/943, the beginning of Muḥammad IV's rule must either be placed a few years earlier than in our chart, or Masʿūdi must actually have in view Muḥammad's father Yazīd (the builder of Yazidiya). According to Masʿūdi Muḥammad and his father were originally masters of لایران to which now were annexed Shirvān, Mūqāniya, and even Darband (v.i. 40.). Muḥammad claimed to be a descendant of the Sāsānian king Bahram Gūr but we need not interpret this ambitious assertion as a break in the Mazyadid line for Masʿūdi'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 Sarir were also "true" descendants of Bahram Gūr.

Another interesting indication is found in the list of feudatories of the Musāfirid Marzubān emanating from the latter's minister Abul-Qāsim (344/955), and transmitted in a trustworthy text (I.H., 250, 254). In it is quoted the name of Muḥammad b. Ahmad al-Asādī (sic) šāhib Shirvānshāh (sic). The contemporary of Abul-Qāsim could be only 10. Muḥammad b. Yazīd and if I.H. really refers to 12. Muḥammad b. Ahmad 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-Asādī (instead of al-Shaybānī) may be an auditive slip for al-Yazīdī which latter would eventually indicate that the ruler was one of the banū Yazīd b. Mazayd.

RULERS OF *LYZĀN AND THEIR FIEF. One detail must particularly attract our attention. Masʿūdi, Murūj, ii, 6, affirms that originally Muḥammad b. Yazīd and his father1 were rulers of لایران (variants: لایران لایران لایران, &c.).

1 Ibid., 69, more decidedly: huwa wa man salafahu min ābā'ihi, i.e., his ancestors, but perhaps on his mother's side!
This geographical name has been studied in detail by Marquart, Erānsahr, 119, who finally adopted the reading *Erān-shāh and thought that the bearers of this title were the princes of the Arrān 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 “Lāyṛān” a position between Shirvān and al-Muqāniya. However, the Murūj, ii, 68–9, distinctly states that the Muqāniya in question¹ lay in the immediate neighbourhood of Qabala and was different from the Muqāniya situated on the shore of the Caspian, see Minorsky, Mukān in EI. Of great importance for the location of Lāyṛān is the passage of Ist., 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 Shamākhī.² Such is also the impression given by Yāqūt’s additional passage on Bāb al-abwāb, missing in Wüstenfeld’s edition, i, 438, 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 (duīna) of Msq.t (§ 50, 3.) lies the town of al-Shābarān, small, fortified, and possessing numerous rustāqs. Above it is the rustāq of Jumādān and beyond it (swara' dhālika) the villages of ḥal (‘Jabal, v.s. 31. Sūq al-‘Jabal?) and Shirvān down to the frontier of Bākūh, D.ｎyq (?), al-Lakz,³ and the confluence of the two rivers [Kur and Araxes?]. Then al-Lyrān lying behind these (khalfa dhālika) and in it stands a great and strong castle in which springs coming down in cascades (kharrāra) 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: ِئّار, appears in our text in the perfectly correct form of Niyāl which is the name of the mountain (6,566 feet high) which separates our 37. Kurdīvān (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 Amini, Bib. Nat. Paris, fonds persan 101, fol. 134v, 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 Shakki).

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 Daghestan (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 Lāhlj from the south.

*LYZĀN, “AL-ABKHĀZ”, LĀHĪJ. Though the name لزان has numerous variants (see their list in Marquart, o.c., 119), the majority of MSS. indicate an initial ل; 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 لزان with ژ. In view of the analogies explained below the reading *Layzān is preferable to *Lizān or Lēzān.

Not only geographically is *Layzān 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 -ژی, -ژی, -ژی, &c. of the other dialects. 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, 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 Layzān. Ist., 187, enumerates the localities of Arrān in the following order: . . . “al-Shammānкhiya, Shirvān, al-Abkhāz, al-Shābarān, Qabala, Shakkī, &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 Samur river, undoubtedly in the region of Quβba, see Minorsky, Kubba in EI, and A. Z. Validi, o.c., 39. The form 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 لاهیان *Layyijān, Layyjān. [In the additional note, ibid., 508, he less happily connected the variant Vlan with Balādhuri’s (p. 197) بخار.

The inhabitants of the Lāhij valley are at present called Tāt, this Turkish term (cf. Kāshgharī, 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 (Tātī) 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 (-یس, -یس, -یس) in the Tātī dialects.

2 The name is known only in Russian transcription of which the original must be لاهیان, but the form لاهی is also possible.

3 Shirvān and Shābarān are strangely separated.

4 Here it has nothing to do with the well-known Abkhāz people of the Black Sea coast (cf. § 50, 4.)!
that the Lāhīj 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., Išt., 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. لایجان and لايجان, are also related. The former is attested in the ninth-century authors (Balādhurī, 196, I.Kh., 124); the latter is found only in the tenth-century geographers (Išt., I.H., Maq.). The term Layzān in the tenth century (I. Faqīh [in Yāqūt], Mas’ūdi, Išt.) seems to survive only as a traditional title.

The difference of the terms *Lay-z and Lāy-j (or Lāy-ij) 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 لايران *Lāyizān or Lāyzān. We may also remember such parallel forms as Arabic آدریکان and Persian آدریکان آدراکان (the two latter with a long ā after b). The earlier Arab writers often used 1 with imāla to render Persian ē (v.s. 35. راج for Bardēj) and to them their short a appeared probably more adequate for rendering the special timbre of the Persian ā. The existence in Arabic of

---


2 Mas’ūdi, Murāj, ii, 2. Balādhurī, 194–5, 197, and I. Faqīh, 288, 291, call them the الساجون, &c., cf. Marquart, Ėrānšahr, 120. In his Āōma in Festschrift Szinney, Ungar. Bibliothek, xiii, 1927, p. 83, Marquart restores the name as الساجون *spāsīgān “Dienstleute”. In his Kulturanaelekten in Ungar. Jahrbücher, ix/1, 1929, pp. 71 and 78, he suggests that the “Tātī” speaking Jews of Daghestan are descendants of the former camp-followers of the spāsīgān. [In BSOS, viii/2, 1936, p. 616, J. H. Kramers quotes some forms in the MSS. suggesting the reading nišāstag “the settled ones, settlers’.”]

3 I.H., 250, after the Shirvān-shāh mentions a king of الإیخاز الإیران “possessing a kingdom which adjoins some of the Qabq mountains, and his districts (nawāhi) 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 الإیران الإیخاز who on p. 254 appears only in his new avatar of Shirvān-shāh! If so, the very confusion of the الإیران الإیخاز and الإیران الإیخاز 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 *Lāyij (Lāyīz) is very striking. The inhabitants of Lāhīj explain this name by the tradition that their ancestors came from Lāhījān (in Gilān). This latter name appears in Zahīr al-dīn, p. 130, and other local historians as لاهیجان Lāhījān but the oldest attested form of it is لاهیجان *Lāfījān (v.s., § 32, 25.) [cf. Ptolemy, vi, 2: Νυφαννάδα>later Nīhāvand]. 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 > Lāyijān (or لیجان) proceeded more rapidly. The evidence in favour of the Lāhīj tradition would be considerably corroborated if it were possible to prove that the name of the Niyāl mountain is also to be found in the Lāhījān region. In Melgunov, o.c., 203–5, Niyaku (*Niyākūh ?) is a village belonging to Lāhījān; another village Liyālāsān or Liyārāstān is mentioned on the road Lāhījān–Längarūd (Līyāl <*Niyāl ?). The Caucasian Lāhīj would not be the only colony of Lāhījān, for south-west of the Urmīya lake a whole district (now inhabited by the Mukrī Kurds) is called Lāhījān and several villages of the same name are known in Ādharbāyjān, Fārs, &c., see Minorsky, Lāhījān in EI. See Map x.

Incidentally it is interesting to confront the Lāhīj tradition with the possible meaning of the name Shirvān. In the latter -vān may be a suffix similar to that of the neighbouring Kurdivān (also v.s., p. 335). The remaining element Shir/Shir is reminiscent of the name of another Caspian locality Shirriz (<Shīr-iz) in Ṭabaristān, Ṭabarī, i, 2658, which in later times was called شیرجان (*Shīr-ījān), 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'ij which corresponds to the لاهیجان stage of the name. Russian maps spell it Лалиж, differently from Lāhīj (Лаги́ч; B. V. Miller: Лахидж). However, La'ij may be due to the Georgian pronunciation in which k 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 Shirvān-shāh = Shirvān-shāh?

3 Cf. also ibid., 660, the personal name شیران شاه of one of the ancestors of the Daylamite Buyids. [Shirjān (Shīrūd-hazār) is definitely substituted by Zahīr al-dīn, 291, to Ṭabarī’s, iii, 1884, al-Shirriz. Both Ṭabarī, iii, 1015, and Yāqūt, iii, 275, reckon Shirriz to Daylam. The river Shīrud flows to the Caspian in Tunikābun, the district intermediary between Gilān and Māzandārān, see Stahl’s map in Petermann’s Mitt., 1927, Heft 7, Tafel 13. On the other hand some Shirriz is often coupled with Lāriz which presumably lay much farther east, Marquart, Erānsahr, 127, 135, Vasmer, in Islamica, iii/1, 1927, 119–20.] See Map x.
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 حرسانه mentioned in Balādhurī, 196 in fine, as the title of the king of the Lakz. On the common frontier of the Lakz with Shirvān see 1ṣṭ., 193 a (quoted above) and Masʿūdi, Murūj, 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.² The Lakz are also named under § 50, 3.

40. The description of Darband is extremely brief and poor in comparison with 1ṣṭ., 184. According to Masʿūdi, Murūj, ii, 5, Muḥammad b. Yazīd of Shirvān seized Bāb al-abwāb after the death of his son-in-law (or father-in-law sihr) ‘Abdullāh b. Hishām (*Hāshim?), descended from one of the prophet's ansār. [The close relations of the Shirvān-shāhs with the Darband Hāshimids can be inferred also from the joint action of 'Alī b. Haytham and the ruler of Darband against the infidels of Sarīr, Shindān, and Khazar, see Mūnejjim-bashi, iii, 174.]

41. The spelling Bāku shows the antiquity of the present-day form. 1ṣṭ., 190, writes Bākuh. 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 Ṣaḥāra can be explained through Hamdānī whose work may have become known rapidly

1 In Moses Kalankatvats’i, book ii, chapters 42–45, the envoys of the "Hun" king of Varačan are called Zirdkin-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 (zīrd "heart").

2 Cf. Balādhurī, 207, quoted in the note to § 50, 3c.
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 *Khoulān must be read instead of Jaaulān (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, Postrouten, p. 108). is most probably as the latter (26.) is an important province and its place after Yamāma would be right. The name may have been confused with Nazwa (var. Nazway, 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 Nazwa would be ). Among the Arab tribes a is a puzzle unless it stands for .

The enumeration, as usual mechanical and erratic, begins with the two sacred towns to which Ta’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 Ḥijāz 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 Yāqut, iv, 279. The circuit “round the stone” seems to be a wrong translation of hijr (an enclosure adjoining the Ka’ba), which the author must have misread into hajar (“stone”). I.Kh. precisely evaluates the circuit of the hijr (daur al-hijr) 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 (dhar al-tawāf), 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 az gird-i *hijr 50 arash va *darāzā-yi tavāf *107 arash.

6. Sa’da. Hamdānī, 67, only says that before Islām it was called Jumā’ and in the days of old (fī qadīm al-dahr) possessed a castle with plastered walls (qasr mashid). I.Kh., 136, speaks of the tanneries in Sa’da.

7. evidently stands for the important district of which Hamdānī, 109, also places “between Šan’a’ and Sa’da”. Cf. Schleifer, Hamdān in EI. On the other hand, in view of the mention of the Banū Ḥimyar, may have been confused with. Maq., 87, says “al-Ḥimyarī is the town (balad) of Qahtān between Zabid and Šan’a’”. Iṣṭ., 26 (= I.H.) 33, mentions the Ḥimyar tribe only in Saba’ and Ḥaḍramūt.

8. Šan’a’. The detail on the crops stands practically as in I.R., 109, and more remotely reminds one of Hamdānī, 109. As regards the antiquity of the town Hamdānī, 55, says that it is the most ancient of the towns (aqdam mudun al-ard) having been built by Noah’s son Shem.


15. I.Kh., 148. The town of ‘Aththar is Baysh, Hamdānī, 120, Maq., 70, 86.

16. 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.


18. On this famous centre of the Sabaeans and Ḫimyarites cf. Tkatsch in *EI*. ‘Uqāb is mentioned on the road from Ṣanʿā’ to Ḥadramūt, 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 farsakhs from Dathīnā, I.Kh., 138. On *Bayḥān* see Landberg, *Arabica*, Leiden, 1898, v, 4. *Fāḥ looks like مساح which I.Kh., 142 mentions under the mikhlāfs of Ṣanʿā’.

19. *Iṣṭ.*, 25. ‘Omān spelt with the usual mistake *Ommān*.

20. Sharja is here evidently the place on the western side of the cape Musandam (*Sharja ibn al-Khattāb*) and not the dependency of Zabīd, Maq., 53 and 92.


22. *Iṣṭ.*, 20, lies half-way between Qādisiya and Mekka, Maq., 251, cf. § 5, 16.


25. All situated on the Tabūk road, Maq., 250: Tabūk–Taimā’–Wādī

§ 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 1. (?), 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 Hims; 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 Sanja according to Le Strange, The lands, 124, is Bölamsu, one of the sources of the Kakhṭā 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. Hisn-Manṣūr is now called Adi-yaman. Qūrus, Iṣṭ., 65 and 67, lay much more to the south at 2 marḥalas 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. صحا (?), which is not found in Iṣṭ. and I.H., seems to correspond to الـسويدة لـ al-Suwaidiya 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 Elath of the Jews and the Aelana of the Romans, now al-ʿAqaba, see Nallino in Battānī, ii, 17. See now a very complete study by Ph. Schertl, Ela-ʿAkaba in Orientalia Christ. periodica, ii/1, 1936, pp. 33–77.
21. So in some MSS. of Iṣṭ., BGA, iv, 386, and I.H., 118 m, but in Maq. Maʿarra Qinnasrin. This place is to be distinguished from Maʿarra Nuʿmān lying some 50 Km. south of it, see Honigmann in EI.

23. 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.

24. Kafr-Ṭab not in Iṣṭ. or I.H. but in Maq., 54.

26. Maq., 181, among the produce of Damascus mentions sufriyāt, which means “copper vases”, BGA, iv, 281, but the variant gives msfryāt (?), of which turanj (?)-i zard may be a tentative rendering.

27. Raqqā, already mentioned under Jazīra 9.


29. Adruḥ, north of Muʿān (Maʿān), see Le Strange’s map in Palestine, and Lammens, Adroh in EI.

32.-42. Iṣṭ., 56, distinguishes between Zughar, Diyar-qaum-Lūt, and Jibāl al-shurāt (cf. Le Strange, Palestine, 28). Zughar, as shown by Le Strange, lay near the south-eastern bank of the Dead Sea. Iṣṭ., 58, 66, counts from Riḥā (Jericho) to Zughar 2 days, and from Zughar to Jibāl al-shurāt 1 day. Maq., himself a native of Jerusalem, instead of Zughar writes Sughar, thereby following still closer the Hebrew name Šoʿar (Tsʿar) “smallness”, Gen. 19, 22, Zoar. The Jibāl al-shurāt are evidently the highlands (Edom) east of the Diyar-qaum-Lūt. Balqāʾ is the locality around ‘Ammān in Transjordania, Iṣṭ., 65, cf. F. Buhl, Ballā, in EI.

§ 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 Fātimids 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-Ṣāʿīd).

1. Of the long description in Iṣṭ. only the detail about Shāfiʿī’s tomb (Iṣṭ., 51) appears in our author.
2. These two names are interesting as not appearing in Išt., and consequently borrowed from some other source. In I.H., 102 and 103a, the two localities are found together, and the variant of the second name ذَبَّقَا accounts for our دَبْقَة. The correct form is دَبْقُ (vocalized: Dabqū) or Dabqū, see Maq., 54, 193, but the place is better known as Dabiq, from which the celebrated textiles came. See Becker, Dabīk, 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: بَيْنَهَا فِنّ كَانَ يَدْعَى قُوَّةٍ فِي مَلْكِهِ فَلَيْدَهُمَا فَإِنَّ الْهَدْمِ إِلَّا مِنَ الْبَنَا cf. also I. Faqīh, 68. Our Arabic quotation resembles it only in the meaning. The size and the item on medical and astronomical inscriptions coincide in both sources. Išt., 51, I.H., 100, and Maq., 210, say nothing of Hermes. Maq. transcribes I.Kh.’s text of the inscription.

8. Išt., 53, too, speaks of the sahara Fir’aun; Išt., 154, and I.H., 106, quite briefly remark that off Būṣīr and Fustāṭ the crocodiles do no harm.

9. For Bulaynā Išt., 53i, gives the variant al-Bulaynā (for Isnā given in the text).

10. The details on mines and wild asses not in Išt., I.H. or Maq. Cf. § 5, 23.

§ 40. Maghrib

Išt., 36–48; I.H., 41–73 (this remarkable chapter remained unknown to our author); Maq., 215–48. Al-Bakrī, Description de l’Afrique septentrionale, tr. by Mac Guckin de Slane, extract from Jour. As., 1858.

This chapter chiefly follows Išt. 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. Išt., 47, Maq., 246, without any detail evaluate the distance from Qayruwān to Zawila as one month, while I.H., 66, counts from Zawila to Ajdabiya 2 months, and from Ajdabiya to Fazzān 15 marhalas. Cf. note to § 60, 1.

6. Išt., 38, awzvalu ’adwat Andalus.

7. Qalshāna is mentioned by I.Kh., 87, among the towns of Qayruwān; Maq., 247, places Qalshāna at one marhala from Qayruwān.


11. is Algiers, see Yver, Alger in EI. The name of the Berber tribe is
usually mis-spelt: Iṣṭ., 38, Mazghannā, and 37 d, R.’by. Maq., 217, 228, Zaghannāya, some MSS. Ra’nāya, &c.
12. “Like Tanas”, probably in that it lies on the coast.
15. Iṣṭ., 38, also says that Baṣra lies opposite (bi-hidhā’) Gibraltar and in a variant, 39 a, the form Buṣaira is also given. However, Baṣra was an island town, cf. Yver, Baṣra in EI, and I.H., 55, gives a correct description of it.
17. Cf. Iṣṭ., 39, where Tanja is described as a great province (kūra) and Fās said to be still in the possession of the (Fātimid) Idrisids, but in our author’s times the Spanish Omayyads were masters at Fās (from a.D. 973).
18. The details about gold and panther-skins are not in Iṣṭ., I.H., or Maq., but Jāḥiz in his interesting treatise on the different classes of merchandise, Tabāṣṣur bil-tijāra, published by Hasan Ḥusnī ’Abd al-Wahhāb al-Tunisī, Damascus, 1351/1932, p. 21, mentions among the produce of the Berber country and Maghrib: “panthers, qaraz (‘leaves of the salam mimosa’ used as a dyeing stuff), saddle-cloths (lubūd), 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 dinārs.

§ 41. Spain


This chapter is entirely based on Iṣṭ. 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 Ócija 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 Iṣṭ., 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 samūr in Tudela, Iṣṭ., 44. Tudela not mentioned in I.H.
4. Bīrunī, Canon: “Lārida on the Gh.lj.sk frontier (thaghr).” Shantabriya (?), mentioned in the neighbourhood of the eastern watershed of Spain (§ 5, 25.), corresponds to Shantabriya where Iṣṭ., 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., Rayū) is the present province of Mālaga, cf. Seybold, Archidona, in EI. Saavedra, 23, interprets the name as “regia, or regium” and compares it with the Phoenician name of Mālaga, Malkhā. Isinja, so too in Iṣt. Ghāfiq was the capital of the Faḥs-Ballūt province, Iṣṭ., 43, which was conterminous with Rayya. According to Saavedra, 50, Ghāfiq corresponds to Castillo del Almogávar, situated at 14 Km. from Los Pedroches in the north of the Córdoba province.

5. 6. Iṣṭ., 47, Bāja to Qūriya six days. Bāja lies west of Guadiana in southern Portugal; not in I.H.

7. Iṣṭ., 43, too, places Merida (and Toledo) “among the greatest cities of Spain”.

8. The detail is not in Iṣṭ.

9. So, too, in Iṣṭ., 41. On Ghaliakashush and Ifranja see under Rūm (§ 42, 20.).

11. Iṣṭ., 42 (cf. also 45), among the produce of Málaga mentions السفان الذي تتخذ منه مقابض السفوف. According to Lane safan is “rough skin, thick or coarse, such as the skins of crocodiles, which is put upon the hilts of swords; rough piece of skin of the lizard called dabb”.

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. Iṣṭ., 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 ākhirīn shahrī-st az ḥudūd-i Andalus bar karān-i daryā must refer to the province of Santarem. Iṣṭ., 47, reckons from Beja to Shantarīn 12 days “and to the extreme limit of the Shantarīn province (aqsā kūra Sh.) 5 days (more)”.

§ 42. Byzantine Empire

I.Kh., 100–13, Qudāma, 252–60, Ya'qūbī, BGA, vii, 323, and Historiae, ii. 171–8; I.R., 119–30; I. Faqīh, 136–56 (see also under Yāqūt); Masfūdī, Tanbih, 176–89; Iṣṭ., 8, 45 (Kharshana), 68–71; I.H., 128–37 (an interesting and independent report based chiefly on Abul-Ḥasan Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Wahhāb al-Tadmūrī); Maq., 147–8, 150; Yāqūt, ii, 861–6, who quotes a long description of the provinces which he attributes to I. Faqīh, though it is not found in BGA, v; Idrissī, ii, 209–304 sq. Constantine Porphyrogenitus, De thematibus, ed. Becker, Bonn, 1840 (cf. idem, De administrando imperio: additional remarks on Charsianon, Διοικητικὸς, &c.); W. R. Ramsay, Asia Minor; Tomaschek, 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.
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. Yahyā. On the former we possess a notice in Masʿūdī’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,¹ the campaigns therein, on the neighbouring kingdoms of the Burjān, Abar, Burghar, Şaqlāiba, and Khazar”. Masʿūdī 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 Ṭasqalān (§ 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.-ʾĀ. 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 Şaqlāb 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 Kondakovianum*, 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. Yahyā’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 Hārn’s data is apparent in our 15. and 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) for which no similar systematic descriptions in Greek are available.

I.Kh., 105, quotes 3 themes in Europe and 11 in Asia 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].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H.-‘Ā.</th>
<th>I.Kh.</th>
<th>Qudāma</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ṭablān</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Thrace</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Macedonia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Thracesion</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Opsikion</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Optimaton</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Seleucia</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Anatolicon</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Buccelarion</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Paphlagonia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Cappadocia</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Charsianon</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Armeniacaon</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Chaldia</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qudāma’s order of enumeration 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H.-‘Ā</th>
<th>Qudāma</th>
<th>I.Kh.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ṭablān</td>
<td>Ṭaylā</td>
<td>Ṭāflā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarqasīs</td>
<td>Ṭarqasīs</td>
<td>Tarqasīs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uftimāt</td>
<td>Ubfimāt</td>
<td>Ufti-māṭi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nāṭliq</td>
<td>Nāṭliq</td>
<td>Nāṭulūs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aflakhūniya</td>
<td>Aflaghūniya</td>
<td>Aflagjūniya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kharshana</td>
<td>Kharshana</td>
<td>Kharsiyyūn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khāldiya</td>
<td>Khāldiya</td>
<td>Khāldiya</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 See now the French edition of A. 2 With which that of I. Faqīḥ (in Vasiliev, Byzance et les Arabes, t. 1, La dynastie d’Amorium, Brussels, 1935.) totally agrees.
The name Ṭāblān (numerous variants in different sources: ḫiyū bṭlw lyl*) has been explained by de Goeje (I.Kh., 105, note i) as Ṭāfpaṛ (Ṭāfros). Suidas, Lexicon, ed. 1853, p. 1053: ṭāfros- to peri to teiχos ḥiyumā' kal tāfṛṇ ... par'Hroδότψ. Consequently the popular name would refer to the Great Wall (to μακρόν teiχος, I. Faqih in Yāqūt, ii, 863, مرن خس) or rather to the moat (ḥiyumā) round it. Gelzer, o.c., 86, accepts the interpretation "Thēma ṭǐς tāfros, or to tō teiχous" and compares it with the terms Ἀστυπή 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 Ṭfālā, Ṭāblān.

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. 'Anatolikōn; b. 'Armeniakōn; c. tōn Ὁρακτησίων; d. 'Ofikion; e. 'Oπτιματον; f. Βουκελ-λαρίων; g. Παυλαγώνων; h. Χαλδία; i. Μεσσοποταμία; k. Κολωνείας; l. Σεβαστεία; m. Λυκανδό; n. Σελευκείας; o. Κιβυρραμώτων.

Constantine Porphyrogenitus does not separately mention our 11. and 12. He speaks of Cappadocia under Armeniacon and adds that Xarpsiaνōn is the middle part of Cappadocia, De them., pp. 18–20. Cf. now E. Honigmann, Charsianon kastron in Byzantion, x, 1935, pp. 129–60. On the other hand Constantine mentions i, k, l, m, o, unknown to our three authors. Mas’ūdī, 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 Qudāma, 258 (<Muslim) the number varied from 15,000 (in Nāṭlīq) to 4,000 (Kharshana, Cappadocia, Khaldiā).

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 Gruz-in. The element -z (-) is a suffix of origin, see Marquart, ZDMG, 49, p. 664; cf. also § 36, 36.: Layzān and § 50, 3.: *Lakz. The older form of Gur-z is attested in Armenian Viř-k’, pointing to Middle Persian *Vr-kān. The earlier Arabic transcription is جوزان (i.e. *Gurz-ān), Baladhurī, 202, but already Ya’qūbī, Historiae, ii, 519, gives جوزان *Gurj-ān and the later authors write جوز *Gurj, see Ibn al-Athīr, passim, Yāqūt, ii, 219. See now Markwart (Marquart), Iberer und
Hyrkanier, in Caucasia, viii, 1931, p. 78. The variation of the forms Gurz/Gurj must be due to some dialect distinctions, cf. -nz/-nj in the name of Ganja: earlier Arabic جَنْجَة, I.Kh., 119, and later Arabic كَنْتَة, cf. Minorsky, Jour. As., July 1930, p. 72.

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 Baladhuri, 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 Sarir. Under § 5, 21. our author speaks of a Kūh-i Gurz, perhaps identical with § 5, 17 B. These details refer to the real Georgia.

On the other hand, the designation of the Black Sea as daryā-yi Gurziyān 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.¹

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 Rūs (§ 44) who according to some earlier source lived on an island. A series of errors with regard to the whereabouts of the real Maecotis (§ 3, 8.) may have caused our author to dissociate the rare Warang from Rūs and finally to misread it into another rare name Gurz. Bīrunī is the earliest known author mentioning بحر ورنيك but he must have found it in some literary source.²

The other source of confusion may have been I.Kh., 105 (<Muslim al-Jarmi), according to whom the themes of Tāflā (Constantinople) and Trāqiya (Thrace) bordered in the north on بحر الخبر. 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 Daryā-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 Sarir!) 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 Idrīsī, ii, 396, mentions an island كَرْب on the way between Taman (on the Azov Sea) and Trebizond. [Const. Porph., De adm. imp., ch. 42, mentions an island near Tamarkha (evidently a part of the Taman peninsula) and several islands off the coast of Zuxia (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 Bīrunī cf. § 10, 55., § 11, 9., § 26, 13., &c.
supposed that I.Kh.'s referred not to the Khazar but to the jurz (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 jurz. 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.nd.r” (§ 53). I.Kh., 92, 105, 109, and Qudāma, 257, systematically following Muslim al-Jarmī, call the Danubian Bulghars Burjān.\(^1\) On the other hand, Hārūn (I.R., 130) applies this term to the Burgundians whereas he calls the Danubian Bulghars Bulghar.\(^2\) Hārūn, 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 (Jayhānī?) must have solved the difficulty by incorporating all these names as if they referred to separate entities. Consequently the Burjān and Bulgharī were differentiated artificially: the former being imagined to be more submissive plain-dwellers, and the latter highlanders\(^3\) “perpetually at war with the Rūmīs” (as in I.R., 126\(_{92}\)). The Bulghari are called Rūmī because they were Christianized from Byzantium in a.d. 864. The qualification kāfir is rather strange. One may remember that Bakrī, 45\(_{20}\), calls the Burjān “Magians” (majūsiya) and this term is constantly applied to the Normans as well, cf. Lévi-Provençal, Madjūs in EI and Idrīsī-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-Jarmī, thus describes the boundaries of Macedonia: in the east the walls (v.s. 1.) stretching between the Black Sea (Bahır al-Khazar) and the Syrian Sea (Bahr al-Sha’m, here evidently “Marmora Sea”); in the south, the Mediterranean; in the west, the lands of the Saqāliba; in the north, the Burjān. This quotation leaves no doubt that by the “Saqāliba lands” the Serbian territory is meant. However, much more decisive is I.R., 127, who quotes Hārūn b. Yahyā’s description of a road from Constantinople, over Saluqiya (read: Salonica)\(^4\) and Venice (B.n.d.qīs) 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: *Quiron <Kīrpos); “beyond it you travel through wooded lowlands (ghiyād min al-shajar) among the Saqāliba 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., 126\(_{13}\)) stands first erroneously for Belgrad (v.s., § 6, 66.) but after this passage on the water conduct comes (I.R., 126\(_{92}\)) 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 (Jayhānī?).

\(^3\) Cf. § 5, 28. on their mountain and § 6, 66. on their river.

\(^4\) Mas’ūdi, Murtūj, ii, 318, also has Saluqiya for Salonica.
houses. They are Christians; they were (gradually) converted (kānu yatanassiruna) 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 B.lātīs *(Spalato, Const. Porph. Aσπάλαθος)*." In our text al-Ṣaγāliba al-mutanassira, standing in the Arabic garb, without any doubt reflects Hārun’s account (through Jayhāni’s medium?). According to Marquart, *ibid.*, 207, Hārun 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 Hārun’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, Croati) 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 IXe 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 Hārun’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 Mirvāt, our author’s source was Hārun, 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, *v.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 1st., 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-bahr) and on account of the buffer (hājiz) 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 Saraqusta, Tuṭayla (Tudela), and Lerida. Then follows a Christian people called Ghalijaskas who are less harmful than the Baskunas (aqalluhum 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 Ghalijaskas "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 Ghalijaskas are the inhabitants of the
Jaca region, south of the important pass in the Pyrenees (at present Jaca is connected by a railway tunnel with Oloron on the French side). The Jaca people were already known to the classical authors under the names of Jaccetani, Iακκετανοι (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 Bashkunas, and that to the north of Tudela lies Huesca (Washqa) situated towards a tribe of the Ifranj called the people. 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-Jāqiya (variant J^) “near the sea”. Cf. de Goeje, Specimen exhibens descriptionem al-Magribi sumtam e Libro Regionum al-Jaqubii, Leiden, 1860, pp. 112-13, and F. Codera, Limites probables 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 the kindness of Prof. A. Gonzalez Palencia. Bīrunī, Canon, places Lerida over against the Gh.l.j.sk, 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., Iṣṭ., or I.H., but I.R., 130 (after Hārūn b. Yahyā) mentions Bārṭiniya (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 Iṣṭ., 70: “Athīnās is the seat of learning of the Ionians (Yūnāniyun) 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.

