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The English translation of the Ḥudūd al-ʾālām and its stupendous commentary undoubtedly form the magnum opus of the late Professor V. F. Minorsky's scholarly career. As he himself explains in his Introductory Note to the second series of Addenda, he spent some six or seven years of his life on it. The preparation of the final manuscript for publication involved both the author himself and his devoted wife and amanuensis, Mrs. Tatiana Minorsky, in a vast amount of work, often repetitious, but at all times demanding a high standard of accuracy.

Over the ensuing years, Minorsky was for long periods busy with other questions of the historical geography of the Orient, above all, with the historical geography of the Iranian world and the Turkish lands of Central Asia. Accordingly, from his pen there came such works as his studies on the sections of Sharaf az-Zamān Ṭāhir Marvazī's Ẓabāʿī al-ḥayawān relating to China, India and the Turks (London 1942); on Abū Dulaf Misʿar b. Muhalhil's Second Risāla (Cairo 1955); and on the parts of the lost Taʿrīkh al-Bāb preserved in Münejjīm Bāshi's Jāmiʿ ad-duwal (London 1953, Cambridge 1958). In all of these works, his procedure was the same: a carefully-edited text, an English translation, and then an extensive historical and topographical commentary.

His interest in the Ḥudūd al-ʾālām did not, meanwhile, abate at all. His other studies frequently illuminated some of the many problems which had had to be left unresolved—usually from sheer lack of historical sources or from inadequate modern exploration of the terrain involved—in the commentary completed in 1937.

By 1955 a substantial number of additions and corrections to the commentary could be gathered together and were published, in company with some valuable observations on the linguistic style and vocabulary of the original Persian text, in the article "Addenda to the Ḥudūd al-ʾĀlām", Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, xvii/2 (1955), pp. 250–70. Over the next decade or so, Minorsky accumulated further corrections. In particular, the travels through central Afghanistan of the French scholar, the late André Maricq, increased our topographical knowledge of the very obscure and isolated mediaeval region of Ghūr. As is well known, Maricq's crowning discovery was that in 1957 of the minaret of Jām, which may possibly mark the site of Fīrūzkūh, the capital during the later 12th and early 13th centuries of the powerful
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Ghūrid Sultans.\(^1\) Anything which contributes to our knowledge of the region of mountain massifs and valleys in central and northern Afghanistan has a particular value in that it throws light on the homeland of the *Hudūd al-ʿālam*‘s author, who came from Güzgān, the principality lying immediately to the north of Ghūr and the Heri-Rūd valley. The description of Güzgān and its dependencies is, indeed, the one section of the book which must depend on personal observation and experience, for apart from this, the author was essentially an armchair geographer, and not a traveller who personally visited the lands which he described. Maricq’s experiences now led Minorsky to modify certain of his earlier comments on the topography of central Afghanistan. Hence the new series of addenda presented here in this second edition of the *Hudūd al-ʿālam* offer a substantially improved version of the section on Güzgān.

Unfortunately, Professor Minorsky died, almost a nonagenarian, on 25th March 1966, before he could put the new series of addenda in order for publication. It had already been decided, however, that a new edition of the *Hudūd al-ʿālam* itself should be envisaged, for the original printing was almost exhausted. The Trustees of the “E. J. W. Gibb Memorial” Series now invited me to take up the work. The actual material conveyed to me from Professor Minorsky’s Nachlass was in a somewhat confused state. It comprised typewritten sheets, some in English and some in Russian, together with many manuscript additions, again written in both English and Russian. It would have been almost impossible for me to arrange these coherently if it had not been for Mrs. Minorsky, who of course knew, as no-one else could know, her husband’s handwriting and ways of working. She was able to reduce all the papers to an ordered, typewritten form. Even with this invaluable help, difficulties remained. The notes obviously contained much overlapping and repetitious matter. Often there were two somewhat differing versions of the same correction. I have had accordingly judiciously to edit these notes, combining them where necessary and pruning superfluous matter. As well as these addenda and corrigenda, the core of which are the improved translation of the section on Güzgān (§ 23, 46–66) and the dependent commentary, Professor Minorsky left a series of comments on the textual improvements made by Dr. Manūchihr Sotūdeh in his edition of

---

\(^1\) For a critical re-assessment of the evidence adduced by Maricq in favour of the identification of Jām with the site of Fīrūzkūh, see now Lorenz S. Leshnik, “Ghor, Firuzkoh and the Minar-i-Jām”, *Central Asiatic Journal*, xii/1 (1968), pp. 36–49.
the Persian text of the _Hudūd al-ʿālam_ published at Tehran in 1340/1962 (Tehran University Publications No. 727); these also have been included in the present edition. Professor J. A. Boyle communicated to me four corrections of his own, and these have been marked by his initials. Finally, I have myself drawn a new sketch-map of Gūzgān and Ghūr, to replace the Map viii of the original edition (p. 329); a certain amount of the information given in the original map has now been corrected, and other information added.

In may be of interest for English readers to learn that a Russian translation of the _Hudūd al-ʿālam_ commentary has been prepared by Mrs. Minorsky, and this will be utilized in a new Russian version of the whole work, to be edited by the Soviet scholar Dr. Y. E. Borshchevsky. This will not only include the 1955 addenda and the present ones, but will also contain a Russian translation of the article which Minorsky contributed to the _Festschrift_ for his friend S. H. Taqizadeh, _A locust's leg_ (London 1962), pp. 189–96, sc. the article "Ibn Farīghūn and the Ḥudūd al-ʿĀlam", in which he suggested that the author of the still-unpublished encyclopaedia of the sciences, the _Jawāmiʿ al-ʿulūm_, might well be a scion of the Farīghūnids of Gūzgān, patrons of the author of the _Hudūd al-ʿālam_.

The re-issue after the author's death of this edition of the _Hudūd al-ʿālam_ will be eloquent witness to the enduring value of much of Professor Minorsky's work; there only now remains for me to thank firstly the Gibb Memorial Trust for ensuring that the book will remain available for future scholars and secondly the School of Oriental and African Studies for agreeing to the reprinting of the 1955 Addenda.

C. E. BOSWORTH

_University of Manchester_
INTRODUCTORY NOTE TO THE SECOND SERIES OF ADDENDA

The romantic story of the unique manuscript of the Ḥudūd al-ʿālam was told by me in the Preface to the English translation of it, below, pp. xli–liv. For several months in 1922 this manuscript was on my desk in Paris, but was repatriated to Leningrad in time for Professor V. V. Barthold to write the important Introduction to the facsimile of the text published by the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R. This edition appeared in Leningrad in 1930 just after Barthold’s death (18th August 1930). I began to work on the translation of the Ḥudūd in 1931 and seven years later the book was published in the Gibb Memorial Series (London 1937). It was impossible to expect that my interpretation of the 61 chapters, divided in my translation and commentary into 1,007 paragraphs (some of them containing several items), should have been the last word. New studies and newly-accessible texts were bound to suggest a number of improvements in my work. Even the publication of the text by Sayyid Jalāl ad-Dīn Tehrānī as an appendix to his Calendar for 1334/1935 reached me too late, and the recent edition of the text by Dr. Manūchihr Sotūdeh (Tehran 1340/1962) has shown how many readings of his predecessor were approximate. Thus in the period 1931–7 I was reduced to my own decipherment of the text compiled in 372/982 and transcribed almost three centuries later in 656/1258, when the Mongols were overrunning Iran and besieging Baghdad. The text was written by an able scribe whose hand, however, possessed individual peculiarities of seven centuries ago, to say nothing of the complications he met with in reproducing the toponomy, often grown obsolete by the 13th century, of remote regions.

As time went on, I collected a number of improvements, which were published in “Addenda to the Ḥudūd al-ʿĀlam”, BSOAS, xvii/2 (1955), pp. 250–70. [These are reproduced in the present edition, below, pp. lv–lxxxii].

In his new edition of the Persian text, Dr. Sotudeh took full advantage of my commentaries and explanations of 1937, and his eagle eye permitted him to discern 38 better readings, of which he published a preliminary list in Farhang-i Īrān-zāmīn, vii/1–3 (1338/1959), pp. 334–46. I accept most of them and wish to add them to the results of my own post-1955 research. There is, unfortunately, no hope of publishing a new edition of my English
translation which would incorporate all the improvements in the body of the text. Readers will still have to use the 1937 edition as a basis, but I now wish to add to my first set of Addenda the present similar list combining textual improvements with my observations and research carried out since 1955.
COMMENTS ON THE TEXTUAL IMPROVEMENTS SUGGESTED BY DR. MANUCHIHR SOTUDEH IN HIS EDITION OF THE PERSIAN TEXT (TEHRAN 1340/1962)

§ 1. Preface. Instead of khwïsh-numâ, read: khwïsh-rã, i.e. not “manifesting himself through different sciences” but “guiding his slaves to different sciences” (M.S. admits the difficulty of the reading).

§ 2. Discourse on the lie (nihïdh) of the earth . . . P. 50, last lines, read: “and all the places . . . in which there are (some) aquatic animals (jânavar andar ü mävi båshad) are within this ninth part of the earth”. There is no doubt about the reading mävi in the text, and the same correction had been suggested to me by my late friend Prof. A. Eghbal in 1938. However, I still suspect a mistake of the scribe, and clinging to my original interpretation, I would restore the text as follows: va jânavar andar ü [va] *mähi dårad.

§ 2, last paragraph (p. 51): instead of mardi, read: märdûmî “the people of those regions are more remote from human nature”.

§ 3, 3 (p. 52). M.S. rightly remarks that in the Hudûd the word digar marks the beginning of a paragraph, and digar daryä-yi buzurg ast ki should not be translated as “another great sea is the sea . . .” etc., but perhaps as “moreover, a great sea which . . .” etc. The suggestion is rather pedantic, and a multitude of “moreovers” would be too obtrusive in an English translation (in French one could more easily say “et encore, une mer qui . . .” etc.).

In the same paragraph, instead of “Saymara [sic]” read “Basra”. For the correct reading, see p. 179. In the text, the name is very indistinct, and the reading “Basra” was already restored in my 1955 Addenda.

§ 3, end of 4 (p. 53). Read: “and from the one shore the other is not visible”, which seems to be a misunderstanding, see Mas‘ûdî, Tanbih.

§ 3, 24 (p. 55). “At times the waters of Lake Zarah grow so much that its rivers overflow into (bigudharadh bi) the province of Kirmän and form a huge lake”. M.S. rightly remarks that va bi-daryä-yi a’zam shavad should be interpreted as “and flow into the Greatest Sea”, i.e. into the Ocean already mentioned under § 3, 4. Practically, this is of course impossible; it reminds one of the story concerning the river of Išfahân which is lost in the swamp of
Gāv-khāna but reappears in Kirmān and flows out into the Eastern (sc. Indian) Ocean, see Ibn Khurdādhbih, p. 176. Cf. the criticism on this point by Mustaufī, Nuzhat al-qulūb, ed. Le Strange, p. 216.

§ 4, 3. Translated “Chinese merchants go there in great numbers”. M.S. judiciously improves: “Chinese merchants frequent (bisyār ravaṇ) it”.

§ 5, 9 ba (p. 63). M.S. suggests that instead of ān-gah “then” the text should be read as ān-ki “and the one (i.e. branch) which turns north-westwards penetrates into Ghūr”. This is quite possible, and this branch (which on p. 199 I identify with the Köh-i Bābā) would be opposed to the northern ramifications described under § 5, 9a. Thus the correction is acceptable, though M.S. in his own edition of the text reverts to my reading va ān-gah.

§ 5, 9 bb (p. 64). In the enumeration of the branches of the range scattered in the present-day Afghanistan, after “Bāmiyān” insert “and in some of the marches of Gūzgānān, and in Bust, Rukhadh, Zamīndāvar and Ghaznīn . . .”

§ 6, 23 (p. 73). M.S. takes exception to my translation of the Arabic term baṭīha as corresponding to the local term daryāzha: In Persian he interprets “swamp” as bātlāq (originally from the Turkish “bog, quagmire”). In fact, “swamp” is the usual translation of the Mesopotamian baṭīha, see Le Strange, The lands of the eastern Caliphate, pp. 26, 42, and means “a tract of wet, spongy land”, suggesting fertility. Of course, the indiscriminate use by our author of both terms may be wrong. Daryāzha is described both in the chapter on lakes (§ 3, 25) and in that on rivers (§ 6, 23), and in the first case, it certainly looks like the reservoir of the four sources of the Zarafshān river from which the latter flowed out as a single stream irrigating the regions of Samarqand and Būkhārā. It is difficult to say now whether it was a real lake or a richly-watered tract in which the waters of the Zarafshān were initially collected. The conditions of irrigation may have considerably changed the aspect of the ground occupied by Daryāzha. Whatever the physical characteristics of the latter may have been, it should not be identified with either of the present-day lakes Iskandar-kul or Qara-kul, as I mistakenly did so in my Commentary, p. 211. [See further the long Addendum on Daryāzha, below pp. xix–xx—C.E.B.]

§ 10, 1 (p. 86). After “a kingdom . . . of Hindustān”, insert: “Its king (pādshāy) is called Qamārūn”. See the Commentary.

§ 10, 37 (p. 90). The “copper idol”. In fact, it would be better to translate rūyīn as “brazen”.

§ 11, 1 (p. 92). The nuggets of gold found in Rāṅg-rōng are said
to be “in the form of several sheep’s heads joined together” (*chand sar-i gusfand ba-yak-para*), but in this case, *chand* should be translated not as “several” but as “as big [as a sheep’s head]”.

§ 12, end of introduction (p. 94). Instead of the sentence “The wealthiest (of the Toghuzghuz?) are the Turks” read “And they (i.e. the Toghuzghuz) are the wealthiest of the Turks”.

§ 23, 11 (p. 103). For the mineral products of Tûs I read “… antimony and the like” (*shibh*). Read now “… antimony and *shabatī*”. In Arabic this mineral is called *sabaj*, see Birûnî, *al-Jawāhir*, ed. F. Krenkow (Hyderabad 1355/1936), p. 199, Russian tr. by Belenitsky (Moscow 1963), pp. 186, 197, and means “jet, gagate, black amber”.

§ 23, 13 (p. 103). Between the boroughs Banâbid and Kûrî insert Tûn, and delete the footnote that the name of Nîshâpûr is added above the line.

§ 23, 51 (p. 106). M.S. suggests that Mânshân is a district adjacent to “the gate of Andara” (i.e. lying close to it), but in § 23, 53 “Dar-i Andara” is given as the name of the military camp lying ½ farsaks from Jahüdân. Delete the mention of Tamrân which by accident got into my translation, and see now the new commentary of § 23, 49 et seqq., below pp. xxx ff.

§ 23, 75 (p. 109). In connection with this paragraph, M.S. examines the systematic use in our text of the expression *küh-hā va shikastagī-hā* (cf. § 20, 9; § 24, 1; § 25, 42; § 25, 46; § 32, 24; etc.). I should have used a single term to render the expression, whereas I translated it now as “mountains and hills”, now as “mountains and broken country”. In M.S.’s opinion, the meaning is “mountains and valleys (*dara*)”. I am nevertheless unconvinced by this interpretation. Admittedly, a valley is a “break” in the mountains, but *shikastagī* would be unusual for “dales”. In § 26, 10 I notice the opposition between mountains and dales expressed by *küh* and *dasht*.

§ 24, 5 (p. 110). It would be better to translate “There are no mosquitoes (*pasha*) in it (sc. in Nih)” rather than “flies”. See also below, under § 32, 7.

§ 25, 1 (p. 112). M.S. suggests that instead of the general expression “woollen carpets”, I should have distinguished between *bisât*, *farsh* and *mušallâ-yi namâz* mentioned in the text (perhaps “woollen carpets, rugs and prayer carpets”).

§ 26, 11 (p. 120). Instead of the queried reading *gardân*, read *gird-i ān*. The translation may stand.

§ 26, 14 (p. 121). As the text stands, *rûy-i namad-i zîn* (or
رُيْي-نَمَاد-يْ زَين) seems to refer to some felt cover for a saddle. M.S. suggests رُيْي “brass” and نَمَاد-يْ زَين “saddle-cloths”, in which case one would expect an additional وَاء after رُيْي.

§ 26, 22 (p. 121). Amongst the products of خَوارزَم is *تَرف (which may have embarassed the copyist, who left the first letter without dots). In my original translation, I read it as بَرف “snow”. The بُرْحَان-يْ قَاتَي، ed. M. Moʿin, i, p. 486, تَرف is explained as كَاشك-يْ سْيَاي (in Turkish, كَارا قَرْعَت), i.e. clotted ewe’s milk. M.S. quotes numerous Persian dialects in which the term still survives. The restoration *تَرف is the more probable as it is followed by رَكْحَبِين, another solid milk preparation (بُرْحَان, ii, p. 931). In a verse by سُزنَي quoted by مُوين, loc. cit., the two terms are combined.

§ 27, 7 (p. 123). M.S. thinks that بَتْنَدح should be “white sugar” instead of “sugar candy”, which is now called نبْت. See also § 28, introduction.

§ 27, 14 (p. 123). Read قَاندابِيل, not قَاندابِيل.

§ 28, 23 (p. 125). Read بَرداشِر, as in § 28, 21.

§ 29, 2 (p. 126). Read in the singular, “an iron mine” and “a silver mine”. Cf. چَشَکَحَرِي، quoted in my Commentary.

§ 29, 12 (p. 127). كَازَرِن: يَقْط ي gives this as قَازَرِن, at present قَازَرِن.

§ 29, 32 (p. 128). Read مَدْحَرَان, but see Commentary, p. 380.

§ 29, 42 (p. 129). Under سَراَن, the term رَقُدح (رُيْي) would be better translated as “brass” rather than as “copper”, as in Commentary, p. 380. [؟ “Brass”, an alloy of copper and zinc or tin, hardly fits the present context of a mine—C.E.B.]

§ 30, 20 (p. 131). The name of the famous textile of قَرْقَب is spelt in our text سُعَان-کَرَد (in two words), as if to stress its etymological meaning of “needle-work”. In fact, it was a combined product of weaving and embroidery, in German Nadelmalerei, Webstickerei; cf. Schwarz, Iran, ii, p. 97, and R. B. Serjeant, “Materials for the history of Islamic textiles”, Ars Islamica, x (1943), 46. The Persian translation of چَشَکَحَرِي (MS. of the 14th century), ed. I. Afshär, p. 134, also gives سُعَان-کَرَد. On the other hand, the Arabic original of چَشَکَحَرِي, BGA, p. 153, calls the same product (made in فَسا on a woollen base and in قَرْقَب on a less suitable silken base) سُعَان-جَرَد. This shows that in common parlance the original سُعَان “a needle” was replaced by سُعَان “a lily” and the final 卡َرَد had become -جَرَد (in Arabic transcription -جَرَد), following the phonetic change attested in place names, cf. دَرَب-کَرَت “made (built) by دَرَب” > دَرَب-جَرَد (in Arabic transcrip-
tion *Dârâb-jird (with *j* for *g*). See Marquart, *A catalogue of the provincial capitals of Erânshahr* (Rome 1931), No. 42 and p. 93. Cf. Ištakhri, *BGA*, p. 123: “Dârâbajird (sic), a foundation of Dârâb, therefore it was called Dârâbajird, to be explained as the work of Dârâ (‘amal Dârâ”).

§ 31, i (p. 131). Under the products of Isfahan, I translate *hulla* as “cloaks”, and under § 31, 21 I give the same translation for *burd*, but as I add the transcription of the Arabic terms, I do not see any inconvenience in my procedure. On the other hand, I admit that “shawl” would be a better translation for the *taylasân* worn by the doctors of Islam.

§ 32, 7 (p. 134). Here I have translated *pasha* as “mosquitoes”, not as “flies”.

§ 32, 13 (p. 134). Amongst the wooden products of Amol, two are not sufficiently clear. I have read *shâna-yi niyäm*, with *idâfat*, and tentatively interpret it as “handles of a plough”. In fact, amongst the various meanings of *shâna* there is “a shoulder, etc.”, and *niyâm* may mean “the wooden frame (chûb) of the plough on which the ploughman presses to make the ploughshare enter more deeply into the soil”, see *Burhân-i qâti*, ed. Mo’in, iv, p. 2223. If *niyâm* refers to the whole wooden frame behind the plough, *shâna* might be its handle or top bar. As a matter of fact, there is no *idâfat* marked in the text, and as *shâna-niyâm* follows on *shâna* (“combs” in my translation), it would be simpler to explain the composite term as “cases for combs”, according to M.S.’s suggestion. As regards *tarâzü-khâna*, M.S. more precisely defines it as “cases for different weights used on the pans (kapa) of scales”.

§ 36, 36 (p. 144). The dimensions of the fortress of Kurdivân. Read: “its high summit is broad, smooth and quadrangular (chahâr-*sû*); it is four farsakhs by four farsakhs”, cf. M.S.’s édition of the text, p. 193. The suggestion does not in practice differ from my “the area of the summit is four farsangs by four farsangs”.

§ 42, after 14 (pp. 156–7). In the text, *bâ* has no dots, and I wrongly read *az* . . . *tâ* “from 3,000 up to 6,000 horse”, whilst expressing my doubts by the word [sic]. The reading *bâ* for *tâ* is suggested by M.S. and is the preferable one. The translation should accordingly run: “In each of these provinces (themes) there was (bûd) a commander-in-chief (sipahsâlâr) on behalf of the king of Rûm (az än-i malik ar-Rûm) with numerous troops consisting of (az) 3,000 foot together with (bâ) 6,000 horse for the purpose of guarding the province”. In my Commentary, p. 421, I noted that the number of troops in each province is out of order.
§ 3, 25 (p. 55). Here Daryāzha figures among the lakes, while under § 6, 23, it is called a baṭīha “swamp”. I now doubt my identification of it (§ 6, 23 and Commentary, p. 211) with the Iskandar-kul.1 The latter is a real lake and its surface is nowadays some 3.5 sq. km. instead of the 4 × 4 farsakhs (28 × 28 km.) assigned to Daryāzha in the Hudūd. Its outlet feeds the important Fan-daryā (draining Yaghnob), which in its turn joins the more northerly river of Matcha accepted as the basic source of the river of Soghd (now the Zarafshān). Only after the confluence of these two rivers near the village Varziminār (now Zāhmatābād) can one speak of a single, united course of the river of Soghd.

I submitted my doubts to A. L. Khromov (Dushamba), who has a great experience of local toponomy and tracks. In his reply (3 December 1964) he admits the ambiguity of the situation. For the four rivers forming the river of Soghd, he first of all suggests (a) the above-mentioned river of Matcha, flowing east to west, and (b) the river Fan-daryā, joining (a) from the south and formed by two rivers, one of which drains Yaghnob and the other collects the waters of the lake Iskandar-kul. The Fan-daryā joins the main river opposite the village of Varziminār (in Soghdian, βrzah, see O. I. Smirnova, Trudi XXV Kongressa, ii, p. 335). For the other two rivers, Khromov suggests (c) the river of Varziminār itself, joining the main river from the right or northern side, and (d) the river of Khushikat, joining it a short distance downstream from Varziminār.

The courses of the two important rivers (a) and (b) are considerably longer than the six farsakhs (42 km.) suggested by the Hudūd, whereas the streams (c) and (d) would be shorter than that norm. Thus some uncertainty remains about the indications of the Hudūd, whose source could not ignore the rivers (a) and (b), but for (c) and (d) might have in view the upper reaches or sources of the Fan-daryā. The system of the Zarafshān has been closely

1 Prof. I. I. Umnyakov (Samarqand) has very kindly sent me an excerpt from an early article by O. I. Smirnova on the historical toponomy of the upper Zarafshān in the rare publication Trudi sogdiysko-tajikskoy arkhеologicheskoy expeditsii 1946–7, v, p. 57. The author analyses the data of the Islamic geographers, including the Hudūd, and also takes Daryāzha for the Iskandar-kul. An important report on the toponomy of the rivers of Soghd was presented by O. I. Smirnova to the 25th International Congress of Orientalists, see Trudi XXV Kongressa (Moscow 1963), ii, pp. 329–36 (with a map).
investigated only in the last hundred years, and c. A.D. 982 one could not expect a detailed knowledge of the gorges of the Buttan mountains.

Very curious is the other suggestion made by A. L. Khromov. He refers to the great landslide of April 1964 near Varziminár. It dammed up the course of the Zarafshān, and the waters rose so high that Samarçand and its neighbourhood were in danger of being flooded (see The Times, 27 April 1964). The water returned to its normal level only after the obstruction had been blown up. Traces of salt deposits were left on the rocks of Varziminár. Some similar phenomenon in the 10th century A.D. may have accounted for the description of Daryāzha in the Ḥudūd. A landslide on a somewhat smaller scale may have occurred, and the reservoir of Daryāzha may have remained as a regulator of the waters of the Zarafshān until the natural dam had been washed away by the pressure and its traces disappeared as a result of further floods and changes in the irrigation system. The tast of finding the traces of Daryāzha can be expected only from geological research on the spot.

§ 12, 2 (p. 94). Hamilton identifies kūzār. k, which he accordingly emends to *kūlūk (perhaps rather kūlūk), with the K'ulluk mentioned in the itinerary of King Het'um and the Chū-lin of the T'ang shu, lying 80 li west of Yeh-lē and corresponding more or less to the modern Fou-k'ang. He reads the name as *Köllüg, a derivative of köl “lake”, i.e. “place where there is a lake”. See J. A. Boyle, “The journey of King Het'um I, King of Little Armenia, to the court of the Great Khan Möngke”, Central Asiatic Journal, ix (1964), pp. 175-89, at p. 182 and n. 47; and J. R. Hamilton, “Autour du manuscrit Staël-Holstein”, T'oung Pao, xlvi (1958), pp. 115-53, at p. 145. [J.A.B.]

§ 12, 2 (p. 273, n. 1). For Bārlugh read *Yārlugh. This is the Yarlīgh of Juvaynī, the Arlekh in the itinerary of King Het'um, identified by Hamilton with the Yeh-lē of the T'ang shu, 180 li east of the present-day relay station Po-yang. He plausibly suggests that the name means “place where there is a cliff (yar)”. See Boyle, op. cit., p. 182 and n. 46, and Hamilton, op. cit., pp. 144-5. [J.A.B.]

§ 12, 16 (pp. 95 and 276). īrgūzgūkath (?) is identified by Hamilton with the Erkop'oruk mentioned in the itinerary of King Het'um; he places it in the neighbourhood of the present-day Ulan

1 In 1911 a landslide in the Pamir region dammed the valley of a river and formed the present-day reservoir of Sarez.

§ 23, 46–66 (pp. 105–8) Güzgânân: Improved translation

46. GÜZGÂNÂN, a very prosperous and pleasant province. Justice, equity and security reign there. In the east, this province marches with the limits of Balkh and Ţukhâristân down to the limits of Bâmiyân; in the south, with the [extreme] limits of Ghûr and the boundary (hâdd) of Bust; in the west, with the limits of Gharchistân with [its] main city Bushtîn, down to the limits of Marv; in the north, with the limits of the [river] Jayhûn. Sovereignty in this province belongs to one of the margraves (mulûk-i âtrâf), whom in Khoräsân they call “malik of Güzgânân”. He is a descendant of Afriðhûn. And all the chiefs (mihtar) within the limits of Gharchistân and Ghûr are under his orders (andar farman), and of all the margraves he is the greatest in kingliness, grandeur (‘izz), rank, policy, liberality and love (dûstdârî) of sciences. This country produces many things: felts, saddle-bags, saddle-girths, woven rugs and druggets (zîlû va palas). In it is found the tree called khunj (“white”); its branches never dry and remain supple so that they can be tied into knots. In this dominion there are many districts.

47. R.BUSHRÂN (*Râvshrân*), a large and very pleasant district; its inhabitants are warlike. The district belongs to Gharchistân of Güzgânân. Some of the waters of Marv rise from here. There are gold mines in it. The chiefs (mihtarân) of this district are among the chiefs of the Marches of Güzgânân (az mihtarân-i âtrâf-i G.) (sic), and they pay an agreed tribute to the malik of Güzgânân.

48. DARMASHÂN (Dar-i Mashân?) consists of two districts: one is joined (payvasta) to Bust, and the other, adjacent to Rabûshrân, is joined to Güzgânân. In this district rise waters which join those of Rabûshrân, and the river of Marv is formed by these waters. The chiefs of this district are called Darmashî-shâhs.

49. TIMRÂN, TAMĀZân, two districts close to the boundary of Ribât-i Karvân, both lie in the mountains. Their chiefs are called [respectively] Timrân-waranda and Tamâzân-waranda.

50. SÂRVÂN, a mountain district. Its inhabitants look arrogant and warlike. They are professional thieves, violent, unreliable, blood-thirsty; and there are constant conflicts (‘asabîyyat) among them.

51. MÂNSHÂN, a mountain district, joined (payvasta) to Dar-i Andara (see 53). In the old days, its chiefs were called B.râz-banda, but now a governor (kârdâr) goes there from the capital (hadrat) of the malik of Güzgânân.
All these districts are very agricultural and abound in amenities. And the chiefs of these districts [come] under the rule of the malik of Güzgânän and pay him agreed tributes (muqâta’a). The inhabitants are mostly simple-hearted; they have great numbers of cattle (châr-pâ), [namely] cows and sheep.

In this kingdom (pâdhshâhî) (i.e. Güzgânän) small districts are numerous. In it there grew a tree from which whips are made. In its mountains there are mines of gold, silver, iron, lead (surb), copper, antimony-stone (sang-i surma) and different kinds of oxides (zâg-hâ-yi gunâgun).

52. Tâlaqân lies on the frontier of Güzgânän and belongs to its king (pâdhshâh). This town is very pleasant. It produces much wine and also felts.

53. Jahûdhân, a prosperous and pleasant town at the foot of the mountains. It is the residence (maqarr) of the malik of Güzgânän, who lives at one-and-a-half farsakhs from the town in a military camp (lashkargâh) called Dar-i Andara. This last is a strong place at the foot of the mountains; [there] the air is more pleasant and healthier (durust) than in Jahûdhân and Pâryâb.

54. Bâryâb (Pâryâb), a very pleasant town on the caravan high road.

55. Naryân, a borough between Jahûdhân and Pâryâb; its boundary is at two farsakhs [from Jahûdhân].

56. Gurzivân, a town on a hill, very pleasant and with an agreeable climate. In olden times, the residence of the maliks of Güzgânän was there.

57. Kundarm (?), a pleasant borough where much good wine (nabidh) is produced.

58. Anbêr (*Anbâr), capital (qaṣaba) of Güzgânän; it is a good and prosperous town, the residence of merchants and the emporium of Balkh, very rich. It lies at the foot of the mountains. In it is produced the Güzgân leather (püst-i gûzgânî) exported to all places.

59. Klâr, a pleasant and flourishing (khurram va âbâdân) borough, with many trees and running waters. It abounds in amenities.

60. Ushtubrân, on the high road, a very prosperous town. It lies in the steppe (sahrâ) and has running waters.

61. Antkhuhdh, a borough in the desert (biyâbân), a place with much cultivation [but] not very attractive (kam ni’mat).

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

1 Iṣṭâkhri: “Its territory is of two

2 On the margin is a note with the unexpected vocalization Indkhû (?).
63. **Ribât-i Kirvān**, a borough on the frontier (sar-hadd) of Güzgānān; in its mountains there is gold.

64. **Sangbun** is a part of Rabūshārān (see above, 47); the pulpit (minbar) [of its mosque] has been founded anew.

65. **Azīv** (read Gīzīv), a town at the end of the province (‘amal) of Güzgānān.

And all these places which we have mentioned belong to the kingdom (pādhshāhi) of the malik of Güzgānān. In the deserts (biyābān) of this dominion (shahr) there are some 20,000 Arabs. These people possess many sheep and camels. Their amīr is appointed from the capital of the malik of Güzgānān, and they pay two (sadaqāt). And all these Arabs are richer (tuvangār) than all the [other] Arabs who are scattered throughout Khorāsān.

66. **Hausch**, a large, flourishing village situated in the desert. It belongs to this sovereign (in pādhshāh, i.e. of Güzgānān), and the majority of the aforementioned Arabs stay here in the summer.

This province (nāḥiyat) has many other large subdivisions (rustā-hā) and districts (nāḥiyat-hā), but the towns with pulpits (minbar) are those which we have mentioned.

§ 23, 46–66. IIIa (pp. 328–37) **Güzgānān**: Revised commentary

The western ramifications of the Hindūkush are formed by two main ranges: the northern one, bearing in ancient times the name of Paropamisus, and the southern one, now called Bābā-kūh. Between them is situated the long basin of the Herat river, the Hari-rūd. The Paropamisus in its turn splits into two ranges, the main southern one (now the Siyāh-kūh) and a shorter northern one (the Band-i Turkistān).

Güzgān proper (Arabic Jūzjān) forms a kind of bridge between the two north-eastern “quarters” of Khorāsān, Marv and Balkh; the geographers usually reckoned it to Balkh. It is situated between the northern slopes of the Band-i Turkistān and the western banks of the Oxus, and is watered by two streams coming from the valleys and gorges of that mountain range, and eastern one (now the Āb-i Safīd) and a western one (now the Āb-i Qaysār). These two rivers flow independently north-eastswards in the direction of the Oxus, but are lost in the sands before reaching it. To the south of the Band-i Turkistān lies the source of the river of Marv, the

1 Pay twice?
Murghāb, rising far in the east. Its valley half-encircles from the south Güzgān proper, and the sources of the river come close to those of the Harī-rūd and the river of Balkh, which flows to the north. It was in this direction that the first stage of the political expansion of Güzgān lay. But the power of the maliks of Gāzgān extended also over the main Paropamisus range into the upper Harī-rūd, which formed the northern part of the possessions of various chieftains of Ghūr. Moreover, the rulers of Güzgān during the brief period of their florescence, as described in our source, reached beyond the second wall of mountains (the Bābā-kūh) into the upper basin of the Hilmand river, which flows down eventually to Sīstān. Here lay the domains of several petty chieftains of Ghūr, and there began a dangerous zone of rivalry with the early rulers of Ghaznī; it was to be Sebüktigin’s son Maḥmūd who eventually annexed Güzgān.

Our author’s description of Güzgān, which is included in the general survey of Khorāsān, is of special interest in view of his direct connection with Güzgān (see above, Preface to the Second Edition, p. viii, and below, Translator’s Preface, § 1), and in view of the fact that he lived in the time when the dominion was in an expanding phase and therefore included a number of neighbouring districts and feudal dependencies in his survey. However, it is only with a consideration of the geographical perspective outlined above that one can begin to understand the complex material of § 23, IIIa, which contains a number of little-known names.

As to the capital and centre of Güzgān in the 10th century, the geographers are somewhat vague. From Ya’qūbī’s somewhat disconnected text (BGA, vii, p. 287, tr. Wiet, Les Pays [Paris 1937], p. 100), one can infer that in his time the capital (madīna) of Güzgān was Anbār/Anbēr, where lived the “governors” (wulāt). Formerly, the malik lived in [the towns of] Kundarma and Karzmāna (Varzmān ?). Finally, “in former days” there was a [particular ?] principality (mamlaka) in Shabūrḵān. Iṣṭakhrī, BGA, i, p. 270, says that the principal town (madīna) of Güzgān was Jahūdiyya (Yahūdiyya), but on the other hand indicates that the seat of government (maqām as-sultān) was the largest of the local towns, Anbār. Ibn Ḥauqal, ed. Kramers, p. 443, who did not revise Iṣṭakhrī’s data very coherently, writes that Anbār is the largest town of Güzgān, which is “the seat of the Afrīghūn family” and the centre of their government (sultān) in winter, whilst in summer their residence is in Jūzvān, a town “between two mountains” (reminding one of the situation of Mecca). About the town of
Yahūdiyya, it is said that it is larger than the town of Sān. Maqdisî, BGA, iii, p. 398, says that in his time (al-yaum) the power of Jüzjān was rising to first importance (sultānuhu muqaddam), that its inhabitants were generous, pious and learned, and that the local capital (qaşaba) was al-Yahūdiyya.

To all appearances, the name Güzgān is not of ethnic origin, but simply means "walnuts, walnut trees" (güz-akān), whilst in the form Güzgānān, frequent in the Hudūd, we have the superaddition of a second plural suffix. It seems that the author wished to stress the fact that he was dealing with the lands of Güzgānān, i.e. every territory depending on Güzgān.

What is curious is the relation of this name to the geographical term Gozbon (*Gōz-bun) found in the Armenian Geography ascribed to Ananias of Shirak (8th century) and also to the ancient legend about the "Aryan" archer Erexšā (modern Persian Ārish), who on the suggestion of king Manūchihr shot an arrow in order to mark the frontier between the possessions of Iran and those of the king of Tūrān Isfandiyār (Aspādiyat). It is astonishing that Firdausī did not make use of this story in his Shāh-nāma at its proper place (sc. in the reign of Manūchihr), and only in the much later chapters mentions Ārish, who "shot arrows to the distance of a farsakh". The reason for Firdausī's reticence may have been that at the time of the declining power of the Sāmānids, he wished to avoid mentioning the limited distance of Ārish's shot, which might have been an encouragement to the Qarakhanids in occupying the Transoxanian dominions of the Sāmānids. In fact, the ancient legend easily took on a political meaning, and the fluctuations of the frontiers were reflected in the interpretations of Iranian authors.

My teacher at the Lazarevsky Institute, R. R. von Stackelberg, consecrated a very detailed article to the question of Erexšā, "Die iranische Schützensage", ZDMG, lviii (1904), 853–63. In the Avesta, Yašt 8, 6, the distance of Erexšā's arrow is indicated by uncertain names: from the mountain Aryō-Xšuţa to the mountain Xvanvant, the position of which is not clear. It may have been near Sarakhs, as indicated in the Mujmal at-tawārikh (written 520/1126), ed. Bahār (Tehran 1318/1938), pp. 43, 90, which says that the arrow flew from Āmol (?) in Mazandarān to the pass of the Mezduran mountains near Sarakhs. Herzfeld, Mitteilungen aus Iran, ii/2 (1930), pp. 83–4, transfers the exploit of Erexšā to western Persia (Pā-ţaq—Alvand, between Hamadān and Kirmān-shāh) which is, however, in contradiction with later interpretations. In Islamic times it was considered that Ārish had stood somewhere...
in Mazandaran (see §§ 32, 9, Sārī, and 15, Rūdhān), but opinions differed as to where the arrow landed in the east.

Tabarî, i, pp. 435–6, reproduces very exactly the Iranian title of the “swift-arrowed” Ārish, and says that the arrow reached the river of Balkh. It is possible that by the latter he means not the left affluent of the Oxus, which waters the neighbourhood of Balkh (to the east of the rivers of Güzgân), but the Oxus itself, see Ibn Faqīh.

According to Thaʿalībi, Taʿrikh ghurar as-siyyar, ed. and tr. Zotenberg (Paris 1900), p. 133, Ārish’s exploit took place during the brief reign of the king Zaw. The arrow should have fallen in Bāḏghīs (see § 23, 24), but an angel carried it to a place near Khulm (see § 23, 68) called Güzīn, which Stackelberg restored as Gūzbun “roots, trunk of a walnut tree”.

In Bīrūnī’s al-Athâr al-bāqiya, tr. 220, it is said that Ārish’s body broke up after his mighty shot, and that the wind carried his arrow to the extreme limits of Khorāsān, between the places F.r.ghāna (?) and Tabaristān (?), where it stuck into the trunk (āsl) of a huge walnut tree. The identity of Bīrūnī’s resting-place for the arrow with Thaʿalībi’s Gūzbun is indisputable, but the names of the places between which the tree stood are definitely distorted. Stackelberg restored the first name as *Ṭukhāristān, but I think that if one were to connect the walnut tree Gūzbun with Güzgân, one would expect to find parallels to the names distorted in Bīrūnī in the vicinity of Güzgân. Thus Ṭ.b.r.stān can be taken for Ṭālaqān (§ 23, 52, mentioned just before the capital town of Jahūdhān, 53), if the lām of the latter were taken as a sin without “teeth”. The reading Fargḥāna is obviously unsuitable, but there are toponyms in the region which yield plausible versions. Thus Farkhār lies a little upstream from Ṭālaqān. Between the two places, the river receives a tributary from the east, along whose banks lies the small district of Gulfagān, separated from the Kishm river basin of Badakhshān by a low pass. This is actually the extreme limit of Ṭukhāristān, because Badakhshān was regarded as a separate region, see below, § 24, 24. It is also possible that the two different Ṭālaqans, that of Ṭukhāristān (§ 23, 76) and the other situated in the western approaches to Güzgân (§ 23, 52), were confused.

Finally, in Gurgānī’s poem Vis u Rāmīn (middle of the 11th century), ed. Minovi (Tehran 1935), p. 366, the arrow flies the distance from Sārī to Marv, see my “Vis u Rāmīn, a Parthian romance”, in Iranica, twenty articles (Tehran 1964), p. 172. We find this same indication in Ibn Isfandiyār’s Taʿrīkh-i Tabaristān (completed in

After these Islamic sources, we shall look at two indications in the Armenian Geography. In the first of these, *Gozbon* is given at the very end of the list of the districts of Khorāsān, which seems to coincide with the general tendency of the story about Ārish. In his composite chapter, which follows Ptolemy on the province of Areia, the Armenian author says in conclusion that the Persians call this region Khorāsān and include in it the districts of Komš (Kūmish), Vrkan (Gurgān), Apršahr (Nishāpūr), Mrov (Marv), Mrōt (Marv ar-Rūdh), Hrev (Herat), Kadšan (present-day Kādis in Bāḏghīs), and then “Gozkan, from where the kingly horses come from,” *Gozbon* down to the river called Arang of which it is said that it carries sulphur and that it is uncrossable in view of a treaty. This is apparently the Phison, which the Persians call Wehrot. It is uncrossable in the sense that it was made so for Persians and Indians by means of a treaty. Further come Hrev with Vadgēs (Bāḏghīs) and Tukharstan. Apparently in this country Kozakan were settled the captive Jews who, according to the scriptures, settled on the Gozan river”. It is noticeable that in this list, based on Persian sources, the enumeration follows a straight line from west to east (from Kūmish to the Oxus), whilst the last names (Herat, Bāḏghīs and Šukhāristān) form an additional southeastern zone. Consequently, there is some probability that *Gozbon* was situated between Gūzgān and the Oxus. As a parallel to the name, one can quote Sang-bun (§ 23, 64) and Tunakābun, which Rabino, *Masandaran*, p. 153, explains as “under or below Tunakā”.

In any case, it would be natural to connect the frontier of Iran with the province of Gūzgān, since Marquart, *Ērānsahr*, pp. 64, 70, has shown that the eastern frontier of the Sāsānid empire “with few fluctuations” lay almost always near Tālaqān (“fast immer bei Tālakān”), see our § 23, 52, and in Ibn Khurdādhbih, p. 36, even

---

1 Cf. the story in the *Qābūs-nāma* quoted above in § 1, p. 176.

2 This point is confused, see Marquart, *Wehrot und Arang*, p. 153, but the order of enumeration is quite clear.

* Forms found in the Armenian authors: *Gozbon*, Kasbion, Gasbun. The form *Gozbon*, which seems to correspond to the Persian *Gozbōn* (with long vowel) may have arisen under the influence of the neighbouring Bābān, Baun > Bōn, the chief place of Gānj Rustāq (§ 23, 31), and later of the whole (?) of Bāḏghīs, see Yāqūt, i, p. 461.
Güzgân itself is reckoned to Tûkhâristân. Of course, the “fourth quarter” of Khorâsân was Balkh on the right bank of the Oxus, but the actual frontier of Iran and Türân was the Oxus itself, difficult to cross, and it would be understandable to direct Ārish’s arrow in the direction from which usually came the incursions from Central Asia into Iran, i.e. at the bend which the river makes when it turns northwards. Here, the threatened point was Marv, and it was natural to adapt the legend to the points lying directly to the east of Marv; and such an advanced point here could be situated within the confines of Güzgân. Gozbûn, “the root of the walnut tree”, was connected with the walnut groves of the district, which itself bore the name of “walnut grove” (*Gûz[â] gân).

It is true that Gozbon (var. Gozbun) comes in the Armenian geography at the very end of the list of the districts of Khorâsân, but the order of the list, although revised by Marquart in an article in the Jubilee issue of the Mekhitarist journal Huschardzan (Vienna 1911), with Stackelberg’s remarks taken into account, still admits improvement. The province (kust) of Khorâsân consisted of 26 districts, but 27 names are mentioned in it. In order to equalise the count, Marquart excluded Mânsân or Mânsbân, but now it should be restored in view of our § 23, 51. In his corrections of 1911, Marquart retained Mânsân, but sacrificed Katashân (or Kadman), which he merged with Herat (Hrev). The ancient name Katashân is evidently of ethnic origin. Already in Sasanian times, and possibly earlier, the warlike tribe of the Qadis or Kadish was settled in Mesopotamia to defend the western frontiers of Iran, where they gave their name, for instance, to Qâdisiyâ, where the Arabs defeated the Persians in 14/635. Much information on this people was collected by Nöldeke in his article in ZDMG, xx (1879), pp. 157-63 (on the Kadischäer). But a witness to the original habitat of the Kadisians is their “visiting card” left in northern Afghanistan in Gharchistân. These Kadisians doubtless formed an element of the Hephthalite confederation, and under Nîzar offered a stubborn resistance to the Arabs in 90-1/708-9. Today, the name Kadish survives as a place in the north of the Herat vilayet, to the east of the road to Maymana (see the administrative map of Afghanistan, 1340/1961). In all events, Kadish is both an historical and a geographical reality which it is difficult not to take into account. It even formed a Christian bishopric in Sasanian times, distinct from that of Herat. [On the Nestorian see of Qâdistân, and on Christian missionary activity amongst the local Hephthalites, see Bosworth, Sîstân under the Arabs, from the Islamic conquest to
the rise of the Šaffārids (30–250/651–864), Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente (Rome 1968), p. 9—C.E.B.

If anything can be sacrificed in the list of districts of Khoräsän, it is Gozbun, added at the very end of the list. In the recorded toponomy there are no indications of it, and it is, indeed, a purely legendary term which was attached first to one place, then to another. It is possible that in the later Sasanian period, the legend of the arrow of Ārish was confused with the story of the spear which Spandiat, of the Vishtäsp family, drove into the ground as a challenge to the Turkish khans and Chionite chiefs, see the story on the founding of Balkh in the Pahlavi text of the history of Iranian cities.¹ The place where the arrow of the “Aryan archer” fell is thus quite illusory. At different epochs it was displaced from one spot to another, probably along the rivers serving as the main frontiers between the sedentary population and the nomads: along the lower course of the Herï-rüd (Tejen), along the Murghāb, and finally along the main water obstacle, the Oxus. Hence the varying indications on the proximity of Gozbun to these regions.

On p. 330 of the original edition of the Hudūd, a new combination of the paragraphs relating to Güzgān should be substituted. It is now clear to me that, probably with some intention to stress the expansion of the dominions of his dedicatee, the author placed immediately after a general description of Güzgān (situated primarily between the northern slopes of the Band-i Turkistān and the Oxus in the north-east, and thus forming a wedge between Marv and Balkh) the lands to the south over which the ruler of Güzgān had spread his power, sc. those in the valley of the easternmost source of the Murghāb, in the valley of the Herï-rüd and even beyond the Kūh-i Bābā in the valleys of the upper course of the Hilmand. It is in these territories of Ghūr that the lands of the Güzgān maliks bordered directly on the dominions of the first Ghaznavids. As a result, the districts dependent on the Güzgān malik were inserted before the description of Güzgān proper. Hence we have the following arrangement of paragraphs: (a) Güzgān proper, § 23, 53–62, 66 (Haush); (b) expansion of Güzgān into the basin of the river of Marv, § 23, 47, 64 and (c) further expansion southwards, § 23, 48–9 (Darmashān, Tamrān), 50 (Sārvān), 51 (Mānshān), 63 (Ribāt-i Karvān), 65 (Azīv).

The location of certain districts, especially of Tamrān and
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Tamazän, must also be now altered in the light of the late André Maricq’s travels in central Afghanistan in 1957, when he discovered the minaret of Jâm, that remarkable monument of the later Ghúrid Sultan Ghiyāth ad-Dîn Muḥammad b. Sām (558–99/1153–1203). Maricq travelled from Kabul across the sources of the Hilmand and the pass of Kirmān (our § 23, 63, Ribāt-i Karvān). He had at his disposal a British map (the 1/2 inch, fol. i–iii) and an American map (USAF World Aeronautics Chart, fol. 430, ed. 1956), which were unavailable to me in 1937. On them, he found that the districts Timrān (sic) and Tamazän were shown in Ghūr in the Hilmand basin, approximately at the latitude of Kabul-Ghaznī. In his excellent report on the journey, he devoted an Appendix to the cartography of the region in question,¹ and on his Map I indicated the positions of Timrān and Tamazän. To the south-east of them he marked Gizāo on another source of the Hilmand. This last is undoubtedly identical with Gazīv (*Gizēv) which the Ṭabaqāt-i Nāṣirī, tr. Raverty, p. 344, couples with Tamrān. In our text, § 23, 65, Azīv “situated at the end of the province of Guzgānān” must be restored as *Gizīv, and is identical with *Gizev, modern Gizāo; on Maricq’s map this lies approximately on the latitude of Ghaznī. (See further on Tamrān and Tamazän, below.)

47. R.ūshārān is an evident clerical error for Rīvshārān (*Rēvshārān). Place-names with the element rēv are numerous in eastern Iran; cf. Rīv, a ward of Samarqand; Rīvdād, a village to the south of that city (Barthold, Turkestan, English edition, pp. 88, 93, 102, 111). See also Marquart, Erānsahr, p. 27, where a personal name is restored as Rēv-Ardasher.²

The position of the district is clear in our source. It must have lain on the south-eastern source of the Murghāb, the headwaters of which come close to the river of Bāmiyān (see Maricq’s Map I: the source of the Murghāb penetrates deeply to the east, with the main, southern wall separating Rivshārān from the basin of the Herī-rūd). This eastwards extension explains why Rīvshārān is sometimes mentioned in the sources together with Bāmiyān; see the list of taxes collected by ‘Abdallāh b. Ṭāhir in 211/826, in Ibn Khurdādhbih, p. 37, and cf. the list of titles on p. 40. The place

¹ A. Maricq and G. Wiet, Le minaret de Djam, la découverte de la capitale des Sultans Ghorides (XIIe–XIIIe siècles) (Paris 1959), pp. 79–82.

² These facts show that *rēv is here a derivation not from the word rīv/rēv (?), explained in Persian dictionaries as “slyness”, but from the Avestan raēvâ > rēv “radiant, splendid” (I. Gershevitch).
Sang-bun, inconsistently mentioned under § 23, 64, also belonged to Rivshärän.

At the end of the 10th century, Rivshärän was subject to Güzgän and paid tribute, although apparently its ruler retained his traditional title, given by Ibn Khurdâdhbih, of Rivshär, malik ar-Rivshärän. Here, the element šahr is the same as that found in the titles of the rulers of Bāmiyān, Gharchistān and Khuttal, titles which Marquart, op. cit., p. 92, explained as a simplified form of Old Persian xšādriya. Vacillations in the Arabic spellings between shir and šahr show that the title was actually pronounced šēr and equated with the meaning “lion” (translated into Arabic as asad). In the account in Ṭabarî, iii, p. 1875, of the seizure in 259/873 of the town of Ahwāz by the rebel Zanj, it is said that until then the town had been governed by a certain Aṣghajūn (var. Aṣfajūr), whilst the chiefs of its garrison were apparently Khorāsānians: Nizak; Harthama, known as Shahr; and Hasan b. Ja’far, known as Rāvshār (*Rēvshār). In the 12th century, one Jalāl ad-Dīn Rivshārī was Vizier to the Ghūrid sultan, see Ṭabaqāt-i Nāṣirī, tr. p. 396.

A certain confusion in the identification of Rivshärän might come from a quotation from Ibn Faqīh, absent in the BGA text, but given by Yaqūt, ii, p. 171, v, p. 146, from his own more complete copy. In this it is said that the Oxus (nahr Balkh) rises at a place called *Rivsharān: “it is a mountain bordering on Sind, Hind (the Panjab) and Kabul, and from there issues a source which begins at a place ‘Andamīn’.” Marquart, op. cit., pp. 219, 228, showed that in regard to the river of Balkh” of Ibn Faqīh, as quoted by Yaqūt, there was a possible confusion of the information on the sources of the main river Jayhūn (the Oxus, from which to Balkh, according to Ibn Faqīh, BGA, v, p. 324, there was a distance of twelve farsakhs) and on the source of the proper river of Balkh (the Dahās), and restored the name of the place from which the latter issues as *Ghundumīn. It is, however, more probable that Ibn Faqīh himself intended to describe the sources of the main river Jayhūn, lying much further to the east in the Lesser Pamir. In the more complete Mashhad MS. of Ibn Faqīh, f. 163a, it is indeed said that the Jayhūn (awkwardly called by him “the river of Balkh”) “comes from the direction of the east (min nāhiyat al-mashriq), from a place called Dīvshahrān”. This could literally mean “the falls of the devils or devils”. Of course, it is easy to restore div as *rīv, and in this case, one would have to take it merely for a place synonymous with our § 23, 47, lying on the sources of the Murghāb. One can add,
curiously enough, that a place Andamín (now written without 'ayn) really does exist in the Lesser Pamir and includes the lake Chilâb (Turkish Chaqmaqtîng). The Afghan author Küshkaki, Russian tr. p. 163, mentions especially that the stream of Andamin is the source of the mighty Oxus.

Another complication about Rîvshârân is that Birûni, al-Qânûn al-Mas'ûdî, mentions this name much further to the south in the third climate. The MS. Brit. Mus. Or. 1997, f. 99b, gives the following co-ordinates:

255 Panjwây long. 93°5‘ lat. 32°50‘
256 Rîvshârân long. 93°30‘ lat. 33°20‘
257 Ghaznîn long. 94°20‘ lat. 33°35‘

Meanwhile, places neighbouring on our Rîvshârân are given in the fourth climate:

460 Herat long. 88°40‘ lat. 34°30‘
467 Anbîr long. 90°15‘ lat. 36°35‘
471 Balkh long. 91°15‘ lat. 36°41‘

In A. Z. V. Togan’s edition (Delhi, c. 1938–9), the name of the southern Rîvshârân is restored from other MSS. as *Irsârân (?), and it is said that it lies in Zâbulistân (in the Brit. Mus. MS., in Râvstîn?).

48. D.mr.shân (perhaps V.rm.shâni) seems to be not so much a geographical as a political unit, for on the one hand part of its waters belonged to the Murghâb basin, while on the other it bordered in the south on Zamîn-dâvar (§ 24, 12–15). This province had its own chief (mihtar), although it was divided into two zones, one dependent on Gûzgân and the other on Bust (§ 24, 9), i.e. coming within the Ghaznavids’ sphere of influence. The part situated within the basin of the Murghâb probably formed an enclave between Rîvshârân and Gharchistân, or else it could have lain on one of the southern affluents of the upper Murghâb, e.g. on the river Shorak, from where the road to Ähangarân led southwards over the mountains (see commentary on § 24, 1).

Geographically, Darmashân must mainly have formed part of Ghûr, but as the ruler of the latter (who had become weakened in the 9th century) bore the title of Ghûr-Shâh, one assumes that the Darmashî-Shâh ruled over some autonomous province. The history of Ghûr is at this time very obscure. Judging from our main source, the Tabaqät-i Nâsîrî, tr. pp. 312–16, there were two rival families in Ghûr. One of these claimed descent from Shanasp or Gushnasp, and had since Hârûn ar-Rashîd’s time enjoyed princely status (imārat), whilst the other family, descended from Shîth (cf.
the biblical name Seth), held the military command (pahlavānī). The later powerful dynasty of Ghūrid Sultans were from the first family, and the historian Jūzjānī had been brought up in the house of one of their princesses; this circumstance may have led the historian to play down the role of the descendants of Shīth in later times. [See further on these questions the article of Bosworth, “The early Islamic history of Ghūr”, Central Asiatic Journal, vi (1961), pp. 116-33—C.E.B.]

As for the name of Darmashān, it could, like a number of other names beginning with dar-, be read as Dar-i Mashān “door, gate, gorge of Mashān”. Though this interpretation would be somewhat restricting for a province stretching southwards over a number of passes. On the other hand, according to Jūzjānī, the Amir B.njī, of the principal dynasty in Ghūr (in Hārūn ar-Rashīd’s time), was the son of Naharān, son of Varm.sh, son of Varm.shān, and it is possible that it is these last names that are reflected in the name of Darmashān, which should be restored as *Varmashān.

The ruler of this province in question is also mentioned under the title of Darm.sh-bat in the description of the campaign of the youthful Mas‘ūd Ghaznavī against Ghūr in 411/1021, see Bayhaqī, Ta’rikh-i Mas‘ūdī, ed. Ghanī and Fayyād, pp. 116-19. Mas‘ūd, who was at that time governor of Herāt, was moving upstream along the right bank of the Herī-rūd, and at some point, situated to the east of Shīrvān (§ 23, 50) and to the west of “the old capital of Ghūr” (Āhangarān?) had to by-pass Jurwās where Darmash-bat was residing. The latter wanted to take up, as it were, a neutral position, but after Mas‘ūd’s successes sent gifts to him and evacuated all the places which he had seized within the limits of Gharchistān (see § 23, 36). This last detail seems to corroborate the above-mentioned indications of our author.