I.Kh., passim, see Index; I. Faqīh, 270 (= I.Kh., 124, but the merchants are called tujjār al-Ṣaqāliba); even the Mashhad MS. of I. Faqīh does not seem to contain any new details on the Rūs, Saqlab, &c., to judge by A. Z. Validi, in Izv. Ross. Akad. Nauk, 1924, pp. 237-48; I. Rusta, 138-48 (Khazar, Burdās, Būkār, al-Majghariya, al-Ṣaqlabiya, al-Rūsīya); I. Faḍlān, Risāla (quoted and utilized by Yāqūt under Itil, Būshghurd, Bulghar, Khazar, Khwārizm, Rūs, and Wīsū); Mas‘ūdi, Mūrūf, ii, 1-77 (Rūs, Burghar, W.lnd.riya, Caucasian peoples); the passage on the Slavs edited in Marquart’s Streifzüge, 97-101; Mas‘ūdi, Tanbih (Burṭās p. 62; W.lnd.riya pp. 180-3; Burghar, Saqlab, Rūs, Sarīr, passion); Iṣṭ., 220-7 (Khazar, al-Sarīr, Burṭās, Bulghār, Rūs, &c.); I.H., 278-87
(Khazar, Burtas, Basjīrt, Bulghar); [Ibrahim b. Wasif-shah], L’abregé des merveilles, tr. Carra de Vaux, 1898 (Slavs, pp. 45–6; Burjān, pp. 123–4); Maq., 360 (Itil, Rūs, Bulghar, Suwār, Khazar—very brief); Gardizī, 78–126 (Bachanāk, Khazar, Burdās, Bulkār, Majghar, Saqlāb [sic], Rūs, Sarīr, Alān); al-Bakrī, ed. Rosen, SPb., 1878 (Saqālib, Bajanākiya, Khazar, Furdās, Bulkār, Majghariya, Sarīr, Burjān); 'Aufī, Jawāmi' al-hikāyāt, part iv, ch. 16, in Barthold, A new Muslim report on the Russians (in Russian), Zap., 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 Gurj, Usłan (*al-Lān?), Sarīr, and Darband are very brief, see Br. Mus., Or. 2676, ff. 67–9); Yaqūt, Itil, i, 112–13, Burtās, i, 567 [this paragraph refers chiefly not to the Burtās but to the Bulghārs], Burghar, i, 568 (after Mas'ūdi), Bulghar, i, 722–7, Bāshghurt, i, 468–70, Khazar, ii, 436–40, Khwārīzim, ii, 484–5, Rūs, ii, 834–40, Saqlāb, iii, 405; Wīsū, i, 34 and iv, 944; Ibn Iyās, in F. Arnold, Chrestomatia Arabica, i, 73–6: Rūs, Bulghār. 

Frāhn, Veteres memoriae Chasarorum ex Ibn Foszlano, Ibn Haukale et Schems-ed-dino Damaseno and De Baschkiris quae memoriae prodicta 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 Foszlans 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 Foszlans Reiseberichten, in Mém. Acad. SPb., série vi, t. i, 1832, pp. 527–77; Charmoy, Relations de Ma’s’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-Nadim’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. Saveliev, 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-Bakrī); Chwalson, Izvestiya o Khazarakh &c. Ibn Dasta [read: Ibn Rustal], SPb., 1869; A. Garkavi (Harkavy), Skazaniya musulmanskikh pisateley o Slav’anakh i Russkikh, SPb., 1870 (Supplement 1871); A. Kunik and Baron V. Rosen, Izvestiya al-Bakri i drugikh autorov o Rusi i slav’anakh, SPb., i, 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’kūb’s Reisebericht über die Slavenländer aus dem Jahre 965, in Mém. Acad. SPb., série viii, t. iii, no. 4, 1898 (a revised edition in Russian: Kommentariy na zapisku Ibrahim ibn

§ 43. The Slavs.

See especially Chwolson, Izvestiya . . . Ibn Dasta [*Rusta], pp. 123-45; Baron Rosen and Kunik, Izvestiya al-Bakrī (Ibrāhīm b. Ya’qūb, circa A.D. 965); Westberg, Ibrāhīm’s-ibn-ja’kūb’s Reisebericht, 1898, and Kommentary, 1903; also passim in Beiträge, 1898, and K analizu, 1908; Marquart, Streifszüge, 95-160 (Mas’ūd on the Slavs), 188-206, 466-73 (“Jayhānī” on the Slavs) and passim; Lévi-Provençal, Šakālība in EI (the Slavs in Spain), Barthold, Slav in EI. Our §§ 43 and 44 have been edited and translated by Toumansky 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 Rūs river”; Išt. (<Balkhi), pp. 4, 7, 10, besides being too vague, has very little to say on the Slavs whom he probably mixes up with the Rūs; the third and most complete source, which was also utilized by I.R., Gardīzī, and ’Aufī has principally influenced our text, as will be seen from

1 Bakrī used it, too, but with regard to the Slavs he chiefly quotes the independant and excellent source—the record of the Jewish traveller Ibrāhīm b. Ya’qūb
Commentary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I.R.</th>
<th>Gardizi</th>
<th>H-'A.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 days' distance from the Bajanāk town of جایApache near the frontier wooded plains; no vines or fields bee-hives, 10 یر قه honey from each</td>
<td>D. and 10 days from the Majghari D. Vāntīt</td>
<td>different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.</td>
<td>D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. each hive 50–100 یر قه honey; some people possess 100 یون honey of honey</td>
<td>D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.</td>
<td>A. much honey; honey-wine; wooden casks; some people prepare 100 casks of wine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. vast wooded plains</td>
<td>D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.</td>
<td>A. the dead burnt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N.</td>
<td>A. commits suicide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cow-worshippers</td>
<td>D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.</td>
<td>A. various string instruments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.</td>
<td>N.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.</td>
<td>N.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.</td>
<td>D. as in I.R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.</td>
<td>A. sow millet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.</td>
<td>A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.</td>
<td>A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.</td>
<td>N.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.</td>
<td>N.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.</td>
<td>D. Smūt-swyt, Khurdāb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.</td>
<td>A. drinks milk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N.</td>
<td>N.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N.</td>
<td>underground dwellings in winter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.</td>
<td>N.</td>
<td>A. the Slavs serve the king</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.</td>
<td>N.</td>
<td>N.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.</td>
<td>N.</td>
<td>N.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.</td>
<td>N.</td>
<td>N.</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 Mas'ūdi. Of this account, as well as of Mas'ūdi's detailed chapter on the Slavs (Marquart, Streifzüge, 95–160), there is no trace in our author. [Some expres-
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 Bulgharī.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 § 44² 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 (l) of the Rūs". In § 3, 8. the Maeotis (i.e. the northern Russian lakes or the Baltic, v.s., p. 181) is placed north of the Saqlābs.

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 Saqāliba 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 Khampil (§ 50, 3 b.) "lies on the river (Volga) which comes from the land of the Saqāliba" and further, p. 154, adds that the Rūs merchants "who are a kind of Saqāliba" travel from the farthest region of Saqlaba to the Rūm sea (Black Sea ?); if eventually they "travel by the Tanās [*Tanais = Don], river of the Saqāliba, they pass to Khamlij"³ and finally starting from Spain they either visit Africa or "follow the road behind Rome in the Slav lands and then to Khamlij" (خلف رومية في بلاد القبالة ثم إلى خمليج). I. Kh., 17, gives the king of the Slavs the title qinnāz, i.e., کیناز کنیز (from Germanic *kuning), common among Slav nations.

The source utilized by I. Rusta and Gardīzī 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-mlk (رئیس الروم، سوّیت ملک); the vice-regent (khalīfatu-hu) (living in the centre of the Saqlāb country ?)⁴ was called سوّیت or سوّیج. [Similar forms are found in Gardīzī whereas in the H.-'Ā. only the king is called بیت سوّیج.

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 marrī 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'la almost reach the Volga near Kamishin. See Map xii.
⁴ The text is suspect here, Marquart, o.c., 470.
mentioned whom the people call S.müt-swyt. Westberg, o.c. (1918), p. 12, very ingeniously supposed that the first part of the name is only a disfigured "they call him" standing in the Arabic text.]1 Chwolson restored سویت-ملک as سویت-ملک Suvit-bulk< Svetopluk (< Svetoplůků) and * as županets (?) 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 Σφενδοπλόκος. 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-Jarmī 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 Croatians Βελοχρoβάτοι whose capital must have been Cracow-on-the-Vistula.2 The king’s capital (Gardizi, جراو، جراو, H.-’Ā. جراو, خرمان, ’Auffi خرمان) is then restored as خروبل Khorvát3 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 Șaqlābs, 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 Gardīzī, who apparently is more faithful to the source responsible for the details on the Magyars, V.n.nd.r, and Mirvāt (§§ 22, 46, 53), suggests that the prototype of our Rūtā is *Dūnā (Danube). In this case the town of *Khorvát 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 ’Auffi, Or. 2676, fol. 67b says: va ışhān-rā ra’isi-st ki ǚ-rā Swyt khwānand.
2 There is not much certainty about this kingdom “dessen Existenz auf Grund der späteren polnischen und čechischen Sagen notwendig vorausgesetzt werden musste, für welche aber bisher nur äusserst dürftige und unbestimmte Zeugnisse aus älterer Zeit beigebracht werden konnten”, ibid., 471. Very characteristic, too, is Marquart’s admission, ibid., 139: “wenn wir nun auch Chorwätin unzweifelhaft [sic. V. M.] mit den Béluchorwaten an der Weichsel gleichzusetzen haben, so scheint es doch, dass er selbst [i.e. Constantine] sie mit den illyrischen Chorwaten zusammengeworfen hat” [sic. V. M.].
3 Chwolson, o.c., p. 142, took جردست for Grādist < Hrādistye, the residence of Svetopluk, cf. Šafarkl, Slavische Alterthümer, ii, 501. [Very doubtful.]
(Τούρκου) lay "Great Moravia, that is the land of Sfendoplokos, which was
totally ruined by these Magyars and occupied by them", whereas the
Croats\(^1\) 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 Savá) had
an ephemeral character, they may have been sufficient to create the im-
pression that he was the supreme lord (*ra’īs al-ru’asā*) of the Khorvāt.
Already Marquart, *o.c.*, 470, pointed out that I.R.’s text on the relations
between *swyżt-mlk* and the *sūbanj* is out of order. The real ruler of the
southern Croats was perhaps the *sūbanj* (*shūbāŋ*)? and Chwolson’s restora-
tion of it as *šupanets* (*šupan?*), if right, would tally with Const. Porph.,
according to whom, cap. 30, Croatian lands were divided into *zoravíai.\(^2\)

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 (fī awwā’il haddihā) stands the
town لابی. In Gardizī, انتِ, follows the mention of the road from the
Majgharī to the Slavs (10 days’ journey). In our text انتِ is the first town
on the east of the Slavs and a resemblance of its inhabitants to the Rūs
suggests that it lay on the Rūs frontier. Already Harkavy thought to con-
nect this town with Kiev, the capital of the Slav *Pol’an’e*. Marquart, *Strei-
züge*, 189, first restored the name as دانست Dānast but finally, *ibid.*, 509,
read it زابی Zānbat, which he compared with *Σαμβατώς* which in Const.
Porph., cap. 9, is a surname of Kiev (τό καστρον Κιόάβα τό ἐπονομαζόμενον
Σαμβατώς).\(^3\) 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 be-
longing to a different tradition (Iṣṭ. < Balkhī), but in principle it is strange
that in Arabic script ẓ 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 župan
et župa (préfect, 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 i
Σαμβατώς*, in *Dokladi Akad. SSSR*, 1930,
No. 4, pp. 66–72, mentions 22 different
explanations of *Samvatas* (Slavonic,
Scandinavian, Hungarian, Armenian,
Lithuanian, &c.) and inclines towards
the Khazar origin of the name as sug-
gested 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
Westberg, *o.c.*, 1908 (March), p. 22,
connected *Vāntīt* with the Ventiči
(*Вєтницi*), the Slav tribe on the Oka,
which is very doubtful.
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 Svetopluk's control. In a text re-
ferring to a vast territory they may have in view the eastern Slavs, living
under the Rūs, p. 159, the Bulghārs, 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 Fränk, 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 'Aufī); Toumansky, Zap., 1896 (the text and transla-
tion 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/1–3, 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 Ukrai-

Since the beginning of the seventeenth century the origin of the name of
Russia (Русь, Россия) 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 Scandi-
navian 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 Variag (Варяг,
i.e., Vargh, Барягос, Waring3 referring to the parties of Norman adven-

1 Const. Porph., cap. 31, calls the Велокрообатои (White Croats to whom
perhaps the name of the Carpathians Karpat is due) δβαγταστοι.
2 Chwolson, Izvestiya, p. 143, pointed
out that in Swyyt-mlk the first element as restored *Svet-
suggests an eastern Slav transmission instead of which one
would expect in the West a nasalized form Svet<-Svent, cf. Σφενδοπλόκος.
The exact time at which nasal sounds disappeared in Slavonic languages is of
course difficult to define. According to Shakhmatov in the ninth century no
more nasal sounds were in existence in

Russian. As regards the Czech the

14th-century form of the name in
question was probably Sventopluk > now
Svetopluk (my friend Dr. B. Unbe-


In Arabic (لزئ), is first attested in
Birūnī, but cf. § 24, 15. [The late Prof.
A. A. Shakhmatov, Introduction to the
history of the Russian language (in Russian), Petrograd 1916, p. 62, thought
that the name Variag "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>
turers bound by an agreement or vow (vår). 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, *Vikingerspuren 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 (*Hrerekr*) 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 Sueonum*), 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.-ʾĀ.*, Gardīzī, *ʾAuфи*, &c., most formally distinguishes the Rūs from the Slavs. The latter, primarily the

---

1 The Russian word corresponding to “all” is here an evident mistake for the homonymous *Bec̆*, 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,¹ 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 (Ṣaqālība) 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” (sinf) 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, Koodā or Kūdā). The farthest distant Rūs are called Ṣ.lāviya,² which looks very much like a parallel form of Ṣaqālība, perhaps referring specially to the Sloveni³ of Novgorod among whom the Normans first settled. The third group are the ژئ (many variants) whose king lives in ژ (many variants). They are the wildest and kill the strangers who would penetrate into their country from which they themselves export black martens and rasās (tin or lead?) by a waterway. Since Frāhn’s Ibn Fosslan, Annex I, p. 162, the name Arthā (Arūbā) has been interpreted as Erz’a, which is the name of one of the two great divisions of the Mordva (§ 52).⁴ The Constantinople MS., Iṣṭ., 226 n, very definitely says that the ژ (Arbā, *Arthā) “are [or perhaps: trade?] between the Khazar and the Great (a’ zam) Bulghār”, which eventually suits⁵ the Erz’a.⁶ If the interpretation is right it indicates that there existed some Rūs centre in the Oka region.⁷ Frāhn 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 Hólmgarðr, i.e. “the island town”), cf. Thomsen, o.c., Marquart, Streifzüge, pp. xxiv, 201, Westberg, o.c., 1908, iii, 25.
² I.H., 285, adds: “and their king is in ژ, a town of theirs.” The variant ژ might indicate the reading of ژ as *Č.lāv- (?), which, however, would be inexplicable.
³ According to the Hypatios chronicle the original settlers in Novgorod were Sloveni (Словени).
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 ἄροφάγος, 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 rasās, interpreted as “tin”, thought that Arthā was Scandinavia! In the Persian translation of Iṣṭ., 226 k, ارزیز renders صاصب و قلمی and ١٣ show that arzīz means both “tin” and “lead”; qa’t which only means “tin” may be an arbitrary addition by the translator who hesitated between the two meanings of arzīz.
⁷ V.s., p. 217.
equally paid tribute to the Rūs.¹ The identification Arthā = Erz’a conflicts with Iṣṭ.’s indication concerning Kūyāba being the nearest to Bulghār, but on the other hand Arthā must have lain to the east of Ślāwiya which was the farthest territory of the Rūs (with regard to Bulghār from which the description apparently starts).² [Kūyāba 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 Gardīzī appears from the following synoptic table. ['Auſī in the first part of his report closely follows the same tradition.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I.R.</th>
<th>Gardīzī</th>
<th>H-.‘A.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the Rūs live on a wooded, damp island</td>
<td>D. 100,000 inhabitants (!)</td>
<td>entirely different (after Iṣṭ.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khāqān Rūs</td>
<td>D.</td>
<td>D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>raid Slavs by sea, sell them to the Khazar and Bulkār</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; Slavs among the Rūs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>newly born presented with swords</td>
<td>D.</td>
<td>N.</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>D.</td>
<td>A. physicians respected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>courageous, enterprising; sailors, not horsemen</td>
<td>D.</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’a. The town (first mentioned under A.D. 1095) was founded in the region where the Slav V’atichi (< Ventši) lived, but originally (from the 7th to the 9th century) the lands along the Oka probably belonged to the Mordva territory. Cf. V. A. Gorodtsoy, The ancient population of the R’azan’ province, in Izv. otdel. russ. yazyka, 1908, t. 13, pp. 147-9. [However, the Erz’a, at least now, live to the east of the Moksha, v.i., § 52.]

² Arthā has a variant أرثا which suggested to Chwolson the identification of *Abārma with Biarmia (Perm) of the Scandinavian sagas (Anglo-Saxon Beornmas, 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 Rūs 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 > Išt.) having supplied our author with the names of the three Rûs territories [shahr, “town or land”] the item on the damp “island” (I.R., Gardizî, ‘Auff) 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 Gardizî’s item on the sulaymānī swords which the Rûs possess (lahum al-suyûf al-sulaymāniya = va andar miyân shamsîr-i sulaymānī farāvān bâshad). On “Solomonian swords” see the Qur’ān, xxxiv, 10–12, cf. Chwolson, o.c., 195. The detail on Ş.lâba is a development of Išt.’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 Rûs and the course of the Rûs river (§ 6, 44.).

The situation of the Rûs country, as understood by our author, appears from the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Northern Lands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Şaqlāb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rūtā river</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

which must be supplemented by the indications that the Majgharî (§ 23) had the Rûs to their north and west [=NW. ?], and that the Turkish Pechenegs (§ 20) lived to the south of the river Rûthā (sic) and had the Majgharî and the Rûs to their west [resp. to the west and north-west ?]. As the Pechenegs are placed north both of the *Bulghârs (§ 51) and *Burtâs (§ 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 Rûs (v.s., p. 217). The Pecheneg mountains (Ural ?) would then form the Rûs boundary somewhere in the region to the north-east of the Volga. The latter river itself, at least down to its junction peoples Isû (Ves’) and Yura (Yugra) of which the first, according to R. Hennig, must be sought near Cherdin (Чердынь) on the Kama, see Der mittelalterl. arab. Handelsverkehr in Osteuropa, in Der Islam, xxii/3, 1935, pp. 239–65. [But cf. Marquart, Arktische Länder, 304, who still follows Fråhn’s theory according to which the Isû must be placed near Belozerō.] In any case the reading Arthâ is better attested. Quite lately V. Moshin took Arthâ for the Tmutarakan’ colony of the Rûs (on the Taman’ peninsula, east of the entrance channel of the Azov sea) but this hypothesis goes counter to Išt.’s indication as to the inaccessibility of the Arthâ land, and its exports.

1 See § 5, 19. where a mountain (Urals) is described as stretching between the end of the Rûs and the beginning of the Kimâk. Cf. also the eventual restoration of ābārma< Biarmia?
with the Oka, was evidently thought to flow in Rus territory (§ 6, 44.) but
the description of the “Rūs river” (upper Volga)\(^1\) does not imply that
Urtāb, Ş.lāba, and Kīiyāfā stood on its banks. The text only indicates that
the river watered their “ confines”. Their enumeration logically goes in the
inverse order to Ĩṣţ. who certainly wrote as if he were looking from Bulghār
westward. [Urtāb ارتاب corresponds to *أرتاب, 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.-ʿĀ., and Gardīzī, and the item of our source on the Rūs river. Along the
latter he disposed the three towns so that Kūyāfā (?) comes to occupy
the place of the future Nizhni-Navgorod at the junction of the Oka with the
Volga; Ş.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 re­
arrangement of written sources with a dangerous tendency towards artificial
systematization.\(^2\)

§ 45. The Inner Bulghār.

Marquart, Streifsüge, 503–6, 517–19; Westberg, K analizu vostoč. istoč.,

The term undoubtedly belongs to Balkhī for only the two geographers
who remodelled his work mention the Bulghār al-dākhil. Ĩṣţ., 226, writes:
“the Rūs trade with the Khazars, Rūm, and Great Bulghār (Bulghār
al-aʿ zam). They border from the north on the Rūm; their numbers are
great and their magnificent 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 Ĩṣţ.’s data some characteristics of the
three towns (Ş.lāwa “sur le sommet
d’une montagne”; Arthān “jolie ville sur
une montagne escarpée”, at 4 days’ dis­
tance 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 contem­
porary Rūsiya and Qumāniya, ii, 397–
400. Therefore Idrīsī’s Kiev may
easily be another avatar of the older
Idrīsī combines various sources of dif­
ferent epochs and Marquart has shown
how inaccurate (“Schwindelwerk”) he is
in eastern regions, cf. Ėransahr, 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 svaqtinā ḥādhā) no trace (baqiya) was left of the Bulghār, Burtās, 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-khārija) which name is given by Iṣṭ., 10, to “a small madīna (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 Iṣṭ., 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, Iṣṭ., 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 prikaspiyskikh 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, Streitsüge, 503. In the explanation of Bulghār al-a’żam Marquart, ibid., 518, hesitates between the Volga and Danube. In Russian chronicles (1236) the “Great town of Bolgar” (velikii gorodт Bolgar’skii) 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, Streitsüge, 503, places the Black Bulghars between the Dniepr and the Khazar lands, and further identifies them with the Kuturgur mentioned in Syriac and Byzantine sources.

4 Marquart refers to the Tanbih, 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] Șaqāliba, 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 Șaqāliba 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 Gardīzī (v.s., § 22 on the basic error with regard to the Majgharī 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I.Kh.</th>
<th>Burjān (§ 42, 16.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Rusta</td>
<td>Bulghārī (§ 42, 18.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iṣṭ.</td>
<td>Inner Bulghār (§ 45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>source common with Gardīzī</td>
<td>V.n.nd.r (§ 53) (?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

§ 46. The Mirvāt.


This chapter ought to come logically after § 53. Our author's geographical indications can be resumed in the following schemes:

![Diagram]

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 Mopōia mentioned by Const. Porph., v.s., notes to § 20.
The only sure parallel of our Mirvāt (so vocalized) is Gardžī’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 Gardžī’s passage which follows the tenor of the original report without trying to fit it into an imaginary scheme of “frontiers” (ḥudūd).

Assuming that Gardžī describes the Atelkuzu stage of Magyar migrations we have further identified the N.nd.r/V.n.nd.r with the Onoghundur-Bulghārs living beyond the Dūbā/Rātā, 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 Atelkuzu the Magyars were attacked by the Pechenegs and had to look for a new habitat; so they drove out the inhabitants of Great Moravia (η μεγάλη Μοραβία) and settled in the land “in which they are still living”. In ch. 40, p. 173, the mention of Σέρμων (situated at 2 days’ distance from Belgrade at the estuary of a river),¹ is accompanied by the note that beyond it (ἀπὸ τῶν ἐκεῖος) lies “the Great Unbaptized Moravia which the Magyars (Toūrκοι) destroyed and over which previously ruled Sventopluk (Σφενδοπλάκοσ)”. Finally, ch. 42, p. 177: “The Magyars live beyond the Danube in the Moravian land (εἰς τὴν τῆς Μοραβίας γῆν) and also on this [i.e. southern] side of it between the Danube and Sava.”

Gardžī’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 *Moravia, to which strikingly resembles.² The distance of 10 days which according to Gardžī separated the N.nd.r from the M.rdāt is also acceptable³ if we consider the difficulty of communication across the Carpathians.

The name مازدا مروآو (Mazda Morow) is indeed found in Mas’ūdī’s report on the Slavs, Muruj, iii, 61–5,⁴ where it is associated with *Khurwāt-in (Northern Croats? v.s., § 42) and *Sākh-in (Czechs?). As Mas’ūdī 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 (Toūrκοι = Magyars) in the neighbourhood of the kingdom of *al-Firag (Prague).⁵

¹ Sirmia (Sryem) lies north of the Sava and upstream from Belgrade.
² A transposition of ٰ and ۱ in Arabic script is extremely frequent, and for the substitution in Persian of ۴ for the final ٨, we have an example in خلی for خلی 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 Prešlav (at 4 hours’ distance to the west of Shumen).
⁴ The text was first edited and explained by Charmoy, in Mém. Acad. SPb., ii, 1834, pp. 297–408, and in the last place by Marquart, Streifzüge, pp. 95–160.
⁵ In Mas’ūdī’s Tanbih, 67, the “Slavonic Žām’in and Murāwa” are mentioned on the river called *Dunāwawa-M.Īwva. Mas’ūdī adds that many Burghar settled in this locality after their conversion to Christianity. Marquart, o.c., 116, thought that this
We can now return to our author who has complicated the situation by arraying the triad of nations: Majghārī-V.n.nd.r-Mīrvāt from north to south, so that the Mīrvāt, 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 Gardīzī'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 Mīrvāt are made to border on the "Inner Bulghārs", 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 Gardīzī says that the Christian M.rdāt 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'ūdī's report and that of Ibrahīm b. Ya'qūb, though of a later date, render possible the supposition that some relations existed between the Arabs and Sventopluk's dominions. Entirely fantastic are our author's assertions that the Mīrvāt knew Arabic and were tent-dwellers. These may be merely personal deductions from the fact that the Mīrvāt dressed like "Arabs".

The confusion in our source is blatant and we are obliged to go in the first place by Gardīzī's less sophisticated parallel text. It could be objected that the identification of Mīrvāt with Moravia conflicts with the description of the Șaqāliba (§ 43), subjects of the same Sventopluk. We must, however, admit that the source on the Șaqāliba has been utilized by I. Rusta, the H.-'Ā., and Gardīzī, whereas the combination of V.n.nd.r and Mīrvāt is known only to the H.-'Ā. and Gardīzī who in 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 (= ἤ μεγάλη Μοραβία) could easily be disconnected from its famous ruler, associated in the other source with the Șaqāliba.

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 Fragmente des Toparcha Gothicus [circa A.D. 963], in Zap. Akad. SPb., 1901, series VII, tome v, No. 2, and lately A. A. Vasiliev, The Goths in the Crimea (in Russian), Izv. 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>Ist. tradition (cf. notes to § 20 where Ist., 10, 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.

Ist. says only that the Pechenegs settled between the Khazar and Rûm.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 Khazar Pechenegs from the Khazars. In the south the Khazar Pechenegs bordered on the Alân (cf. § 48) and in Mas‘ûdi’s account of the *W.l.n.d.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 Alân (*sâhib al-Lân*), *v.i.*, notes to § 53. The detail on the Gurz sea lying to the west of the Khazar 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 Mirvât are named as the neighbours of the Khazar 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 Mirvât whose name he found in his special source [or passage] unknown to I.Kh., I. Rusta, or Ist. The latter author, *v.s.* p. 314, l. 1, is right when he suggests that the Pechenegs extended westwards down to the Rûm, *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‘ûdi’s embossed account of the *W.l.n.d.rî* hordes operating against the Byzantine empire. But the above-mentioned particular source, common to the *H.-‘A.* and Gardîzî, 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 “Rûm” in point of religion). The situation in the steppes in this period is extremely dark and, following Mas‘ûdi’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. Porphyrius. quoted in the notes to § 20.
2 Cf. § 5, 18. where *miyân-i nāhiyat-i* *Bachanāk-i Khazari biburrodh*, to suit § 47, ought to read: *miyân-i Bachanāk-i Khazar [va Khazar] bigudharadh (?).
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 Mirvāt arranged the bearers of them from north to south, so that the Mirvāt 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 'Aufī’s text published by Barthold, Turkestan, i, 99, and Marquart, Komanen, 40, is of great interest. 'Aufī (thirteenth century) writes that the arrival of the Q.ri (Qūn? v.s., notes to §§ 14, 1. and 21) in the Sāri land made the inhabitants of the latter move into the land of the Türkmāns [= Ghuz] with the result that the Ghuz [= Türkmān] 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 'Aufī has in view the migration of the tribes in the eleventh century when the Qipchaq (see notes to § 21) drove the Ghūz out of their steppes. For a short time the supremacy in the southern Russian steppes passed to the Ghūz. 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 Alān.

Vsevolod Miller, Osetinskiye et’udi, 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; Täubler, Zur Geschichte der Alenanen, in Klio, ix, 1909, pp. 14-28 (notes on ancient history); Barthold, Allān in EI; Marquart, Komanen, pp. 107-9 (the Alāns to the east of the Caspian Sea); Bleichsteiner, Das Volk d. Alanan, in Berichte d. Forschungs-Institutes f. Osten und Orient, Wien, ii, 1918, pp. 4-16; Marquart, Iberer und Hyrcanier, in Caucasica, fasc. 8, 1931, pp. 79-88 (critical remarks on Täubler). [J. Charpentier, Die ethnographische Stellung d. Tocharer, in ZDMG, 71, 1917, pp. 347-88, contains (pp. 357-66) a detailed study of the Osset connexions; the author makes a point of showing the identity of the Wu-sun (Chinese name of a people in the neighbourhood of the Issikul), ‘Aṣioi, Asiani (who towards

¹ The term دریای آرمینه (sic) is very strange and suits the Caspian better than the Black sea which we would expect at this place!
A.D. 200 became the lords of the Tocharians, as results from Justin’s epitome of Trogus Pompeius) and Alani [7]. As regards the Caucasus Charpentier, p. 363, considers the Ossets as an independent branch of the great Alân people.]

§§ 48 and 49 ought to come logically after § 36 (Shirvân).

The Iranian Alâns, later called Âs (cf. § 50, 4. Țulâs) were the ancestors of the present-day Ossets (from Georgian Ovs-et’î<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 Alâns bordering in the west (*southeast) on the Rûm 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. Digest (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). The restoration *As can be supported by the fact that nowadays the Ossets call their western neighbours the Balqar Turks Asiat and their territory Asi having evidently transferred to them the name of their own tribe which formerly occupied the region near the Elburz. Some temporary elevation of this particular branch may account for the generalization in Muslim literature of the Mongol epoch (thirteenth century) of the term Âs, instead of the older Alân. However, the Mongol dominion, under which many Âs 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 Alân tribes, the one to which the king belonged, was called دجسم D.khs-Âs.5 The *Tuwal-Âs mentioned in our § 50, 4. may be another ramification of the Âs. As the Tuwal-Âs are coupled together with the Abkhaz their notoriety may be due to their holding some important pass (e.g. the Kルクホルr connecting the Qara-chay territory with Abkhazia). At present Twal-tâ 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 s sounded to a foreign ear like š is shown by such names on the Turkish (former Osset) territory as Ashtotur<oss. Was-Totur "Saint Theodore", Miller, Oset. Et’udî, iii, 8.
3 Miller, o.c., iii, 6–7.
4 Const. Porph., De cerimoniiis, ii, 48, speaks separately of the ἐξουσιοδότης 'Alâvanas and the ἄρχοντες 'A'jas (in whose land the Κασπία πόλις = Darial are situated). This 'A'jas may possibly refer to the Âs?
5 Perhaps *Ruxâs Rukhs-Âs, cf. Rox-alani?
1. Kāsak (as in Mas’ūdī, Tanbīh, 184) but Murūj, ii, 45: كشف, corresponds to Byzantine Kασαüία, old Russian Рaкоры, 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, Komanen, 181, explains the later name Cherkes from Persian *chahār-kas “the four tribes of the Kas” (?), cf. also Streifzüge, 10, 145, 161, 175, 479. The Cherkes call themselves by an entirely different name Adige.

The Kashak are not mentioned in I.R., Iṣṭ., or Gardžī and here again, as in the account of Lyẓān (§ 36, 36.) we find in the H.-‘Ā. some common traits with Mas’ūdī.

2. Khaylān (?) is otherwise unknown, unless it is a repetition of Khaydān mentioned under the Sarir (§ 49, 2.), but Khaydān was separated from the Alān territory by the whole length of the Sarir.