49. Tamrān and Tamāzān. In 1937, not having the most recent maps at my disposal, I sought to bring these districts too close to the original Güzgān. A. Maricq, using the British map 1:253,440, found on it Timrān, Tamazān and Gizāo (our § 23, 65), situated fan-wise from north to south on the three sources of the Hilmand, i.e. considerably further south of the Herī-rūd basin and the Kūh-i Bābā range. These districts lie in the heart of Ghūr, on a longitude to the east of its present-day centre Taywāra, and on a latitude between those of Kabul and Ghaznī. From the unsystematic text of the Hudūd it was impossible to assume that the Farīghūnids could claim the allegiance of their petty vassals so far to the south. Evidently, in view of the weakening of the rulers of Ghūr, the
chiefs who bore the ancient titles of Tamrān-varanda and Tamāzān-varanda¹ sought the patronage of the strongest actual power.

Jūzjānī in 618/1221 personally visited Tamrān and Gizīv as a guest of the Sultan of Ghūr, when the Shanaspids had already assumed power in the whole of this region (tr. p. 344). We can rely on this author when he says that Tamrān lay “within the spurs and neighbourhood of the highest peak of Ghūr, bearing the name of Ashk” (ibid., p. 319).² On the British map of 1955 (1:1,000,000, sheet 430), based on the American aerial survey, there appears to the north of Gizāo, on one of the sources of the Hilmand, a height of 13,458 feet, which even though it is not the “highest” peak of Ghūr, may still fit the situation of Tamrān.

The family of the princes of Tamāzān no longer played an independent role in local history, but at least four maliks of Tamrān are mentioned amongst the suite of the 17th Sultan of Ghūr, Muḥammad b. Sām, who died in 599/1203. His son Maḥmūd (602–9/1205–12) was married to the daughter of the malik of Tamrān Tāj ad-Dīn and her son Sām became the 20th Sultan of Ghūr, cf. the Tabaqāt-i Nasīrī, tr. pp. 390, 408.

The latest editor of the history, the Qandahāri ‘Abd al-Ḥayy Ḥabībī, says in his extensive geographical commentary (Vol. ii [Lahore 1954], p. 806) that in 1326/1947 he had visited “Gizīv, Tamrān, Tamāzān and Kajūrān”, but that the names of Tamrān and Tamāzān seem to have become forgotten locally. Ḥabībī thinks that under pressure from other tribes, the Tāmrānis moved to the west, where they now form the Taymuris, located to the south-east of Herat. [In the second edition of Ḥabībī’s text, Kabul 1341–3/1962–5, the note on Gizīv and Tamrān is on pp. 341–2 of Vol. ii—C.E.B.]

In 1962 I received from Kabul the map of the administrative divisions of Afghanistan (published already in 1337/1958). On it Gizāo is marked within the district of Uruzgān, depending on Qandahār, and Tamazān is given within the district of Dāyakān, immediately to the north. Tamrān does not appear on the map, but it is possible that it, too, should be sought to the north of Dāyakān (see the map in H. F. Schurmann, The Mongols of Afghanistan [The Hague 1962]). On a similar map, dated 1340/1961, only Gizāo is

¹ Of particular interest is the spelling of these names with the Arabic letter ڏ = β, an interlabial v, which is found in Khvārazmian texts and early Khorāsānian manuscripts, see G. Lazard, La langue des plus anciens monuments de la prose persane (Paris 1963), pp. 137–8.
² Var. D.r.shk (*Dar-i Ashk)? It is possible that the name Ashk reflects the Persian word for “fang”, yashk; see the Burhān-i qātī, ed. Mo’in, iv, p. 2435.
mentioned, lying on the longest of the sources of the Hilmand which rises to the south of the Ghörband, not far to the west of the Pagmash mountains near Kabul. According to Schurmann, the Taymuris are now Tajik speakers.

50. Sārvān. This should in all probability be restored as *Shārvān, or better Shērvān, as the vacillating transcription between alif and yā' points to the Persian ē vowel. This district must correspond to the Shīrvān (*Shervān) mentioned in Bayhaqī, ed. Morley, p. 128, ed. Ghanī and Fayyād, p. 115. The name probably meant "the place of [the prince of] Shēr", but in his report on Mas'ūd’s Ghūr expedition of 411/1021, Bayhaqī uses it as a personal name. In five marches from Herat along the northern bank of the Herī-rūd, Mas'ūd arrived at Chisht and then at Ribāt-i Vazīr, the first fortified place against Ghūr, cf. Iṣṭakhri, BGA, i, p. 363. Here Bü’l-Ḥasan of Ghūr and the apparently more powerful Shīrvān, whose province bordered on Güzgān, joined him with their detachments. Together they besieged Jurwas, where resided Darmash-bat (see above, under § 23, 48), who had remained neutral. Mas'ūd successfully attacked the castle (Vay ?) which had formerly been the ruler of Ghūr's capital, and took it by storm. The expedition then returned from there, and the frightened Darmash-bat gave back to Mas'ūd the castles of Gharchistān which he had earlier seized.

One can conclude from this account, which still needs checking on the spot, that both the unnamed province of Bü’l-Ḥasan and that of Shīrvān lay to the west (north-west?) of Chisht, and that the possessions of Darmash-bat lay further to the east and bordered on Gharchistān.

All these details show the fragmentary character of the districts making up Ghūr, the fluctuations of frontiers and the patchiness of the separate principalities.

51. Mānshān. This is not mentioned in other Muslim sources, but it is possible that it corresponds to the district of Mansan mentioned by the Armenian Geography amongst the 26 provinces of Khorāsān (see Marquart, Erānšahr, p. 85, with corrections in Huschardzan [Vienna 1911], p. 301). Man-shan appears in the list of administrative subdivisions which the Chinese established on the eastern fringes of Khorāsān c. A.D. 660, see Chavannes, Documents sur les Tou-Kiue (St. Petersburg 1903), pp. 71, 268; here it forms a district of the kingdom of Hou-che-kien, a name which Chavannes explains as Khujikān = Jüzjān (better Güzgān, V. M.). For the geographical orientation of Mānshān, the following indications
can serve: (1) it came up close to Dar-i Andar, where stood the camp of the ruler of Güzgän, one farsakh from his capital Jahüdhän (§ 23, 53), and (2) within the limits of Mänshän there was a mountain lake (§ 3, 26) near Bastarāb. It can be assumed that this last name is reflected in the name of the western source of the river on which lies Sar-i Pul (the Safid-rūd). On the British map of 1914 (1:1,000,000) this source is called Astar-āb (on the 1955 edition, this name is omitted). Mr. Mīr Husayn Shāh of the University of Kabul (letter of 20th February 1963) kindly tells me that the lake is no more known on the aerial survey of the Ministry of Mines, but experts in geology (zamīn-shīnāsī) have confirmed the existence on this spot of a swamp, now dried up. My correspondent uses for this swamp or lake the term of Indian origin jhil, and in the Russian-Afghan dictionary jihi is given as the equivalent for “lake”. The disappearance of a mountain lake may be a useful parallel to our commentary on Daryāzha (§ 3, 25 and § 6, 23).

It seems that c. a.d. 982 Mänshān was of no great size, but on the road up the Heriirūd the Arabic geographers (Iṣṭakhrī, p. 363, Ibn Ḥauqal, ed. Kramers, p. 457, Maqdisī, p. 349) mention at four stages from Herat the not quite clearly vocalized Astarābiyān, which could perhaps be a trace of the former spread of the Mänshān possessions to the south (or simply a settlement from Astar-āb?). The administration of Mänshān was taken over by Güzgān, but our author also mentions the title of the local princeling.

56. Gurzivān. The name is known to this day on the maps: Darzāb va Gurzivān. In this district rises the river which is now called Shīrīn-tagāb, on which, further downstream, lie Fāryāb and Andkhoy. Within Gurzivān, on the eastern bank of the river, is marked the place Shahr-i virān “the ruined city”, although Dr. A. D. H. Bivar informs me that this region lacks water in summer. To the south is situated the central part of the Māk valley and Mänshān, see below, p. 334, commentary on § 23, 51.

In Arabic sources, the name is given as Jurzvān or Kurzvān (both variants given by Yāqūt, apparently from different sources).¹ The form Gurz-vān is evidently of ethnic origin and means “dwelling of Gurz”. The term Gurz/Gurj (where -z/-j is a suffix of origin) is

¹ Still puzzling is the transcription of Ya‘qūbi, BGA, vii, p. 287: Ḥurzmān, which de Goeje restored as Qurzumān, which is doubtful. It is even possible that the first letter, written without dots, was taken from an old Khorā-
known as designating the Georgians, but it is somewhat difficult
to imagine a colony of Transcaucasians, about which nothing is
known, settled in Afghanistan already in the 10th century. Another
suggestion is, however, possible. During their penetration of
India, the Arabs used the term Jurz as early as the 7th century to
designate the Gurjara dynasty which ruled in Qannauj. The
origins of this dynasty are obscure, but V. Smith thought that the
Gurjara (the present-day Gurjarajah) were a “Central Asian tribe”
who appeared in India about the time of the Hephthalite invasions
(sc. in the 4th or 5th centuries A.D.). All the northern slopes of the
Paropamisus were, according to the terminology of such an eminent
Arabic geographer as Maqdisi, called Haital (better *Habtal), the
“land of the Hephthalites”, a name which has probably been
preserved in that of the district of Yaftal to the north of Fayzâbad.
Whatever may be the explanation of the Indian form Gurjara, the
Muslim form Jurz/Gurz (see above, § 10, 46; Baladhuri, ed. de
Goeje, p. 442; etc.) could on equal grounds have been used to the
north of the Hindu Kush and the Paropamisus.

Gurzivân, the earlier capital of Gûzgân, lay to the east of
Bâdghîs, the last principality of the Hephthalites, whose chief Nizak
was in 91/709 captured by Qutâiba (see above, commentary on
§ 23, 71). The place where Nizak at last surrendered was called
al-Kurj, which gives a form close to that of Gurz. It should be
sought near the Salang pass, where Soviet engineers have built a
tunnel through the Hindu Kush. As the crow flies, Gurzivân
lies less than 200 km. from Kadiş, the centre of the Hephthalite
principality.

It is not out of place here to mention that in the description of
the Paropamisus, § 5, 9 bc, our author strangely says that the range
runs “between Kündarm and Anbîr, between Gurzivân and
Jahûdhân”, etc. The only possible explanation is that the author does
not speak of the watershed between the pairs of names quoted, but of
the foot of the mountain separating the plains from the hilly country.

63. Ribât-i Karvân. In my original commentary, the mistake in
the location of Tamrân and Tamâzân (§ 23, 49) affects also the
position of this place, which I had sought near the watershed of the

1 Cf. the villages Gurji-vân and Kurdivi-vân in the basin of the river Ak-su in
Shirvân (now the Azerbaijan S.S.R.).
2 V. Smith, Early history of India
(Oxford 1924), p. 304; La Vallée
Poussin, Dynasties et histoire de l’Inde
jusqu’aux invasions musulmanes (Paris
1935), p. 115; B. N. Puri, The history of
the Gurjara-Pratiharas (Bombay 1953),
pp. 2-14.
3 ? Kirvân. Kiru means a “hollow,
decayed tooth”; possibly this conceals
some hint at the character of the local
mountain landscape.
Herī-rūd and the river of Balkh. This is only partly correct, as Ribāṭ-i Karvān lies at the pass between the Herī-rūd and the Hilmand, somewhat to the south of the watershed with the river of Balkh, so that the latter river skirts the northern limits of Ribāṭ-i Karvān. Tamrān and Tamāzān, on the other hand, lie within the upper Hilmand basin and skirt the southern limits of Ribāṭ-i Karvān. It is accordingly clear that the district lay on the direct route Herat-Kabul which goes up to the Herī-rūd, across the Bābā Kūh, enters the region of the Hilmand headwaters and then the Kabul river basin. Ribāṭ-i Karvān is the last point of the Herī-rūd basin from where a pass leads to the Hilmand. A description of this road is given in the book of Vavilov and Bukinín, *Agricultural Afghanistan* (1929), p. 506; cf. also the anonymous German itinerary, quoted by Marquart, *Wehrot und Arang*, p. 168.

This place is now called, with a slight phonetic alteration Rabāt-Kirmān. Ribāṭ-i Karvān is mentioned by the geographers (Iṣṭakhrī, pp. 265, 272; Ibn Ḥauqal, ed. Kramers, p. 444) as “the extreme eastern limit of Ghūr” belonging to Gūzgān. The pathetic letter of the Ghaznavid Sultan Masūd, in which he informed Arslan Khan of his defeat at the hands of the Seljuqs, was written from Ribāṭ-i Karvān. The Sultan was retreating through Ghūr to the capital Ghazna, to reach which seven more stages were required, see Bayhaqī, ed. Ghanī and Fāyyād, p. 630. Forty years ago, crowded gatherings of Afghan tribesmen still took place at Rabāt-Kirmān, see *Jnat.* of the *Royal Central Asian Society* (1954), No. 1, p. 50.

§ 25, 91 (p. 119). DHARNUKH (?) is apparently to be identified with Hetʿum’s Zurnukh, the Zarnuq or Zurnuq of Juvaynī and the Zafar-nāma, the last stage before the bank of the Syr Darya in Tīmūr’s march from Samarqand to Uṭrār. See Boyle in *Central Asiatic Journal*, ix (1964), p. 184 and n. 75.

§ 42, 1 (p. 156). Amongst the Byzantine “themes”, the least readily identifiable name is that of the one including the capital Constantinople, sc. Tāblān and its numerous variants (see above, p. 421). In his note “Le thème byzantin de Tafla-tavlān”, *La Nouvelle Clio*, iv (1952), pp. 388–91, H. Grégoire suggested a new etymology, i.e. “stables”, referring to “la grande banlieue de Constantinople”. Its initial s- may have been taken by such Arabs as Muslim b. Abī Muslim al-Jarmī for the preposition eis “into” which has been preserved in names like Istanbul, Izmir, etc., but contrariwise, the basic s- may have been mistaken for the said particle and omitted as superfluous.
THE TRANSLATOR’S PREFACE

I. DESCRIPTION OF THE MS.


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 khanbalīq description.

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

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


---

1 On the author cf. p. xii; he was a 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 Ḥ-.‘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 nāḥiyat it would have been better, perhaps, to translate Ḥudūd 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 Jāmī al-‘ulūm, v.i., p. viii.

c. Ḥudūd al-Ālam (see above).

d. The well known encyclopedia Ḥāmi‘ al-‘Ulūm (ff. 1-50) by Fakhr al-dīn al-Rāzī (d. 606/1209) with the colophon: waqa‘a al-firāqh min tahštirī yāum al-jum‘a lil-sādis wāl-‘ishrin min jumādā al-ūlā sana thamānī wa khamsin wa sitta-mi‘a ‘ala yādī. Ad‘āfī ‘ibād allāh wa ahqaruhum Abūl-Mu‘ayyad ‘Abd al-Qayyūm b. al-Ḥusayn(?) b. ‘Alī. Consequently this work, too, was copied by the scribe of the Ḥudūd al-Ālam on Friday, 26 Jumādā al-ūlā 658 (Thursday 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 Baghdad Caliphate and remodelling the administration of Persia

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

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

The Russian orientalist, Captain (later Major-General) A. G. Toumansky, was a great friend of the Bahā‘īs whom he first met in Askhabad in 1890. He eagerly studied their religious literature and rendered some signal services to the thriving Bahā‘ī colony established in the Russian Transcaspian province, for example at the time when the first temple of the new religion (mashriq al-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 arba‘a 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 shāb-i jum‘a and considered as the beginning of Friday.
3 The data on the manuscript are partly borrowed from Toumansky’s article (v.i., p. ix, n. 2) and partly based on the notes personally taken in Paris in 1921.
4 See his edition of the Kitāb-i aqdas, SPb. 1899 (Mémoires de l’Académie des
availed himself of the occasional visits to Bukhārā of the learned Bahā'ī of Samarqand Mīrzā Abul-Fadl Gulpāyagānī who soon after, in a letter in Persian dated 2 Rabi' 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 (mugaddama-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 ūmī al-ulūm of Imām Fakhr-i Rāzī.” When, in 1893, Toumansky joined Mīrzā Abul-Fadl in Bukhārā, his Persian friend made him a present of his find “on condition that it should be edited and not be lost for science”.

A journey to Persia and the vicissitudes of a military career made it impossible for Toumansky to publish the manuscript immediately but in an article which appeared in 1896 he explained the circumstances which led to the discovery of the Ḥ.-‘Ā., gave its description (date, colophon, dedication to the Farīghūnīd 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 Faḍl 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
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. Zhukovsky was thus able to utilize the passage relative to Marv in his standard description of that province (see note to § 23, 37.). V. V. Barthold quoted extensively from the H.-‘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.1 After Toumansky’s death he published the fragment on Tibet (see notes to § 11) and summarized the contents of the chapter on Gilân (see notes to § 32, 35.).

Nevertheless, in Western Europe very little was known about the H.-‘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.2

On 13 December 1921 in a Russian paper edited in Paris I published an obituary notice of the head of the Bahá’í community ‘Abbáṣ 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 Báb and the Bahá’-alláh. 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.

paper Okraina, 2 May 1893) and on the Burtâs-Barâdhâs (as a supplement to. A. V. Markov, Russo-Mordovan relations, Tiflis 1914, v.i., p. 462).

1 Cf. p. 169.

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

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

3. THE TRANSLATOR’S TASK

In the concluding words of his Preface (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. As already mentioned the MS. is written in a script clear enough and yet in some places presenting considerable difficulties. Barthold (letter of 5. iii. 1930) was ready to admit with regard to the photographic reproduction of the MS. that “it would not be an edition in the proper sense, and orientalists who had no great experience in the reading of Muslim MSS. would feel disappointed”. In such circumstances, many people interested principally in the geographical contents of the book were likely to be hampered by the character of the script, while Barthold’s Preface, though extremely valuable, is far from exhausting the problems raised by the text.

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

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

The present book comprises the following parts:

1. A translation of V. V. Barthold’s Russian Preface.
3. My commentary on the text, disposed in the order of the chapters.
4. Appendices containing remarks on the marginal notes, the language of the Ḥ.-ʿĀ., &c., as well as a Glossary of the rare and less usual words and expressions.
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, 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.]

3 The ancient Preface to the Book of Kings, 346/957; Balʿami’s translation of ʿTabari’s History, 352/963; translation of ʿTabari’s Commentary on the Qurʾān by a group of Transoxanian scholars, under Maḥmūd Qazvīnī’s Preface to Marzubān-nāma, p. 3 [cf. also E. G. Browne’s description of another very archaic Commentary in the Cambridge University Library, JRAS, 1894, pp. 417–524]; Abū Naṣr Ḥasan b. ʿAli Qumī, Kitāb-i mudhkil dar ‘ilm-i nujūm, 365/975, see W. Ahlwardt, Verzeichnis d. arab. Handschr., Berlin, 1893, v, 149, No. 5663 [I owe the reference to my friend S. H. Taqi-zadeh]; the first edition of the Shāh-nāma, 384/994. As Shaykh Muhammad Qazvīnī tells me (30.VI.1936), Abū Maḥmūd Muḥammad b. Muvaffaq al-dīn ʿAli Ḥaravī’s Kitāb al-adwīya can hardly pretend to the same antiquity, for the scribe’s entry on the back of the book suggests that the author was still alive in 447/1055.
Practically all the rarer words and expressions figure in my translation.

I have numbered all the chapters of the \( H.-\ddot{A}. \) (§§ 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 İslâm (§§ 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 \( H.-\ddot{A}. \). Of the slightly younger works I constantly quote Bırūnî (inclusive of his \textit{Canon}, Br. Mus. Or. 1997), Gardīzī (containing a number of invaluable parallels to the \( H.-\ddot{A}. \)) and Maḥmūd al-Ḵašḵhārī. 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 \textit{Orbis Terrarum Musulmanis notus}\(^1\) and making

\(^1\) Le Strange’s excellent book \textit{The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate}, 1905, describes only the countries between Asia Minor and Transoxiana; P. Schwarz’s amazingly full \textit{Iran im Mittelalter} (in progress since 1896), covers only Persia. See my reviews of these books \textit{resp.} in \textit{BSOS}, vi/3, 1931, pp. 802–3, and \textit{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 \textit{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 Barthold² and Marquart,³ unaccompanied by
such graphic aids. I take this occasion to say in pious gratitude what
I owe to these two great scholars who by their contributions (so
different in method, yet equally admirable as results) have shed light
on numberless points of Muslim historical geography.

5. THE COMMENTARY: THE SOURCES OF THE H.-'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,
 viz. books,⁴ and any other information coming under the rubrics of
yādhkīrd-i hakīmān “memories of the sages” (f. 2a₂),⁵ akhbār “information [heard]” (cf. f. 13b₂: ba-akhbār-hā ba-shāndīm), or simply dhikr “mention” (f. 12a₂). There is no indication in the text as to which
particular details were derived from non-literary sources, unless we
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.]
² Barthold’s (15 xi. 1869–19 viii. 1930) bibliography comprises over 300 titles
of books and articles. See Umniakov, V. V. Barthold, on the occasion of
the 30th year of his professorship (in Russian) in Bulletin de l’Université de
l’Asie Centrale, 1926, No. 14, pp. 175–
202; Milius Dostoevsky, W. Barthold
zum Gedächtnis, in Die Welt des Islam,
³ See V. Minorsky, Essai de bibliographie de J. Markwart [Marquart]
313–24 [where the obituary and bibliographic notices by G. Messina, H. H.
Schaeder, &c. are quoted].
⁴ Kitāb-hā-yī pishīnāgān “books of the predecessors”, folios 2a₁ and 13b₂; or
simply “books”, folios 4a₁, 9a₁ (concerning the Kuchā river). Under 11b₁,
kitāb-hā va akhbār-hā are clearly distinguished.
⁵ I see that the reading yādhkīrd has
been accepted also in the text of the
H.-'Ā. printed in Tehrān, p. 4 (contrary
to Barthold, v. i., p. 31, note 1).
include in this category the above-mentioned details regarding Güzgānān and Gilān.

Abul-Fadl Gulpāyagānī (v.i., p. ix) made an interesting suggestion in taking the Ḥ.-‘A. 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-Khāzīn’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. Ist., 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. 426, 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 Gardizī’s parallels, v.i. p. 229, 260; cf. also pp. 251, 289, 293, 363, 380, 382, 391. [ Cf. Index E: Map.]

3 By Ištakhrī, 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. cxxii–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 Qorān, iv, 16, where the “two Orient” 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 *Mirwāt* 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 5a₂). With this reservation, we may enumerate our author's more obvious authorities as follows:

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

---

1 In § 4, 33. Sardinia is located to the south of *Rūmiya*. Has Sardinia been confused with Sicily?

2 Cf. also §§ 13, 1., § 15, 12.-13.

3 Cf. also § 8, 5. "the Greeks".

4 Maq., 271: *idhā nasārta fi kitābi-ʾl-Jayhāniyyi wajadahu qad ihtawāʾ alā jamiʿi aṣli Ibn Khurdādhbih."

---
(b) Some unknown work which was also utilized by I. Rusta, Bakri, Gardizi, 'Aufe, &c.,¹ and which is usually identified with Abū 'Abdillāh Muhammad b. Ahmad Jayhānī’s lost Kitāb al-mamālik wal-masālik.² 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.³ This may be the explanation of the fact that the peoples V.n. nd.r and Mirvāt figure only in the H.-‘Ā. and Gardizi. The rare reports quoted by name in I. Rusta (e.g. Abū 'Abdillāh b. Ishāq on India, v.i., pp. 235 and 241,⁴ and Hārûn b. Yahyā on the Byzantine Empire and the Balkans, v.i., pp. 320, 419, 468) may have been originally collected by Jayhānī. Through him may have been transmitted even the echoes of Khuwārizmi⁵ and Sulaymān-the-Merchant,⁶ 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. Ahmad 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 divān should be written down and brought to him, such (as existed in) the Byzantine empire, Turkestān, 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 Gardizi-M. Nāzim, 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 Préface, v.i., p. 23, cf. also S. Janicsek, Al-Djaihäni’s lost ‘Kitāb al-Masālik wal-mamālik’. Is it to be found at Mashhad? in BSOS, v/1, 1926, pp. 14–25. [We now know that the rumour about the discovery of Jayhānī’s work in Mashhad was premature.]
³ According to the Fihrist, p. 154, Ibn al-Faqih “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., 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.
Maq., pp. 3–4, says that Jayhānī "assembled foreigners, questioned them on the kingdoms, their revenues, the kind of roads leading to them, also on the height of the stars and the length of the shadows in their land, in order in this wise to facilitate the conquest of provinces, to know their revenues, &c. . . . He divided the world into seven climes\(^1\) and assigned a star to each. Now he speaks of stars and geometry, anon of matters which are of no use to the mass of people, now he describes Indian idols, now he relates the wonders of Sind, now he enumerates taxes and revenues. I myself have seen that he mentions also little-known stations and far-distant halting-places. He does not enumerate provinces, nor forces, he does not describe towns. . . . On the other hand, he speaks of the roads to east, west, north, and south, together with a description of the plains, mountains, valleys, hillocks, forests, and rivers found thereon. Consequently the book is long, yet he neglected most of the military roads, as well as the description of the chief towns.\(^2\) We may then attribute personally to Jayhānī many interesting items in our book on the Farther East\(^3\) and the Turkish tribes. The data on the Turks living round the Issik-kul (§ 12) reflect the complete disintegration of the former dominions of the Türkish, and even the latter's successors the Khallukh seem to be under pressure from the south by the Yaghmā (future Qarā-khānids). In some details we may even recognize traces of Jayhānī's interested curiosity to which Maq. alludes (cf. infra, p. 270). Some Arabic forms of names (§ 10, 45. and 46., § 15, 9., § 17, 1., § 42, 17.) may also be due to Jayhānī's original text.

\(^{(c)}\) Ištakhrī (§Balkhī) is without doubt the source most systematically utilized in the \(H.-\AA.\). 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 form\(^4\) one would infer that Išt. was used in a Persian translation. Several points in Central Asia have parallels only in Ibn Ḫauqal (\(BGA, ii\)) and Maqdisī (\(BGA, iii\)). However, our author could not have utilized I.H., as otherwise we should find in the \(H.-\AA.\) 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.
\(^2\) Cf Barthold, Turkestan, p. 12.
\(^3\) Cf. the reference to the "books" with regard to the Kuchchā river, § 6, 4.
\(^4\) Cf. Index E.
tional items on Transoxiana, &c. existed in the original Išt. and were preserved both by I.H and the H.-Ā. As regards Maq. even the earliest date in his book precludes the possibility of its use by our author. Consequently in cases of coincidence we have to suppose that Maq., too, BGA, 5a (Const. MS.), utilized some additional passages in Balkhī>Išt., which were also available in our author’s copy.

(d) More than problematic is the influence of Mas’ūdī 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!), Dagestan, and the northern Caucasus (§§ 35–6, 48–9), but our author adds several details not found elsewhere and we should rather assume that he utilizes a source of which Mas’ūdī possessed only an abstract. Possibly the same source is responsible for the interesting details on Gīlān.

(e) Very curious are a few original points on Arabia. One might suppose (v.i., p. 411) that some of them are due to an early knowledge of Hamdānī’s Jazīrat al-‘arab 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 conversations with him constitute one of the very pleasant recollections of my life.

1 See de Goeje in BGA, iv, p. vi: to the years 377 and even 387/997 A.H. 375/985 but certain passages point
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.
ADDENDA TO THE ḤUDŪD AL-ĀLAM

By V. MINORSKY

When my translation of the Ḥudūd al-Ālam was published in 1937, it was found impossible to swell the book¹ by further remarks on the language of the Persian original, and I promised (p. xlvi) to deal with this problem at a later date.

On the other hand, the quarter of a century which has elapsed since I began my work on the Ḥudūd has brought a considerable number of new facts bearing on the interpretation of the data which I was trying to explain. In various ways my work has been continued, both in the articles which can be considered as a by-product of the Ḥudūd,² and in contributions on fresh but cognate texts.³ The object of my present article is to bring the book up to date by integrating my own research and by completing it with references to the studies of other scholars.

Part I

In my translation of the Ḥudūd, the actual Persian expressions (either in transcription, or in the original) have been profusely quoted throughout the text. This enables me in the following to refer only to the more typical cases. I wish to mention here the valuable work on the evolution of Persian style by the late poet-laureate Bahār (Sabk-shināsī, 3 vols. undated, from 1331/1942 on); as a specimen of the Ḥudūd al-Ālam he quotes only its Introduction (ii, 17-18), but in his careful analysis of the peculiarities of older Persian (i, 300-436) he often gives examples from our text (i, 367, 368, 376, 378, 384, 387, 403, 425).

Addenda to the Ḥudūd al-ʿĀlam

1. Spel·lings

A desire to distinguish between the maʿrūf (і, ū) and majhūl (ē, ō) sounds can be traced in the MS. Kūhsaym seems to indicate -sēm (instead of the usual sīm), 24a. Some local ē/ā are indicated by the forms Ḥnībīr (*Anbēr), 21a, as against Ist., 270, Anbār, and shahr-salīr (*salēr for salārī?). Īmadh (for Ṭāmīd), 10b, is a strange combination of the Arabic imāla with the Persian dh after a vowel. The vocalization Raudhān corresponds to *Rōdhān and Kaumīs to *Komīs, 7a and 17a. One cannot attach importance to Sāǔk-ī for Sūk-chou, 14a, etc.

Khuwar, 19b, suggests that w after kh was still pronounced before a short vowel. [The names of the two neighbouring boroughs: Khwar and Khusp (whatever their origin) suggest a pun: "eat and sleep"][14a, etc.

The idāfat after ă and ū is usually expressed by a hamza درازناه او دانکه‌ها خوردی، 7a, or even omitted سروع کرک، 7a, or even omitted سروع کرک، 7a, or even omitted سروع کرک، 7a, or even omitted سروع کرک، 7a, or even omitted سروع کرک، 7a. Of the word tarsā the plural is spelt ترسآن، 32a (a spelling which has survived only in some place-names like براان in Isfahan).

Ki “which” standing alone is regularly spelt كی; otherwise it is usually joined with the words that follow: بوقت کوشا پایه، 2a کانجا “at the time wanted by them”.

Dh, intervocalic and final (after vowels), is regularly marked but the initial ẓ in dhadhagan، 17a, Dhakhkhās، 24a, and Dharnūk looks strange. By the side of zimistān، 19a، we have 18a clearly dimistān and 16b dhimistān (?). (On the form dimistān see H. W. Bailey، J.R.A.S.، 1930، 138–40 (on the Kumzari dialect، Oman).)

The letter (with three dots)—typical for Eastern Iranian usage (for w/β)—occurs in Kanafe کنافه، 10b، 27b; كنافه for Jaffa، یافا، 27b for Jaffa، یافا، 27b; كنافه for Jaffا، یافا، 27b; كنافه for Jaffa، یافا، 27b; كنافه for Jaffا، یافا، 27b; كنافه for Jaffa، یافا， 27b; كنافه كفائة كفائة، 9a， 20b، and apparently in كوراه/کوراه، 10b، 38a، but it is difficult to decide what reasons underlie this erratic practice. In 1258، when our text was copied، it may have been but a survival of a sign no more understood.

Sad “one hundred” is spelt with ص but shast “sixty” with a ۸۰. Geographical names are given in a Persian garb: Büshang (for Arabicized Büshanj); Khūna and Kara (for Khūnaj and Karaj)، Adharbādhangān، *Harē (Herat)، etc.
The style of the *Hudūd* is matter-of-fact. The sentences are short and purely descriptive, which naturally reduces the field of observations on grammar and syntax.

(a) Nouns

Quite often nouns without any addition stand for locatives: *Bukhārā nishīnad* 19a; *in nāhiyat kharān-i nīk uftadh* "good asses are found in the region", 34b.

Diminutives are very common: *shahrak; shākhak* "a small branch", 7a; *biyābānak, 12, daryāyak* "a lake", 37a; *nāhiyat, 38b.*

The plural ending *-ān/-agān* is still general for animate beings: *jānāvarān, 2a; *dadhagān, 17a; gabragān* (a plural of *gabra* and not of a diminutive *gabrak*, cf. *Fārs-nāma, Nicholson’s Introduction, xxix*); and even *hamdūnagān, 34a*.

The suffix *-ina* is used for groups and kinds of beings and things: *gilīmīna* "various kinds of gilims", 22b; *rūdhīna* perhaps "madder" (?), 32b (though, f. 33a: *rūnās*).

The suffix *-nā* appears in *dirāznā* "length", 2a (but 7a: *dirāzā*); cf. *tangnā* "narrowsness", *Ahsan al-tawārikh*, 431.

Compounds of every kind are very frequent: badh-dil, *badh-rag* (see vocabulary), *giyā-khwār, tang-‘alaf* "wanting in grass"; javānmard-*pīsha* "professional stalwart", 25b; *yak-izār bāshand* "they are people wearing only the izār", 15a; *tan-durust* "healthy", referring both to men and to the climate, 27a. *Bisyār* is often used with nouns as an adjective expressing abundance: *shahrīst bisyār-mardum* "a populous town", 18a; *bisyār-pādhshāy* "with many kings (or *pādhsha‘i* kingdoms?)", 14a; *mardūmānī bisyār-zar* "wealthy (moneyed) men", 39b. Such compound adjectives are then used as comparatives: *bisyār-khwāsta-tar*, 19a, or superlatives: *bisyār-mi`mat-tarīn, 39b*.

The pronouns *ū, vay, and ān* indiscriminately refer to single or several objects, both animate and inanimate: *si andar vay* "three out of (seven)", 4a; *shish jazīra az vay ... ān-ra khāliya khwānand, 5a; dū jazīra ... ā-ra s.qytrā khwānand, 4b; daryāyak-hā yākī az ā, 4a.*

This curious usage seems to be connected with the use of singular and plural in the verb, see below under (d) 2.

The use of *ān-i* (with an *idafat*), both as "(someone's) own" and as a substitute for the noun already mentioned ("and that of") is frequent, see correction *ad* p. 87. In § 23, 6, ān seems to stand in the latter function راکه کرکانست واین کوس ونسابورست جاجوهم
"J. is the store-place of G. and that of K. and N.", in which case the reading in-i Kūmis should be presumed.

(b) Verbs

The present particle mī/hami occurs rarely, e.g. in kūhī az gird-i in jazīra bar-āyadh one would expect mī; when used, it usually stresses the meaning as "continually, ever": va hamī-ravadh tā hama(-i) nāhiyat-i Nūba bi-burradh, 11b.

Particle bi-, as attested by the spelling 5b, seems to have sounded ba-.

When added to the past it seems to give it the sense of what in Slavonic languages is called "perfective aspect": va bīshtar-i āb-i in shahr-hā az chashma-hā-st ki andar xamin biyāvarad-ānd "have brought underground" (in Russian: проведи), 19a; rūdh-kadhā-hā-yi ā bi-kanda-ānd.

A considerable number of verbs, now chiefly transitive, are used intransitively: bar-dāradh, bar-giradh "begins, starts", 2b; bāzdāradh "adjoins", etc., see Vocabulary; oikashadh "stretches", 2b; bi-kushāyadh "branches off", 3b; andar ā namak bandadh "salt is formed"; ānā jā ki bi-burradh "down to where it ends"; 5b.

*Gudhārdan is used as a causative of gudhashtan: kūhīst... bārhā ā bar pusht basta bāshand bad-ān kūh *bighudhārand "they carry over", 15b.

The verb dāshtan serves almost as an auxiliary in such expressions as: bar sar bar-nihādha dārand "wear on their heads", 37b; (shalvār) bar sar-i zānū gird-karda dārand, 37b. " cf. Gardizi (Barthold), 92: va chis-i ki ishān-rā ba-kār āyad ān āvikhtā dārand.

After tavān and bāyad usually the full form of the infinitive is found: va ān... na-tavān kushādan, 7a; du-tāh tavān kardan, 38a; bi-bāyadh burūdhan, 34a. But: ba hama jihān na-tavān dānist "it is impossible to know it even for a whole world", or perhaps "unknown throughout the whole world", 27b.

The composite future is very rare: bidānist ki tüfān hamī khwāhad būd "he knew that the flood would happen". Hamī khwāhad seems to indicate the stage at which khwāhad had not yet become a mere auxiliary.

The past participle used with -ast has a passive meaning by itself, whereas at present one would expect the auxiliary verbs (shudan, gārdīdan): bar ān kūh... sūrāt-i har maliki nīghašt-ast va sar-gudhasht-hā-yi īshān bar ān jay nīghašt-ast "are represented... are
written” (27b); andar miyän-i kūh-u daryā nihādha-ast “is situated”, 29b [cf. Juvaynī, iii, 235: gūrī nihāda-ast].

This helps us to explain the difficult passage: mar ü-rā andar kitāb-hā(-i) akhbār yādh karda-ast (see below, p. lxvi), where karda-ast corresponds to the present-day karda shuda-ast.

(c) Prepositions and Particles

Az stresses the use of ān-i (see above): pādhā’i az ān-i Balharāy-ast “kingship belongs to B.”, 14b, 15a.

Bā/bāz indicates direction: bāz nashriq rasad, 2a; bā daryā-yi Khwārazm uftadh “(the Jaxartes) flows to (into) the Aral sea”.

Bi with shudhan: bi darya-yi a’zam shavadh “turns into a great sea” (in Russian становится морем).

The use of prepositions combined with postposition (as frequent in the Shāh-nama) is not attested in the Hudūd: in the sentence bar sar bar-nihādha dārand, 37b, the second bar is only a pre-verb belonging to nihādhan.

Chand with the following yā-yi vaḥdat stands for “the size of . . .”: chand gūsfandī, 35b; har yakī chand kabki “as big as a quail”, 38a. cf. Tārikh-i Sistān, 261: chand māda-pīlī.


(d) Syntax

1. Phrases

The order of words in a phrase is free and expressive: va paydhā kardim hama-i jazirahā-ī ki-buzurg-ast, az ābādhān-i vay va virān (2a); va ammā rūdhi ṭabi’ī ān-ast ki ābha’ī buvadh buzurg ki az gudhāz-i barf . . . bikushāyadh (8b). Adjectives often stand separated from the nouns to which they refer, at the end of the sentence: shākh-ī az sūy-ī maghrib bāz kashadh khurd (8a); rūdhhā kī andar jihān-ast buzurg (2a).

1 The meaning seems to be: “and as regards the two mountains they are mentioned”.
The asyndeton construction and anacolutha are very frequent: *nuhum jazira'ist . . . Hiranj khwánand* “[which] they call H.”, 4b; *yakih ax án küh-i Kufíj khwánand andar miyán-i biyábán-ast* “[which] lies in a desert”, 7a; *náhiyat-hä-i junúb mardumánish siyáh-and*, 39a; *náhiyat-ist mashriq-i vay rüdh-i Atíl . . . va mardumání-and kish-i Ghúziyán dårân* “to the east of [which] is the Atíl . . . and they are people (who) have the religion of the Ghùz”; *har yakih ax-in küh ù-rá nám-ha-i bisyár-ast*, 6a; *nám-i qaumí-st bar küh-i Bulghari nishínad*, 37a. In some of such cases the *yā-yi ishrát* seems to be the link with what follows.  

2. Singular and Plural

The complicated problem of the use of plural and singular in Persian verbs was treated by M. Minovi in *JRAS*, 1942/i, 41–7. He admits that “more often than not”, he had to depend on his ears and that the rules cannot be formulated in a way “that those to whom Persian is not natal could exercise their own judgment”. On the whole, he thinks that after inanimate and abstract nouns verbs should not be used in the plural. To this rule he adds a rider that this use seems to be subject to the “spirit of the verb”. If the action it expresses is “the peculiarity of human beings” plural might be used.

In grammar the only safe method is induction, and the “rules” of the grammarians can be taken only as generalizations from the facts observed. Outsiders cannot tamper with the facts provided by the speakers, but in the formulation of the conclusions foreigners have often rendered help to the building up of national grammars. Two points are certain:

(1) The subject must be treated historically: what is accepted at one period may be rejected as “incorrect” at a later date.

(2) Poetical quotations are less reliable than prose in view of the temptations to which poets are exposed.

On the whole, one might suggest as a “working hypothesis” the view that the choice of singular or plural in Persian is often dictated by the character of the subject in the sentence. Should the plural elements composing the subject represent a kind of collective total, the verb is used in the singular; should they, on the contrary, have individual characteristics, or be meant to be personified, the plural is admissible. Therefore, using Minovi’s examples: *birinj-hä rikht*
requires the singular because not the individual grains but their collective mass is in view; *panj sarbāz rasīd* also singular, because the five soldiers are treated as a group; but in *dar an vaqt panj shā`ir-e busurg būdand* “at that time there were five great poets”, I should venture a plural because the poets cannot be de-personalized as grains, or even as soldiers; *sang-hā az ham mī tarakīdand* “the stones (began) to burst”, requires a plural not because their action is a “peculiarity of human beings”, but because they went off one after the other, and not like in the case when “five ton of stones” was exploded.

Here are some illustrations from the *Ḥudūd*: daryāyak-hā-i khurd hisyār-ast chūn daryāyak-hā-i kī yākī az-ū (sic) andar kūh-hā-i Gūzgānān-ast . . . va chinān(k)i andar kūh-hā-i Tūs-ast va kūh-hā-i Ṭabaristān-ast va lā(ā)kin na-ma`rūf-and (sic) va yā vaqt buvadh kī khushk shavadh (sic), 4b. In this passage the lakes are treated first indefinitely in singular; then plural is introduced, as it seems with reference to the lakes enumerated by name; then a singular is used to show that some particular group dries up at times. Ḥar qaumī k-andan nāhiyat-hā(-i) mukhtalīf-and, 1b. Here the plural is used *ad sensum*, whether with regard to the collective qaum “people”, or to the numerous cases. Other examples: *hama-biyābān-hā kī ma`rūf-ast*, meaning the totality, 2a. هفتم دریاژه... کی از چهار رود پیوندی کی از بیان کشايد “from the four rivers which (jointly) come out of Buttamān”, 4a.

A special use of plural is for recurring seasons: *ba-vaqt-i bahārān* “in the spring”, 9a (in Russian bëchnami). For bahār-ān, see other similar words referring to festivals and periods of time: bāmdād-ān, khatna-sūr-ān and even khāch-shūr-ān (for the Armenian Twelfth-tide).

3. Vocabulary

The following selection concentrates on the uses of words and shades of meaning more than on technical terms, the equivalents of which are given in the text and in the Indexes: D. on the products and E. of special terms, *Ḥudūd*, pp. 520–4.

ābādhān “prosperous, inhabited”, 3a, 3b, 17b, 18a; ābādhānī “cultivated lands, a settlement”, 4a.

ābānk (ābānak ?)-i surkh, meaning unknown (a textile ?), 26a.

ābkāma “a sauce or condiment of milk, buttermilk, seeds of wild rue, yeast, and vinegar”, Zhubkovsky, Razvalini Merva, 1894, p. 22 (quoting the *Ḥudūd*).
äb-khız “floods”, 20a.
afvāh “aromas”, 5b.
‘akka “magpie”, 9a.
ālāt “objects”, 17a; “accessories, utensils”, 21b.
āmilā “emblica officinalis”, 15b (Lauffer, 581).
āmisanda “sociable, good mixer”, 17b.
‘amūd-i rūdh “the main stream of the river”, 8b.
andaki “a small quantity”, 5b; rūdh-i Ṣil andaki buvadh “dwindles”, 3b.
andar parāgandan “to scatter”, 6a.
argusad “asafetida”.
arzan “millet”, 37b (cf. jāvars).
arzīs “lead”, 23a (see surb); “tin”, 4b.
turkān-i āshi “trucial Turks”, 24b.
bādhībn “a fan”, 23a.
badh-dīl “cowards” (Vullers, i, 201: timidus), 38b, but badh-rag “malicious” (see Vullers, i, 203: malae stirpis, malae naturae, malignus), 18b.
az bahr-i ān “therefore”, 4a; nuh bahr and nuh-yak “one-ninth”, 2a.
bār “plenty” (bār-and “are numerous”), 17a.
bar-dāradh “begins”, 2b; “separates”, 6b; bar-girād “begins”, 2b, 5b; “shoots off”, 6a; (raftan) bar “to skirt”, 11b; bar hudūd . . . bigudharadh “marches with”, 12b; ba bar-i Ghūz “towards the Ghuz, to the Ghuz side”, 18b.
barākūh “the slope of a mountain, uplands”, 17b, cf. barākūh va bar sar-i ān-kūh “on the slope and on the top”, 28b. cf. Barākūh, a mountain in Osh, see Barthold, Turkestan, p. 156; and the nisba Barākūhi in Tārikh-i Bayhaq, 153.
bastan: ghalaba bastan “to vanquish”, 38a.
bāz “toll”, 25b, but bāzgāh “toll-house”, 33a.
bāzargānī (bāzurgānī ?) “current money”, 34a; “profit, transaction”, 36a.
bāz dāradh bi . . . “adjoins”, 3b; bāz gardadh “turns off, separates”, 6a; bāz kashadh “separates, shoots off”, 8a.
bāz-khwāndan . . . ba “to call something after something”, 29b.
bįjashk (*pjijashk) “a doctor”, 29a.
birūn as “apart from, except”, 4a.
būrīdhan “to end, to cease”, 5b.
chādar (now chadur) “a kind of light shawl”, 34a.
dāngū-hā(-i) khudānī “edible cereals”, 32b.
dāradh “there is”, har kūhī-rā mihtarī dāradh, 72; dāradh az . . . ba . . . “stretches from . . . to”, 9a; dāradh . . . ba “is contiguous”, 19a.
darāṣā “length”, 72; darāṣnā, 2a.
dīda-bān, 24a, corresponds to Ist. 333: al-jabal allādhī ‘alayhi marqab al-ahrās ‘alā al-Turk “the mountain on which is the observation post of the guards (watching) the Turks”. Consequently dīda-bān, in the idea of the author, is connected with the verb dīdan. In the same sense the word is used in Arabic (plur. dīyādība “watchers”, see Tabari, iii, 1229).
dīgar “for the rest, moreover”, 38a.
falāta “sweet dish made of ewe’s milk”, V. A. Zhukovsky, Razvalini Meroa, 1894, p. 21 (quoting the Hudūd), 20a.
fanak “weasel” (?), 17a. [French dictionaries give “fennec, petit renard des régions sahariennes”. Is this the original meaning?]
furūdh āyadh ba ... “follows, takes (a direction)”, 6a, 7a.

fūsūdhan “to grow, to increase”, 3a.

ganda “bad-smelling”, 10b.

gardanda bar havā “(nomads) wandering in accordance with the seasons”, 22b.

gāvars “millet, vetch”, 26b. In the corresponding passages of Iṣṭakhrī, 166-7: dhurra “sorghum”, but Ya’qūbi, BGA, vii, 205: va laysa bi-Turk-āstān zarʾ illā al-dūkhn, va huwa al-jāvars (i.e. gāvars). cf. also I. Faḍlān, Mashhad MS., 203b.


ghīzhgāv “yak, bos grunniens”, 17a.

gird andar āyadh “forms a circle”, 6b; az gird-i Kavār andar āyadh or gardadh “makes a sweep around”, 10a.

giyyā-khwār “a prairie”, 8b.

gū “a sphere, a globe”, 2a.

bi-gudārand (*bi-gudhärand) “they carry over”, 15a; gudhāstan (?) “to cross (a river)”, 16a

gudhāzanda “fusible”, 22b.

hadd “extent, length” (as opposed to karāna : “limit”), 2b; hudūd (1) “confines (i.e. the area within certain limits)”, 6a, 10a (cf. Preface, pp. i and xv); (2) “marches, outlying territories”, §§ 24, 26.

hamdāna “a baboon”, 34a.

havāsīl “a pelican”, 5b.

illā-ki (after negation) “but”, 7b.

jauz [göz]-i buvā “a nutmeg”, 5b.

jōvār, see gāvars.

jiḥāz “merchandise, commodities”, 15a, 16b, 34a.

jūr.b “bags (stockings?)”, 37a (the form possibly reflects the Arabic original). ba-zar kanda “inlaid with gold”, 15b.

kapī “monkey”, 34a.

karāna “confines, limits”, 2b.

kārdār “deputy governor”, 13b, 20b; kārkard “works”, 21a; bi-kār dārand “they use”, 12b, 30a; bi kār shavaḏā “is used, used up (?)”, 10b, 11b, 29b.


k.rk.ri “some Indian bird”, 14a.

H. W. Bailey compares this name with Skt. kukkutī “domestic fowl”, which survives in many Indian dialects. [In IF, 131: juwānk.rk “a fantastic bird (?)”].
khashāvarz [sic] kunand “they till”, 17b.

kāz “a hut”, 37b.

kazdum (for kashdum) “a scorpion”, 32a.

khar-i waḥshi “wild ass” (Persian: gōr), 8b.

khargāh “felt hut”, 6b.

khāukhī-i chinī “some kind of (silk) textile”, 13b, 30a (see below, note ad p. 84).

khayzurān “bamboo”, 5b.

khiŋ-but “the White Idol”, 21b.

khumb (now khum) “earthen vessel”, 37b.

khutū “rhinoceros horn”, 13b; but see surū. cf. Manīnī-Ūtbī, ii, 31, and Minorsky, Marvazi, p. 82.

-khwār, e.g. giyyā-khwār, 17b, “grazing-ground”; mardum-khwāra “man-eater”, 4b.

khvāsta “wealth, belongings”, 2a.

kimukhta “shagreen”, 30a.

khushk “dry land, mainland”, 5a; jāba-yi khushk, 6b, “Jāba of the mainland”; khushk-rūdh “dry bed”, 22b.

jāma-yi k.nis, some kind of textile, 30a.
Addenda to the Hudūd al-ʿĀlam

kushūdhan “to conquer”, 7a; az gudhāz-i barf bi-kushāyadh “is formed from the thawing of snow”, 8b.
mardum “a man”, 6a; mardumān “men”, 6a; mardumānī-and ba-mardum nāzdīk “they are men near to humanity”, 17b; dūrta az tab’i mardī “more remote from humanity”, 36b.
mahfūrī “stamped velvet”, 33b; cf. Rāḥat al-sudur, ζ12; Mujmal al-tavārikh, ιοί; Dozy, Supp. i, 303.
Mānavī “Manichæan”, 23a.
jāy-i mansil “port of call”, 4b.
mār-i shikānī “deadly snake”, 28b.
ma’rūfgar “a pious man, a conformist”, 31a.
mazgīt-i ādhīnī “a Friday mosque”, 14b, 27a.
mihmān-dār “hospitable”, 29b.
bā-miyānā “in the centre”, 4b; bar-miyānā “on the middle (course?)”, perhaps “a middling (town)”, 16a.
murtāfī “excellent”, 4b.
musalmānī “Islamic world”, 17b; “Islamic behaviour”, 16a.
mūy “furs”, 17b, cf. Gardizī, 100.
nāhiyāt “direction”, 6a; hamānāhiyāt “every direction”; also “a region”.
nakhchir-zan “a hunter”, 17a.
na-mārūf “unknown”, 4a; nē-bādhd “not bad, so-so”, 20a; na-mahdūd “indefinite, unlimited”, 8a.
namāz-burdan “to venerate”, 18b.
namūdhan: musalmānī namāyadh “he makes, show of Islam”, 16a.
nighushak “Manichæan auditores”, 23a.
nihādh “the lie (of a country)”, 2a.
nik-akhtari “auspiciousness”, 1b.
ni’mat, for the meaning see Translation, pp. 126, 162; kam-ni’mat va bīsīyār mardum, 4b; bīsīyār ni’mat va kam-khwāsta, 37a. This special use differs from Gulistan, ch. ii, story 18, where ni’mat stands for “goods, wares”.
nishtā “residence”, 17b, 28b; andar nishtān “to embark”, 13b; bar nishtān “to mount, to take the field” (on an expedition), 15b, 19a.
padhdh kardan “to elicit”, 13b (see paydhā).
pādshā “king”, 14, 16a; pādshāh, 16a; pādshā’ī (often spelt pādshāy) “kingdom”, 14b.
pānimī “sugar, candy”, 21a.
paydhā kardan “bring to light, elucidate”, 1b, 2a.
pāy kūftān “to dance”, 30b.
pāy-zahr “an antidote”, 23b.
ghāzī-pisha “a professional ghazi”.
pishinagān “the earlier generations”, 2a.
pūl for pul “a bridge”, 31a.
rāy “an Indian raja”, 6a.
rūdh “copper (red), brass”, 24b.
rūdh-kadha “river-bed, river”, 5b, 8b.
rūdh zadān “to play on a stringed instrument”, 30b.
rūspī-khānā “a brothel”, 15a.
rūnās “madder” (in Barda’), 33a; rūdhina in Mūqān, 32b, supported by I.H., 249, who refers to madder (fuswā) in Varthān on the Araxes; rūyan [sic] on an island of the Caspian, 5b, cf. I.H., ibid.
rūyin “made of brass”, 15a.
sābiyān, as applied “to (Turkish) heathens”, 17a.
sbīja, some animal (?), 17a.
sakh “hardy”, 17a; sakhi ‘azīn “very great”, 8a.
Part II

A list of the reviews of my translation of the Ḥudūd, known to me, will be found in my bibliography, BSOAS, 1952, xiv/3, p. 676. I am obliged to Prof. I. I. Umnyakov (Samarqand), who drew my attention to a line which is missing from my translation, whereby the orientation of § 16 (Chigil) is disfigured, and to Prof. A. Eghbal (Tehran) who in a conversation (Paris, 2nd October, 1937) corrected some of my readings of the difficult script of the original. I am sorry that the text of the Ḥudūd, printed in Tehran by Sayyid Jalāl al-dīn Tehrani, in appendix to his calendar (gāh-nāma) for the
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year 1314/1935, reached me too late to make use of some of his readings.¹

Here are my additional and fresh remarks on the text.

P. vii. More exactly the Ḥ.-ʿ.Ā. was begun (not completed) in 372/982–3.


P. xiv. Ba akhbār-hā shanīdīm may refer to such special collections of stories as Akhbār al-ʿSin, etc., see Marvāzī, Index, and below under p. 172. The meaning of 44: مر او را اندر کنیا اختبار یاد کرده است is probably “concerning them mention is made in the books of akhbār”.


P. 16. Yāqūt, Irshād al-arīb, i, 142: wa kāna . . . lil-jayhānī . . . jawārīn yudirruḥā alayya. Barthold’s interpretation of jawārī as “female slaves” is wrong. See A. Muller in Fihrīst, ii, 56, who explains jawārī as a plural of “grants, pensions”.

P. 17. Balkhi’s monthly salary was 500 (later 1,000) dirhams, not dinars. The mistake is not Barthold’s but the translator’s.

P. 24. Instead of Tawāḍuʿ al-dunyā A.E. suggests *nawāḥī. Perhaps *mawādī?

P. 37. Bā-niʿmat can be paralleled with the Greek ἐὐδαμο ὅν, see Strabo, xi, 14, 4, “prosperous, opulent”. In Russian “благодатный”. But see Saʿdi, Gulistān, ii, No. 18: kārvānī-rā bisadand va nīmat-i bi-qiyyās burdand, which suggests “goods”.

P. 49. Read yādkhārd (A.E.) as in § 23, 67, kārkard.

P. 50. Nihādh “the lie of the Earth”. Penultimate: “animals and fishes”, read: “which is the habitat (maʿwā) of the animals” (S.J.).


Pp. 61 and 194. The mysterious name of the range Mānisā (مانسا) may be connected with the Min-shan mountain on the

¹ The corrections derived from these sources are acknowledged with the initials I.U., A.E., and J.T. The criticisms formulated in A. Z. V. Togan’s article “Die Völkerschaften des Chazarenreiches in neunten Jahrhundert”, published during the war in Körösi Csoma Archivum, 1940, iii/1, pp. 40–75, seem to be based mostly on misunderstandings.

P. 71 read: Khûkand-ghün 9a (k being clear).

P. 83–86. On China see now my commentary in “Marvazi” and my article Tamîm ibn Bahr, see above p. lv. The word khâvkîr occurs in the text twice. Under China (13b), khâvkîr-i *chînî (hardly khavjîr as in S.J.) comes after harîr va parand) and seems to refer to some special variety of this textile; under Sârî (30a) it stands without any qualification. One might recall here that in Persian khâv means “pile (of a textile)”. Under China, some confusion is not excluded with kîmkhâu (or kînkhâ?) which I. Khurâdhbîh, 70, mentions under China, after al-ḥarîr wa falârand! Kîmkhâ (perhaps kînkhâ) is “silk worked with gold and silver flowers, brocaded silk”, in English kincob, from Chinese kîn-hua, see Quatremère, Notices et extraits, xiv/1, 214, 304, and Blochet, Introduction, 245.