3. Dar-i Alān, cf. § 5, 18 d., is the celebrated Bāb al-Lān, i.e. the Darial pass in Central Caucasus on the Military Georgian road connecting Vladikavkaz 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 (Qal’at al-Lān) in Mas’ūdī, 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 Gardžī, where it is expressly stated that the king’s subjects are heathens. V.s., p. 444, l. 26.

According to Mas’ūdī, ii, 42, the capital of the Alāns was called *Maghašun meaning “piety” (diyāna). It is not mentioned in any other Muslim source but may be connected with the city A-su Mie-k’ie-sz (probably “M., city of the Ās”) which is several times mentioned in Chinese sources (Yüan-shi, &c.) in the accounts of Mangu’s expedition in Northern Caucasus in a.d. 1239, cf. Bretschneider, Mediaeval researches, i, 316–7. See also Pelliot, Jour. As., April 1920, pp. 168–9, who further identifies the town of the Chinese sources with مکس or مکس mentioned in Rashid al-din, ed. Blochet, pp. 43, 47, after the expeditions to قریم (“Crimea”) and before that to Darband. However, in Juvaynī, GMS, i, 222, 222 (var. مکس) mentioned together with Bulghār seems to refer to the Moksha (a Mordvan tribe, cf. § 52) and such may be the case of p. 225; p. 224 is perhaps also a mis-spelling of the same name.

1 In the Tanbīh, 184, both Kāsak and Kashak are mentioned erroneously as separate peoples.

2 Instead of Garš and K’ut in the Armenian Geography, Marquart, Komanen, 181, suggests to read K’arš (i.e. Kashak, Cherkes) 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 Sarīr.

Sarīr is no original name of the country, being only an abridgement of the title šāḥīb al-sarīr “Master of the Throne” which the Arabs gave to the local king (on his golden throne sarīr, in our text takht, see I.R., 147, Mas’ūdī, Murūj, ii, 41, Iṣṭ., 223). I.R. and Gardīzī, 101, call the king respectively and ازار ازار. This detail suggested to Marquart and Barthold (Daghestān in EI) the identification of the Sarīr with the Avar people in Daghستان (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 Balādhurī, p. 196 in fine, discussing the titles given by Anūshirvān to the princes of Daghستان says: “the khāqān of the mountain (khāqān al-jabal!) who is the Master of the Throne is called وهرار(وهرارنشاه،وهرارنشاه(variants: Wolražal)”. Thomas Artsruni (tenth century) mentions the people Aurhaz-k’ (أذرگ) jointly with the Tsanār-k’ (Sanār, § 36, 33.), cf. Marquart, o.c., 496. In the Zafar-nāma (written in A.D. 1424), i, 772, 777, 779, the Daghستان Avars are called Auhar, and this form is very much like the first element of the king’s name in Balādhurī.² Mas’ūdī, ii, 41, relates a story of the descendence of the Master of the Throne from Bahram Gur, and abusively confers on him an additional title of Filān-shāh (variants: Filānān). The connexion with the Master of the Throne seems to have been much appreciated for not only Mas’ūdī speaks of the matrimonial ties between the Alān and the Sarīr princely families but we know that Ishāq b. Ismā‘īl, ruler of Tiflis circa A.D. 830–53, was married to a daughter of this king, see Ṭabarī, 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 Daghستان. 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 Sarīr. 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 چو-چان or چو-چان and which, according to P. Pelliot, was of Mongol race.³ In A.D. 551 they were vanquished by the Turks (T’u-chūeh)

1 The Avars are now an entirely Daghستانian people, but their name may reflect that of some former dynasty issued from the pre-Islamic *Abapoi, ’Abāwes, see I.Kh., 92 and 119: al-Abār, cf. Marquart, Komanen, 74–5.

2 In Armenian Aurhazk’, k’ is the suffix of plural and the group rh, with usual metathesis, must stand for hr. In *Auhraz I consider z as an Iranian suffix of origin similar to that of Gur-z, Lak-z, Lāy-z (§ 36, 36.). Consequently the Armenian form *Auhra-z (easily < Auhar-z) is identical with later Persian Auhar (=Avār) and in its light we may restore Balādhurī’s title, which consists of a name+suffix z+suffix an. As regards the form وهرار we may suppose that it is a result of several tentatives to transcribe the difficult name containing the elements ورا usually confused in writing. One of the ṣ may be superfluous and with *Wera (or still better *Wera) we approach the Armenian form. The tentative restoration would be *Auher-z-ān-shāh.

3 Cf. T.-Pao, xxxii/4, 1936, p. 235.
and according to Theophylactos Simocatta fled partly to China (Tanγαν = Tahghach = the Wei dynasty) and partly to the Mowṣir. 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 'Oγόφ (Uyghur) tribes Oβάρ, Xουννί, &c. Cf. Marquart, Die Chronologie d. alttürk. Inschriften, 94, Erānsahr, 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-čhi (Wu-čhi) or Mo-ho which lived north of Corea, cf. Herrmann, Historical Atlas of China, Cambridge, U.S.A., 1935, Map 30), but Marquart, Erānsahr, 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 Rashid al-dīn, ed. Bérézine, vii, 90 (transl. v, 70) one of the four divisions of the Avar tribes was called *Auḥar (?), which name is, indeed, reminiscent of the title borne by the Sarir king. This item does not, of course, constitute a proof for the “true-Avar” origin of the rulers of Sarir, who, following Theophyl. Simocatta’s 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 Sarir see § 5, 18. On the wrong idea of the sources of the Kur see § 6, 56. Our author makes the Sarir border on the Rūm, the latter term evidently referring only to the Georgians (§ 42, 15.). No parallels could be found for the story about the giant flies (pasha). Mas’ūdī, ii, 42, gives the name *Maghasin to the Alān capital (v.s.). Could not some popular etymology *Maghaś-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. Mas’ūdī, ii, 42, calls the seat of government (dār al-mulk) of the Sarir خرخ (dūr; d’Ohsson quotes the variant خرخ). This place may correspond to the present centre of the Avar territory, Khunzakh (*خَرْخِ). See Map xi.

2. خرخان (perhaps repeated under § 48, 2.) corresponds to خرخ in I.R., 147, and Gardizi, 109, and خرخان in Mas’ūdī, 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 خرخان puisque le pays ici désigné est encore habité par les Kaitacs (٤٥٨ dans Abul-Fidā and the coast of the Caspian sea near the town of Bāb al-abwāb in a southern
Kātib-Chelebi)." Marquart in the additions to his Streifzüge, 492, came practically to the same conclusion. The Qaytaq (speaking [now] a Dagestanian language) live on the rivers Gumri (*Humri?) and Darbakh, along the coast immediately north of Darband. I.R., 147-8, quoting from some earlier source calls the king of Khyzān Ādharnarsē and says that he is equally respectful to the three religions of his subjects (Muslims, Jews, and Christians). He places Khyzān at 12 mansils “to the right” of the Master of the Throne’s castle which distance is certainly exaggerated, unless it is based on a confusion with a different Khyzān. According to Masʿūdi the Ḧydān was formerly a part of the Khazarian principalities (dākhila fi jumlat mulūk al-Khazar); in his times the king, a Muslim said to be of the Qaḥṭān tribe, bore the hereditary name of Ṣafan.4

A certain difficulty results from some of Balādhurī’s data on خيران: p. 204, in the enumeration of Salmān’s federates he mentions “Shakki, Khyzān, Shirvān”, &c., as if they were neighbours; p. 206, he says that Jarraḥ after having attacked the people of *Ḥumrīn (حمرین) Ḧumrīn? cf. Balādhuri, 208)settled them in the “rustāq (sic) of Khyzān” which suggests a place in the rear [?]. Finally I.Kh., 124, in his identification of the places mentioned in the Qorānic legend of Moses, mentions “the village of Khyzān” along with Bājarvān (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” (v.s.).

Masʿūdi entirely separates Ḧydān from the Sarīr but I.R. and Gardīzi speak of Khyzān 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 Kh.nḍān in the present chapter. The Sarīrian “generals” living in the town may be only an echo of the original report on the king Ādharnarsē.

3. A parallel of ʪنفس is found only in I.R., 148, who places ʪنفس at a distance of 10 farsakhs from the town of Khyzān and describes the cult of the tree practised by its inhabitants, cf. Marquart, Streifzüge, 15. The

direction. Then quoting from al’-Asīzī (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 الْيَتْق Qaytaq who are a (special) race (jins); and on its southern side the Lazgi who are also a (special) race”.

1 Jihān-nīmā, pp. 401-2.
2 Marquart, o.c., p. 492, identifies Ḧydān with Majālis (on the left bank of the Buam). 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’Ohsson, o.c., p. 10, proposed the identification of this place to بَلاْح where according to Balādhuri, p. 195. Anūshīrvaṇ met the khāqān of the Khazars. Consequently Ḫِدَق may be Bashli = بَلاْح [= Armenian Varac an].

3 It can mean only to the “south-east” for, p. 148, the Alān 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 Masʿūdi’s Ḧydān.
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 Tabarsarān) lie very close to one another. Therefore the mention of Rubas would not be unexpected after Qaytaq (*Khaytāq). The mention of Rubas 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 Khyzān and Rhhs, finishes the chapter by mentioning a second castle belonging to the Master of the Throne: "it is called الال وغريبك 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 Mašūdī, 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.


The principal Muslim source on the Khazars is Ibn Faḍlān (in Yāqūt, ii, 436-40), many of whose data are found also in Išt., 220-5, though each of the two sources has a good many independent details. Since Frāhn it has been admitted that Ibn Faḍlān (who travelled in 309-10/921-2) was the

¹ The *Tā'rikh Bāb al-Abwāb* quoted by A. Z. Validi, *Azerbaycan*, p. 39, spells the name رویاس but the name may have had an older form.

² The territory of Qumiq is occupied by the Lak who are also called *Qazi-Qumiq* (to be distinguished from the Turkish *Qumiq* living further northeast towards the Caspian sea). Cf. Dirr, in Peterm. Mitteil., 54, 1908, pp. 204-12.
source of Iṣṭakhrī, but lately Kmoskó 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, Bakrī, Gardīzī, and 'Aufī.

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 Iṣṭ., 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:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Const. Porphyry. cap. 42,} & \quad \text{ο \, χαγάνος} & \quad \text{ο \, πέχ} \\
(\text{cf. Marquart, o.c., 27}) & \quad \text{Khazar Khāqān} & \quad \text{Ayshā} \\
Ibn Rusta & \quad \text{Khāqān} & \quad \text{Malik} \\
Masūdī, Murūj, ii, 12 & \quad \text{Malik Khazar} & \quad \text{Khāqān Khazar, or Bek} \\
Iṣṭakhrī & \quad \text{Khāqān Khazar} & \quad \text{Malik Khazar} \\
Ibn Ḥauqal & \quad \text{Khazar Khāqān} & \quad \text{Abshād} \\
Gardīzī
\end{align*}
\]

In the Ḩ.-'Ā. the two persons are run into one and the king (pādshāḥ) is called Ṭarkhān Khāqān, from the children of Ansā (cf. Ayshā, Abshād). The latter name was borrowed from the source common also to I.R. and Gardīzī, whereas the addition to the title khāqān of a further title ṭarkhān finds an explanation in the story of the interpreter Sallām’s journey to the wall of Gog and Magog, I.Kh., 163, where Ṭarkhān malik al-Khazar is mentioned, though at another place I.Kh., 41, says that ṭarkhān was the title of lesser Turkish kings. [A Khwārazmian mercenary Ras-Ṭarkhān commanded the Khazar forces which invaded Transcaucasia in 147/764. Marquart, Ungar. Jahrbücher, 1924, p. 271, explains by this person’s name that of the later town Astrakhan. Cf. Ṭabarī, iii, 328, استرانخان, *Ās-ṭarkhān? .]

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, Iṣṭ., 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.

\textit{Prima facie} our enumeration of the Khazar towns presents great difficulties. In fact these towns were only \textit{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 \textit{two} Volga towns under \textit{five} different names and thus his total rises to \textit{seven}, to say nothing of the \textit{five} additional names wrongly quoted under Khazar.

\footnote{The places of the rulers are wrong.}
The complication with the Volga towns will be best presented in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st.</th>
<th>Western Atil</th>
<th>Eastern Atil</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.Kh.</td>
<td>ال팟ا</td>
<td>خملخ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.R.</td>
<td>سارعشن</td>
<td>حلول هلغ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakrī</td>
<td>بارغش</td>
<td>حلخ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The three traditions, namely: A (Iṣṭ. < I. Faḍlān), B (I.Kh.), C (I.R. and Gardžī), are all side by side incorporated in H.-ʿĀ. 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 ايتل (read ايتل > Etil) was a double town for it was divided by the Atil 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, Murūj, ii, 7, reckons from Darband to Samandar 8 days and thence to Atil (so instead of Amul) 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 Kizlar (on the Terek) and Petrovsk (now Makhach-qalʿa) 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 تدلی T.dlī” which may easily stand for ترکو 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: وا مدوون al-Khazar: *Khamlīkh wa Balanjar ِو 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 Balanjar, 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, Baladhurī, 204, Yaʿqūbī, Historiae, 194 (in the account of

1 The reading of the name may be *Sumundur, *Samundur, &c.
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 Balanjar² and tentatively identifies the Balanjar river with the Qoy-su “the Sheep river” (Abulfidā, 204: nahr al-aghnām flowing through the Sarīr). 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 Khasavyurt 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 Marwān³ 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 ِ سَارِقَهُ. The first element of the name *Sārigh-sh.n is evidently Turkish sarigh “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., 1, arbitrarily restores the second element ٣ as shar < shahr, but I am strongly inclined to think that the name *Sarigh-shin is the original form of the still enigmatic Saqsīn, as the geographers of Mongol times call a town situated by a mighty river and usually quoted along with the Volga Bulghar, cf. Barthold, Saksīn in El.⁵ To sum up: Baydā may be only an Arabic name for the first of the two Atil towns already mentioned under 1. 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.

3b. 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 ِ رَّبَيْانِ which here 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 Barshiyā, v.s., p. 449, note 1, in Armenian Varar’an, see Moses Kaşankatvats’i, book ii, ch. xxix, Russian transl. by Patkanov, SPb., 1861, p. 192.]

2 Marquart, ibid., 166, identifies Balanjar with Varar’an 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 Ṣarkel = Russian Bēlaveža “White tent” is called in the Khazar king’s letter (version B) Sharkil, 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 Saqsīn with the Itil town was recognized by Westberg, o.c., 1908 (March), p. 40; I think that even phonetically Saqsīn < Sarigh-shin (or -sin?) [As a parallel cf. the name of Tsaritsin “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 *Sarichin (?) supposed to mean “yellow island” (?). *Sari-sin would mean “yellow tomb”.]
also to I.R., Bakrī, and Gardīzī (see the table above). The unusual form of the first name *jārū may have been influenced by the two towns Shāeghar in Transoxiana, cf. Barthold, Turkestan, 174. The second name, as spelt by our author, would be *Khutlugh “happy” but to judge by I.R.’s variants it looks like a compound with the Turkish word -balīgh “town”. Very probably another form of the same name is I.Kh.’s *Khulīg (so instead of خُلِيج chosen by de Goeje) Khambilkh, possibly with a contraction from <Khammalikh<Kham-balīgh<Kham-balīgh. The first element still offers a difficulty. Marquart, Komanen, 71, rightly criticized M. Hartmann’s restoration *Khan-balīgh, but his own reading *Qapīgh-balīgh 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 Jurjān, *i.e.* along the *eastern* coast of the Caspian.

3c. The last three names are found in I.Kh., 124, who following on the enumeration of the three Khazar towns says: “and outside al-Bāb (Darband) are a. the Malik of Suwar, b. the Malik of al-Lakz, c. the Malik of al-Lān, d. the Malik of Filān, e. the Malik of al-M.sq.t, f. the Master of the SARīr, and g. the town of Samandar”. In this list a. corresponds to our *Swr;* b. to our *Lkn, 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. Filān has been left out of consideration.1

Neither of the three names *Lakz, Swr,* and M.sq.t could be quoted in the tenth century under the heading *Khazar.* Even Darband-i Khazarān (§ 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” (*thaghr*) 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 Shirvān-shāh, *v.s.*, notes to § 36, 36. and Iṣṭ., 219. A remote reason for the inclusion of *Lakz, Suwar,* and *M.sq.t* between Shirvān and Bāb al-Lān (Darial), cf. I.Kh., 123, bāb L.bān-shāh. This *L.b.n* probably corresponds to *Lip‘in-k* of the Armenian authors and Lupenii of Pliny, *n. h.*, vi, 29, and it is not impossible to connect *Lipin,* &c. with *Fil-* by admitting a metathesis *Līf/Fīl.* It is true that Balādhuri, 196, specially mentions Malik Filān but the different sources may account for the difference *L.b.n/Filān.* [In the eastern part of Shahkī near the sources of the Turiyan-chay several places are found with such names as Filisfī, perhaps <Fīl-i Filān (cf. the royal title of Gil-i Gilān). This is only a hint to the future investigators on the spot.]

1 Perhaps because our author, like Mas‘ūdī, *Murūj,* ii, 42, took Filān-shāh for the hereditary title of the Sarīr kings. This, however, is inexact, for Balādhuri, 196, names separately sāhib al-Sarīr and malik-Filān. Nothing practically is known of this prince and his people. In Yāqūt’s very valuable passage on the peoples of Daghhestān, i, 438 (cf. *BGA,* i, 184) immediately after Ṭabarsarān (on the Rubas river) is mentioned umma ilā janbīhim tu‘raf bi-Filān which suggests that the Filān lived quite close to the Ṭabarsarān. After the Filān come the Lakz, al-Lārān, and Sharvān (sic). Balādhuri, 194, speaks of سَدَ اللَّه “the wall of the *L.b.n*” which the Sasanian Qubādāh built

---

Commentary § 50
*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 Samūr river and Shābarān in the lower parts of the Lakz lands (*fi sahl arḍ al-Lakz), see Balādhuri, 207. On the middle course of the Samūr there is still a village Khazri<

*Khazari.

stands undoubtedly for لکز. As mentioned above (§ 36, 36.) the Lakz, or a part of them, seem to be identical with the *Khursān (Balādhuri, 196). According to Mas'ūdī, Murūj, ii, 6, the Shirvān-shāh Muḥammad b. Yazīd annexed the possessions of خراسان (خراسان) (read: شاه و زادان) and this agrees with the threefold title of the Shirvān-shāh in our source (v.s.). Mas'ūdī, ii, 5, even adds that the Lakz kingdom (mamlaka) was the bulwark (mu'awwal) of the Shirvān kingdom. Balādhuri, 209, mentions a fortress of the Shirvān-shāh named خورش. The original extent of the Lakz territory is uncertain but they appear as the immediate neighbours of the Layzān (v.s.). According to Abul-Fidā, trans. ii/2, p. 299, the Samūr river flowed across the Lakz territory and Balādhuri's passage, 207, indicates that in the region between the Samūr 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. خویق), 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. Trubetsky'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 Lak became Lazg, which form was further used by Persians with the addition of the usual suffix of origin Lazg-ī (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 vocalized Suwar in I.Kh., 124, nothing is known and de Goeje's annotation: "سوار vulgo _written below_ Suwar" (cf. § 51) remains on his responsibility. As a guess one might connect the name Suwar (*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. Mas'ūdī, Tanbih, 83, pretends that the "Turkish" name of the Khazar was *Ser (Ser, سر)." [V.s., p. 401.]

Vocalized (cf. also § 49, 3.) vocalized in I.Kh. al-Masqat most probably must be read *Masqu.2 Marquart, Kulturanalekten in Ungar. Jahrbücher, ix/1, 1929, p. 78, quotes as its parallels Armenian Mask'ut'k', Maskut', &c., and ingeniously takes the present-day Mushkur for a later avatar of the old

1 The Suwar whom the Khazar king mentions in the list of his neighbours, Kokovtsov, 98, do not seem to be connected with Daghestān.

2 Cf. a mountain south of Ganja called Maskhut on Russian maps.
name (the passage $t\rightarrow\delta\rightarrow r$ 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. Kavkaza, i, 94, cf. Abul-Fidā, transl. ii/2, p. 229. In Balādhuri’s time (p. 196) Masqut had already ceased to exist as a kingdom.

4. These names [omitted in Gardīzī] occur in the following writers (cf. Marquart, Streifzüge, 173, and v.s., p. 445):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I.R., 139.</th>
<th>Ťūlās</th>
<th>Lūgh.r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bakrī</td>
<td>Ābīn</td>
<td>Āwgh.n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Aufī</td>
<td>Ťūlās</td>
<td>Kūgh.r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shukrullāh</td>
<td>Ťūlās</td>
<td>K.ṛgh ра</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 ʔaqṣāhū) live the Ťūlās and Lūgh.r and which stretches to the land of Tiflis”. To Marquart, Streifzüge, 31, 164–76, is due the ingenious explanation of the two names. He interprets Ťūlās as *Ţūl-Ās in which Ās represents the well-known alternative name of the Alāns: old Russian Yas; Georgian Ous-i and, with the suffix denoting the country Ous-et’i > modern Russian Oset-in. In Muslim literature Ās replaces Alān (§ 48) in Mongol times, cf. Juwaynī, GMS, i, 214, 222: Ās; Ibn Baṭṭūta, ii, 448: Ās. Bakrī’s Ābīn could then be easily improved into Ābīn, and, as a compound, Ťūl-Ās would be paralleled by the name of the principal clan of the Alān as given by I.R., 148:

The second name Ās, cf. Bakrī’s Āwgh.n, is restored by Marquart as Āwgh.n/Avghz, i.e. Abkhaz, Arabic أَوْغَز, Greek Αβασγόλ, [Contarini, ed. Hakluyt Society, p. 144: Acogasia]. 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. Masʿūdī, ii, 65, seems to distinguish between the جزرن (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 Āwgh.n/Avghz would refer only to the real Abkhaz.

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 (!) and professing the same religion. [V.i., p. 481, 3.]

2 ‘Aufī and Shukrullāh consider the Ťūlās and Kūgh.r (K.ṛgh ра) 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 Rûs as well were considered Turks by Muslim writers. طوَّلَس could even have been mistaken for طوَّلَس (v.s., notes to § 14).
So far, so good, but Marquart in his *Streifzüge*, 173, 495, overreached the goal by further identifying the Ţūlās and *Aughaz* respectively with the N.nd.r and M.rdāt 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).1

Summing up the situation, we should:

1. distinguish between the two pairs of peoples (see notes to §§ 42 and 53);
2. locate the Ţūlās and Lūgh.r in the western Caucasus;
3. provisionally maintain the first part of Marquart’s hypothesis: Ţūlās = 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 Ţūlās 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 خزر Khazar with جزر “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 Ţūl-Ās is confronted by Marquart, *ibid.*, 172, with the name of the Alan prince Dula, known from Magyar sources.2 It is much simpler, however, to identify it with the Osset Tūl-tā, 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 Liakhvi 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 طولا would then be read *Tuwal-Ās*.3 See Additional Note to § 48.

(6.) As regards Bakrī’s report on the جور, 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 Mīrvāt in our author and Gardizi (v.s., § 46).


3 There exists a Georgian family Tulasdeze 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 does not seem to be connected with the Ossets. In any case, the attested Georgian form of the name Tual is Dval-i (from which the family name of Dvalishvili is derived). [The imaginary name دولی which Nizâmi in his *Iskandar-nāma* gives to the Abkhâz king may reproduce Dvali.]
parative table of the relevant passages in I.R.’s and Bakrī’s chapters on the Khazars:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I.R.</th>
<th>Bakrī</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description of the road from the Pechenegs to the Khazars.</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The Khazar country is a vast land one of whose sides adjoins a huge mountain”</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“and this is the mountain at the farthest end of which live the Ṭūlās and Lūgh.r”</td>
<td>left out, v.i.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“and this mountain stretches to the lands of Tiflis”</td>
<td>“then [you go tasīru] to the lands of Tiflis, the latter (Tiflis) being the beginning of the frontier of Armenia”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instead of the sentence on the two peoples left out in the chapter on the Khazars, Bakrī, 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 who possess horses, cattle, and fields; under that mountain on the sea-coast lives the people called Aughūna; 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.1 This mountain continues down to Bāb al-abwāb and joins the Khazar country.”

Bakrī’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). Bakrī proceeds in an opposite direction (the Majgharī [in some of their seats on the Black Sea coast], the [Caucasian] mountains, the *Ās and Aughūna, then Tiflis, Bāb al-abwāb, and the Khazar). The form of Bakrī’s names is peculiar. If for لُغُر (Loğr) is due to the general use of forms in -iya (Bajānākiya, Majghariya), אָין presents more difficulty. Marquart, o.c., 167, restored it as *גָּע (As which is a later appellation of the Alān (§ 48), the latter name not appearing in the known fragments of Bakrī. Although the forms *D.khs-Ās and Ṭwł-Ās occur already in I. Rusta as the names of special tribes, the pure form Ās as referring to the Alāns in general appears only in Mongol times. Moreover Bakrī’s description of the לוכם אָין lacks the characteristic features of the Alān. Even the combination of אָין with the *Aughaziya suggests that Bakrī has in view the particular clan corresponding to Ṭwlās.2 The disclosure of the identity of Bakrī’s אָין (i.e. whether it stands for Alān or Ṭwlās) is important

1 The passage in italics is a repetition 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.

2 As the separation from the name Ṭwlās of the basic element Ās is not at all an obvious matter we are perhaps

levanted to suppose that Bakrī 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 Bakrī possessed some more detailed knowledge of the early Magyar seats near the Caucasus than is found in the more complete text of the earlier I. Rusta. In the second eventuality the vicinity of the Magyars to the 

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., Gardīzī, and 'Aufī. This group of authors definitely says that the Magyar country reaches down to the Rūm sea (bahr, daryā) instead of which Bakrī mentions "Rūm country" (bilād al-Rūm), 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 Bakrī quotes a detail not found in I.R., H.-'Ā., Gardīzī, or 'Aufī. We must remember that according to I.R., 143[1], the Khazars "some time ago" entrenched themselves against the Magyars and other peoples (yuqālu anna-’l-Khazar fimā taqaddama kānat qad khandaqat 'alā nafsi-hā ittiqā a ’l-Majghariya wa ghayrihim min al-umam al-mutākhima li-bilādihim). Assuming then that the Magyars were the neighbours of the Khazars, Bakrī 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 Bakrī's mysterious passage.

This hypothesis may be objected to on the ground that according to our § 47 the Khazarian Pechenegs neighboured in the south on the Alān and a similar view is suggested by Mas‘ūdi's embroiled passage on the W.l.nd.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 Alāns. As the Pechenegs ousted the Magyars from their Lebedia seats it could have been inferred that the latter as well had bordered on the Alāns. However, the fact is that Muslim authors knew nothing of what we ourselves, thanks to Const. Porph., know about the events, cf. Iṣt., 10, and our § 47. Therefore a retrospective conclusion 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 Bakrī 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) Bakrī's āb in refers not to the Alāns as a whole but to the little-known tribe of Twlās, and (b) that the idea that the Magyars and āb were neighbours is a result of Bakrī's personal surmise. As a matter of fact even at the time when the Magyars lived near the Caucasus the Twlās mountaineers must have been separated from them by the other Alān tribes living in the plains. [Cf. p. 458, l. 18?] 

(7.) During his expedition to the north-eastern Caucasus Timur operated against the Khazar fortress of Sarkel (on the Don) and 1 Marquart, Streifsüge, 28, connects this report with the construction of the Khazar fortress of Sarkel (on the Don) after A.D. 833.
Tā'ūs appear as the names of two local chiefs, though they may represent hereditary titles. The fortress of Tā'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 (Balqar? at the sources of the Terek). Both the name طراس, which could be easily restored as *طلاس, and the geographical details make it possible to see in our passage an echo of the tenth-century terminology. [Haïji-Khalifa, p. 402, repeats the statement of the Z.-nāma.]

§ 51. [The Bulkār.]

Fränh, Drei Münzen and Die ältesten arabischen Nachrichten über die Wolga-Bulgharen, 1832 (still valuable); Chwolson, Izvestiya . . . Ibn Dasta [Rusta], 80–101; Barthold, Bulghar in EI (in great detail); R. Vasmer, Über die Münzen der Wolga-Bulgharen, in Wiener Numism. Zeitschrift, 57 (1924), pp. 63–84 (instead of پارمان read on some coins Vasmer restores the well-known title of the Bulghar kings پارمان); Marquart, Arktische Länder, 365–77.

There are two gross misunderstandings in the present chapter. Its title “Burs” is entirely wrong (cf. also § 20). Burtās is only another form of *Burdās (see § 52), whereas here the Volga Bulghārs 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 tentatives 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 őkőr in Magyar and wākār 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, Chwashi i yikh sosedî, 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 Muqtadir to the

1 Rashid al-dīn, ed. Blochet, p. 45; mentions an Ās chief executed by Ogedey; (note the final كله).

2 As Barthold has pointed out, the Bulghar and Burtās are also confused in Yaqūt, i, 567.
Bulghār khāqān in view of the latter’s desire to be advised on religious matters.

The present chapter is a poor abstract chiefly of Ištı. The details on the special language and the number of the Bulghārs and their towns remind one of this latter author who, p. 225, says that the Bulghār language has a resemblance to the Khazar language (the latter, p. 222, being an idiom apart), and that in the towns of Bulghār and Suvār there are some 10,000 men (nās). Gardizī, 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>Bulghār</th>
<th>Ibn Rusta</th>
<th>Gardizī</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.ḥdīlā</td>
<td>B.rsūlā</td>
<td>B.rsūlā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ishkil (?)</td>
<td>Isghil (?)</td>
<td>Iskil (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.lkār</td>
<td>B.lkār</td>
<td>B.lkār</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The form of the latter name points to the Persian (?) origin of the basic source: *Bulghār. The name B.rsūlā (*B.rchulā) is known in two places: since the fifth–sixth century A.D. the Byzantine and other Christian authors mention Ḍapɔrjλכ, Bεpζvλła, &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 turcized by the Huns, see Die Chronol. d. alttürk. Inschr., 87–93, Streifsätze, pp. 490–1, and Arktische Länder, p. 328. The name seems to have found an echo even in the Shāh-nāma, ed. Mohl, iv, 70, where Afrāsiyāb is accompanied by his grandsons اَلاَ حُتْقِل (cf. the name of the river ہم<Ilā) and بزرولā Barzwtuila (the Mujmal al-tawārikh gives: B.rzīlā). Justi’s Iranian etymology in Iran. Namenbuch, p. 74, is certainly inadequate. Idrisi, ii, 398, mentions on the Dniepr a place رژولā which lay at one day’s journey upstream from Pereyaslav (ہزراو) 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 Faḍlān’s original risāla is called اَلَشِّبِن شَلَشْكِبِ بَطَوار. *Almush and this name resembles the name Almus which was borne by the father of Arpád, founder of the first Magyar dynasty, Chwolson, Izvestiya, 91, Marquart, Streifsätze, 497. Our author dropped al which he evidently took for the Arabic article. Bltwār must be perhaps restored as بَطْوار *Yiltuvār or Yiltūvār in view of the Hunnic (= Turkish) title Alp-Ilutver found in Moses Kalankatvats’i, Part ii, chap. 41, Patkanov’s transl., p. 198. [Marquart: Ḉ̄ Alp-ilātvār ? ]

The second error in our text is that the description of the two Bulghār towns is inserted out of place between § 53 and 54. The ruins of Bulghār (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. Suvār lay on the river Utka near the present village Kuznechikha, cf. Barthold, Bulghār in EL. 2 See Map xii.

1 Chwolson, Izvestiya, 97, compares this name with that of the Transylvanian Szekler (?). [Cf. supra p. 320, line 2.] 2 Smolin, Po rasval. drev. Bulgara, Kazan, 1926.
§ 52. Burādhās (?).

Chwolson, Izvestiya ... Ibn Dasta, pp. 71-80; Bretschneider, Mediaeval Researches, i, 311 (on Mongol times); I. N. Smirnov, Les Populations finnoises, i/2: les Mordves, traduit par P. Boyer, Paris 1898; A. V. Markov, Russo-Mordvan relations in history (in Russian), Tiflis 1914 (in annex Toumansky’s translation of our § 52); Barthold, Burūtās in EI; Finno-Ugorskij sbornik, ed. by the Academy of the U.S.S.R., 1926. See Map xii.

Although according to Persian phonetics in Burādās is consistent with an intervocalic position, the first l appears superfluous in view of Mas‘ūdī, Murūj, ii, 14, Išt., I.H., as well as in our source (rightly [?] in the chapter on the rivers, § 6, 43., but wrongly in § 51). The form Burūtās 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 Burūtās from old Iranian *mṛtāsa “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 paratu, Kurdish purd) 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 Burūdās 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). Išt., 227, reckons 20 days from the Khazar capital to the Burūtās boundary, adding that the Burūtās country was 15 days long. In the description of the Volga Išt., 222, says that after its bend to the east (read: south-east) it “flows past the Rūs, then Bulghār, then Burūtās”. Mas‘ūdī, Murūj, ii, 14, in a confused passage speaks of a Burūtās river which from the upper regions flows into the river on which the Khazar capital stands (nahrun fauq al-madīna yaṣībbu ilā nahri-hā min a‘ālī-hā yuqālu la-hā Burūtās). 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 Burūtās river. The Burūtās are a great nation of Turks (?) living between the lands of Khuwārizm (?) and the Khazar king-

1 Already Tomaschek, Kritik d. ältesten Nachrichten über d. skytischen Norden, in Sitzungsbg. Wien. Akad., 1889, t. 107, pp. 7-16, suggested an identification of the Herodotian ‘Avrōphágyos with the Mordva whose name he compared with the old Persian μαρτχωρος commented in Greek as āvdr̲ph̲ávos.

2 A rigorous interpretation of this text would indicate that Burūtās lay downstream from Bulghār (both these names in Išt., 222, stand without article).
dom and depending on the Khazar. This [? ] river is navigated by large vessels (carrying) various merchandise from the Khuvārizm 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 Burτās in the direction of Khvārazm 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 Khvārazm to the Khazar country and, judging by Ist.’s indications, one would think that by some mistake Mas’ūdī has substituted Khuvārizm for *Bulghār. Of all the sources the H.-’Ā. (§ 52) most positively locates the Burādhās to the west of the Ātil river (§ 6, 43. which simply follows Ist., 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 Gardīzī, 96, say only that struggles were going on between the Burτās and the Pechenegs and, moreover, speak of the Pechenegs as neighbours of the Slavs.1 On the western neighbours of the Burτās 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 Gardīzī and omits many details. The item about the two kings seems to be a misunderstanding. I. Rusta says that the Burdās have no chief (ra’īs) but “in every community of theirs (mahalla) there is an elder (shaykh), or two (shaykha’yan) to whom they have recourse in the matters which happen to them” (ditto in Gardīzī). The religion is described as in I.R. and Gardīzī, and the burning of the dead as in I.R.2

Since Frāhn’s time the Burτās 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 Burτas, and the Erz’a in the basin of the Sura which flows to the Volga to the east of the Oka.3


---

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* (*Mordvini*) are evidently the eastern *Erz’a* but the difficult point is the name *Merdas* which Rubruquis applies to the latter. Is it a deformation of *Mordva*, 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 *Mordva*, which name down to the sixteenth century referred only to the *Erz’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 = Mordva* (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 *Išṭ.*, 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 *Burtasi* 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 *Išṭ.*’s *š[ł]* (v.s., § 44, 3.) with *Erz’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.
wa hum fi mashājir), the honey, and the Burtāsī furs suit the Mordva quite well. The travellers like Rubruquis and Herberstein quite particularly insist on these details. The freedom enjoyed by the Burtās 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.n.nd.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.n.nd.r), § 46 (Mirvāt). The subject is of considerable difficulty and the following points must be examined:

The seats of the V.n.nd.r/N.nd.r.
Harkavi's and Marquart's views
The Onoghundur.
The source of the H.-‘Ā. and Gardīzī.
W.l.nd.r in Mas'ūdi.
W.n.nt.r in the Khazar king's letter.

The seats of the V.N.N.D.R. Our peoples V.n.nd.r (§ 53) and Mirvāt (§ 46) have direct parallels only in Gardīzī's N.nd.r and M.rdāt. In both the H.-‘Ā. and Gardīzī the V.n.nd.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.n.nd.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.rdāt. The reading of the Oxford MS. according to which the mountain stood above the N.nd.r. would suggest

1 The kh.l.nj (kh.l.ng) trees abounding in the Burtās 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 Burtās 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.n.d.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., § 22). Consequently the N.n.d.r lived west of the last mentioned river, or south of the Danube, with the Transylvanian Carpathians standing "above" them. Gardīzī adds that the N.n.d.r lived in the direction (bar jahn "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.n.n.d.r-Mirvāt is concerned. In § 46, north [east?] of the Mirvāt are named "some of the Inner Bulghār and [!] the V.n.n.d.r mountains". As the Inner Bulghār belong definitely to the Iṣṭ. <Balkhī tradition which does not know the V.n.n.d.r, 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.n.n.d.r by that of the Bulgarian Ovnvoouyovdoypou but it was a long time before the parallel names in H.-'Ā. and Gardīzī became known. When Marquart first studied Gardīzī's passage, Streifzüge, 172, he was led astray by the fact that Bakrī 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 Gardīzī. He overlooked the fact that Bakrī (see notes to § 50, 4.) speaks of their south-eastern neighbours, while Gardīzī has in view the later Atelkuzu territory and its south-western neighbours. The identification of Gardīzī's with Bakrī's and Marquart has often been taken for granted, but after the publication of the H.-'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.n.n.d.r 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 Lander (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 Hordennamen Ovnvoouyovdoypou (Nikephoros); Ulughundur (Ibn al-Kalbī, † um 820, bei Jāqūt); Otxontor (Anania

1 In his translation of § 52 (in annex to Markov's work) Toumansky illustrates V.n.n.d.r by *jij, found in Ibn al-Athīr, i, 243 (<Mas'ūdī, Murūj, ii, 58–64). On other similar hints cf. now Kokovtsov, o.c., 92.

Sirakac'i, VII. Jahrh.) > W(u)l(u)ndur Bulkar (Ps. Moses Chorenac'i, letztes Drittel des IX. Jahrh.), Wunundur (Hudūd al-Ālam, Ende des X. Jahrh.), bereits mit prothetischem ו vor labialem Vokal, wie im Čuwarschien; Wulundur (al-Mas'ūdī, 943–4 n. Chr.) = magy. Nándor Fejérvar = Belgrad.

The exact references of this cryptic passage are: Nicephori Archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani Opuscula, ed. de Boor, Lipsiae 1880, p. 24; Yāqūt, iii, 404: Japhet's sons: Yūnān, al-Ṣaqlab, "(sic)," Ṣarūm; Géographie de Moïse de Corène [attributed sometimes to A. Shira-kats'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 H.-'Ā. evidently hails from Westberg's Beiträge. Mas'ūdī mentions Wulundur, 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.nd.r the reading *Vunundur. [Gardīzl's N.nd.r can hardly be compared directly with the Magyar form Nándor; most probably the initial ס taken for the conjunction סה was dropped by the scribe in the same way as we find in our text Khān instead of Vakhān, cf. also Mas'ūdī's, wndr, with initial ס.]

THE ONOĞHUNDUR. 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 Kobar (Kobrāertos) 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 Kobar's son) remained in their former seats as Khazar subjects, whereas another of Kobar'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 'Ονογουνδουροι." The centre of Asparukh's kingdom was in the strong locality "Ογλωv surrounded on one side by marshes and on the other by very high rocks. Jireček, Geschichte d. Bulgaren, 1876, p. 129, read the name "Ογλωv <Slavonic oglů "angle, corner" and identified it with the southern part of Bessarabia known under the Turkish name Bujaq which also means "corner." [However the situation of "Ογλωv 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 Magyars

---

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-.
began their westward trek which finally brought them into the present-day Hungary, cf. Moravcsik, *o.c.*, 89.

**The Source of the *H.-ʿĀ.* 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.-ʿĀ.* and Gardīzī the V.n.nd.r/N.nd.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.-ʿĀ.* and Gardīzī belong to the same source (Ḥārūn b. Yahyā?). 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.-ʿĀ.* nor Gardīzī mentions any enmity between the V.n.nd.r and Magyars. The qualification of the V.n.nd.r in our source as cowards (*badh-dīl*) may be due to a wrong interpretation of the word *tarsā* (which means both “Christian” and “coward”).³ In Gardīzī⁴ the N.nd.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 (*ʿOyōvōpov*) is mentioned under the metropolitan of Crimean Gothia (*ἐπαρχία Πορθίας*), 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.⁵ The rest of our author’s characteristics may be only a development of his initial mistake about *tarsā.⁶*

See Munkácsi and Németh quoted by Moravcsik, *o.c.*, 81, note 3.

¹ The Khazar king’s letter (*v.i.*) 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.nd.r < Onoghundur refers to some special Bulghar territory, such as the original *ʿOyōlov* 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 (*kāriz*) in the M.ṛdāt country, mentioned in Gardīzī, could hardly strike any one except an Iranian. Cf. also the strange transcription of the name *bkār* (§ 51) بكار and *bāḍās* (§ 52). These facts still await an explanation. Masʿūdī, *Murūj*, ii, 59, says that dissensions among the *W.l.nd.ri* 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 *Vmundur* one might consider as the Magyars’ neighbours the Rumanian Vlachs, see Kunik in *Izvestiya al-Bakrt*, 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 (= *Burjān* = Inner Bulghār = 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’ÜDĪ’S “W.L.ND.R”. An entirely independent use of the term⁠¹ is found in Mas’ūdī’s well-known report on the incursion into the Byzantine Empire of the nomads called W.l.Nd.rī in (or after) 320/932.² In the Murūj (written in 332/943), i, 262, ii, 58–64, Mas’ūdī calls the invaders “Turkish peoples” and enumerates their four tribes, namely, B.jnī,³ Bajghurt (= evidently Magyar), Pecheneg (the most valiant of the four), and Nūkarda (still obscure). In the Tanbih, 180, 182, Mas’ūdī 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’ūdī’s version. As regards the date, the invasion seems to correspond best to that of the Toörkou (i.e. in Byzantine terminology: Magyars) recorded under 934! However, Mas’ūdī presents the four tribes as living in the neighbourhood of the Khazars and Alāns,⁴ which after the events of 889 (v.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’ūdī says that the tribes were called after the town of the رلندر, situated in the extreme frontier region of the Rūm 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 Δεσελγός 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.⁵ Jireček, o.c., 499, already suspected in W.l.Nd.r a Bulgarian (non-Slavonic) name corresponding to some different official term (Debeltos?). Mas’ūdī 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’ūdī results from the dissimilation n.n > l.n. Cf. the Armenian form Vləndur.

² See Marquart, Streifzüge, 60–74, 499–500, 527.

³ Contrary to Marquart, o.c., 67, بجنی mentioned alongside with Pecheneg can hardly be identical with the latter. Perhaps it is only a metathesis of بجنی Čäpni, as one of the Oghuz clans is called in Kâshghari, i, 57; on their later history see M. F. Köprülü-zade, Oğuz etnolojisine dayır, pp. 24–7 (v.s., § 18). However, cf. infra the Khazar king’s letter. [Rashid al-dīn, ed. Bérézine, vii, 7, among the Oghuz tribes issued from Kök-khan mentions separately بجنی and بجنی.]

⁴ Marquart, o.c., 74: “verblasste Erinnerungen”.

⁵ See now V. Zlatarski, Istoriya na Bŭlgarskata dŭrţava, 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 Kobotr, *Streifsziige, 529, or because it was directed against the Vulundur (in Arabic one might say: 'alā thaqhr al-Wulundur), and consequently Mas‘ūdi’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‘ūdi is a firmly established fact interesting as a parallel to our *Vunundur.

**The Khazar King’s Letter.** Among the parallels to the name V.nnd.r it remains for us to consider V.nnt.r דנָץ found in the Hebrew letter supposed to have been sent by the Khazar king Joseph in answer to that of Chasdai ben Shafrit, an agent to the Cordovan caliph 'Abd al-Rahmān (A.D. 912–61). The year 961 is the *terminus ante quem* of Chasdai’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. 193); 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.nnt.r 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 formerly the V.nnt.r. Our Khazar ancestors warred against them. The V.nnt.r 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 Runā (A. רענָ) or Dūnā (B. דנָ), and “until the present day they are situated on the river Runā/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., "Ογλον = Bujak.
2 In his final “Zusatz”, o.c., 528, Marquart writes: "was es mit der Ersturmung der Festung Walandar 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 Walandarhorden eigentlich die Bulgaren (B.rgh.r) und ihre damaligen Verbündeten, die Pečenegen, sind...." [Cf. C. A. Macartney in Byz.-Neogr. Jahrb., 1930, pp. 159–70.]
3 See Prof. P. K. Kokovtsov, Yevreysko-khazarskaya perepiska 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 (חזרא most probably חזרה *Bacna referring to Bajnī or Bajnā whom Masʿūdī associates with the Pechenegs, v.s., p. 469, n. 3). The (inhabitants) of this country lived near the river V. zg (A. spells Y zg, very probably *Uzu = Dniepr) and wandered in the steppe down to the limits of the H. grīm (A. Hyndyʿim), 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. nnt. 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. nnt. r has a striking resemblance to our V. nnd. 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. nnt. r as well. The interpolator could not possibly know the H.-ʿĀ. 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/Dūbā as Danube and, on the other hand, suggest the identity of our V. nnd. 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 Zābāj (§ 56) which is a connecting link with the southern islands (§ 4, 8.). The principal sources of the African chapters are Khuwārizmī (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 tsov, o.c. 98-9.
2 See, however, supra, p. 217.
The term Zangistān (later Zangibār > Zanzibar, “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 Ouaqu-ouaq, 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 Zābaj. 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. *M.ljān*, which stands before Sofāla must correspond to *M.lndī*, mentioned in Idrīsī, i, 56, and Ibn Sa’īd (A.D. 1250) in Ferrand, *Relations*. Malindī 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’ūdi, *Murūj*, iii, 6, calls this king ملندي, read cf. in Bantu mfaleme “king”, plur. wafaleme, Ferrand, *Jour. As.*, January 1921, p. 163.] This *M.ljān* (*M.lndī*) must be distinguished from the name similarly spelt under § 56, 2.

2. Sofāla (Sofāla) lies in the southern part of the Portuguese Mozambique (south of Beira). The place is mentioned in Mas’ūdi, *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. *Hwfl (?). At this place one would expect وافاق Wāqwāq and such a restoration is admissible in Arabic script. Cf. Mas’ūdi, i, 233: bilād Sofāla wal Wāqwāq (الواقواق) min aqāsī ard al-Zanj wal-asāfil 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 *Hwfl* is هووا (Howa), applied to the southern part of Madagascar (jazirat 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 *Howa* could, however, hardly be known in the tenth century.

§ 56. Zābaj.

G. Ferrand, *L’Empire sumatranais de Črīvijaya*, in *Jour. As.*, 1922, t. xx, pp. 1–104, 164–246 (an extremely complete survey of sources), and Zābaj in EI.

That our author pronounced Zābaj (not Zābij) is clear from his other transcription of this name زابا Zāba (§ 4, 6.) on a false analogy with the Persian
forms: Khūnaj > Khūna, &c. Zābaj (Java“Javanese”) is a term designating now Java, now the centre and south of Sumatra, now the whole of the Sunda archipelago, see Tomaschek, Mohīt, map I, 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 the which he interprets (transl., p. 16) as Pati-Jaba, “prince of Java” (?). Ferrand, Relations, p. 24, and L’Empire, p. 52, explains the name as Indonesian puṅgawa “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-maharāj.

The town 1. M.nj.ri (?) is unknown. One wonders whether it is not simply a mis-spelling of maharāj > maharāy *marai. The complex shahr-i Maharāy “the town of the M.” could easily be transformed into “M., the town [of Zābaj]”.

2. very probably corresponds to the island of M.ljān (?) 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 Waqwāq = 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. Iṣṭ., 35. Our § 7, 13. represents Ḥabasha 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 Ras is that it was the king’s residence. According to I.R., 66, 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 (*)ахум*) appears only in later Muslim sources (Maqrīzī). Marquart, *Benin*, pp. ccciii–iv, has finally disposed of the mistake in the Ma’mūnian map and Khwārizmī’s *Ṣūrat al-ard* caused by Ptolemy’s broad use of the term *Aἰθίοπες* 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 μητρόπολις* (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 *Γαραμαννας*, is shown to the south-west of *Phazana = Fazzān* (near Murzūq, in the present-day Italian Libya, cf. § 60, 2.) 1. Idrisi, i, 112, mentions جِمَة 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 Tasāwa.

2. The first idea is that by some mistake represents *Assuan* (v.s., § 39, 10.) which in Khwārizmī, No. 80, is spelt سوان and stands 4 lines below جريه but I now prefer to restore the name as عذاب which, as *Iṣṭ.*, 54, admits, was reckoned to Abyssinia in spite of the fact that its inhabitants were Buja. ‘Aydḥāb is identified with Aidip lying on the sea-coast opposite Jidda at N. lat. 22° 19’ 47", cf. C. H. Becker, *‘Aidḥāb in EI.* 2 Reen (different from its homonym § 60, 2.) most probably is دُلْعَ زْيْلَα’, which in *Iṣṭ.*, 36, follows on ‘Aydḥāb. It is the well-known port of British Somaliland, immediately east of the Bay of Tajura. During the late Abyssinian crisis (1935) Zaylā’ was mentioned as an eventual point of access to the sea for Abyssinia. [November 1936: *tempora mutantur*!]

§ 58. Buja.


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, *Iṣṭ.*, 28, 34. The Buja had no towns, ‘Aydḥāb on the

1 Jointly with *Jarmī al-Ḥabash* (long. 41° 40’, lat. 10° 40’) Khwārizmī mentions another *Jarmī madīnat al-kabīra* (long. 34°, lat. 19° 30’). Marquart thought that “Gross Garma und Garma der Ḫabaš sind . . . in Wirklichkeit identisch”, but Mžik, *Afrika*, No. 75, with more probability restores the second name as جِرَة مدينة الكِبْرَة and explains it as Γεϊρα μητρόπολις (cf. Ptolemy’s Γεϊρων Ἀἰθιόπες).

§§ 58–9

coast of the Red Sea being considered as Abyssinia's, Ist., 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.


Ist., 11, says that Nubia is conterminous with Egypt,1 with the desert lying between Egypt and the Sûdân, 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'qûbî, 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 Sûba (to the east of the present-day Khartûm). Mas'ûdî, Murûj, iii, 32, confirms these facts adding that in 332/943 he heard in Fustât that the king living in Dunqula and ruling over Māqurra and 'Alwa was Kbry b. S.rwr,2 a descendant of a long line of kings. On Dongola cf. also I.R., 96, and I. Faqîh, 78.

I.Kh., 17, gives the king of Nubia the title of Kâbîl, which detail is reproduced in our text. كابل and كری do not seem to refer to the same dynasty. From our § 6, 63, it results that Kâbîl's capital lay near the junction of the Nile with the Blue Nile (al-bahr al-azraq) for near Dongola no river joins the Nile from the east. This would indicate that Kâbîl ruled (chiefly?) over 'Alwa though such an interpretation conflicts with Yāqût, iv, 820,3 where Kâbîl is called king of Muqurayr and Nûba, whereas 'Alwâ is mentioned separately. Idrîsî, i, 33, mis-spelt the name of the king into Kâmil.

The mines situated amidst the sands are mentioned in § 7, 12. See in detail, Ya'qûbî, 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 Ṭ.rî (Ṭ.ḥî?) 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 Ṭārî, nor Ṭahî reminds me of anything) they would seem to belong to the unknown region which is fairly extensive.

1 I. Faqîh, 78, says that Nubia began at 5 days' distance to the south of Assuan. Cf. § 39, 10., and I.Kh., 83.

2 Ya'qûbî, BGA, vii, 339, calls the king of Muqurra (sic) Zakariyâ b. Q.rqî = Zacharia son of Kyriakos, cf. Quatremère, o.c., 65.

3 Marquart takes I. Faqîh for the authority of this passage in Yâqût, but if this is true for the first part of it, iv, 820, lines 3–15, the second part, p. 820–1 is introduced with a vague qâlu and has no parallel in I. Faqîh's printed text.

4 [See now Appendix B.]
in Nubian geography." Outwardly \( (^U) \) resembles Ub and \( ^J \). Of these Tahā 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 Turā and Shahrān (lying in the neighbourhood of Turā) possessed each a monastery. See Abū Šāliḥ (circa A.D. 1202), *The Churches and Monasteries of Egypt*, ed. B. T. A. Evetts and A. J. Butler in *Anecdota Oxfoniensia*, 1896, fol. 47a, 74, and 77. However, Tahā, I.Kh. 81, lay in Egypt, north of Munya between Ushmunayn and Qays, cf. Mžik, *Afrika*, 12 (No. 148), and Turā was situated still more north near Hulwān. Another, equally doubtful, hypothesis would be the restoration of \( ^Jj^Jf \) as originally the lake Tsana in Abyssinia, and later the lake Chad was called, cf. Maqrīzī, *Khitat*, 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 Vogue*, 1909, p. 143 (bāhra kuerā [ṣic] associated with the people Quārā, Khuārā) and Marquart, *Benin*, lxxxiv, and additional note in Index, p. 104. [See additional note in Appendix B.]

§ 60. The Südān.

W. D. Cooley, *The Negroland of the Arabs* (after Ibn Khaldūn, Ibn Batṭūta, &c., whom the author used in Don P. Gayangos’s translations), London 1841; Marquart, *Benin*, Leiden 1913 (a capital work as regards the earlier Arabic sources on the Südān); H. v. Mžik, *Afrika* (cf. § 57); Delafosse, *Südān* 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 Südān 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 *Rā’ī b. Rā’ī* in our mutilated passage. In view of this important point of likeness [v.s., § 59: Kābī] 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 Grosse”, but makes several interesting suggestions: the most obvious conclusion is that he was the king of the mighty kingdom of Ghāna (western Südān); 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, *Songhoi* in *EI*, among whom such names are found as Zā-Zakoy, Zā-Akoy, Zā-Kū, see al-Sa’di, *Tā’rikh al-sūdān*, ed. Houdas, pp. 2–3; finally Marquart quotes several Berber names (ṣāṣ, &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 Sūdān 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-Bahriya (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>Ghāna</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 كرك Gogo on the Niger to the south-east of Timbuktu, cf. Yāqūt, iv, 329.

3. مقياس مقياس (maqs < maks "toll-house"), an Egyptian frontier post towards Nubia, lying at 6 days above Wādī Ḥalfa, see Maqrizī, *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 لا resembles غانه 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 زاغو, 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 Dārfur. At present one of the five tribes of Dārfur still bears the name of Zaghāwa, see C. H. Becker, *Zur Geschichte des östlichen Sūdān*, in *Der Islam*, i, 1910, pp. 162-77, cf. Yāqūt, ii, 932, iv, 230 (who quotes Hasan b. Aḥmad al-Muhallabi's work *al-'Azīzī*, 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 Adūlis (!), 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.Ḥ., 66, places Zaghāwa at 2 months' distance from Fazzān (*v.s.* 1.). Idrīsī, transl. i, 112, reckons Fazzān to Zaghāwa.
As mentioned in the Preface, p. v, the marginal notes in the unique copy of the H.-'A. do not shed any light on the history of its composition.

The uppermost part of fol. ia 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 Ḥājji 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

نو همی رنگ در باغان دختری خشمت این کی کویست کی خری

The first of the two verses (rhyme in -āz) to the left of the title is

کفتم کی کننم خرچ رهت عمر درار نا بولک سوم با نو محرم راز

The poem below the title (9 verses of which the rhyme +radif is -āz rasadh) begins

روزها راپیکان زدست مده نیست امکان ان کی پای رسد

I am obliged to my friend 'Abbās Eghbāl Āshtiyānī 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 Jāmi, otherwise unknown.

Still lower down there are entries in a different hand (B). The first, on the authority of the Qor'ānic Tafsīr by Muhammad '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 divine called Āl, and of that called Umm al-şibyān. The second (hand B?) is a rubā'ì composed by Ḥaḍrat-i Amir Sayyid Ahmad Lāla'i, one of the khulafā' of the late Amir '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’il 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 (?) 'Ubaydullah-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.
[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 our entry in his *Ruins of Old Merv*, p. 74. Moreover, Zhukovsky reads our *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, *l.c.*, 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 Gulpäyagānī, the discoverer of the manuscript, in his fine writing recorded some data on the construction of the walls around Bukhārā [evidently borrowed from Narshakhī, 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.
APPENDIX B
ADDITIONAL NOTES

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 Toghuzghuz, more complete than Yāqūt’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:

\[ \text{\ldots which hints at the heyday of the Uyghur political life. Therefore my explanations (pp. 268–9) must be accordingly altered.} \]

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 *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 *Tahdīd al-amākin*:

The passage shows how long the “Alān and (!) 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 *Qizil-Alan*, cf. my article *Tūrān* in *EI*.
Here are some other additional remarks:

4. *Ad* p. 67, l. 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 Gardīzī, p. 298, l. 23.

6. *Ad* p. 227, l. 35. Our author’s statement concerning 360 districts of China (v.s., p. 84, l. 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 Barskhān is found in the Mashhad MS. of Ibn al-Faqīh, fol. 170a (cf. Yāqūt, iv, 823).

8. *Ad* p. 297, l. 15. In the Manichaean Ṭaḥrānāmag edited by F. W. K. Müller, *Ein Doppelblatt, SBA*, 1913, l. 77, a certain Ṭrvaν-č žabghū is mentioned among the local rulers. The town (or district) *Parvān* of which this žabghū was the lord may be identical with Bārmān/Po-huan.

9. *Ad* p. 332, l. 23. In the Mashhad text of I. Faqīh f. 163a it is said of the Balkh river: *(sic)* (sic) (sic) (sic) (sic) of which this žabghū was the lord may be identical with Bārmān/Po-huan.

10. *Ad* p. 365, note 3. A. Z. Validi has found in a Constantinople MS. of the *Canon*: wa jalā’uhu bi-Badhakhshān, “and the polishing (of the rubies) is done in Badhakhshān”, with reference to the preceding item.


---

1 [The source of Ibn al-Wardī (689–749/1290–1348) is undoubtedly Idrīsī who (tr. Jaubert, i, 27) speaking of the sources of the Nile (cf. our § 6, 62.) mentions the great lake formed by the six rivers and “près duquel est située une ville nommée طرفية populeuse et dont les environs sont fertiles en riz” (follows the story of the statue). This *Ṭrî* (I. al-Wardī: Ṭ.rmy) must be another avatar of our Ṭrī.]
INDEX

The present index contains all the names found in the text of the H.-ʻĀ. 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 H.-ʻĀ. 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; is.—island; l.—lake; mt.—mountain; p.—pass; r.—river; t.—tribe.