Pp. 86–92. On India see now “Marvazi” and my article “Gardîzî on India”, see above, p. 250. See below ad p. 235. P. 87 (§ 10, 12). Better: pâdshâ’i (pâdshâhi?) az ân-i zanî buvadh Râniya khwânand “and the kingship belongs to a woman (whom they call )Râni”.


Pp. 94–5 and 97–8. On Toghuzghuz and Khallukh, see “Tamîm ibn Bahr”.

P. 98. Several words are missing from the translation, which is misleading (I.U.). Read: “East and South of the Chigil country are the limits of the Khallukh; west of it are the limits of the Tukhs”. The commentary p. 227 should also be altered accordingly.

P. 100 (§ 18, 2): instead of Q.rq.rkhän A. Z. Validî Togan, Ibn Fadlân, p. 328, suggests *Qirqiz-khan, which would suit the indication that the customs which the inhabitants follow are those of the Khirkhîz.

P. 102. § 23, 2: “*Sabzavâr, a small borough on the road to Rayy and the chief place of the district Byh” (S.J. and A.E.). The author definitely wishes to say that Sabzavâr is the centre of the district which in the Arabicized form is called Bayhaq. The older Persian form must have been *Bëhak, later *Bëha. In fact, this latter form is attested in the “History of Bayhaq” (563/1164), Tehran 1317/1938, p. 33, where various etymologies are suggested.
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See also Hāfiz-i Abrū, *Geography*, Brit. Mus., Or. 1577, fol. 185b, which explains that Bēha means bihtar “better”. It is possible that in our text ینه is a mis-spelling for ینه attested in the other sources and supported by the Arabic ینه.


P. 119. § 25, 93. A Turkish document gives the reading *Y.känknt* (Henning), but in Muqaddasi, 48, *Takābkath* and *Yakänkath* figure side by side, under Isbījāb. cf. *BSOAS*, ix/3, 552.

P. 122. § 26, 25: the division of Gurgānj into two parts, inner and outer (*bīrūnī*), is interesting as accounting for the *nisba* of Abū-Rayḥān Bīrūnī.


P. 152. On the talisman against the crocodiles in Egypt (Fustāṭ) see Bīrūnī, *al-Āthār*, p. 259, who does not quote his source but in parallel passages refers to *al-Qibṭ* (“Egyptians?”).

P. 159, 1. 15 (on the Rūs) instead of بذرك read: ِزرك of large frames”. cf. I. Rusta, 149: *wa lahum juthath*.

P. 161, § 49, 2. See below ad p. 447.

P. 162, § 50.: the Khazar king “is one of the descendants of Ansā”. A. Z. V. Togān, *Ibn-Fadlān*, 1939, p. 270, has restored the name as “sicher Asena, das heisst a-se-na oder a-če-na”, a well-known name of an ancient Turkman clan or family. I strongly doubt this hypothesis. I treat the sources comparatively. In this part the Hudūd runs entirely parallel to I. Rusta and Gardīzī and there is no doubt possible that all the three are based on the same
report.\(^1\) The most important fact about the Khazars is that they had two rulers, the one personifying the idea of "kingship" and the other acting as the real ruler.\(^2\) This striking arrangement was known already to Sir J. G. Frazer, see his article, "The killing of the Khazar king", *Folk-lore*, xxvii, 1917, pp. 382–407, and *The Golden Bough*, iv, 120.

Ibn Rusta, 139–140, at the given place says\(^3\): "They have a king who is called İṣḥā (Ayshā). The supreme king is Khazar Khāqān. He does not enjoy the obedience of the Khazars but has the name only. The power to command belongs to the İṣḥā, since in regard to control and the armies he is so placed that he does not have to care for anyone above him. Their supreme ruler is a Jew, and likewise the İṣḥā and those of the generals and the chief men who follow his way of thinking. The rest of them have a religion like the religion of the Turks".

The corresponding passage in Gardīzī, ed. Barthold, p. 95 (and checked by me on the Cambridge MS., f. 190a) is as follows: "And they have a king whose name is Abshād-malik the great (?) and they call the great king Khazar-Khāqān and the Khazar-Khāqān is only a bearer of the name, whereas the direction (*madār*) of every office (*shughl*) in the country and at the court (*hasham*) is incumbent on Abshād and no one is greater than Abshād. The greater chief and Abshād are Jews (by religion), as well as those who are inclined thereto (or friendly to him? to them?) as well as (some) commanders and noblemen (*buzurgān*). The others are holding a religion which resembles that of the Ghuz Turks..."

The passage in the *Ḥudūd* (f. 38b) is as follows:

آئل شهريست ك روذ آئل بر ميان وى بكندر وقصبة خزرانست و مستقر پادشاه است و اوا طرخان خاقان خواند و اف فرزندان آنسا است واندر. نیمه مغربی نشیند ازین شهري باهم لشکر و این نیمه باره دارذ و اندرین (کذا) نیمه دیگر مسیلیان و بت پرستان اند وان پادشاها هفت حاکست اندرین شهر از هفت دین مختلف بر سعثی چون داوری پزکتر افتند از پادشا دستوری خواهند یا اکه کندن بحکم آن داوری.

\(^1\) Marvazi, p. 33, also uses the same report but at his time the Khazars' power had been destroyed and he omits the part concerning the kings.

\(^2\) cf. p. 333 on the division of power in Ghūr (§ 23, 48).

We cannot, evidently, restore A-se-na in I. Rusta and Gardîzî, and thus the name in the Hudûd (based on the same source) would be an exception. It is clear that the epitomizer has drastically compressed the original, and should we read A-se-na (which no other source knows) the last trace of dyarchy would disappear from the text. Misunderstandings in Persian sources while translating from the Arabic\(^1\) are not uncommon and I have a strong suspicion that the author of the Hudûd in the passage و هم الملك يقال له ايشا (see I. Rusta) has somehow misread an indistinctly written ل as ولد and translated it accordingly as farzandân. In conjunction with the two other parallel sources this is likely, but if we treat each source separately, we run the risk of reading into it what we wish.

According to Constantine Porphyrogenitus, ch. 42, the first king was called ὁ χάκανος and the second only ὁ περχ (bek). Therefore in Muslim sources one can suspect some minor title, like shad. Could we then restore the whole title tentatively Ay-shad “the Moon-shad”? See the names of Oghuz-khan’s sons Gün-khan, Ay-khan, etc.

P. 168. Several oversights in the dates. Ya’qûbî’s history ends in 278/892. Qudâma wrote after 316/928 and died in 337/948. Birûnî’s “India” circa 421/1030, but according to A. Z. V. Togan circa 1025. Tafhîm 420/1029 (also p. 170).

P. 172. Sulaymân, Silsilat al-tawârikh, see now an excellent new edition of this text by the late J. Sauvaget, under the more appropriate title: Akhbar al-Šin wal-Hind, 1948. Sulaymân-the-Merchant is now considered only as one of the sources of the book. cf. my “Marvazi”, 143.

P. 177. Another scion of the Gûzgânân house may have been the author of the Jawâmû al-ulûm, “ibn Farîghûn”, see F. Rosenthal, A History of Muslim Historiography, 1952, p. 32. As he is said to have been a pupil of Âbü Zayd Balkhi (d. 322/934) he must have lived in the earlier part of the 10th century.

P. 183. § 3, 12. سیاطی occurs in Sarakhsi, see above, under p. 15.

P. 187. § 4, 9: delete Kra after Kedâ!


P. 195. § 5, 6. Could not Turfan itself refer to the T’u-fan “Tibetans” who occupied the region of “the four garrisons”

\(^1\) I presume that the original source was Jayhânî and that the latter’s work was in Arabic.
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(Kashghar, Khotan, Kucha, and Qarashahr) between 790 and 860, see H. Hoffmann, “Tibets Eintritt in die Universalgeschichte”, in Saeculum, ii, München, 1950, p. 270. A parasitic r appears in Kucha-r and some other names of this region (see in Marco Polo forms like Succuir for *Suk-chou).

Pp. 196–200. The fact that the “Belt of the Earth” was called Minṭaqat al-ʿArḍ points to an Arabic source. Apart from I. Hauqal, 109–111 (ed. Kramers, p. 249): jabal ἀλά ἀλξάρ ἀλ-ʿارḍ, see Biruni, India, 96 (tr. i, 197), on “the range of towering mountains like the vertebrae of a pine stretching through the middle latitude of the earth from China to Galicia (Jalāliqa) in Spain”. A similar idea was known even in antiquity. The late E. Honigmann drew my attention (8th January, 1952) to Orosius, adv. paganos, i/2, 17–18, and H. Berger in Wissen. Erdkunde, 2nd ed., p. 418.¹ A different idea is found in the Bundahishn, ch. viii and xii (“the other mountains have grown out of Alburz, in number 2244 mountains”). I. Faqih, 295, transfers the centre to jabal al-Qafq (the Caucasus), which he traces down to Mecca. cf. also jihān-nāma (circa A.D. 1200), quoted in Barthold’s Turkestan, i, 81, on the orography of Central Asia and al-ʿOmari in Blachère, Extraits des principaux géographes, 1932, pp. 302–8, who speaks of Jabal-Qāf as Umm al-jibāl but purely theoretically and following Ptolemy. In any case, the passage of the Ḥudūd remains the most remarkable and realistic synthesis of little-known facts—nine centuries in advance of modern exploration! See my articles: “A Persian Geographer of A.D. 982 on the Orogaphy of Central Asia”, in Geogr. Jour., September, 1937, pp. 259–264, and “Géographes et voyageurs musulmans”, in Bull. de la Soc. R. de Géographie d’Egypte, Cairo, November, 1951, pp. 19–46.

P. 199. In the Tārikh-i Bayhaq, Tehran, p. 19, the following countries are enumerated: 45. Ṭukhāristān, 46. Bilūr, 47. Qāshmīr, 48. Bilād al-thalj (“country of the snow”) and 49. Soghd.

P. 211. As Juvaynī, i, 47, spells the original name must have been Panākat.

P. 212. The river Khwābdān is mentioned between Shiraz and Naubandagān, see Miskawaih, The Eclipse, ed. Margoliouth, iii, 183.

¹ The exact reference is to H. Berger, Geschichte der wissenschaftlichen Erdkunde der Griechen, Leipzig, 1903, p. 418. The Macedonian writers gave the name of Caucasus to the (theoretical) range continuing the Taurus of Asia Minor throughout Asia. See Eratosthenes in Arrian’s Anabasis, v, 3, 1, and Strabo, xv, C689. The range formed the wall (διάφραγμα) between the northern and the southern zones of the Earth.
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P. 214. Dahana-yi shīr must correspond to the whirlpool which Abū-Dulaf strangely calls فم البواب, see my “Abū-Dulaf Mis‘ar ibn Muhahil’s travels in Iran”. Cairo, 1955, p. 60. cf. also the name of a whirlpool in the Caspian in I. Faqīh, 290: mauḍī‘ yuqūlu lahu dahān-shīr wa fīhi dūrdūr.

P. 218. § 6, 49. Add: Le Strange, “Al-Abrik, the capital of the Paulicians”, JRAI, 1896, p. 74.

P. 223. On China see in more detail my “Marvazī” and the analysis of Abū-Dulaf’s travels in the work quoted above ad p. 214.

Pp. 227 and 256. The most original part of the Ḥudūd is that concerning Central Asia and the eastern Turkish tribes. The source which our anonymous author used is probably Jayhānī’s lost work, but even Jayhānī could have combined various reports (see my “Marvazī”, p. 7). Prima facie, the basic itineraries utilized for the northern and southern parts of the present-day territories of Sin-kiang (Chinese Turkestan) may seem to form one block, but it is quite possible that the original inquiries were carried out by different persons and at different times. The shifting scenes of the 9th century, when the Tibetan-Chinese struggles were still going on and the Uyghur and other Turkish tribes were advancing westwards, greatly complicated the unification of the heterogeneous reports.

In my commentary I assumed that the date of the occupation of Kan-chou by the Uyghurs was A.D. 843–4, and that—as only Tibetans and Chinese are mentioned in our paragraph on Kan-chou (§ 9, 7)—the description of the latter must be previous to that date. In my “Tamīm”, p. 278, following the advice of the late Prof. G. Haloun, I amended the dates of the Uyghur occupation—of Kan-su as “after 847”, and of the region of Turfan as “after 866”—adding that both the principalities “came into their full rights only at the beginning of the tenth century”. As according to the Ḥudūd Kuchā (§ 9, 10) was exposed to the attacks of the Toghuzghuz, I had admitted the possibility of the Toghuzghuz being, in this case, some remnants of the pre-Uyghur “Western T‘u-chüeh”. This hypothesis has been doubted by J. R. Hamilton in his carefully written book Les Ouighours à l’époque des cinq dynasties [907–960], Paris, 1955, p. 13, in which he says: “on doit dater cette mention de H.-‘Ā. (§ 9, 7: Kan-chou) des années après 848, et on remarque alors que les renseignements de la géographie persane sur Kan-tcheou et sur Koutcha sont pratiquement contemporains”.

If, however, we consider the chapter on the Toghuzghuz (§ 12),
we see that the author represents the region of the Eastern T'ien-shan as solidly occupied by the Toghuzghuz, and in this case the term refers apparently to the Uyghurs. Gardizï, whose sources are close to those of the Hudûd, adds that the religion of the Toghuzghuz settled in Panjikant (i.e. Bish-balïq) is Manichæan (Dînâvarî), and this was a typical feature of the Uyghurs.

Consequently, in consideration of § 12, we might assign to the report on Kuchä even a considerably later date than 847 (or even 866)—for example "circa 900"—which would bring it nearer to the time of Jayhânï. Should the report on Eastern T'ien-shan (§ 12) be connected with that on Kuchä (§ 9, 7), it would be tempting to assume that the report on Kan-chou (§ 9, 7) also belongs to the same original source. However, in view of the possible multiplicity of reports such a conclusion is not indispensable: our § 9, 7, may still have in view the situation circa or before 847 (848?).

I am afraid that for the time being we cannot fix any closer the exact period to which the Hudûd refers. All we can say is that the reports on the distribution of the Turkish tribes are so remarkably circumstantial that they must be based on very careful intelligence. More precision may yet come from Saka, Soghdian, Tibetan, or Chinese documents.

P. 229. The late G. Haloun derived the name of Khumdăn from Chinese, BSOAS, 1948, xii/3, p. 408.

P. 235. On India see now my “Marvazi” and “Gardizî on India”, BSOAS, 1948, xii/3, pp. 625–640. The king Dahum has been identified as Dharma-pâla of Bengal.

P. 251. Krmân in I. Athîr, xi, 108, is not Farmul but Kurram, as in Juvaynî, ii, 139.


P. 268. My analysis of the data of Tamîm is accompanied by an additional note, p. 431, which was further developed in my article “Tamîm ibn Bahr”, BSOAS, 1948, xii/2, pp. 275–305, in which I arrived at the conclusion that this traveller visited the old Uyghur capital on the Orkhon. The reference to Qudâm should be 262, l. 5.

P. 271. Misti kamtha refers not to Panjikant (Bish-baliq) but to the preceding Sëcu (H. W. B.).

P. 272. Bârlugh mentioned between Panjikat (Bish-baliq) and Jâmghar is possibly identical with برلِغ (read برلیگ) which Juvaynî,
ii, 225, mentions as the birthplace of Kurküz, at a distance of 4 farsakhs from Bish-baligh.

P. 273. Instead of our S.tkhath (§ 12, 4) read *Sikath, i.e. Yar-khoto, see Chavannes, Documents, p. 7.


P. 277. The ruins of Qayaliq lie on the right bank of the Ili near Chingildi (Dungene), in the district of Qara-tal, see Kratkive soobshch. inst. mater. kultūri, 1940, iv, pp. 43–5.

P. 280. In support of the Yaghma origin of the Qara-khanids see also Mujmal al-tawārikhy, Barthold, Turkestan, i, 20: padshāh-i yaghmā rā Bughrā-khān khwānand.

P. 287. Instead of H.skî Marvazi gives بعسکلهی which A. Z. V. Togan reads Haytılıya (?) and O. Pritsak (1951): Bağa-çıgil.¹


P. 295. In Birûnî, Canon, No. 597 (A. Z. V. Togan, “Biruni’s Picture of the World”, p. 52) read: Ajmâ qašbat al-Khotan. Now Achma, where some Saka MSS. were found. See Sir A. Stein, Ancient Khotan, i, 468, and ii, Map: east of the Qara-tash-Chira river. Üch and Bärman (spelt Färman) are mentioned in Zafarnäma, i, 485, in the course of ‘Omar-shaykh’s campaign.

P. 297. § 16. See correction ad p. 98.

P. 298. In Mir Ḥaydar Tilpe’s Makhzan al-asrār, Iskandar pādshāh is called the ruler of the Barlas, Qiyat, and M.qliq (?).

P. 303. A. N. Bernstam locates Sū-yāb differently on the Great Kemin, above its junction with the Chu, see Trudi Semirech. expeditii (the Chu valley), 1950, map i.


P. 316. According to Nasawī, Sīrat Jalāl al-dīn, 25 (trans. 44), Tārākānkhātun, mother of Jalāl al-dīn, was of the tribe Bayāwut, one of the subdivisions of Yimak. On the other hand, Juwaynī, ii, 198, says that she was a Qanqlī. In the Russian Lavrentievsky chronicle (year 1184) the term половицы Емкакве reflects the name Yimāk.


¹ “Von den Karluk zu den Karachaniden”, ZDMG, Band 101, 1951, 271. In this article O. I. Pritsak has discussed several of the names appearing in the Hudūd, Gardīzī, Marvazi, etc. See also his other article, “Die Karachaniden”, in Der Islam, Band 31/1, 1953, 18–68.


P. 330. The Shāh-nāma (Tehran), v, 1199, insists on the appurtenance of Gūzgān to Iran: “and also Gōzgānān, the ‘blessed place’, as it has been called by the ruler of the world (Manūchihr or Kay-Khusrau ?)”.

P. 331. In Ṭabaqāt-i Nāširī, 360 (Raverty’s transl. 1054), Qādas is mentioned at 10 fars. from Kālbūn (?). cf. Ṭabari, ii, 79, Balādhuri, 4–9, on the appointment (in 41/661) of Nāfī‘ b. Khālid as governor of Qādas *Evār-ān possibly corresponds to Fēvār (should the latter be read with a ẓ bēvār ?). cf. Marquart, Wehrōt, 42.

P. 334. § 23, 49. On an expedition against Ṭūr (Ḵurōn) (?), the king of Gharchistān, in 107/725, see Balādhuri, 428, Ṭabari, ii, 1488, I. Athīr, v, 102. The name of the peak *Ishk means “a tusk”, see Minorsky, “Gardīzi on India”, BSOAS, 1948, xii/3, 635 (cf. yishk in Vis-u-Rāmin).

P. 335. For the titles composed with -banda, cf. Ṭabari, iii, 815–16: Otrār-bandā.

It is tempting to identify Gurzivān (Qurzumān) with the kingdom of the petty king Waručān-sāh, mentioned in a Manichaean fragment. W. B. Henning, in Jour. of the Greater India Soc., xi, No. 2, p. 88, came very near to this identification: “it would thus appear probable that the country Waruč lay in or close to, Gōzgānān and Gharčistān, or at any rate to the S.W. of Bakh”. Our Gurzuvān satisfies this condition, and seems to represent a regular phonetic development V.rē > Gurz.1 The position of Jurzuvān “between,

---

1 It remains to be seen whether this name appearing in the neighbourhood of the Hephthalite nest in Khorasan (Marquart, Wehrōt, 40–5, and recently R. Ghirshman, Les Chionites-Hephthalites, 1948, p. 98) has any further links with the Hephthalite Gurjara in India.
two mountains" reminded I. Hauqal, 66, of the situation of Auda-
ghusht in Morocco. cf. also Henning, BSOAS, 1947, xii/1, 49.

P. 336. § 23, 62. In 120/738 a famous battle was fought at Sān
between Asad and the khaqan. It was called waq'a Sān or waq'a

P. 338. § 23, 70. On the antiquities on the Khulm river see also
Dr. Vyacheslov, in the collectanea Afghanistan, Moscow, 1924,

P. 347. On the Khalaj see my "The Language of the Khalaj",
in BSOAS, 1940, x/2, pp. 417–437.

P. 349. It would be worth while to trace the origin of the name
of the Afghān (not of the Afghan nation) to some Far Eastern tribe
which at some time may have given its rulers to the Pathans. There
is a Mongol tribe called Aokhan in Manchuria. O. Lattimore,
The Mongols of Manchuria, 1935, pp. 264–5, tries to connect the
name either with aoga "strength, might", or with aogan "elder,
senior". It is curious that the epics of Keser-khan are known in the
Burushaski language, which might indicate an early passage of
some Mongol tribe through Pamir, or Western Sin-kiang to India.
However, D. L. R. Lorimer, "An Oral Version of the Kesar
saga from Hunza", Folk-lore, xvii, No. 2, June, 1931, pp. 105–140,
points out that the local version is derived from the Tibetan version
of Ladakh. G. N. Roerich, "The epic of King Kesar of Ling", in
JRAS. Bengal, 1942, viii/2, p. 311, is also definite about the birth
of the epic in north-eastern Tibet. My second reference to Mongols
should be omitted.

P. 353. The historical sources on the present-day Tajikistan have
been analysed by A. M. Belenitsky (on Khuttal) and N. Negmatov
(Usrūshana) in Tajikskaya arkheol. expeditsiya, i (1950), pp. 109–
127, and ii (1953), pp. 231–252.

Under §§ 25, 26, read: Rēg-ar, lang-ar, band-ar, though
W. Henning (letter 3rd Nov., 1953) thinks that they may be of
different formation. On Chaghāniyān see the ode of Farrukhī,
Divān, 332, in which hints are made at the local mines of gold and
silver.

P. 355, § 25, 60. Pāp, now Minchak-tepe, on the right bank of the
Sir-darya, see Masson, in Krat. soobshch. inst. mater."kulturē, 1940,
iv, 53.

P. 357, § 25, 78. I. Hauqal, 510, lists mints in Bukhara, Samar-
qand, and Ṣlāq.

P. 360. The famous "Treasure of Oxus", now in the British
Museum, is said to have been found near Faydābād.
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P. 367. On the hot spring on the Lutküh river see Morgenstierne, “Iranian Pamir languages”, p. 485: the hot geyser in the Garm-Chashma valley in Shughnan is called *shund* “hot”.


P. 378, § 29, 16. Correct: according to Yāqūt, i, 193: Arrajān (which al-Mutanabbi calls *Arjān*) “is called *Arghān* by the Persians” (thence probably the vulgar form *Arghūn* in the *Zafar-nāma*, i, 600.

P. 384, § 31, 21. The author of the *Taʾrīkh Mayyāfārīqīn*, B.M. Or. 5803, fol. 180a. who travelled to the court of the “king of Jibāl” (Fakhr al-daula), also mentions the tombs of Kisāʾī, of Muḥammad b. Ḥasan ṣāḥib of Abū Ḥanīfa, etc. In fact I. Faqīh, 253, refers to the *aṭbāq al-mudahhana* “glazed dishes” of Rayy.


P. 392. The proverb: *lay sa warāʿ Abbadān qaryatun* is quoted in Juvaynī, iii, 20, and in Nizāmī’s *Haft Paykār*, ed. Rypka, 146.


P. 341. In addition to the important list of Caucasian highlanders in the *Armenian Geography*, see also the list in the Armenian historian Elishe (Russ. transl., p. 157) and the report of the journey of the bishop Israel in Moses Kalankatvats’i, ii, ch. 39. See also the analysis of data on Dagestan in Minorsky, *Studies in Caucasian History* (II)—ready for publication.

Pp. 405–411. The form attested in the sources before the
Addenda to the Hudūd al-ʿĀlam

16th century is Sharvān, but already in the Hudūd the form Shirvān makes its appearance on f. 33b. The term “Mazya-
dids” is misleading for it coincides with the designation of an
entirely different Mesopotamian dynasty. The dynasty of Sharvān,
as attested in Khāqānī’s Divān, 50, 474, 686, called themselves
Yazīdiyān, “Yazidids”. The later “Kisrānids” also considered
themselves as Yazidids. The tree on p. 405 has been revised in my
Studies (II). [On the original form of the name see the quotations
collected by S. Nafisi in his article Sharvān-va-Shirvān, in
Armaghān, 1327/1948, No. 1 (Farvardīn), pp. 23–32.]

P. 411, § 37. Ibn al-Mujāwir’s work is called Taʿrīkh al-
Mustabsir, see now “Descripțio Arabiae Meridionalis”, i–ii, edidit

P. 418, § 42. Arabic descriptions of the Byzantine Empire are
exhaustively quoted in A. A. Vasiliev, Byzance et les Arabes,
Bruxelles, i (1935), ii (1950)—now entirely revised by M. Canard.
cf. Minorsky, “Marvazi on the Byzantines”, in Mélanges H. Grégoire, ii, 455–469. See also a short list of Byzantine titles in

P. 419. Read: “the neighbouring kingdoms of the Burjān, Abar,
Burghar, Saqālība, Khazar, and others (wa ghayri-him)”. (Here
Abar may refer to the Avars of Daghestan).

P. 420, 1. 2: the use of the term “the Khazar sea” for the Black
Sea is attested even in the history of the Seljuqs of Rum by Ibn
Bibī, ed. Houtsma, iv, 129: dhikr-i guzashtan-i lashkar-i sultan
az daryā-yi Khazar. The most probable explanation is that the
author of the Hudūd misread جزر خزر into جزر Jurz, which he then
reproduced in the Persian form كرز Gurz. P. 422. The “islands”
of the Black Sea refer to the Taman peninsula, which, in point of fact,
consisted of islands divided by branches of the Kuban, see V. I.

P. 425. An example of the strange deformations of the Northern
Spanish names is found in the Akâm al-marjān, ed. A. Codazzi,
p. 412: Jαš (for people of Jacá (?), Huesca, Aragon).

P. 427, § 43. In his Ibn Faḍlān, A. Z. V. Togan has obscured
the situation by playing down the rōle of the Slavs, while trying to give
a new explanation of the term Saqālība, p. 305: “Anfangs, als man
die Bulgaren, Burtasen und andere Völker der mittleren Wolga
noch Ṣaqāliba nannte, hat man das ganze System der Wolga als "Nahr al-Ṣaqāliba" bezeichnet, später aber, als das Wort Ṣaqāliba' in Bezug auf Ost- und Nordeuropa mehr für die germanischen und finnischen Volker, und speziell (sic—V.M.) für die Germanen und baltischen Völker verwendet wurde, bedeutete 'Nahr al-Ṣaqāliba' offenbar nur die Obere Wolga". For the situation in 10th-century Europe—which had changed since the times of Ptolemy and Tacitus—see the independent contemporary reports on the Ṣaqāliba by Mas'ūdi (a.d. 943) in Marquart, Streifzüge, 95-160; and by Ibrāhīm ibn Ya'qūb (a.d. 355/965) in Th. Kowalski, Relatio Ibrāhīm b. Ya'kūb de itinere slavico, Kraków, 1946, and A. Z. V. Togan's own quotation of Khuwārizmī, No. 1593 (indicating the changes which had taken place in the area of Ptolemy’s Germania).

B. N. Zakhoder, in his review of my "Marvazi", Izv. geogr. obshch., 1943, 75/6, pp. 25-43, has objected to my identification of the Ṣaqāliba kings with the Moravian princes. The fact is that the Arabs often fused their information on various kinds of Ṣaqāliba in the same rubric. Thus Moravia could be placed under the same roof as the town وانثيث. (This latter (Hudūd, 431, note 4), has still considerable chances to reflect the name of the Việtic, Vyatichi, as, first suggested by Westberg, "Beiträge", 1899, p. 213, despite Marquart, Streifzüge, 200).

P. 432, § 44. In Soviet literature the origin of the Rūs (or rather of their name) is still debated with great animation—although the events of the 9th–10th centuries have no more bearing on the situation obtaining in the 20th century than the origin of the names France or Prussia on contemporary politics. Some arguments seem to miss the point and tone down such facts as the terminology used by Const. Porphyrogenitus and the Initial Russian Chronicle, new edition, 1950, i, 24. To the literature quoted at the beginning of § 44 (p. 432) should be added V. Barthold’s "Arabskiye izvestiya o russkikh", written in 1918 but published posthumously in 1940, in Soviet. Vostokovedeniye, i, 15–50. See also the unexpected new facts on the expeditions of the Rūs on the Caspian, in Minorsky, "Rus' v Zakavkazye", in Izv. na instituta na búlgar. istoriya, Sofia, 1954, v, 377–380. Pp. 432–3: the term Warank first emerging in Birùnī was probably heard by the latter from the Bulghar ambassador to Sultan Maḥmūd, see Minorsky, "On some of Biruni’s informants", in Al-Birùnī Commemoration Volume, Calcutta, 1951, pp. 233–6. P. 436, note 2: the identity of Arthā with the Finnish
Erzya is far from conclusive. By no means would the Arabs have confused the appearance of a Finnish people with the Rūs of Küyäba (Kiev) and Novgorod. The character 풌 in Arfav is highly problematic and, having regard to the variant ابارقة and to the fact that among the goods coming from Arthā (Iṣṭakhrī, 226) was risūs “lead or tin”, one should not discard Chwolson’s tentative identification of this territory with Biarmia, though not with Perm but with the old region of the Sagas near the White Sea and Lake Ladoga, visited by Norsemen from Norway, cf. M. A. Tallgren, “Biarmia”, in Eurasia septentrionalis, 1931, vi, 100–120.


P. 442. On the Arab occupation of Apulia and Bari and their expeditions against Ragusa, see Babinger, Raguse in EI.

P. 444, § 48. On the Alans a mass of information has been systematized in V. I. Abayev’s articles collected in Osetinsky yazik, i, 1949. See also Minorsky, “The Alan capital Magas”, in BSOAS, 1952, xiv/2, 221–238: Mas‘ūdi’s Maghas, interpreted in the manuscripts as دیانة “a fly”! P. 446: Marquart’s interpretation of Cherkes as Chār-Kas “the four Kas” finds support in the name of one of Saladin’s generals: جهارکس, Abul-Fidā, iv, 245.

P. 447. On the Sarir, see Nizāmi’s poem Iskandar-nāma (Sharaf-nāma), ch. xl, ed. Ali-zade and Bertels, Baku, 1947, p. 300. P. 448: خیداق must certainly be restored as خیداق; in Khaqani, Divān, p. 240. غیداق, Barshaliya (Barashliya?) most probably corresponds to Varac’-an (in Armenian) and the present-day Bashli (*Barash-ū) “borough”. As a parallel to our دنخس (or rather دنخس) one can quote دیکس in the History of Bāb al-abwāb. The place probably corresponds to the present-day Dilgasha.
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Addenda to the Hudūd al-Alam, in Zap. Instit. Vostokoved., 1939, vii, 129-155. A. Z. V. Togan’s article “Die Völkerschaften des Chazarenreiches”, see above, p. lxvi, is vitiated by his polemical tone and contradictions. On the one hand he admits the compilatory character of the Islamic sources (p. 40) and their tendency to fuse heterogeneous materials (pp. 45, 49: “zusammengeworfen”; p. 61: “verworren”). On the other hand, he accepts the data of the Hudūd on Eastern Europe literally and reconstructs them into a rather fantastic scheme (pp. 43-4) which he then tries to identify with the area over which ran the writ of the Khazar khaqans (p. 45). My own contention was to analyse the composition of § 50, which is almost definitely an amalgam of the sources partly known to us (I. Khurdādhbih, İṣṭakhri) and partly capable of being reconstructed from the combination of such parallel sources of İ. Rusta, the Hudūd, and Gardiži.

P. 453. The later Saqsīn/Saḥšīn is definitely a haplology of I. Khurdādhbih’s Sārīgh-shin (or better *-sīn “tomb, monument”, as the form Saqsīn seems to suggest). This assumption of mine has an importance for the mutual fixation of the position of either of them. *Khāmlīkh cannot be Khan-bālīkh, as already stated by Marquart. The position of Sarkel/Sharkel/Bela-veza has been fixed near Trekh-Ostrovnaya, above the place where the Sakarka (whose name seems to reflect Sarkel) joins the Don (on the left bank), see K. V. Kudryashov in Izv. Ak. Nauk. (historical section), 1947, iv/6, pp. 536-568. P. 459, para (7), the quotation from the Zafar-nama should be omitted, because طاوس should be restored as *Tanūs, as the plateau above Khunzakh (Avaria) is called.

P. 460. The mistake in the title of § 51, which in our MS. is Burtās, was already noticed by Barthold in an additional note (Russian text, p. 32, note 3): “(Our source) erroneously refers the report on the Bulghars (BGA, vii, 141) to the Burtās, see the title of the king (Alm.ṣ), the Islamic religion and the three tribes (aṣnāf). The confusion of the Bulghar with the Burtās is also found in Yāqūt, i, 567”. In full agreement with these remarks, and in conformity with I. Rusta, 141, I have restored the title of § 51 as: “[Bulkār]”. A. Z. V. Togan, who disapproves of this indispensable improvement (“Völkerschaften”, p. 44) must have neglected to read either Barthold’s or my own explanations. In addition to the excellent old book by Shpilevsky, Ancient towns and other Bulghar-Tatar remains in the government of Kazan (in Russian), Kazan, 1875, see now B. D. Grekov, “The Volga Bulghars in the

P. 462, § 52. See now Rikov, Sketches of the history of Mordva according to archeol. data, Moscow, 1933, 122 pp., and E. I. Goryunova, “Selische Polyanki”, in Krat. soobshch. inst. mater. kulturi, xv, 1947, 106–110 (the author knows the Ḥudūd and identifies the Burṭās with the Moksha Mordvans). I must again stress the fact that the Ḥudūd locates the Burādhās (Burṭās) to the west of the Volga. To the older Iranian elements in the Volga languages I wish to add the name of the “old man of the woods (леший)” in Chuvash: arzurri (BSOAS, xii/1, p. 81) which may be arzur-aři. The second element is Turkish, ār “a man”, but the first strikingly resembles the Avestan and Pahlavi arzūr “wood”, which (according to Marquart) underlies also the name of Shahrazūr (in Iraq).

P. 465, § 53. See H. Grégoire, “L’habitat primitif des Magyars et les Σαβάρτοι ἀσφαλοί”, Byzantion, 1938, xiii, 19–30, where he wishes to identify the V.n.nd.r. with the settlers from Adrianople established on the Danube between 813 and 836. The fact is that the V.n.nd.r. seem to be connected with the Eastern Bulgarian tribes (see pp. 466–7).

P. 468. I wrote: “The qualification of the V.n.nd.r in our sources as cowards (badh-dil)¹ may be due to a wrong interpretation of the word tarsā (which means both ‘Christian’ and ‘coward’). In Gardīzī the N.nd.r are definitely called Christians (tarsā) and Rūmī, i.e. ‘Byzantines’, very possibly with reference to their religion”. This is slightly different from how A. Z. V. Togan puts it (ibid., 41): “(Minorsky) bezichtigt den Verfasser [scil. of the Ḥudūd] erneut der willkürlich [?V.M.] veränderten Wiedergabe des Wortlautes seiner Quelle, so habe er das richtige Wort tarsā ‘Christ’, bei Gardīzī einfach in bad-dil ‘Poltron’ abgeändert”. My entirely objective purpose was to account for the discrepancy of the two parallel sources. I have yet to hear of a different explanation.

P. 473, § 56, 2. Kalāh-bar is not Kra but Kedah, which lies south-east of the northern corner of the Kra peninsula in Malaya.


¹ Different from badh-rag, see Vocabulary.
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ADDENDA TO THE *HUDUD AL-‘ALAM*
THE present edition is intended to discharge an obligation under P 3 which Russian science has long lain; namely, that of rendering available to the specialists the important work dealing with Muslim geography which was discovered in 1882 in Bukhara through the initiative of the Russian orientalist, A. G. Toumanský (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 Toumanský MS., al-Nadim composed his Fihrist; from this work and from later bibliographical compilations European scholars have culled most of their information as to what works, known to be important and not yet to be found in European libraries, must still be sought for. Such quests, even if successful in bringing to light desired volumes, have sometimes brought disillusion as well, even in the cases when the book was linked with a great name.

The Persian Abul-Faḍl Gulpāyagānī, who had the luck to discover the present precious MS., was searching in Bukhara, on behalf of Toumanský, 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 Toumanský 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 Shaʿbān = 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. V. Barthold]

3 The work of the wazīr Maghrībī who continued al-Nadim, see Irshād, vi, 467, has not reached us. On the wazīr Maghrībī see Brockelmann, i, 353; E. Zambaur, Manuel de généalogie et de chronologie pour l’histoire de l’Islam, Hanovre 1927, p. 15.
would have brought but little benefit to science. But while engaged in his search, Gulpāyagānī found a document quite unknown until then and mentioned in none of the bibliographical surveys, which has proved to be of the greatest scientific importance.

The MS. does not contain the author's name, but the date of its composition is indicated: the author began his work in 372 H. (between 26 vi. 982 and 14 vi. 983) for Abul-Ḥārīth Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad, prince of the province of Güzgān or Güzgānān (in Arabic garb jūzān, or jūzānān), which lies in the north-western part of the present-day Afghanistan. It is quite natural that the author allows more space (ff. 20b–21a) to this province than would have been expected from its comparative unimportance, even though at that time 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 Jāmt al-tawārīkh, 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 Jarbādhağānī. In a note added to Toumansky's article I have mentioned a fact recorded by an author of the eleventh century—Gardīzī—that the amīr of 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-Ḥārīth Muḥammad ibn-Aḥmad (in Utbi: Aḥmad ibn-Muḥammad).

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) 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.
4 Text of Gardīzī, according to the Cambridge MS., King's College, 213, f. 104b: va bā amīr Abul-Ḥasan ibn Farīghūn khwāshī kārd tā bad-īshān pushšt-i u qāwī gasht.
5 E.g. Balādhurī, p. 406 below.
6 V. Barthold, Historico-geographical Survey of Iran (in Russian), St. Petersburg, 1903, p. 23. [See Map viii.]
7 BGA, vi, 3211.
Fāryāb and Shabūrqān¹ (or Shubūrqān;² in our author: Ushbūrqān or Ashbūrqān,³ now Shibarghān), at an equal distance (9 farsakhs) from both. According to Yaʿqūbī, Fāryāb was “the old town”; the second most important town at that time, and the residence of the Arab governor (ʿāmil) of Fāryāb, was the town of Yahūdān (in Ištakhri 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 Güzgān; there lived the local ruler (malīk) of Güzgān, whereas the Arab governors of Güzgān resided in Anbār (according to our author: Anbīr), on the site of the present town Sar-i-Pul. In Ištakhri’s time (or that of his source, Balkhī) the situation had changed. It is not mentioned whether at that time Fāryāb was part of Güzgān, 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 Güzgān”, and Anbār as the capital of the province (qaṣaba, the same term is used by Birūnī,⁴ in whose work we also find the form Anbīr).

Our author assigns to the rulers of Güzgān the first place among the vassal princes (mulāk-i atrāf) of the Sāmānīd kingdom, not only for their political importance, but also for their “love of science”. At that time the sway of the prince of Güzgān 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 Güzgān” and was administered directly by the prince of Güzgān, whose frontier towns were those of Tālaqān, on the site of Qalʿa-Walī,⁵ and Rabāṭ-i Karvān on the upper Harūrūd.⁶ On the upper Murghāb Güzgān had a common frontier with that of the prince of Bust (on the Hīlmand). 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 Güzgān. To the latter tribute was

¹ Such vocalization in Ištakhri, BGA, i, 270; in Marco Polo, Sapurgan, with several variants.
² Vocalization, BGA, vi, 321; vii, 287; distorted vocalization in Yāqūt, iii, 254 and 304, though Yāqūt had visited the place.
³ BGA, ii, 321 and 322: Ashbūrqān.
⁴ Thus in the work of A.-Z. Validov [Validi], Al-Birūnī āthāriy, now in the press, p. 18; in the Berlin MS. (on it see Ahlwardt, No. 5667), f. 123a, instead of qaṣaba stands qaṣr.
⁵ On its situation see ZVO, xiv, 031.
⁶ Similarly in Ištakhri, BGA, i, 272; cf. ibid. 265 below. [V.i., p. 336.
likewise paid by the nomad Arabs of the neighbouring steppes, who numbered 20,000, possessed herds of sheep and camels and were considered to be the richest of all the Arabs of Khorāsān.

The Farīghūnids called themselves descendants of the mythical Farīdūn,¹ but apparently there exists no information as to whence this dynasty sprang, when and how it gained its power, and whether or not it was related to the pre-Islamic rulers of Gūzgān, the Gūzgān-khudāts.² The name of the dynasty had some relation to a locality in the extreme north of the province; Maqdisī³ mentions a Rabāṭ Afrīghūn, one day’s march from Andkhoy and two from Karki. According to Narshakhi,⁴ Aḥmad ibn-Farīghūn was already amīr of Gūzgān in the last years of the ninth century, at the time when the relations between the Ṣaffārid ʿAmr ibn-Laith and the Sāmānīd Ismāʿīl ibn-Aḥmad were broken off. Since Iṣṭakhri⁵ mentions an Abū ʿHārīrī ibn-Farīghūn, apparently the same Abū ʿHārīrī Muḥammad ibn-Aḥmad who was a contemporary of our author, this ruler must have lived unusually long.⁶ It is probable that the name of this prince was not yet recorded in Balkhī’s original work, as it is mentioned not in the chapter on Khorāsān, but in that on Fārs, a chapter which, according to de Goeje,⁷ belongs without doubt to Iṣṭakhri and not to Balkhī, though Iṣṭakhri 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. Iṣṭakhri mentions also a secretary or minister (kāṭīb) of the amīr of Gūzgān, Jaʿfar ibn-Sahl ibn-Marzūbān, of the family of Marzūbān ibn-Zādīya, 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;⁸ Ibn Ḥauqal⁹ was acquainted with him and speaks of

¹ There is no foundation for reading Afrīghūn instead of Afrīdhūn, as Toumanskij proposes, ZVO, x, 130.
² J. Marquart (Markwart), Erānsahr, p. 80.
³ BGA, iii, 347ff.
⁴ Ed. Schefer, p. 85.
⁵ BGA, i, 148f.
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 Mahmūd (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 Bakh and did not strike coins. The names and dates given by Zambaur do not in the least correspond to reality and represent a step backwards in comparison with Sachau’s article to which Zambaur refers.
⁷ ZDMG, xxv, 50.
⁸ As the Sāmānīd amīr contemporary with himself Ibn Ḥauqal names Maṃṣūr ibn-Nūh (961–76), BGA, ii, 341f. In 358 (968–9) this author was on the Gur-gān (ibid., p. 282f.), in the same year “for the last time” in Mosul, ibid., p. 146f., and apparently returned no more to the east.
⁹ Ibid., p. 208.
the rare unanimity with which the qualities of the Güzgân 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 rabāṭ 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 Hudūd 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. As Toumansky remarks, “nowhere does he name his sources, except for Ptolemy, and even him, probably, only as a rhetorical figure”. This remark does not entirely correspond to the facts, for besides Ptolemy, Aristotle is named (f. 2a), and his “Meteorologica” (al-ʿĀthār al-ʿulwiya) cited. The same passage (about the ocean encircling the earth) is quoted by al-Kharaqi, 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 Ὁκεανός). 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-Khalidāt, in our author al-Khalliyā, and in Battānī al-Khalliyāt). From Ptolemy was derived the information

1 ZVO, x, 132.
2 Text in Nallino, Al-Battānī sive Albatenii opus astronomicum, pars i, Mediolani, 1903, p. 175.
3 Battānī-Nallino, i, 17, note 2. This is not the only case of coincidence of Battānī’s text with that of our author. According to Battānī, ibid., p. 18, note 5, and our author (f. 4b), near India and Ceylon there were fifty-nine islands; according to Ibn-Rustā, BGA, vii, 8445, and Kharaqi, in agreement with the text of Ptolemy (vii, 4, 11–13), the islands were nineteen. In Nallino’s opinion Battānī read 产业园区, instead of 产业园区, which stood in his list; this mistake was evidently made by the source common to Battānī and our author.
about the "isles of Britannia", of which, according to our author and to Arab geographers,¹ there were twelve (this number is not in Ptolemy). Concerning Britannia, as well as the "Isles of the Blest" (Canary Islands), our author gives information which, apparently, does not exist in other sources: he says that in the "Isles of the Blest" there are "gold mines; once a year people from the Südän and from towns of Sūs al-'Aqsā make their way there and bring away gold from those mines; no one can live there on account of the intense heat". Britannia is called (f. 37b) "the storehouse of goods from Byzantium (Rûm) and Spain (Andalus)". Yet among the names of the twenty-five islands there are some that do not occur in Ptolemy: by mistake the author places Rhodes and 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.

II

The history of Arabian geographical science has been very insufficently 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 Djaghrāfiyā, 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, 85, Ibn Rusta; Battānī-Nallino, i, 18.
² Kunik-Rosen, Izvestiya al-Bekri, &c., i, 80; Peschel-Ruge, Geschichte der Erdkunde, p. 90; Nallino, Al-Huwārismi, p. 50.
³ Nallino, i.e., p. 52.
⁴ In the broadly planned Introduc tion to the History of Sciences (G. Sarton, Carnegie Institution of Washington, Publication No. 376, 1927; cf. a review by E. J. Holmyard in J.R.A.S., 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.\(^1\) The work of Abū-Jaʿfar Muḥammad ibn-Mūsā al-Khuwārizmī, 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.\(^2\) But as early as 1895 this work had been the subject of a classical study by C. A. Nallino,\(^3\) 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).\(^4\)

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.\(^5\) 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\(^6\) contemporary with him and with his descendants. Some efforts, not always successful, were made in Muslim literature to localize ancient geographical traditions; thus Bīrūnī in his *Canon* (eleventh century) tried to identify the classical Ilion with the Syrian Tripoli.\(^7\) There is no literal rendering of Ptolemy’s text in Arabic; from the outset Muslim scholars treated this text much more independently than at a later date did the West-European scholars.

\(^1\) Géographie d’Aboulféda, t. i, Introduction générale à la géographie des orientaux.


\(^4\) C. A. Nallino, *Al-Battānī sive 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.


\(^7\) Berlin MS. Ahlw. 5667, f. 34a: طوطالوس — في ایام فتح اولین وهو (sic!) اطرابلس شام بعد حصار عشر سنین لیب استیا اسکندر قروی امرأة بعض الملك cf. *Chronologie*, p. 86.
Already in Muhammad Khuwārizmī’s Šūrat al-ard we find a new version of Ptolemy, partly corrected and completed, partly distorted. According to Nallino 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.

The exact date of M. Khuwārizmī’s work is unknown. The scanty biographical information about him has lately been summarized by E. Wiedemann. The appellation al-Qutrubbultī indicates that he was associated not only with Khorāsān, but also with the locality on the Tigris whither, perhaps, already his ancestors had migrated; the appellation al-Majūsī shows that his ancestors were not Christians but Zoroastrians; this may partly account for the fact that he was more influenced by Indian and Persian traditions than by Greek ones. Besides astronomical and mathematical treatises (it is well known that “algorithm” is a distorted form of al-Khuwārizmī’s name), he compiled an historical work, references to which are found in so early an historian as Ahmad ibn-Abī-Ṭāhir Ṭayfūr; in Tabārī the earliest reference to Khuwārizmī’s work deals with the death of the caliph Mahdī (A.D. 785), while the last reference is made under 210 (A.D. 825–6). 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; later, under the influence of the legend of the Septuaginta, &c., it was said that seventy scholars took part in this work. Consequently in Nallino’s 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 Qiman 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); if so, Khuwārizmī wrote not earlier than 201 H. As the latest
date, 210 (A.D. 826–7) is proposed, but no explicit reason for its adoption is advanced. In reality the work of Khuwârizmî in its present form cannot be placed in the reign of Ma’mûn, as it mentions the new capital Surra-man-ra’a (Sâmarrâ), the construction of which began in 211 (A.D. 836) under the caliph Mu’tasîm (A.D. 833–42). The terminus post quem must therefore be advanced by twenty years; as terminus ante quem could be taken the date of Khuwârizmî’s death, if that date were known to us; the last time Khuwârizmî’s name seems to be mentioned is on the occasion of the caliph Wâthîq’s death in A.D. 847.

In Khuwârizmî’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; Yâqût in his dictionary says, with reference to geographical names occurring in pre-Muslim authors, that “owing to the length of time” they have mostly become unintelligible. It is interesting to note the efforts of Khuwârizmî 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 Alâns; both Scythias, respectively, with the land of the Turks in general and that of the Turks of the extreme east, the Toghuzghuz; Serika, with Sînistân, i.e. China. The last example shows that for comparison with Greek terms Persian geographical names were utilized as well. For the exact title of Ptolemy’s book Γεωγραφική Ἑπηγήσις, “Geography” or in the Arabic version Jaghrâfiyâ was substituted; this word was generally translated as “image of the earth” (ṣûrat al-ard), and here probably lies the explanation of the title of Khuwârizmî’s book. The author of the Fihrist knew that Ptolemy’s work consisted of eight books or sections (in Greek βιβλίον, in Arabic maqâla). The first translation, an unsatisfactory one, was made for a younger contemporary of Khuwârizmî, Abû-Yûsuf Ya’qûb al-Kindî, tutor and familiar of Ahmad, son of the caliph Mu’tasîm. The death of Kindi is given as 260 (A.D. 873–4). It is very probable that Kindi utilized this translation for his own geographical work, “Description of the inhabited part of the earth” (Rasm al-mamûr min al-ard), mentioned

---

1 In Mźik’s edition, No. 301.
2 Tabarî, iii, 1180; BGA, viii, 357a.
3 Tabarî, iii, 1364a.
4 Li-tajâtawi-li-zamûn, Yâqût, i, 7a.
5 Mźik’s edition, p. 105 (Nos. 1593, 1596, 1600, 1601, 1602).
6 e.g. Yâqût, i, 7a, also H. Khalifa, ii, 601. In Mas’ûdî, BGA, viii, 331a, the translation is qaṭ’ al-ard (the crossing of the earth).
7 Fihrist, p. 268; ZDMG, i, 213.
8 Thus according to Nallino’s Arabic work, ‘Ilm al-falâk, p. 115; T). 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. A pupil of Kindī, Ahmad ibn-Muḥammad ibn-al-Ṭayyib Ṣarakhṣī (d. in A.D. 899), was also author of a geographical work; the title “Book of Routes and Kingdoms” (Kitāb al-masālik wa-l-mamālik), frequently occurring in Arabic geographical literature, is also often applied to this work. At the same time an improved translation of Ptolemy was made by Abul-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 Nallino explains the tendency of Battānī, who also belonged to the pagan (Ṣābian) milieu of Harrān, to revert in some cases from Khwārizmī to Ptolemy, though it constituted a step backwards (un vero regresso).

From the geographical works of such mathematicians and astronomers as Khwārizmī, Kindī, Thābit ibn-Qurra, and Battānī the “Books of Routes and Kingdoms” greatly differed in that much more space was allotted in them to political and economical than to mathematical and physical geography. These works contained not only a list of provinces into which the world, and principally the Muslim world, as known to Arabic science, was divided, but also information on towns, commercial routes, articles of export from particular provinces and towns, &c. According to the Fihrist the author of the first work on “Routes and Kingdoms” was Abul-ʿAbbās Jaʿfar ibn-Ahmad al-Marwāzī; 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, Abul-Qāsim ʿUbaydullāh ibn-ʿAbdillāh ibn-khurdādhbih. This work is likewise mentioned in the Fihrist, with no historical details except that the author was a familiar of the caliph Muʿtamid (A.D. 870–92). Ibn Khurdādhbih dedicated his work to some member of the 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 Goeje Ibn Khurdādhbih originally wrote his work in 232 (A.D. 846–7), i.e. in the reign of the caliph Wāthiq (A.D. 842–7), and rewrote it in 272 (A.D. 885–6), under the caliph Muʿtamid. If the first date is exact, the “Book of Routes and

1 BGA, viii, 2519.  
2 On the author Brockelmann, i, 210; Fihrist, p. 261.  
3 H. Khalifa, i, 509 (No. 11870).  
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 Bahr al-Muṭṭawwi‘ī, 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’qūbī, 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 Khurdādhbih 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 Khurdādhbih 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.|

P 11 In spite of his study of Ptolemy, Ibn Khurdādhbih wrote his book on a totally different plan. The astronomical divisions are entirely put aside; the principal part is devoted to “itineraries”, i.e. the description of routes connecting provinces and towns, with an exact indication of distances. Mas'ūdī,6 with some contempt, calls geography, as understood by Ibn Khurdādhbih, 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 Nedorosi). 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, 30. 4 Al-Ḥuwārdī, 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 Khurdadhbih, Kindī, who wrote a geographical treatise under a different title, indicating a closer relation to mathematical geography; but a pupil of Kindī, Aḥmad Sarakhsi, wrote, like Ibn Khurdadhbih, a book of routes and kingdoms. Sarakhsi, 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. 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.

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

The most important addition to de Goeje’s data is Yāqūt’s testimony according to which Balkhī died (in Dhul-qa’dā 322/October 934) at the age of 87 or 88; he was therefore born about 235 (A.D. 849-50). His geographical work, composed, as may be gathered from de Goeje, 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 (Yāqūt 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 wazīr Qāsim fraudulently added the name of Sarakhsi to the list, confirmed by the caliph, of persons condemned to death, is in contradiction with that of a familiar of the caliph Mu’taṣim, Ibn Hamdūn, recorded by Yāqūt, GMS, vi, i, p. 159, according to which the caliph deliberately sent Sarakhsi 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, i, pp. 141-52.

5 Ibid., pp. 143, 144, and 147

6 Ibid., p. 141.

7 ZDMG, xxv, 49.

8 GMS, vi, i, p. 145.
that he studied under Kindi, who died soon after 870 (see above). Balkhī spent eight years in 'Irāq and while there visited the neighbouring countries. He acquired broad and many-sided knowledge and when, by way of Herat, he returned to his native Balkh, his learning won him great fame. The eight years spent in 'Irāq 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 Sāmānīd Nasr 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 Nasr II belong, in all probability, Balkhī’s comments, quoted in the Fihrist, about his relations with the general Husayn ibn-‘Ali al-Mawzá (or Marwarrūdhi) and also with the wāzīr Abū-‘Abdillāh Muḥammad ibn-Aḥmad Jayhānī. Balkhī received from Husayn and his brother Muhammad Su’lūk regular material assistance, but forfeited this subsidy in consequence of having composed a religious treatise, which later was highly appreciated in orthodox circles. Yāqūt 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. (Husayn was an Ismā’īlī heretic; Balkhī, too; in his youth held Shi’ite views, which he later abandoned.) The wāzīr 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-Qarābīn wal-Dhabā’ih), which he disliked. The wāzīr 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.

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, Ahmad ibn-Sahl (A.D. 918-19), who was held to be a descendant of the Persian kings. Ahmad was at the head of the Sāmānīd troops who quelled the revolt of Husayn Marwarrūdhi, and took the latter prisoner. Subsequently, while in Nīshāpūr, Ahmad abandoned the cause of the Sāmānīds and was obliged to retreat to Marv where he was defeated and taken prisoner, and later died in the prison of Bukhārā. Ahmad ibn-Sahl came from a family

1 GMS, vi, i, p. 147.
2 Fihrist, 138, quoted in Yāqūt, l.c., 141 and sq. In the Fihrist Abū-'Ali stands, by mistake, instead of Abū-‘Abdillāh.
3 On him de Goeje, ZDMG, xxv, 54, note 1.
4 GMS, vi, i, p. 149 below.
5 On this GMS, vi, 6, p. 293, according to Sallāmī’s History of the Rulers of Khorāsān, now lost. On this cf. my Turkestan, ii (Engl. ed., p. 10).
of zealous Iranian patriots; his brothers fell victims to the national fanaticism (*ta'assub*) of the Arabs; there lived with Āḥmad in Marv a certain Sarv, to whom Firdausī refers when recounting the lays of Rustam.\(^1\) 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 'Alī and the other companions of the Prophet.\(^2\) Whatever his own national origin, and whatever his native language, he, as a scholar, spoke the literary Arabic, and in the same language, though with no great success, did the amīr Āḥmad ibn-Sahl\(^3\) try to communicate with him when he arrived in Balkh (there is no other information on Āḥmad ibn-Sahl's stay in Balkh). When Balkhī declined the office of wāzīr offered him by Āḥmad ibn-Sahl, there was appointed to this position a friend and countryman of his, Abū-Ḥasān 'Abdullāh ibn-Āḥmad ibn-Māhμūd Ka'bī, who also wrote treatises of a religious nature, though even farther removed from orthodoxy. In Samānī he is called head of the Mu'tazilites.\(^4\) Balkhī took a post as secretary under Ka'bī with an allowance of 500 dinārs a month. Abū-Ḥasān was entitled to a sum of 1,000 dinārs, but he himself gave orders to the cashier to pay him 900, and to increase Balkhī's salary to 600, on the express understanding that Balkhī should receive his salary in good coin, while all questionable coins were to be put down to his own account.\(^5\) At that happy time Balkhī, thanks to the generosity both of the amīr and the wāzīr, acquired some property in his native village of Shāmīstīyān, 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 Āḥmad ibn-Sahl, Balkhī, apparently, lived as a private person on his own lands. Without indication of date\(^6\) it is reported that a Sāmānīd 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 Chaghāniyān (later viceroys of Khosraūn), Abū-Bakr Muḥammad and his son Abū-'Alī Āḥmad,\(^7\) but he seems not to have met them in person.

---

\(^1\) *ZVO*, xxii, 280.
\(^2\) *GMS*, vi, 1, p. 148.  
\(^4\) *GMS*, xx, p. 485.  
\(^5\) *GMS*, vi, 1, p. 147.
\(^6\) Only in Maqdisī, *BGA*, iii, 4.  
\(^7\) *GMS*, vi, 1, p. 143.
The number of Balkhï’s compositions, according to his grandson, was sixty. The geographical treatise of Balkhï, which in all probability (reports are somewhat contradictory) bore the title *Suwar-al-aqâlim* (“Images of Climes”), is not expressly mentioned among them. The contents of Ištâkhri’s work, founded, as is known, on that of Balkhï, 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 Ištâkhri enumerates twenty, and the same number appeared in Balkhï. As a matter of fact in the list of Balkhï’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-suwar*). It is possible that by the latter title is meant the geographical work of Balkhï which, according to Maqdisi, was only a very short commentary on Balkhï’s maps.

Already in those times the question of the authorship of the work, which now forms the first volume of the *Bibliotheca Geographorum Arabicorum*, was not quite clear. Maqdisi saw only three copies of this work, one—in Râyy, another—in Nishâpûr, and the third—in Bukhârâ. In the first case, the authorship of the maps was attributed to Balkhï; in the second (in the MS. itself there was no author’s name), to Abû Bakr Muḥammad ibn-al-Marzûbân al-Muḥawwâlî al-Karkhî, who died in 309 (A.D. 921–2); in the third, to Abû-Iṣḥâq Ibrâhîm ibn-Muḥammad al-Fârisî al-Iṣṭâkhri, who was named in the MS. itself. Maqdisi considers the last to be the most probable, as he had seen several persons who had known Ištâkhri and witnessed the composition of his work; one of these witnesses was Abû-Nâṣr al-Ḥarbi, muḥtasib of the town of Bukhârâ. The putative authorship of Karkhî is mentioned

---

2 *ZDMG*, xxv, 57.  
4 Given by Yâqût (*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=2, Yâqût, *GMS*, vi, 1, p. 142=17, a full stop may have wrongly cut into two the unique title *Kitâb tafṣīr suwar kitâb al-samâ‘ wal-‘alam li Abî Ja‘far al-Khâzin* “Book of Interpretation of the Maps of Abû Ja‘far al-Khâzin’s Book of the Heavens and the Universe”. He then proceeds: If this title refers to the geographical work of Balkhï, this could lead to the conclusion that to Balkhï belonged only the explanation of the maps, but not the maps themselves. The astronomer Abû-Ja‘far al-Khâzin is often mentioned in Arabic literature, e.g. in Birûnî, see Sachau’s *Index to his edition of the Chronology.*]  
6 *BGA*, iii, 5a.  
7 On the library of the minister İsmâ‘îl ibn-‘Abbâd in that town see *ibid.*, p. 391.  
again in the chapter on Sind; but in the references and quotations Maqdisi names only Balkhi and Iṣṭakhrî. According to de Goeje all the quotations in which Balkhi is named correspond entirely to Iṣṭakhrî’s text. Nevertheless de Goeje thinks it possible that Maqdisi might have had in his hands, besides the text of Iṣṭakhrî, that of Balkhi, but that Yāqūt, on the other hand, was in possession of a single book, and that quoting from this he referred principally to Iṣṭakhrî, but sometimes to Balkhi as well, “as though following a definite system”. This last guess is hardly supported by the facts: Yāqūt refers to Balkhi without mentioning Iṣṭakhrî only once, with regard to the distance between Jedda and ‘Aden; the corresponding words are of course to be found also in Iṣṭakhrî. In all the other cases Iṣṭakhrî alone is quoted, e.g. with regard to the distance between Hadramūt and ‘Aden. Consistency, which de Goeje vainly seeks in Yāqūt, can be discovered only in Maqdisi: with regard to three out of the twenty climes mentioned, viz. the last three: Khorāsān, Sīstān, and Mā-warā’ al-nahr, Balkhi is preferentially quoted; while in three others, Fārs, Kirmān, and Sind, preference is given to Iṣṭakhrî.

In de Goeje’s opinion the work of Iṣṭakhrî represents a second and greatly enlarged edition of Balkhi’s work, compiled between 318 and 321 (A.D. 930–3), i.e. in Balkhi’s lifetime. In Russian works the date 340 (A.D. 951) is often attributed to Iṣṭakhrî’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 Iṣṭakhrî’s meeting with Ibn Hauqal at the same date. The meeting is confirmed by Ibn Hauqal himself, who, with Iṣṭakhrî’s consent, undertook the revision of his work. Unfortunately, Ibn Hauqal 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 Hauqal intended to give at the end of his work a full synopsis

---

1 Ibid., p. 475; cf. the interpretation of the text, ibid., p. 5a, 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, 4117.
6 BG.A, i, 27 above.
7 Yāqūt, ii, 28519; Iṣṭakhrî, 273.
8 ZDMG, xxv, 50.
9 Cf. e.g. Toumânsky’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 Iṣṭakhrî in his time had received a similar consent from Balkhi, and whether he had met him at all, is not known.
13 BG.A, ii, 236.
14 In the final edition of Ibn Hauqal’s work, Ādharbayjān, as in Iṣṭakhrî, 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 Baghdad
(Thursday, Ramaḍān 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 Ḥauqal 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 Fāṭimid caliph, and
apparently spent in the West the years preceding the completion of
his book, since in 361 (A.D. 971–2) he was in Sicily.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 Iṣṭakhrī was translated into Persian; the manu-
script which Sir W. Ouseley took for a copy of the translation of
Ibn Ḥauqal and edited as such was found to be an abridged version
of Iṣṭakhrī’s book.⁶ The acquisition by the library of Shāhruḵh in
the fifteenth century of a copy of the Arabic original of Iṣṭakhrī
gave an impulse to the composition in Persian of the geographical
work of Ḥāfiz-i Abrū.⁷

¹ BGA, ii, 236ff.
² Ibid., 518. It is apparently not quite exact, as the day of the week does
not correspond to the date. If instead of ḥalāuna one reads baqīna, the date
would be 1 June, 943, but such a supposi-
tion would be untenable. Ibn Ḥauqal
adds that on the same day the Ḥan-
dānid Nāṣir al-daula left Baghdad,
leaving the Turks. Nāṣir al-daula
became chief amir of Baghdaḵ (amīr
942); the same date in Ibn-Miskawain,
Eclipse of the Abbasid Caliphate, ii, 28,
and in Ibn al-Athīr, viii, 286. His rule
came to an end as a result of the battle
mentioned by Ibn Ḥauqal; it had
lasted, according to Ibn-Miskawain,
(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 Ramaḍān 331; it is
possible that Thursday, Ramaḍān 3, is
meant (A.D. ii.v.943). In Zambaur
(Manuel, p. 9) the day of Ramaḍān 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-

³ In de Goeje’s opinion, BGA, iv, p. v, this date results from the mention,
BGA, ii, 2016, of the khutba, read “last year”, by the Ziyādid ruler of Yemen,
(Lane-Poole, The Muhammadan Dynas-
ties, Russian transl., p. 72; Zambaur,
p. 115), in the name of the Fāṭimid
caliph. But de Goeje fails to say at
this place (and apparently at any other)
in what source he found the change of
the khutba in Yemen in 366. In Ibn
al-Athīr there is no information on the
subject. Sir J. W. Redhouse in his Intro-
duction to Khazrajī’s History of Yemen
(GMS, iii, i, p. 11) says that when in
377 (A.D. 987) “the Hiwāliyy ruler of Šan’ā” took Zabīd, he suppressed the
khutba in the name of the Fāṭimids.
Reinaud (Géographie d’Aboulfeda,
Intro., p. lxxxiii), without proofs,
places the termination of Ibn Ḥauqal’s
work in 366 (A.D. 976) [evidently after
Uylenbroek, Specimen, p. 157].
⁴ BGA, ii, 146; see above.
⁵ Ibid., 2216–16.
⁶ Rieu, Pers. MSS., p. 416.
⁷ Al-Muṣaffariya (a volume dedi-
cated 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 Balkhî or of Ištakhrî. 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 Ištakhrî's text, p. 62:

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

Historical facts are likewise now and then borrowed from Ištakhrî (or Balkhî). In the chapter on mountains (f. 7b), as in Ištakhrî'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 Ištakhrî, it is said that the locality was conquered by the Qarmatian Muḥammad ibn-al-Fāḍl. 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.;¹ but perhaps the words andar qadîm, 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 Ištakhrî. In the chapter on 'Irâq (f. 31b) Qâsr ibn-Hubayra is called the largest town between Baghdad and Küfa; 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 Qarmatian Muḥammad ibn-al-Fāḍl, apparently, the brother of the Qarmatian 'Adî ibn-al-Fāḍl, who sacked Zabid 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 Ḥauqal’s original; in this case, as in
many others, Nöldeke is right in saying that Ibn Ḥauqal’s relation
to Ḩistakhri cannot be determined by a simple comparison of the two
texts of BGA, i and BGA, ii. The missing words of Ḩistakhri’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 Ḩistakhri.

The terms of our author’s description (26a) of three Muslim
colonies on the lower reaches of the Sīr-daryā corresponds almost
literally to Ibn Ḥauqal’s text, p. 393. In BGA, i, these colonies are
not mentioned; but it is sufficient to compare Ḩistakhri’s text in de
Goeje’s edition, p. 333, with Yāqūt’s quotation from Ḩistakhri, to be
convinced that the course of the Sīr-daryā was described in Ḩistakhri
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 Ḩistakhri’s version? Some passages apparently show the
influence of those chapters of BGA, i, which are principally attributed
to Ḩistakhri, e.g., the chapters on Sind and especially the description
of Manṣūra (f. 26a), cf. Ḩistakhri’s text, p. 173. But this passage
may also have stood in Balkhī. The dependence on Balkhī–Ḥistakhri
is still more noticeable in the chapters of the Hudūd al-‘ālam dealing
with Khorāsān and Transoxiana which, in the original, belong un-
doubtedly to Balkhī: vide the passages on the Herat mosque and the
number of people who spend their time there (f. 19b, cf. Ḩistakhri,
p. 265); the description of Būshang (ibid., cf. Ḩistakhri, p. 270); the
account of the river Murghāb, which crosses the village Dīza (f. 20a,
cf. Ḩistakhri, p. 270); the account of the three Buttām (or Butmān)
mountain chains (f. 23b, cf. Ḩistakhri, p. 333); the account of the
outposts at Osh (f. 24a, cf. Ḩistakhri, p. 333); and the account of
Khatlām or Khaylām as being the birthplace of the amīr Naṣr
( ibid., cf. Ḩistakhri, p. 334). In two instances, namely in the accounts
of the market in Marsmanda (f. 23b, cf. Ibn Ḥauqal, p. 384e) and of
sixty villages near Sokh (f. 24a, Ibn Ḥauqal, p. 396), our author’s
words can be compared only with the text of BGA, ii, because in
BGA, i, the corresponding passages of the Balkhī–Ḥistakhri text have

1 ZDMG, i iv, 433.
2 Barthold, Turkestan, ii, 179, Engl.
transl., p. 178; Barthold, History of
Irrigation in Turkestan, SPb. 1914 (in
Russian), p. 149.
3 Yāqūt, ii, 404 and sq. The text in
Yāqūt, as de Goeje points out in a foot-
note, BGA, ii, 393c, is clearly corrupt,
especially 405b where instead of fa
yamtaddu ‘alā al-atrāk al-Ghuzziyā
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 “wäh-
rend der eigentliche Text des Ḩistakhri
bei Ibn Ḥauqal und in den Anmer-
kungen 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 convincingly that the MSS. that were at his disposal, inclusive of the Berlin MS. (which Brockelmann 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 bey and the “Balḥikodex mit schönen Karten”, acquired in Baghdād for the Hamburg library: the necessary evidence as to the extent to which their texts differ from that of BGA is still to be given.

IV

A geographical work, under the same current title of “Book of Routes and Kingdoms”, was written by the Sāmānīd wazîr Abū ‘Abdillâh 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 Ḥauqal and Maqdisī. It can be seen from the latter’s comments that Ibn Khurdâdhbih’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 Khurdâdhbih, 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, 414), never crossed the Oxus.

6 BGA, ii, 236, with an unfavourable mention both of Jayhānī’s work and of that of Ibn Khurdâdhbih.

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 Maqdisi, it was a 140 days’
journey from Tünkat to the principal town of China, “as Jayhānī
was told by the ambassadors, and he mentioned this in his book and
clearly expressed it in his statement”.

Unfortunately this itinerary has not come down to us either
through Maqdisi or any other author; I have not met with quotations
from it. But one might suppose a priori that the great number of
geographical names belonging to Central Asia and found in our
author shows the latter’s dependence on the itinerary given by
Jayhānī. It is somewhat difficult to determine the extent of such
a dependence, seeing that our author does not give any itineraries;
but many of the geographical names of the Hudūd al-ʿālam 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-ʿālam. Gardīzī states that
he borrowed these data from Ibn Khurdādhbih, Jayhānī, and a third
anonymous work under the title Tawāduʿ al-dunyā. At one place
Gardīzī’s expressions literally coincide with the quotation from
Jayhānī found in Būrūnī, though referring not to the route to China,
but to that from Khotan to Tibet. According to Būrūnī, Jayhānī
said that “the Chinese in ancient times built a bridge from the summit
of a mountain to the summit of another, on the way from Khotan
into the province of the Tibetan Khāqān; whoever crosses this
bridge enters the locality where the air impedes respiration and
renders the tongue heavy; many of those who pass there die from this,
but many recover as well. The Tibetans call it Mountain of Hell.”
The same passage (of course in Persian translation) is found almost
verbatim in 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 Tünkat one should read Navīkat, the town of
   Navākat or Navikat being the starting-point of several routes to China, V.
3 V. Barthold, Report, &c., pp. 78–726.
4 Ibid., p. 103 (text) and p. 126 (transl.). [Barthold translates Tawāduʿ
   by “Insignificance”, “Frailty”, which is rather a strange name for a geo-
   graphical treatise. It is more probable that the book bore the name *Raʾ al-
   dunyā, “Habitable part of the World”, as indicated by a variant, see M.
   Nāẓım’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 Toghuuzghuz and China. Gardīzī mentions none of the Tibetan towns, while the Ḥudūd al-ʿālam names a whole series of them and even attributes to Tibet several towns placed by Gardīzī on the way from Kāshghar to Khotan,³ though the town of Khotan itself (as in Gardīzī) is described in the chapter on China (f. 14a); moreover, Khotan is placed on the frontier between China and Tibet, and the title “Chief of Turks and Tibetans”⁴ is attributed to the Khotan ruler.

A passage at the beginning of the chapter on Tibet in the Toumansky MS. (on the involuntary gaiety felt by every one entering Tibet) is clearly borrowed from Ibn Khurdādhbih.⁵ The data on the Tibetan towns are apparently derived from various sources; two names, Lhāsā and Krsāṅ,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, Vandūšāvūr, instead of in the Arabic, Junday-Sābūr; the spelling of the Toumansky MS. approximates very closely to the pronunciation Vandēw-Shāpūr proposed by Nöldeke.⁹ In the data borrowed from Balkhī-Iṣṭakhrī the author sometimes substitutes a local Persian form for the literary

¹ Kornilov, Kashgariya (in Russian), Tashkent, 1903, p. 349.
³ V. Barthold, Report, p. 94 (text) and p. 119 (transl.); Tadrūf and Rabtūya, mentioned there, figure in the Toumansky MS. among the towns which formerly belonged to China, and “now” belong to Tibet.
⁴ Cf. the title ʿAzīm al-Khotan in a twelfth-century author, Turkestan, i, 202.
⁵ BGA, vi, 170q.
⁷ [But see p. 44, note.]
⁸ BGA, i, 93. [See my notes. V.M.]
⁹ Nöldeke, Geschichte der Perser und Araber, p. 42.
Arabic one; thus in the passage on Herat (f. 19b), evidently borrowed from Balkhī–Iṣṭakhrī (p. 265), he writes Hari instead of Harat.

The similarities of both the *Hudūd al-ʿālam* 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 Baghshur 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-ʿālam*, 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.e.*, 12, 9, λίθινος πύργος, cf. Qudāma; *burj al-ḥijāra*); in Gardīzī no such name occurs. On the other hand, the *Hudūd al-ʿālam* 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 (*Khāmčū*, 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-Muttawwī; but during the whole of the tenth century Kan-chou was an Uyghur 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 *Hudūd al-ʿālam*, 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-ʿālam*, f. 17a.
4 *Report*, p. 92 (text) and p. 117 (transl.). [But see note to § 12, 9.]
5 [Barthold translates: *sultan*, but in the tenth century this word meant more probably “government”. V.M.]
6 Yāqūt, i, 840, above; Barthold, *Report*, p. 34.
other early Arabian geographers was in this case provided by the work of the traveller Abū ʿAbdillāh Muḥammad ibn-Ishaq, who lived two years in Khmer (Qimār), i.e. Cambodia; he it was who originated the passage (f. 14b) on the strict forbiddance of adultery in that country, as well as the story of the woman who ruled Orissa. The name Orissa occurs in two forms: Ürsfîn and Ürshfîn (in the story of the queen). The work of Balkhī–Īṣṭakhrī was utilized for instance in the passage dealing with the Arab rulers of Multān and with the town Bābī (in Īṣṭakhrī, Bāniya). According to Īṣṭakhrī the khūṭba in Multān was read in the name of the caliph; according to Ibn Ḥauqal6 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 Muʿizzī (bar Muʿizzī); but it is not clear whether we have to do here with a clerical error, the possibilities being Muʿizz (the Fāṭimid caliph who ruled from 953 till 975), and “Muʿizzī” which might designate the son and successor of Muʿizz, the caliph ʿAzīz. 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 Mahmūd the Ghaznavid in 1006; the epitomizer of Ibn Ḥauqal, who wrote in the twelfth century, gratuitously supposed, in order to explain Mahmūd’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, as confirmed by the Chinese source in which it was stated that this town bore the name of Yū-chou. Gardīzī  

1 BGA, vii, 132.  
2 Ibid., and vi, 66 and sq.  
3 Together with Smndr, as in Ibn Khurdādhbih, p. 642, who gives Ürn-šin. [But see my note, p. 243. V.M.]  
4 As in Ibn Rusta, p. 13413.  
5 BGA, i, 175.  
6 Ibid. ii, 230.  
7 Ibid. iii, 485.  
8 On this 'Uṭbi-Manīnī, ii, 72; Elliot, History of India, ii, 441.  
9 E. Chavannes, Documents sur les Tšou-Kius (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*, but not *Üj*. Mahmūd Kāshgharī (eleventh century) gives *Üj* but not *Bnchūl*, whereas our author (18a) names *Bnchūl* and *Üj* 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 Qirghız empire, at the end of the ninth and the beginning of the tenth centuries, 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, it is very probable that the first name Tuz-kul also designates Issik-kul. Nallino, 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); his massacre of the Balūches, an event mentioned by our author (f. 26b) and by Maqdisī after him, probably belongs to the end of his reign.

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, *wa ghayra-hu min al-'ulumā*. V.M.]
8 BGA, iii, 489.
9 Ibn Ḥauqal (BGA, ii, 2212) speaks only of the victory which 'Aḍud al-daula, with the help of the Balūches, won over the Küfīch; 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 (dabir) Bul-Fadl, the son of 'Amid, was a native of that place. The person here meant is the famous Buyid minister Abul-Fadl ibn al-'Amid,¹ who died in Hamadân on the night of Thursday,² 6 Šafar 360 (8 December 970). Quite singular is the mention by our author (33a), in the chapter on Ādharbayjān, Armenia, and Arrān, of the large village of Mubārkā which was situated at the gates of Barda‘ā where “the camp of the Russians (Rūs) stood, at the time when they seized Barda‘ā”, 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 Hudūd al-‘ālam.

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 Ustūvān 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

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 'Abbasid Khalifate, v, 293.
³ Cf. Yakubovsky in Vizantiiskiy Vremennik, xxiv, 63-92; the Hudūd al-‘ālam quoted, ibid., p. 91.
⁴ Izv. Kavkaz. Instituta, vi, 63 and sq.
⁵ J.rn.mān, f. 11a and f. 19b, BGA, iii, 300 below and 320 J.rn.mūkān; on its site, ibid., p. 352, where J.rn.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 ‘Utbī\(^1\) was considered the oldest author mentioning this ethnographical term (al-Afghāniya). Particularly little information is given on that part of Afghanistān where, at that time (since A.D. 977) ruled Sabuktāgin, founder of the Ghaznavid dynasty, later so powerful.\(^2\) Apparently, the text here has been somewhat corrupted by the copyists. The name of the town of Ghazna occurs several times in its usual form “Ghaznīn”, but it is not impossible that to this same town may pertain the words about the rich commercial town Ghazaq, which at first belonged to India but later passed under the sway of Islām and formed the frontier between the possessions of the Muslims and those of the Infidels (f. 22a).

From the Preface translated by Toumansky\(^3\) 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 ila 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 Khurdādbih’s words,\(^5\) Ptolemy *abāna al-hudūd*, which de Goeje translates “a donné une bonne description”.\(^6\) However, in the description of two provinces Khorāsān and Transoxiana, our author uses the word *hudūd* in some special and not very clear sense. Separately from the description of the provinces themselves are described their *hudūd*, and of the Sāmānids, the rulers of the whole country, it is said (f. 19a): “In the whole of Khorāsān are their lieutenants, while on the frontiers (andar hadd-hā) 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

---

\(^1\) *Enc. of Islam*, under Afghanistān (M. L. Dames). Cf. also in ‘Utbī the chapter on the Afghāns, *‘Utbī-Manānī*, ii, 300. [But cf. p. 349, n. 2.]


\(^3\) *ZVO*, x, 127.


\(^5\) *BGÅ*, vi, 39.


\(^7\) [Barthold translates andar hadd-hā “within the limits”, but this expression means: “on the frontiers”; on the other
in that on the “limits [read: ‘marches’, V.M.] of Khorāsān” would be described the vassal principalities, then he did not adhere consistently to this distinction. Enough to say that the possessions of the amīr of Gūzgān, the most important of the vassal rulers, are included in Khorāsān proper (f. 20b), and not in “the limits [read: “marches’, V.M.] of Khorāsān”.

In spite of the relatively insignificant size of the Ḥudūd al-‘ālam, 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 Tūs and in the mountains of Tabaristān; but these lakes are not known and are not ancient; or it happens [read: va yā vaqt bwadān, 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 (batiha-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

hand he renders mulūk-i ṣaḥāf by udel-sages”, V.M.] correspond on f. 13b the niye proviteli (“vassal rulers”) whereas words: ba-akhbār-hā shanādan. 2 On the district Mānishān see also the description of Gūzgān, f. 20b, the town B.st.rāb is not mentioned there. 3 Touransky, 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 akhdār or daryā-yi sabz, in Arabic al-bahr al-akhdār) to the Eastern Ocean, and the term Great Sea (al-bahr al-ażam) to the Indian Ocean, while in Muḥammad ibn-Mūsā al-Khuwārizmî1 both terms are applied to the Indian Ocean (the Great Sea—al-bahr al-kabir), 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 not mentioned among the people living around the Black Sea; in another passage, that dealing with the description of Byzantium, the Black Sea bears the name of 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. Mzik, p. 74. 2 Ibid., p. 80. 3 Cf. Enc. of Islam, i, under Bahr 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 1, 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 Ḍasiyāt al-kubrā (f. 13a) entirely corresponds to Ptolemy's expression ἡ μεγάλη Ἄσια (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,¹ 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 (nahiyat) in all, of which five are situated south of the Equator, one (the Südān) is astride it and forty-five lie north of it. The number of the provinces is very near to that given by Kuwārizmī, viz. fifty-six, but the names of the provinces in Kuwārizmī² are entirely different, and many of them are borrowed from Ptolemy, which is not the case with our author. The provinces situated to the south of the Equator are enumerated in the usual order from east to west; the first to be named is Zāba (but f. 2b and f. 39a, as well as in Arab geographers, Zābaj); further on come Zangistān (country of the Zanj or Negroes, actual Zanzibār), Ḥabasha (Abyssinia), the country of Buja (or Baja, a people of Hamitic descent, still existing, and divided into several branches),³ 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 geographers, who sometimes confuse the names Jāba (Java) and

¹ Cf. quotation in Yāqūt, i, 63. It is remarkable that on the other hand Ibn Khurdādhbih, p. 155, entirely ignores Asia and divides the world into four parts: Europe, Libya, Ethiopia, and Scythia.
³ Cf. articles "Abābde", "Bedja", and "Bishārin" in Enc. of Islam.
Zäbaj;\(^1\) but in any case the term Zäbaj always refers to the Malay coast or archipelago.\(^2\) The data of the Ḥudūd al-ṭalam 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.\(^3\) A certain influence of Balkhī is also felt in that our author, similarly to Iṣṭakhři, 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.\(^4\) But in this part of his work the author seems to have utilized sources unknown to us. Thus in Abyssinia are mentioned the following towns: Rāsun, on the seashore, residence of the king; Savār, where the army is stationed; and Rīn, the residence of the commander-in-chief. In other works we find entirely different names.\(^5\) The folio containing the description of the countries of Buja and Nubia has been considerably damaged.

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

---

\(^1\) BGA, vi, 46, note 2; also Enc. of Islam, ii, under “Java”. [See my note, p. 473. V.M.]
\(^2\) According to Birūnī, India, ed. Sachau, p. 103 above, the islands Zābaj are nearer to China than to India.
\(^3\) BGA, vi, 66; mámlakat jābat al-Hindi [referring to the maritime Jāba. V.M.]
\(^4\) Our author places Zanj as well opposite Sind, and so does Iṣṭakhři; at another place Iṣṭakhři, p. 36, places Zanj opposite some parts of Hind. [This seems to be a misunderstanding, as Iṣṭakhři, 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, Yghmīyā, but 13a, 17b, and 18a correctly Yghmā. The chapter on this people mentions Kāshghar, though at the same time it is said that the town is situated on the frontier between the possessions of the Yaghmā, the Tibetans, the Khirkhīz, and the Chinese.
\(^8\) Iṣṭakhři, p. 9 below, also speaks of the Ocean (al-bahr al-muḥīf) as the frontier of the Khirkhīz.
and describes the Khallukh (Qarluq) whose province on the east adjoined Tibet\textsuperscript{1} and the limits of the Yaghmā and the Toghuzghuz; then the Chigil, who had separated themselves \[?\textit{v.i.} \S\textit{16}\] from the Khallukh, whose country on the east \[?\] and south adjoined the limits of the Khallukh and whose western neighbours were the Tukhsï.\textsuperscript{2} Again passing to the north the author speaks of the Kïmâk, living to the west of the Khirkhïz and to the north of the Irtish, and of the Ghüz. In the chapter on the Ghüz it is said that to the east and south of their province is situated the Ghüz desert\textsuperscript{3} and the towns of Transoxiana; the Kïmâk are not mentioned in this connexion, but in their special chapter their peaceful relations as well as their wars \textit{with} the Ghüz are mentioned.\textsuperscript{4} After this come the Turkish Pecheneg, living to the west of the Ghüz, and the Khifjâkh (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 Khifjâkh separated from the Kïmâk, from which one might deduce that these latter had once been the eastern neighbours of the Khifjâkh. After the Khifjâkh is mentioned only one “Turkish” (according to the ideas of the Arab geographers!) people, the Magyars \textit{(Majghari)}. Nothing is said of the frontier between them and the Khifjâkh, 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 Rûs. The text presents some resemblances to that of Ibn Rusta,\textsuperscript{5} and likewise to that of Gardïzï\textsuperscript{6} \textit{(e.g.,} the number of horsemen and the mention of the great extent of the Magyar country; Gardïzï estimates both its length and width as 100 farsakhs, while according to the \textit{Hudüd al-ālam} 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 Khurdâdhbih) which has been most fully utilized by Gardïzï.

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

\textsuperscript{1} [See p. 256, note 2. V.M.]

\textsuperscript{2} In the translation of the text of Gardïzï \textit{(Report}, p. 125) and in the \textit{Sketch of the History of the Semirechye}, p. 15, I wrote “Takhsi” \textit{; but in the MS. of Mahmûd of Kâshghar, judging by the printed edition (i, 28, 85, 342; ii, 243), everywhere stands Tukhsï. [In the \textit{Hudüd al-ālam} : Tukhsï, probably formed from Tukhsiyân, on a false analogy with Ghûziyân \textit{<} Ghûz. V.M.]

\textsuperscript{3} The expression \textit{biyâbân-i Ghûz} corresponds to the expression \textit{mafâsat al-Ghuzziya}, in Balkh-İştakhrî \textit{(BGA}, i, 217 and sq.).

\textsuperscript{4} According to İştakhî, p. 222, the frontier between the countries of the Kîmâk and the Ghuzz was formed by the river Itil \textit{(Ithil)}, by which is probably meant the lower course of the Kama (cf. my article “Ghuz” in the \textit{Enc. of Islam}).

\textsuperscript{5} \textit{e.g.} the mention of 20,000 Magyar horsemen, \textit{BGA}, vii, 142.

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-ālam 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-Iṣṭakhrī.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 Qazvīn, is included in the Jībāl, and not, as in Balkhī-Iṣṭakhrī,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 Irāq, lying to the west of Khūzistān, follow; then again comes the description of northern provinces: Jazīra, Ādharbayjān, Armenia, and Arrān. As in Balkhī-Iṣṭakhrī, 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, Baghdad 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 Ṣanā in Yemen (f. 34a). The chief town of the province of 'Omān,2 Ṣoḥār (the name of this town has been for some reason replaced by the name of the province), is the storehouse for goods from all over the world; there is no other town where merchants are richer; all the merchandise from east, west, south, and north is brought to this town and from here re-exported. In Khūzistān prosperity3 is greater than in any of the neighbouring provinces (f. 28b). Egypt is the richest country of the Muslim world; Fusṭāṭ (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 Khurdādhbih4 shows that the Persian arash corresponds to the Arabic dhira'). Sometimes the author mentions an edifice as having an exceptional significance for the whole world, whereas in his source (Balkhī-Iṣṭakhri) 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 kammardum. [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 'Omān.

3 In the text bisyār-ni'mat-tar. In the Hudūd al-ʿalam 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.]

* BGA, vi, 159. Therefrom, too, are borrowed the words about the inscription [but not the wording of it. V.M.]
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” (jäy-i bāzargānän [present-day pronunciation bāzurgān, V.M.] or jāyagāh-i bāzargānän);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 bārkādha) 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 jäy is substituted the word ma’dan), and the port of Abaskün (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 Türkistān) 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 Šabrān, or Šaurān, was “the place of the Ghūz merchants” (ibid.). The situation of Karmina, Dabūsiya, 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 bāzargānän bisyār, meaning that at a given place there are numerous merchants.
⁴ The Khorāsān pilgrims went via Baghādād; this may account for the mention of Qādisiya “on the way of the pilgrims” (f. 31b).
⁵ On it see my Turkestan, p. 76; English ed.. p. 74.
place of paupers, though with abundant riches”; paupers were also the inhabitants of the town of Chaghāniyān (ibid.). Other “places of paupers” were the small town of Sakalkand or Iskalkand1 in the mountains of Hindūkūsh (f. 21b) and, as now, the Zarafshān mountains (f. 23b). The expressions “highway” (shāhrāh) and “highway of caravans” are used only with reference to the road from Marwarrūd to Balkh, through Faryāb and Shapūrqān (or Ushpūrqān, f. 21a).2 The store-house of Balkh was, however, the principal town of Guzgān, Anbār (or Anbār, ibid.), situated away from the above-mentioned road. The store-houses of India were Balkh (ibid.) and Lamghān, i.e. Laghmān (f. 16a); the gates to India were Bust on the Hilmand (f. 22a) and Parvān near the Hindūkūsh (f. 22b). To Andarāb near the Hindūkūsh was brought the silver from the mines of Panjhir and Járiyāba 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 Samārqandādāq (“Little Samarkand”), where live Hindus, Tibetans, Vakhani people (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 Bahmanābād and Mazānān and the road to Gurgān through Jājarm; Jājarm was the store-house of Gurgān (f. 19b). Several industrial and commercial towns are mentioned in the Caspian provinces; an interesting description is given of Pirīm (or Firīm), principal town of the mountain province Qārīn.3 In the detailed and precise description of the Caspian provinces is to be found a striking absurdity: the words of the Qorān (xviii, 78), concerning the ruler who seized every ship by force, are applied to the continental town of Ahar in Ādharbajān ff. 32b–33a). The legend, as in Iṣṭakhri,4 refers to the dynasty of the Julandids, but Iṣṭakhri has in mind not the principal branch of the dynasty, which ruled in ‘Oman,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. 114, uses the expression shāhrāh with regard to the Bukhārā–Samarkand 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 Barthold 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 Qor'ānic legend should have been transferred from one place to the other, to which they evidently can have no reference. Another evident and incomprehensible mistake occurs at the end of the chapter on 'Irāq (f. 13b), where it is said that the construction of the small towns of Karkh and Dūr (in the text by mistake Dwn), near Sāmarrā was begun by Mu'tasim (833–42), and completed by Ma'mūn (A.D. 813–33).

Store-places were: in Kirmān, Hurmuz (f. 26b); in Fārs, Sīrāf, and Māhīrūbān (or Māhrūbān, f. 27b);\(^1\) in Khūzistān, Sūs (f. 28b, here and in other passages—Shūsh). Consequently in Kirmān and Fārs such significance was attributed to sea-side towns, and in Khūzistān to a continental one. Yemen (f. 24a) is described in much greater detail than by Ištakhrī: 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 Ištakhrī.

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

VII

From Spain the author again passes to the non-Muslim provinces, first of all to Byzantium, information on which is mostly borrowed from Ibn 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; Yaqūt, iv, 699.
2 According to Maqdisī, Zabīd was "the Baghdad of Yemen" and only by its size was inferior to Ṣanʿā, which was in a state of decadence, BGA, iii, 84 and 86. \(^3\) BGA, vi, 109, above. \(^4\) ["Land"? V.M.]
the Burjâns. To the north-west of Rüm the author places the Bulgars (Bulgharî), not noticing that they are identical with the Burjâns whom he has just named. As distinct from the Bulgars are named, but not described, "the Slavs who have accepted Christianity", who paid tribute to the emperor of Byzantium. The country of Rüm 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 Ištâkhrî. Rome is included in the Frank country. As already explained, the information on Britain as a store-house of Rüm and Spain stands isolated. The deformation of Balkhî—Ištâkhrî’s report on the Greeks and Athens has been noted above, p. 21.

The subsequent chapters, those concerning the Slavs and the Rüs (ff. 37b–38b), the text of which has been edited by Toumansky, give little that is new. The chapter on the Rüs forms a characteristic example of the indiscriminate amalgamation of data pertaining to different periods; one finds the report probably derived from Ibn Khurdâdhbih about a single Russian khâqân, side by side with that about three independent Russian towns, taken probably from Ibn Faqlân. The fact that our author places the said three towns on the same river Rüs seems to result from an arbitrary combination by him of his sources. By the river Rüs in the present case is probably meant not the Volga in its upper course, above its junction with the Kama, as supposed by Toumansky, but the Don. The next people after the Rüs are "the Inner Bulgars", in whom Marquait sees the Danube Bulgars, and Westberg the Black Bulgars who, according to the Russian Chronicle and to Constantine Porphyrogennetos, 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, 12618, "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 (Rüs) tribes there are Mirvats", ZVO, x, 136, note 3. The word mrvut of the text (va andar gurîhî as îtîn muruvvat-ast) is probably the translation of the Arabic rujla (BGA, vii, 14614).

5 ZVO, x, 137, note.

6 BGA, ii, 27b.

7 J. Marquait, Osteuropäische und östasiatische Streifzüge, Leipzig, 1903, p. 517.

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

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

¹ Cf. Enc. of Islam, Barthold, Daghestân.
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 Sarîr 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 Tüläs and Lüghar, 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 Tüläs correspond to the Nandars (or Vanandars) of both the Toumansky MS. and Gardüzî, and likewise that the Lüghar correspond to the Mirvät, the name Lüghar itself being a distortion of Aughaz, or (with the article) al-Aughâz, by which are meant the Abkhâz. Meanwhile he (Marquart) thinks that in the source common to the Hudûd al-ālam and Gardüzî the information about these peoples had been confused, and that the Nandar, who according to their description correspond to the Alâns, received the name of Abkhâz.

North of the Khazars, and west of the Volga, lived the Barâdhâs, and west of the latter the Vanandar. East of the Volga lived the Burşâs, and north of the Burşâs and the Barâdhâs lived the Turkish Pechenegs, while north of the Vanandar were the Magyars. Gardüzî 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 Mirdât (Mirvät); between their province and that of the Nandar there was a distance of ten days' journey. The neighbours of the Burşâs on the south-east were the Central-Asian (?) Ghûz. 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, 139.
3 Streifege, pp. 31, 176, and 496.
4 Westberg, i.e., p. 388, was also inclined to consider the Mirvät as Abkhâz.
5 V. Barthold, Report, p. 98 (text) and p. 122 (transl.). To the Danube (Dûnâ) apparently refer the words of our author about the river, the name of which in our MS. can be read Rûtâ or Rûshâ, ZVO, x, 135, note 11. On the different names of the Danube in Arabic literature, cf. BGA, viii, 67, note o.
6 [Instead of Burşâs (§ 51) read: Bulghâr, as suggested by Barthold in an additional note. V.i., p. 450.]
Of the Pechenegs and other peoples considered as Turks, inclusive of the Magyars, information is given elsewhere, as we have seen. The northern outskirts of the Inhabited World begin in the east with the land of the Qirghiz (Khirkhis), whose neighbours on the west were the Kïmäk, who in their turn had as neighbours the Qipchaq (Khifjakh, 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 Ghüz; to the south, the Burṭās¹ and the Barādhās; to the west, the Magyars and the Rüs; 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 Rüs; 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:]

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: Bulghär. V.M.] ² [Very doubtful. V.M.] ³ For a detailed survey and explanation of the data quoted by Barthold on pp. 42–4, see my notes to §§ 46, 53, &c. V.M.]
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§ 61. Epilogue of the book
WITH bliss and happiness (bil-yumn wal-sa‘āda)! Thanks (sipās) be to God, the Almighty (twānā), Eternal (jāvidh), Creator of the World, Opener of difficulties (gushāyanda-yi kār-hā), guiding his slaves and manifesting himself (khwāsh-numā) through different sciences; and ample praises (durūdh) upon Muhammad 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 sifat-i xamin) in the year 372 from the Prophet’s emigration, on him be God’s blessings. In it we have brought to light (paydhā kardīm) 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: pādshāh-hā) of the Earth, so far (ānch) as they have become known until now, and the state of each different people found in those lands, and the customs of their kings, as they exist in our times, and everything that comes forth from those lands.

We have brought to light every land (shahr) of the world of which we have found information in the books of (our) predecessors (pishinagān) and in the memories (*yādhkirdi)? of the sages, with particulars of that land as regards its greatness or smallness, its deficiency or abundance of amenities (ni‘mat), wealth (khwāsta), and populations, and its cultivation or lack of the same; also, the disposition (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 (khalīj), 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 (aṣlī) mountains of the world and their manifold mines and the animals existing there.

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

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

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 muḥī't-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 (*ẓāwiya-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-äfäq*) 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 (*ābādhānt*) of the Earth, which (is) at the South Pole; then it passes by the western parts until it reaches again the East (*bāz məshriq rasadh*). And this circle is the one which separates this visible (*ṣāhir*) 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 (*ābādhānt*) 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 (*darāsnā*), because (*az än-k*) the largest (*mihtarīn*) circle traceable round the Earth (*gird-i zamān 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 zamān*). 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.
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4. In the eastern region (nāhiyat) the farthest lying city is the capital (qasaba) of China (Chūnistān) called Khumdān on the shore of the Green Sea (daryā-yi sabz). The Greeks (Rūmiyān) call this sea the Eastern Ocean (ugīyānūs-i mashriqī) and the Arabs (tāziyān) the Green Sea (bahr al-akhdār). And so Aristotle says in the book Āthār-i 'Uleī ("Meteorologica") that this sea surrounds the Earth like the Horizon and ships cannot work in this sea | and nobody has 2b crossed it (buridha) and it is unknown where it ends. And on the whole stretch of the inhabited zone (har chand kī ābdāhānī-st) the people see that sea but cannot cross it in a ship, except for a very short distance from the inhabited places.

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

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

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

As regards the region lying south of the Equator some parts of it are (occupied by) the sea, and, moreover, great heat prevails there (va dīgar sakht garmā-st) and the people of those regions are more removed from the character of humanity (tāḇ-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 (hadd), 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 (äkhîr) of cultivation ('imârat) in the south down to the Equator, the island Wâqwâq, the lands of Wâqwâq, the country (nâhiyat) of Chînistân, and the confines of the lands (karâna-yi shahr-hâ) of the Toghuzghuz and Khirkhîz. This sea has no known gulfs (straits?).

2. The other sea is the WESTERN OCEAN. Its extension, so far (än-k) as it is known, is from the extreme limit of the countries of the Südân, the Maghrib, and Sûs-the-Distant, up to the Rûmî Strait (khâlij), up to the extreme limit of the countries of Rûm and Saqlâb and up to the Tûlî (i.e. Thule) Island. This sea has a strait through which it joins the Rûmî Sea.

3. Another large sea is the one called the GREAT SEA (Bahr al-A'zam). Its eastern limit adjoins the sea (called) the Eastern Ocean, and about one-third (miqdar-i si-yaki) of the Equator stretches across this sea. Its northern limit starts from China (Chin), skirts the countries of Hindûstân and Sind, and the boundaries (hudûd) of Kirmân, Fârs, Khûzistân and Šaymara [sic]. The southern limit of this sea begins at the Jabal al-Ṭâ'in, skirts the country (nâhiyat) of Zâbaj and reaches that of Zangistân and Abyssinia. The western limit of this sea is a gulf which surrounds all the Arab country (gird-i hama-yi nâhiyat-i 'Arab andar gardadh).

This sea has five gulfs: (a) One of them begins (bar dâradh) from the limits of Abyssinia and stretches westward; off (barâbar) the Südân it is called the BARBARI GULF. (b) Another gulf (which) adjoins it, takes a northern direction ([ba] nâhiyat-i shamâl furûdh âyadh) up to the confines (hudûd) of Egypt, growing narrow till (tâ ânjâ-ki) its breadth becomes one mile (mil); it is called the ARABIAN GULF (khâlij-i 'Arabî), or the GULF OF AYLA (spelt: Ila),1 or QULZUM. (c) The third gulf starts (bar giradh) from the frontiers of Fârs 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 jammâza); it is called the GULF OF 'IRAQ. All the Arab lands lie between these two gulfs, i.e. the Gulf of Ayla and that of 'Irâq. (d) The fourth gulf is that of PâRS which starts from the limit (hadd) of Fârs, where it has a small breadth, and extends to the frontiers of Sind. (e) The fifth | 3a gulf starts from the country of Hindûstân and becomes a gulf while taking a northern direction; it is called INDIAN GULF (khâlij-i hindû'i).

Each portion of the Great Sea is called after the towns and countries (nâhiyat) which adjoin it, e.g. (chûnân-k) the sea of Pârs, the sea of Basra, the sea of 'Omân (spelt: Ommân), the sea of Zangistân, the Indian Sea, and the like. And this sea is the mine of all precious things (gauhar)2 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 Chïnistân, 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 (bikähadh) 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 (khalij) of Constantinople is 4 miles, and the narrowest (bārīk-tarin) part of the western strait (khalij) is 10 farsakhs and from the one shore the other is visible.

5. Another sea is the SEA OF THE KHAZARS. Its eastern¹ side (nāḥiyat) is a desert adjoining the Ghüz and Khwārazm. Its northern side (adjoins) the Ghüz 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 (khalij). Its length is 400 farsangs with a breadth of 400 farsangs. It produces nothing but fish.

6. Another sea is that of the Georgians (Gurziyān) and it is called BONTOS (Black Sea). Its eastern limit is formed by the confines of the Alāns (al-Lān); its northern limit is formed by the places (occupied by) the Pechenegs (Bajanāk), the Khazars,¹ the Mirvāts, the Inner Bulghārs, and the Ṣaqlābs; its western limit is the country (nāḥiyat) 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 Ghüz. 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. MAEOTIS (Māvīts, “the Azov\(^1\) sea”) at the extreme limit of the Șaqlābs towards the North. Its length is 100 farsangs with a breadth of 30 farsangs. From the Sea of the Georgians a strait (khālij) joins it. And from this same sea a strait joins the Western Ocean.\(^2\) Round it (i.e., Maeotis) lie desolate places (vīrānī). 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 (*Fārīta?*) in Rūm. Its length is three days’ journey and its breadth two days’ journey. Round it lie inhabited lands (ābādhānī) and it has plenty of fish. 12. The fifth is the lake MÝMĀTY (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 (manāfi’). 14. The seventh is the lake BÅSAFRÈ (*Bāsafüya*) 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.NKĀN in Pārs, 12 farsangs long and 10 farsangs broad. It has some useful products and round it are inhabited lands. 16. The ninth is the lake BÍJAGĀN [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 Dārāḡird and it continues (hami-ravadh) 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 (gabilat). 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 (rūdhi Nil andakhi buvadh) it grows salt. In the middle of this lake are two towns, the one Tinnīs (spelt: Tīnains) and the other Dimyāt. All the costly textiles (jāma) exported from Egypt come from these two towns. This lake is 15 farsangs long and 11 farsangs broad. 20. The lake of Tiberias (Ṭabariya) is in Syria. It is 12 farsangs long and 7 farsangs broad. 21. The lake of Nicaea (spelt: Tīnya, <*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 (spelt: Subrūshna) is formed by four rivers rising from Buttamān (kt 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 Gūzgān 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 Tūs and Tabaristān. 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'ṟūf ast) are nine: 28–30. three among them (lie in) the desolate lands of the south (si andar vay virāṇi-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 (batīha bandadh); then (āngah) from each of the (two) marshes rise three rivers, which (all) join in one place (ba yak jā gird āyadh) and from all the six of them one swamp (yakt batīha) is formed. Then from

1 mar ū-ra andar kitāb-hā [*va] akhbār yādā 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 Tinnis. 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 Kūfā 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-yī Paykand and is situated in the desert. 35. The eighth is at the upper end (a‘ālī) of Chīnistan, in the region (hudūd) of the town Khumdān. 36. The ninth is in the North of Chīnistan.

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

§ 4. Discourse on the Islands

Any land situated in the midst of a sea above the surface of the water, or any mountain standing in the midst of a sea,¹ is called island.

A. In the Eastern Ocean there is a (well)-known island called 1. SILVER-ISLAND (jazīrat al-fidda) 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 Chīnistan (az shumār-i Chīnistan) and called the City of the Silver-island. It is prosperous (ābādhān) and has a numerous population (bisyār-mardum).

B. In the Great Sea there are thirteen known islands and 2. two inhabited mountains, of which the one stretches in a southern direction (az nāḥiyat-i jumūbi 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 (dahabbiya); its periphery is of 300 farsangs and it possesses gold-mines and many cultivated lands (ābādhānī), and its inhabitants are called Wāqwāqian Zangī (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 ṬABARNA\(^4\) (*Taprobanē\(\)\). Its periphery is 1,000 farsangs. Round it are fifty-nine large islands both cultivated and desolate. On it are found numerous towns and villages as well as many rivers and mountains. It possesses mines of corundum (yāqūt) of all colours. This island lies off the frontier (sarḥadd) separating Chīnīstān from Hindūstān, and in it there is a large city called MUVAS; it is situated on the extremity (karān) which lies towards Hindūstān (ba Hindūstān baż dāradh). Whatever this island produces is carried to that city and therefrom to the cities of the world. 5. The third island RĀMĪ (al-Rāmī) lies in the region (hudūd) of Sarandīb, southward of it. There live black people, wild and naked. They are divers and this is the place of pearls (muruārid). The island produces ambergris (‘ambar), Brazil wood (dār-i parniyan), and the animal (called) rhinoceros (karg-i jānavar).\(^1\) They sell amber for (barābar) iron. The root of the trees of Brazil wood (bīkh-i dār-i parniyan) which comes from this island is an antidote to all poisons (tīryāk-ast az hama zahr-hā).

6. The fourth island is .§RĪH (*Zābaj?), west[?] of Sarandīb. In it grow camphor trees, the people there are wild and snakes numerous.

7. The fifth is called JĀBA and SALĀHIṬ (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 KALĀ; and it is the kingdom of the Indian Jāba.\(^2\) Between Bālūs and Kala the distance is a two days’ journey. In it (Kala) grow numerous bamboos (khayzurān), and it possesses tin (arsīx) mines.

10. The eighth island, called BANKĀLŪS (*Lankābālūs), is situated west of Kala. Between them there is a distance of six days. Its people are naked; they mingle (andar āmizand) 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 (khurräm) town, (also) called Lāft. On it there are fields

\(^1\) To distinguish it from the bird karg.

\(^2\) could be alternatively translated: “The king of Jāba is an Indian” but our text is an exact rendering of I. Kh., 66: و هي مملكة جاية
(kisht-u-barz) and many amenities (ni‘mat), and pleasant waters, and from all the world (people) go there for trade. This island is situated off Pars. 13. The eleventh is Nâra, lying on the Equator line, in the middle (bar miyâna) of the inhabited world. Its longitude (tût) from East to West is 90 degrees. The astronomical tables and observations (ṣij va rasâd), as well as the positions of planets (kawâkib-i sayyâra) and fixed stars (thâbitât), were calculated in the ancient tables (ṣij) with regard to this island (badhîn jazîra râst kardand). This island is called “equinoctial” (istiwâ al-layl wa ‘l-nahâr). 14. The twelfth island, called *Wâl (*Uwâl), lies off Pars and possesses many pleasant villages. It is a port of call (jây-i manzil) for ships. 15. The thirteenth, called Khârâk, lies south of Basra at a distance of 50 farsangs. It possesses a large and prosperous town called Khârâk. Near it excellent (murtafi‘) and costly pearls (murvârid) are found. 16. The other two islands are small and lie close to each other. They are called Socotra (û râ Saqîrâ [sic] khwânand) and are situated near the country ‘Omân. It is a place of little amenity (kam ni‘mat) 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 (bâdiya) lie the rocks 5a (küh) called Fârân and Jubaylât. The sea | there is always billowy and agitated (bâ mauj va âshufta).

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 Südân are called 18. Al-jazâ‘îr al-khâliya and possess gold-mines. Once a year people from the region (nâhiyat) of the Südân and the towns of Süs-the-Distant go to fetch gold from the mines but nobody can settle down there (kas muqîm natavânad shudan) on account of the intensity of heat. 19. The seventh island is Ghâdira (spelt: ‘Adîra) which lies at the point where the sea of Rûm joins this Ocean; from it rises (bigushâyadh) a large spring of water. The mouth of the strait opens into the Rûm Sea (dahna-yi khaliy daryâ-yi Rûm gardadh). The eighth and the ninth are two islands situated close to one another: the one is called 20. Rhodes (spelt: Rûdhas) and the other 21. Arwâdh; they lie off the lands of Rûm. (The position of) the stars was observed by the Greeks (raṣad-hâ-yi Yûnâniyân) from (andar) these two islands. The tenth and the eleventh are two islands situated half a farsang from one another, off the last limits (âkhir-i hadd) of Rûm 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 tavālūd 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 (nāhiyāt-i shamāl-i in darya) there are twelve islands called 24. BRĪṬÂNĪYA, 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. TŪWĀS (or Tūs) and situated north of the islands of BRĪṬÂNĪYA. It is 100 farsangs long and from it comes a large water (āb-i buzurg) which overflows the dry land (bār khushk rizadh) and flows straight to the sea of Maeotis (spelt: Marts) situated north of the Saqlāb, as we have mentioned.1 The twenty-fifth is the island 26. THŪLĪ (Thule). For some of the northern cities the longitude was fixed (girifta-and) from those islands [sic]. This is the island where the circle parallel (muwāzi spelt: mawāzi) to the Equator and passing through this island touches (gudharadh) the (extreme) limit of the inhabited lands (ābādhānt) 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. JĀBAL-ṬĀRIQ (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 (dārū) usual in that land, e.g., gentian (jintiyānā) and the like. The other mountain is 28. JĀBAL AL-QILĀL near the Roman land (shahr-i Rūmiya?);2 west of it (andar maghrib 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. YĀBĪS (spelt: Bālus); its periphery is 300 miles. The fourth is 32. SICILY (spelt: Saqliya), near the Roman country (Rūmiya); a high mountain encircles it. | In the days of old, Roman treasure used 5b

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 (ustuwārī). Its length is 7 post stages (mansil) 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: Iqrītas), 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. JAZIRAT 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 (duzdī) 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 (sayyādān-i bāz va hawāsil), 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 (sūrat kardim) 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 (ašlī) mountains, stretching from one region (nāḥiyat) into another, growing now thin and now thick (sitabr), 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-ṭāʾ 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 (yāqīt) 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 (Sarandib) 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 bava) and all kinds of spices (afvāḥ). It has numerous coco-nut trees, Brazil wood (dār-i parnīyān), and bamboos. There are found in it musk-deer, civet-cats (hayvān-i zabād) | and rhinoceroses 6a (karg). On it the trace of a human foot is found impressed upon a stone (nishān-i pāy-i mardum ba-sangfurū 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 Chinistān. 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 ('atf) westwards and goes between China and the country (nāḥiyat) 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 Chinistān; (then stretches) between (miyān) the towns of Transoxiana and the towns of Turkistān up to the confines (hudūd) of Tarāz 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 Chinistān (ba Chinistān 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 nāḥiyat) 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 (nawāḥi) of Chīnistān there are eighteen mountains, small and big, separate (burīdhā) from each other. And in each locality there are some mountains scattered (parāganda) in every direction. In fourteen of these mountains gold-mines are found.

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

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

8. Another mountain shoots off (bar giradh) from the beginning of the Toghuzghuz frontier (ḥadd) in the neighbourhood of the lake Issi-kūl (spelt: Iskük). It continues till the end of the Tukhs (Tukhsiyān) and the beginning of the Khallukh frontier, then it bends (‘atf), and a branch separates¹ from it (bāz gardadh) into the land (nāḥiyat) 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 (furūd̄ ayadh) 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 (ḥudūd) of Hītāl (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: صَوْر، صُوْر؟
9 A. One branch going northwards enters (furūdh āyadh) the confines (hudūd) of Ṭīthāl (?) and Nītāl (*Nēpāl*?), and passes between (miyāna) the farthest limit of India and Tibet, going north of the confines (hudūd) of Bolōr, Samarqandāq, Shāknān [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 Buttāmān belonging to Transoxiana, until it reaches (bar āyadh) the confines of Surūshna (spelt: Sarūshna). This mountain has numberless (biṣyār va bi-`adad) ramifications in the districts (az hudūd) Shāknān, 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 Buttāmān. 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 aṣl) comes near Buttāmān, (the chain) splits into two, but when (these two branches) come to the confines (hudūd) of Surūshna (spelt: Shurūshna) they unite again. From the confines (hudūd) of Buttāmān a branch shoots off (bar giradh) which passes between the Buttāmān-of-Daryāzha and Chaghāniyān (andar miyān-i Buttāmān-i Daryāzha va miyān-i Ch.) and skirts the confines (bar hudūd) of Samargand and Sughd down to the confines of Būkhārā. And likewise, each of these branches has a few or many offshoots.

9 B. As regards the other branch, from the frontier (hadd) of Ḥibtāl [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 Lhrz2 where it is called the mountain of Q.S.K (?), and so it runs north (andar shamāl) of the confines of Qashmīr, Vayhind (spelt: Vbhnd), Dunpūr, and Lamghān, and south of Bolōr, Shāknān, 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, Khulum (and) Simingān, and south of Balkh, and enters the confines of Sān and Chāryāk 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 (Ispīzār),

1 Khushk, "dry land", cf. § 4, 25. 2 Small erasure, but the text is complete.
Herat (Haré), Büshang, and Nishāpūr. Then between Nishāpūr and Sabzavār (spelt: Sgroār < *Safsavār), it takes the direction of the road (following the latter) on its northern side (ba rāh furūdh āyadh az sīy-i šamāl) 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 (ḥudūd) of Gilān.