Abādān 386
Abādha 129
Ābān Kasavān 114, 209, 353
Abarliq (?) 117
Ābaskūn 28, 38, 77, 134, 386
ʻAbbadān 76, 139, 392
Abbotābād 370
ʻAbdsi 138
ʻAbdīn 381
Abhar (Auhar) 132, 383
Āb-i Gargar 214
Āb-i Maymana 5
Āb-i Qaysār 329
Āb-i Safid 199, 329
Abkhāz (= Aughaz, Lūgh.r.) 43, 168, 324, 445, 450
Abkhāz (= Lāyzān?) 403–4, 406–10
Abl (?) 123
Abraj 129
Ab.rdkath (?) 117
Abriq (Aphrike) 218, cf. Ibrīq.
Absus see Arabissos
Abū Ghānim's Highlands see Kūhīstān-i Abū Ghānim
Abwayt 204
Abyssinia (Habasha) 33–4, 51–2, 79, 81, 83, 147, 163–4, 179, 223, 473
Abyssinian Sea 145
A-ch'ai see Ajāyul
ʻAden 19, 147
Adhana (Adana) 149
Ādharakhsh, fire temple 383

Ādharbāyjān (Ādharbādhagān) 19, 29, 36, 37, 39, 53, 65, 66, 77, 83, 131, 133, 136, 137, 142, 393
Ahdhiksh t. 347
Ahd.r (*Aṭhīr), cf. Kaurīstān 255
Adhrūh 150
Adīnāpūr see Dunpūr
Adīștān (Srīnagār) 254
Adrama (Adhrāma) 140
Adraskand 327
Adūlis 477
Afghāns (cf. Ayghān) 30, 91
Afghānistān 4, 30, 288
Afslakhūniya see Paphlagonia
Afrakhūn 68, 204
Afrāva 325
Africa 33, 53, 78, 153, 154
Afhrīdān 115
Afnūkāt 119
Aghbāb, Bahr al-Aghbāb, Bilād al-Aghbāb 87, 180, 242–3
Aghrīstān 377
Āhangarān (Angren) r. 24, 211, 356
Āhangarān, in Ghūr 333, 343
Ahar 39, 143, 395
Aḥqāf sands 77, 81, 222
Aḥwāz 12, 74, 75, 130, 381
Aja' mt. 203
Ajlād, Kīmāk t. 305
Al-Ajma, near Sarakhs 327
Ajugh 200
Index A

Akhā-yul see Ajāyul
Akhlāt (Khilāt) 173
Akhmim 78, 152
Akharūn 337, 353
AKshū r. 208
AKshikath 72, 116
A-kie-t'ien see Aq-tagh
'Akka 59, 149
Alagez (Aragats) mt. 203
Alāl-wa-Ghumīq 450
Alān Gāte 68, 161, 401, 446
Alankaburda see Lombards
Ala-Tau 195
Alay Range 198
Alazan r. 410
Albān see Labān
Aleppo 150
Alexandria 78, 151, 416
Alexandrovsky range 194, 195, 289
Algeciras (al-Jazīra) 155
Alhum ('Ayn al-Humm) 135, 386
Alī (?), 110
A-li-shih, Tūrgish t. 302
Alishār 383
Alishūr 255
Alkā-bulaq 280
Alkhājās (Alkh.njās?) 117
Alkrz (?), cf. Sakalkand 338
Almāta (Verniy) 208, 300
Al.n.k.bālus see Lankabālus
Al.shān 255
Alqabolūk t. 280
Altau mt. 196, 202, 283, 286, 287
Altin-Tagh 194
'Alwa ('Alwa al-Bahriyya) 221, 475, 477
Amazonas 8, 191
Āmid (Diyārbakr) 76, 201
Āmūlūf 200
Āmoll 64, 77, 133, 134, 386
Amorion see 'Amūriya
Amū-daryā see Oxus
'Amūriya 220
Ānā 76, 141
Anār, in Kirmān 125; in Fārs 129
Anatolicon (Naṭliq) 156
Anbār (Anbēr), in Gūzgān 5, 39, 64, 107, 335; in Jazīra 76, 141
Andalus see Spain
Andaminn (Andamīn?) 332
Andarāb 39, 64, 109, 341
Andar az Khīfjāq 100, 309, 316
Andar-haz see Hīrānd r.
And.ghar t. 373
Andrās (Andhra?), in India 87, 241
Andrās, in Kashmir 121, 364, 370
Andishārāg (Andishhārāgh) 208, 359-60
Andkhudh (Antkhudh-Andkhyō) 6, 107, 177, 336
Anfarun (?), 358
Anf.s 84

Angara r. 284
Angren r. see Āhangarān
Anhilvāra (Nahrvāra) 238
An-Hsī 227
al-Ankubarda see Lombards
Anmū (Khundān) 224
Annari (Nari) 89, 246
Anqara 220
Anqartūs 149
Antkhudh see Andkhudh
Apar t., cf. Apurim 284
Aphrikē see Abriq
Apsaherun 193
Apurim t., cf. Apar 284
'Āqaba, cf. Ayāla 180
Aq-Bura 211
Aq.rāq.r (?), 98, 293, 297
Aq-su r. (Taushqan) 27, 184, 206, 289, 296
Aq.tagh (A-kie-t'ien) 226
'Arab Sea see Red Sea
Arabia 36, 145
Arabian Gulf 52, 81, 179
Arabisoss 204
Arachosis 346
Aral sea (Khwarazm sea, Arvāniyān sea) 32, 180, 312, 313
'Arandal 415
Ararat, Great (Hārith), 66, 203
Ararat, Lesser (Huwayrith), 66, 77, 218
Aras (Araxes) r. 77, 144
Araskan (cf. Adraskan) 104
Aravalli mt. 198
Araxes see Aras
Ardabil (Ardavīl) 66, 142, 304, 468
Ardalānkath 117, 357
Ardashir-Khurra 376, 377
Ardon r. 457
Aresh 400
Arγyrē is. 186
Ārhan ford 208, 359, 360
Arin see Uijayn
Arjīj (Archesh) 143
Arjīnān 129
Ark, Arl (Būgür?) 94, 207, 293
Arm r. 401
Armābil 123
al-Arm.n (al-Kām.n) c. in India 237
Arman (Zarmān) 113, 237
Armenia 19, 29, 36-7, 67, 77, 142-4, 393, 396

484
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Arsaṅg (K.rsāng), cf. Ěsāṅ 25, 262
Arthāniya (Abārma?) 434, 436-8
Artūj (Bartūj) 96, 281
Artush see Irtish
Arvāniyān (?), cf. Aral sea 180
Arwādāh, Arwād is. 8, 58, 190
Arzan (Arzhan) 55, 185
Ās t. 445, 456, 458, 481
Asābād (Asadābād) 132
Asad t. 146
Asak (Āsak, Āsk) 130, 380-1
Asbūzār see Aspūzār
Asgil (Ashkil, &c.) 162, 320, 461
Ashbūrzān see Ushbūrzān
Ashkavar 388
Ashkil see Asgil
Aṣhmūnayn 152
Ashpara 289
Ashtīgōr t., cf. Ěs 445
Asia, 33, 82; Central 24, 27
Asiāni t., cf. Ěs 444
A-si-yen 294
Askar see Sukar 221
al-'Askar in Sistān 345
'Askar-i Mukram 75, 130
Asf 123
Asna (Ushnū) 142
Aspūzār 63, 64, 104, 199
'Asqālān 81, 149
Assam see Qāmarūn
Assuān (Suwān, Uswān) 68, 78, 152
Astarāb (Astarā?): on the Caspian 137, 391; in Gūzgān see Bastarāb
Astarābdāh 29, 134, 386
Asus r., cf. Ishim 308
Atak 200
'Atbarā r. 221
At-Bashi 292
Atelkuzu 313, 320, 322, 441, 444, 468
Athens 21, 41, 158
'Atthār 147
Ātil town 75, 80, 161, 452; r. see Itil
Atlālīgh (Otlālīgh ?) 98
Atlantic 201
Aṭrābūlus 60, 149, 153
Atrak 29, 200, 218, 385
Aufa see Ėba
Aughaz see Abkhaz
Auhar in Ādharbaijān see Abhar; in Daghestān see Avār
Aulās (Eleusa) 149
Aurhakz', cf. Ėvār 447
Āva 133, 384
Āvāl 116, 355
Avār t. 42, 419, 429, 447, 450, 455
Avars, Pseudo- 448
Āvāza-yī Paykand, cf. Paykand 56, 73, 185, 211
Awās see Ephesus
Axum 474
Ayvaj (Auwaj), on the Oxus 360
'Aydhāb 474
Ayghān (Abghān, Afghān ?) 349
Ayla 52, 81, 149, 222, 414
'Ayn al-Humm see Alhum
'Ayn-Zarba 149
Ayyān-i Kūsār 138
Az (Azirān) t. cf. Lāzīna 99, 302
'Aẓa (Ha-ẓa), cf. Ajāyul 258
Āzād-hāvār 102
Azaila 154
Azam 381
Azār 296
Azbārā 128
Azd (Urd?) 74
Azūv 108
Azov sea (Maeotis) 32, 41, 42, 54, 59, 180, 181, 182, 216, 320, 422, 429
'Azr (Gh.zr?), in India (?) 86, 235
Bā'lbaldc 67, 150
Bāb, in Farghāna see Pāb
Bāb-Akhsīkāth 355
Bāb al-Mandeb 472
| Bāb al-Abwāb see Darband
Babarhān 370
Bābil 139
Bābīn, cf. Nubin (?) 243
Bābol r. 218
Babr (Hlr?) 391
Bābīn, cf. Nubin (?) 243
1
Badakhšān (Bādakhshān) 63, 71, 112, 119, 325, 365, 366, 482; ford, 359
Badal-Art see Bedel
Bādhghis 104, 386
Bādkhāna 387
Baft 124
Baghaskān (?) 116
Baghdād 12, 15, 20-3, 37-8, 76, 129, 138-40
Baghlān 109, 340
Baghrās 67, 150
Baghshur, in China 26, 70, 84, 229, 230; near Marv 64, 104, 327
Baghūykath 117
Bahāmshir canal 214
Bahār (spelt . . . ghārl) 125
Bahārak 350, 395
Bahārān in Fārs 127
Bahr al-A'zam (Great Sea) 32, 51-2, 56, 72-4, 76-7, 79, 80-3, 85-6, 122-4, 126, 145, 163, 179, 220
Bahr al-Muḥīt see Western Ocean
Bahrāmābād 201
Bahrāyij 89, 246
Bahrayn 81, 127, 148, 164, 412, cf. Nizwayn
Bahrūgān 124, 374
Barbārī Gulf 52, 81, 164, 222
Barchūla t. 162, 461
Barchuq, cf. J.rm.q 281
Bardangān 129
Bardasīr 125
Barduj see Varduqiya
Barghar (Falghar), in Sughd 115, 354
Bārgin-i Farākh 183
Bargri 143
Bāriha (B.rīja, B.rīkha) near Khotan 70, 92-3, 206, 262
Bārijān (Bārizān) mt. 65, 125, 201
Bārimmā mt. 66, 202
Bārjān (?), in Kirmān 373
Barkul 1
Bārlugh 94, 272, 273
Bārmān, cf. Aqrāq.r. 295, 296, 482
Baroda 245
Baroghil p. 365, 369
Baros (Bālus) 57, 187, 228, 241
Barqua 81, 153
Bar-qa'id 140
Barquh (Abarquh) 129
Bārsāragh, cf. Bāsārān, K.brs.rāgh, 121, 359, 361
Barsarkān (?) 128
Barshliya, cf. Bashli 449
Barskaun valley 293
Barskhān (Barsghān), Upper 28, 54, 98, 116, 269, 273, 276, 287, 289, 291-3, 296, 298, 482; Lower 269
Bārtang 208, 360
Bartuj see Artuj
Barv (Burj ?) 131
Barzand 142, 403
Barzanj (?) 403
Bāsafuya (Bāsfahuya) 1
Bāsand 38, 114
Bāsfahrī see Bāsafuya
Bāsārān (Bās.rā) see Bārsāragh
Bashin (Abshīn) 64, 73, 106, 327
Bashli 449
Bāsiyān 74, 75, 130, 214, 381
Bāshard, Bashghurt, Bashqir, cf. Basjirt 312, 318-20, 322, 469
Bāsht 201
Basinnay see Basunnay
Bāsiyān 74, 75, 130, 214, 381
Bāshghird, Bashghurt, Bashqir, cf. Basjirt 312, 318-20, 322, 469
Bāsht 201
Basinnay see Basunnay
Baskunas, see Basques
Basmad 246
Basmil t. 264, 266, 272, 285
Basques 158, 424
Bašra 58, 76, 81, 137-9, 146; sea of Bašra 52; swamps 56, 76; desert 137
Bašra (Buṣayra), in Morocco 154, 417
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Index A</strong></th>
<th><strong>487</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bastarāb (Astarāb?)</td>
<td>31, 55, 185, 334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baṣunāy (Baṣinnay)</td>
<td>75, 131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batsrā, cf. Bajnī</td>
<td>471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baun (Bavan?)</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bāvard (Abīvard)</td>
<td>64, 80, 103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bāvul (Bābol)</td>
<td>r. 77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayān</td>
<td>139, 214, 381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayānīrd t.</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayās (Payas)</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baydā, in Fārs</td>
<td>23, 128; in Khazaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayhān (spelt: Mījān)</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baylaqān</td>
<td>144, 398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayrūt (Beirut)</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baysūn</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baytāl (Nepāl?)</td>
<td>91, 239, 248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bazda</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bāzhgāh</td>
<td>144, 398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bazmān-kūh, cf. Dunāvand</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bāzrānj</td>
<td>74, 212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.dhnimiya</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.dhūshāvr see Gundē-Shāpūr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedel</td>
<td>p. 195, 293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedouin steppe</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behbehān</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beja (Bāja), in Spain</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belbela r.</td>
<td>456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgrad, near Constantinople</td>
<td>41, 221, 423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belozero l.</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belt of the Earth mt.</td>
<td>65, 196, 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benares</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bengal, cf. Harikel</td>
<td>188, 241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bengal Gulf</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbers</td>
<td>40, 153, 154, 221, 476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethlehem (Bayt al-Lahm)</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.gh-Shūrā, Baghsūz see Baghsūr in China</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.ghūrank (?)</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.hdūlā, B.rsūlā see Barchūla</td>
<td>461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIarmia (Perm)</td>
<td>436-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bīchagān see Bakhtagān</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bidhān</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bidlis</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bigiligh (Bigiligh)</td>
<td>99, 298, 303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bih</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bh-Shāpūr see Bishāpur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bijāgan (Bīchagān) see Bakhtagān</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilād al-Dawār see Zamin-D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilasuvār</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilwat fort</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bīmand, cf. Kūtmīdhan</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binā</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binālūd mt.</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bind</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binkath</td>
<td>118, 357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bīrdhaun</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bīrūn (Nīrūn)</td>
<td>122, 372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bīrūza, cf. Ba’ūra</td>
<td>72, 91, 210, 239, 253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bīrzula, cf. Barchūla (?)</td>
<td>461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bīshāpur (Bishāvūr)</td>
<td>376, 379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bīshārīn t.</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bīsh-balīq (B.-baligh), cf. Panjikath</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishgird see Veshgird</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishlang (Bashling?)</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bīskant</td>
<td>356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bīstān</td>
<td>36, 135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bīstān t.</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bīstarāb see Bastarāb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bīsūk</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biya-Pas</td>
<td>388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biya-Pish</td>
<td>388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.jūna</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.ksān</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.lāq t.</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.lhāri</td>
<td>72, 88, 246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.lkār see Bulghār</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.lkh.mkān (?)</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.lh.m(? + pattan)</td>
<td>188, 243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.l.vv.t see Balavvat</td>
<td>72, 253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.nābid</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bnchūl (*Bnchuk?) see Wen-su</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.niya (?) in Tibet</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.χrūza, cf. Ba’ura</td>
<td>72, 210, 239, 253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolān p.</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolōr</td>
<td>39, 63, 71, 93, 121, 208, 258, 364, 367, 369; Bolōriān Tibet see Tibet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bōn see Baun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bončos (Pontos) see Black Sea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boro-Dbasun</td>
<td>l. 184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosphiros</td>
<td>21, 141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brahmanabād</td>
<td>372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brahmaputra r.</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.rhāra</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.rkhmān in Tibet</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Br.niya (?) in Tibet</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.rwān (perhaps *jVj) see Wen-su</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.rdq.lus</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.nvāda</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolan</td>
<td>p. 346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benares</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bengal, cf. Harikel</td>
<td>188, 241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bengal Gulf</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbers</td>
<td>40, 153, 154, 221, 476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethlehem (Bayt al-Lahm)</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bgh-Shūrā, Baghsūz see Baghsūr in China</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.hūrank (?)</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.dhūlā, B.rsūlā see Barchūla</td>
<td>461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIarmia (Perm)</td>
<td>436-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bīchagān see Bakhtagān</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bidhān</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bidlis</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bīgilīgh (Bīgilīgh)</td>
<td>99, 298, 303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bih</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bīh-Shāpūr see Bishāpur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bijāgan (Bīchagān) see Bakhtagān</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilād al-Dawār see Zamin-D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilasuvār</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilwat fort</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bīmand, cf. Kūtmīdhan</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binā</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binālūd mt.</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bind</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binkath</td>
<td>118, 357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bīrdhaun</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bīrūn (Nīrūn)</td>
<td>122, 372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bīrūza, cf. Ba’ūra</td>
<td>72, 91, 210, 239, 253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bīrzula, cf. Barchūla (?)</td>
<td>461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bīshāpur (Bishāvūr)</td>
<td>376, 379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bīshārīn t.</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bīsh-balīq (B.-baligh), cf. Panjikath</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Bula see Ubulla; Bula canal 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Bulainā 512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Bulaiq 274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Bulghār, Black 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Bulghār, Great (a’ṣam) 434, 438, 439; Magna Bulgaria, 319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Bulghārs, Outer (al-khārīja) 439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Bulghār, town 163, 221, 312, 461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Bulghari (cf. Bulghars on the Danube) 157, 423, 440; mt. 69, 79, r. 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Bulgaria 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Bulghārs on the Danube, cf. Burjān, Bulghari, V.n.n.d.r. 11, 40, 41, 157, 181, 423, 440, 460, 468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Bulghārs (Bulḵār) on the Volga (Muslim Bulghārs) 43–4, 75, 81, 159, 162, 181, 217, 319, 437, 439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Bulkār, cf. Bulghar on the Volga 320, 436, 460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Bulrī 72, 89, 246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Būmākath (?) 112, 352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Bunābidh 326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Būnjīkath 115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Bānbūghnī t. 84, 229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Buqallār see Buccellarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Burghar (Bulghar) 419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Burj 213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Burjān (Burchān, Danube Bulghars) 40, 41, 53, 79, 156–7, 423, 429, 440, 468; Burgund (?) 419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Burj-i sangin (Lithinos pyrgos?) 26, 85, 233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Bārkhīmu 86, 234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Burma (al-Arm.n, Rahmaniya) 237, 242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Burūtās t. (Mordva) 25, 43, 44, 75, 83, 101, 162, 217, 314, 315, 437, 439, 440, 462, 464, 465; r. 462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Burūgird 132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Burūzn-mahr, fire-temple 325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Buṣaïra see Bagr, in Morocco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Būṣanana (Būsāna?) 133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Bāshang 22, 64, 104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Busht 117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Bāṣir 68, 152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Bust 5, 39, 64, 73, 106, 110–1, 344–5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Bustugan 128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Buṭṭamān (Buttam, Butmān) mt. 22, 55, 63, 71–3, 115–16, 120, 198, 211, 354, 363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Buzdighur 103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Būžhagan (Pūchagan) 103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Bystān (?) t. 289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Byzantines (Rūmīyān), cf. Greeks 53, 143, 149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Byzantium (see also Rūm) 8, 32, 38, 40, 41, 42, 148, 218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>B.zr.k., cf. F.rz.k 127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Cadiz (Ghadira) 58, 190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Cairo 37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hamvārān 114, 209, 353
Han-hai mt. 284
Haramayn (Pyramids) 152
Haranj (H.r.nj?) is. 57
Harāt see Herat
Hārda see Mārida
Harhaz (Harāzpey) r. 77, 218
Hari (*Hare) see Herat
Harikel see Bengal
Harrūd (Herat r.) 5, 73
Hārīth see Ararat, Great
Harkand, on east coast of India 87, 241
Hārān, in Jazīra 12, 141
Hārūnī 149
Hasan-Kiyā-Dih 390
Hashādhar 391
Ḥāshimi t. 149
Ḥāshumkirt (Ḥāshim-gird) 114
Hauf [al-sharqī] 68
Hausam 136, 388
Haush 108
Haybak 338
Haydarābād 372
Haytal or Ḥayṭāl (Hephthalites) 277, 288, 301, 327, 340, 347, 359, 362
Ḥazār 128, 379
H dd.njira(?) 87, 241
Hephthalites see Haytal
Her-āb (Herow), in Ādharbaijān, cf. Babr 391
Herāt (Harāt, Ḥare) 16, 22, 26, 64, 73, 103-5, 109, 125, 327
Ḥijāz 146, 164
Hilmand (Ḥidhmān) r. 5, 36, 39, 73, 110, 344
Himalaya 196, 198, 236, 240
Hims 67, 150
Himyar (Ḥimyari) 146, 412
Hind (Panjāb and India south of the Indus) 34, 80, 89
Hindū, Hindū see Indians
Hindiyān r., cf. Shīrin 212-3, 378
Hindūkush 39, 199, 340, 367
Hindūstān 7, 34, 39, 52, 56, 61-3, 65, 83-4, 86-92, 102, 108-11, 119, 123, 235-54; Gate of H., 110, 112,
Hira 140
Hirand (Gurgān) r. 29, 77, 133, 218, 325, 385
Hisār 108
Hisān-Mahdī 74, 214, 381
Hit 76, 141
Ḥitāl (Ḥibtāl, Ḥayṭāl?), in the Himalaya 62-3, 90-1, 198, 239
Ḥivān (?) 72, 91, 210, 253
The Home of the People of Lot 151
Horizon (dā’irat al-āfāq) 50, 51
Ḥormuz see Hurmuz
Hovā 472
Ḥ. rān (Fazzān?) 165, 477
Ḥ. ṟ. j 188
Ḥrmz (?) 375
Hsi-An-fu see Khumdān
H.sinākra(?) 88
H.ṣki t. 287
Huang-ho 195, 206, 207, 221, 228
Hulbuk (Hulmuk, Hulbag) 71, 119, 359-60, 369
Hu-lu 294
Hulwān 139, 201
Hu-mi see Vakhān
Hunarakart see Khunān
Hun-rakart see Khunān
Hūmārakart see Khunān
Hungar- (H.gry‘īm), Hungary 319, 477
Hurmuz, in Kirmān 40, 74, 124
Hurmuz-Shahr see Ahwāz
Husaynān (ILsynān?) 91, 251
Hutm see Khuthum
Huwayrith see Ararat, Lesser
Ḥwfl (Wāqwāq?) 163, 472
Ibiza (Yābis) is. 59, 192
Ibrīq (Abwait, Rīf?) 68, 204
Idha (Idhaj, read: Tustar) 130
Iflākhuniya see Paphlagonia
Ifranja see Frank
Ifrīqiya see Africa
Ighāraj(?)-Art mt. 62, 71, 95-6, 195, 206, 277, 278
Ighāraj, t. or land 275, 277, 305
Ij 129
Iki-Öğüz 276-7
Ilā see Ilī
Ilāk r. 309
Ilāq 117, 118, 356
Ilār (Ilā) r. 71, 195-6, 208, 277-8, 300-1
Ilīn 9
Ilmen l. 181
Imāk (Imāk), cf. Kimāk 304
Imām-Bābā 328
Imī t. 304
India see Hindūstān
Indian Ocean 7, 14, 32, 34, 52, 186
Indian Ocean 7, 32, 34, 52, 186
India see Hindūstān
Indians 39, 62, 88, 90, 92, 109, 111, 121
Indus (Mihrān) 72, 80, 86, 89, 122-3, 198-9, 210, 253, 372; cf. Sind-rūdh
Inhabited world 44, 83
Iqlīd see Kilīdh
Iraj 128
Irāq 15-6, 32-7, 50, 52, 66, 81, 83, 88, 129-31, 137-40, 142, 392
Irāq gulf 137
Irghiz (Savuq) r. 306, 308-10
Irbūz, in Kirmān 40, 74, 124
Irtish (Artush) r. 35, 75, 99, 100, 196, 215, 305, 306, 312,
Irtish, Black r. 215, 310; White r. 215, 310
Iṣbījāb see Isfijāb
Isfara r. 355
Isfarāyin (Siparāyin) 64, 102, 200
Isfijāb (Iṣbījāb, Iṣpījāb, Ispēchāb) 38, 118-9, 306, 312, 357
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>Index A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jigili (Chigili), a Khallukh t. 287</td>
<td>Kamičik t. 362, cf. Kumijí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jil(-ariq), on the Chu 292</td>
<td>Kamin 129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jili-kul plateau 360</td>
<td>al-Kám.n (al-Arm.n), in India 237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jinânjkath see Chinânjkath</td>
<td>Kamsighiyā 94, 273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jira, in Fārs 127, 377; in Africa 474</td>
<td>Kan'aniyūn see Kaldaniyūn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jirm see Jerm</td>
<td>Kanbāya 62, 88, 244, 245, 372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jiruft 65, 73, 124, 125, 201, 374</td>
<td>Kan-chou see Khāmchū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jisr-Manjib 141</td>
<td>Kândur-taghi see Kundâvar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.milkath 95, 306</td>
<td>Kang-diz 189, 224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.m.lkat (J.m.l-kath), 94, 272, 273</td>
<td>Kāngir 308, 324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.nān 1. 54</td>
<td>Kangri (Gangra in Asia Minor) 220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.n.kh-kath 93</td>
<td>Kanis 149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jībāl (Media) 36, 65, 74-5, 83, 129, 131-3, 136-7, 150, 382-4</td>
<td>Kānjāk t. near Kāshghar 280, 281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jou-Jan t. 447</td>
<td>Kan-su 226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. rm.q (Barchuq?) 281, 295</td>
<td>Kao-ch'ang see Chinânjkath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jubaylāt is. 58, 190</td>
<td>Kapan see Qabān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jubbay (Jubbā, Jubbē?) 74, 130</td>
<td>Karaj-i Abū-Dulaf 65, 132, 201, 383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jūbīn see Chūbīn</td>
<td>Karaj-i Rudhrāvar 132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jūdāhanjān 136, 388</td>
<td>Karakorum mt. 196, 199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judda see Jedda</td>
<td>Karas-kūh see Kargas-kūh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jūdi mt. 66, 203</td>
<td>Karbalā 77, 302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jumul t. 275, 285</td>
<td>Kārbang (Kārbanj) 359-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junāvidh 326</td>
<td>Kargas-kūh mt. and desert 36, 80, 83, 102, 126, 131, 222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday-Sābūr see Gundē-Shāpur</td>
<td>Kāriyān 128, 379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurash 146</td>
<td>Karkh 40, 140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurjān see Gurgān (p. 180 *Gurgānjī?)</td>
<td>Karkha r. 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurūj 123</td>
<td>Karki (Karkūh) 6, 332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurz (spelt Lurz), in India 63, 91, 183, 199, 239, 249, 250, cf. also Qinnauj; Georgians in the Caucasus see Gurz</td>
<td>Karrān see Kurān in Badhakhshān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jut (Yuttya) t., in Kirmān 373</td>
<td>Karūkh 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jüygān 131</td>
<td>Karrūn r. see Shūshtart r.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jydan see Khyzān</td>
<td>Karvān, in Fārs 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jūyum see Gūyum</td>
<td>Kārzīn 128, 379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ka'ba 37, 412</td>
<td>Kāsak (Kashak) see Cherkes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kabudhān l. and is. 54, 60, 143, 192</td>
<td>Kāsān 341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kābul 111, 346; Kābul r. 209</td>
<td>Kasavān, cf. Abān Kasavān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kādhākh (Katak?), near the Lob-nor 85, 233-4</td>
<td>Kasba 114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kadir, on the Jaxartes 118, 358</td>
<td>Kasbān 124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kafarbayyā 149</td>
<td>Kāshān (Qāshan) 80, 133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kafartūṭāh 141</td>
<td>al-Kāshbyn, in India 242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāfirihān r. 353, 360, 362, 363</td>
<td>Kashkūl (?), 206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kafr-Tāb 150</td>
<td>Kashmīr (Qashmīr) 63, 92, 121, 198, 199, 238, 254, 363, 364, 370; Inner and Outer K. 254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaftar 65, 125</td>
<td>Kashukath 117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kah 342</td>
<td>Kāskān (Barsarkān?) 379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāhūn 125</td>
<td>Kasra-bās see Qochqar-bashi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K'ai-Fēng 226</td>
<td>Kastek p. 195, 290, 298, 391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kakheta, cf. Tsanar 402</td>
<td>Kāth (spelt: Kāzh), in Khwārazm 38, 121, 370, 371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāktār r. 414</td>
<td>Katha (Yazd) 129, 380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kala (Kalāh-bār, Kra), in Indo-China 57, 187, 473</td>
<td>Kattūn (Kalvūn) 104, 326-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalār, Kalār-dasht 135-6, 388</td>
<td>Kavar 74, 219, 379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalb t. 146</td>
<td>Kavāzhān (?) 104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaldāniyūn (Chaldaeans) 392</td>
<td>Kaw see Kiev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalvūn (Kātūn) 104, 326-7</td>
<td>Kazalinsk 308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kam see Yenissee</td>
<td>Kazan 315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kama r. 41, 216</td>
<td>Kāzrūn 54, 127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kā-mard 342</td>
<td>K.bāl, on the Chu r. 289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāmarūpa see Qāmarūn</td>
<td>K.briya 117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Khumdān r., cf. Huang-ho and Wei-ho 70, 80, 206
Khumrak, in Êlaj 357
Khūna (Khūnaj) 142
Khunān (Hunarakert) 144, 398
Khunāsiro 81, 149
Khunzakh 448
Khūr (Khuvār?) 103
Khurdāb (?), a Rūs town 42, 67, 76, 159, 217, 430
Khurμuk (Khurmuj) 127, 377
Khurra 129
Khurramābād (Shāpūrkhāst) 383
Khursāb (Khurshāb), in Farghāna 72, 116, 211, 355
Khursān, t., in Daghеstān, cf. Lakz 144-5, 411, 455
Khūr-sh, in China, cf. Kūr.ish 70, 84, 228
Khurvāt-in (Croаt) 441
Khusb 103
Khushkāb (?), in Transoxiana 117
Khushkarūd 388
Khushmūthan 121
Khushnābād 125
Khursaу-gird 102
Khuthum (Hutm) 80, 86, 234
Khutlugh, cf. Khaμlikh 162, 454
Kh.s.n (Kh.nīn) 282
Khuttal (Khuttalān), 63, 71, 109, 114-5, 119-20, 198, 341, 359
Khutukbāi (Ku-t'a-ba) 272
Khuvākand (Khvākand, Kokand) 116, 355
Khuvānīn (Khvānīn), in Ghūr 111, 346
Khuvāsh (Khvāsh), in Sistān 110
Khūyadhān (Khuvāyjān?) 74
Khuzār (Guzā̰) 352
Khūzistān 25, 36, 40, 52, 65-6, 74-5, 83, 126, 128-31, 137, 212, 380
Kh.vāra see Javāra
Khwārazm 38, 53, 71, 121-2, 370, 463; desert 81; sea see Aral sea, cf. Arvāniyān
Khwāsh 125, 375
Khwāsh 125, 375
Khwas cf. Khalaμ 347
Kh.nān (Jyān, Khyaμ, Khyzān, Qaytaq?) 161, 448-9
Kh.zā, near Khotan, cf. Khadalik 86, 234
Kiа see Yang-tze
Kiа-su province 221
Kie-tan, sacred mt. near Kastek 290, 303
Kif 104
Kiy (Kēj, Kījkānān, Kiz), in Balūchistān, cf. Qīqān 123, 373
Kīlān 262
Kīlidh (Iqqīlīd) 129, 380
Kīmāk t. 35, 44, 66, 68, 75, 81, 83, 94-101, 180, 202, 204, 214, 216, 222, 283, 301, 304-5, 312, 316-7, 437
Kīmāk-Yīghūr see Yughur
Kīmārij (Kumārij, Kamārij) 128, 379
Kin-sha-kian see Kīsau
Kīrīn see Altai
Kīrmān 19, 34, 40, 52, 55, 65, 73-4, 80, 83, 109, 122, 123-8, 128-9, 163, 373; desert 109
Kīrmānshāhān (Qarmasīn) 132, 383
Kīrmīnkath (Kumb.rkat, &c.) 98, 289, 292, 297-8
Kīrind r., in Tabaristān 386
Kīs 129
Kīsau r. 70-1, 206, 229
Kīsh (Kīshsh), in Bukhārā 113, 200
Kīshm r. 331
Kīshīntīm, cf. Ting-ling 286
Kīstna r. 241
Kītān see Qītay
Kīzh, in Fārs 129
K.jā 229, 255
K.jūrān, in Ghur 343
K.k.rāl 118
K.kār, in Guzgān 107, 335
K.lān (Jydān, Khydān, Khyzān, Qaytaq?) 161, 448-9
K.lār, in Tibet 71, 94, 258
K.l.bān, in Tibet 71, 94, 207, 256
K.l.sh.j, k 117, 357
K.l.skān 117
K.l.rāh, in Ghūr 111
K.l.rārkhun (K.vārkhun) 95
K.l.sān, in China 85, 233
K.l.rbānk, in Tibet 71, 94, 207, 256
K.l.sān, in China 85, 233
K.l.sān, in China 85, 233
K.s.n (Kh.nīn) 282
Kuang-(chou)-fu 224
Kuchchā (Kuchchā) r. [Tarim and Huang-ho?] 71, 80, 94-5, 207
Kuchān (Kuchchā, K.jā, Kushān?) 70, 85, 207, 229, 230
Kuchchā (Kuchān, K.jā), cf. also Kuchā 71, 80, 85, 207, 221, 229-30
Kuchaspān 390
Küfa 21, 81, 139-40, 145; swamp 56, 76, 137
Kūfīch (Kōfīch, Qufs) t., in Kirmān 28, 65, 124, 336, 362, 373-4; mt. 65, 80, 124, 201
Kūghm.r 85, 232
Kūghūn 125
Kūh-i Bashākirt 201
Kūh-gilū (Kūh-jilū) mt. 66, 74, 201, 213-4, 380
Kūh-i Gurz, cf. Gurz 68, 422
Kūh-i La'l 367
Kūh-i sīm, in Kirmān 65; in Khorāsān 104; cf. Kūhsaym
Kūh-i sharāh (shurāt?) 67
Kūh-i yakh see Qasak
Kūh-i zhr in Tibet 235
Kuhak 111, 346
Kuhān-rūdh (Kargāna-rūd?) 137, 391
Kuhdum see Kūtum; cf. Gūrāb-i Kuhdum
Kūhistān, in Khorāsān 64, 103, 125, 326; in Syria (Jībāl) 150
Kūhistān-i Abū Ghānim 65, 124, 374
Kuhrān 201
Kūhsaym (Kūh-i sīm?) 117
Kūkān (Kōkān) mt. 196, 282
Kūkyāl (Kōk-yāl?) 98
Kulāb see Hulbuk; Kulāb r. (Khi-Surkhāb) 208
Kūlān (Tarti) 97, 289, 354, 358
Ku-li t., cf. Qūrī 284
Kūlī, near Kanbāya 62, 196
Kūlī, estuary of the Indus 72, 196
Ku-li-kan, cf. Qūrī 284
Kumārij see Kimārij
Kumārbkat see Kirmīnkath
Kumēdh, in Khuttal 361, 363
Kumij (Kōmēdī?) t., in Khuttal 71, 120, 361, 363
Kūmīn 124
Kūmīs (Kūm.s, Kūmīs) [-art] 95, 274-5
Kūmīsh (Kūmīs), in Daylam 36, 64, 102, 135, 387
Kūmī-talas 274
al-Kumkam see Konkan
Ku-mo 294
Kūm.s-art see Kumīs
Kūn, cf. Comans 316
Kundār 64, 107, 335
Kundāvar (Kāndūr, Kandavur?) -daghi mt., in Kimakia 66, 202, 308, 324
Kundur 103
Kūnges r. 275
Kūngey-ala-tau 195, 299
Kunjidā (Kunjidā) 119, 358
K'un-lun mt. 194
Kūnkrā (?) 93
Kūns.r, cf. Nu'nīn, Ujjayn 88
Kū-π'lo 294
Kur (Kurr) r. (in Arrān) 77, 144, 218, 391, 448
Kurān, in Fārs 127; in Badhakhshān 365, 368
Kurdar in Khwārazm 122
Kurday (Qurday) p. 298, 301, 303
Kurdivān 144, 145, 4°7
Kurdiyān 129
Kurds' 138, 336, 377, 392, (in Kāriyān) 410 (Mukn)
Kurī 103
Kurkath (Cyropolis?) 115, 354
Kurr, in Transcaucasia see Kur; in Fārs 74
Kūr.sh, in China, cf. Khur.sh 70, 207, 228
Kusān, cf. Kuchā 232
Kūsāqū 273
Kushān (Kuchān, Kuei-shun?) 230
Kushānl, in Soghd 113
Kūshk-i Qand 123
Kushmihan. Kushmehan 105
Kuskān 70, 206
Kuhrān 201
Kutsaym (Kūh-i sīm?) 117
Kūh-i La'l 367
Kūh-i sīm, in Kirmān 65; in Khorāsān 104; cf. Kūhsaym
Kūh-i sharāh (shurāt?) 67
Kūh-i yakh see Qasak
Kūh-i zhr in Tibet 235
Kuhak 111, 346
Kuhān-rūdh (Kargāna-rūd?) 137, 391
Kuhdum see Kūtum; cf. Gūrāb-i Kuhdum
Kūhistān, in Khorāsān 64, 103, 125, 326; in Syria (Jībāl) 150
Kūhistān-i Abū Ghānim 65, 124, 374
Kuhrān 201
Kūhsaym (Kūh-i sīm?) 117
Kūkān (Kōkān) mt. 196, 282
Kūkuyāl (Kōk-yāl?) 98
Kulāb see Hulbuk; Kulāb r. (Khi-Surkhāb) 208
Kūlān (Tarti) 97, 289, 354, 358
Ku-li t., cf. Qūrī 284
Kūlī, near Kanbāya 62, 196
Kūlī, estuary of the Indus 72, 196
Ku-li-kan, cf. Qūrī 284
Kumārij see Kimārij
Kumēdh, in Khuttal 361, 363
Kumij (Kōmēdī?) t., in Khuttal 71, 120, 361, 363
Kūmīn 124
Kūmīs (Kūm.s, Kūmīs) [-art] 95, 274-5
Kūmīsh (Kūmīs), in Daylam 36, 64, 102, 135, 387
Kūmī-talas 274
al-Kumkam see Konkan
Ku-mo 294
Kūm.s-art see Kumīs
Kūn, cf. Comans 316
Kundār 64, 107, 335
Kundāvar (Kāndūr, Kandavur?) -daghi mt., in Kimakia 66, 202, 308, 324
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Lahógar (Lôgar), near Kábul 347-8
Lahór (Lôhâvar, Lôhâvar), on the Rávi 89, 246-7; cf. Lohara
Lak t., in Daghestan see Qazi-qumuq
Lakz (Lazgi) t., cf. Khûrsân 162, 407, 408, 411, 454
Lambârân 398
Lamghân (Lâghmân, Lamqân) 39, 63, 72, 92, 209, 251, 252; r. 72
al-Lân see Alân
Lan-chou, cf. Kuchân 207, 230
Langâ 136, 387
Lank see Ceylon
Lanka town 188
Lankabâlûs (Alankabâlûs, Lanjabâlûs), Nicobar is. 57, 187, 188
Lankurân (Lankorân) 193
Lârân, on the Oxûs 364
Lârandân 74, 127, 212, 213, 379
Lârijân (Lâriz), in Daylam 77, 410
Latrâ 136, 387
Lâyân (Lâyân, Lîyzân), cf. Lâhîj 144, 402, 404, 406-10
Lâzîna (?), cf. Az 99, 302
L.b.n, cf. Filân, Lupenii
Lebedia 313, 320, 459
Lena r. 285
Lerida (Làrida) 69, 155
Lhâsâ 25, 93, 208, 256, 258
Lîrz see Jurz (India)
Liakhvi r. 457
Liân-chou (Eri-chu) 230
Libya 33, 83, 477
Limrâsk 134, 386
Lip’în-k’ see Lupenii
Lîshtar (Aliştar) 132, 383
Livkand (Lévkand) 120, 359, 361
Liyârstân (Liyâlassân), in Gilân 410
L.R.n see Lâzîn
Loango 477
Lob-nor 186, 206, 207, 221
Lôgar (Laukár), near Marv 73, 328
Lohâra (Lôhâwar), in Kashmir 247, 249
Lôhrânî 372
Lombards (al-Ankubarda) 191, 192, 336, 424
Lou-Lan 235, 259, cf. B.rwân
Lo-yang 226
Lubnân (Lebanon) 67
Lûgh.r see Abkhaz
Lukchun 274
Lukkâm mt. 67, 76, 149, 204
Lûglî (Uglî?) 98
Lun-t’ai see Urumchi (earlier, Bûgûr)
Lupenii 454
Luqin (Lung-pien), in China 244
Luristan 201, 383
Lût (Lot) see The Home of L.’s people
Lîyzân cf. Lâyân