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

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

9 b c. On reaching the locality of Sān and Chahāryak belonging 7 a to Gūzgān, this ridge of mountains splits into two: | the one branch is that which we have described (padhūdh);3 the other one goes north of it taking a western direction between Kundarm and Anbīr. It passes between Gurzivān and Jahūdhān, between Bashīn and Dīza, between *Mārrūdh and Baghshūr and south of Sarakhs. Then it takes a northern direction and goes to the limits (ḥudūd) of Tūs, Bāvard, and Nasā until it reaches the limits (ḥudūd) 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 Sibarāyīn (*Siparāyīn > Isfarāyīn) until it reaches the limits of Gurgān (az ḥudūd-i S. furūdh āyadh tā ba ḥudūd-i G. rasadh). Then it turns south-westwards going on (hāmī ravadh) south of Āmol and the towns

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

10. Other mountains are in the province of Kirmān. They are separate (buridha) 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 kūhī rā . . . mihtarī dāradh) and the representatives of the government (ʿāmil-i sultān) do not go (nashavadh) to those mountains, and those chiefs (ān mihtarān) every year collect and send in the amount of tribute-money (muqātaʿa 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 (ustūwār) and cannot be conquered by armies and war. Between Jīruft and this mountain there are hills (shākhak-hā-yi kūh) and the locality is called Bū GHĀNĪMʾS 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 maghnātīs), 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 Darāgīrd 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 (*Rōdhān). Then it turns westwards and runs on to the frontier between Pārs and Khūzistān. Then it takes a northern direction, passes (furūdāh āyadh) between Bū-Dulaf’s Šara (i.e., Karaj) and Sipāhān, and enters the lands of the Jībāl (ba shahr-hā-yi f. furūdāh 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 Ādharbādhagān, and then stops (biburradh). This mountain in the districts (kuwar) of the Jībāl | sends out so many offshoots that there remains no town but possesses near it a spur of this mountain.
Likewise in the province of Pars this mountain has many ramifications and (other) mountains lie there, both joined (to one another) and separate (buridha), so that in the neighbourhood of each city of Pars there is a mountain. This mountain has also ramifications near Sipahân, which spread out (paraganadh) in Khûzistân. Near Sipahân this mountain is called Kûh-jîlû.

12. Another mountain lies in the northern parts (nâhiyat), between the frontier of the Kîmâk and the beginning of the Khirkhîz. It starts from the frontier of Kîmâk and stretches eastwards to the frontier of the Khirkhîz. Then it follows a northern direction till where the inhabited part (âbädhäm) of the world finishes in the north. In the northern region this mountain is called by the Kîmâk, K.N.DÄV.R-BÄGHÎ (*Kundavar, Kandâ’ur-taghi).

13. Another small [?] mountain situated in the province (nâhiyat) of Ādharbâdhagän near Ardabil, is called SABALÂN (spelt: Sabilân?).

14. Another mountain lies in the districts of Armenia. It starts from Takrit in ‘Irâq, where it is called KûH-Î*BÄRÎMMA, and so it goes between the frontiers (bar miyän-i hadd) of Armenia and Ādharbâdhagän until it reaches the limits of Bardâ’.  

15. In the same region (nâhiyat) are two other mountains separate from each other. The higher one is called HÄRÎTH (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 HUWAYRÎTH, is similar to Härith but smaller than it.

16. In the province of Jâzîra there are two separate mountains. The one, called JÜDÎ, is the mountain on which Noah’s ark (kashti) came aground (biistädh). The other, called the MOUNTAIN OF MÄRDÎN, is situated near Nişîbîn (spelt: Naşibîn).

17. In the Arab country there are many small mountains; thirteen of them are called TİHÄMA. One mountain is near Mekka and is called GHAZWÂN. Another called SHİBÂM (spelt: Shiyâm) is near Şan’â; 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 (chahâr sî andar gîrd) of 20 farsangs, lies at the end of the mountains of Tihâma. Its summit is flat (hämün) and has villages (âbâdhânî), agriculture (kisht), and running waters. In the days of old, Muḥammad ibn Faḍîl al-Qarmaṭî conquered it. Another hill (kûhak) called RAḌWA stands near Madîna; the Mekkan whetstones (sang-i fasân) come from there. The other two hills (kûhak)
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 **TİH OF THE SONS OF ISRAEL**. Near, and joined to it, stands a high mountain called **TUR SINÀ**. 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, Himş, passing north of these towns and north of Baghrās and crossing the river Jayhūn 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 (bar gardadh) 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 Bahanāk-i Khassāri 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 Şaqālāb. Then it takes a northern direction, traverses (andar miyān) the Şaqālāb (country) and skirts that town of the Şaqālāb which is called Khurdāb, after which it reaches the end of the Şaqālāb and there stops (biburradh).

From the Tür Sinā to Zughar (spelt: Za’ur) they call this mountain **MOUNTAIN OF THE KHĀRIJITES (shurāt, spelt: sh.rāh)** and on it are many villages (ābdhānu) and near it all the people are Khārijites (khārijiyān). From *Zughar to the limits of Damascus they call it BALQA. From Damascus to Himş, LUBNĀN; from Himş to the limits of Baghrās, [the Mountain of the] **BAHRĀ (spelt: Dahrā) and TANUKH**; 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 ‘atif-hā bikunadh) it reaches the beginning of the Alāns, it is called QABQ; after this, until finally (tā ākhīr ki) it disappears (mungati’), each place is called after the town and the district which adjoins it, as is the case with the other mountains.

18 A. When it reaches the end of Syria and the beginning of Armenia a large branch separates from it and enters the region (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 Sarîr a huge (ʼazîm) branch shoots off from it and thus it runs on eastwards (aş sûy-i mashrîq) between those two mountains until it reaches a fortress. The latter is a town on the summit of this mountain, of which the wall (bâra) is every day guarded in turn (ba-naubat) by (a detachment of) 1,000 men. Mines of gold and lead are found there.

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

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

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

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

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

23. In the province of Egypt there are two mountains: the one is situated on the eastern side of the river Nile (bar sûy-i mashriq az rûdîh-i Nil). From the frontier of Uswän and the beginning of the frontier of Nubia (Nûba) it runs straight north and enters Upper Egypt (Ṣaʼîd al-a’lâ). It skirts the limits (hudûd) of Bûṣîr (spelt: Tawṣîr) and Fustâf, which is the capital (qasaba) of Egypt, until it reaches Hauf [al-Sharqî: “eastern bank”] (spelt: Khauf) and the place where the Jifâr (spelt: Ḷîfâra) 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’aṣṣam).

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

---

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

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

26. Another mountain is within the limits (andar hudūd) 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 (Tulaytila), 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 (dārū).

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 farangs.

30. The other eight mountains vary in longitude, latitude, and extension (ṭīl va ‘ard va masāfāt); their places and dimensions are such as we have shown (paydhā) on the Map (sūrat). 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 (rüdhdhāda) have been dug out and the water brought (therein) for the benefit (ābādhanī) 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-māhdūd) 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 (hamī 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 (ābādhānī) 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 baṭṭha 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 Mānīsā and reaches the place situated in the centre of Tibet (badh-ān jāy ki ba-miyāna-yi hudūd-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 (nāḥiyat) 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 (Masībhajākh?), rises on the eastern side of the said mountain Mānīsā at the extreme limit (akhir-i ḥadd) 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 nāḥiyat-i Sājū andar gudhārād) forms a swamp. Thence it flows down to the limits of Kuchā, then passes through (andar miyān) the province (nāḥiyat) of Kūr.sh (?) and the province of F.rāj.klī 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 crossed\(^1\) (va hargiz pahnä-yi in āb naburrand?). When the river reaches the limits of Kuchchä [sic] it is called the river of Kuchchä 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.mäy.n-d-ghün, the second kh.räy.n-d (Khwäy.n-d?)-ghün, and the third khül.n-d (Khük.n-d?)-ghün. Between Gh.zä and K.lbänk all the three rivers flow into the river of Thajäkh [sic].

4. From the Kïsau river a big river separates which comes near this [?] fortress of Tubbat-khäqän and to *Üsäng (ba nazdik-i in qal’a-yi Tubbat-khäqän va ba-Karsäng [sic] āyadh) and there it is used for the fields and meadows (kisht-u-giyä-khwär).

5. Another river is called ìlä. It comes from the mountain Irghäj-ärt [sic], takes a northern direction, and falls into the lake Issi-kül (spelt: Abštük)\(^2\).

6. Another river is JAYHÜN which rises from the region of Vakhän and follows the frontier (bar hadd) between the limits of Bolör and those of Shāknän, (which is) of Vakhän,\(^2\) down to the limits of Khuttalän, Ṭukhärístän, Balkh, Chaghāniyän, Khorāsän, and Transoxiana, (then) down to the limits of Khwārazm, (finally) to fall into the sea of Khwārazm.

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

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

9. Another river called VAKHSHÄB rises from the Vakhsh mountains and near Vakhsh flows into the Jayhün.

10. Another river rises from the limits of the KUMIJTS (Kumijiyän), flows through their mountains, passes through (bar miyän) Nü-diz, and flows into the Jayhün near Qavādiyän.

11. Another river is CHAGHÄN-RÜDH, which rises from Chaghāniyän and falls into the Jayhün near Tarmid [sic].

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

12. Two other rivers, of which the larger is called RÜDH-I DARGHÄM

---

\(^1\) So in view of §2,4. Less probably: "cannot be dammed in".

D'äm, come from the limits of Ţukhâristân, unite into one river, and having passed between Valvâlij and Khulm, fall into the Jayhūn.

13. Another river rises from the mountains on the confines of Lamghân and Danpûr [sic] and passes south [north? ] of *Nînhâr (bar ād-i bigudhârad az sîy-i junûb). It is called the RIVER OF LAMGHÂN. It flows past the region (bar hudûd) of Mûltân (spelt: Mûliyân) and the towns *Rûr (spelt Divîn), Sadûsân, Bulrî, Mansûra, and Manjabrî, and near Kûlî empties itself into the Great Sea.

14. Another river called SIND-RÛDH rises on the west of the mountain Qasak, which is also called the Mountain of Ice (Kûh-i yakh). The river flows southwards (az sîy-i junûb), enters the confines (hudûd) of Mûltân, and joins the river of Lamghân [sic] from the eastern side.

15. Another river (called) HÎVÂN, comes from the mountain Hûvân, passes between Jalâvat, Balâvat, and Birûza (spelt ܝܘܪܐ), enters the province of Mûltân, and falls into the river of Lamghân from the western [read: eastern] side.

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

It is said that from the summit of the Mountain of Ice, which is Qasak, a water springs up like a fountain (bar damadh chîn fawwâra) and also [that it?] separates into two in such wise (hamchinân) that one half flows northwards, and it is the river Kharnâb, and the other flows southwards, and it is the river Sind-rûdh, which afterwards becomes the Mihrân.

16. Another river is the LESSER MIHRÂN which rises in the Indian mountain (Kûh-i Hinduvân) and, separating the frontiers (miyân-i ād) of (the dominions of) Dahum and (those of) the Rây, passes between (miyân) Hamânân and B.lhârî and between (miyân) Nu’nûn and Nu’nîn; it skirts (bar hudûd) Qandahâr, reaches the limits of Kûlî, and flows into the Great Sea.

17. Another river is ÜZGAND which rises from behind the mountain of the Khallukh and skirts Üzgand, the town of Bâb, Akhsîkat, Khûjand, and Banâkat, down to the limits of Châch (spelt: Châj). Then it skirts S.tkand, Pârâb, and numerous boroughs down to the limit (tā bî-ād) of Jand and Javâra (Khavâra?), and flows into (bâ sic) the sea of Khwârazm.

18. Another river is KHIRSÂB (spelt: Kûrsâb) which rises from the extreme limit (ākhir-i ād) of Buttamân on the northern side of the mountain, and near the town of Khursâb joins the river Üzgand.

19. Another river is ÔSH, which rises in the same mountain, passes between (bar miyân) Ôsh and Ôrasht (Õrast) and joins the Üzgand.
20. Another river is Qubä which rises in the same mountain and joins the Üzgand near Qubä.

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

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

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

23. Another river is that of Bukhārā. Four rivers rise in the mountain of Middle Buttāmān. They flow for a distance of 6 farsangs; then all four form a swamp (batiha) called Daryāzha; out of the latter flows a river which skirts the confines (bar ḥudūd) of Surūshāna, 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 Avāsa of Paykand.

24. Another river is that of Balkh which rises in the region (hudūd) 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 Hīdhmān which rises at the frontier (hadd) of Gūzgānān. In the neighbourhood of Ghūr it flows past (bar) Durghush [sic], Til, and Bust and makes a sweep round the region of Sistān (as gird-i Sistān andar āyadh). Some of it is utilized for agriculture, and some flows into the lake Zarah.

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

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

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

29. Another river is sakān in Pārs which rises in the mountains and the district (rustā) of Rūyagān; changing its direction it flows round the town Kavar (az girdi Kavar andar gardadh) and between Najīram and Sirāf joins the Great Sea.

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

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

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

These four rivers flow in a north to south direction.

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

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

35. Another river is tāb, which rises in the Kūh-Jilū, situated on the confines (ba ādud) of Sipāhān, follows the frontier between Khūzistān and Pārs (ba ḥadd-i miyān-i Khūzistān va Pārs) and falls into the Great Sea. The town Māhirūbān stands in the sea between (two branches of) this river (andar miyān-i in abast bayn-i daryā).¹

36. The river sardān rises also in the Kūh-Jilū and falls into the river Tāb (ba rūd-i Tāb andar ʿuftadh). The town Sardān (spelt: Surdān) 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 Jībal (shahr-i jībal). It flows² through Shūshtar, Šūq al-ʿArbaʿā, Ahwāz, Jubbay, and Bāsiyān until it reaches Dahana-yi Shīr (“The Lion’s Mouth”) and Ḫiṣn Mahdī. Then it falls into the Great Sea.

¹ On the position of this town, cf. ² On the margin: al-juzʿ al-thāni, § 29, 15. “second section” (?).
38. Another river in Khüzistân is **masruqän**. It separates *(bar dărâd) from the Shüshtar river and flows down to Ahwâz watering all the fields; the rest falls again into the river of Shüshtar *(bätz rûdh-i Sh. uftadh) near Ahwâz. The town ‘Askar-i Mukram (spelt: ‘Askar va Makrum) is situated between these two rivers.

39. Another river also separates from the river of Shüshtar off *(as hadd) Bâsiyân and irrigates the fields*¹ of Bâsiyân, Khân Mur-dûna [sic], and Dauraq up to the limits of Râm Ürmizd.

40. Another river is that of **shüsh** which rises in the neighbourhood of Karkha *(as hadd-i Karkha bar-dărâd) from one of the spurs of the Jibâl mountains and it flows to irrigate the countryside *(sawâd) of Shüshtar [*?] and Shüsh. It passes between Shüsh and B.dhüshâvur [*?], but before reaching the limit of Basunnay all of it is used up in the fields *(tâ . . . rasadh hama andar kisht-hâ ba-kâr shudha bâshadh).*

41. Another river is the **ras** [*?], flowing up in the North *(andar hadd-i shamâl) in the country of the Ghûz. It is a large river of which (the waters) are black and bad-smelling *(siyâh va gandâ); it rises from the mountain which is on the frontier between the Kîmâk and the Khirkîz, traverses *(andar miyân) the Ghûz 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 *(shîrîn). It flows between the Ghûz and the Kîmâk until it reaches the village Jûbîn (*Chûbîn) in the Kîmâk 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 Kîmâk country *(andar miyâna-yi Kîmâkiyân) down to the village Jûbîn (*Chûbîn); then it flows westwards along the frontier between the Ghûz and the Kîmâk until it has passed Bulghâr *(tâ bar Bulghâr bigudharadh); then it turns southwards, flowing between the Turkish Pechenegs and the Burtaş,² traverses the town of Ātil belonging to the Khazar *(as hadd-i Khazarân), and flows into the Khazar sea.*

44. Another river is that of the **rûs** which rises from the interior of the Şaqlâb country and flows on in an eastern direction until it arrives at the Rûs limits. Then it skirts the confines *(bar hudûd) of Urtâb, Ş.lâb, and Küyâfâ, which are the towns of the Rûs, and the confines of Khifjâkh. Then it changes its direction and flows southwards to the limits of the Pechenegs *(ba hudûd Bachanâk) and empties itself into the river Ātil.

¹ Read: *kisht*, instead of *kashtihâ.*  
² V. i., p. 463.
45. Another river is the Rūtā (?) which rises from a mountain situated on the frontier (sarḥadd) between the Pechenegs, the Majgharī, and the Rūs. Then it enters the Rūs limits (āndar miyāna-yi ḥadd-i Rūs) and flows to the Șaqlâb. Then it reaches the town Khurdâb belonging to the Șaqlâb and is used in their fields and meadows.

46. Another river is the Tigris which rises in the mountains of Diyārbâkîr (Ămîd; spelt: İmîdh), flows past (ba) Balad, Mauşîl, Takrît, and Sâmarra, cuts into two both Baghdâd and Wâsîṭ (miyāna-yi B. biburradhî), and finally reaches Madhâr, Bula (*Ubulla), and the limits of Baṣra; then it empties itself into the Great Sea. Near Fâṭh a river separates from the Tigris, which is called canal of Maʿqîl 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 (hudûd) of Baṣra it joins the Maʿqîl canal. Then it passes through (ax) Baṣra, where it is called Dubays-canal. Finally it once more (bâz) joins the Tigris near 'Abbâdân. Between Wâsîṭ and Madhâr a canal separates from the Tigris, and forms two swamps | called Baṣra Swamps.

47. In the Armenian mountains rise two rivers called the two zâbs (Zăbayn, spelt: Zăbir), the Lesser and Greater Zâb. Both flow in a south-western direction and empty themselves into the Tigris between the towns Ḥadîthâ and Baṣra.

48. Of the other two rivers, the one called sâs (Sâbus ?) 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 nahrawân, is utilized in the fields, and when it reaches Nahrawân none of it remains.

49. Another river is the Euphrates, which rises in the mountain ‘Ulayq (‘Aliq ?) and flows through the Rûm country, cutting the mountain Lukkâm (az miyān . . . biburradh). It arrives at the limits (hudûd) of *Malatîya (spelt: Malatîya) and thus (hamchînîn), turning southwards, skirts Shumaysîśât, Sanja, and Bâlas (*Bâlus ?). Then it takes a north-easterly [read: south-westerly!] direction until it has skirted Raqqa, Qarqîsîya, Raḥba, Āna, Ḥit, and Anbâr. Then again it changes its direction and flows towards the south-[east] (miyān-i junûb [*va mashriq]), till it reaches the Kûfa swamp. After Anbâr a canal called Nahr-‘Īsâ separates from it, goes down to Baghdâd (tâ B.), and empties itself into the Tigris, and the people navigate (ba-kâshî ravandaḥ) this canal from the Euphrates to the Tigris. Lower down (ax zîr-i Nahr-‘Īsâ), another canal larger than the Nahr-‘Īsâ separates from the Euphrates (ham az in rûdḥ); it is called Nahr-Šarṣar and is utilized in the fields of the town Šarṣar. Still
lower down, a canal larger than the Nahr-Şarşar, 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 (hudūd) of Karbalā. It is called Nahr-Sūrā and flows until it too [i.e., like the Euphrates] empties itself into the Wāṣīt swamp. The town Jāmi‘ayn is between these two rivers, i.e., the chief stream (‘amūd) of the Euphrates and the Sūrā canal.

50. Another river in the province (hudūd) of Khorāsān is called HIRAND. It rises from the mountain of Tūs and skirts the region of Ustuvā (spelt: Asatavū) 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 ṬIZHIN-rūdh. It rises in the Qārīn mountain in the neighbourhood of Pirrīm, skirts Sārī, and (empties itself into the Khazar) sea.

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

53. Another river, called HARHAZ, rises in the mountains of Rayy and Lārijān on the frontier (az hadd) 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 Hūwayrīth in Armenia, flows westwards [read: eastwards], traverses (miyān) Gīlān, and empties itself into the Khazar sea.

55. Another river, called ARAS (spelt: Arūs), 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 Ādharbādhagān, Armenia, and Arrān, it joins the Khazar sea.

56. Another river called KURR rises in the province Arrān in the mountain lying between Arrān and the Sarīr. Taking an easterly1 direction it flows down to the limits of Shakī and Qabala (spelt: Qibla) and skirts Bardīj (*Bardēj). Then it unites with the river 11b Aras (spelt: Āris) and their waters flow between Mūqān and Bākū to join the Khazar sea.

57. Another river in the ’Arab country2 is BAYHĀN (spelt: Mījān) It rises from the farthest end (ākhir-i hudūd) of the Tihāma mountains, i.e., from the easternmost part of it (ānk ba mashriq nazdiktar-ast), skirts the town of the Wādí Bayhān (spelt: Mījān), Shabwa (spelt: Saywa), and the towns of Ḥadramūt, (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 Shām) 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 (as miyānā-yi Rūm), and flows into the Sea of the Georgians.

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

60. Another river rises from the Opsikian theme (Ubsiq) of Rūm, skirts the town of Bndaq.lus (?) and Didūn (B.d.ndún, N.dydún?), to flow into the *Nīqiya (spelt: Tanqiya) lake in Rūm.

61. Another river also rises here (ídhar) and follows the frontier (bar miyān-i hadd) between the theme of Anatolicon (*Natliq spelt: Batliq) and the Buccellariote theme (Buqallār). Then it turns southwards, flowing between Khāk (k) 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. From each five (of them) a swamp is formed (batīha bandadh); then from each of the swamps come out three rivers. From all these six rivers a swamp is formed (yaktī batīha bandadh) outside the limits of Nubia towards the south (bīrūn as ḥudūd-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: Sabra), 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, Fayyūm, and Fuṣṭāṭ, and empties itself into the lake Tinnīs.

63. And from the sands which lie between the districts (nāwāhī) 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-MĀ’DAN.²

64. From the Nile a large canal separates near Fuṣṭāṭ 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 Ifriqiya, 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 (nähiyat) of Süs-the-Distant there are no great and important (kul) rivers, except such as (magar chunânk) serve for drinking (khurd) and (the irrigation of) the fields.

Likewise we have not found any information in the books and reports (andar kitâb-hâ va akhbâr-hâ) about any rivers in Südân.

66. Another river rises in the west of the country Rüm, from the mountain Bulghari, and follows (hami ravadh) an easterly direction until it reaches the place (jây) of the Saqlâbians living in the Rüm country. After having traversed the country of the Burchân (ba nähiyat-i Burchân [sic] bigudharadh) it skirts the theme (bar 'amal) of Thrace (spelt: Burâqiya), and in this (reach?) traverses the town Qustantîniya (andar in [miyân?] miyân-i Q. bigudharadh), while the remainder (of the water) flows out into the strait. This river is called Bulghari.

67. The river TAGUS (^lr *Täju) rising in the mountains of Spain near Toledo, flows round the town of Toledo (azgird-ishahr-i Tulaytula andar âyadh), following a westerly direction, then turns eastwards, (then) again westwards. And it flows on till the limits of *Merida (spelt: Härda) and Santarem (Shantarim). 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 (nähiyat) 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 (miyân) the Buja, and falls into the sea near Abyssinia (Habasha). God is omniscient and there is no might but in God!

§ 7. Discourse on the Deserts and Sands

Every land (samin) where there are sands (rig), or salt marshes (šûra), 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 (ābâdhânt) of the world.

1. In the southern part of the country Chînistân, between the mountain Ta'in fil-bahr and Khumdân 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 (*Chin حن). East of it lies the Eastern Ocean; south of it, the provinces (nawāḥī) of China (حی); west of it, the river of Kuchchā; and north of it, the Toghuzghuz and Khirkhīz.

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

4. Another desert is (that) east of which lie the limits of Tibet; south of it, the country of Hind (bilād-i Hind);² west of it, the limits of Transoxiana; and north of it, the Khallukh country. It is a hard (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 (ḥadd) of Sarandīb 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 Kūfīj mountains; and north of it, some parts of Sind and Kirmān.

7. Another desert (is the one) east of which lie the northern parts of the province of Sind down to the region (ḥudūd, basin ?) of the river Mihrān, and of which the southern (part) skirts (bar ḥudūd . . . 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 (ḥudūd) 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 gīrd bar āyadh) | and are called the Sīstān sands.

8. Another desert is the one of which the east skirts the confines of Marv (bar ḥudūd 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 (manzils).

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

10. Another desert is the steppe (bādiya) of which the eastern side stretches from the limits of Hajar to those of Bahrayn and Basra; (then) it marches with the region of Qādisiya and Kūfa (spelt: Kāh), up to the limits of the river Euphrates; south of it lies the whole of the Arab sea (daryā-yi 'Arab hama), the limits of the Ayla [read: *Barbari] Gulf, the Great Sea, the districts (nawāhi) of Ḥādramūt and Yemen; its west marches with the regions of Jidda, Jār, Madyan, and *Ayla; its north, with the regions of Muʿān (spelt: Mahān), 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 seashore in the region of Bahrayn and varying in breadth from 2 to 4 stages (manzil), while its length is 20 stages. It is called the Ḥabīr sand, and its sand is red and used by the goldsmiths. All the pilgrims travelling by the 'Irāq route must cross this sand-plain (rig).

11. Other sands lie on the sea-shore south of this [i.e. 10.] desert and surround (az gird bar āyadh) the towns of Ḥādramūt. They are called the Āhqāf-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 (ma'dan) because in them there is much gold, and much gold is (actually) found there.

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

14. Other sands lie in the country of Egypt. Their eastern side stretches from 'Asqalān to the Dead Sea (Buhayrat 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 'Asqalān. They are called the SANDS OF JIFĀR.

15. In the country of Maghrib (nāḥiyat-ī M.), from Egypt, the Mountain of al-Wāḥāt, Barqa and Tārābulus down to the province of Sūs-the-Distant, (the land) is mostly desert (bıshṭar-i hama biyābān-ast).
16. In the country of Maghrib there are extensive sands in the province Sijilmäsa, called Raml al-Ma’dan. Much gold is found there.

17. The region lying south of the Equator is mostly desert (bishtar-i hama biyābān-ast). Their inhabited places (ābādhani) 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 (jay) 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 kafiri), 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 (judha) from another in four respects (rūy). 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 (padhsha‘i-hā). The frontiers of a country are separated from those of another country by three things: first, by mountains,1 great or small, stretching between them; secondly, by rivers, great or small, flowing between them; thirdly, by deserts, great or small, stretching between them (miyān-i du nāhiyat andar).

2. The Greeks (Rūmiya) have said that all the cultivated lands (ābādhani) of the world form three parts. The one is that which, on the east, has the Eastern Ocean and the (farthest) limits of the Toghuughuz 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 (Urūfī, spelt: Azwfi), and forms one-quarter of all the cultivated lands of the world.

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

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 (hudūd), Transoxiana with its Marches, Kirmān, Pārs, the desert of Kargas-kūh (spelt: Karas-kūk), Daylamān, Khūzistān, the province of Jībāl, 'Irāq, the lands of the Arabs (diyār-i 'Arab), Jazīra, Ādharbādhagān, Syria, Egypt, Maghrib, Spain, Rūm, the Sarīr, the Alān, the Khazar; the Șaqlāb, the Khazarian Pechenegs, the M.rvāt, the Inner Bulghār; the Rūs, the Majhārī, the N. nd.r (*V. n. nd.r), the Turkish Pechēnegs, the B. rādas [sic], the Buṛtās, the Khījāq, the Gḥūz, the Kīmāk, the Chigil, the Tukhs, the Khallukh, the Yaghmā, the Toghuzghūz; and the Khirkhīz. Each of these countries is divided into provinces (amāl), and in each of the latter there are numerous towns. In another section (fasl) we shall explain (padhidh kunīm) the size (miqdār) of each country and town, its nature and climate, the wonders and marvels coming from each town; all the kingdoms (pādhshāhi-hā) and towns of each country; their customs and manners and the religion of their inhabitants, so far as (badhān miqdār ki) we could find (these details) in the books of (our) predecessors (pishīnagān) or hear reports about them (ba-akhbār-hā shanīdīm), for (zīrāk-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 Sarandīb mountain, and the Great Sea;

1 Persian ābādhānī corresponds here to Greek oikouμένη 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 (nimat) 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 Farīdhūn. It is reported that the king (malik) of China has 360 districts (nāhiyat) and each day of the year the taxes of a district are brought to the Treasury. The inhabitants of this country (nāhiyat) are good craftsmen and make wonderful things. Embarking (andar nishasta) on the river *Ghiyān (spelt: 'Inān) they visit Tibet for trade. Most of them are Manichaeans (dīn-i Mānī), but their king is a Buddhist1 (shamān). From this country comes much gold, silk (harīr va parand), Chinese khāvkhir (?), brocades (dibā), chinā (ghāḍāra), cinnamon (dār-šīnī), khutū-horns from which knife-handles (dasta-hā-yī kār [read: kārd] kunand) are fabricated, and all sorts of wonderful objects (kār-hā-yī bādī). 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 (nimat). Its capital is M. qys, which is a small town (where) merchants of various classes (gūnāgūn) stay.

2. Besides Wāq-Wāq, China has nine large provinces (nāhiyat) on the coast of the Eastern Ocean: (a) Ṭī. sh.; (b) Khrū. 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: badhtn!), 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 (nimat), 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. Bugshūr [sic], a large town belonging to China. In it reside numerous merchants from different cities and it is a very pleasant place (va jā'ī bisyār-nimāt-ast).

1 “Shamanist” would be impossible here.
2 Cf. § 2, 4. but a swamp is mentioned near Khumdān under § 3, 34.
5. **KUCHĀN**, a small town in which reside Tibetan and Chinese merchants.

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

7. **Khāmchū** (Kan-chou), half of which (nīma-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 (ghīzhghāv) are found.

9. **Sakhčū** is like Saukjū, but larger (mih). Its government’s seat is Saukjū.

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

11. **Būrj-i Sangīn** (“Stone-tower”), a large village in China, prosperous and very pleasant.

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

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

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

15. **K.Sān**, a town far from the road. It has few amenities (kam-ni'mat) and its governor (kārdār) comes from Tibet.

16. **Kādhākh** lies in China, but the governor (kārdār) is on behalf of Tibet.

17. **Khotan** is situated between two rivers. In its limits (hudūd) live wild people who are man-eaters (mardumān-and vaḥshi mardum-khwāra). The commodities (khwāsta) 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” (‘ażīm al-Turk wal-Tubbāt). He lives on the boundary of China and Tibet. This king of Khotan has eunuchs (khīṣiyān) in charge of all his districts. This

---

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

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

20. HUTM (Kutum, Jutm?) is desolate; only a flourishing idol-temple is found there (andar vay yak but-khâna ābādhān bas).

21. SĀVNĪK, a village, round (az gird) which there are sands.

22. BūRKHĪMŪ and NAVĪJKATH(?), two towns of China on the sea-coast (bar karān-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 Chinistān, on the sea-coast (bar karān-i daryā). It possesses numerous districts and running waters. In its rivers diamonds (almās) are found. From Sarandib come different kinds of corundum (yāqūt). Its king is independent (ba sar-i khwish).

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

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

East of it are the countries of China and Tibet; south of it, the Great Sea; west of it, the river Mihrān; north of it, the country of Shaknān belonging to Vakhān and some parts of Tibet. This country possesses many amenities, a numerous population, and many kings (pādshāy). Numerous towns lie in it. It has mountains, deserts, seas, and sands. Many perfumes (tīb-hā) come from it, musk, aloes-wood ('ūd), ambergris, camphor, various precious things (gauhar), pearls (murvarid), 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.ri-[birds ?], parrots (tūjak), Indian cuckoos (shārak), and the like. This 4b is the largest country in the northern oecumene. All through Hindūstān wine (nabidh) 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. ŚANF (Champa?), large land (shahr) of the Qāmarūn kingdom. The Šanfi-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 Qämarün kingdom. From it come the Mandalï-aloes.

Both these lands (shahr) are on the coast.

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

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

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

7. **N. Myās, Harkand, Ûrshīn, S.M.Nd.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 (magar pādshāyi [sic] Q. va D.).2 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 (sapīd muhra) which is blown like a trumpet (büq) and is called *shank* (spelt: sanbak). In this country there are numerous elephants (pil).

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

9. **Mūsa,** a country adjacent to China and Tūsūl. 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. **Nūbin (?)** forms the frontier of Dahum's country (mamlakat). The provisions and corn (ghalla) of Sarandīb come from this town.

12. **Ûr. Shefīn,** 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”3 (pādshāhī az ān-i zani buvadh rāyina khwānand).

---

1 So vocalized.  
2 Evidently *pādshāhī-yi Q. va D.  
3 *rāniya?
Extremely large (‘azīm buṣurg) 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 (pāḏshāḥī) of Ballah-rāy. From it comes much rotang (dār-i nayza) and pepper.

14. Şamūr (صمر), Sindān, Subāra (spelt: Sūyāra), Kanbāya, four towns on the coast, in which live Muslims and Hindus (Hinduvān). In that locality (andar-ū?) is a Friday-mosque (mazgit-i ādhīna) and an idol-temple. The people of these towns have long hair (mīy-i furū-hishtā) and at all seasons wear only an izār (yak-izār bāshand ba har vaqqi). The climate (of these parts) is hot. The government (pāḏshāḥī) 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’lān: “sandals”?) are produced which are exported to all the countries of the world.

15. Qāmūhul (*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 brāhmanān). It is a pleasant town to which appertains a special province (nāhiyat-i khasa).

18. Hsināgra (*J.sināgra?), a pleasant locality with numerous districts.

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

20. Kūnās, 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 (rūsūṭi-khāna) in it.

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

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. **R.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. **KHĀLHĪN (*Jālhin ?),** 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. **B.RHĀRA,** 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 ā harsh bar-nishīnand).²

30. **BULRĪ, QALRĪ, NARĪ (?), RŪR** (spelt: Zūr), four towns belonging to Sind but lying on this (eastern!) side of the Mihrān river. This is a very pleasant locality. There stands a preacher's pulpit (minbar) and the Hindūsān merchandise (jihāz) is brought (uftadh) to these little towns. Rūr possesses two strong walls (bar-ū du bāra mukham). This place is full of dampness and humidity (tar-u-namnāk).

31. **B.S.M.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 Hindūsān 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 maghrībī).³

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

34. **JĀB.RS.RĪ (?),** a populous and very pleasant village. In it great quantities of tamarind (khurmā-yi hindi) and cassia fistularis (khiyār-i shanbar) are found.

35. **BAHRĀYIJ** was a large town but at present is desolate, and little (andak jāṭi) of it is left.

36. **LAHŌR,** a town with numerous districts. Its government (sultān) is on behalf of the chief (mir) 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.  
² The Fātimid caliph is meant here 
³ 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. Rāmīyān (Rāmayān?), a town on a huge mound (tall). In it there are some Muslims called Sālhārī. The rest are all idolaters. Many Hindu slaves (barda) and numerous Indian commodities (jihāz-i Hindūstān) are brought there (uftadh). The local government is on behalf of the amīr of Multān. At the town gate stands an idol-temple with a copper idol inlaid with gold (ba-zar kanda). They hold it in great reverence, and daily thirty women go round about this idol (si 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 (sārdsir) and producing great quantities of velvets and stuffs (jāma), plain and figured (sādha va munāqqash). Between Rāmīyān and Jālhandar there is a distance of five days, and all this road is planted with trees (producing) myrobalan (halīla), terminalia bellerica (balīla), emblica officinalis (āmūla), and (other) drugs (dārū), exported to all the world. This town belongs to the dominions (hudūd) of the raja (rāy) of Qinnauj.

39. S.lābūr (S.lāpūr?), a large town with markets, merchants, and commodities (khwāsta). The government (pādshāhī) belongs to the raja of Qinnauj. The coins with which their trade is carried on are of various kinds, e.g., bārāda, nākhwār, shabāni, kabuhra, kimavān, and kūrā, each of them having a different weight. S.lābūr has numerous idol-temples. Their sages (dānishmand) are Brahmans. Sugar, candy-sugar (panīd), 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 (tīz) market is held there. The place lies near Qinnauj, within the dominions of the latter’s raja (va hudūd-i rāy-ast). It possesses 300 idol-temples and a water, of which it is said that whoever washes himself in it is free from any ill-luck (āfat). And whenever one of their chiefs (mīhtar) dies, all the inferiors (kihtar) living under his shadow kill themselves. The king of their town sits on a throne and wherever he travels (har jā ki ravadh) many men (bāst 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. Hāytāl, 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 Hāytāl (pādshāhī)

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

42. **TYTHÄL (?),** a country adjacent to Haytal. Between them stands a mountain of difficult access (ṣa’b) over which the inhabitants transport (bigudârand< *bigudharânand) loads tied to their backs. It is a place with few amenities (kam-ni’mat).

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

44. **TÄFÎ (*Täqi),** a country with populous towns and ample amenities (ni’mat-i farâkh). Its people are dark and white.

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

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

47. **GARDÎZ,** a frontier town between Ghaznin and Hindüstän, situated on the summit of a mound (tall) and possessing a strong fortress (hişâr) with three walls. The inhabitants are Khârijites.

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

49. **HUSAYNÄN,** a town in the hot zone lying by a steppe (bar şahrâ).

50. **NÎNHÄR,** a place of which the king makes show of Islam (musalmâni numâyadh), and has many wives, (namely) over thirty Muslim, Afghân, and Hindü (wives). The rest (va dîgar mardûm) of the people are idolaters. In (Nînhär) there are three large idols.

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

52. **JALÄT** and **BALÄT,** 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 sugâr-cane, cows, and sheep.

53. **BÎRÜZA** is a town within the limits (andar hudûd) of Mültän

---

1 Cf. § 5, 9 B.
2 Those of Täqi, Salüqi, and Jurz?
3 Spelt: Banîhâr, cf. § 6, 13.
4 Under § 6, 15: Jalavvat and Balavvat.
in Hindustan. All the merchandise of Hindustan (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 rūdh). It is the emporium (bārgāh) of Hindustān and a residence of merchants and it possesses idol-temples.

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

56. Vayhind, a large town. Its king Jaypāl is under the orders (of the raja) of Qinnauj. In it live a few Muslims, and the Hindustān merchandise, such as musk, precious things (gauhar), and precious stuffs, mostly come to this country (jihāz-hā-yi H. bishtar badhin 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, Hindustān; 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 Toghuqghuz. 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-rōng, a province (nāhiyat) of Tibet adjacent to Hindustān and Chīnistān. In Tibet there is no province poorer (dāreishtar) 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.lūri) TIBET, a province of Tibet adjoining the
confines (hudūd) of Bolor. The people are chiefly merchants and
live in tents (khayma) and felt-huts (khargākh). The country is 15 days’
journey long and 15 days’ journey wide.

3. N.ZVĀN (?), a wealthy (twvangar) 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-nī′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. LHĀSA, a small town (shahhrak) with numerous idol temples
(Buddhist temples?) and one Muslim mosque (masgīt). In it live a
few Muslims.

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

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

8. GREAT AND LITTLE J.RM.N.GĀN (Charmangān?), two towns on
the edge of the desert. It is a place of few amenities and few
commodities (andak khwāsta). The people (mardum) are hunters³
(sayyādī kunand).

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

KATH, 15. KÜNKRĀ, 16. RĀYKŪTIYA, 17. B.RNIYA, 18. N.DRŪF,
19. D.STUYA, 20. M.TH, small towns (lands?) which formerly
belonged to China, but now are held by the Tibetans. In them the
Toghuqghuz (mardumān-i Toghuqghuzi) are numerous. They are
places possessing commodities (khwāsta), amenities (ni′mat), and
huge fortress is situated to the right (of the road) on a high moun-
tain, and the treasure (khazīna-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.BĀN*K (?) two small towns belonging to Tibet with numerous troops, warriors, and arms (*ba lashkar va mardu- manī [sic] jangi va bā silāh*).

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

§ 12. **Discourse on the Toghuzghuz Country and its Towns**

East of it is the country of China; south of it, some parts of Tibet and the Khallukh; west of it, some parts of the Khirkhīz; north of it, also the Khirkhīz (who?) extend along all the Toghuzghuz country (*andar hama ḥudūd-i ī biravadh*). This country is the largest of the Turkish countries and originally (*dar āsīl*) 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 (*mardumānī jangi*) possessing great numbers of arms. In summer and winter (*dimistān!* they wander from place to place along the grazing grounds (*giyā-khwār*) in the climates which (happen to be) the best (*khustar bucadh*). 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*?), *sabija* (?), *khotū*-horns, and yaks (*ghishgāv*). 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 Tätär 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, *PANJIKATH, BĀRLUGH, JĀMGHAR*. The king of the Toghuzghuz in summer lives in this village of Panjikath. North of the Toghuzghuz is a steppe (*sahṛā*) stretching between them and the Khirkhīz up to (*tā*) the country of the Kīmāk.

3. **K.MSĪGHĪYĀ**, 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.RÄRHÜN (K.värkhün?), 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 (tarsäyän), Zoroastrians (gabrakän), and heathens (? šäbiyän). The locality is in the cold zone and is surrounded by mountains.

8. KÜMS (Kümis ?)-ART, a village on a mountain (bar sar-i kühi). Its people are hunters.

9. KHMÜD (Khumül, Qumül ?), a locality with meadows (marghazâr) and grazing grounds (giyä-khwâr), with tents and felt-huts of the Toghuzghuz. The people own sheep (khudavandän-i guspand).

10. JMLIKATH, a large village of which the chief is called Yabghü (spelt: Baighu). They [now?] settle (nishänand) there the subjects of Yabghü (Baighu'iyän), (as) the Kïmäk (Kimäkiyän), Khallukh, and Yaghmä used constantly to plunder (gharat kardandi) this village.

11. T.NZÄGH-ART, an earthen mountain (kühi-st as khâk) and a stage (manzil) for the merchants.

12. MÄB.NJ J.RÄBAS (?), a stage at which a big river (āb) and plenty of grass (giyä) are found.

13. B.LKH.MKÄN (?), a stage where formerly lived the Toghuzghuz and which is now desolate.

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

15. ṢAM MSAK—ART, a stage.

16. ÊRGÜZGÜKATH (?), a stage with pasture lands (charä-gäh) and springs.

17. *IGHRĀJ-ART, a stage which is never free from snow. Wild beasts (dhadhagän) and harts (gavaznän) are found there in profusion (bâr-and), and from this mountain harts’ antlers (surü’i gavazn) are brought in great numbers.

§ 13. Discourse on the Country of the *Yaghmah³ and its Towns

East of it is the Toghuzghuz country (nâhiyat); south[?] of it, the river Khüland-ghün which flows into the Kuchä river; west of it are the Khallukh borders (hudüd). 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 Šäbiyän are probably the Buddhists, differently from § 34, 17.

2 *Topragh-ART which in Turkish exactly means "earthen pass".

3 Spelt: Yaghmiyä.
is from the family of the Toghuzghuz kings. These Yaghmä (Yagh-
mä'iyän) 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.Iāq (B.lāqiyyän)
are also a clan (qaum) of the Yaghmä mixed with the Toghuzghuz, and
in their region¹ there are a few villages (dih-hä-st andaki).

1. KĀSHGHAR | belongs to Chïnistân but is situated on the frontier
between the Yaghmä, Tibet, the Khirkhiz, and China. The chiefs
of Kāshghar in the days of old were from the Khallukh, or from
the Yaghmä.

The mountain Ighräj-art traverses (andar miyän) the Yaghmä
country (nāhiyat-i Yaghmiyä [sic]).

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

3. KHÏRM.KÏ (Khïraklï?), a large village. (The people) are *Artū-
jiants (spelt: Bartüji). In the village are three kinds of Turks:
Yaghmä, Khallukh, and Toghuzghuz.

§ 14. Discourse on the Khirkhiz 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 Kîmâk country; [north of it, parts] of the Unin-
habited Lands of the North (vïrânt-yi shamâl). In the [outlying] part
of their country (andar nāhiyat az vay) there is no population (hîch
âbâdhäm 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 khutü
(dastayi-kär-i khütü, read: kârd-i khütü). Their king is called
Khirkhîz-khäqän. These people have the nature of wild beasts (tabl-i
dadhakän) and have rough faces (durusht-sûrat) and scanty hair.
They are lawless (bidâdhkâr) and merciless, (but) good fighters
(mubâriz) and warlike. They are at war and on hostile terms with
all the people living round them. Their wealth (khwâsta) consists of
Khirkhîz merchandise (jihâz-hâ-yi Khirkhîz), sheep, cows, and horses.
They wander (mi-gardand) along rivers, grass, (good) climates, and
meadows (marghâzâr). They venerate (buzurg dor and) the Fire and
burn the dead. They are owners (khudâvandän) of tents and felt-
huts, and are hunters and game-killers (nakhchîr-zan).

¹ Andar-û, perhaps, in the Yaghmä country in general.
1. Fûrî (Qûrî?), name of a tribe which also belongs to the Khirkhîz but lives east of them and does not mix with the other groups of the Khirkhîz. They are man-eaters (mârdum-khwar) and merciless. The other Khirkhîz do not know their language (zaftān-i ışān digar Kh. nadānand) and they are like savages (va chîn wahshtyand).

2. This side of the Fûrî (az zir-i vay) there is a town K.M.Jkath where the Khirkhîz-khâqân lives.

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

Except at the residence (nishast) of the khâqân, no class of the Khirkhîz 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 Yaghmâ and the Toghuzghuz; south of it, some parts of the Yaghmâ and the country (nâhiyat) of Transoxiana; west of it, the borders of the Ghûz; north of it, the borders of the Tukhs, Chigil, and Toghuzghuz. This is a prosperous (âbâdhân) country, the most pleasant of the Turkish lands. It possesses running waters and a moderate climate. From it come different furs (müy-hâ). The Khallukh are near to (civilized) people (mârdumân-and ba-mârdum naṣdik), pleasant tempered (khush-khû) and sociable (amîxanda). In the days of old, the kings of the Khallukh were called Jabghûy, and also Yabghû. The country possesses towns and villages. Some of the Khallukh are hunters, some agriculturists (kishâvarz [sic]-kunand), and some herdsmen. Their wealth is in sheep, horses, and various furs. They are a warlike people, prone to forays (tâkhtan barando).

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

2. Mirkî, a village inhabited by the Khallukh and also visited by merchants. Between these two villages [scil., Kûlân and Mirki] there are three Khallukh tribes | called: Bîstân, Khaym, and B.rîsh.

3. Nûn-kat (*Nawî-kat?) was a town near the mountain Ürûn-‘Ärj (Ghärch?), 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.Nksîr, a large village with numerous Khallukh tribes. It is a prosperous place.
§ 15. **Tüzün-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 Tüzün-'Ār.j (*Ghärch ?*) is the lake *tuz-kül* (spelt: *Tûzkük*), wherefrom seven tribes of the Khallukh procure for themselves salt.

7. **Kükyl (*Kök-yal ?*), Atlähīgh (*Otlāligh ?*), Lül.Gh (*Ül.gh ?*) are three prosperous and pleasant villages, situated on the slope of a mountain (*babarāküh*); their princes (*dihqān*) were Yabghū’s brothers.

8. Üzkath and M.Ljkath (?), two villages situated on the slope of a mountain (*barākūh*), prosperous and pleasant, which belong to Jabghū’s kingdom (va *pādshāhī yi* *Jaβghūy*).

9. 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-kül (spelt: *Iskūl*). The inhabitants are warlike, courageous, and valiant.

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

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

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

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

15. 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 it 2 is [still ?] a country (with) a numerous population (*nāḥiyati-st bisyār-mardum*). East and south of it are the limits of the Tukhs; north of

---

1 Evidently referring to the Issi-kül just mentioned under 10.
2 *Nāḥiyat-ast va ašl-i ü (?) az Khallukh-ast va lākin &c. [See Annex B.]"
it, the Khirkhīz country. And whatever comes (uftad) from the Khallukh and Khirkhīz countries is also produced (khīzad) in (that of the) Chigil. The latter possess great riches. They own tents and felt-huts (but) possess few (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 (nasdīk 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 (nāhiyat-st bīyār-ni mattar) than (that of the) Chigil. From it come musk and various furs (mūy). Their wealth is in horses, sheep, furs, tents, and felt-huts. In winter (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. Bīglīlīgh (‘home of the Beg’s men’), a large village, called in Soghdian S.m.knā. Its prince (dikhān [sic]) is called Y.nālb.rr.ķīn (*Yināl-beg-tēgin). 3,000 men take the field with him (bā ū . . . bar nishṭānd).

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

§ 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 Khīfchākh and some of the Northern Uninhabited Lands (virānī-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 qadîd). Whenever there is peace between them and the Ghûz, they go in winter towards (ba-bar) the Ghûz. The king of the Kîmâk is called khäqän. He has eleven lieutenants (‘āmîl) within the Kîmâk country, and the fiefs (a’mâl) are given by heritage to the children of the lieutenants.

1. ANDAR AZ KHIFCHÄQ (“Cis-Khifchâqia”?),¹ a country (nâhiyat) of the Kîmâk of which the inhabitants resemble the Ghûz in some of their customs.

2. Q.RQ.RKHÄN, another district of the Kîmâk, of which the inhabitants have the customs of the Khirkhîz.

3. Y.GHSÜN YÂSÛ, another district of the Kîmâk, between the rivers Ātil and Irtish [sic], which has more pleasant people and more settled conditions (mardumâni bîshtar bâ-nî’mat va kârî sâkhtatar dâradh).

4. NAMAKIYA, a town in Kîmâk which is the Khâqân’s residence during summer. Between this town and Tarâz (spelt: T.râr) there is a distance of eighty days for a horseman travelling at speed (ba-skitäb).

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

§ 19. Discourse on the Ghûz Country

East of this country is the Ghûz 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 Ghûz have arrogant faces (shûkh-rûy) and are quarrelsome (sitïza-kâr), malicious (badh-rag), and malevolent (hasûd). Both in summer and winter they wander along the pasture-lands and grazing-grounds (charâgäh-va-giyâ-khwâr). Their wealth is in horses, cows, sheep, arms, and game in small quantities. Among them merchants are very numerous. And whatever the Ghûz, or the merchants, possess of good or wonderful is the object of veneration by the Ghûz (va ham az Ghûz va ham az ishân har chizi-râ ki nikû buvad va ’ajab buvad namâz barand). (The Ghûz) greatly esteem the physicians (tabîbân) and, whenever they see them, venerate them (namâz barand), and these doctors (pijishkân) have command over their lives (khûn) and property (khwâsta). The Ghûz have no towns, but the people owning felt-huts are very numerous. They possess arms and implements (silâh va âlât) and are courageous and daring (shûkh) in war. They continually make inroads (ghazuw) into the lands of Islam (nawâhî-yi

¹ In Arabic the equivalent would be mâ dûn Kh. [Perhaps “Inner Khifchâkh”?].
Islam), whatever place be on the way (ba har jā’ī uftadh), and (then) strike (bar-küband), plunder, and retreat as quickly as possible. Each of their tribes has a (separate) chief on account of their discords (nā-sāzandagi) with each other.

§ 20. Discourse on the Turkish Pechenegs

East of this country are the limits (hudūd) of the Ghūz; south of it, 19 a those of the Burṯās and Barāḏās; west of it, those of the Majghāri 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 Khīfchākh Country

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

§ 22. Discourse on the Majghāri Country

East of it is a mountain; south of it,2 a tribe of Christians (tarsāyān) called V.n.n.d.r; west and north of (the Majghāri) are the districts (nawāḥ) of the Rūs. This country has some 20,000 men who take the field with their king (bā malikāshān bar-nishinānd). The king of this country is called *Jula (খুলা: read: ḥūlā). 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 (bādḥān xindagānī gudhārānadh). They are very rich people but base3 (mardumānī bīyār-khwāstā-and va-sufla?). This country possesses many trees and running waters. The (people) are good-looking and awe-inspiring (bā-haybat). The Majghāri are at war with all the infidels living around them and are (usually) victorious (bīhtar 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 (Kāfīrān), lying in the western parts.

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

It is a country east of which is Hindistān [sic]; south of it, some of its (own) Marches (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'matī farākh). It is situated near the centre of the Inhabited Lands of the world. In it gold-mines and silver-mines are found as well as precious things (gauhar) such as are (extracted) from mountains. This country produces horses and its people are warlike. It is the gate of Turkistān. It produces numerous textiles (jāma), gold, silver, 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 mir of Khorāsān resides at Bukhārā (B. nishīnadh); 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 ātrāf).

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.

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

2. SABZAVĀR, a small borough (shahrak-st khurd) on the road to Rayy and the chief place of a district (gaṣaba-yi rustā'iyyal).

3. KHUSRAU-GIRD, small borough near Sabzavār.

4. BAHMAN-ĀBĀD and MAZĪNĀN, two small boroughs on the road to Rayy with numerous fields.

5. ĀZĀDHVAR, 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 (bār-kadha-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. Jarmagan, Sibnak, Khujan, Ravini, prosperous boroughs with many fields, situated amidst hills and plains.

All these are within the limits of Nishapur.

9. Nas, 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. Bavard 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. Tus, a district in which are situated the boroughs, such as Tavaran, Nauqan, BuZidhur (spelt: Brughun), Rayagan, B.Nvadh, (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 fasan), trousercords (shalvar-band), and stockings. In Nauqan is found the blessed tomb (marqad) of Ali-ibn-Musa al-Rida and people go there on pilgrimage. There too is found the grave (gur) of Harun al-Rashid. (Nauqan) produces stone kettles.

12. Mayhana, a borough in the district (hudud) of Bavard, situated in the desert.

13. Turshiz, Kundur, B.Nabid, Kur, boroughs belonging (az hudud) to Khustan and Nishapur,1 with numerous fields.

14. Qain, chief town (qasaba) of Khustan, is surrounded by a moat (khandaq) and possesses a citadel (quhandiz) and a cathedral mosque (mazgit-i jam'). The government palace (sary-i sultan) 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 (kariz). The town lies on the desert.


17. Tabasi Masinan lies between the mountains and the desert and is a pleasant place.

18. Khur (spelt: Khuvar, *Khur) and Khusb,2 two towns on the edge of the desert. Their water is from underground canals. The wealth of the inhabitants is chiefly in cattle (char-pay).

19. Buzhagan, Khaymand, Sangan, Salumidh, Zuzan, are boroughs on the confines of Nishapur (az hudud-i N). These places have much cultivated land and produce cotton stuffs (karbas).

20. Herat (Har < *Har), a large town with a very strong shahristan, a citadel, and a suburb. It has running waters. Its cathedral mosque

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

21. Büshang is about half (the size of) Herat (chand nima‘ī az H.) and is surrounded by a moat and has a strong fortress (hisār). In it 'ar'ar-trees (juniperus polycarpus?) are found and a plant (giyāhi)\textsuperscript{20} of which the juice (shīr) is an antidote (tīryāk) against the venom of snakes and scorpions.

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

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

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

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

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

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

28. Mālin belongs to Herat; from it come good Ṭā‘īfī raisins (mavīz).

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

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

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

32. Kīr, also a small borough like Baun.

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

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

35. SHÜRMIN, a borough of Herat.

36. GHARCHISTAN, a district of which the chief place is BASHIN. 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 herdsman and agriculturists.

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

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

39. DIZ-I AHNAF (spelt: Dar-i Ḥинф), a borough in the desert with many fields and running waters.

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

41. GİRANG, a small town.

42. MARV, a large town. In the days of old the residence of the mīr of Khorāsān was there but now he lives in Bukhārā. It is a pleasant and flourishing place with a citadel built by Tahmūrath; in it there are numerous castles (ḵūshk). It was the abode of the (Sasanian) kings (ḵusravān). 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 'ABBĀDĪ, a town with numerous districts, prosperous and pleasant.

44. DANDANAQĀN, 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 (*Kushman), MUSFARĪ, MĀSHĀN, SŪSANAQĀN, SHĀBIRINJĪ (?), ZARQ—these boroughs, small and big, belong to the province ('amal) of Marv, and the agriculture of all these districts depends on irrigation from the Marv river.

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

---

1 Something fallen out: az nihādh [-i vay biḥ].
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 (pādhshāy)
of this province is one of the margraves (muluk-i aṭrāf). 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 fārmān). He is the greatest of all the margraves
in authority, greatness (‘izz), rank, policy (siyāsat), liberality and love
(dūstdar) of knowledge. This country produces numerous horses,
false, saddle-bags (haqība),1 saddle-girths (tang-i asp), zīlā, and palās.
In it is found the khīnj2 tree, the wood of which never becomes dry,
and is so tender (narm) that one can make knots (gīrīh afgandān) in
it. In this kingdom (andar in pādhshāy [sic]) there are numerous
districts.

47. R.Būshārān (Rīvshārān ?),3 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 mi-
tarān-i aṭrāf-i G.) and they pay their annual tribute-money (muqāja’a)
to the malik of Gūzgānān.

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

49. Tamrān, Tamāzān, two districts situated in the mountains
near the limits of Ribāt-i Karvān. Their chiefs are called (respec-
tively) Tamrān-*waranda (Frūnd *baranda) and Tamāzān-*waranda.

50. Sārvān, a mountainous district. The inhabitants look arrogant
(shūkh-rūy) and are warlike. They are professional thieves (duzd-
pīsha) and quarrelsome (sitīza-kār), faithless (bī-vafā), and blood-
thirsty (khūn-khwārā); and clan animosity (‘āsābiyyat) 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 (haḍrat) of the malik of Gūzgānān.

---

1 Persic: khūrjīn (?).  
2 “white”.  
3 Spelt in the text.
All these districts are very agricultural and abound in amenities. Their chiefs are (appointed) on behalf of the malik of Güzgänän and pay him annual tribute-money (muqāta'a). The inhabitants are mostly simple-hearted (sādha-dil) and own great numbers of cattle, (namely) of cows and sheep. In this kingdom (pādshāhī) small districts are very numerous. In it (i.e., Güzgänän) grows a tree of which whips (tāsiyana) are made. In its mountains are found mines of gold, silver, iron, lead, copper, antimony-stone (sang-i surma), and different kinds of vitriol (zāg-hā-yi gūnāgūn).

52. Tālaqān lies on the frontier of Güzgänän and belongs to its king. It is a very pleasant town which produces much wine (nabidh) and felt.

53. Jahüdhān, a prosperous and pleasant town at the foot of a mountain. It is the residence of the malik of Güzgänän 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 Jahüdhān and Pāryāb [sic].

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

55. Naryān, a borough between Jahüdhān 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 Güzgänän was there.

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

58. Anbīr (*Anbēr), capital (qasaba) of Güzgänän 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. Ushbūrqān, 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 nī'mat).

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

63. Ribāt-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. **S.NG-B.N** appertains to R.būshārān. Its **minbar** has been recently built (*ba-nau nihādha-and*).

65. **AZĪV**, a town at the end of the province (*ʿamal*) of Gūzgānān.

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

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

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

67. **BALKH**, a large and flourishing town which was formerly the residence of the Sasanian kings (spelt: *Khisravān*, [sic]). In it are found buildings of the Sasanian kings with paintings (*naqsha*) and wonderful works (*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 (*nīlūfar “lotus”*). Balkh has a *shahristān* surrounded by a mighty wall. In its suburb there are numerous marshes.

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

69. **ṬUHKĀRISTĀN**, a pleasant province consisting mostly of mountains. In its steppes (*saḥrā*) live the Khallukh\(^1\) 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 appertaining to pavilions. On it various figures are painted in the fashion of Indians (az kirdar-i H.). Simingän 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 (darvishan).

72. BAGHLÄN is like Sakalkand.

73. VALVÄLJ, a flourishing town and the capital (qasaba) of Ţukhärístän. It possesses numerous amenities and running waters. Its people are sociable (āmizanda).

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

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

76. TÄYAQĀN, a town on the frontier between Ţukhärístän 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 Panjhir and Jāriyāna. Its king is called Shahr-salīr (*salīr?).

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

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

80. MADR, MÛ, two small towns within the limits of Andarāb (andar 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 Ţukhärístän. Some parts of this region belong to the hot zone and some to the cold. From its mountains the Ghūr-slaves (barda-yī ghūrī) are brought (uftadh) to

---

1 Kūshk, usually “castle”.
2 i.e., on the rock.
3 Or: “bearing likeness to Indians”.
4 nāhiyat-i hudūd-i Khurāsān.
Khoräsän. 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 (shikastagi-hā). It has a king called Ghūr-shāh. He draws his strength from the mīr of Güzgānān. In the days of old this province of Ghūr was pagan (kāfir); actually most of the people are Muslims. To them belong numerous boroughs and villages. From this province come slaves, armour (xirih), coats of mail (jaushan), and good arms. The people are bad-tempered, unruly (nā-sāzanda), and ignorant. They are white and swarthy (asmar).

2. SĪSTÂN, a province of which the chief place is called ZARANG. The town has a fortress (hiṣār), 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 farski)1 similar to those of Tabaristān (tabari), zilū-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 Ḥidhmand.

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

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

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

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

9. BUST, a large town with a solid wall, situated on the bank of the river Ḥidhmand and possessing many districts (bā nāḥiyatī 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 Šaffārids.
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 (thaghṛ) against (bar rūy) Ghūr. In Durghush grows much saffron. It¹ is adjacent to the district Darmashān (*Varmashān ?) of Bust.


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

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

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

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

18. Balis, 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, Sīvī, of which Kūshk is the residence of the amīr.

19. Ghaznīn (spelt: Ghazaq), a town situated on the slope of a mountain (babarakūh), 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 *Sukāvand, two small boroughs at the foot of the mountains. Sukāvand possesses a strong fortress and much cultivation.

22. In Ghaznīn and in the limits (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), ⁴ grazing grounds and pasture-lands (marā?i). 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, e.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 ZĀBULISTÂN.

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 'AQABA-YI S.N.K.S.

27. S.QLIYA (ٹئ?), 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 (dīvāri . . . ba-yak pāra), and all the ribāts and villages are within this wall (az andarūn-i in dīvār).

2. M.GHKĀN, KHUJĀDĀK, ZANDANA (spelt: Dandūna), BŪMKATH (?), MADYĀMIJKATH, KHARGHĀNKATH (spelt: J.zgh.nkath), boroughs with pulpits (minbar) within the area of Bukhārā; they are very prosperous places with much cultivation.
3. FÍRÁB (Firabr), a borough on the bank of the Jayhūn. The Lord of the River (mîr-i rûdh, “overseer of irrigation”) lives there. The place is situated in the desert.

4. PÁYKÁNĐ, a borough with a thousand ribâts. Its soil is good (durust). In it stands the tumular dome1 (gunbad-i gûrkāna-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 dindār) 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, DÂBŪSI, | RÂBÌNJAN, boroughs in Sughd. They are 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. ISHTIKHĀN, a flourishing, prosperous, and very pleasant place.

11. K.NJKATH (Garjkath?), F.R.NKATH, two towns lying between the river and Ishtikhān.

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 arzīs). In Samarqand stands the monastery of the Manicheans (khānagāh-i Mānaviyān) who are called nighūshāk (“auditores”). Samarqand produces paper which is exported all over the world, and hemp cords (rishta-yi qinnab). The Bukhārā river flows near the gate of Samarqand.

14. VARAGHSAR, B.NJKATH, two boroughs of Samarqand, lying on the Bukhārā river. In this Varaghsar stands (the weir) distributing the waters (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 (tāran-gābin), and red salt, which are exported everywhere.

1 Or: domes? [Impossible to refer to the later gūr-khāns!]
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16. NAUQAT-I QURAYSH (Nüqad Quraysh), a very agricultural borough.

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

18. SÜBAKH, a town belonging to Nakhshab.

19. SAKİFAGHN, a town with cultivation.

20. BAZDA, a borough sparsely populated (ham-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 (dülāb, “noria”).

21. KASBA, a place with much cultivation.

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-bīzān).

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 (bisyār kisht-u-baṛā), but it has lazy peasants (barsīgarānī kāhil) and is a place of poor people (darvīshān); (yet) it possesses many amenities. The people are warlike and courageous. The district has an agreeable climate, good (durust) soil, and waters good for digestion (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 (mulāk-i atrāf) and is called amīr of Chaghāniyān.

26. DĀRZANGĪ (spelt: Dārzānlt), a borough surrounded by a moat and belonging to Chaghāniyān. It produces puttees (pāy-tāba), different sorts of tapestry-woven carpets (gilimīna), 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. ZİNVAR, a borough with much cultivation, but sparsely populated.

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

31. ?, 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. SHÜMÄN, 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. AFRIDHĀN, 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 Chaghâniyân and Khuttalân. Wind blows there constantly, and there lies the tomb (turbat) of Shaqïq Balkhi, God's mercy upon him. This place produces much saffron.

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

37. ZĀMIN, a town of Surūshana lying on the road of Khujand and Farghäna. 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 (bāzurgānī) is transacted for upwards of 100,000 dinars.

40. BŪNJIKATH (spelt: Navinjkath), 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, ḥadd): Inner, Middle, and Outer Buttamān. This is a region with much cultivation but with a poor population (darvīshān). 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), ammoniac, quicksilver (šmāb), combustible schists (chirāgh-sang?), bezoar stone (sang-i pāy-sahr), lodestone (sang-i maghnāfis), 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, a district of Farghāna lying amidst mountains and broken country and possessing many boroughs and villages. It produces horses and a great number of sheep, and has mines as well.

47. AKHŠIKATH, the capital of Farghāna and the residence of the amīr and (his) lieutenants (’ummal). 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 (nabidh-khwāra).

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

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

50. TAMĀKHUS, NĀMKĀKHUS [sic], two boroughs situated on the slope of a mountain.

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

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

53. BAGHASKĀN (?) belongs to Āval.

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

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

56. ÖSH, 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 (didābān) are posted, to observe the infidel Turks (kāfīr-i Turk rā nigāh dārand).

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

58. ÜZGAND, 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, BARKHĀN, comes from the Khallukh country.

59. KHATLĀM, a borough which is the birth-place (maulūd) of Naṣr ibn Ahmad, 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 Farghäuserna.

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

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

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

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

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

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

69. َجَح (؟), 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, ARDALÂNKHATH, S.T.BGH.VĀ, | | َجَح, are 24b boroughs situated near one another, populous, with much cultivation and running waters. Ardalānkath is the chief place of these boroughs.

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

74. َجَح, small boroughs, prosperous, pleasant, and lying close to one another.

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

1 Barthold’s Index: Khābs.
76. SH.KÄKAB, دیجاس, two flourishing and prosperous towns of Iläq.

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

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

79. CHÄCH (spelt: Chäj), 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 khalanj-wood, and of bows and arrows made of khadang-wood. Its kings formerly belonged to the class of margraves (mulük-i vay ... az mulük-i aträf bûdandî).

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

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

82. K.RJÄKATH (?), TARKUS, KHÄTÜNKATH, two [sic] small but prosperous boroughs which are the store-places (bärgäh) of Sughd and Samarqand, as well as of Farghäna and Iläq (va än-i F. va I. ast).

83. BÄNÄKATH, a flourishing and prosperous borough on the bank of the river Khashart. حرکجک حرسسک, sh.TÜRKATH, S.BKATH (Biskath ?), K.K.RÄL, boroughs of Chäch producing the chächi-bows. The locality is flourishing, very pleasant, and prosperous.

84. ISBİJÂB, a region on the frontier between the Muslims and the Infidels. It is an extensive and pleasant locality on the frontier of Turkistän, and whatever is produced in any place of Turkistän is brought here. It possesses many towns, provinces, and districts, and produces felt and sheep. The chief place is called Isbïjâb. 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 bâzurgânän).

85. SÄNİKATH, a flourishing, pleasant, and wealthy (tuvangar) town.

86. دکک, 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 (jäy-i Turkân-i äshü). From their tribes many have turned Muslims.

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

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

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

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

93. SHIĻJĪ, TARĀZ (spelt: T.rār), KAKĀK (Takābkath ?), FARŪNKHATH, 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 Surūshāna 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: Kharnāb2 and Jayhūn. Its district extends to the confines of Badhakhshān and is called Rustā Bik. (Nuchārā) is a town on one side of which is the Jayhūn and on the other a mountain. It is a very pleasant locality, and the emporium of Khuttalān.

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

1 nāhiyat-i hudūd-i Mā warā’ al-nahr. 2 •Vakhshāb? See Notes.
5. Bārsāragh, Munk, T. Mliyāt (مَلَات), small boroughs, very pleasant and prosperous, with a warlike population.

6. Vakhsh, a prosperous region lying on the bank (كارانة) of Vakhshāb.

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

8. Livkand (*Lëvkand) belongs to Vakhsh, and from it come the vakhshi-sheep.

9. Zhāsht (Rāsht ?), a district lying amid mountains and broken country (اندار کوه-ها و شیکاستگی-ها), between Buttamān and Khuttalān, with many divisions (رستا) 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 (گرūh) called Kūmījiyān. They are courageous and warlike and professional thieves. Their wealth is in sheep and slaves. They possess numerous villages and districts but have no towns. Those of them who are within the limits of Chaghāniyān are found in the district Saylākān (*Selākān) situated between Shūmān and Bishgird (*Vēshgird?). And those of them who live within the limits of Khuttalān are found between *Tamlīyāt (spelt: Namliyāt) and Munk. They live among mountains and dales (دشت) which have running waters and are pleasant places. Each tribe lives under the orders of the amir of its district (اندار فرمان-ی امیر-ی ناحیه-ی کهشیش-اند), and the amirs of Khuttalān and Chaghāniyān, when they have need, solicit their help (وا امیران-ی خوتتلاان و چاغانیان-را چین بایاد az یشان یاری خوواهاند).1

11. The K. njīn Turks, a tribe of few men living in the mountains between Khuttalān and Chaghāniyān and established in a valley (درا). This place is very strong. The people are professional thieves and looters of caravans (کاروان-شیکان) and look arrogant (شکر-ری). In their predatory expeditions they behave gallantly (اندار این دژت جاومنارد-پشان). They go for looting to a distance of 40 and 50 farsangs from the periphery (?gardān) of their district. They show attachment (پایوستگی نمایند) to the amir 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 (بَز) and keep watch on the road. And when you come out of this gate (یو) you are in the limits of Vakhān.


14. SIKÂSHIM (Ishkâshim), a town and the chief place of the
region of Vakhân (gaşaba-yi nâhiyat-i ü (? Vakhân-ast). Its inhabit-
ants are infidels (gabrakân, Zoroastrians?) and Muslims, and the
malik of Vakhân (spelt: Râkhân) lives there. From it come covers
for saddle-cloths (rüy-i namad-zin), and the vakhi arrows.

15. KHAMDÀDH, a place where the idol-temples of the Vakhîs are
(ander [ü] but-khâna-hâ-yi Vakhîyân-ast). A few Tibetans are found
in it. On its left side is a fortress occupied by the Tibetans.

16. S.NGLNJ (Sanglich?), lies at the foot of a mountain. The mine
of the Badhakhshi garnets (bijädha) and of rubies (la’l) lies in that
mountain. Near the mine is a hot spring in a pool (ab-i garm va
istädha), 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 RÜSTÄ *B.LJM (M.lj.m?)
(va az änjä bigudhari nâhiyatı âyadh ü-rä rüstä [mâl].? khawanand).

18. SAMARQANDÃQ, a large village in which live Indians, Tibetans,
and Vakhîs, as well as Muslims. It is the frontier and the farthest
point (âkhîr-i hudûd) of Transoxiana.

19. BOLOR (Bulûr)1 is a vast country (nâhiyatı-st ‘azîm) with a king
who declares that he is the Son of the Sun (mâ farzand-i âftâb-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 Bulûrîn-shâh.
In this country there is no salt but that imported from Kashmir [sic].

20. ANDRÄS (?), a town in which live Tibetans and Indians. From
it to Kashmir is a journey of two days (? dwza râh < *du rûza râh ?).

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

21. KHWÂRAZM. West of Transoxiana are the limits of Khwârazm.

22. KÂTH (spelt: Kæzh), the capital of Khwârazm and the Gate of
the Ghûz Turkistân (T.-i Ghûs). It is the emporium of the Turks,
Turkistân, Transoxiana, and the Khazar. It is a resort of merchants.
Its king, who is one of the margraves (az mulûk-i atrâf), is called
Khwârazmshâh. The people are active fighters for the faith and are
warlike. The town abounds in wealth (khwâsta). It produces covers
for cushions (rüy-i mukhadda), quilted garments (qashägand), cotton
stuffs (karbâs), felt, snow (barf), and rukhbin.3

23. KHUSHMÎTHAN, 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. **nüzhābān**, 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 Khwarazmshāh, but now its government (*pādhshāhiyash*) is separate and its king (*pādhshāy*) is called mir 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. **Krdnāzkhās** (*Kurdarānkhas?*), **b. dhmīniya**, **dihi-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: *Khiv*), 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-ni mat*), but numerous merchants (are found in it). The country produces skins (*pūst*), leather (*charm*), red *abānk* (?),1 shoes (*nālāin*), dates (*khurmā*), and sugar-candy (*pānidh*).

1. **manṣūra**, a great (*ʻazīm*) 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**, **sādūsān**, two prosperous towns of the country of Sind, situated on the bank of the river Mihrān.

3. *bīrūn*2 (spelt: *bārūr*), **masvāhī**, two towns in the limits of Sind. (The inhabitants) are the people carrying on the sea-trade (*mardūnān*-and *kī bāzurgāni-yī daryā kunand*). These places have few amenities.

1 the word *dJbU* unknowii. 2 Or: *Nīrūn?*
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. Nīkī (*Q. nb. li?), *Armābīl, two towns of Mukrān (aż hūdud-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 (aż hūdud-i S.), situated on the coast of the Great Sea. It is not an interesting place (kam sayr?).

7. Kīz, Kūshk-i Qand, Bīh (4), Bind (4), 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. Mushkī (spelt: Hushkī), 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-nī 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 (4) region, prosperous and extremely pleasant; its inhabitants are Muslims.

14. Qandābīl, a large town, prosperous, pleasant, and situated on the plain. It produces great quantities of dates.

§ 28. Discourse on the Province of Kirmān and its Towns

East of the province of Kirmān are the limits of Sind; south of it, the Great Sea; west of it, the province of Pārs; north of it, the desert of Sistān. Whatever parts of this province lie towards the sea, they are in the hot zone, their people are swarthy; there reside merchants and there are deserts; the local products are cumin (zīrā), dates, indigo, sugar-cane, and sugar-candy; the food of the inhabitants is millet-bread. And whatever places are remote from the sea (and) near to the desert of Sistān, they belong to the cold zone, are prosperous and very pleasant, and the bodies (of the inhabitants) are healthy (tan-hā

1 To the reading: one would prefer: "hot zone".

2 تاحیت کمپینه بسوی دریاست چابهای کرمسر است
durust); here (too) lie numerous mountains with mines of gold, silver, copper, lead, and lodestone (maghnātīs).

1. SÏRGÂN, the capital of Kirmān and the seat of the king (pādhs̄hāh). 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 iza).)

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 (hāng kunān); its water is so abundant that it turns sixty mills, and in its canals auriferous sand (khāk-i zar) is found.

4. MĪZHĀN, a borough situated on the slope of a mountain. The fruit, fuel, and snow of Jīruft come from this town.

5. MUGHŪN (?), VULĂSHGIRD, KŪMĪN, BAHRŪGĀN, MANŪGĀN, large and small boroughs. From them come indigo, cumin (zīrāra, 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 Kūfīj mountains. They are professional way-layers, herdsmen, intrepid (nā-bāk) and bloodthirsty. They were [formerly] very numerous but [the Büyid] *Panā-Khusrau has destroyed them by various stratagems (hilāt).

7. KŪFIJ, mountaineers (kūhiyān) living on the Kūhi Küfīj. They are divided into seven tribes of which each has a chief. The Kūfīj too are professional looters, herdsmen and agriculturists. East of the Kūh-i Küfīj down to Mukrīn is a desert. Between Jīruft and Manūgān is a mountainous country, very prosperous and pleasant, called KÜHISTĀN-I ABŪ GHĀNĪM. West of this mountainous tract is a district (rustā) RÜDBĀR, altogether woods, trees, and meadows (marghār).

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

9. SHAHRUVĀ, a borough on the sea-coast where fishermen (say-yādān) live.

10. SŪRÎQĀN, MAZRŪQĀN, KASBĀN, RĀVĪN, KHAHRŪQĀN 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. KAFTAR, DIHAK, two boroughs on the mountain Bārijān, and whatever comes (uftadh) from the mountain Bārijān is brought (uftadh) to these towns.

13. DĪH-I GŌZ (spelt: Kūr), DĀRCHĪN (spelt: Dārjīn), two boroughs between Bam and Jīruft, prosperous and very pleasant. From it (Dārchn?) comes cinnamon (dārchīn).

14. KHWĀSH and RĪQĀN, two boroughs situated in the desert between Sind and Kirmān.

15. SHĀMĀT, | ...GHĀR (Bahār?), ḤAN (Khannāb?), GHUBAIRĀ, KŪGHŪN, RĀYĪN (?), SARVISTĀN, DĀRCHĪN,1 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-durm). In its shahrīstān stands a strong fortress. It is larger than Jīruft and possesses three cathedral mosques (mazɣit-i jāmī?): one belongs to the Khārijites, another to the Muslims, and the third is in the fortress. From it come cotton stuffs (karbās), turbans (′āmāma, spelt: ′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, KHAṢĪ, very pleasant towns with a salubrious (durust) climate. Some of them are situated in the mountains and some in the steppe (biyābān).

21. BARDĀSĪR, JANZARŪDĪH,2 two boroughs on the road to Herat and Kūhistān, very favoured by nature (bā ni′mat-i bisyār), but with a sparse population.

22. KŪṬMĪDḤĀN, K.RDĀGĀN, ANĀR are (āyand, read: -and) very pleasant boroughs on the road from Pārs to Rūdhān.

23. Between Sīrgān and Bardāsīr lies a mountainous tract (kūhīstān), very prosperous and pleasant; there lie 260 villages, prosperous, pleasant, and populous.

In the whole province of Kirmān no large river is found, such as could be navigable (chinānk kashti bitavānād raftan). In its mountains there are long-living (dārz-zindagānī) and healthy people.

1 At both places probably the same town. 2 Spelt: Chatrūdh.
§ 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 (hudūd) of Sipāḥān (Isfahān); north of it, the desert of Pārs, (which is a part) of (that of) Kargas-kūh. (Pārs) possesses many cities and a numerous population. It is a prosperus 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 (jāmā) of linen (kātān), wool, and cotton, and also rose-water, violet-water, palm-blossom water (āb-i tal), carpets, rugs (bisāt va farsh), silū-rugs, and gilīm (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: *gabrāni) 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 rūṣgār-i Islām kardā-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 sūsān (spelt: sūs) -i nargis, of which the leaves (petals?) are like those of a lily (sūsān), and the middle (miyāna) like the narcissus.

2. Iṣṭakhr, a large and ancient town, which had been the seat 27b of the Sasanian kings. | In it ancient buildings, images (naqsh), and figures (sūrat) are found. Iṣṭakhr has many districts (navāhi), and (some) wonderful buildings called Solomon’s Mosque (mazgīt-i Sulaymān). In it grows an apple, of which one half is sour, and the other sweet. In its mountain iron mines are found, and in its region, silver mines.

3. Dīz-I Pīsār-i ‘Umāra, “The castle of ‘Umāra’s son”, a borough with a fortress, situated on the coast of the Great Sea. It is a place of fishermen, and a travelling stage (manzil) of merchants.

1 Something fallen out: jījb jījy » j^* jō — jjiîl
4. Siraf, 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, Kurân, Khur Muk (؟ حرمک), boroughs within the limits ( hudûd) of Siraf, very prosperous and populous.

6. Gur, a flourishing town which was built by Ardashir Babakan and served him as a residence. Round it is a solid wall. From it comes the juri rose-water exported everywhere. It produces palm-blossom water (ab-i tal') and santoline (qaishum)-water which are exported everywhere and are not to be found anywhere else. Gur possesses a powerful (sakht) spring of water.


8. Najiram, a town on the sea-shore which is a resort of merchants.

9. Sa'ada, Bahlavân (?), two flourishing boroughs, prosperous and situated close to the sea.

10. Ganawa (کانه [sic]), a large and flourishing town which is a resort of merchants and possesses much wealth. From it come manifold textiles (jama). In the sea of Ganâsa (کانه [sic]) there is a pearl bank (ma'dan-i murvâridh). Bû Sa'id Daqqâq, who carried on propaganda (da'vat kard) and took Bahrayn, was from this place. Sulaymân ibn al-Hasan al-Qarmatî was the son of Ibn Bû Sa'id.

11. Tavaz, a town situated between two rivers. Its inhabitants are numerous and rich (tvvangar). All the tavasi textiles come from it.

12. Kazrun lies near the lake Yun. It is a large and prosperous town with much wealth. In it there are two venerated fire-temples.

13. Sinîz, a town on the sea-shore, very pleasant and with a salubrious (durust) climate. All the sinizi-textiles come from there.


15. Mahî-Rûbân, a town standing like an island amidst waters. It is a flourishing place and the emporium of the whole of Pars.

16. Araghân (Arragan, Arrajân), a large and flourishing town with much wealth, abounding in amenities and enjoying a good climate. In its district (rustâ) there is a well of water of which no one in the world knows the depth (ki zarfi-yi án ba-hama jihân natavânand dänist); from it comes a water to turn one mill (miqdär-i yak âsiyâb) and spreads over the soil. This town produces good grape-syrup (dushâb).

18. Naubandagän, a flourishing town, very pleasant and having much wealth (*khwāsta*).

19. [Bishāvur], 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 (*pīsh az vay*) are represented (*miqāshta*) and at the same place their adventures written down (*nīvīsha-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 dūdhiparpadh*) is burned and falls down.

20. Vāyagān, Kimārij, two boroughs of Bishāvur, flourishing and prosperous.


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 (*Kauristān ?*), two prosperous and pleasant boroughs of (ax) Shīrāz.

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

25. Hazār, Zarqān, Khīr, boroughs . . . [flourishing], 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, Dārakahān, Mazīrākān (Murayzigān ?), 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 (*nawāhi*) 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 (. . . ndr ?)3 an inaccessible (*sa’b*) and strong fortress (*hisār*). A venerated fire-temple is found in it.

32. Samīrān, Īraj, 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 zilâ-rugs and good prayer-carpets.

34. KIZH, a town with a strong fortress (hisâr) in it.

35. KHÎR, KURDIYÂN, two prosperous boroughs having much cultivation and belonging to Pasâ.

36. İj, İSTAHBANÂT, KHIYÂR, MâSHKANÂT, boroughs situated on the slope of a mountain, sparsely populated, but having much cultivation, and much favoured by nature.

37. ABADHA, BARDÂNGÂN, JÀHUK, boroughs between İstäkhîr and Kirmân. They are caravan-stages, much favoured by nature.

38. KAMÎN, SARVÂB, M.ZÎRAKÂN (?),1 SHAHR-I BĀBAK (spelt: Fânak), KHURRA, KîS, 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 Dârâ.

39. BAJJA (spelt: ~), KILÎDH (spelt: Kîldîd), SHAMAGÂN, SURMA, ARJÎNÂN, boroughs lying amidst the mountains of the cold zone. The locality is prosperous, cultivated, very pleasant, and populous.

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

41. [NÄYÎN],2 a prosperous and pleasant town. In its mountains there are silver-mines.

42. SARDÂN, a town situated between two rivers. It is a . . . prosperous and flourishing place, and in its mountains a mine of copper (ma’dan-i rüdhî) is found.

43. ABRAJ, K.SBÀ, MÄYIN, prosperous boroughs between Pârs and Ispâhân.

44. RÚDÎHÂN, DARKÂN, two towns on the frontier between Pârs and Kirmân. They are caravan-stages and belong to the cold zone.

45. ANÅR, BAHRA, KATHA, MAYBUDH, NÄYÎN, boroughs of the cold zone, much favoured by nature and lying on the frontier between Pârs and the desert.

§ 30. Discourse on the Province of Khûzistân and its Towns

East of this province lies Pârs and the borders of Sipâhân; south of it, the sea and some of the 'Irâq frontier (hadd); west of it, some of the borders (hûdûd) of 'Irâq, and of the countryside (sawâd) of Baghdâd and Wâsit; north of it, the lands (shahr-hâ) of the province of 28b Jîbâl. 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.
sawäd-hā) is flourishing and (its) mountains full of utility. From it come: sugar, manifold textiles, curtains (pärda-hā), sūzangird-textiles, trouser-cords (shalvārband), fragrant citrons (turanj-i shammāma), and dates. The people of this province are gain-loving and avaricious.

1. Dīz-i Mahdī (spelt: Dar-i M.), a flourishing and prosperous town situated on the river between Irāq and Khūzistān.

2. Bāsiyān (spelt: Bāsābān?), Khān Mardūna, Daurāq, boroughs situated on the bank of the river, prosperous, flourishing, wealthy (twangar), 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 [Khārijītes] (spelt: Raqīyān) took place there.

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

6. Sūq al-Arba'ā, a town situated on the bank of the river, very pleasant and prosperous.

7. Ahwāz, an extremely flourishing town. There is no town in Khūzistān more flourishing than this. It abounds in amenities and has a good situation. The people are yellow-faced. It is said that whoever establishes himself in Ahwāz becomes wanting in brains, and every aroma that is carried there (hama tibī [spelt: tbyy] 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], Rāmhis?), 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 Ürdmizd, a large town, flourishing, prosperous, and very pleasant. It is a resort of merchants and is situated between Pars and Khūzistān.


14. Idha [read: Tustar], a town with a very flourishing countryside

1 The sense is clear but the word is incomplete ... پسورد. After r two dots are seen under the line.
(sayād), prosperous, very pleasant, and possessing much wealth. It lies on the bank of a river. It produces great quantities of brocades (dībā). There also the brocade of the cover for the Mecca (sanctuary) (parda-yi Makka) is made.

15. V. NDUSHAVUR, a prosperous and very pleasant town. The tomb of Yaʿqūb (ibn) Layth is situated there.

16. SHUSH, a wealthy town, which is a resort of merchants and the emporium of Khūzistān. It produces textiles and turbans of precious silk stuff (jāma va ʿamāma-yi khaz), and fragrant citrons (turunj-i dastanbūy). The coffin (tābūt) of the prophet Daniel was discovered here.

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

18. BAŠUNNAY (Ba-Ṣunnā, Ba-Ṣunne), a flourishing wealthy town. It produces good curtains (parda), exported everywhere.

19. TĪB, a flourishing and prosperous town producing very good trouser-cords, just like the Armenian.

20. SHAHR-I QURQŪB, a small and prosperous town. It produces sūxangird 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 Khurāsān; south of it, the borders of Khūzistān; west of it, some parts of ʿIrāq and of Ādharbādhagan; north of it, the mountains of Daylamān. This province has much cultivation and is 29 a prosperous. It is the place of clerks and litterati (dabirān va adībān). It is very pleasant and produces cotton stuffs (karbās), textiles of (silk?) . . ., 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 nim “half” instead of nuk “nine”]. It is a flourishing town, much favoured by nature. . . . in Jibāl. It has a river called Zarīn-rūdūh which is utilized in its fields. It produces . . . silk textiles of different kinds, such as hulla (“cloaks”?), “tabby” (“attābi, coarse watered silk), and “siglaton” (siglātūn).

2. KHĀN LANJI, 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. 29a and the beginning of the lines on f. 29b are torn (1–2 words per line wanting).
5. [KARAJ?] is large but most of it lies in ruins. There stood the army camp of Abū Dulaf of Karaj (spelt: Karkhi).

6. BURŪGIRD, a flourishing and pleasant borough . . ., producing saffron and good fruit.

7. RĀMIN, a sparsely populated borough with much cultivation, situated on the slope of a mountain.

8. [KARAJ-I RUDHRĀVAR?], a large town, prosperous, pleasant, and very populous. It is a resort of merchants. It produces much saffron and cheese (?) . . ., exported everywhere.

9. RUDHRĀVAR, a borough, thickly populated (anbūh), and lying on the slope of a mountain.

10. NIHĀVAND, a town . . . with two cathedral mosques in it (andar vay). It is a very pleasant place. It produces saffron and fruit which owing to (their) excellency . . .

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

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

13. ASĀBĀD (Asadābad?), KIRMĀNSHĀHÂN, MARJ, boroughs on the road of the pilgrims (hujjāj), densely populated (anbūh), prosperous, . . . and pleasant.

14. ŞAYMARA, SĪRVAN, two prosperous and flourishing boroughs, producing dates.

15. DĪNĀVAR, SHAHRA-ZHŪR, [SUHRAVAR]RD, densely populated towns, much favoured by nature, and having a sociable (āmisanda) population.

16. ZANGĀN, a town much favoured by nature. The people . . .

17. AUHAR, a borough situated on the slope of a mountain (ba-bar-i kūh, [sic]), and possessing numerous waters (?) and fields. The inhabitants are slow (āhausta).

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 ki bikhurand), and the people . . . Good fruit is found there.

19. TĀLAQĀN, a borough of Rayy, lying close to Daylam.

20. KHU VAR (Khvār), 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 Jibāl (pādhshāh-i f.). . . . The water is from underground canals. It produces cotton stuffs (karbās), cloaks (burd), cotton, china (ghādāra), oil (raughan), and wine (nabīdh). From its districts come good woollenýtaylasān (scarfs worn on the head). Muhammad Zakariyyā the Doctor (bijishk) is (buried) there. The tombs (türbat) of Muḥammad ibn
al-Hasan the Lawyer (al-faqih), Kisā'i the Reader (al-muqri), and Fazārī the Astronomer are also there.

22. Sāvā, Āva, Būsānāna (Būsana?), Rūdha, boroughs densely populated, prosperous, very pleasant, flourishing, and enjoying an equable climate. (They are) on the road of the pilgrims of Khorāsān.

23. Qum, a large town, (now) lying in ruins, with many fields. The inhabitants are Shi'ites, and Bul-Faḍl | ibn 'Amīd the Minister (dabir) 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 (kasdum) abound.

§ 32. Discourse on Daylamān and its Towns

This is an extensive region possessing many different dialects and types (?), which is called the Daylamite country (nāhiyati bisyār-ast bā zabān-hā va šūrat-hā-yi mukhtalīf ki ba-nāhiyat-i Dayālim bāx khwānand).

East of this province is Khorāsān; south of it, the Jībāl lands; west of it, the limits of Ādharbād-hagān; 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 (zūpin). They are pleasant . . . . This province produces silk textiles (jāma-yi abrisum), of one colour or of (several) colours (yak-rang va bā-rang) e.g., mubram, harīr, and the like, as well as great quantities of linen cloths and of wooden [utensils].

1. Gurgān, a town with a large province and flourishing countryside (sawād), very well cultivated and abounding in amenities. It forms the frontier between Daylamān and Khorāsān. The people have regular features (durūst-šūrat), 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 Tabaristan [read: King of Gurgān]. It produces black silk textiles, viqāya (long veils), brocade (dībā), and raw silk textiles (qazīn).

2. Dīhistān, a district possessing a ribāt with a minbar. It is very well cultivated place with extensive countryside (sawādi bisyār). This is a frontier post (thaghr) against (bar rūy) the Ghūz. The tomb of 'Alī b. Sukkari (Sagzī?) lies there.

3. Farāv, a ribāt, situated on the frontier between Khorāsān and Dīhistān, on the edge of the desert. It is a frontier post against the

¹ Cf. under 13. Āmol.
Ghūz. Within the ribāt there is a spring of water sufficient for drinking purposes (chandānk khurd rā ba-kār shavadh). The inhabitants have no fields, and bring grain from Nasā and Dihistān.

4. Astarābādh, a town at the foot of a mountain, pleasant and flourishing. It has running waters, and an equable climate. The people speak two languages: the one is the kwtrā (?) of Astarābādh, and the other is the Persian of Gurgān. From it come many silk textiles, such as mubram and za'fūri of different kinds.

5. Ābaskun, a prosperous town on the sea-coast and a haunt of merchants from the whole world trading on the Khazar sea. From it come shagreen, woollen cloth (kimukhta [va] pashmin ?), and various fish.

6. Ṭabaristān is a large (division) of this country of Daylamān. Its frontier (hadd) is from Chālūs to Tamīša. 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 (sufāl) on account of the frequency of rain both in summer and in winter.

7. Tamīša, a small borough round which there is a wall. It is a very pleasant place, lying (nihāda-ast) between the mountains and the sea. It possesses a strong fortress. In (all parts of) the town mosquitoes are plentiful, except in the cathedral mosque where they do not enter.

8. Limrāsk, a flourishing borough at the foot of the mountains. 30a Within a distance of 1 farsang from it | there is a salt-mine (namaki-stān) which supplies salt to Gurgān and Ṭabaristān.

9. Sārī, a prosperous and pleasant town with many inhabitants and merchants. It produces silk tissues (jāma-yi ḥarīr va parniyān), khāvkhīr (?), as well as saffron-water (mā [sic] za'farān), sandal-wood water (mā sandal), and perfumed water (mā khalūq), which are exported everywhere.

10. Māmātīr, a borough with running waters. It produces thick mats (haṣṭī sitabr) of very good quality, which they use (ba-kār dārand) in summer.

11. Turjī, a prosperous borough, the most ancient in Ṭabaristān.

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

13. Āmol, a great town and the capital of Ṭabaristān. The city (shahristān) has a moat but no walls. Round the city lies the suburb. (Āmol) is the seat of the kings of Ṭabaristān (mulāk-i T.), and a haunt of merchants. It possesses great wealth, and in it live numerous scholars in every science. It has very numerous running waters. It produces linen-cloth, kerchiefs of linen-and-cotton (dastār-i khish),
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 Kümish-giūms with gold thread (zarbāft), various kerchiefs shot with gold thread (dastārcha-yi zarbāft), shagreen (kimukhta), and wooden implements (ālat-hā-yi chūbt), like ladles (kafcha), combs, handles for the plough (shāna-yi niyām?), scales (tūrāz-khäna), bowls, platters (tabaq), deep plates (tayfürï), and the like.

14. ALHUM, a borough on the sea-coast which is a haunt of seamen and merchants.

15. NÄTIL, CHÄLÜS [sic], RÜDĦÄN, KALÄR, boroughs lying among mountains and broken country. (These towns form) a district of Ṭabaristān, but the kingdom is separate and the king is called Ustundār. Its limits stretch from Rayy down to the sea. Kalār and Chālūs are on the frontier between Daylamān proper (khaṣṣa) and Ṭabaristān. This Chālūs is on the sea-coast, while Kalār is in the mountains. From Rüdhān comes the red woollen cloth, from which rain-cloaks (bārāni) are made, which are exported everywhere, as well as blue giūms which they use in Ṭabaristān itself (ki ham der Ṭ. 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.nīs (?)-textiles, and fruit, of which there is no like in the world; they are exported to Gurgān and Ṭabaristān.

17. DAMGHĀN, a town having little water, and situated at the foot of the mountain. Its inhabitants are warlike. It produces dessert napkins with fine borders (dastār-hā-yi sharāb bā ‘alam-hā-yi nikū).

18. BÎSTĀM, 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 (uštād).

21. KÛH-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 (rū zgār) the kings of this district have been from the descendants (farzandān) of Bāv.

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

1 Indistinct: giūm-i safīd-i Kūmish, or giūm-i safīd-gūsh?
sipahbadhs is at the military camp (lashkargâh) situated half a farsang from the town. In (Pirrim ?) live Muslims, mostly strangers, [namely], artisans (pîshavâr) and merchants, because (zîrâk) 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 (ârâstâ),1 frolic (misâh kunand), organize games (bâzi kunand), play on string instruments (rudh xanand), and make friends (düstî girand). The custom of this province is such that each man who loves (düst dâradh) a girl, beguiles her (bifiribadh), carries her away, and for three days does with her as he likes (bidâradh har chün ki khwâhad). Then he sends some one to the father (ba bar-i pîdhar) of the girl that he should give the girl in marriage. In the districts of Kûh-i Qârin 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 (nabîdh), music, songs, and dances (pây küftan). They pray God for their needs (hâjat-hâkhwâhând), considering this as a sort of worship (ta’abbud); they pray for rain when they need it2 and the rain comes (down).

23. Sâmâr (? Shâhmâr), a small borough of the same province (nâhiyât), producing much iron, antimony, and lead (surb).

24. Daylamân, the district of the Daylam proper (Daylam-i khâsâ) who come from it. It is situated between Tâbaristân, the Jibâl, Gîlân, and the Khazar sea. These people are of two classes (gurûh): 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.TRÄ, VâRPUVÄ, LANGÄ, M.RD, CHÄLKRUĐH, GURGRUĐH (?), DÎNÄRRUĐH, JUDÄHANJÄN, سلن رنبار, hausam. Behind the mountains three big districts correspond to these ten districts: vastân, shîr, P.ZHM. Each of these districts has numerous sub-divisions and villages. All these lie within an area of 20 farsangs by 20 farsangs. This district of Daylam is prosperous and rich. Its people are all soldiers (lashkari) or agriculturists. Their women, too, till the soil (barzigari kunand). They have no towns with minbars; their towns are Kalâr and Châlus.

25. Gîlân, a separate district between Daylamân, the Jibâl, Ähharbâdhtagân, and the Khazar sea. This district lies in the open land (bar sahrâ nihâdhâ), between the sea and the mountains of the Jibâl. Gîlân has many running waters; one of them is a great river

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

2 بوقتى گکان باین ba vaqti-ki-shân bibâyâdh. Cf. p. 120, n. 1.
called Sapîdh-rûdh, which crosses Gîlân and flows out into the Khazar sea. There are two classes (gurûh) of these Gîl-s (Gîlân): one class lives between the sea and the river, and is called: “those-of-this-side-of-the-river” (in-sûy-i-rûdhî), 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: LÄFJÄN, MYÄLFJÄN (?), KUŞH-KAJÄN (?), BARFJÄN, DÄKHIL, TIJIN, CH.MA. That of the other side of the river occupies eleven large districts: NANAK, HAKKEGJAL, KÛTUM, SARAVÄN, PAYLAMÄN-SHAHR, RASHT, TÜLİM, DÜLAB, KUHAN-RÛDH, ASTARÄB, KÎHÄN-BALÎ (?), and each of these has very numerous villages. This province of Gîlân is prosperous, favoured by nature, and wealthy (tuvangar). All the agricultural work is done by the women. The men have no other business but warfare, and on all the frontier (hadd) of Gîlân and Daylamân, 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 (aşabiyat). 

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’rûfgar), and if in any district (andar hama nähîyat) of Gîlân one man calls another names or drinks wine (nabîdh), or commits other offences, they give him forty or eighty strokes of the stick (chihil chüb bizanand). The (Gîl-s) possess boroughs with minibars, such as GÎLABÄDH, SHÄL, DÜLAB, PAYLAMÄN-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’rûfgaran). The food in all this province is lit. r (?), rice, and fish. From Gîlân come brooms, mats, prayer-carpets, and mäha-fish (mähi-yi mäha ?), which are exported everywhere.

§ 33. Discourse on the Country of ‘Irâq and its Towns

East of this country lie some confines (hudüd) of Khûzistân and of the Jîbâl; south of it, some parts of the ‘Irâq Gulf (khalij-i ‘Irâq) and of the steppe (bâdiya) of Basra; west of it, the deserts of Basra and Kūfa; north of it, some parts of the Jazîra and of Ādhârbâdhagän. This country is situated near to the centre of the world, and is the most prosperous (ābâdhântarîn) country in Islam. It has running waters and a flourishing countryside (sawâdh). It is a haunt of merchants, and a place of great riches, many people, and numerous
It is the seat of the great kings (pādhshāhān-i buzurg).\textsuperscript{1} It belongs to the hot zone, and from it come dates which are exported everywhere (ki ba-hamā jihān bi-barand), as well as various textiles (jāma), and most of the implements (bishtar-i ālāt) becoming kings (mulūk rā shāyadh).

1. BAGHDĀD, a great town, which is the capital (qašāba) of ʿIrāq and the seat of the caliphs.\textsuperscript{2} It is the most prosperous town in (andar miyān) the world, and a place of scholars and of great riches. Ṭānisīr built it (kardā-ast) in the times of Islām. The river Tigris flows through it (andar miyān ba-vay? bigusaradh); on it there is a bridge (pulli-st [sic]) made of boats. Baghdād produces cotton stuffs, silk textiles (jāma-yi pamba va abrishum), crystals turned on a lathe (ābgīna-yi makhruṯ), glaze-ware (ālāt-hā-yi mad-hān), as well as [various] oils (unguents?), potions (? sharāb), and electuaries (maʿjūn), exported everywhere.

2. MADAṬIN, a borough lying east of the Tigris. It was the seat of the Sasanian kings of yore (ān khusravān). 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. NUʿMĀNTYA lies west of the Tigris, and DĀYR ʿAQUL east of it. These two towns are prosperous.

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

5. JARJARĀṬĀ (spelt: ḟrjāṭā), east of the Tigris, FĀM AL-ṢILḤ, east of the Tigris, SĀBUS (spelt: Sābas), west of the Tigris—these are prosperous and pleasant boroughs.

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

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

8. MAFTĀH, a populous borough east of the Tigris; the canal Maʿqīl 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 ʿamāma-yi bullī).

10. BĀṢRA, a great town possessing twelve wards; each one of

\textsuperscript{1} Evidently the Būyids. \textsuperscript{2} So much only about the caliphs!
these is of the size of a town (chand shahri) and they are separated (gusista) from each other. Basra is said to possess 124,000 canals. It was founded by ‘Omar ibn al-Khattāb, God be pleased with him. Basra is the only country of tithes (‘ushri) in ‘Iraq. The ‘Alawi Burqa’i rose from there. There lie the tombs of Talha, Anas ibn Malik, Shaykh Hasan Basri, and the Son of Sirin. It produces good shoes (na’layn) and aprons (fīta), as well as linen-and-cotton stuffs of high quality (jāma-hā-yi katān-va-khish-i murtāfī’).

11. BAYĀN, a borough to the east of the Tigris, prosperous and flourishing.

12. SALMÂNĀN, 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. MĀDĀRAYĀ, a prosperous and flourishing town, with much cultivation.

15. USKĀF BANI JUNAYD, a place on the fields of which the remainder of the Nahravān canal is used up.

16. NAHRĀWĀN, a town with some prosperity (bā ābādhānī andak). In it some palm-trees (khurmā andak) are found, as well as some places built by the Sasanian kings (kusravān).

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

18. QASR-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. HULWĀN, a very pleasant town, traversed by a river. It produces figs which are dried and exported everywhere.

20. KUTHAY-RABBĀ, a town in the neighbourhood of which there are mounds of ashes, and they are said to be (the remnants) of the fire which Nimrūd had kindled in order to burn the prophet Abraham, on him be God’s blessings and protection.

21. BĀBIL, the most ancient borough in ‘Irāq, which was the seat of the kings of the Canaanites (Kanāniyān [sic]).

22. SĀRSĀR, a prosperous and very pleasant borough through which flows the river Şarşar.

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

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

1 Cf. § 38, 23.
25. JAMI'AYN, a borough situated between the principal course of the Euphrates ('amūd va Furāt, read: 'amūd-i F.) and the canal Surā. From all sides the access to it is only by water.

26. KUFA, a borough on the bank of the Euphrates, founded by Sa'd ibn Abi Waqqās, and there lies the sepulchre (rauda) of the Prince of the Faithful 'Ali ibn Abi Tālib, may God exalt his face.

27. ḤIRA (spelt: Jīra), 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, 'UKBARĀ, 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, DÜR (spelt: Dūn), two boroughs founded by Mu'tasim and finished by Ma'mūn [sic],1 prosperous and pleasant.

32. TAKRĪT, a town lying on the frontier between the Jazīra and 'Irāq, prosperous, flourishing, and populous.

§ 34. Discourse on the Jazīra Province and its Towns
This province on its four sides is surrounded by the waters of two rivers, the Tigris and the Euphrates, and on this account it is called the Jazīra ("island"). This is a province prosperous, pleasant, very populous, with an equable climate and running waters. It has mountains, numerous towns, flourishing countryside, gardens and orchards known for their flourishing state (khurrami). In it there are many people belonging to the Rabi'a tribe, and many Khārijites.

1. MAUŠIL, a large town, with an equable climate and with some amenity (nimat-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. NISĪBĪN, 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 (kāsdūm) are found. In it a strong fortress stands, inside which snakes are numerous. From it comes glass-stone (sang-i ăbgīna) of good quality.

5. DĀRĀ, a borough at the foot of a mountain with numerous running waters.

---

6. KAFARTÜTHÄ, a flourishing and prosperous town with running waters.

7. RA'S AL-'AYN, a flourishing town with many springs which form five rivers; the latter unite (ba-yak jāy) and, under the name of Khābūr, flow into the Euphrates.

8. DIYĀR-RABI'A (spelt: Diyār Ra'nay), a very pleasant land (shahr).

9. RAQQA,¹ RĀFIQA (spelt: Rā'īqa), two large and flourishing towns joined with one another and situated on the bank of the Euphrates. The battle of Şiffin took place in their neighbourhood (andar ḥadd-i ū) on the other side of the river.

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

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

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

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

14. HĪT, a prosperous and pleasant town within a solid wall. 'Abd-Allāh ibn al-Mubārak's tomb (tūrbat) 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 Raqqa to Anbār, are situated on the bank of the Euphrates.

16. BĀLIS (spelt: Tālis), JISR-MANBIJ (spelt: جسر عنب), SUMAYSĀT (spelt: Shumaishāt), boroughs situated on the bank of the Euphrates and adjacent to Syria.²

17. ḤARRĀN, a town with little water (ābashān andāk). In it live numerous Sābians (Ṣābiyān).

18. SARŪJ, a prosperous borough.

19. RUHĀ (spelt: Rahā), a flourishing town. Most of its inhabitants are Christians. In it stands a church (kanīsa); in the whole world there is none larger, better attended (ābādhāntar), and more wonderful. To it belongs a flourishing countryside, and in it live numerous monks (ruhbānān).

20. JAZĪRA IBN 'OMAR, a flourishing borough, with trees and running waters, situated on the bank of the Tigris.

21. ḤADĪTHA, a town with very good orchards.

22. SÌNN, 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, Arminiya, and Arrān, and their Towns

These three provinces are adjacent to each other. Their countrysides enter into each other (ba yak-dīgar andar shudha). East of this region (nāhiyat) are the borders of Gilān; south of it, the borders of ʿĪraq 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`mattarīn) among the Islamic lands. The region is very prosperous and pleasant, with running waters and good fruit. It is the abode (jäygāh) of merchants, fighters for the faith (ghāziyān), and strangers coming from all parts. It produces crimson (qirmīz > “kermes”), trouser-cords (shalvār-[band]), woollen stuffs, madder (? ṛūdīna), cotton, fish, honey, and wax. There (too) Greek, Armenian, Pecheneg, Khazar, and Slav (saqlābī) slaves are brought.

1. ARDĀVĪL, the capital (qasaba) 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-yi burd), and stuffs of various colours (jāma-yi rangīn).

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

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

4. MARĀḠA, 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 qaṭīfa-textiles.2

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 (rūdhiba), grain for food (dāngū-hā-yi khurdanī), 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. Arminiya and Arrān]

8. DUVIN (Dwīn), 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 qaṭīfa.
pleasant town with great riches, men, and merchants. To it belongs a vast countryside (sawād-i bisyār) stretching down to the limits of the Jazīrā and even (khud) adjoining Rūm. It produces worms from which the crimson-dye is made, and good trouser-cords.

9. Đākharraqān (spelt: Đantwortāb), a flourishing borough, with running waters, near the lake Kabūdhān.

10. Urmīya (spelt: Armanā), a large town, very prosperous and very pleasant.

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

12. Khoj, Bargri, Arjī, Akhlāt, Nakhchūvān, Bīdīs (spelt: Budlais)—these are all boroughs, small or large, flourishing, pleasant, populous, having riches and merchants. They produce large quantities of zilī-carpets (? zilī-hā-yi qālt), trouser-cords, and wood(?).1

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

14. Qālīqala (usually Qāliqalā, 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. Mayyāfāriqīn (spelt: Miyafāriqīn), a town inside [sic] a fortress (hişār), on the frontier between Armenia, the Jazīrā, (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 Julantā bu K.r.k.r, the 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 Sunbāt.

All these boroughs which we have enumerated belong to Armenia.

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

21. Barda’, a large town, very pleasant. It is the capital of Arrān and the seat of the king of that province. To it belongs a countryside, flourishing, with many fields and much fruit, densely populated: In it grow numerous mulberry-trees of which the fruit belongs to everybody (tūd-h-i sabil). The town produces much silk, good mules, madder (rūnās), chestnuts (shāh-balūt), and caraway (karaviyā).

1 Perhaps: “good (khūb) trouser-cords”, instead of chūb “wood”. V. M.]
22. Baylaqân, a very pleasant borough, producing striped textiles (burd-hâ) in great numbers, horse-rugs (jul), veils (burqa'), and nâtîf-sweets.

23. Bâzhgâh ("Toll-house"), a borough on the bank of the river Aras (Araxes), producing fish.

24. Ganja, Shamkûr, two towns with extensive fields, prosperous, pleasant, and producing woollen stuffs of all kinds.

25. Khunân, a district on the banks of the river Kur, forming the frontier between Armenia and Arrân.

26. Vardûqiya (Bardûj?), a small and sparsely populated town in Khunân.

27. Qal'A, a great fortress and a minbar on the frontier between Armenia and Arrân.

28. Tiflîs, a large town, flourishing, strong, prosperous, and very pleasant, within a double wall. It is a frontier post (thaghîr) against the infidels (bar rûy-i kâfirân). The river Kur passes through it (andar miyân-i vay). Tiflîs possesses a spring of water, extremely hot; above it hot baths (garmâba) have been built which are always hot without any fire (to heat them).

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

30. Mubârakî, a large village at the gate of Barda'. There the camp of the Russians (Rûsiyân) stood when they came and seized (bisitadand) Barda'. This Mubârakî is at the head of the frontier (awal-i hadd) of Shakkî.

31. Sûq al-Jabal, a town of Shakkî, close to Barda'.

32. Sunbâtûmân (?), a town at the farther end of Shakkî (âkhîr-i hadd-i Sh.), with a strong fortress (hisâr). These two (last-named) towns are prosperous.

33. Şanâr, a region 20 farsangs long and situated between Shakkî and Tiflîs. The inhabitants are all infidels.

34. Qabala, a town between Shakkî, Barda', and Shirvân, prosperous and pleasant. From it come many beaver-furs (gunduz).

35. Bardîj (?), a small town, prosperous and pleasant.

36. Shirvân (شیران), Khursân, Lizân (Layzân?), three provinces under one king. He is called Shirvân-shâh, Khursân-shâh, and Lizân-shâh. He lives at the army camp (ba lashkargâhi, spelt: lashkarhâhi) at a farsang’s distance from Shamâkhi. In the region (hûdûd) of Kurdivân he possesses a mountain with a high summit, which is broad and smooth (pahn va hâmûn). Its area (chahâr-sâ) 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 kārān d va ānjā khurān). 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 mahīfūri which are found in the
world are from the said three districts.

38. Kurdīvān, 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-i Khazarān, a town on the sea-coast. Between the
town and the sea a huge chain has been stretched so that no ship
can enter there without permission (dastūrī). This chain is solidly
attached to the walls made of stone and lead (arzīz). The town
produces linen-cloths and saffron. Slaves (bandagān) are brought
d 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 Daylāmān 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 (bādiya) 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 (padīḥ) in our notice (yādkhīrd)
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 Ḥaḍramūt, 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 ʾaslī) 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 (māgar ānk) who live in the
towns of this country. This country produces dates of different
kinds, skins (adīm), Mekkan sand (rīg-i makki), whet-stones, pilgrim
shoes (naʾlān-i mashʿar), and parti-coloured (mulamma’) shoes. In
it live various strange animals.
The districts of this region are as follows: YEMEN, HIJAZ, TİHAMA, YAMAMA, NİZWAIN (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 (padīdīh) 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 (sharīstarīn) town in the world because there was born our Prophet, on Him (added: and on His family) be God’s blessings and protection, and because it is the House of God, may He be exalted. The length of the mosque of the House of God is 370 cubits (arash = Arab. dhirā‘) and its width 315 cubits. The House of Mekka (i.e., the Ka‘ba itself) is 24½ by 23½ cubits. The height (samk) of the Ka‘ba is 27 cubits and the circuit around the stone (? va as gird-i sang tawāf) is 50 cubits; while the length [of the tawāf, i.e., circumambulation?] is 150 cubits. Mekka was built (bīnā‘) 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 (‘axīz karda-ast).

2. Madīna, an agreeable (khush) town, with a numerous population. The sepulchre (rauda) of the Prophet, on Him and His family be God’s blessings, as well as of many of his companions are there. From the districts of Madīna come whet-stones which are exported everywhere.

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

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

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

6. Sā‘da, a prosperous and populous town. Merchants from Baṣra are found in it. In the days of old it was the seat of the kings of Yemen. It produces great quantities of skins (adīm) and the yemeni-shoes for pilgrims (na‘lāin-i yamani-yi mash‘ar).

7. Samdān (Hamdān?), a district in Yemen, between Sā‘da and Sān‘ā. It possesses three boroughs in which live the sons of Himyar (farzandān-i Ḥimyar) who have fields, pasture grounds (marā‘i), and vines (raz).

8. Sān‘ā, the capital of Yemen. It is a flourishing and prosperous town. Whatever (goods) come from the majority of the districts of Yemen are also produced in this town. It is the most pleasant place in all Yemen. In all the Arab country there is no larger and more

1 may be a misspelling for بحرین v.s. 26.
2 Read: *Hijr. 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. Dhimär (spelt: Dimär), a populous town with markets belonging to the district (‘amal) of Şan‘ā. It is a very pleasant place. Their current money (bāzurgāni)¹ is something (chīzī) similar to the ganda-hārī-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 Şan‘ā there is no larger town in Yemen than Zabīd. At a distance of three days from there is the frontier of Abyssinia. Their current money is silver and gold, but their 12 dirhams weigh only 1 dirham’s weight (yak dirham-sang sanjadh).

12. Mankath, a small borough with stone walls. Huge mountains surround it and its districts (rustā), and in whatever direction one travels in it, it is necessary to cross mountains (va az har sīy ki dar vay ravi kūh bibāyadh buridan). The frontier of this place marches with that of Ḥadramūt.

13. Şuhayb (spelt: Sahib), a flourishing and prosperous borough. All these places are in Yemen. Among the latter’s mountains and plains there is a place of monkeys (kapiyān). All the baboons (ham-dūnagān) are from there.