Ma’arra Maşrîn (Ma’arra Qinnasrîn) 150, 415; Ma’arra Nu’mân 415

Mâb.nj J.râbâs (?), cf. Yafînj 95, 276-7
Macedonia 156, 423
Madagascar (Jazîrât al-Qumr) 205, 472
Mâdîn (Ctesiphon) 138
Mâdârayî 139
Mâdhar 76, 218
Mâdîhvân 128
Madina 66, 146, 148
Madr (Madhr) 64, 73, 109, 211, 336, 342
Madura 244
Madyâmîjkatî 112
Madyan, in Arabia 81, 148
Maeotis see Azov sea
Maftah 138
Maghâs, in Alania 448
Maghrib 36, 38, 52, 81-3, 148, 151, 153-6, 165
Magnâ Bulgarîa, Magna Hungarîa 319
Mâhalûya (Mâhrûlû) I., cf. Jânkân 183
Mâhân 125
Mâhiyya 153
Majhûr 147
Mâhirûbân (Mâhrûbân, Mâhrûyak) 40, 74, 127, 213, 378
Majjar, Majghari see Magyar
Mâk valley 334
Malaga (Mâliqa) 69, 155
Mālâmîr (Idhaj) 381
Malît 388
Malatya 21, 76, 149
Malay archipelago 34
Malay (Malabâr, Malabâr) 57, 88, 238, 241, 243-4
Malâzgîrd 143, 395
Mâlin 104
Mallaghân 212
Mallorca 191
Mâlûwâ 245
Mâmitir (Mâmîr, Bârfûrûsh) 77, 134, 386
Mânak (Mâyd, Mând), in Burma 87, 243
Manas, in the T’ien-shan 272, 293
Manâs r., in India 240
Manbij, cf. Jîsr Manbij 149
Mân.b.klû (Mâtiklû) mt. (Altai?), 196, 282
Mând (Qara-aghach) r., cf. Sakân 74, 212, 377
Mandal, in India (?) 87, 236, 240
Mandíl p. 367
Mandam peninsula, cf. Ur.shfîn 243
Mandûsh, in Ghûr 343
Mandû, in Mâlûwâ 245
Mandrî-pattan 244
Manghishlaq peninsula see Siyâh-kuh
Mânîsâ (?) mts. 61-2, 70, 73, 194-5, 206, 208, 211
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Manjābī 72, 122
Mankath 147, 413
Mānkīr (Manyakheta) 238, 246
Mānshān (Mānishān) 31, 55, 106, 332, 334
Mānšūr, in Syria 149
M.nha 22, 72, 88, 122, 239, 246, 372; in Armenia 400
Māntūb see Māttuth

Manughān 124, 374
Mā'qil canal 76, 138, 392
Maqys (M.qys), in Wāqwāq 84, 228; in the Sūdān 165, 477

Marāgha 65, 142
Maral-Bashi, cf. Barchuq 281
Mārān (Arrajān) r. 213
Marand 143
Mār'ash 149, 201
Mārdin 66, 203
Margelān, in Farghāna 355
Maristas r. 221
Mariyya in Spain 417
Marj 132
Marqā, cf. Qūn, Qūrī 244-5, 317; Markakul l. 285; Markha 285
Marrūdīh (Marrūdh) see Marvarūd

Masamanda (Marsmanda) 22, 115, 354
Mār.st (Abār.st), in Tabaristān 386
Marv 16-17, 73, 80, 104, 105, 106, 328; r. see Murghāb

Marvarūd (Bāla-Murghāb), cf. Maruchaq 39, 64, 73, 105, 328
Māsabadhān 203
Māsand 359
Māshān, in Marv 105
Mashkai r. cf. Mushkī 373
Māshkanāt 129
Mashkēl 373
Masin (Misin), in Fārs 213-4, 380
Māsjā 149
Masius see Mārdīn mts. 203
Masjid Ibrāhīm, in Syria 150
Masjid-i Sulaymān (Masqit-i S.), in Ištakhr 126
Masqut (Maskut', Mushkūr), in Daghestan 161-2, 454-5
Māsrūqān 75, 130, 214
Māsvāhi 122
Māttuth (Manūb, Manūf) 131, 382
Mausil (Mossul) 6, 76, 140
Mā-varā' al-Nahr see Transoxiana
Maybūdha 129
Mayhana 103
Māy-hind, cf. Vay-hind (? ) 252
Māyāin 129
Maymana (Jahudhān) 335
Mayūl (M.yūl) 93, 257
Mayyāfāriqīn 143, 397
Māzandarān see Tabaristān 200, 218
Māzinān 39, 102
Māzirākān 128

Māzruqān, in Kirmān 124
M'do-smat, cf. Tūsma't 259
M.dū, in Tibet 259
Medina Sidonia (Sadūna) 155
Mediterranean see Rūm sea
Mekka 37-8, 66, 131, 146, 148, 412
Men. Isle of, 8, 58, 59
Merida (Māridā, spelt: Ḥārda) 21, 79, 155, 221
Meščera t. 464
Mesopotamia see 'Irāq, Jazīra 19, 37, 38
M.gīhān 112
M.hāli (? ) 123
Mīhrā 127
Mīhrān r. see Indus; Lesser (Second)
Mīhrān (Mīhrān al-thāni) see Narbada
Mikhlâf 'Akk 147
Mirki 97, 119, 289-90, 358
Miyān 142
Mii-chih-t'o see K.m.jkath 286
Mīyālafjān 1, Niyālafiān?) 137, 388
Mīyān-rūdān, :n Farehana 356
Mizhān 124
M.ksh (M.nk.s 1. :n Alania 446
M.lh.mān iM.ljān?) in Zābaj 164, 473
M.l.iān (M.l.jndi'. in Zanj 163, 472
M.ljkath see Panjīkath on the Chu 98
M.nha (Thatha?), cf. Lohrāni and Mansura 372
M.nj.ri 164
Mnkwr 1, Mnkwr-oghli, Qipchaq t. 202
Moksha (Moxel) t. 446, 463–4
Mombasa 472
Mongols, cf. Tatar 94, 270, 316; desert 221
Moravia 431, 441–2
Mordva (Mordia?), cf. Erz’a, Moksha 313, 434, 462–3
Mori-shiburghān (Qal’a-yi Maur), cf. Baghshur, near Marv 328
Mōrān (Maurūn) 135, 205
M.qys see Maqys
M.d in Daylam 136
M.k.shmīghnāthur, near the T’ien-shan 273
M.t.iuli 401
Mū’ān (Ma’ān) 81, 149
Mubārakābād 380
MubārakI, near Bardha’ 29, 144, 400
Mudar t. 146
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Mudhaikhira mt. 203
Mughakān 391
Mughūn (?) 124
Mugojar mt. 202
Muhit see Ocean
Mukrān (Makrān) 123–4, 222, 371
Mukri, cf. Merkit, t. in Far-East 448; Kurdish t. 410
Mūltān (Multān) xv, 27, 72, 89–91, 121, 210, 239, 363
Munjān (B.lj.m, M.lj.am, Mundajān) 364–8
Munk (Baljuvān) 71, 120, 208, 359–60, 369; r. (Talvār) 360
Mūqān (Mughān) 77, 142, 395
al-Mūqāniya, near Qabala 402, 406, 407
Muqṭam t. 68
Muqurra (Māqurra), in Nubia 475
Murād-gūlū l. 183
Murcia 155
Murdā lagoon 391
Murgāb r. (Marv r., Marvarūd r.) 5, 22, 70, 73, 105–6, 208, 211, 333
Murgāb, Bālā-, cf. Marvarūd 328
Mūrzūq, in Libya 474
Mūsā (Mūja), in Burma (?) 87, 243
Musfari, in Marv 105
Mushtī (?), in Baluchistān 123
Muskhūr, cf. Masqūţ 455
Muvās (?), in Ceylon (?) 57, 187, 235
Mūy 109, 342
Muzāţ t. in Kirmān 373
Muz-art p. 195, 206–7, 277, 296; r. 274
Muz-tagh 199
Mymāţy (Smāţy) l. 54, 183
M.zīrakān (?) 129
Nābān 377
Nābulus 151
Naghar 251
Nahla (Pahra) 125
Nahr-İsa 76
Nahr al-Karūm 78, 220
Nahr al-Malik 77, 139
Nahr-Sābus see Sās
Nahr-Sābūr 212
Nahr-Šarşar 76, 77
Nahrawān 139; r. (Diyāla, Sirvān) 76, 218
Nahrvāra, cf. Anhilvara 238
Najtram 74, 127, 377
Najrūn 146
Nakhchuvān (Nakhichevān) 143, 352
Nakhshab (Nasaf) 114, 200, 352
Nakūr 154
Namakiya (Kimakiya, Yimakiya) 100, 310
Namkākhus 116
Nanak, in Gilān 137, 390
Nandar see Vanandar
Nan-shan 194
Naqād, in Farghāna 355
Nara (or Hakrā) r. 372
Nāra is. (Ceylon) see Bāra 58, 179, 235
Narbada (Lesser Mihrān?) 72, 196, 198, 210, 236, 245
Nargen is., off Bākū 191
Nari (?) see Annari
Nātin r. see Khaylām, cf. Uzgand
Narmāshir 125, 375
Naryān (M.rsān?), in Gūzgān 107, 335
Nāsā (*Nisā) 29, 64, 80, 103, 134, 325, 335
Nātil 135
Naubandagān (Naubanjān) 209, 212
Nau-Bihār, in Balkh 108, 337
Nauqān (Mashhad) 103
Nauzhān 114
Navākat (Navīkat), cf. Nunkath 24, 97, 109, 289–91, 298, 301, 303
Navījkath (?), in China 86, 234
Nawyta (Fārita?) 1
Nāyīn 129
Nazvān (T.zvān?), in Tibet 61, 93, 194, 258
Nazwa 412
N.dā (B.dvā) t. 287
N.druf (Tadruf?) 93, 260
Negroes 33, 476
Nepal (Naypāl, spelt; Baytāl, Nitāl, &c.) 63, 198, 248
Nicaea (Niqiya) 78, 220; 1. 55, 78, 184
Niebla (Labia) 155
Nihām r. 114, 209
Nihān 114
Nīm-rudhi 138
Nīrāgān (Nīghār, Nagarahār, Ningnahār) 72, 91, 209, 251–3
Nīriz, in Ādharbāyjān 394; in Fārs 201, 380
Nīzhān 114
Nīzwayn (Bahrayn ?) 146
N.mudhlugh 356
N.myās in India 87, 241
Northmen, cf. Rus, Warank 181
North Pole 50–1, 181
Novgorod 434
Nubia (Nūba) 33–4, 55–6, 68, 78, 81, 83, 151–2, 164–5, 475; desert 222
Nūbyn (Bābyn) 87, 243
Nuchārā see Andīchārāgh 119, 360
Nūdīz (Nauzīz?) 71, 209, 359, 361
Nūjakāth 118, 357
Nūkarda t. 469
Nūkath see Tūnkath
Nükkh.k (Nükhik) 282
Nükhî, in Shakkî 400
Nü mâniya 138
Nûmîkath 352
Nu’nîn (Kûns.?), cf. Ujjayn 72, 245
Nûnkât (Nûnzkat) 97 (Navâkât); 289–90
(Navâkât and Tûnkât)
Nu’nûn(?) 72, 88, 245
Nu-shih-pî t. 287
Nûsrâtâbâd 375
Nûzhâbân 122
Nûzhgân 104
Nûnzkat (var. Nûnkât) see Tûnkât 289
Nylân-Rûdbâr 388

Oases see Wâhât
Oba (Aafa) 343
Obî (Yumar) r. 275, 285, 305
Ocean, Eastern (Uqiymînî-i Mashriqî), cf. Green See 32, 34, 51–2, 56, 70, 79, 80, 82–4, 96, 179, 186
Ocean, Encircling (Muhîtî) 216
Ocean, Western (Uqiymînî-i maghribî) 7, 8, 32, 41, 51, 53–4, 58–9, 79, 83, 153–4, 156, 158, 165, 179, 181, 190
Ocsonaba (Ukhsunaba) 155, 418
Oghôr, cf. Uyghur, Avars (Pseudo-) 448
Oghûz, cf. Toghuzghuz, Ghuz 311
313, 469
Oglon (*Onglon) see Bujaq 467, 470
Ohind see Vayhind
Oichedès (Tarim?) 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
Opsikion (Ubsîq) 78, 156
Optimaton (Ufîmât) 156
Ordu-kand see Kâshghar
Orissa, Urshîn 27, 87, 241
Osh 22, 72, 116, 355
Osset see Alân, Aṣ 318, 456
Ostiaks 309, 318; Yenisei Ostiaks 302
Otrar, cf. Turâr 325
Oxus (Amû-daryâ) 5, 17, 198–9, 268
Pâb (Pâp) 72–3, 117, 355
Pai-ma-ho 294
Palembang 188
Palestine (Filastîn) 150, 151
Pa-lu-kia 294
Pamir (Fâmîr) 196, 361–2
Panj r. see Amû-daryâ, Vakhân r. 198
Panjâb (Hind?) 89
Panjûr (Panigûr) 123, 373
Panjhir 39, 64, 109, 325, 341; r. 348
Panjikath (Bish-Baliq), cf. Pei-t’ing 94, 227, 267–9, 271–2, 275; in Sughd 113; on the Chu (M.Îjkath) 98, 291
Panjvây (Panjvây) 111, 332, 345–6
Pannonia 431
Paphlagonia, cf. Afrakhûn 78, 156, 204
Pârâb (Fârâb), on the Jaxartes 72, 118–9, 122, 284, 306, 312
Parak r. 73, 118, 211, 289
Pârghar (Pârghar, Bârghar) in Khuttal 71, 119, 208, 360–1
Pârs see Fârs
Partav see Bardha’a 307
Parthians see Dahae 386
Parvân 39, 112, 348; P.rvân 482
Pâryâb (Fâryâb) in Guzgân 4, 5, 39, 107, 335
Pasá (Fâsá) 65, 128, 129
Pashm (Bashm), different from Pazhm? 388
Pavlodar 308
Paykand, cf. Áváza 56, 73, 113, 352
Paylamân(?)-shahr 137, 390
Pazhm 136; cf. P.zhm
Pechenegs (Bachânâk) 35, 42, 44, 53, 75, 96, 101, 142, 159, 162, 355, 312–5, 319, 458–9, 469; mt. 159, 204, 437
Pechenegs (Khazarîan) 42, 67, 83, 160, 442, 443
Pecheneg, Turkish 43, 75, 83, 101, 160, 162, 312, 314
Pechina (Bajjâna) 155
Pegu 243
Pei Chih-li 228
Pei-T’ing 227, 266, 272
Perovsk 308, 371
Persian Gulf (Khalîj-i Iraq) 52, 180
Perta, cf. Nawyṭa
P’iao see Pyu
P’ir-i Alamdâr, in Dâmghân 387
Pîrrîm (Pîrîm, Fîrrîm) 39, 77, 135, 136, 387
Podandon see Budhandûn
Po-lu-huan 294, 297
Poland 433
Polovtsi see Khifchaq 315
Pontos see Black sea 182
Po-ta-ling see Bedel p.
Prague (Firagh) 441
Prinkant see Farinkath 352
P.r.kd.r see Barakdz
Przhevalsk (Qara-qol) 293
Puhlpara 123
Pu-ku-chen (Black Irtish?) 286
Pu-lu see Bolor
Pulvâr r. see Fârvâb 213
Purdas see Burtâs 462
Pyû, t. in Burma 242
P.zhm, west of Somâm? 136 see Map X
Qabala 77, 144, 402, 407
Qabân (Kapan) 143, 398
Qabq mt., cf. Caucasus 67, 145, 201, 203, 409, 411
Qâdiṣiya 38, 81, 140
Qaghan-Stupa, in Bish-baliq 269
Qâhtân t. 412, 449
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Raml al-Ma‘dan 81–2, 164; r. 78
Rāng-Rong (?) 61, 92, 194, 256–7
Raqqarr 76, 141, 150
Ras (?) r., cf. Asus, Ishim, Artush 75, 215, 283, 305, 308
Ra’s al-Ayn 141
Rasht, in Gilān 137, 361, 362, 390
Rāsht see Zhāsht
Rāsk 123
Rasūkh t. 373
Rāsun see Jarmī
Ratn r. 212, 377
Rāvī r. 246
Ravin in Kirmān 124
Rāvini (Rivand) 103, 326
Rāyagan 103
Rāyīn (?) 125
Rāykūtiya (Rayküyand ?) 93
Rāyy 18, 36, 39, 64–5, 80, 102, 132, 135, 384; mt. 77
Rayyyu (Regio ?) 155
R’azan, in Russia 436
R.-bind (?) 89
R. bkh.s (R.nj.s) see Rūbās 161, 449
Red sea (Khālij-i ‘arabī) 52, 180, 222
Regar 353
Rhodes (Rhudas) 8, 158, 190
Rhynakos (Rundhāq) 220
Rūbāt Afrīghūn 6, 175, 331; R. al-ajurr 386; R.-Fādil 349–50; R.-Hāfs 386, R.-i karvān (spelt kār-vān) 5, 73, 106–7, 211, 330, 334, 336
Rīf, in Egypt, cf. Ībriq 204
Rīhā (Jericho) 151
Rīqān 125, 375
Rīshahr, in Khūzistān 74, 127, 212, 213, 378; in Fārs (Reshīr) 378
Rīshān 116
Rivand see Rāvini 326
Rivshārān (Rūbūshārān ?) 106, 108, 332, 336, 482
Riyas (?) 55, 184
R.kht.jab see Zaybāk 120, 364, 481
R.nj.s see R. bkh.s
Rome see Rūmiya
R.stūya 255, 256
Rūbās r., cf. R. bkh.s 450
Rūd-i A’lā (Gūpāl) r. 381; R.-i Hilla 212, 377; R.-i shir 183, 212
Rūdbār, in Kirmān 124
Rūdha, in Jībal 133, 384
Rūdhān (Rodhān), in Afghānistān 111, 346; between Kirmān and Yazd 65, 125, 201; between Fārs and Kirmān 129; in Daylam (Rūyān) 135, 387
Rūdhravar (Rūdārvar) 132, 383
Rūdlisar 388
Rūf in Ghūr 343
Rūfta 128
Rūhā (Edessa) 37, 141
Rūhūn (Adam’s peak) 134
Rukhhdh (Rukkhhdh, Rukkhkaj, Arahosia) XV, 64, 111, 121, 346
Rūm (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. Rūmiya
Rūm sea (Mediterranean) 32, 52–4, 58–9, 60, 82–3, 148–9, 151, 153–6, 158, 191, 320, 459
Rūmi strait 52
Rūmiya (Rome, Roman land) 21, 59, 60, 158, 192
Rūmiyān see Byzantines, cf. Greeks
Rūnā see Dunā (Danube)
Ruotsi, cf. Rūs 432
Rū (Rohri, Rōr) 72, 89, 246, 372
Rustā Bīk 119, 359–60: R.-i Bīk.m (M.-i Bīk.m?) see Munjān 121; R.-ustān (?) 128; R.-yi Awās (Ephesus?) 68
Rustāq 359
Rūṭā (Ruthā) r. cf. Dunā 43–4, 76, 101, 159, 217–8, 315–6, 430, 437
Ruvāt 150
Rūy (Rūb’) 338
Rūyagan (Ruwayjān) 74, 212, 379
Rūyān see Rūdūn, in Daylam
Ryn, in Abyssinia (Zayla’) 34, 164, 474; in the Sudān 165, 477
Ṣa’āda 127
Ṣaba’ (Saba’) 148
Sabalān (Savalan) mt. 66, 202
Ṣabāt 115, 354
Sabir t. cf. Swr 455
Ṣabar (Ṣaurān, spelt: Şahrān) 119, 306, 308, 358
Ṣābūr, Bishāpur 212
Ṣābus cf. Sās (Shāsh) 76, 138, 218
Sabhāvar 64, 102
Ṣa’da 146
Ṣadūsān, in Sind 72, 122
Ṣafīd-Rūd (Sapīdh-rudh) 77, 137, 218, 390
Ṣaghūr (Bālā-Saghūn ?) on the Chu 291
Ṣahand mt. 201
Ṣahārā 223
Ṣabān, in Sind 372
Ṣahuk see Chāhuk
Ṣa’id see Egypt, Upper
Ṣājū see Sha-chou
Ṣakāh-Haumavrgah 368
Ṣakala (Silkot), cf. Tāqī 249
Ṣakalkand (Iskalkand) 39, 63, 109, 338–40
Ṣakān (Mānd) r. 74
Ṣakkhchū (Sukkhchū), cf. Saukju 85, 232
Ṣāḵh-in, Czechs 441
Ṣakhtasār 388
Ṣakīfaghn 114
Ṣalāḥīt see Shalāḥīt
Ṣalamās (Salmās) 143
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Salamiya 81, 149
Salamaqān see Chālakān
Salre peak, in India 196
Salhārī 90
Salma mt. 203
Salmānān, cf. Sāmānī 139
Salmān-i Pāk 392
Salonica 423
Salor (Salghur?) 336, 466
Salūmidh 103
Shaμāluh 220
Samandar, in Daghestan 162, 452, 454
Sāmār (Sahmār) 136, 387
Samara, in Russia 310
Samargand, 4, 23, 38-9, 55, 63, 73, 113-14, 118, 352
Samargandāq, cf. Sarhadd 39, 63, 121, 364, 369
Sāmārā (Sāmara) 11, 40, 76, 140
Sambatas cf. Kiev 431
Sambil (Bāzār-i S., Sūq-Sanbil) 130, 381
Šamādān (*Hamdān?) 146
Šamīrān, in Fārs 128
Šāmi-sbrak (Šāmīsirak) 117, 357
Šāmjan, cf. Avāza 185
Samundar (Samudra), in India 27, 87, 241
Samūr r. in Daghestan 408, 455-6
Šamūr (Sawūr?) in India 62, 198; cf. Šaymūr
Sān see Sangchārak
San‘ā 20, 37, 40, 66, 146, 147, 411
Sanān 128
Šanār (Tsanar) 144, 400
Šāndābil (Kan-chou?) 232
Šanf (Champa, Annam) 86, 236, 240
San-fo-ts‘i, cf. Šrivijaya, Palembang 188, 241
Sangalākh (Sanglak) 26, 85, 229, 233
Sangān, in Khorāsān 103
Sangarios r. 220
Sangchārak (Sān-va-Charyak) 63-4, 107, 199, 336
Sangli (*Sanglich), cf. S.nks 112, 121, 350, 364, 367-8
Sang-Tūda see Livkand 361
Sānikāth 118
Sanja 76, 149
Sanju, near Khotan 207, 260
Santarem (Shantarīn) 79, 156, 221, 418
Šaqāliba, Šaqlab see Slavs
al-Saqāliba al-Mutanassira see Slavs, Christianized
Šaqšīn, cf. Sārigh-sh.n 453
Sarag, Saragh, Sharagh, in China 225
Saragossa (spelt: Sarquis) 155
Sarakhsh 64, 104
Sarandib, cf. Ceylon 57, 61, 80, 86-7, 194, 234-5, 244; m. (connected with Indo-China see Map I), cf. Mānisā 61, 70, 83, 266, 235
Sarāv (Sarāb, Sarāt) 142, 394
Sarāvān 137
Sāray 360
Sarbāz r. 373
Sārdābrūd 388
Sardan, in Fārs 74, 129, 379, 380; r. 74, 213-4
Sardinia (Surdāniya) xvi, 60, 192
Sarhadd, cf. Samarqandāq 369
Sārī (Sārīya) 77, 134, 284, 315, 317, 386, 444
Sari-Yughur see Uyghur
Sārigh, near the Chu, cf. Yār 284-5, 289
Sārigh-sh.n, in Khazaria, cf. Sāvgihar 453-4
Sarikol (K‘ie-p‘an-t‘o) 370
Sar-i Pul (Anbār in Guzgān) 5, 199
Satif (spelt: Sazīf) 153
Saukju see Su-chou
Saul, cf. Farmul 91, 251
Sāva 133, 384
Sāvghar (Sārigh-sh.n?) 162, 453-4
Savitra 183
Sāvnīk (Sārnik) 80, 86, 234
Sawur (?) see Samur
Saydā (Sidon) 149
Saylākān (Selākān) 120, 362
Saymara 52, 132
Saymūr (Chaymur, Chaul), on the west coast of India 88 (?), 244-6, cf. Samur
Sayram 358
Sālhārl 90
Salmānt 118
Sayyān. mt. 282
Šāyda (Sidon) 149
Sayhūn see Jaxartes, Chāch r. 73, 149
Saylākān (Šālākān) 120, 362
Šāymara 52, 132
Šāymūr (Chaymūr, Chaul), on the west coast of India 88 (?), 244-6, cf. Šāmūr
Sayram 358
S. bkath 118
Sceythia 11, 401
S.dnk, cf. Sidhing-kul 95, 276
Sea of Darkness 179, 193
Sea of Aghbāb 87
Selenga r. 265
Seleucia (Selefke) 69, 156, 205
Semirechye (Jetti-su) 306
Senna 218
Sorbs, cf. Kh.rwat-īn, White Croats 423-4
Sereth r. 466
Serika (Sinistān) see China 11
Seven Sleepers' Cave 204
Sevilla 155
S.f.nja‘ī (Isfinjāy) 111, 346
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Shābirinji (?) 105
Shabūrgan, &c. see Ushbūrgān
Shabwa 77
Sha-chou 26, 70, 85, 207, 229, 230-1, 233, 235
Shādīhān (Shādīhān r.) 74, 212, 377
Shah-Mobadh’s Fortress 126
Shahd 1, cf. Sind, Tus l. 185
Shahra-zhūr (Shahrazūr, Siyārazūr) 132, 383
Shahr-ī Bābak (Pāpak) 129, 380
Shahristān, in Gūrgān 133, 385; in Ispāhān 131
Shariyār-Kūh see Qārin 387
Shahruvā 124
Shāh-Seeūn t. 304
Shāhū peninsula 193
Shāh (?)-dara r. 367
Shakī (Shakkī) 77, 144, 398
Shāl 137
Shālahīt see Sumatra 57, 187
Shalanba 135
Shālē see Kāshghār
Shamāgān 129
Shamākhi (Shammākhiya) 144, 403
Shāmāt 125
Shāmīstiyān 17
Shamkūr (Shamkhor) 144, 398
Shān-chou, cf. Sha-chou, 230
Shan-shan 258
Shantarīn see Santarem
Shantariya (read Shantabrīya, Centobriga) 69, 155, 205, 417-8
Shantung 221
Shāpūr 376 see Bishāpūr
Shāpūrkāst, cf. Khurramābād 132, 383
Shāristānā, near Nasā 325
Sharja 148
Sharkhiyān (Charkhiyān) 6
Sha’-t’o t. 266, 267, 270
Shā’ūr (Shāvur) r., of Shūsh 214
Shāvaṟān (Shābarān) 145, 404, 408
Shāvghar 454
Shayzar 150
Shetland is. 191
Sh.glh.jān 306
Shibām (spelt: Shiyām) 66, 147, 203
Shihr 148
Shīlā, Shīlā see Corea
Shillī (Shalji) 61, 119, 194, 358
Shimshāt (Arsamosata) 393
Shindān, in Daghestān (?) 411
Shing-bun (?) see Sng-b.n
Shing-i ‘Abbādī 105
Shinjū see Zaytun
Shīr, in Gilān 136
Shīrāz 6, 54-5, 126, 128
Shīr-Guzār 361
Shīrīn (Shirīn) r. see Hindiyān 74, 212-3, 378
Shīrūn-Tagāb 335
Shīrjān (Shirriz) 410
Shīrūd-Hazār 410

Shīrūn (Shirvan) 144-5, 193, 403-4, 410, 445, 454
Sh.kākāb (Shikākāh) 118, 357
Sh.lāt (S.lāt) 117, 356
Shorak p. 343
Sh.rwi r. 217
Sh.tūrkāh 118
Shughnān (Shakīna, Shaqīna, Shakhnān, Shīkinān, Shīqīnān, S.qiyyā?) 63, 71, 86, 112, 349-50, 363-4, 366, 368
Shu-lē see Kāshghār
Shūmān 115, 120, 337
Shumāyshāt 1, Sumaysāt, Samosata) 76, 148, 193
Shur-kul. cl- Tuz-kul 184, 290
Shurmin 105, 327
Shush (Susa) 40, 75, 131, 214
Shūsha, in Transcaucasia 398
Shūshant (Tustar) town and r. 74, 130, 213-4
Silala 249
Sia-shih 294
Sībdāst 200
Sībā (Sibī), in Kirmān 125, 375
Sībīnākān (Isfīnaqān) 103, 325
Sīkāshim see Ishkāshim
Sikīmisht see Ishkāmish
Sīkul, on the Issik-kul 99, 299
Silistria (Distra) 313
Silver island see Jazirat al-fidda
Simhapura (Seng-ho-poluo) see Szāburqān
Simingān 63, 108, 109
Simnān 36, 64, 135
Sināi see Tür-Sīnā; S. desert see Tin
Sind 19, 34, 36, 52, 64, 86, 83, 89, 109, 122-3, 125, 163, 371; desert 109; village near Nasā 185
Sind-rūdh, cf. Sind, Tus 185
Sīnlz 74, 127, 212, 377
Sinn 76, 141
Sipāhān see Ispahān
Siparāyin see Isfarāyin
Shāpur 376 see Bishāpur
Shāpurkāst, cf. Khurramābād 132, 383
Shāristāna, near Nasā 325
Sirmia (Srem) 441
Sirrayn 147
Sirvān, near Šaymara 132, 383
Sisar 218
Sīstān 19, 36, 55, 73, 80, 110, 125; desert 80, 123
Siyāh-kūh (Manghishlaq) 60, 193
Sīvī, in Baluchistan 111, 346
Siyāhkal 388, 390
Δ.λάβα (Δλάβ, Δλάβια), a division of 
Δ.λάβου (Δλάβου Πανορός?) 75, 159, 
433-4, 438
Δ.λάμπου (Δλάμπου Πανορός?) 90, 247
Δλαύβα (Δλάβα) 11, 14, 42, 52-4, 59, 67, 
75-6, 79, 82-3, 142, 156, 158-60, 181, 
282, 321, 428, 433, 439-40, 442, 463; 
r. 216-7, 429; S., Christianized 157, 
320, 424, 429, 468; S., Macedonian 
429
Δ.λιγκ see Δλατζιν
Δ.μάιν.δο-γούρ 71
Δ.μινάρ 99
Δαβαρχά, cf. K.ρρκ, Κερχ 182
Δ.μ.ντ.δ see Δαμαρλάν (Δλαζαρία) and 
Δαμαρλάν (Δλαζαρία)
Δ.μινβ.μ, in Δατε την 255
Δ.ηγάν (Δηγάν, Δηγύφνι?) 143, 397
Δ.μιν-β.ν (Δηγ-β.ν) 108, 336
Δ.νκ.δ village and p., in the Ηνδούκσθ, 
cf. Σάνγλν 112
Δαρκότα 58, 190
Δ.φάλα (Δφάλα), in Δαφρα 163, 472; cf. 
also Δφάλα
Δαγδήδα 55, 63, 73, 95, 113, 118, 225, 234; 
r. (Δαγδήδα) 55, 73, 198, 211; 
Σαγονδάν 95, 235, 274, 304, 374
Σόκχ 22, 116, 355
Σο-κό Μο-χο, Δυργις τ. 302
Σο-λο-φούν 294
Σομαλίλαν 473
Σωμάν 388
Σονγό γογο 476
Δ.δορία (Δηδορία) 18, 21, 36, 38, 40-1, 53, 
59, 69, 79, 83, 148, 153-6, 158
Δαλάτο 424
Δπιν της Δθέρθ (Δθ.δπέρθ) 200
Δ.κλια Δι Σιλίρη; near the Δνδούκσθ, 
cf. Δθύγκθον και Δθίκτυλ 112, 364
Δ.ρίχ (Δρίζα?) 57
Σιναρά 254, 370
Σ.ρεκά (Δ.ρεκά) r. 276
Σσό-χουν 194
Σταλίναβάθ (Δ.σταλίναβάθ) 353
Σ.τβρ.σ ι 117
Σ.τάκλ δ (Δπελ: Δθάκαλδ, Δθίσκαμι?), 
near the Δαξαρτές, different from 
Σ.τάκλ 72, 118
Σ.τάκλ Δ, see Δ.σκαν, near Τουρφάν 94, 293
Στοκέ Σπίνθος, in Χούτταλ 359-60
“Στοιχειά Δαχτύλων” (Δρόμος της Δαχτύλων), cf.
Δαραύτ-προγκάν, Τασκέντ, Τασκέντ 
233, 357
Σόμβα, in Νυβία 475
Σόμβαθ 114
Σόμβαρα, in Ινδία 88, 190, 244-5
Σο-χου (Σοκ-χου) 26, 85, 232
Σόδαν, cf. Νότρες 8, 33, 52, 58, 79, 83, 
153-4, 164-5, 179
Σωκγόν, on the Χ ρ 303
Σωκγόν see Σωκγόν
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tabghach (Taugast, China under Wei dynasty) 284, 448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tāblān (Tāflān, Taylān) 156, 421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabrīz 142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabūk 148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tadmur 81, 149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taft see Taqi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tafqān (Turfan?) mt. 62, 94, 194, 271, 293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taghdumbash-Pamir 370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tāhā, in Egypt 476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tāhār 154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tāhī see Tari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ta‘īf 146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tā in fil-bahr see Jabal-T.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tā‘ir-su, cf. Andichārāgh 360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tājkistān 353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tagus (Tāju) r. 79, 155, 205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṭakkā-Dešā, cf. Taqi 239, 249-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṭakrit 66, 76, 140, 201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talas see Ṭarāz, cf. Kūmī-Talas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṭalaqān, near Qazvin 132; in Gūzgān 5, 107, 200, 332, 335; in Tukhāristān (Ṭaraqān,Ṭāyaqān) 63, 109, 339, 340-1, 349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṭalish (Ṭaylāsān?) 391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṭālkhūz 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṭambūk-i Mūristān 212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṭamīn t. 146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tāmīsha 134, 386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tāmīstān 128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tāmilīyat (Namlīyat) 120, 360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tāmrān 106, 334, 336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṭāna (Thāna), near Bombay 238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṭanās 154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṭangīr (Ṭanja) 53, 78, 154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṭangut 228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṭānis (Ṭanais), cf. Don 216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṭānnu-ola mt. 283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṭānūkh 67, 204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṭaptī r. 196, 198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṭāq 110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṭāqī (Ṭaqqīn), cf. Ṭakka-deša 91, 239, 249, 251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṭarābulus, in Syria 9, 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṭārān 58, 190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṭārāz (Ṭalas, Ulugh Ṭalas) 61, 100, 119, 194, 202, 269, 274, 292, 303, 306, 308, 357; r. 286, 358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṭarbaghatai range, cf. To-ta 274, 278, 283, 286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṭār (Ṭahl), in Nubia 164, 475, 482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṭarīm (Kuchā, Wajākh) r. 70, 206-7, 222, 235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṭarqu (Ṭarkhu), cf. Samandar 452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṭarkūs (Ṭarkūsh) 118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṭarmīdīh (Ṭirmīdīh, Termez) 71, 114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṭarmūt 221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṭārsāqan r. see Ishim 202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṭarsūs 149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṭārum, in Fārs 128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tās (Unās?) 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṭasāwā, in N. Africa 474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṭa-shih, cf. Wen-su 294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṭashkent see Chāhch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṭash-Qurghan, in Sarikol 233, 369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṭasht (Bakhtagan) l. 183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṭāt t., in Shīrvān 408, 456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṭatabi t. 284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṭatar, a Turkish t. 285; Volga T. 460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṭār, a branch of Kimāk 304, 309, 317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṭaurus 204; Cilician 205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṭā us fortress, cf. Villas 460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṭavarān, near Tus 103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṭavāvis 113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṭavaj 74, 212, or Tavaz 127, 377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṭaylasān (Ṭālish) 180, 391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṭaymā 148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṭaymāts, cf. Jabalān 67, 203, 221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṭ.Sāgh.r, read Yabāghu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tekes r. 275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tekinābād 343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tephrike see Abrīq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terek r., cf. Armn 204, 457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tīiaspī 391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tījīn, in Gīlān 137, 390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tījīn see Tizhin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tih bani Isrā’il (Sinai desert) 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tihāma 146, 203; mts. 66, 77, 145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tījasī 391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tijin, in Gilān 137, 390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tijin see Tizhin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Til (Till), on the Hilmand 73, 111, 211, 345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timbuktu 477</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Ting-ling (Kishtim) 286
Tinnis town 55, 151; l. 54, 56, 78, 81, 151-2
Tirchul, in Burma 242, cf. T.rsul
Tirgaran 365
Tiz 123
Tizhin-rūd (Tijin), in Māzandarān 77, 218, 237
T.khsīn, a Khallukh t. 287 (cf. 282, n. 3)
T. nkūy (?), in China 84
T. nzāgh-art, read: Topragh-art 95
Tohguhzug, cf. T'u-chūch, Ghuz 11, 13, 25-6, 28, 34-5, 52, 54, 62, 80, 82-5, 92-8, 207, 227, 263-77, 287, 352, 481
Toksun, near Turfan 272
Tolās, (Tolös, Tūlis), name of the Uyghur (?) federation 266, 284-5, cf. Tūlas, Tūlis
Toledo (Tulaiṭula) 69, 79, 155
Tong valley, near the Issik-kul 98, 292
Tonkin 243
Topragh-art 276
Toqmaq (perhaps < Tūmkat ?), cf. Suisi, Tun-kien 289, 303
Tortosa (Tūrtūsha) 155
To-ta (Tarbaghatāi?) mt. 286
Trans-Alay Range 198
Transoxiana 19, 22, 30, 35-6, 38-9, 61-3, 71, 80, 83, 97, 100, 102, 112-9, 121, 351-8
Transoxanian Marches (hudūd) 30, 83, 92, 119-22, 359-71
Transylvania 444
T.rsul (Tūsūl, Tirchul) 87, 242
Truxillo (Tūrjāla) 69, 155, 205
Tsana l. 476
Tsanar see Sanār
Tsaritsin, on the Volga 453
Tšiš-shī mts., near Lan-chou (?) 207
Tšna r., in Russia 404
Tual-tā see Tūlas 445, 457
T'u-chūch, first Turkish empire, cf. Tohguhzug 264, 286, 290, 447; Western T. 270, 286, 300
Tudela (Tūtaxtial) 155, 417
Tukath (Tukkath) 117, 357
Tukhs (Tukhīs) 35, 62, 83, 97-9, 297-300, 302, 304
Tukhārīstān 63-4, 71-2, 105, 108-9, 111, 278, 337, 347, 362; Upper T. 349; Tukharīs 304, 359, 445
Tūlas (Tuval-Ās, Tual-Ās, Tual-tā), cf. Alān, Ās 43, 162, 324, 445, 456
Tūlas (Tūlis, Tūlisī?) mts., cf. Altaï, Kin-shan, Tōlās, Yūn.s 62, 196, 283, 287
Tālim 137, 391
Tu-lu, cf. Western T'u-chūch 286, 300
Tūmkat (perhaps > Toqmaq) 289, 291, 297
Tūnal see Tong
Tunikābun 387, 410

Tūnis 153
Tūnkat see Nūkath 24, 117, 356
Tūnkat-i B.khārnān 118
Tun-kien, cf. Tūnkat 289
Tūrā, in Egypt 476
Tūrān, in Balūchistān 123, 372
Tūrār-Zarākh, on the Jaxartes, cf. Otrar 358
Tūrfān (cf. Tāfquān) 26, 195, 229, 271
Turghay r. 308
Türkisch, cf. Issik-kul, Boro-dabasun, Shur-kul 28, 54, 98, 184, 290
Tuwaysha 378
Ubaru (Bula) 76, 138
Üc-qurīqan 284
Ugra r. 323
Ūj (Uch-Turfan) 28, 98, 293-5
Ujjayn, cf. Nu'nin 189, 245, 336
'Ukbarā 76, 140, 218
Uk-tagh mt. 305
'UlayqAliq?), 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
Ur, (Chashma-yi sabz, Shahd) 55, 185
Urgun (?), cf. Farmul 251
Urkath (Uzkath?) 99, 304
Urmiya 143, 183; l. (Kabūdhān) 379
Ur.shāfīn, cf. Manduri-pattan, Mandam 27, 87, 243
Urshin (Urshin) see Orissa 27, 87, 241
Urtab see Arthaniya 75, 159, 438
Uruchhi 265
Urín-árj (Uzun-aghach) mt. 97, 290, 298
Usáng, (Arsáng, K.rsáng) 25, 71, 94, 208
Ushbáníkat 358
Ushbúrqán (Shabúraqán, Shibarghán, Sapurgan, &c.) 5, 39, 117, 335
Ushnu (cf. Asna) 394
Ushurj 336
Uskaf bani Junayd 139
Ustuvá, cf. Khúján 29, 77
Üst-yurt (Chink) 312, 314
Uswán see Assuan
Utrigur t. 264
Uwal (Wál) is., cf. Bahrayn 190
Uyghur, on the Orkhon 13, 233, 264, 268; in Kan-chou (Sari-yoghur) 26, 227, 256, 264-5; On-Uyghur 265; cf. Oghor, Tooghuzghuz, Yíghur, Yughur
Uzam (?) 130
Uzbek, in Afghanistan 288
Úzgand 72, 116, 211, 280, 355; rivers of, Yabághu and Barskhán (Khaylám, Nárin) 72-3, 116, 288
Üzkath (Z.kath), on the Chu 98, 291, 304
Uzu see Dniepr
Uzun-aghach see Urun-árj
Valencia (Balansiya) 155
Vábntí (Vántti, Vábí, &c.), a Slav town 159, 428, 431
Vadhár 352
Vagkhath (Vagat) see Faghkhat 354
Vakhán (Vakhkhán) 39, 63, 71, 86, 120-1, 325, 350, 366-8; r. (Vakhkháb) 208; Vakhli (Vakhánians) 39, 121
Vakhjír p. 364
Vakhsh (Vakhsháb, Surkháb) r. 71, 120, 198, 209, 360-1; district 120; mts. (Alay?) 71
Válishtán see Bális
Vallabha, south of Chaul 246
Valválij 72, 109, 209, 340
Varáčan (Barshiya, Bashli?) 449, 453
Varaghshar 113
Varang see Warank
Vardhúl 117
Vardoj r. 365
Vardük 357
Vardúqiya (Bardú?) 144, 398
Variag (Var’ag), cf. Warank 432-3
Varmeshán see D.rn.shán
Várpúvá (Varfu) 136, 387
Vartân (Warthán, Altan) 77, 142, 395, 403
Varzuqán, near Ahar 396
Vásarník see Sávník
Vascones see Basques
Vastán, in Daylam 136, 388
Váthkath (Vankath) 116, 355
Vatichi, Russian t. 436
Váyagán 74, 127-8, 213, 379
Vayhind (Ohind, Gandhára) 63, 92, 251, 253-4
Vayshagir (Bishgird, Vëshagirt) 115, 120, 353
Vehrot (Öxus) 331
Venice 423
Vima, in Tabaristán 135
Vindhya, mts. 198, 236
Vindúshávar see Gundé-Shávar
Vistula r. 430
V.j.khváñ (Vajákh), in Tibet 93, cf. Wajákh (?)
Vlachs (Rumanians) 468
Volg, cf. Itil 41, 43-4, 305, 312-6, 462
Volga Tartars see Tatar
V.r.ní mt., in Ghur (?) 343
V.r.shan, in Khazaria, cf. Yarac an (?) 453
Vuláshgird 124
Vulundur see W.lnd.r 470
Vuy-tsang, in Tibet, cf. Usāng 262
Wei-ho r. 206
Wei-su (B.nchul, *B.nchuk) 27-8, 98, 240, 283, 293-4, 296
White Croats 430, 432, cf. Serbs
Wlsu, northern t. 309
W. lnd.r (W.lnd.rí, *Wulundur), cf. Vanandar 443, 459, 468-70
Women, Isle of, (Kwen, Naissare) 8, 58-9, 191
Wu-sun t. 444
Xádhró-suka see Vayshagir 353
Xvanvant mt. 330
Yabághu, Khallukh t. 285, 287-8; r. (cf. Úzgand r.) 116, 211, 288-9, 293
Yabghu (Yafghu, Janart) 276, 296
Yābis (Ibiza) is. 59, 192
Yafinj, cf. Māb.nj-J.rābās 95, 276-7
Yaghmā (Y.ghmiyā) t. 34-5, 62, 73, 83, 95-8, 195, 260, 270, 278, 290, 301
Yam byes (B.yn, B.yin, B.yun) 3-5
Yamka (B.yn, B.yin, B.yun) 3-5
Yamás (B.yun, B.yin, B.yn) 3-5
Yamás (B.yn, B.yin, B.yun) 3-5
Yamás (B.yn, B.yin, B.yun) 3-5
Yamás (B.yn, B.yin, B.yun) 3-5
Yamás (B.yn, B.yin, B.yun) 3-5
Zāmin 115
Zamin-dāvar 64, 111, 177, 344-5
Zamm 200
Zamr-i Ātash-parast 366
Zandana 112
Zandarāmish 116
Zangān 132
Zang, "East-Africans" 51, 163-4; Wāq-wāqian Z. 56
Zangistān (Zangibār, Zanj) 33-4, 52, 83, 163-4, 179, 228, 471-2; sea 52
Zangūya 262
Zarafrshān r. see Soghd r.; range see Buttamān 211
Zarah 55, 73, 185
Zāri-i Murgh mt., in Ghur 343
Zarīn-rudh (Zāyanda-rud) 131, 383
Zarmān (spelt: Armān) 113, 352
Zarq, in Marv 105
Zarqān, in Fārs 128, 379
Zava, near Khotan 93, 259
Zawila, in Fazzān 153, 416, 477
Zaybāk, cf. R.kht.j.b 120, 364-5, 367
Zayla' (spelt: Ryn) 474
Zaytun, in China 227
Zhāsht (Jāsht, Rāsht) 63, 120, 361, 363
Zina-āb 353
Zinvar 114
Zirīgarān, in Daghestān 450
Zīrkhān 365
Z.kat see Uzkath 291
Zughar (Zo'ar) 67, 151, 415
Zuzan (Zozan) 103
The following names could not be transliterated in Latin characters:
Yahudhan see Jahudhān
Yahudhiq 117
Yakh-su (Akhshu), cf. Kulāb r. 208
Yakh, Kuh-i yakh see Qasak
Yakutsk 285
Yalama r. 456
Yalāpān (?) 118
Yamāk (Yımāk), cf. Kimāk, Namakiya 305, 316
Yamakoṭi see Jamagird 189
Yammāna 146
Yamgān, Y.nb.qān see Yumgān
Yamkert see Jamagird
Yang-i-Baliq, in the T'ien-shan 235, 272
Yang-i-Kand see Dih-inau
Yār, near the Issik-kul [perhaps = Sārīgh] 292, 297-8
Yarkhoto (Si-chou) 265
Yarīm, in Arabia 413
Yākand 248; r. 206
Yasi p. 292-3, 310
Yasin-Gilgit r. 210
Yayavipna (Iabadiu, Jazirat al-ﬁdda) 186
Yayik (Ural) r. 215, 309, 313-4
Yazd (Katha) 129, 380
Yazdashīr, in Kirmān 375
Yazīdiya, in Shirvān 404
Yemen 20-1, 40, 66, 81, 146-7
Yen-ch'i see Qarashar 275
Yenişey r. 196, 283, 286, 362
Yevlakh, on the Kurr 400
Y.ghsūn-Yāsū, in Kimakia 100, 309
Yighur see Yughur
Yighur of Turkistān 309
Yumār see Obi
Y. ra r., near Khotan 255
Yū-chou, cf. Üj, Wen-su 27, 294
Yugriia, "Southern" (?) 318
Yūkand 117
Yūghūr (Yīghūr, Kimak-Yīghūr), a t. near the Aral sea 180, 215, 310, 312
Yulduz, in the T'ien-shan 275-6
Yumgān 367-8
Yūn (?) kingdom, in Tūkhāristān 109, 340, 349
Yūn (Bwr, Mwr?) l., in Fārs 54, 127, 183
Yūnān see Greece 158
Yūngū see Aq-su 296
Yūn-nan 236, 240
Yūn.s mt. see Tūlas 287
Yūra (Yūghra), t. 309-10, 437
Zāb, Greater and Lesser 76
Zabīd 20-1, 40, 147
Zābul (Jābulistān) 112, 346
Zaghāwa (spelt: Lāba) 165, 477
Zagros 383
Zakatali (according to A. Genko, *Zakartala? "Zacharia's plot") 410
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B. PERSONAL NAMES AND TITLES

'Abd al-Rahmân, Cordovan caliph 470
'Abdallah ibn al-Mubârak 141
'Abbâsids 11, 12-13, 15, 27, 40, 140-1, 352, 460
'Abd al-Qayyûm b. al-Husayn b. 'Ali al-Fârisî, owner and scribe of the H. 'A. vii-viii, 166
Abraham 37, 88, 139, 150
abshâd (ayshã, ansã), Khazar title 162, 451
Abû 'Ali Ahmad, of Chaghâniyân 17
Abû 'Ali, a Mu'tazilite imâm 381
Abû Bakr Muḥammad, of Chaghâniyân 17
Abû Dâ'ûdids 341, 345, 359
Abû Dulaf of Karaj 132, 383
Abû-Abbâs, caliph 141
Abul-Faḍl ibn-al-'Amîd 29, 133
Abul-Faḍl Gulpâyagâni ix, xv, 3
Abû-Fat'h, of Badhakhshân 349-50
Abû-Hâríth, see Muḥammad b. Āhmad
Abû Muzaffar, see Muḥammad b. Āhmad
Abû Muḥammad [b.] Ḥasan b. Mîhrân 177
Abû Muṣṭafâ, Muhammad b. 246
Abû-Naṣr Muḥammad b. Muḥammad 6, 177
Abû-Sâj, see Yusûf
Adam 37, 61, 146, 194
'Alî b. Abî Tâlîb 17, 140
'Ali b. Abî Ṭâlib 17, 140
'Ali b. Haytham, of Shîrûn 406
'Ali b. Muṣâ al-Riḍâ, in Mashhad 103
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Chasda'i ben Shafrut 470
Chaulukya dynasty 250
choereiscopos (korikos) 402

Dahum (Ruhmî, &c.), king in India 62, 72, 80, 87, 236-8.
Daniel, prophet 131, 382.
Dân-sânkû, see B.dân-sânkû
Daqiqi, poet 178
Dârâ (Darius) 129
Darmashi-shâh (Varmêshân), in Güzgân 106, 333
Dhanga, Chandôl king 237
Dib-baqwy 357
Dîqân-i Îlãq 117, 356
Dîqân-i Zâhast 120
Dula, Alan prince 457
Daqqâq, Hasan Abû Sa'id 127, 377

etâbîr, Turkish title 265
Erân-shâh (?), see Layzân-shâh 407

Faďl b. Sahîl 350
Faďl b. Yahyâ, Barmakid 350, 361
Fâghfur-i Chîn 84
Fâ'iq, amîr 176
Fânâ-Khûrsâu, see Panâ-Khursâu
Farûdîn (Afrîdhûn, Farîdhûn) 6, 84, 106, 174, 227
Farîghûnids 4-7, 173-8, 336, 344
Fâtîmids, cf. Maghribi 20, 27, 89, 239, 246, 415
Fazârî, astronomer 133, 189, 384
Fazhîghûn, cf. Afrîgh 173
Filân-shâh 454

Galên (Jâšînûs) 151
Ghâbê, king in India, cf. Jâbê 237
Ghâdâ'îrî, poet 384
Ghâzâvadôs 30, 177, 343-4, 346
Ghûr-shâh 1, 5, 110
Gog and Magog (absent in the text) 439, 451
Gurjara-Prathîha dynasty 198, 239, 246, 249
Gûzgân-khûdah 175

Habbâr b. al-Aswâd 372
Hajjâj b. Yusûf 138
Hâllâj 23, 128, 379
Hâmânûdôs 20
al-Harbi, âbû Naʃr 18
Hârûn al-Rashid 103, 149
Hasan Basrî 139
Hâšîm b. Bânîjur 353
Hâšîm b. Dâ'ud, of Khuttâlân 361
Hêkmât, A. A. khân 376
Hermes 37, 152
Hîvâlî, rulers of Şân'â 20
Hsî Tsung, emperor 267
Hstûn Tsung, emperor 265
Huang-Ch'ao 259, 267
Ibrahim Darbândî, ruler of Shirvân 405

idigut, king of Bish-balîq 271
Idrisids 417
Ihtisâh, kings of Farghânâ 355
Îmlâm s.n.-jâbûya 288
Ilyâsid dynasty 374
Isaac 150
Ismâ'îl ibn-'Abbâd, minister 18
Ismâ'îl ibn-Ahmad, Sâmânîd 6, 176
I Tsung 265

Jâba “the Indian”, king of Sumatra (?) 57, 249
Jâba-yi khushk, “Continental” Jâba 63, 249
jabghû see yabghû
jabîyâ 298
Jacob 150
Ja'far b. Sahl b. Marzbân 6-7
Jalâl al-dîn Khwârazm-shâh 348
Javânshîr b. Grigor 396
Jaypâl of Vayhind 92, 237, 254
Jebu-Khâk'an 304
Jesus 150
Jubbâ'i, Abu 'All 130
Julandôs 45, 143
Julandîds 39, 40, 390
Kâbil, king of Nubia 78, 164, 475
Kâbil-shâh 350
Kanârang 379
Kasrânîd dynasty 404, 406
Kaykâ'ûs 189
Khâidu 275
Khâqân Rüs see Rûs-khâqân
Khâqân of Tibet 85
Khazar-khâqân 451
Khîrkîkh-khâqân 96, 97
Khudzân-shâh 144, 404, 455
Khûr-tegin 355
Khutoğlan 288
Khûrsân-shâh 121-2, 174, 180, 309-10, 348, 371
Kimak-khâqân 100; Kimâq-kabghû 310
King of the East, see Sâmânîds 112
Kisâ'i the Reader 133, 384
K. nd.s, Magyar title 320, 323
K. nd.r, title 323-4
Kobrat 467, 470
Kül-tèkin, title 312
Kûl-tegin 302
Kûr-şûl (Kul-chur) 301

Kûyô, Saffârid ruler of Ithân 110
L. bân-shâh, cf. albân 454
Li-k'ø-yung 267
Layzân-shâh (Lâyrân, &c.) 144, 404-11
Lohara dynasty 250
Long-tègin see P'äng-t'e-le 226
Mir-ı rudh 113
Louis the Pious, emperor 433
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Maghrībi, cf. Fātimids 3, 246
al-maharaj of Ẓābān 473
Mahdi, caliph 10, 311
Māhmūd Ghaznavīd 6, 27, 176, 327, 336, 346
Mahodaya, cf. Ba‘ūra 253
Mā'min, caliph 10–11, 40, 112, 140, 220, 350
Mā’mūns of Khwārazm 174, 371
manaf (?) 293
Mānī 25, 84–5, 130, 269
Maniānī, a Soğhdīān 293
Manjik, poet 178
Manṣūr, caliph 138
Manṣūr (b.) Nūh, Sāmānid 6
Marwān, Omayyad 452, 455, 476
al-Marwazī, ʿAllī, a general 16
al-Marwazī, Muhammad Su‘luk 16
Marzbān b. Zādiya 6
Marzūbān b. Muḥammad, Musāfīrīd 396–7, 406, 409
Masʿūd Ghaznavīd 177, 334, 336, 343
Mazyadīs 404
Māziyār 387
Mihrān dynasty 397
M.n.b (Fanjab, puṅgawa?), king of Ẓābān 164
Moses 148, 449
Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Muṣafīr, of Chaghāniyān 178
Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Ḥārīth, Farighūnī vii, 4, 6, 49, 173, 175–6
Muḥammad b. Faḍl Qarmatī 21, 66, 203
Muḥammad b. Ḥasan the Lawyer 133, 384
Muḥammad b. Yaẓīd, Shīrvān-shāh 406, 455
Muḥammad Ghaznavīd 177
Muḥammad Khwārazm-shāh 309
Muḥammad Nādir khān, king of Afghanistan 337
Muḥammad b. Zakariyyā Rāzī 132, 384
Muḥtāj family of Chaghāniyān 353
Muʿizz, Fāṭimīd 27
Munṭaṣīr, Sāmānid 177
al-Muqanna’ā 311, 356
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Qutayba b. Muslim 338, 340
rāy, Indian rajah 62, 72, 238; cf. Ballah-rāy
rāyina [*rāniya?], Indian queen 87, 238, 243
R.hmī, cf. Dāhum 237
R’urik 433
Rus-khāqān 159, 433, 436, 438
Rustam 17
Rusudan, queen of Georgia 397
Rutbi, see Zunbīl
Sabuktagın 30, 176, 342, 344
Sa’d b. ʿAbd al-Muṣafīr, of Chaghāniyān 178
Saṭūhā (?), ruler in Sumatra (?) 87, 236, 241
Satuq Bughra-khan 278, 281
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tarkhān-khāqān, Khazar title 161, 451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tekin, title 288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T'e-p'ang-le 275, 301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timūr 196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tubbat-khāqān 71, 92, 93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tūr, son of Farādīn 227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turgish-khaqan 284, 289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuzūn, Turkish chief 20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. AUTHORITIES QUOTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L'Abrégé des Merveilles 187, 426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abul-Fidā 372, 390, 453, 455–6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abul-Ghāzī 292, 308, 310, 312, 357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abū Ma'shar Balkhi 189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abū Sahl Ahmad b. ’Ubaydillāh, biographer of Abū Zayd Balkhi 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abū Ṣāliḥ, The Churches of Egypt 476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abū Zayd Balkhi, see Balkhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abū Zayd Muhammad Sirāfī 224, 259, 267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn al'-Adhārī ['Idhārī] 425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahlwardt 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmedrozd 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anvari 328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aristotle xvi, 7, 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aristov 286, 311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenian Geography 32–3, 330–1, 334, 401, 445–6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assemani 290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn al-Athīr 20, 28, 245, 267, 311, 397, 421, 453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Aṭṭār, Farīd al-dīn 354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avesta 330, 353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-'Aẓīzī 449, 477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bā bur-Nāma 253, 336, 354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacot, J. 258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badger, G. P. 39, 396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baghdādī, 'Abdul-Qādir 338</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Index C