14. ’Aden, a borough on the sea-coast. Many pearls come from it. It is adjacent to the limits (budūd) of Abyssinia.

15. Ḥadramūt, 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 (mukhalafati kunadh ba-madhhab bā ishān).


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. Sīrrayn (spelt: Sarīr), a flourishing and prosperous town. The inhabitants sow sorghum² 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, u.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 (?), MĀGH, WĀDI BAYHĀN (? spelt: mulūq māghan), 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 (tuvangartar) than here, and all the commodities (jīhāz) 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: Furgh), 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 (ḥudūd-i Jazīra); south of it, the Sea of Quزum; west of it, the limits of Egypt and some parts of the Rūm sea; north of it, the limits of Rūm. This country is flourishing, prosperous, with many people, great riches, and numerous towns. Whatever is produced in Maghrib, Egypt, Byzantium (Rūm), and Spain (Andalus) is brought there.

THE FORTIFIED LINE (thaghr-hā) OF JAZĪRA. These are the boroughs (forming) the military frontier (thaghr) against the Byzantines (Rūmiyān), and belonging to Syria, though called after Jazīra:

1. SUMAISĀT, a flourishing borough lying on the bank of the river (Euphrates).¹

¹ Cf. under Jazīra, § 34, 16.
2. SANJA, a flourishing borough near which there is a bridge; in the whole world there is no better and more marvellous bridge.

3. MANBIJ, a strong borough in the desert.¹

4. MANŞÜR, QÜRUS, two prosperous but sparsely populated boroughs.

5. MALAṬYA (spelt: Malatiya), the largest frontier post (thalghr) on this side of the mountain Lukkām. Its fruit is all given free (mubah) and has no owners.

6. MAR'ASH, HADATH (spelt: Jadhab), 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. KAFARBAYYĀ (spelt: Kamarinā), MAŞĪA, two flourishing and prosperous boroughs divided by the river Jayhūn. If one mounts (chin . . . 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 Sayhūn.

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 Islām 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, ŞÜBA, LĀDHĪQIYA, ANṬARŢŪS, AṬRĀBULUS, BAYRŪT, ŞAYDĀ (Sidon), ŞŪR (Tyre), 'AKKA, QAYSĀRIYA, YĀFĀ (spelt: Ila),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. BĀLIS, a town of Syria situated on the bank of the Euphrates.

17. KHUNĀSIRA, TADMUR, SALAMIYA, MU'ĀN (spelt: Maghān, now: Ma'ān), boroughs | on the edge of the Syrian steppe. The people of 35a Salamiya are all Hāshimites, and those of Mu'ān, Omayyads.

18. AYLĀ (spelt: Ila), a borough on the coast of the Quzum 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 (wagf), in order that anybody reaching that town should be put up and entertained (nihmāni) in the said building.

21. Maʿarra Maṣrīn, a flourishing borough with rain-water.

22. Qinnasrīn, a flourishing and prosperous town.

23. Hims (spelt: Himis), 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 (nikūrūy). Snakes and scorpions abound in it.

24. Kafr-Ṭab (spelt: Bqr-Ṭāb), Shayzar, Hamāt, prosperous, pleasant, and very flourishing towns.

25. Bāʿalbak, a very pleasant town lying on the slope of the mountain (bar bar-i kūh).

26. Damascus, a prosperous and flourishing town, possessing many fields, a nice countryside (sawādi kkush), 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. Raqqa, 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. Adhruḥ (spelt: Adhrukh), a flourishing and pleasant borough, inhabited by the Khārijites.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 (Filastīn), a province with many fields and fruits, great riches, and many inhabitants.

33. Ramla (spelt: Zamla), the capital of Palestine. The locality is pleasant and the town large.

34. Ghazza (spelt: 'Arra), a borough on the frontier between Syria and Egypt.

35. Bethlehem (Bayt al-lahm), a borough where the Prophet Jesus, on Him be God's blessings and protection, was born (maulūd).

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 Jazīra, § 34, 9.
² Iṣṭ., 58: al-shurāt.
37. **NABLUS, RIḤA** (Jericho, spelt: Riḵhā), 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 Lūṭ), 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 Khārījites (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 (tuvangartarīn) country of Islām and in it lie numerous towns, all prosperous, flourishing, wealthy, and extremely favoured by nature in many respects (bā‘ni‘mat-hā-yī bisyār-i gūnāgūn). 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 dabīqī [and ?] khazz.1

And in this country | good asses are found of great price (kharān-i 35b nīk 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 Shāfī‘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 Jīfār. The tomb of Galen (jalīnūs) 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
Tinnis. 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 Fustāt; their mortar (milāt) is of a substance (jauhar) on which nothing has effect. Each of them is 400 cubits long by 400 cubits broad and 400 cubits high. Inside (them) rooms have been made (khāna-hā). (Each) has a narrow door. Hermes built these buildings before the Flood, as he knew that the Flood would take place (khwāhad būd), and he built them in order that the water might not do him harm (ziyān, spelt: zabān). He has written on them in Arabic: “We have built this by a (supernatural) power; if some one wants to know how we have built it, let him destroy it.” And on these two pyramids much science has been engraved (kanda-ast) of medicine, astronomy, geometry, and philosophy.

7. Fayyum, 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’īdān) who were with Pharaoh and who worked sorceries (jādhū’ī), 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 natavānadh kardan), and it may happen that children catch a crocodile in the water and sit upon it and guide it (hami-gardānand) and it cannot do any harm. And wherever the crocodiles are upstream and downstream of this town they are harm-doers.

9. Ashmūnayn (spelt: Ash‘ūnayn), Akhmīm, Bulainā, three towns on the bank of the Nile, to the west of it. They are prosperous, flourishing, and very pleasant. In (this locality) grow numerous ebony trees.

10. Suwān (Assuan), the last town of Egypt and a frontier post (thaghr) against the Nubians. It is situated west of the Nile and is a town with great riches (māl). The people are warlike. In the mountains which are near Suwān and belong to al-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.”
of wild asses, striped (*mulamma*) (with) black and yellow, small, of the size of a sheep (*khurd chand guspandi*). If taken out of that country, they die.\(^1\)

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

East of this country is the country of Egypt; south of it, a desert of 36 \(\text{a}\) which the farther end adjoins the country of the Südän (*ba-nāḥiyat-i S. bāz dāradh*); west of it, the Western Ocean; north of it, the Sea of Rüm. 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 (*bāzurgān*)\(^2\) are mostly in gold (*ba-zarr*).\(^3\)

1. *Aṭrābulus*, the first town of Ifriqiya. It is a large and prosperous town lying on the shore of the Rüm Sea. It is populous and is the resort of the Byzantine and Spanish merchants. Whatever the Rüm sea produces comes there.

2. *Maḥdiya*, a large town on the coast of the Rüm Sea and adjacent to the limits of Qayruwān. It is a pleasant place. Merchants from (different) lands (*az jāyhā*) 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 Südān. In its neighbourhood and in its district live many Berbers. In the deserts (*biyābān-hā*) of Maghrib these Berbers are what the Arabs are in (their) steppe (*bādiya*). They own cattle (*khudāvandān-i chahār-pāy*) and much gold (*zar*), but the Arabs are wealthier (*tuwangartar*) in cattle, and the Berbers in gold.

6. *Tūnis* (spelt: *Tūnas*), a town of Maghrib on the sea-coast. This is the first town opposite Spain (Andalus).

7. *Farsāna* (Qalshāna?), a flourishing town, very pleasant. The people are sociable (*āmizanda*) and possess great wealth. The town lies near Qayruwān.

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

9. *Ṭabarqa*, a town on the coast of the Rüm 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. JAZIRA BANĪ ZAGHANNĀ (spelt: Raʾnā), a town surrounded on its three sides (si karān) by the sea. In its region (ḥawālit) live many Berbers.

12. NĀKŪR, a town like Tanas.

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

14. SIJILMĀSA (spelt: Slhmāsa), a town situated on the edge of the desert of Südān amid sands which are auriferous. This town is separated (gusista) from all the districts; it is little favoured by nature (kam-niʾmat) but has much gold.

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

16. AZAYLA (spelt: 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. | 

36b 18. SŪS AL-AQSĀ, a land (shahr) situated on the coast of the Western Ocean which is the last land of the oecumene (ābādhāni-yi ʿālam) towards the west. It is a great land and its people have extraordinary (bi-andāsa) quantities of gold. The people are somewhat far (dūrtar) from the characteristics of humanity (ṭabʾ-ʾi mardī). Strangers rarely happen to visit it (kamtar uftadh). (The articles) mostly coming from the country of the Berbers are panther-skins (palang). The Berbers hunt (panthers) and bring their skins (pūst) to Muslim towns.

§ 41. Discourse on the Country of Spain (Andalus) and its Towns

East of this country are the borders of Rūm; south of it, the straits of the Rūm Sea; west of it, the Western Ocean; north of it, also the borders of Rūm. This country is prosperous and flourishing, and possesses many mountains, running waters, and great riches. In it mines of every kind (maʾdan-i hama-yi jauhar-hā) are found: gold, copper, lead (arzīs), and the like. Their houses are of stone. The people are white-skinned and blue-eyed.

1. CORDOBA (spelt: Qrṭna), the capital of Spain, prosperous,
populous, with great amenities and riches. By the nearest road there is a three days' journey from it to the sea. Cordoba lies near a mountain and is the seat of the government. The kingdom belongs to the Omayyads (*pādīshāh-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*),¹ 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: Saraquṣta*), **Shantariya**, *regio* (*? B.* *Rayyu*), **Écija** (*Isinja, spelt: Istinja*), **Jaen** (*Jayyān, spelt: Khyān*), **Morón** (*Maurūr, spelt: Maurūd*), **Carmona** (*Qarmūna*), **Niebla** (*Labla*), CHĀFIQ, 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** (*Turtūsha*), a prosperous town on the coast of the Rūm Sea, adjacent to the limits of CH.L.J.SK.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 (*khalīj*) 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 shamshir*).

12. **Algeciras** (*Jazīra*), a borough on the coast of the straits. At the beginning of the Islamization (*musalmānt*) Spain was conquered from this town (*az in shahr bigushādhand*).

13. **Medina Sidonia** (*Sadūna*), **Sevilla** (*Ishbiliya*), **Ocosnaba** (*Ukhshunaba*), boroughs in the maritime region (*bar karān*) of the

¹ The phrase is awkward: *va [lab-i] rūdh?
Western Ocean. They are places with few amenities and sparsely populated.

14. SANTAREM (Shantarîn?), the farthest town of Spain in the maritime zone of the Ocean. From it comes extremely good ambergris (‘anbar-i ashhab) in great quantities.

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

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

East of this country lie Armenia, the Sarîr, and the Alân (al-Lân); south of it, some parts of Syria, of the Rûm Sea, and of Spain; west of it, the Western Ocean; north of it, some Uninhabited Lands 37a (vitrânt) of the North, some parts of the countries of the Şaqštâb and Burjâ(n) (ba’di hudûd-i Şaqštâb va ba’di nâhiyat-i Barjâ-st [sic]), and some parts of the Khazar Sea (daryâ-yi Khazarânt). This country is extremely vast; it abounds in amenities beyond description (bî andâza), and is extremely prosperous. It has many towns, villages, and great provinces, all with extensive fields, running waters, wealth, and troops. In it small lakes (daryâyak-hâ), mountains, and very numerous fortresses (hisâr) and castles (qal’a) are found. It produces in great quantities brocades (jâma-yi dibâ), sundus-textiles (of silk), maysâni-(textiles?), carpets (tanfasa), stockings, and valuable trouser-cords.

The provinces of Rûm 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 Tâblân in which Constantinople is situated. The latter is the seat of the kings of Rûm and a place of great wealth.

2. The other is MACEDONIA (Maqadûniya). Alexander of Rûm was a native of it. It lies by the Rûm Sea.

3. The third is Thrace (Thrâqiya, spelt: Brâqiya) which lies by the Georgian Sea (daryâ-yi Gurz).

As regards the other eleven provinces which lie eastwards of the straits of Constantinople, they bear the following names: 4. THRAÇEON (spelt: Brqsis); 5. OPSIKION (spelt: Absyq); 6. OPTIMATON (spelt: Aftmât); 7. SELÉUCIA (Salûqiya); 8. ANATOLICON (Nâṭîq); 9. BUCCELLARION (spelt: Bqlär); 10. PAPHLAGONIA (Aflakhünîya); 11. CAPPADOCIA (Qabâdhaq, spelt: Fyâdq); 12. CHARSIANON (Khârsâna?); 13. ARMENIACON (Arminyâq); 14. CHALDIA (Khâldiya).

Each of these provinces (themes) is vast and has numerous towns,
villages, castles, fortresses, mountains, running waters, and amenities. In each of these provinces lives a commander-in-chief (sipähıllar) on behalf of the king of Rüm (az än-i malik al-Rüm), with numerous troops numbering from 3,000 men to 6,000 horse [sic] and (destined) to guard the province (mar nigah dâshtan-i nâhiyat râ).

In the days of old cities were numerous in Rüm (andar Rüm shahr-i qadîm andar bisyâr bûdh, read: andar qadîm ?), but now they have become few. Most of the districts (rustâ-hâ) are prosperous and pleasant, and have (each) an extremely strong fortress (bâ hisâri sakht bisyâr ustuvâr), on account of the frequency of the raids (tâkhtan) which the fighters for the faith (ghâziyân) 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 (sûrat).

15. GURZ (Georgia ?) is also a province of Rüm; most of its (population) live on small islands. By (?) the sea of Gurz they have a land (shahr) called Gurz which lies in Rüm on the coast of the said sea. All the customs (akhlâq) of these people resemble exactly and in every respect (râst ba-hama rûy) those of the people of Rüm (Rûmiyân).

16. BURJÂN, 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 bisyâr-nî mat va kam-khwâsta). Taking it altogether it is steppe and cultivated lands (va dîgar hama şahrâ-st va kisht-u-barx). It is a prosperous place and has running waters. It is a part of Rüm and (its people) pay land-taxes (kharâj) to the king of Rüm.

17. CHRISTIANIZED SLAVS (al-Şaqâliba al-mutanassira), a province of Rüm, in which live the Slavs who have become Christians (Şaqâlibi-yi tarsâ gashta). They pay land-taxes (kharâj) to the king of Rüm. They are wealthy (tuvangar) people and their country is pleasant and safe.

18. BULGĦARI, is the name of a people living on the mountain Bulghari (qaumî-st bar kûh-i Bulghari nishinand) to the north-west of Rüm. They are infidels (kâfir). They too are Rûmî, but are

---

1 Kt andar gurikhtan... Something omitted by the scribe: *ba-änjâ pânâ-hand.

2 The text is awkward: the words "villages" and "towns" ought to come in inverted order.

perpetually at war with the other Rûmîs. These Bulgharî are moun-
taineers, possessing fields and great numbers of cattle.

This country of Rûm stretches westwards (*ba maghrib bikashad*)
down to the Western Ocean, and its southern side (*sûy*) marches
with Spain. Towards | the north it marches with the Uninhabited
Lands of the North, and includes some (*pîra-î*) deserts. In all the
other places of Rûm there are no deserts; on the contrary (*illâ*)
cultivated lands (*âbûdhâni*) are everywhere.


20. **RÜMIYA**(Rome), a town on the coast of this sea, belonging to Ifranja.
In the days of old the seat of the kings of Rûm was in this Rûmiya.

are two provinces between Ifranja and Spain. The (people) are
Christians.

22. **BRITANNIA**(Bariîniya), the last land (*shahr*) of Rûm on the
coast of the Ocean. It is an emporium (*bârgâh*) of Rûm and Spain.

From the limit of the straits (of Constantinople) down to Spain
whatever is on the shore of the Sea of Rûm is called “the coast of
Athens” (*sâhil-i Athînâs*).

23. **YÜNÄN**(Greece) was in the days of old a town of this Athens¹
and all the sages and philosophers arose (*khâsta*) from this region of
Athens (*nâhiyat-i A.*).

§ 43. **Discourse on the Slav Country (Saqlâb).**

East of this country are the Inner Bulghârs (*Bulghâr-i andarûnî*)
and some of the Rûs; south of it, some parts of the Gurz sea and some
parts of Rûm; west and north of it everywhere are the deserts
of the Uninhabited Lands of the North. This is a vast country
with extremely numerous trees growing close together (*payvasta*).
The people live among the trees and sow (*kisht*) nothing except
millet (*arzan*). They have no grapes but possess plenty of honey
from which they prepare wine and the like. Their vessels (casks)
for wine (*khumb-i nabîdh*) are made of wood, and there are people
(*mard buvadh ki*) who annually prepare a hundred of such vessels
of wine. They possess herds of swine (*ramma-hâ-yi khûg*) which
are just like (*ham chinânk*) 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 (*pirahan va múza
tâ ba ka‘b*). All of them are fire-worshippers. They possess
string instruments (*âlât-hâ-yi rûdî*) unknown in the Islamic

¹ *Shahri bûd az in Athînâs.* Perhaps: *Shahr bûd* “was the country (belonging)
to this (town) of Athens.”
countries (andar musalmān), on which they play. Their arms are shields, javelins (ẓūpin), and lances. The Śaqlāb 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-xamin-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. VÂBNIT is the first town on the east of the Śaqlāb 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 Rūṭā (ฎ, ?); west of it, the Śaqlāb; 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 nā-sāzanda), arrogant-looking (shīkh-rūy), quarrelsome (sītīs-kār), and warlike (harb-kun). They war with all the infidels (kāsfir) who live round them, and come out victorious (bihtar āyand). The king is called Rūs-kḥāqān. 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 (tabībān rā buzurg dārand). They annually pay the tithe on their booty and commercial profits (gkanimat va bāzurgānī) 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 zānū gird kārdā dārand). They wear woollen bonnets (ba sar bar nīhādha 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 khwīstān dāradh), clothes, and 38a ornaments (pīraya). They (also) place in the grave, with the dead, food and drinks (tāʾām va sharāb).

1. KŪYĀBA (? Kübāba, &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. Ś.LĀBA (?), a pleasant town from which, whenever peace reigns, they go for trade (? bā bāzurgānī āyand) to the districts of Bulghār.

3. URTĀB (?), 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 Șaqlābs; north of it, the Rūs mountain. It is a country without towns. The people are courageous, warlike, and terror-inspiring (bā 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 (bāzurgānī² 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’dī daryā-yī 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 (tāsi!) 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 Bachanākī); they came here, took the country by conquest (ba ghalaba in nāḥiyat bisitadand), and settled down in it. They own felt-huts and tents (khargāh va qubba), cattle, and sheep. They wander within the same territory on the grazing grounds situated in the Khazar mountains. The Khazar slaves brought (uftadh) to the Islamic lands (musalmānī) are mostly from here.

These three (last) named countries are little favoured by nature (kam-nī’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 shikastagī-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. **KASAK**, a land (*shahr*) of the Alân on the coast of the Gurz Sea. It is a pleasant place and there are merchants in it.

2. **KHAYLÄN (?)**, the town where the king's army is stationed.

3. **DAR-I ALÂN** ("the Alân gate"), a town situated like a fort on the summit of a mountain. Every day 1,000 men by turn mount guard on its wall.¹

§ 49. Discourse on the Sarîr Country and its Towns

East and south of it are the borders of Armenia; west of it, the Rûm limits; north of it, the Alân 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 kabki*). Every now and then (*har chand gahi*) this king sends to the place where the flies dwell large quantities of carrion of slaughtered or dead cattle and of game (*shikāri-hā*) to be thrown there for their nourishment, for if they grow hungry, they come and devour every man (*mardum*) and animal whom they may meet.

1. **THE KING'S CASTLE** (*Qal' a-yi malik*) is an extremely huge (*sakht `azim*) 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 (*takhtī sakht `azim*) of red gold.

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

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

From both these countries (*nāhiyat*)² numerous slaves are brought to the Islamic countries.

§ 50. Discourse on the Country of the Khazars³

East of it is a wall stretching between the mountains and the sea, and for the rest (*digar*) the sea and some parts of the river *Ātil* [sic]; south of it, the Sarîr; west of it, mountains; north of it, the B.rādhas and N.n.d.r (*V.n.nd.r*). This is a very pleasant and prosperous country with great riches. From it come cows, sheep, and innumerable slaves.

1. **ĀTIL**, a town divided by the river *Ātil*. It is the capital of the Khazars and the seat of the king, who is called *Tarkhān Khāqān* and

---

¹ Cf. § 5, 18 c.  
² i.e., the Alân and the Sarîr.  
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 sāʿati) when a more important litigation arises (chūn dāvardi busurgtar uftādā), they ask the king for instructions (dastūr), or inform him of the decision (taken) on that litigation.

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

3. *KHAMLĪKH (حمّ), *BALANJAR (بنجر), BAYḌĀ, SĀVGHAR (?), KH.TL.GH, L.KN, SWR, MS.Ṭ (M.sq.ṭ ?), towns of the Khazars, all with strong walls. The well-being (niʿmat) and wealth of the king (mlk, *malik or *mulk?) of the Khazars are mostly from the maritime customs (bāz-i daryā).

4. ṬULĀŚ, LUGH.R (?), two regions of (az) the Khazar (country). The people are warlike and have great numbers of arms.

§ 51. Discourse on the Country of Burtās [read: Bulghār!]
East and south of it are the Ghūz; west of it, the river Ātil; north of it, the Pecheneg country. The people are Muslims and have a particular (khāssa) language. The king is called Mus (?). They own tents and felt-tents and are divided into three hordes (gurūḥ): *BARCHŪLA (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).1

§ 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 tāʿat-i Khazariyān). Their wealth is in weasel-furs (pūst-i dala). They have two kings who keep separate from each other (nayāmīsand).

§ 53. Discourse on the Country of V.n.nd.r
East of it are the B.rādhās; south of it, the Khazars; west of it, mountains; north of it, the Majghari. They are cowards (badh-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 (Musalmānī va Kāfīrī), situated in the northern part of the oecumene (nāḥiyat-i shimāl az ābādhānī-yi jihān).

1. Bulghār, a town to which belongs a small province (nāḥiyat) on the bank of the river Ātil. The inhabitants are all Muslims. From (Bulghār) some 20,000 horsemen (mārd-i savār) come out who fight against any number (bā har chand kā buvad) of infidel troops and have the upper hand. The place is extremely (sakht va bisyār) pleasant.

2. Sūvār, 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 (amm ā nāḥiyat-hā-yi junūb-rū madumān-ash siyāh-ānd) on account of the heat of their climate. Most of them (go) naked. In all their lands (zāmān) and provinces (nawāh) gold is found. They are people distant from the standards of humanity (az itīdāl-i mārdī dūr).

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

It is the largest (mihtarān) country in the south. Some of its eastern regions adjoin Zābaj; its north adjoins the Great Sea; some of its western parts adjoin Abyssinia; on its south are mountains. Their soil is (full of) gold-mines. The country is situated opposite Pārs, Kirmān, and Sind. The people are full-faced (tamām-šūrat), with large bones, and curly hair (jā’d-μū). Their nature is that of wild animals (dadḥagān va bahā’īm). They are extremely black. Enmity reigns between them and the Abyssiniahs and Zābaj.

1. Mājmān (M.lijmān?), a town of the Zang on the sea-coast (bar karāna-yi daryā). It is the haunt of the mērēhānts visiting those parts.

2. Sūfālā, the seat of the Zang king.

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

§ 56. Discourse on the Country of Zābaj and its Towns

West and partly south of it is the country of Zangistān; north of it, the sea; for the rest (it is contiguous with) the Southern Uninhabited Lands.

1 The passage in { } belongs to § 51.
2 Or: “and altogether (this country is) lands.”
Uninhabited Lands (va dīgar hama biyābān-i juntūb-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. nhub (?). They constantly war with Zangistān. In the mountains of Zābaj grow camphor-trees, and snakes are found which are said to swallow at a gulp (ba yak bār) men, buffaloes, and elephants. A few Muslims and (some) merchants are found in it.

2. M. LH. Mān (?), the king’s residence. (But) these Zābaj possess on the sea a great island and in summer their king resides there.

§ 57. Discourse on the Country of Abyssinia and its Towns
East of it live some Zang; south and west of it is a desert; north of it lie the sea and some parts of the Barbarī Gulf. (The inhabitants of) this (country) have faces of the average size (bā i’tidāl-i šūrat). The people are black and lazy, but with high aspirations (bā himmat-i buzurg-and), and obedient (farmān bardār) to their king. The merchants of ‘Omān, Hijāz, and Bahrayn come here.

1. Rāsun (*Jarami), 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.

§§ 56-9

1 Contrary to the Sudanese, cf. § 60. 3 Cf. § 6, 63. 2 The edge of the fol. 39 is torn and the remaining words of the lines 20–3 make no complete sense. 4 Cf. Appendix B. 5 Neither bu’d nor ba’ād nor bi-‘add make any good sense.
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 (ishān) 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 (ḥama maʿdan-i zar). Their king is the best man from among these negroes and they call the king Rāʾī b. Raʾī (?1) 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 nabidh khuram, va bas). 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 hīch nīst). The people are cowards (badh-dil), and covetous in business. The upper part of their body is short, and the lower part long. They are slender (bārik-tan), thick-lipped (sijabr-lab), long-fingered, and large-faced (busurg-sūrat). Most of them go about naked. Egyptian merchants carry there salt, glass (<ābgīna), and lead (arzīz), and sell them for the same weight in gold (ba hamsang-i zar). A group of them wanders in this region of theirs, camping at the places where they find more gold ore (rag-i zar). In the southern parts there is no more populous (bisyār-mardumtar) country than this. The merchants steal their children and bring them (with them). Then they castrate (khīṣī) 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 (rīsh bar-ārand). They are the most sociable people in this country.

2. KH.FĀN, RYN, two boroughs near the frontier of Maghrib, and (their inhabitants) possess much gold (va in mardumānī bisyār-zar-and).

3. M.QYS (?), a large town and the residence of the commander-in-chief of that king.

4. ḋĀBA, a country (shahr) in the neighbourhood (nazdiktar) of the limits of Nubia. The people are thieves (dūzd), poor (darvīsh), naked, and the most despicable (madhmūm) of all this country.

*malik [rā] rāʾī bin (?) rāʾī? khwānand?
§ 61. Epilogue\(^1\) of the book

The inhabited (ābūdhān) 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 āvardīm) in this book, but we have rejected its (their?) superfluities (hashwiyat ?).

As regards the inhabited part of the world . . . which (has been the subject of) astronomical observations (raṣad) . . . and it was not very much. Therefore each town [which Ptolemy??] . . . and other astronomers who were after him . . .

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

\(^1\) Andar khatmat (?).
PART III

COMMENTARY ON THE TRANSLATION OF THE ḤUDŪD AL-ʿĀLAM

By V. MINORSKY
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>232/846</td>
<td>First draft of I. Khurdädhhbih</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>272/885</td>
<td>Second draft of I. Khurdädhhbih</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237/851</td>
<td>Written down by Sulaymân</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304/916</td>
<td>Completed by Abū Zayd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278/891</td>
<td>Yaqūbī, <em>Geography</em> written</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302/914</td>
<td>Jayhānī became vazīr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290/903</td>
<td>I. Faqīh [used Jayhānī]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300/912</td>
<td>I. Rusta circa or after</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308/920</td>
<td>Balkhī wrote circa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317/929</td>
<td>Battānī died after</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316/928</td>
<td>Qudāma, <em>Kitāb al-khārij</em> written</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318-21/930-3</td>
<td>Iṣṭakhri, <em>Kitāb al-masālik</em> written</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340/951</td>
<td>Masūdī, <em>Murūj al-dhahab</em> published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332/943</td>
<td>Masūdī, <em>Murūj al-dhahab</em> published after</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>345/956</td>
<td>Hamdānī died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>334/945</td>
<td>I. Ḥauqal circa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>367/977</td>
<td>Ḥudūd al-ʿĀlam begun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>372/982</td>
<td>Maqdisi, <em>Aḥsan al-taqāṣīm</em> text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>375/985</td>
<td>Maqdisi, <em>Aḥsan al-taqāṣīm</em> additions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>387/997</td>
<td>Birūnī, <em>Chronology</em> India circa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>390/1000</td>
<td>Birūnī, <em>Chronology</em> India circa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>421/1030</td>
<td>Birūnī, <em>Chronology</em> India circa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>421/1030</td>
<td>Birūnī, <em>Chronology</em> India circa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>345/956</td>
<td>Gardīzī, <em>Zayn al-akhbār</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>442/1050</td>
<td>Gardīzī, <em>Zayn al-akhbār</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>487/1094</td>
<td>Bakrī died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>466/1074</td>
<td>Kāshghāri, <em>Dīwān-l-al-Turk</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>470/1077</td>
<td>Idrīsī, <em>Nuzhat al-mushtāq</em> [or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>548/1154</td>
<td>Idrīsī, <em>Nuzhat al-mushtāq</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>633/1236</td>
<td>'Auffī, <em>Jawāmī</em> al-ḥikāyāt* before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>610-85/1214-86</td>
<td>I. Saʿīd lived</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>721/1321</td>
<td>Abul-Fidā, <em>Taqwīm al-buldān</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ABBREVIATIONS

The following list of abbreviations comprises only the main works quoted throughout the commentary. Some of the books specially consulted for particular subjects will be referred to under the respective chapters, though even such indications must certainly not be taken for an exhaustive "bibliography" of the given subject. A tentative list of authorities on eastern Europe is prefixed to § 43.


Barthold, Christentum—Barthold, Zur Geschichte des Christentums in Mittel-Asien, Leipzig, 1901 [Russian original in ZVO, viii (1893), 1-39].


Barthold, Irrigation—Barthold, K istorii orosheniya Turkestana, SPb., 1914 ("History of Irrigation in Turkestan").

Barthold, Obzor—Barthold, Istoriko-geograficheskii obzor Iran'a, SPb., 1903 [Persian translation by Sardädvar, Tehrân, 1308/1930].


Barthold, Semirechye—Barthold, Ocherk istorii Semirechya, in Pam’atnaya knizhka oblastnogo statisticheskago Komiteta Semirech. oblasti na 1898, tome ii, Verny, 1898.

Barthold, Turkestan—Barthold, Turkestan down to the Mongol Invasion, GMS, 1928 [Russian original: Turkestan v epokhu Mongolskago nashestviya, SPb., 1900, consists of 2 volumes: I (selection of illustrative texts in Oriental languages) and II (Russian text); English edition gives the translation only of II with cross-references to the pages of the original].

Barthold, Vorlesungen—Barthold, 12 Vorlesungen über die Geschichte der Türken Mittelasiens [original in Turkish], deutsche Bearbeitung von Th. Meinel, published in Die Welt des Isams (1932-5) and separately 1935.

Battäni—Al-Battäni sive Albatenii Opus Astronomicum, ed. C. A. Nallino, in Pubblicazioni del rea! osservatorio di Brera in Milano, N. xl, Pars I (versio capitum), 1903; Pars II (versio tabularum), 1907; Pars III (textus arab.), 1899.

Abbreviations

BGA—Bibliotheca geographorum arabicorum, ed. de Goeje.


Chavannes, Documents—E. Chavannes, Documents sur les T'ou-Kïue (Turcs) occidentaux, SPb., 1903 (published as vol. vi of Sbornik trudov Orkhnoskoy expeditsii).


Elliot-Dowson—Elliot-Dowson, The History of India as told by its own Historians, i–viii, 1867–77.


GMS—Gibb Memorial Series.

H.-'Ā.—Ḥudûd al-ʿĀlam.


Hsüan-Tsang, Life (Beal)—The Life of Hiuen-Tsiang, by S. Beal, London, 1911.


Hsüan-Tsang, Si-yu-ki (Beal)—Buddhist Records of the Western World, tr. by S. Beal, London, 1884.


Idrisî, Tallgren—Idrisî, La Finlande et les autres pays baltiques orientaux (Géographie, vii, 4), édition critique par O. J. Tallgren-Tuulio et A. M. Tallgren, Helsingfors, 1930 (Societas Orientalis Fennica, Studia Orientalia, iii).

I.H.—Ibn Ḥauqal, BGA, ii.

I.Kh.—Ibn Khurdâdhbih, BGA, v.
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Išt.—Ištahri, BGA, i.
Kâshgharî-Brockelmann—Brockelmann, Mitteltürkischer Wortschatz, Budapest, 1928.
Maq.—Maqdisî [or Muqaddasî], BGA, iii.
Marquart, Ţrânsâhr—Marquart, Ţrânsâhr nach der Geographie des Ps. Moses Xorenac'i, Berlin, 1901.
Marquart, Streifzüge—Marquart, Osteuropäische und Ostasiatische Streifzüge, Leipzig, 1903.
Mas'ûdî, Murûj—Mas'ûdî, Murûj al-dhahab, ed. by Barbier de Meynard and Pavet de Courteille, Paris, 1861.
Mas'ûdî, Tanbîh—Mas'ûdî, Tanbih, BGA, viii.
Mohît—[Turkish admiral Südî 'Ali Reîs], Die topographischen Capitäl des indischen Seespiegels Mohît, übersetzt von Dr. M. Bittner, mit einer Einleitung, sowie mit 30 Tafeln versehen von Dr. W. Tomaschek, Wien, 1897.
Qudâma—Qudâma, BGA, vi.
Ramsay, Asia Minor—W. M. Ramsay, The Historical Geography of Asia Minor, Royal Geogr. Society, Supplementary Papers, iv, 1890.
Abbreviations


Reinaud, Relations des voyages. See Sulaymân.


Sprenger, Postrouten—Sprenger, *Die Post- und Reiserouten des Orients*, in *Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, iii/3, 1864 (with maps utilizing, among other sources, Birûnî’s *Canon*).


Zap.—*Zapiski Vostochnago Otdeleniya Imperatorskago Russkago Arkheologicheskago Obshchestva* (continued as *Zapiski kollegii vostokovedov* and *Zapiski instituta vostokovedeniya*).

*Note.* My use of brackets may appear not strictly consistent. In principle, and especially in the translation of the *H.-‘A.*, simple brackets ( ) are used for additions more or less understood in the text, whereas in square brackets [ ] are given additional explanations not directly belonging to the text. In the notes, square brackets are used for the passages and corrections added after the basic text was printed.
§ 1. Prefatory

THE brevity and simplicity of the style of this Preface are very characteristic. In the whole of the book only one quotation from the Qor'ân 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 Farîghûnids

1. THE AUTHOR'S PATRON. Our book is dedicated to Abul-Härith Muham-mad b. Ahmad, ruler of Guzgânän (cf. § 23, 26.). The author goes no further in his patron's genealogy and even omits to mention anywhere the name of Farîghûn, usually considered as the eponym of the dynasty to which Abul-Härith belonged.


3. THE NAME FARGIHûN. The eponym's name is clearly associated with the lore of the Oxus basin. Nâsîr-i Khusrau in his Dîvân, Tehran, 1307, pp. 329, 335, 474, thrice mentions a Fazhîghûn (Farighûn) referring to some tyrant who may be identical with the king of Khwârazm Afrîgh quoted in Birûnî, Chronology, p. 35 (transl. 41). This ruler was supposed to have reigned nine generations before the Prophet Muham-mad (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 Afrîgh (Afrîgh, or Ifrîgh) which is only a parallel form of
Farīgh, while the final -ūn is probably only a suffix, of which the sense will become clearer when we learn more about the former Iranian language of Khwārazm. In spite of Birūnī and 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.3 [As another example of a name, repulsive in tradition but used in Eastern Iran, may be mentioned Zahāk, or Zuhāk (Iran, azdahak), in Arabic garb: the kings of Ghūr considered themselves descendants of the famous tyrant, see Ţabaqät-i Nāṣirī, 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 Ḍāḥīk, though the latter was known among the Khārijītes, § 10, 47.]

4. The Ma'amūnids wrongly called Farīghūnids. It is noteworthy that Ghaffārī, in his Jahān-ārā, written about 972/1564–5 (Br. Mus., Or. 141, f. 86a) under salāṭīn-i āl-i Farīghūn ki mulaqqab ba Khwārazmshāh būdand speaks of the short-lived Khwārazmshāhs (descendants of Afrīgh). Ghaffārī's blunder passed into Browne's Lit. Hist. of Persia, ii. 230, 237, but was denounced by Muḥammad khan Qazvīnī in his edition of the Chahār maqāla, p. 243. The relationship of the Ma'amūnids, 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 Afrīdhūn 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 Tür (see I. Kh., 16, cf. Minorsky, Türk in EI.), and Gūzgān lay right on the frontier between Iran and Türān. A more specious consideration would be that if the Farīghūnids (v.s.) were to be connected with the Khwārazmshāh Afrīgh, they would probably have proclaimed as their ancestor the Kayānid Siyāvush (cf. Birūnī, l.c.) rather than the Pīshdādīan Farīdhūn. However, in the popular opinion the

---

1. Ḍāḥīk figures in Sachau's Zur Gesch. v. Khwārizm, 1873. The form Ḍāḥīk, with the initial long d, admitted into Sachau's edition of the Chronology, was most probably given preference in order to suit the editor's personal hypothesis on the etymology of the name ["Shedder of water"?], cf. Sachau in ZDMG, 1874, xxviii, 448–52.


3. See the History of Samarqand, Bib. Nat., ms. arabe 6284, f. 18b [I owe the reference to the kindness of Muḥammad khan Qazvīnī].
Kayânids were certainly connected with the Pîshdâdians; cf. Christensen, *Les Kayânides*, Copenhagen, 1932, p. 70.

6. **THE ORIGINS OF THE FARÎGHÛNIDS.** As Barthold has noticed, *v.s.*, p. 6, we know nothing on the connexion of our Farîghûnids (4th/10th cent.) with the earlier rulers of Güzgânân whom I. Kh., p. 40, calls Gûzgân-khudâh and on whom Tabari, *ii*, 1206, 1569, 1609–11, 1694, gives some details under the years 90, 119, and 120 A.H. Had such a connexion existed, the 10th–11th-cent. writers would hardly have failed to notice it. But our chief source Utbi, very favourably disposed to the Farîghûnids, writes only, *ii*, 101–2: "The province of Gûzgân belonged to the Farîghûn family in the days of the Sâmânids (qad kânat wilâyat al- Juûjân li-âli Farîghûn ayyâma Sâmân) and they (i.e. the Farîghûnids) inherited it from father to son (kâbir 'an kâbir) 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 Sâmânids (3rd/9th cent.).

**THE CHART OF THE FARÎGHÛNIDS.** The number of the ruling members of the family was certainly very limited. Utbi, *ii*, 101–5, mentions by name only two Farîghûnids, Abû-Ḥârîth and Abû Naṣr, whereas Gardîzî, p. 48, gives the genealogy of the former as Abû-Ḥârîth Muḥammad b. ʿAḥmad b. Farîghûn.

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

```
a. Farîghûn
   b. ʿAḥmad
      c. Abû-Ḥârîth Muḥammad
         e. Abû Naṣr
             Ahmad, married to Sabuktâgin's daughter
         d. Farîghûn [?]
             daughter, wife of Nûh b. Maḥmûd
         f. ʿHasan [?]
             daughter, wife of Abû ʿAḥmad Muḥammad, son of Sultan Maḥmûd
```

The name of *a. FARÎGHÛN* is known to us only from the patronymic of his son (*v.i.*) whom Narshakhi and Gardîzî call ʿAḥmad ibn Farîghûn, and the *Qâbûs-nâma*: ʿAḥmad i Farîghûn. It is probable that in this case Farîghûn was a definite person, though in later times, and with regard to other persons, the appellation "ibn Farîghûn" could be used in the general sense of "Farîghûnid" and did not necessarily mean "son of a definite Farîghûn". In view of Utbi, *ii*, 101, this Farîghûn may have lived under the earlier Sâmânids in the 3rd/9th cent. and the Rabât Afrîghûn, *v.s.*, p. 6, may have been associated with his activities.

*b. The amîr AḤMAD B. FARÎGHÛN* is mentioned for the first time towards
287/900 as a prince of some importance. During the struggle of the Sāmānid ʿĪl with the Ṣaffārid ʿAmr b. Layth, he was unwilling to help ʿĪl, and was treated by ʿAmr on terms of equality not only with ʿĪl, see Narshakhi, p. 85, cf. Barthold, Turkestan, p. 224 [differently in T.-Sīstān, p. 251]. In a story of the Qābūs-nāma, ch. xxv, p. 90, Ahmad-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-ḤĀRĪTH MUḤAMMAD B. ĀḤMAD is the name transmitted to us in the Ḥudūd al-ʿĀlam and Gardīzī. However, ʿUtbi, i, 166 (Persian translation p. 114 incomplete) and ii, 101 (Persian translation pp. 305–6) speaks of Abul-Ḥārīth ʿĀḥmad [sic] b. Muḥammad who was father of Abū-Naṣr ʿĀḥmad b. Muḥammad [sic]. And the latter form: Abū Naṣr ʿĀḥmad 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-Ḥārīth as Muḥammad b. Āḥmad and of his son as Abū Naṣr ʿĀḥmad b. Muḥammad, whereas Muḥammad Nāzīm is wrong in interpolating an “Abul-Ḥārīth ʿĀḥmad” between our c. Abul-Ḥārīth Muḥammad and d. Abū Naṣr ʿĀḥmad, 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-Ḥārīth ʿĀḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Farīghūnī” and Abul-Muzaffar Muḥammad b. ʿĀḥmad. 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-Ḥārīth Muḥammad b. Āḥmad’s reign marks the heyday of the Farīghūnīd power. The earliest mention of Abul-Ḥārīth “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-Ḥārīth gave his daughter to the youthful Sāmānid Nūḥ b. Ṭanṣūr, Gardīzī, 48. In 372/982–4 the Ḥudūd al-ʿĀlam was dedicated to him. After 380/990, ‘Utbi, i, 165–6, he was requested by Nūḥ b. Ṭanṣūr to march against the rebellious amir Fāʾiq, but was defeated by the latter; cf. Ibn al-Athīr under 383 H. In 383/993 Nūḥ on his way to Khorāsān arrived at Gūzgān and was joined by Abul-Ḥārīth al-Farīghūnī, ‘Utbi, i, 184; cf. Barthold, Turkestan, 262. In 385/995 during the struggle of Sabuktağin with Fāʾiq, the former sent for Abul-Ḥārīth al-Farīghūnī, ‘Utbi, i, 209, Gardīzī, 56; cf. Barthold, ibid. 262. Probably about that time of rapprochement with Sabuktağin Abul-Ḥārīth gave his daughter to Maḥmūd b. Sabuktağin and took a daughter of Sabuktağin’s for his son Abū Naṣr, ‘Utbi, ii, 101. When Sabuktağin died (387/997) Abul-Ḥārīth 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-Ḥārīth’s care, ibid. i, 316; cf. Barthold, ibid. 271. This is the last mention of Abul-Ḥārīth.
d. In 394 or 395 (A.D. 1004–5) 'Utbi, ii, 343, mentions some Farighün b. Muhammad who with 40 generals (qa'id) was dispatched by Mahmūd from Balkh against the last Šāmānid Muntasir. The latter at that time was roaming in the region of Andkhudh (v.i., § 23, 61.) and Pul-i Zāghūl (near Marwarrūdh), and it is likely, therefore, that this Farighün belonged to the Farighūnīd family and was sent as a person acquainted with the territory of Güzgānān. We can only suppose that he was a son of Abul-Ḥārīth Muhammad, but we have no means by which to ascertain whether his appearance towards 1004–5 indicates some sort of interregnum between Abul-Ḥārīth and Abū Naṣr.

e. Abū Naṣr Ahmad b. Muhammad is mentioned for the first time as “wālī of Güzgānān” in 398/January 1008 when in the battle near the bridge of Charkhiyān in which the Qara-Khānīdīs were defeated, he, together with Mahmūd’s brother, was in command of the centre of Mahmūd’s army, 'Utbi, ii, 84; cf. Gardīzī, 69 and Barthold, Turkestan, 273. In 399/1009 he accompanied Mahmūd when the latter entered the fortress of Bhīm Nagar in India, 'Utbi, ii, 95. He died in 401/1010–1, ibid. ii, 102, and Ibn al-Athīr sub 401 H.

f. Bayhaqī, p. 125, describing under 401 the times when the Ghaznavid princes Mas‘ūd and Muhammad, both 14 years old, were living in Zamīndāvar while their father Mahmūd was warring in Ghūr, mentions as their companion “Hasan, son of amīr Farighūn, amīr of Güzgānān”. We know that exactly in 401 A.H. the last known Farighūnid ruler died, and we may imagine that Hasan was the youthful candidate to the throne of Güzgānān kept, during his minority, with his Ghaznavid cousins. Whose son was this Hasan? If we keep literally to Bayhaqī’s text: حسن .... پسر آمیر فریگون امیر گوزگان Hasan’s father may have been d. Farighūn b. Muhammad. But probably “amīr Farighūn” stands here only for “Farighūnid ruler”, in which case Hasan may have been the son of the last Farighūnid amīr Abū Naṣr Ahmad. On the other hand, we know that Sultān Mahmūd having married his son Abū Aḥmad Muhammad to a daughter of the amīr Abū Naṣr al-Farīghūnī gave him Güzgān as a fief (‘aqada lahū ala’ am’al al-‘ūṣjān) and appointed Abū Muhammad b. Hasan b. Mihrān to act as his adviser. The young prince inaugurated in Güzgān a new era (wa barasa ilayhā burūz al-sayf min yad al-sāqil), and displayed much solicitude for the population’s welfare, 'Utbi, ii, 230. Muhammad’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 Güzgān into a Ghaznavid fief took place in 408/1017–18 and Nāṣīr-i Khusrau in his Divān, ed. Tehran, 1307, refers to the event in the following verse, p. 818:

"Where is he [i.e. Mahmūd] for fear of whom the Farīghūnīds let slip Güzgān from their hands?"
We have enumerated all the known members of the Farîghûn family, and it remains to us only to mention the prince of Chaghäniyân (v.i., § 25, 27.) Abul-Muzaffar Muḥammad b. Aḥmad, who has been wrongly supposed to be a Farîghûnid; cf. Barthold, Turkestan, p. 254, and more decisively Saʿīd Naṣīfī, o.c., p. 258. The appellation “Farîghûnî” has been only by mistake appended to the name of this Abul-Muzaffar in the Persian translation of ‘Utbi, p. 114, and is absent in the Arabic original, i, 167. This Abul-Muzaffar was dispossessed by his relative Ṭâhir b. Faḍl, but evidently was reinstated after the latter’s death. ‘Utbi, i, 165, mentions these events some time after 380/990, but according to the Lubāb al-albāb, pp. 27-9, Ṭâhir died in 377/987; cf. Muḥammad khān Qazvīnī’s notes in the Chahār-maqāla, pp. 163-6.

On the possessions of the Farîghûnids see § 23, 46.-66. and Barthold’s Preface, pp. 5-6.

Writers patronized by the Farîghûnids. Among the men of letters patronized by the Farîghûnids ‘Utbi, ii, 102-5, names Abul-Faḍl Aḥmad b. Ḥusain Bādī’ al-zamān Hamadhānī (the poem quoted will be found in the latter’s Dīvān, Cairo, 1321, p. 33) and the poet Abul-Fath Bustī. Mūnejjīm-bāshi adds to their number Khuwārizmī, “author of the Mafāṭīh al-ʾulūm”. Finally our Ḥudūd al-ʾĀlam is a tangible proof of Abul Ḥārīth Muḥammad’s literary and scientific tastes.

§ 2. Cosmographic

1. Entirely as in I.R., 8, 12, who quotes Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Kathīr al-Farḡānī, author of the Kitāb fil-ḥarakāt al-samawīya, who was still alive in a.d. 861; see Sarton, Introduction, i, 567.

2. According to I. Kh., 5, the invisible (الذي جُنُبا “antipodal”) part of the world is devoid of inhabitants.

1 The connexion of the author of the Mafāṭīh with the Farîghûnids is probable, as he dedicated his book to the wazīr of the Sāmānīd Nūḥ b. Maṃṣūr [976-97] who was son-in-law of the Farîghûnid Abul-Ḥārīth Muḥammad. However, the name of the author of the Mafāṭīh was Abū ‘Abdillāh Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Yūsuf. Mūnejjīm-bāshi by an evident slip calls him Abū Bahr, which is the kunya of a different Khuwārizmī, namely of Muḥammad b. ‘Abbās, author of the Dīvān Rasāʾīl, who died in 383/993 in Nishāpūr; cf. Ibn Khallikān, Paris, 1842, i, 736 [transl. iii, 108].

2 E. G. Browne, A Lit. Hist. of Persia, i, 453, mentions among the Farîghûnid clients the poets Daqīqī and Manjīk, though he does not quote his authority [Ethē?]. No such statement is found in ‘Auffī, Daulatshāh, or the Majmā’ al-fusūḥā. According to ‘Auffī’s Lubāb al-albāb, ii, 13-14, Manjīk was the panegyrict of the amīr of Chaghānīyān [v.i., § 25, 25.] Abul-Muzaffar Ṭāhir b. al-Faḍl b. Muḥammad b. al-Muzaffar, and Daqīqī, ibid., ii, 11, that of the amīrs of Chaghānīyān [particularly of Abū Saʿīd Muḥammad Muẓaffar Muḥtāj] and of the Sāmānīd Maṃṣūr (b. Nūḥ b.) Naṣr b. Aḥmad. Farrukhī in his famous qasīdā dedicated to Abul-Muzaffar Chaghānī says: tā tarāzanday (sic) mādīh-i tu Daqīqī dar gudhasht, z-əfarīn-i tu dilāganda chīnān k-az dānā nār, see Chahār maqāla, p. 165. The explanation of the error may be the fact that the said amīr Abul-Muzaffar Muḥammad had been wrongly taken for a Farîghûnid, 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. $180^\circ$, while in latitude it occupies $63^\circ$ in the northern part of it and $17^\circ$ in its southern part. $180 \times (63 + 17) = 14,400$, while the whole area of the earth (both visible and invisible) $= 360 \times 360 = 129,600$. Of the latter number $1/9$ is exactly $14,400$. I. Kh., 4, says that the earth is inhabited as far as $24^\circ$ beyond the Equator, i.e. southern lat. $24^\circ$. Prof. C. A. Nallino kindly writes to me (Rome, 5. xi. 1932): "Je pense que les chiffres $63^\circ$ et $17^\circ$ sont tout simplement l'application de l'idée que l'okonouêny (ربع المور) est la quatrième partie de la surface [scil. visible V.M.] du globe terrestre; $63^\circ$ étant la limite boréale des habitations humaines, et $90^\circ$ la largeur de l'habitable (sur $180^\circ$ de longueur), on a fait $90 - 63 = 17$.

5. See § 4, 13. on the island Nâra (*Bâra) lying on the Equator.

§ 3. The Seas and the Gulfs

The word *khaltj* stands in the text both for "gulf" and "strait", and *batîha* 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 Khuwârizmî's, p. 32, "Sea of Darkness" *al-bahr al-muslîm*, and to *al-bahr al-akhďar* of Ibn Rusta and Mas'ūdî; 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, *i.e.*, 3.) towards China and the Khirkhîz, 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 Khuwârizmî, p. 74, calls *bahr al-Qulzum*, *al-bahr al-akhďar*, *bahr al-Sind*, *bahr al-Hind*, *bahr al-Šin*, 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 Barbarâ is situated; cf. *al-khalîj al-Barbarâ* in Mas'ūdî, *Murîj*, i, 231–3, and Yâqût, 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 "Barbarî Gulf". Under § 57 some parts of the Barbarî Gulf are placed north of Abyssinia, and as in § 3 a the name Barbarî is given to the gulf off the Südâñ 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 Südâñ"), which he took for the source of the term *Barbarî*. Under § 7, 12 the confusion of Barbar and Barbarâ 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 Barbarâ! (b) the Arab Gulf
(under § 7, 10.: the Arab Sea) represents the Red Sea jointly with the Gulfs of Suez and 'Aqaba (Ayła < 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 'Omān with the Arabian Sea, and (e) perhaps that of Bengal.

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?). On the supposed communication between the Caspian and the Black Sea see note to § 6, 44. On the term daryā-ya Khazarān as applied to the Black Sea see § 49, 17.

6. (§§ 42 and 45-7: دررایه کرزن) is here clearly identified with the Pontos (پیطس). 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 Birūnī’s Canon with regard to Balkhān (north of the present-day Krasnovodsk, on the eastern coast of the Caspian sea): نُهان البحر را اراضع طهن ع مفرط ال بحر اروسان ویدر [ بلد ؟ ] حروان “Balkhān is a deserted place (khirba), on account of the Jayḥūn having deflected from its course [and having flowed] towards the Arvāniyān (?) sea and the town of Jurjān [read: *Jurjāniya = Gurgānj, § 26, 25.].” Birūnī’s style is uncouth but the meaning is more likely that given in our translation than that “the [former] course of the Jayḥūn 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 اروران (or ارووان), with all the Qifchaq tribe, adding that he sent to him his son Fīrān < Pirān (cf. infra p. 295, note 2) with a number of Yūghūr-zādāgān (v.i. § 18, 3.). Birūnī’s term اروران Arvāniyān, Urāniyān, Usāniyān (?) 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. مانويل stands undoubtedly for *Maeotis as the Greeks called the Azov

1 On the bahr 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, are rightly indicated, it is placed north of the Saqlâb 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. This idea of the Maeotis being a connecting link between the Baltic and the Black Sea may reflect the rumours of the usual road of the Normans who utilized Russian lakes and rivers and dragged their boats over the short stretches of dry land intervening between the different basins [Map xii]. Our Maeotis may stand for the northern Russian lakes (Ilmen, Ladoga) near which the Norman Rus (§ 44) had their settlements. A further confusion may have arisen out of the fact that several expanses of water were associated with the Normans and that the latter were designated by two different names, Rūs and Varang.

The sense of our passage (§ 4, 25-26.) about some “water” connecting the Western Ocean with the Maeotis becomes much clearer in the light of the description of the Baltic Sea in Bïrunï’s cosmographical work al-Tafhim, where it is said that al-Bahr al-Muhit (= our Western Ocean), beyond Tangier and Andalus (Spain), “stretches northwards along the land of the Saqāliba, and from it a large gulf separates north of the Saqāliba which stretches up to the neighbourhood of the Muslim Bulghars’ land. This (gulf) is known under the name of Bahr Warank (given it) after the name of the people living on its coast. Then it curves in beyond this people towards the east, and between its coast and the furthest limits of the Turkish lands lie lands and mountains, unknown, barren, and untrodden.” Cf. Wiedemann in Sitzungsber. d. physik.-mediz. Societät zu Erlangen, Band 44 (1912), p. 4, and Abul-Fidā, text, p. 35, transl., p. 42, where it is stated that the said Bahr-Warank is found only in Bïrunï’s works and in Naṣīr al-dīn (Ţûsi)’s Tadhkira. The real Maeotis, i.e. the Azov Sea, was named by the Muslims equally after the Normans. Mas‘ūdî, Murûj, ii, 15, says that “in the upper reaches of the Khazar river [i.e. the Volga] there is an outflow (fi a‘ālī 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”. Most probably the passage refers to the Azov Sea, and this is confirmed by the later Idrīsî, who makes the Nahr al-Rûsiya, as he calls the Tanais (Don), flow into the Bahr al-

1 Our dimensions correspond to those given by I.R., 86: ‘length from west to east 300 miles, width 100 miles’ (1 farsakh = 3 mil, cf. Maq., 66). Cf. also Mas‘ūdî, i, 261 and Bakri, ed. Rosen, p. 25 (Bakri literally follows I.R.).

2 On a similar idea of the Maeotis stretching towards the North Pole cf. Mas‘ūdî, Tanbiḥ, p. 66. I.R., p. 85, makes the Tanais [Don] come out of the Maeotis.

3 And even for the Baltic sea itself!

4 Ed. R. Wright, p. 121 [the translation made from the Persian is slightly different from ours].

5 Cf. I.H., 276, quoted in the note to § 6, 44.

6 Could the latter detail refer to the still mysterious Russian principality of Tmutarakan (Const. Porphy., ch. 42, Ta mũrapxa) on the Taman peninsula?
Rüsiyà, 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 Rüs 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: daryâ-yi Gursiyân (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 Zend standing in this case for the original Zend. Graphically such a substitution is quite imaginable, if for instance, the final ی was written somewhat above the line and the top bar of ز happened to be drawn near the initial ز.

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 = Rüs, for whose special association with the Azov Sea we possess several indications in Muslim sources. This confusion was rendered possible by the fact that our compiler merged the Azov Sea into the Black Sea.

[Additional note. The alternative explanation of the strange term would be to connect it with كرخ 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. كرخ K.рkh can be easily restored as * كرخ K.rj of which would be a tentative iranization. Instead of كرخ I. Faqih, 281, mentions سكرش of which the two latter evidently retranscribe the names quoted by I.Faqih and I.R. For our purpose it is enough to say that our author, who among his sources undoubtedly had the text utilized by I.R., may have derived his Iranian 3شr from كرخ as (cf. Hebrew كرخ). As كرخ is most probably Kerch [the alternance in Arabic of sh/j is in favour of the original ی], this explanation, already suggested by Westberg, v.s.y, 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 name as كرخ with the initial element س- (some adjective in a local language), or the name of some neighbouring place only slightly differing from the original كرخ.