Bailey, H. W. xix. 271
al-Bakri 314, 319-20, 322-3, 416, 426-7, 456-8
Baladhuri 4, 374, 384, 395, 398, 404, 408-9, 421-2, 447, 449, 455-6
Balkhi, Abu Zayed 6, 15, 17-19, 21-3, 25-7, 34-7, 41, 301, 325, 351, 434, 437, 443
Barnett, Dr. L. D. 243
Barsov, N. 323
Barth, H. 474
Barthold, V. V. xi-xii, xiv, 4, 6, 13, 16-18, 22-6, 28-30, 39, 43-4, 140, 211, 266, 274 and passim
Z. Gesch. der Saffariden 346
Mesto Prikaspiiskikh Oblastey 439
Ibn Sa'id 211
Semirechye 280, 294, 302
Barthoux, J. 253
al-Battani 7-9, 12, 28, 190, 192
Ibn Battuta 241, 245, 456
Bayhaqi, Abul-Fadl Muhammad, Tarikh 173, 177, 200, 334, 343, 362
Becker, C. H. 474, 477
Benveniste, E. 203, 271, 354
Berezin, I. N. 273
Beveridge, Annette S. 252
Bichurin, Iakinf (Hyacinth) 226, 262, 264, 284
al-Biruni, Abu Rayhan xiii, 18, 24, 33-4, 233, 368, 372, 422, 432
Canon 9, 180, 189, 204, 244-5, 248, 251, 272, 280, 284, 295, 309, 325, 332, 335-6, 340-1, 356, 365, 376, 397-9, 372, 377, 417, 425
Chronology 330
India 34, 189, 238, 247-9, 252, 335, 338, 362
al-Tafhim 181, 189, 284
Blagden, C. O. 242
Bleichstein 444
Blochet 460
de Boer, Tj. 11
Book of Marvels (an unknown) 415, 471
Boswell, A. Bruce 315
Boyer, P. 462
Bretschneider 26, 223, 272, 284, 446, 462
Brockelmann 3, 8, 11-12, 15, 23
Brooks 419
Brosset, M. F. 398, 401, 457
Browne, E. G. 178, 384-5
Brutzkus, Y. 431
Büchner, V. F. 344
Bundahishn 200, 254, 326, 327, 377, 379, 400
Burrard and Hayden 196
Bury 421, 440, 467
Butkov, P. 456
Cahen, Claude 393, 395
Carta Catalana 299
Cerulli 473
Chahar-Maqala 353
Chardin 183
Charmoy 426
Charpentier, J. 444
Chau Ju-kua 241
Chiu T'ang-shu 266, 288
Christensen, A. 175
Chwolson, D. 317-18, 430, 437, 461-2
Codera, F. 425
Codium 341, 357
Cohn-Wiener 476
Cooley, W. D. 476
Cousens, H. 246, 371
Cunningham, Gen. A. 247
Dames, L., 328, 343, 374
Defrémery, Ch. 426
Deguignes 226
Delafosse 476
Deny, J. 311
Devic, L. M. 471
Dietrich 317
Dimashqi 193, 254
Dolbezev, B. 272
Dorn, B. 385, 403, 426
Dozy and de Goeje 417
Dussaud, R. 414
Dvornik, F. 424, 431, 440
Elias, N. 369
Elliot-Dowson 27, 235, 253, 372
Eusebius 9
Ibn-Fadlan 41, 215, 309, 312-14, 425, 450, 452, 460
Fakhr al-din Mubarakhshahi 180, 229, 269
al-Farghani, Ahmad b. Muhammad 178
Ibn al-Faqih xvi, 14, 332, 384, 387, 409, 418, 420-1, 425, 475, 481-2
Farrukhi 178
Fars-Nama, GMS 212, 214, 376-7
Fars-Nama-yi Nasiri, by Hasan Fasai 183, 376-7, 379
Fehér, G. 440
Fejér, G. 439
Ferrand, G. 188, 228, 241, 471-2
al-Fihrist 3, 13, 290, 352
Firdausi 17, 383, see Shah-nama
Firkovich 470-1
Fitzgerald, Dr. P. 230
Foucher, A. 211
Frahn 426, 434, 460, 463
Franke, O. 224, 263, 265
Frobenius, L. 477

L12
Index C

Majumdar, N. G. 371
Malov, S. E. 265
Manandian, A. 397
Mann, Oscar 396
Mannerheim, baron 257, 265
Man-shu 242
Maqrizi 221, 267, 476
Marāqīd al-ittilā'ī 192
Marko Polo 5, 369, 374
Marquart (Markwart), J., x, xiv and passim
Arktische Länder 284, 437, 451, 462, 466, 469
Beiträge (ZDMG, xlix) 410, 421, 455
Benin 473, 476
Chronologie 210, 266, 448, 461
Erumahr 6, 26 and passim
Historische Glossen 356
Iberer und Hyrkanier 421-2, 444
Komanen 446
Kulturanalysten 322, 455, 457
Das Reich Zābul 333, 344-5, 370
Streifzüge 13, 41-3, 266, 322, 461 and passim
Südarmenien 218, 383
Skizzen 211, 398
Wehrot 186, 209-10, 233, 327, 331, 340, 349, 352, 359, 362-3, 383, 400
Woher... der Name Kaukasus? 199
Marr, N. Y. 402
Marschall v. Bieberstein, F. A. 404
al-Marwāzī, Ja'far ibn-Ahmad, geographer 12-13
Marsyas, Prince V. I. 300, 360
Maspero, G. 240
Mas'udī, xix
Marr, N. Y. 402
Marschall v. Bieberstein, F. A. 404
al-Marwāzī, Ja'far ibn-Ahmad, geographer 12-13
Marsyas, Prince V. I. 300, 360
Maspero, G. 240
Mas'ūdī, xix
Murrūj 181 (ii, 15), 210 (i, 212), 224-5 (i, 307, 347), 242 (i, 388), 253 (i, 206), 265 (i, 288), 267 (i, 305), 312 (i, 213), 320 (i, 262), 337 (iv, 48), 345 (viii, 42), 347 (iii, 254), 350 (ii, 302), 394 (ii, 6), 400-2 (ii, 68), 403 (ii, 75), 409 (ii, 2), 441 (iii, 61-5), 443 (i, 212), 446 (ii, 42), 447-8 (ii, 41-2), 452 (iii, 7), 456 (ii, 65), 463 (ii, 14), 467 (ii, 58), 469 (ii, 58, v, 212), 472 (iii, 6), 474 (iii, 32)
Tambih 11-12, 14, 216, 349, 418, 439, 446, 467, 469
Mathnawī (Jalāl ad-din Rūmī) 297
Melgunov, G. 356, 385-6, 410
Mehoranski, P. M. 302
Mikkola, J. J. 460
Miller, B. V. 408-9
Miller, K., Mappae Arabicae 216-17
Miller, V. F. 444
Minchul kuthukhtu 255
Mingana, Dr. A. 182, 284-5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pakhomov, E. A.</td>
<td>403, 405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palló, M.</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patkanov, K.</td>
<td>401, 453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Persian Gulf Pilot</td>
<td>214, 376, 377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peschel-Ruge</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petrovsky, N.</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pevtsov</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playfair</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popov, A. N.</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poppe, N.</td>
<td>453, 460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poettler</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pevtsov</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pevtsov</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poudzarin</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qābūs-nāma</td>
<td>173, 331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qārān</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qazvīnī, Muḥammad khān xix</td>
<td>174, 178, 353, 365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qazvīnī, Zakariyāw</td>
<td>194, 367, 387, 419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn al-Qīṭī</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quatremère</td>
<td>224, 475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qudāma</td>
<td>26, 190, 225, 256, 268-9, 287, 291, 298, 301, 306, 310, 328, 384, 418, 420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qorān</td>
<td>39, 143, 148, 173, 437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabino, H. L.</td>
<td>385, 388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radloff, W.</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rājatarangī</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramsay, W. R.</td>
<td>220, 418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramstedt, G.</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rashid al-dīn</td>
<td>4, 12, 173, 223, 228, 232, 273, 284, 315, 448, 460, 469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rasovsky, D. A.</td>
<td>313, 315-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravaisse</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raverty, H. G.</td>
<td>89, 251, 273, 371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray, H. Ch.</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redhouse, Sir J. W.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reichelt</td>
<td>230, 275, 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinaud xv</td>
<td>9-10, 20, 189, 192, 221, 223-5, 391, 472, 474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richthofen, F. von</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riḍa-qulī khān</td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockhill, W.</td>
<td>223-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robertson, Sir G. S.</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roeder, G.</td>
<td>475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roerich, G.</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosen, baron V.</td>
<td>20, 395, 427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross, Sir E. D.</td>
<td>25, 255, 269, 369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubruquis</td>
<td>277, 315, 463-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Chronicles</td>
<td>311, 316, 434, 439, 462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Rusta xvii</td>
<td>7-8, 14, 27, 35, 43, 178, 321-3, 327, 429, 437, 442, 446, 452, 458-9, 462, 473</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- Index entries are sorted alphabetically.
- Pages listed are those where the entry is mentioned.
- Some entries include additional information such as editions or volumes.
- The entries are formatted to match the style of the original document.
D. LOCAL PRODUCTS AND SPECIALITIES

Ambergris—Hindūstān, Rāmī, Santarem

Animals: Civet Cats—Sarandīb; Elephants—Andrās, &c., China, Qimār, Ur.shfīn, Urshīn; Game—Ararat, Ghūz, Jabal-al-Qīlāl, Yaghmā; Harts—Ighraj-art; Monkeys—Yemen; Musk-deer—Sarandīb, Saukjū, Tūlas; Rhinoceroses—Qāmarūn, Rāmī, Sarandīb, Wāq-wāq; Wild Asses—mt. of the Oases, region between Egypt and Nubia; Wild Sheep—mt. of the Oases

Antidotes—Rāmī, Čūshāng

Armour, Arms, Coats of Mail—Ghūr; Arrows—Chāch, Sikāshim; Blades—Urtāb; Bows—Chāch; “Solomonian” Swords—Rūs (p. 437)

Asa Poetiida—Marv, Sīstān

Birds: ‘Akka—on the Tarim; Faucons and Pelicans—Dihistān-sūr; Indian Cuckoos, K.ırkī, Parrots and Peacocks—India

Brooms—Gilān

Caraway—Barda

Cardamum—Sarandīb

Carpets—Fārs, Rūm (tanfasa); Prayer—Gilān, Jahrum, Mūḡān; Woollen—Bukhārā, Dārzāngī; Zīlū—Akhlāt

Arjī, Bargī, Bidlis, Gūzgān, Jahrum, Khoy, Mūḡān, Nakhkevān, Fārs, Sīstān; Rugs—Amol, Fārs; Palās-rugs—Chaghānīyān, Gūzgān, Mūḡān; Stuff used as Carpets—Sīstān, Tābaristān; cf. Gilīm

Cattle—Bulgharī, Hāshumkīrt, Khazar Pecheneks, Khur, Kī-jānān, Maghrib, Turān; Asses—Egypt; Cameels—Sarakh, Shībīr, S.īlābur; Cows—Balūt, Chigīl, Ghūz, Gūzgān, Kātūn, Khallukh, Khirkhīz, Khuttalān, K. rāl, &c., Tibet, Toghużghūz; Horses—Chadghal, Chaghānīyān, Ghūz, Gūzgān, Kātūn, Khallukh, Khirkhīz, Khuttalān, K. rāl, &c., Tibet, Toghużghūz; Prisoners—Chadghal, Chigīl, Ghūz, Gūzgān, Hāshumkīrt, Inner Bulghār, Isbījāb, Jālūt, Khallukh, Khazar, Khazarian Pecheneks, Khirkhīz, Kh. mūd, Kīmāk, N. zvān, Rang-Rong, Saylakān, Sān, Saqlāb, Sīlābur, Tibet, Toghużghūz, Tuḥkūr, Tuḥkūr, Yaghmā; Mules—Barda’, Kīsh; Sheep—Balūt, Chadghal, Chigīl, Ghūz, Gūzgān, Hāshumkīrt, Inner Bulghār, Isbījāb, Jālūt, Khallukh, Khazar, Khazarian Pecheneks, Khirkhīz, Kh. mūd, Kīmāk, N. zvān, Rang-Rong, Saylakān, Sān, Saqlāb, Sīlābur, Tibet, Toghużghūz, Tuḥkūr, Tuḥkūr, Yaghmā, Zābulistān; Vakhshī Sheep—Līvakān; Swine—Saqlāb; Yaks—Saukju

Cereals—Andarāb, Dīhistān, Gharchistān, Mūḡān, Nasā, Nūbīn, Sīkimīshīt, Tuḥkūr; Barley—San’ā,
Index D

Sirrâyin; Millet—Sâqlâb, Kirmân; Rice—Daylâmân; Sorghum—Mughûn, &c., Sirrâyin; Wheat—Sanâ'

Cheese (?)—Karaj-i Rûdhrâvar; Rukkhân—Kâth

China (ghadâra)—China, Rayy

Cinnamon—China, Dârchin

Clothing: Aprons—Basrâ; Cloaks—Ispâhan, Rayy; Handkerchiefs—Egypt; Kerchiefs—Amol, Bulli Kerchiefs—Ubulla, Gold Shot—Amol; Puttees—Dârzangi; Quilted Garments—Kâth

Dates—'Abdasî, Alin, Arabia, Bam, Bayâs, Farah, Bahrûgân, &c., Nahrawân, Nim-Rûdhi, Qandabil; Dried dates—Sîstân; Figs—Hulwân; Grapes—Hamdân (p. 146), Mirvât (p. 321); Hazel-nuts—Lishtar; Jalghuza—Lahore; Mulberry—Barda'; Oranges, sour—Āmol, Balkh; Pomegranates—Khujand; Raisins—Kârûkh, Mâlin (Tâ'ifi)

Fuel—Ararat, Jabal al-Qilâl, Mizhân

Furs—Khallukh, Khirkhiz, Kuyâba, N.zvân, Tukhs, Yaghmâ; Beaver—Qabala; Ermine—Tibet; Foxes, Black—Tibet, Toghuzghuz; Striped and Red—Toghuzghuz; Grey Squirrels—Tibet, Tulas; Lambskins—Kurdar; Sabîja (?)—Toghuzghuz; Sable Martens—Kimâk, Tibet, Tabarqa, Tudela, Tulas (cf. pp. 196, 278); Weasel—Barâdhâs, Tibet

Gilims (Tapestry Woven Carpets)—Dârzangi, Pars, Wâsit; Blue—Rudhân; Kumis Gilhns—Amol; Glass—see Nisibîn and p. 165

Glace-ware—Baghdâd, Rayy (?)

Grape-syrup—Araghân, Bâun, Herat

Honey—Adharbayjân, Armenia, Arrân, Sâqlâb, Kirmân; Jâba, Salâhit, Sarandîb; Millet—Saqlâb, Kirmân; Rice—Daylamân; Sorghum—Muğhûn, &c., Sirrâyin; Wheat—Sanâ'

Insects and Reptiles: Crocodiles—Busîr; Flies (carnivorous)—Sarlr; Mosquitoes (pashsha)—Nih, Tamîsha; Scorpions—Kâshân, Nisibîn, Hims, Tabarqa; Snakes—Ahwâz, Artuj, Hims, Nîsibîn, Khâvkhir, Chinese—China
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Insects and Reptiles: Crocodiles—Busîr; Flies (carnivorous)—Sarlr; Mosquitoes (pashsha)—Nih, Tamîsha; Scorpions—Kâshân, Nisibîn, Hims, Tabarqa; Snakes—Ahwâz, Artuj, Hims, Nîsibîn, Khâvkhir, Chinese—China
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Dates—'Abdasî, Alin, Arabia, Bam, Bayâs, Farah, Bahrûgân, &c., Nahrawân, Nim-Rûdhi, Qandabil; Dried dates—Sîstân; Figs—Hulwân; Grapes—Hamdân (p. 146), Mirvât (p. 321); Hazel-nuts—Lishtar; Jalghuza—Lahore; Mulberry—Barda'; Oranges, sour—Āmol, Balkh; Pomegranates—Khujand; Raisins—Kârûkh, Mâlin (Tâ'ifi)

Fuel—Ararat, Jabal al-Qilâl, Mizhân

Furs—Khallukh, Khirkhiz, Kuyâba, N.zvân, Tukhs, Yaghmâ; Beaver—Qabala; Ermine—Tibet; Foxes, Black—Tibet, Toghuzghuz; Striped and Red—Toghuzghuz; Grey Squirrels—Tibet, Tulas; Lambskins—Kurdar; Sabîja (?)—Toghuzghuz; Sable Martens—Kimâk, Tibet, Tabarqa, Tudela, Tulas (cf. pp. 196, 278); Weasel—Barâdhâs, Tibet

Gilims (Tapestry Woven Carpets)—Dârzangi, Pars, Wâsit; Blue—Rudhân; Kumis Gilhns—Amol; Glass—see Nisibîn and p. 165

Glace-ware—Baghdâd, Rayy (?)

Grape-syrup—Araghân, Bâun, Herat

Honey—Adharbayjân, Armenia, Arrân, Sâqlâb, S.lâbûr

Insects and Reptiles: Crocodiles—Busîr; Flies (carnivorous)—Sarlr; Mosquitoes (pashsha)—Nih, Tamîsha; Scorpions—Kâshân, Nisibîn, Hims, Tabarqa; Snakes—Ahwâz, Artuj, Hims, Nîsibîn, Khâvkhir, Chinese—China

Khâvkhir—China, Khirkhiz, Tibet

Clothes, Covers for—Kâth

Drinks (potions?)—Baghdâd

Drugs—Farghâna, Khâlkhin, Khorasan, Kish, Transoxiana, mt. between Coria and Truxillo; Cassia Fistularis and Tamarind—Jab.rs.; Cucub—Jâba, Salâhit; Emblica Officinalis, Myrobalan, Terminalia Belerica—road between Râmiyân and Jalhandar; Gentian—Gibraltar; Tiryâk (antidote) plant—Bûshang

Electuaries—Baghdâd

Fans—Tîrmdh

Felts—Gûzgân, Isbîjât, Kâth, Tîlaqân (Gûzgân)

Fish—Abaksûn, Arzan 1, Bankâlûs, Bâzhgâh, Caspian sea, Daylâmân, Mymâtûl, Majgharî; Mâhâ fish (Gûzgân)

Frankincense—Shîhr

Fruit—Ark, 'Ayn-Zarba, Barda', Bukhârâ, Burûgird, Diza, Farah, Kumish, Malatya, Marûd, Mizhân, Nihâvand, Palestine, Qazvîn, Sîmînân, Sîmân, Tûkhûrîstân; Dried—Bust; Almonds—Lahore; Apples—Istâkhr; Bananas—Bûlûs, Bankâlûs; Chestnuts—Barda'; Citrons—Amol, Balkh; Fragrant citrons—Shûsh; Yellow Citrons—Damascus; Coco-nuts—Bûlûs, Bankâlûs, Kanbâyâ mt. La-
Minerals: Ammoniac Pepper Nutmeg Napkins, Dessert Musk Perfumed Waters Pearls Plaster of Paris Precious Stones

Jān, Farghāna, Guzgān, Kirmān, Sāmār, Sarīr, Spain, Transoxiana, Tūs; Quicksilver—Farghāna, Sokh (? § 25, 49.); Silver—Akhshikāth, Andārāb, Georgian mts., Guzgān, Ilāq, Jabal al-Qamar, Jāriyān, Khorāsān, Khuttālān, Kirmān, Kuh-i Sim, Kūhsaym, Muqattam, Nāyīn, Panjīr, Pārs, Sardan mt., Silver is., Transoxiana; Tin—Kala [cf. p. 187]

Precious Stones—F.mā, Khorāsān, Vayshagirt; Sāri; Black and Yellow Salt—Dārāgird; Red Salt—Baylaqān

Sacks—Mūqān Saddle-bags—Guzgān; Saddle-cloths, Covers for—Sīkāshim; Saddle-girths—Guzgān; Horse-rugs—Baylaqān

Shagreen—Abāskūn Shank (“White Conch”)—Dahmān’s country

Shoes—Bāṣra, Kanbāya, Sind; Yemeni—Sha’dā Silk—Barda’, China, Nishāpūr; Mulham—Egypt; Raw—Gurgān, Kho- tan, Marv; Textiles—Astarābād, Baghdād, Ispahān (’Attabi, Sīqālātān), Nishāpūr, Rūm, Sāri; Black—Gurgān; Khazz—Egypt, cf. p. 382; Sundús—Rūm; Za′furi (?)—Astarābād

Skins—Sha’dā, Sind, Ţā’if; Leopard—Berbers; Lizard—Malaga; Panther—Sus-the-Distant

Slaves—Ālān country, Darband-i Kha- zaran, Farghāna, Ghur, Khazar, Khazarīan Pecheneg, Rāmīyān, Say- lakān, Sarīr, Sūdān [cf. Ādarbayjān, p. 142]

Snow—Kath, Mīzhān Soap—Bust, Tirmīdīh Spices—Sarandīb Spikenard—Jāba, Salāḥīt, Sarandīb Stone Kettles—Nauqān String Instruments—Saqlāb country Sugar—Khūzistān, Sīlabūr; Red and Refined—Askar-i Mukram; Candy—Bahṛūgān, &c., Kīz, &c.; Cane—Bahṛūgān, &c., Balkh, Bālūs, Balūt, Jalūt, Mīla

Sweets: Filāta—Marv; Nāṭīf—Bay- laqān

Tents—Tukhs Textiles—Ardavīl, Astarābād, Barzand, Baylaqān, Dimyāt, Gurgān, ’Irāq, Ispahān, Jālhandar, Jībāl, Khorāsān, Khūzistān, Kūmis, Nishāpūr, Pārs, Rūm, Shūsh, Sinīz, Tavaz; Brocades—China, Gurgān, Idha (Shūshartari?), Rūm; Cotton Stuffs—Baghdād, Ban, Bāṣra, Bust, Buzhāgan, &c., Herat, Kath, Kurf, Nishāpūr, Pārs, Rayy; Linen Cloth—Amol, Bāṣra, Dānqara, Darband-i Khazarān, Dhamira, Dimyāt, Pārs, Qašqā, Tinnīs; Maysānī—Rūm; Precious Stuffs—Shūsh, Vay- hind; Susangīr—Qurqūb; Velvet—
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Jalhandar, Khâlkîhîn; Woollen Stuffs—Abaskûn, Chaghâniyân, Dimyât, Ganja, Khursân, Marand, Shamûrûk, Pûrs, Tiranîs; Red Woollen Stuffs—Rûdhân Touch-Stone (mîhakk)—Shâvârân; Whet-Stone (fasân)—Arab country, Radwâ mt., Tîhâmâ, Tûs

Trees: Aloes—Jâba, al-Jurz, Salâhif, Red Sandal—Salûqiyîn; Teak—Silver is.; Timber—Jabal al-Qilâl, Khoy, &c. (?)

Vinegar—Marv

Wax—Âdharbayjân, Armenia, Arrân

Wine—K.nd.rm, Rayy, Saqlâb, Simingân, Surusnâ, Talaqân

Wooden Utensils—Amol, Daylamân; Wine Vessels—Saqlâb

Wool, dyed—Wâsi(523Jalhandar, Khâlkhîn; Woollen Stuffs—Abaskûn, Chaghâniyân, Dimyât, Ganja, Khursân, Marand, Shamûrûk, Pûrs, Tiranîs; Red Woollen Stuffs—Rûdhân Touch-Stone (mîhakk)—Shâvârân; Whet-Stone (fasân)—Arab country, Radwâ mt., Tîhâmâ, Tûs

Trees: Aloes—Jâba, al-Jurz, Salâhif, Red Sandal—Salûqiyîn; Teak—Silver is.; Timber—Jabal al-Qilâl, Khoy, &c. (?)

Vinegar—Marv

Wax—Âdharbayjân, Armenia, Arrân

Wine—K.nd.rm, Rayy, Saqlâb, Simingân, Surusnâ, Talaqân

Wooden Utensils—Amol, Daylamân; Wine Vessels—Saqlâb

Wool, dyed—Wâsi

E. SELECTION OF CATCHWORDS

ābâdhân, “prosperous” 37, 53 and pas-sim; abâdhânî, “inhabited lands” 54, “oecumene” 83, “prosperous place” 85, &c.

akhbâr, “information [heard?]” 55, 79, 83

albân, alpāghit 92


Arabic, misunderstood in the H.-‘A. 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’i viii, ix

band, bâvâ 220

baṭîha, “swamp” 55, 179

bâzargâni (bâzurgani), “business transac-tions” 115, 153

bearings, wrong xv, 192, 222, 289, 300, 316, 325, 351, 372–4, 376, 380, 443, 445

Bih-Āfarîdhî, sect 105, 328

bîyâbân “desert, plain” 79, 221

brothels 88

Brahmans 88

Buddhists 233, 337; (shamani) 84, (but-parast) 85

champâ, a flower and a sort of rice 240

clime (iqlîm) xviii, 61, 349; cf. 94, 111

Christians (tarsâ) 95, 101, 140–2, 149–50, 158, 160–1, 147, 475–6; (kâfirân) 144, 157

coins and money 90, 147, 153, 237, 247

commerce: caravan stations (stages) 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 mer-chants (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 (bârkadha) 87, 102, 107–8, 119, 121, 127, 131, 148; trade-port (furdu) 346

dâ’irat al-āfāq “Horizon” 50

darvishān, “poor people, paupers” 92, 109, 114–15, 117, 124, 162, 165
dihqân “hereditary ruler” 98–9, 109, 116–17, 120

doctors and magicians 100, 152, 159
eunuchs 85, 165

farkhâr (vihâra) 263

fire-temples 126–9, 383

fire-worshippers: Khîrkîz 96; Majgharî 321; Rus see Majus; Slavs 158; cf. Zoroastrians

“gates” (dar) 38, 102, 112, 115, 120–2;
Alan gate 68; Dar-i Andara 107, 334;
Dar-i Tâziyân, 112; Dar-i Tubbat 120, 256; cf. bāb 254, 404, 454
gauhar, “precious things” 38, 102, 107–8, 119, 121, 127, 131, 148; trade-port (furdu) 346

dâ’irat al-āfāq “Horizon” 50

darvishān, “poor people, paupers” 92, 109, 114–15, 117, 124, 162, 165
dihqân “hereditary ruler” 98–9, 109, 116–17, 120
doctors and magicians 100, 152, 159
eunuchs 85, 165

farkhâr (vihâra) 263

fire-temples 126–9, 383

fire-worshippers: Khîrkîz 96; Majgharî 321; Rus see Majus; Slavs 158; cf. Zoroastrians

“gates” (dar) 38, 102, 112, 115, 120–2;
Alan gate 68; Dar-i Andara 107, 334;
Dar-i Tâziyân, 112; Dar-i Tubbat 120, 256; cf. bāb 254, 404, 454
gauhar, “precious things” 52, 86, 89, 92, 102; jauhar, “substance” 112, 152, 154 (suggesting metals?)
ghaḍâra, “china” 384

hâr “frontier, extension” 51; sar-hâdd “frontier” 57, &c.
hîr at the Ka’ba 412

hudud: “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, 88–94, 109, 118; idol-worshippers 161–2

Infidels (kâfir): Turks 116, 118; neigh-bours of the Rûs 159; wâshi 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.
Nestorians 290
nighushāk, “auditores” 113
ni’mat, “amenities”, passim; “re­
sources” 126; “well-being” 162;
bā ni’mat, “pleasant, favoured by na­
nature” [“well-endowed”] passim
Persian language of Gurgān 134
qurday, “pelican” 303
rustā, “district” 61, 74, 104, 119; Rustā
[stc]-Rustām 128; Rustā-Bljm 121
sabīl, “charitable gift” 398
§ābīyān, “Sābians” 12,141; “Buddhists
(?)” 95
Sālhārī, Muslims in Rāmiyān 90
Sapīd-jāmagān 117; mubayyida
356
The Seven Sleepers 204
sayyād, “fishermen” 60, 93 (?) 124, 126;
“hunters” 60, 93, 95
shamanī, “Buddhist” 84
shank (Sankha, conchs 242
siyāsijun (*spāsīk)?) 409
Soghdian language 99, 185, 229, 231,
271, 369, 378, 380, 468
sources of the //-. xii-xvii, 25 ff.
Sultān “governor, government” 89, &c.
Sun-worship 99, 121
Sālhārī, Muslims in Rāmiyān 90
Sapīd-jāmagān 117; mubayyida
356
The Seven Sleepers 204
sayyād, “fishermen” 60, 93 (?) 124, 126;
“hunters” 60, 93, 95
shamanī, “Buddhist” 84
shank (Sankha, conchs 242
siyāsijun (*spāsīk)?) 409
Soghdian language 99, 185, 229, 231,
271, 273, 300, 369
Sultān “governor, government” 89, &c.
Sun-worship 99, 121
jąłasān, “gulf” 391
taxes: bar-āb 105, 108; bridge-toll 398;
dah-yak 159; gate-toll 120; kharāj
157; maritime customs 162; sar-gazīt
92; ushr 139, 392; cf. mash
thaghr, “military frontier” 133, 143-4,
148-9, 152, 470
Tukharian language 304, 359, 369, 445
türk, “strength” 264
Turkān-i āshtī, “trucial Turks” 118-19
vaulted buildings 124, 374
wind-mills 110
yabaqu, “felt-wool” 288
yādhkird 49, 145
yasi, “broad”
yīghach, “farsang” 290
Zoroastrian (gabrān, gabrakān) 95, 105,
121, 126, 269; Bihāfaridhī 105
Zūn (Zūn), Indian god 345
Muslims in outlying lands 88, 90-1, 93
nāhiyat, “country” 47 and passim; “direction” 62; “district” 84; “parts” 66; “province” 123; “region” 123; “side” 53, &c.
Nestorians 290
nighushāk, “auditores” 113
ni’mat, “amenities”, passim; “resources” 126; “well-being” 162; bā ni’mat, “pleasant, favoured by nature” [“well-endowed”] passim
Persian language of Gurgān 134
qurday, “pelican” 303
rustā, “district” 61, 74, 104, 119; Rustā [stc]-Rustām 128; Rustā-Bljm 121
sabīl, “charitable gift” 398
§ābīyān, “Sābians” 12, 141; “Buddhists (?)” 95
Sālhārī, Muslims in Rāmiyān 90
Sapīd-jāmagān 117; mubaayida 356
The Seven Sleepers 204
sayyād, “fishermen” 60, 93 (?) 124, 126; “hunters” 60, 93, 95
shamanī, “Buddhist” 84
shank (Sankha), conchs 242
siyāsijun (aistākh?) 409
Soghdian language 99, 185, 229, 231, 369, 371, 380, 398
sources of the /A. xii-xvii, 25 ff.
Sultān “governor, government” 89, &c.
Sun-worship 99, 121
vaulted buildings 124, 374
wind-mills 110
yabaqu, “felt-wool” 288
yādhkird 49, 145
yasti, “broad”
yīghach, “farsang” 290
Zoroastrian (gabrān, gabrakān) 95, 105, 121, 126, 269; Bihāfarīdhi 105
Zūn (Zūn), Indian god 345