1 According to Masʿudi, Muruş, ii, 272, Tanbih, 67, Pontos and Maeotis are one sea, cf. Marquart, Streifsüge, 161.
2 S.mk.rsh may be either the same
of Muslim al-Jarmi) is called جزر خزر Khazar and جزر 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 جزر Jurz and as our author everywhere substitutes Iranian Gurz for Arabic Jurz, the Black Sea could under this name (Gurz > Gurziyân) 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 ساسک with which in I.Kh.'s itinerary, p. 113, immediately follows Fârita (Perta). This place evidently lay by a lake, for I. Kh. speaks of "bank of?". Both names are certainly corrupted, but it is not impossible that they stand for Savitra, of which it is only known that it lay in the waterless Lycaonian desert not far from Archelais. W. M. Ramsay, Asia Minor, p. 340 and Map, places Savitra south-west of Perta. The respective positions of Perta and Savitra are not very certain; the latter lay perhaps farther north, and in that case could have given its name to the (salt?) lake which lies immediately south-west of the Tuz-chölü and which is now called Muräd-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. Iṣṭ., 100, and I.H., 193, give Bur, Lou, Bun, Bawd, Twz, Muxz, but actually the lake is called Famûr, which confirms the reading Mûr in the older Fârs-nâma, ed. Le Strange, GMS, 154.

14. Iṣṭ., 122, Bâsfahîya, I.H., 123, Bâshafîya, &c., is the Lake of Tasht now forming the northern part of the Lake Bakhtagân (Bîchagân), see Schwarz, Iran, 11, Le Strange, The Lands, 276. Iṣṭ., 122, praises its utility.

15. Iṣṭ., 122, also gives Fânkân (*Fanjagân), while the older Fârs-nâma, 153, has Mâhalîya, nowadays turkicized into Mahârlu.

16. *Bijagân, cf. also § 6, 33., is now called Bakhtagân but Hasan Fasâ’i on his detailed map of Fârs (note to § 29) gives the alternative Bîchagân. The river of Dârâgird (Rûd-i Shûr 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. Iṣṭ., 121: "the Kurr is said to possess a spring (manba’) in some of the districts of Dârâgird and to outflow into the sea". Chardin, ed. Langlès, viii, 235, 499, who crossed the Rûd-i Shûr on his way from Lâr to Bandar-i 'Abbâst, took it for a continuation of the Band-i-mûr river (i.e. of the Kur). Tomaschek, Nearch, p. 44, calls it Ab-i Kurr (without quoting his authority) and identifies it with the Coros mentioned by P. Mela and Kopios found in Ptolemy, vi, cap. 8; cf. Schwarz, Iran, p. 8.
17. 18. Barthold’s hypothesis of the identity of the Issik-kül and Tüz-kül, 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 Tüzün-Bulaq and Tüzün-‘Ärj, § 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 Gardizi 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, Turkestanskiy kray, SPb., 1913, p. 48, and Molchanov, The Lakes of Central Asia (in Russian), Tashkent, 1929, p. 49. The suggestion is interesting, but a close consideration of our text makes it very difficult to include the region of Boro-dabasun within the limits of the Khallukh (already at Barskhān, § 15, 11., the Khallukh influence was weak). Therefore I am personally more inclined to identify the Tuz-kul with the Shür-kul “Salt lake” situated at an altitude of 5,000 feet on the southern slope of the T’ien-shan some 140 Km. to the north-east of 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 Shür-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. 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 رأس بحيرة الباسيليون i.e. the locality “at the head of the lake of Basilion”. In I. Kh.’s passage the word رأس could have been misspelt into رأس i.e. the name “Riyas, lake of Bäsiliyun” may have retained the name and dropped the explanation. Le Strange, The Lands, p. 135, identifies the lake Bäsiliyun with that of the Forty Martyrs, i.e. the Ak-shehir-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, buhayrat 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 -zïra (Qum-zïra, Büyük-zïra, with a Turkish beginning, but Khara-zïra "Ass [Dorn: Pig?] Island" purely Iranian, cf. Dorn, Caspia, 82).

24. Daryāzha 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 Ţūs lies in the mountain separating Ţūs from Nishāpūr. Bīrūnī, Chronology, p. 264, calls the lake Sabzārūd and gives various explanations of its situation on a height. In the Nushat al-qulūb, GMS, p. 241, it is called Buḥayra-yi chashma-yi sabz and identified with the legendary lake from which came out the horse that killed 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, Ţūs in EI.¹ Following Sir P. Sykes, A sixth journey, in GJ, Jan. 1911, p. 3, the Chashma Sabz lies under the Lük Shīrbād peak (between Nishāpūr and Ţūs) and occupies an area of 400 x 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 Bārgīn-i farākh; see Barthold, Turkestan, 117, and Barthold, Irrigation, 124. In our text the word āvāz is evidently a common name "lake, swamp". The same word still survives in Avoza-Kart-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 Bahārām Chūbīn takes after a siege during his campaign against the "Turkish" king Shāba and his son Parmūdha.

¹ Marquart, Wehrot, p. 7, thinks that Shāh in Firdausi is an error for Sind, as the lower course of the Herat river was probably called after a village which existed in the neighbourhood of Nasā and Abīward (§ 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 Dizh-i Nayāzak = Dizh-i rōyin = 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 (Baïkal?).

§ 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 Chrysē and Argyrē but describe them too vaguely for location, see Coedès, p. xiii. As the source of the early Muslim geographers is Ptolemy, it is much more probable that the Jazīrat al-fidda (Khuwārizmi) represents Ptolemy’s Ḥabādīu *Yāvadvipa (Sumatra, or Java) the capital of which was called Ἀργυρή (Ptolemy, vii, 2, 29). However, the situation is complicated by the fact that Ptolemy mentions in the Transgangetic India (vii, 2, 17) two countries bearing respectively the names of Ἀργυρᾶ and Χρυσῆ (cf. Coedès, Index). In Khuwārizmi’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 Khuwārizmi’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 Khuwārizmi’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: Ἀργυρῆ.

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 Ὑπρόδης, see Ptolemy, vii, 3, and Marcianus of Heraclea (5th cent.) § 45, cf. Coedès, 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. l.).
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 Zangîs”. 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. Ûtabarnā is T̄aṃprōbānī, 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 Sarandib island”. Our author distinguishes Ûtabarnā from Sarandib; see § 9, 23., cf. Ferrand, Relations, p. 205, note 2. The name of the town Muvas is a puzzle unless it stands for مويس v.i. 10. and § 10, 13. From Sarandib Malay lies certainly “towards Hindūstān”. From the graphical point of view has a parallel in ٣(٢٥) مويس⁴. 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.1.]

5. Rāmī < Rāmni is Sumatra (v.i., 7), Ferrand, Relations, p. 25. This paragraph closely follows I.Kh., 64–5. On the products, cf. also Sulaymān, p. 9.

6. in spite of its location west of Sarandib stands evidently for جة for the details (camphor-trees, snakes) correspond to those quoted under § 56.

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

8. Bālūs is the port lying on the south-western coast of Sumatra. Ferrand, Relations, p. 27, note 5, and Ferrand, Wak-Wâk in EI. “The said Jába” refers to the preceding 7. I.Kh., 66, places Kala at 2 days’ distance from Bālūs (this sentence in our text comes under 9.) and from the latter counts 2 farsaks to Jāba, Shalāḥīt, 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 Bālūs” Kala ought to be located north (north-east) of it. Sulaymān says that after *Lanjabālūs the ships call at Kalāh-bār, which is (a part) of the Zābaj. The name of tin in Arabic al-riṣas al-qal‘ī, or simply qal‘ī (<kali), is a derivative from Kala. The “Indian (or Brahmanic?) Jába” (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 Jába”, see § 5, 9, b and § 10, 45; cf. Barthold’s Preface, p. 34, note 3.

10. Bankälüs stands for I.Kh.’s, 66, Al.n.k.bälüs “the Nicobar islands”. Ferrand, Relations, p. 26, takes as the right form *Lankabälüs. Our author exactly translates I.Kh.’s: ʿAmalāūm al-hadīd wa-jīlān al-thājār. I.Kh. counts 10–15 days from Al.n.k.bälūs to Sarandīb, and, moreover, mentions the distances Malay–B.līn, 2 days, B.līn–*Bāpattān, 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 Bankālūs and Malay.

11. One would perhaps expect, v.s., note to 7., that H.r.nj (Harlaj) following the group of islands situated east of India stands for H.r.lj (Harlaj) which I.Kh., 66, associates with Sumatra. I.R., 138, says that “Harlaj was only the name of the king’s military representative (qāʾīd)”, 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 H.r.nj in Sulaymān’s (p. 5) name for the sea off the south-western coast of India: ḥark. In, and round, this H.r.k.nd Sea Sulayman mentions 1,900 islands ( dibājāt < ssk. dīvā “island”) corresponding to the Laccadives, &c. Our H.r.nj island may refer to the latter. The name ḥark 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 -ゝ: (1) the sea near the Laccadives, (2) Bengal, and (3) some part of Sumatra.

12. Lāft, v.i. under 14.

13. The name Ṣbrūnī, Birūnī, India, 157: Ṣbrūnī must be read *ṣbrūnī 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. A mention of the Equinoctial, or Equatorial, Island is found in I.R., 83: ḥazrāt istīwā al-layl wal-nahār, who adds that the Indian Ocean, of which the area between Abyssinia and the furthest end of India is 8,000×2,700 miles, extends beyond this island

1 According to the Chinese annals of the Sung dynasty (960–1279) the kings of San-fo-ts’ī, i.e. the Śrivijaya kings of Palembang in Sumatra, had the title of chan-pei. The latter (still unexplained!) according to Ferrand’s hypothesis must be the equivalent (in Chinese pronunciation) of the Arabic Jába. The annals of the Ming dynasty (1368–1644) suggest that the name of the kingdom of Jambī (north-west of Palembang) is derived from the same chan-pei. See Ferrand, ʿCrīvidjaya, 16–17, 166.

2 It is possible that Sulaymān’s H.r.k.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 Malayadvīpa on which lies the town of Lankā inaccessible to men, while Lankā is also the name of Ceylon; cf. Kirfel, Die Kosmographie der Inder, Leipzig, 1920, p. 111.
The island Lank known in the books as the 'Cupola of the Earth' long. lat. 100° 50' 0° 0'

*Bāra [sine punctis] mentioned by Fazārī and Ya'qūb b. Tāriq long. lat. 190° 50' 0° 0'

"Jamakūt situated at the extreme eastern limit; Persians call it Jamāgird. long. lat. 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-majhūlät)". The text of Or. 1997 is faulty and an additional numeration suggests the following order in which the localities should follow: ... 4. Lank; 5. Süra island; 6. Jamakūt; 7. Bāra.

In the Taftim, p. 140, § 239, Bīrūnī 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 Hindus however say that it is a high place named Lankā, the home of devils.”

Finally in his India, p. 157, transl. i, 303, Bīrūnī more explicitly says: “Yamakoṭī (যামকোটি) is, according to Ya’qūb [b. Tāriq] and al-Fazārī, the country where is the city Tārā [read: Bāra!] within the sea. I have not found the slightest trace of this name in Indian literature. As koṭī means castle and *Yama (يا) is the Angel of Death, the word reminds me of Kangdiz, which, according to the Persians, had been built by Kaykāḥūs, or Jam, in the most remote east, behind the sea. ... Abū Ma’ṣhar of Balkh has based his geographical canon on Kangdiz, as the o° of longitude, or first meridian.” Reinaud, o.c., ccxii, ccxxxix, &c., who first commented on this passage, showed how this Yamakoṭī (= Jamshīdgird)

(1) has got confused with the “Cupola of the Earth” (قبة الأرض) which in India was identified with the site of the town of Ujjain, *Ozψη, οζψη, άζην, 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. Bīrūnī, 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..."
et on reporta la Coupole d'Arin à l'ouest. Mais ici on se partagea encore: quelques personnes (al-Battânî, Mas'ûdi) . . . parlaissaient 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 . . . prolongeaienl 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-Battânî and Mas'ûdi, ibid., ad p. cchxxii.

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 Idrïsï, transl. Jaubert, i, 171: "Sûbâra [cf. § 10, 14.] . . . est voisine de l'île de Bâra, laquelle est petite et où croissent quelques cocotiers et le costus."

12. 14. and 15. lie in the Persian Gulf. 12. Läft is mentioned in Išt., 107, where it is said that the island was also called jazîra banî Kâwân (or Barkâwân). This last name is mentioned only in Sulaymân, p. 16, and in I. Kh., p. 62, according to whom it was inhabited by the Ibâdite sectarians. It corresponds to the large island Qishm, on the northern promontory of which there is a village called Läft; see Tomaschek, Nearch, p. 48. Our author seems to be the first to speak of the commercial activity of Läft. 14. 15. Uwâl is one of the Bahrayn islands, Yaqût, i, 395. The pearl-fisheries of 15. Khârak, are mentioned in Išt., 32.

16. I.R., 87, spells the name *Sugîtara, Yaqût, iii, 101, 543, Suqitrâ and Suqatrâ; cf. Tkatsch, Sokotrâ, in El. I.R., in his description of the Bahr al-Hind, mentions Socotra immediately after Bahrayn, 'Omân, and Masqat. 17. Išt., 13, 30, 31, 33, places Târân between the gulfs of Suez and 'Aqaba (bayn al-Qulzum wa Ayla) and Jubaylât near Târân. The locality is familiar for its winds and a whirlpool, and is reputed to be the place of Pharaoh's death [Exodus, 14, 29]. Maq., 11, spells نار. Yaqût, iii, 834, places the islands near Hijâz.

C. THE WESTERN OCEAN


19. Ghadïra, i.e. Cadiz, see Qudâma, 231, and I.R. 85; Khawârizmî, 15 [= Nallino, p. 48], has غدرا. The Greek name is Γάδεφα, Ptolemy, i, 3, Punic Gaddir ("wall"). See Seybold, Cadiz, in El.

20. 21. should really appear under d.

20. Rhodes is mentioned in Khawârizmî, 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. Arwâdh, small island off Tartús in Syria, now Ruwâd. The name cannot be directly derived from Ptolemy's, 'Apaðos (Geog., v, 14). It is not found in any other ancient Muslim sources, except Tabarî, ii, 163.

22. 23. Khuwârizmî, 89 [= Nallino, 50] mentions the islands אמאטוס of which the first is inhabited by the men and the second by the women. Nallino suggests the emendation of אמאטוס into אמאטוס 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. Idrîsî, ii, 433, Idrîsî-Tallgren, 34, 77, 140: אמאטוס. Tallgren says that the island Nargen (off Reval = Tallinn) is called in Finnish Naissare “The island of the Woman, or the Women”. A story of the Town of Women (madinat al-nisâ), situated west of the Rüs, is reported in Ibrâhîm b. Ya’qûb [circa A.D. 965], quoted in al-Bakrî, 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 (as in Qudäma, 231), hails evidently from a source different from that of Патане 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 İst., 71, and I.H., 136, as a very strong place seized by a party of Muslims and held by them against the Ifrâjja. According to İst. 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]. Yaqût, i, 392, speaking of the Alanka-burda (Lombards) says that their country is vast and is situated half-way (bayn) between Constantinople and Spain: “it begins from a side of the Mediterranean (bahr al-khalij, cf. Yaqût, ii, 465) opposite the Jabal al-qilal and stretches opposite the Maghrib coast until it reaches the lands of Calabria (Qalawriya)”. These data seem to refer to the greatest extension of the Lombard kingdom and at all events to the times before the latter was crushed by Charlemagne in A.D. 776, but we do not know whether the J. al-qilal was known under that name in the eighth century, or whether Yaqût 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 Marāṣid al-Itīlāʾ [an abridgement of Yāqūt's Muʿjam 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-qilāl 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 Ḥ.ʿĀ. regarding the silver mine and the high mountain to the west of the Jabal al-qilāl are not found elsewhere. The high mountain could be identified with the Massif des Maures which stretches north and south-west of the Fraxinetum. The mention by our author of the "Roman land", or the "town of Rome" in the neighbourhood of the Jabal al-qilāl may be related to the old text on the Lombards reproduced in Yāqūt.1

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

30. قرِس stands certainly for قَرِين, Kūplos, i.e. Corsica, Ptolemy, iii, 2. This usually mis-spelt name is found in I. Rusta, 85 (with a periphery of 200 miles), as well as in Qudāma and al-Battāni (quoted ibid., 85 d). The position of Corsica is confused by our author with that of Crete.

31.对应的 بالس (var. ِئِبَس) in Qudāma, 231, which is Yābis Eβυσσος, now Ibiza, one of the Balearic islands. [Not to be confused with جَالِة (جالة), خَالِة (خالة)] which I.H., 136, places between Sicily and Crete.

32. Iṣṭ., 70, and I.H., 136, place Sicily very close to the Ifranja (Franks) and give similar dimensions of 7 marhalas in length (and 4 in width), while I. Rusta, 85, following his system, gives its periphery as being of 500 miles.

33. Sardinia is mentioned in I. Kh., 109 (there lives the patrician governor of all the islands), in Qudāma, 231 (under a different form سِرَدَانَة) and in I. Rusta, 85, who also estimates the length of its periphery as 300 miles. Our author evidently confuses Sardinia with Sicily for he places Sardinia south of Rūmiya, whereas the Imperial treasure is mentioned in Sicily.

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

e. The name 35. Kabūdḥān "the blue one" belongs certainly to the lake itself called in Strabo, xi, 13, 2, Λυμνήν τήν Σπάυταν, read: *Καπάυταν, Old Kāpyʿṭān, Old *Kāpyʿṭān, 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, *Eränšahr*, 143. [The word is now attested in *kāsaka ha *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 Shāhū, Tabari, iii, 1171, Shāhī, is understood here. See Minorsky, *Marāgha, Marand, Tabriz*, and *Urmiya*, in *EI*.

f. The island *Jazīrat al-Bāb* according to the description is the "Madder island" *Jasīra-yi Rūynās* which is mentioned in Khāqānī's well-known ode referring to a Russian raid in Shirvān towards a.d. 1175. Cf. also Dimashqi, ed. Mehren, 147, and *Nuzhat al-qulūb*, GMS, 239: جزیره روب. There are no islands in the immediate neighbourhood of Darband. Khanikoff, in *Mélanges Asiâtiques*, iii, 131, identifies the Madder Island with the Sārā Island off Lankurān, while Westberg, *Jour. Min. Narod. Prosv.*, 1908, xiv, 7, thinks that the peninsula of Apsheron (Ābshārān), on which Bākū stands, is meant here.

37. Siyāh-kūh, on the north-eastern coast of the Caspian, is now known under the Turkish name Manghishlaq, on which see Barthold in *EI*. Ist., 219, says that the Turks "recently" seized Siyāh-kūh.

38. The MS. vocalizes Dihistānān-sur [in which -sur is hardly connected with the name of the local prince شير *Chūr*]. It is tempting to read the name as *D.-sar*, in which case it would mean "the promontory of D.", cf. Miyānasar, the headland protecting the Gulf of Astarābād. The promontory must correspond to that of the Bay of Hasan-quili by the estuary of the Atrak, near the district of Dihistān, "the country of the ancient people Ādāc, Dahae"; cf. Hoffmann, *Auszüge aus syrischen Akten*, Leipzig, 1880, 277–81, and Minorsky, *Meshhad-i Mestoriyān* in *EI*. On the other hand, Dihistānān-sur (or -sar) very probably is the place where Firdausi, ed. Vullers, i, 115, places the Dizh-i Alānān, cf. Marquart, *Komanen*, 109, Minorsky, *Türān*, in *EI*. On the falcons caught on the islands lying opposite the Jurjān coast, see Mas'ūdī, *Murūj*, 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-*Tāʾ in fil-bāhr* most probably means only "projecting into the sea"; cf. Bīrūnī, *Canon*, 3rd climate: al-*Mahdīya* ʿalā anfin tāʾ in fil-bāhr. If eventually tāʾ in be taken in the sense of "striking" it may refer to some legend of the Alexandrian (?) lore. So Dimashqi (A.D. 1325), *Cosmographie*, SPb., 1866, p. 170, speaking of the Sea of Darkness (bāhr al-zulumāt) 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 Khwārizmi's al-*Qalʿ at al-muṣṭa* by a story found in the *Abrégé des Merveilles*, tr. by Carra de Vaux, p. 46. As the easternmost mountain of the world Ibn Saʿīd (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-Ṭā‘in fil-bahr* and seem to refer to the locality between Shantung and Corea.

2. Sarandib = Ceylon is regarded as belonging to China, § 9, 23. Khuwārizmī, 40, calls the mountain of Ceylon (Adam’s peak) Ruhūn [Ssk. ṭōhāna “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-makhlūqāt*, 112.

3. It is difficult to see how the Mānisā range is connected with a “corner” of Ceylon but under § 6, 1. it is again called the Sarandib mountain. Possibly Ceylon is here confused with Sumatra. The sections of the range are as follows:

a. Between the imaginary “corner” of Ceylon and the boundary of Hindūstān with China. This first part of the Mānisā must represent the longitudinal chains of the Malay peninsula.

b. Eastern frontier of Tibet towards China (the ranges running west of Ssū-chuan?). Rāng-Rong (?), on which see § 11, 1., must accordingly be looked for in the south-east of Tibet.

c. The stretch of the Mānisā where from the south-to-north direction it bends to the north-west, shutting off China from the Tibetan N.zvān (cf. § 11, 3), seems to correspond to the Nan-shan mountains separating Kan-su from the Koko-nor and Tsaidam.

d. The part of the range dividing Tūsmat (*Twsmt*) from China “up to the end of the desert (forming) the extremity of China” must be the Altīn-tagh and K‘un-lun separating northern Tibet from the Taklamakan desert. Possibly instead of “between Tūsmat and China” (spelt چین) we must read “between Tūsmat and Khotan” (خان). On a similar confusion in writing of خان see Barthold’s *Preface*, p. 25. On Tūsmat see § 11, 9. On Khotan § 9, 18.

e. Some connecting words must have fallen out in the description of the final portion of the Mānisā which is represented as stretching in the north into Turkestan towards Tarāz and Shiljī (on the latter see § 25, 93. and Ist., 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,
resp. its central and eastern parts, is only mentioned as “joined” to the Mânisâ (cf. infra, 7. Ighräj-art and 6. Tafqân).

Consequently the Mânisâ 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 Mânisâ, such as the mountains separating the basins of the Yang-tze and Huang-ho in China, the mountains of the Central Plateau of Tibet and the off-shoots of the Alexandrovsky range.

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

6. is perhaps a mis-spelling for Turfân. The mountains must be the eastern T’ien-shan (Boghdo)—separating Turfân (in the south) from Dzungaria (in the north). The capital of the Toghuzghuz Chînânj-kath (Khara-Khocho) stood near it, § 12, 1. The length of 4 farsakhs may refer only to the central peak.

7. This range is certainly the central T’ien-shan stretching north of Kuchâ, Aq-su, &c. The reading of the name Ighräj-art, in Turkish “the col of Ighraj”, is not certain but as under § 6, 5. it is vocalized Irghâj (with metathesis) the form Ighräj has been adopted. The mountain (and the pass) of Ighräj-art, situated “in the neighbourhood” of the river Khûland-ghûn (§ 6, 3.) is either the Muz-art, or the lower1 and more western Bedel-pass. More likely the Ighraj-art is the Muz-art, if we judge by the description under § 12, 17. (cf. note to § 6, 3.) and by the fact that the Ili river is said to rise from it (§ 6, 5). The stage of Ighraj-art (§ 12, 17.) lay on the Toghuzghuz territory, but the mountain of Ighraj-art traversed the Yaghmâ territory (§ 13, 1.) as well. It is difficult to say whether (under § 6, 5.) 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 Toghuzghuz territory, north of the Issik-kul, and consequently corresponds to the Küngey-Ala-tau from the western extremity of which2 a branch shoots off northwards, i.e. at a right angle. This branch separates the basins of the Ili and Chu, and on it are situated such passes as Kastek (7780 f.) &c.3 This “Ili-Chu range” seems to be the branch mentioned at the end of 8. as “stretching off towards the Khirkhiz country”. Several other passages in our book (see notes to § 14) also point to the presence of the Khirkhiz in the region north of Kastek, but though the meaning of the text is clear, the accuracy of the author’s statement cannot yet be controlled by any other contemporary evidence. The name Tûls (*Tûlâs *) given in the text to the range is known

---

1 Alt. 14,000 feet.

2 More exactly, of the “Trans-Ili Alatau” which is a parallel range running to the north of the Küngey Ala-tau.

3 Farther north the height rapidly decreases and here the range is crossed now by the “Turksib” railway. See Maps v and vi.
to us only at an entirely different place. According to the Zafar-nāma, i, 495, in 792/1390 Tīmūr 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 (sāmūr) 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 Gardīzī, 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 Toghuzghuz territory to that of the Khirkhīz. The distances in Gardīzī are vague (see note to § 14), but the Mānb.klū mountain seems to stand at four days’ distance south (or south-west) of the Kükmān (*Kökman) 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. 281s.]

To sum up: geographically our author’s description of the range running north of the Issik-kul and its northern offshoot is correct, but he may have transferred to it some characteristics borrowed from a different source and belonging to some range lying farther to the east (Tūlas = Altai?). For an explanation see p. 286, n. 1.

9. In this important paragraph on the “Belt of the Earth” an attempt is made to link up the Central Indian hills with the highest ranges forming the north-eastern border of India; these again are linked up with the mountains north and south of the Oxus and finally with the Elburz. See the map “Orographical features” in Imp Gazetteer of India, vol. xxvi, plate 4, and S. G. Burrard and H. H. Hayden, A Sketch of the Geography and Geology of the Himalaya Mountains and Tibet, revised edition, Delhi, 1933.

The Central Indian range is represented as starting from the western coast of India, stretching eastwards and then splitting into two so that its outer ramification (9 a) comprises the Himalaya, Karakorum, Pamir, and the ranges north of the Oxus, while its inner ramification (9 b) comprises the part of the Himalaya immediately north of Kashmir which is then connected with the Hindukush, &c.

The paragraph on the Central Indian hills must be examined in the light of the description of the Lesser Mihrān (§ 6, 16.) which in its lower course is said to flow through the limits of Kūlī. This Kūlī of Kanbāya must be clearly distinguished from the Kūlī estuary of the Indus (§ 6, 13.). It is difficult to decide whether the starting-point of the hills is taken south or north of the Narbadā, but the presumption is for the south, as the hills descend here much nearer to the coast and possess a peak of 5,261 ft. (Saler, south of the Tapti) which is the prominent landmark of the whole of Central
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India. Samür, or Şawur (indistinctly written), can hardly have anything to do with the coastal Şamür mentioned in § 10, 14. Geographically it would be tempting to identify our Şamür ($s = ?$) with Chandor (Chandor hills west of Ajänta), 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 Hitäl (?). 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 Taptī 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.

9a. The “northward” line (in reality stretching eastwards) was then supposed to join the Himalaya and skirt Ṭīthāl and Nītāl, 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).

9a. are the ramifications of 9A, 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 Daryāscla and Chaghāniyān is that of Hisār, which forms the southern watershed of the Zarafshān in the basin of which both Samarqand and Bukhāra are situated.

9b. 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. 9A. The continuation of the Aravalli range is the watershed of the Ganges and the Indus, and consequently the dominions of the “continental Jāba” (cf. § 10, 45.)2 must be looked for in the basin of the Indus, and probably south of Kashmir. The further extension of 9B 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 9A.

2 Bordering on the possessions of *al-Jurz (§ 10, 46.), evidently identical with the king of Qinnauj.
watershed between the sources of the Indus and the Oxus and the Hindúkush. The latter is then linked up with the ranges of northern Persia, but the Elburz range is not continued beyond Gilán. The Q.s.k (*Qasak?) mountain belonging to 9B is not mentioned in any other known source. No particular precision is expected from its location in, or near the kingdom of Lhrz (Jurz, § 10, 46.), of which, according to § 10, 57., Kashmir was a dependency. This mountain *grosso modo stands for the watershed between the sources of the Indus and the Oxus (or more particularly the Khurnáb, see note to § 6, 14.). The name *Qasak is curious. Ptolemy, vi, 15, mentions a locality called ἶ Κασίαχώρα 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 Küh-i-yakh (i.e. Mountain of Ice)”, which looks like a Persian translation of the native term. The Turkish equivalent of this would be Muz-tagh, which is a common term in the region: Muz-tagh-ata, west of Yarkand, Muz-tagh, south of Khotan, to say nothing of the Muz-art, 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 Sän-va-Chāryak (now Sangchārak), lying on the Ābi-Safid 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 (Isfizār) lies north of it]; he further connects it with the mountains of southern Khorāsān and follows them up to the region of Nishāpūr 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 Mashhad and Nishāpūr.] See Map viii.

9B b. Here our author describes the central part of the knot of the Hindūkush and Kōh-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 Ghaznī) 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 Sän-va-Chāryak. On the localities mentioned see notes to § 23, 53. &c. In the west the Band-i Turkistān is linked with the outer

---

1 In reality the Hindūkush continues the Kara-korum range, which according to our author belongs to 9A and not 9B.
2 The language to which the name [as well as -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, 1. Teil, 1930, p. 31. For the second element of the name cf. also the Greek forms Καύκαος, Καύκαος.
3 In this description mtyän does not seem to mean that the range separates the points mentioned but simply that it stretches along them. Cf. p. 63, line 37.
(northern) range of Khoräsän separating the latter from the Atak ("the skirt of the mountains", i.e. the Transcaspian province, now Turkmenistan). The author skips the valley of the upper Atrak [which he confuses with the Gurgän, § 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 Gurgän river and which was known under the name of Dinär-zäri. Ist., 217, gives the following itinerary from Jurjän to Khoräsän: from Jurjän to Dinär-zäri one marhala; thence to Amlütlû (> Armüt-‘Ali?) ditto; thence to Ajugh (?) ditto; thence to Sibdäst ditto; thence to Isfarä’in ditto.1 In the Tārīkh-i Bayhaqi (Morley), p. 255, Dinär-zäri is described as a gorge (sarp-darra) on the way from Nishäpür to Gurgän; Zahir al-din, Tārīkh-i Ṭabaristān (ed. Dorn), p. 19, describes Dinär-chäri as the eastern frontier of Ṭabaristān. Nowadays the gorge is called Dahana-yi Gurgän. The "mountain on the other side of the valley" is that stretching along the left bank of the Gurgän river and separating Gurgän (in the north) from Isfaräyân (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 Simnän, 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 Mintaqat al-Ard in the sense in which our author uses it.2 But a similar conception is found in I.H. who, pp. 109–11, gives an account of the mountain stretching along “the spine of the earth” (jabal ‘alā zahr al-ard) 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 Kharlukh land, until it penetrates into Farghāna which is within the Islamic limits. The ridge (sadr) of the mountain stretches over Farghāna towards the mountain of Buttam situated south of Ushrūsana. . . . Then it directs itself towards Samarqand skirting it also on the south, goes towards . . . Kishsh and Nasaf and the region of Zamm. Then it crosses the Jayhūn and . . . goes westwards to Jūzjān . . . and over Tālaqān to Marw ar-rūd and Tūs . . . leaving Nisābūr to the east [cf. supra 9B a]. Then it stretches to Rayy . . . while the mountains of Jurjān, Ṭabaristān, Gilān and Daylam branch off from it. Then it joins the

1 Napier, The northern frontier of Khorāsān, GY, 1876, shows on his map "Dasht-i Armūt-Alī" between the northern source of the Gurgān and the pass of Simalghān. 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".
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mountains of Ādharbāyjān.” It stretches on the right of the road from Rayy to Ḥulwān, then turns north towards Takrīt and Āmid sending off its branches into Armenia and towards the Caucasus (*al-Qabq*). Then it continues towards Marʿāsh 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 Ḥ.'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 Küfij mountains, according to our author, occupied an extensive area between Jiruft and the sea, cf. Ist., 164. They correspond *grosso modo* to the ranges which separate the closed basin of Jaz-Moriyān from the sea, such as Kūh-i Bashākīrt (6,800 feet), Kuhrān (7,095 feet), &c. On the Küfij cf. § 28, 7. The Bārijān (Ist., 167, Bāriz) separates Jiruft from Bam. The highlands of Abū Ghānim, according to Ist., 164, lay north of the Küfij, and according to our § 28, 7. they must be the mountains to the south of Khānū (Kūh-i Dasht-gird?). The silver mountain west of Jiruft towards Khabr is probably the Sīyāh Kūh. See 1:2,000,000 Map of Persia.

11. South-east of the Niriz 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 Fāsā from Dārāb the starting-point of a range which, after a sweep to the east towards Kirmān, turns in the opposite direction of south-east to north-west. This range is then brought into connexion with that forming the western border of Isfahān, with that of Northern Luristān, with the Alvand and further with the ranges of Persian Kurdistan 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 Ṭās, *Unās, Tās, &c.*, is not certain, cf. Ist., 102 d. Abū Dulaf’s Karaj lay on the road from Isfahān to Hamadān near the present-day Sultanābād, cf. § 31, 5. The Sahand mountain (between Marāgha and Tabrīz) is evidently considered as the northern end of the range.

The author’s idea was to describe the inner chain of the western mountains of Persia, as opposed to the outer range stretching between the Persian Gulf and the Ararat. The idea is not inaccurate, but some misunderstandings in details were natural. Even Ist., 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-Gīlū (*Gēlōya*) mountains are usually reckoned to Fārs. The present day Kūh-Gīlū is reduced to the territory between Bāsht and Behbehān, cf. Minorsky, *Luristān*, in EI.
12. The mountain stretching between the Kimäk (cf. § 18) and Khirkhz (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. ndäv.r mountain must be sought. Barthold reads this name Kändir (?) and Marquart Komanen, 92, 205: Kändör (?) and Kündävar (with a reference to Persian kündävar “army-leader, hero”). I now feel inclined to identify K. ndäv.r with the mountain described by Bırünü, Chronology, ed. Sachau, 264 (transl. 255): “similar to this little lake (i.e. Sabzartud, v.s. § 3, 27.) is a sweet-water well in the district of the Kimäk in a mountain called كور, 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 Mnkwor as *min köl “thousand lakes” is inadequate from the point of view of Bırünü's description. One can assume that in Gardizî K. ndäv.r the alif is only a tribute to the Persian popular etymology *kundävar [most suspect with regard to such a remote Turkish territory as ours]. Then كندور improved into كندور. But even supposing that the two names are identical it is not easy to decide which form must be given preference. For Mnkwor we have the parallel of a Qipchaq clan مکور اغلا quoted in al-Warrâq (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'udi-bulâk in EI. The form K. ndwar (*k. ndür) 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 Kängir mentioned in the note to § 18.

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

13. The Savalän, 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, Bärrimma, in EI. The name Bärrimma was applied to
the present-day Ḥamrīn where the Tigris cuts the latter south of the estuary of the Lesser Zāb and north of Takrit. The Ḥamrīn is a long range of reddish hills following on the west the border range of the Persian plateau. Ist., 75, vaguely says that “in the east” it stretches to the limits of Kirmān; and that “it is (also) the mountain of Māsadabān”. 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 11.). 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 Bōhtān, north of the Tigris and north-east of Jazīra-ibn-‘Omar. On its association with Noah’s ἀποβατήριον see Streck, Djūdī, 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 Ἶαλας. See Minorsky, Mārdīn, in EI.

17. Tīhāma is the low coastal region along the Red Sea overlooked by a long range of mountains. Ghazwān is the mountain on which Ṭā‘if is situated, Ist., 19. The Shibām mountain is situated at 2 days distance towards the south-west of Ṣan‘ā, see Grohmann, Shibām I, in EI. The mountain “at the end of Tīhāma” is Mudhaikhira, see Ist., 24, where both its length of 20 fars. and its conquest by Muhammad 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 Tīhāma. 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 Dagestan. 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 Dagestan mountains, grosso modo from Darband to the Darial 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 Lukâm cf. Ist., 14 and 56, who also mentions the tribes Bahrā and Tanūkh. [*al-Ukkām < Syr. ukkāmā “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 Dagestan 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 Sārīr 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 Qāzbez (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, Aṣḥāb al-Kahf in EI. The Seven Sleepers’ cave, according to I. Kh., 106, lay in Kharama, a district situated between Amorion and Nicaea, at 4 days’ distance from the Cappadocian fortress 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. Yarpuz) situated at the foot of the Kūrŏd-daghī. Cf. Yaqqūt, i, 91: “Absus, ruined town near Ablastayn [now Albistān]; from it were the Companions of the Cave”, Khuwārizmī, 128, calls Ephesus ياقووت and Būrūnī in his Canon.

21. If by the town (province?) of Afrakhūn (cf. § 74, 10.) Paphlagonia is meant, the mountains in question are the Pontic Alps.

22. On the Georgian mountain see above 18 B, but the details on the mountain possessing mines are too vague.

24. بسط squint looks like a mis-spelling of بسط on which see Buwait in EI. I am obliged to Mr. R. Guest for this suggestion and for a quotation from Ibn Duqmāq, iii, p. 3, who remarks that Abwaīt is situated في رأس الجبل الذي يسمى الطور, i.e. “on the top of the bank (of the Nile) whence
the road goes up to Fayyüm". [The difficulty is that in our author's
two principal sources (I.Kh. and Ist.) Abwoayt (or Buwayt) is not found. I
now see that Prince Youssouf Kamal (v.i., § 39), p. 665, restores as
*أبوذويَت. The translation must accordingly run: "(this mountain) also starts
straight from the Nubian frontier and follows a northerly direction1 down to
the Fayyüm region, until it reaches the Rif" (i.e. the fertile region near the
delta). This seems to be a satisfactory reading. On the name أباذويَت see
note to § 6, 49.]
25. If the author means here the Seleucia (now Sefleke) situated north­
west of the Gulf (khalîj) 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 Ist., 42, the Tagus comes, cf. § 41, 4. Then the waters­
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
Turjàla (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 (Maurûn) would be a suitable
point to mark the northern limit of the range starting from Coria.
28. The Balkans, cf. § 42, 17. The name Balqan belonging originally to
the mountain east of the Krasnovodsk bay, on the eastern shore of the
Caspian, was probably transferred to the Balkans by the Turcomans who
remembered the toponymy of their ancient country; see Barthold, Balkhân,
in El. Cf. note to § 3, 5.
29. The reading of جبل الفَلْم "Moon Mountain" corre­
sponds exactly to Ptolemy's τὸ τῆς Σελήνης δροσ ἀρ' ο ὑποδέχονται τὰς χιόνας
ai τοῦ Νέου λίμνατι. However the reading of الفَلْم in the later geographical
literature of the Arabs has given rise to some controversy, see Ferrand,
Relations, p. 330. Ibn Sa'id (circa A.D. 1208–86) warns explicitly against
the pronunciation with a fatha (*qamar) to which he prefers a form with u
(*Qumr, Qumar?), but this evidently with the intention of justifying his
very interesting theory about the inner Asiatic people فَلْم (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.e.s. § 5) is very important as facilitating a more exact
location of numerous places.
1 Or: "runs straight in a northerly direction".
1. The river of Khumdän (§ 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 (Mänisä) cf. § 5, 3. The Huang-ho comes from the region of lakes on the north-eastern border of Tibet. The swamp on its middle course is imaginary, unless the author thinks that through the Lob-nor the Huang-ho is connected with the Tarim, 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 Khuwârizmî. The latter, p. 125, mentions the river rising from the mountain of the river and then flowing through a swamp (batîba), after which the river crosses the City of China (madînat al-Šîn) and disembogues into the sea. Our author substitutes for this vague “City of China” (= Σήρα μητρόπολις, Ptolemy, vi, 16, 8) the name of Khumdän, and for the indication of longitude and latitude his simplified reckoning by day-marches.

2. The name Kísau (KÆn), if emended into Kesur 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 *Ghiyân (kiang “The River”, as the Yangtze is usually called) is confirmed by Gardîzi’s Qiîyân. 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 *Wajâk (cf. § 11, 12.), Bariha (cf. § 11, 13.) and Küskän. Of these at least presents some resemblance to the col of Brinjak (برنجک) in the mountains south of Khotan (evidently understood under the Mänisä, v.s. note to § 5, 3d.).

The names of the three tributaries of the Khotan (Wajâk) river look Iranian with their terminations in -and; the element -ghûn stands apparently for “river” but in what language? The obvious course is to identify the three rivers with the principal streams joining the Khotan river, i.e. respectively with the rivers of Yärkand, Kâshghar, and Aq-su. One cannot, however, ignore the difficulties raised by the eventual identification of Khûland-ghûn (v.i. 5. and 7. and §§ 12, 5. and 13.) with Aq-su. The mountain of Ighräj-art (“the col of Ighräj”), located by our author “in the neighbourhood” of Khûland-ghûn, as explained in the note to § 5, 7., looks more like the higher eastern Muz-art, than the lower western Bedel

1 Khuwârizmî adds that another river rising also from the “mountain of the river” falls into the same swamp.

2 perhaps = Οἰξάρης, Ptolemy, vi, 16.

3 A remote parallel of the name Köskän could be that of the Kashkül glacier situated above the locality of Nisa [south of Khotan].

4 The names of the rivers Gunt [*Ghund], in the Pamir, and Tasghun (†), south of Kâshghar, may be recalled here as parallels. [Or ghûn = 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, \textit{v.i.}, p. 296. On the other hand, the town of Ark (الركة) belonging to the Toghuqghuz (§ 12, 5.) is said to be situated near Khūland-ghūn. In the itinerary quoted by Gardizī, 91, جاز (probably corresponding to our جاز) is placed to the east of Kuchā, see note to § 12, 5. These considerations suggest for Khūland-ghūn an easterly position in the neighbourhood of the Muz-art pass, though here again we are confronted by some difficulty for neither the Kuchā nor any other river in this region now reaches the Tarim, whatever may have been the case in the past.

If the Khūland-ghūn is to be placed so far east it is possible that the other two rivers should also be moved to the western T‘ien-shan and this would entail further uncertainty about the localities of Gh.zā and K.İbānk between which the affluents join the *Wajākh river. Under § 11, 21., Gh.zā is placed “at the very beginning of Tibet from the Toghuqghuz side, near the river of Kuchā”, but we shall presently see that the use of this last term involves us in fresh complications.

The river Tarim is further represented as continued beyond the Lob-nor (\textit{v.s.} 1.) by the Huang-ho. The Chinese themselves were responsible for this belief: “This river [\textit{Sita} = Tarim] on the east enters the sea. Passing through the Salt Lake [\textit{Yen-tse} = Lob-nor] it flows underground and emerging at the Tshih-shi mountains [west of Lan-chou?] it is the origin of our [Yellow] river”, Hsün-Tsang, Life (Beal), p. 199, less clearly in Hsün-Tsang, Life (Julien), p. 273, cf. Richthofen, China, i, 318 and Chavannes, in \textit{T‘oung-Pao}, 1907, p. 168, note 4. Consequently the sentence: “thence [from Lob-nor] it flows (down) to the limits of Kuchchā, then passes through the province of Kür.sh and the province of F.rājkī 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 Kuchchā (sic)” where the Tarim received the name of “Kuchchā river” lie downstream (\textit{i.e.}, E. or S.) of the swamp of *Sha-chou\footnote{\text{Sha-chou} is certainly *Sha-chou [§ 9, 15.]. \text{Sanju}, near Khotan, is out of the question.} by which only the Lob-nor can be meant. In principle it would be embarrassing to surname any reach of the Tarim after the well-known town of Kuchā (§ 9, 10.) which lies on a river of its own\footnote{It is true that the Huang-ho [\textit{v.s.} 1.] is called “river of Khumdān” though this is geographically inexact.} rising from the western T‘ien-shan and losing itself (at present!) short of the Tarim. Thus we are led to admit that by Kuchchā كُكُحْصُر our author may mean a different locality, namely Kuchān كُجُحْصُر (see note to § 9, 5.)\footnote{In this case the 	extit{tashdīd} over the first form may be a simple mis-spelling of the final ن of the second form.} which most likely is to be sought on the real course of the Huang-ho, near Lan-chou-fu. If so “the river of Kuchchā” must refer not to the Tarim, but to the Huang-ho (cf. § 7, 2.),\footnote{Under § 7, 3. the Lob-Nor is called طَبْحَةَ رَوْدَ كُجُحْصُر but it remains a moot point whether the “swamp” is called after the} and Ghazā is then to be placed accordingly.

The curious passage on the ‘\textit{akka}-birds nesting on the banks of the Tarim can hardly be connected with what Idrīsī, i, 502, says about the lake
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.rsăng 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 Mânisâ, 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 Ilä (i.e. Ilî) 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. Kâshgharî, i, 85, writes Ilä (Ilä) and calls the river “Jayhûn of the Turkish country”. On the Ighräj-art (central T’ien-shan) see § 5, 7. and § 6, 3.

6.-12. The system of the Amû-daryâ (Oxus). See Barthold, Turkestan, ch. i; Le Strange, The Lands, ch. xxxi; Barthold, Irrigation, pp. 71–102; Barthold, Amû-daryâ, in EI.; Tajzikstân (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 Jayhûn and Khârnâb (خساپ) of which the former (flowing immediately north of Bolor) is certainly the Vakhân river (Panj), and the latter must be the Murghâb, which rises to the east of the Vakhân and after a north-eastern sweep crosses the Pamir and joins the Panj near Bârtang. Our writer is right in attaching more importance to the Khârnâb–Murghâb, though for some time this river has been dammed up at Sarez (following the 1911 earthquake). Išt., 296, confuses the two headwaters: “the principal stream (‘amûd) of the Jayhûn is called Jaryâb (ئریاب) and rises in Vakhkhân”. See Map iv.

8. The Kuläb river (Kchî Surkhâb) is composed of two branches: Yakh-su (<Iranian Akhshü, cf. Išt., 296, Akhshuâ) and Qîzîl-su. The village Pârkhâr still exists. Munk = Baljuvân, on the Qîzîl-su, Hulbuk = Hulbag, south of Kuläb, on the Yakh-su, cf. Barthold, Turkestan, 68–9. Our author considers this river quite correctly as forming one drainage area, while Išt., 296, presents Fârghar as a separate stream. On the contrary, our author forgets the following river Andijârâgh, on which see § 26, 3. I.R., 93, speaking of the course of the Vakhshâb and the Vakhkh-âb (=the Vakhân river, Oxus) mentions south of the latter a rustâq of the Upper Tukhârstân called پرگار. De Goeje restored this name as پرگار i.e. Pârghar and this form led astray Marquart, EränSahr, 234, and Barthold, see § 23, 69. Our text very rightly places Pârghar to the north of the river, therefore the name found in I.R. must most probably be restored as پرگار, cf. Išt., 275, 339. Arhan river forming it, or the river coming out of it. In a route to Tibet, of which the starting-point is Kâshghar, Gardizi, 88a, mentions “the stream of Kujâ (کجی) which flows towards Kujâ”. The distinction between this stream and a river (رون) 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, Ist., 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 *Ωξος < Vakhsh has become the name for the whole of the Amū-daryā.

10. This river undoubtedly is the Kāfīr-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 Kāfīr-Nihān 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 Kāfīr-Nihān, see note to § 26, 5.

11. On Chaghāniyān see § 25, 25. The river is now called Surkhān, Barthold, Turkestan, 72-5. Under § 25, 32., كاید(*Regar?) is placed on the Nihām river, which is also mentioned in I.R., 93 (but wrongly considered as a source of the Kāfīr-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 Kasāvān (v.i. note to § 25, 32.) must have belonged to the Kāfīr-Nihān basin.

12. The form درغام confirms that the Arabic spelling درغام in I.Kh., 33, and I.R., 93, is based only on a popular etymology (“the Lion river”). Marquart, Brânsahr, 230, has shown its identity with Ptolemy’s Δάργος. Valvālij (§ 23, 73.) has been long identified with Qunduz, which lies between the rivers Dōshī (Surkh-āb), coming from the south-west, and the Talaqān river, coming from the south-east. The latter, according to I.R., 93 and Maq., 303, was composed of two sources حَلَب and رَاب. The names (several variants) may mean “Lower river” (*jīl-āb, cf. Persian zir “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 Dōshī 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 كَوَكَچا with the Kokcha is wrong.

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


13. The Kābul river is considered as the principal course of the Indus. It is represented as being formed by the waters of Lamghān and Dunpūr (§ 10, 154-55); on Nihār < *Nagarahār = Jalālābād see § 10, 50.

*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 Kāfīr-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 كَرِيَة 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 Mas‘ūdi, *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 Lamghān 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, 131–2, 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 Qandāhār, which this river skirts, is certainly that mentioned under § 10, 17., i.e. Ghandhar in the Bay of Cambay. The name of Kūlī is very misleading for its form is identical with the كَرِيَة just mentioned as the estuary of the Indus (13.). Under § 5, 9., our author distinctively refers to the district of Kūlī in Kanbāya, which is also mentioned by I.Kh., 62, as lying 18 farsaks north of Sindān (§ 10, 14.), evidently at the entrance to the Bay of Cambay. It may correspond to Kūlinar of the Mohīd 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, 24.

17–22.: the system of the Sīr-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 Birūni’s *Canon*, under *Sutkand*. Marquart in his *Chronologie d. alttürk. Inschr.*, 1898, 5–6, first explained Ιαξάρτης as yaxša-arta “wahre edle Perle” (cf. Barthold’s criticism in *Irrigation*, 130), then interpreted it as Soghdian *Yaxšart* < *Rxša-arta* (?), *Skizzen z. hist.*

¹ مَنْهِرُ الْأَنْد هُوَ شَعْبٌ نَهْر َجَيْحَنَ. More detail in the confused additional paragraph *ibid.*, 178.
The Rivers

Topographie vom Kaukasus, Vienna, 1928, p. 16, and finally, Catalogue, 35, considered as the old form of the name *Oρξάρης, "i.e. Old Iranian *Rxa-rta, 'the true Araxes'! The attested Iranian form remains Khashart.

17. This is the main stream of the Sir-Darya (Jaxartes) coming from the south. Üzgand is situated at the easternmost end of Farghana. On its two rivers, T.bägh.r. and Barskhän, see § 25, 58. and § 15, 11. Bägh must be improved into *Bäghü, in view of Kâshghari, iii, 27, who says that "Yabâghü-suvî is the river flowing from the Kâshghar mountains past Üzjand in Farghana". Yabâghü was a Turkish tribe which according to Kâshghari, i, 29, lived much more to the east but yabâghü 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 (= Mânisâ, v.s. note to § 5, 3e), see Barthold, o.c., 157. On Khatlá (Khaylâm?) see § 25, 59.

22. Parak, now Chirkik, Barthold, o.c., 169, flows into the Sir-Darya, south of Tashkent. The Khallukh mountains mentioned here must be the hills separating the Narin from the basin of the Chirkik, i.e. Chatkal (Arab. ǧidghil) mountains. Banäkat lay near the point where the more southern Áhangarâän (Angren) joins the Sir-Darya, ibid., 169. The wall of Qaläš on the northern side of the Chirkik was built for protection against the Turks, ibid., 172, and Barthold, Ibn Sa'id, 238.

23. The basin of the Sughd River (now Zarafshan), Barthold, Turkestan, 82., Barthold, Irrigation, 103–25. The Middle Buttamän is the Zarafshan range stretching between, and parallel to those of Turkestan and Hisâr. The lake Daryâzha is now called Iskandar-kul and the äväza of Paykand is the Qara-kul, cf. § 3, 34.

24. The river of Balkh was called Dah-äs ("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 Kâmar and Du-äb-i shâh, evidently still in the basin of the Surkh-äb (western headwater of the Qunduz river, v.s. 12.). On Ribât-i karvän see § 23, 63.

25. Several branches of the Hilmand rise south of the Küh-i Bâbâ in the immediate neighbourhood of the sources of the Harât river. As Ist., 265, places the latter "in the neighbourhood of Ribât-i Karvân" (§ 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 Güzgän possessions. On Durghush, Til, and Bust see § 24, 12.

26. On the upper course of the Marvarüd (Murghâb) 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 Dïvrüdh.


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

31. According to *Išt.*, 119, Shādhagan rose in Bāzranj (province of Arrajān) and flowed to the sea through Tambūk-i Mūristān (province of Sābūr) and Dasht-i Dastagān (the town of which was *Shān*), § 29, 9.). Shādhagan is not mentioned in the *Fārs-nāma*. As suggested by Le Strange, *o.e.*, 274, the river meant here may be one of the streams emptying themselves into the sea south of Ganāwa. In point of fact recent English maps show a considerable river Rūd-i Shūr of which the estuary is located 12 miles north of that of the Rūd-i Hilla (= Shāpūr), and south of Bandar-Rig. The course of this little known river can be traced for some 60 miles northwards up to the parallel 30°. This must be the Shādhakān.

32. 35. 36. (and 30.). In the mountainous region connecting Fārs with Khūzistān there are only two important basins, vīz. the rivers of Hindiyān (in the south) and Arrajān (in the north). Both rivers flow parallel to one another, and *grosso modo* from east (Fārs) to west (Khūzistān). Until very lately their lower course in the plain, on the way to the Persian Gulf, was very insufficiently known, and even now the region of their sources remains unsurveyed.

The confusion in our sources with regard to these two rivers will be best presented in the following comparative tables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>Išt.</th>
<th><em>Fārs-nāma</em></th>
<th><em>H.-‘Ā.</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>name</td>
<td>Shirīn</td>
<td>Shirīn</td>
<td>Shirīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sources</td>
<td>Mt. Dinār</td>
<td>limits of Bāzrang</td>
<td>Mt. Dhanbād,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Bāzranj</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>in Bāzranj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affluents</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Khwābdān river</td>
<td>between Vāyagan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>course</td>
<td><em>F</em>r.z.k.,</td>
<td><em>Gunbadh,</em></td>
<td>and Lārandān,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jalādāgān</td>
<td><em>Mallaghan</em></td>
<td>Arrajān, <em>Rishahr</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>estuary in the sea</td>
<td>towards Jannāba</td>
<td>between <em>Sinīz</em> and Janābā</td>
<td>between <em>Sīnīz</em> and Ganāfa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following questions arise with regard to this table:

a. The estuary of the “Shirin” river lies now south of Hindiyân; 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 Siniz (§ 29, 13.), and still less near Ganäva (§ 29, 10.), which are shut off from it by mountains. Here all the three sources are in error.

b. The river of Arrajän (§ 29, 16.), which is now called Mârân, flows first to the north until it joins the river of Râm-Hurmûz; then their joint stream, called Jarrahî, flows south-westwards to Fallâhiya and, through the Dauraq canal, comes into connexion with the Khor-Müsä creek (which is the terminus of the new Trans-Persian railway). It is quite possible that, formerly, at least a branch of the Jarrahî joined the Kûrûn,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 Tâb between Siniz and Ganäva, in which case it would have flowed across the basin of the Hindiyân river.2 In our text, Mâhirûbân, lying west of Siniz, comes nearer to the point, though there are good reasons in favour of the location of Mâhirûbân in the region of Hindiyân, i.e. on the Shirin 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 Shirin3 with the middle course of the Tâb; therefore his Sirîn rising near Mt. Dhanbâdh4 flows past Arrajän and Rishahr!5

1 And this might account for the mention of Tustar in Išt’s original text, for the Kûrûn was rightly called “Tustar [= Shûstar] river”, cf. § 6, 37. Then Išt.’s text should be read تَمْ يَقْعُ فِي الْبُحْرَ عند حُدّ يُسَرُّ وَفَتْرَ “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 Sirin flowed in a north to south direction.

3 Vâyagân and Lârandân named near its course are mentioned under § 29, 17. together with B.rz.K., which undoubtedly is identical with Išt.’s F.rz.K., see the table p. 212.

4 Išt. دَيْنَارَ [var. دُسَان]. The mountain meant is surely the lofty Küh-i Dinâ [17,000–18,000 ft.] though on the latter’s western side rise in fact only the headwaters of the Khirdân, the south-eastermost affluent of the Kûrûn, see C. Haussknecht, Routen im Orient, iv [map edited by Kiepert] and the English • 2,000,000 map.

5 [Cf. infra, p. 378.]
34. Farvāb, now Pulvār, cf. Le Strange, *o.e.*, 276.

36. This Sardan river is called Masin in *Iṣt.*, 119, and *Fārs-nāma*, 152. This headwater of the Tab rose, according to *Iṣt.*, from the limits of Isfahān and came out (*yazhur*) in Sardan. The *Fārs-nāma* more precisely locates its sources in the mountains of Sumayram and Simtakht (*Sisakht 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. The enumeration of localities is probably borrowed from *Iṣt.*, 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 'Abbādān 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, *Obsd.*, 127, and the canal, now called Bahamshīr (still navigable), was probably the natural outlet of the river into the Persian Gulf. Cf. *The Persian Gulf Pilot*, Admiralty, 1864, p. 225.

38. Masruqān = Āb-i Gargar, *i.e.* the left (eastern) of the two branches into which the Kārūn is divided by the famous weir at Shūstar.

39. Only the latest English maps present a clear picture of the hydrographic conditions south of the lower course of the Kārūn. The oasis of Fallāhiya (ancient Dauraq) is watered both by a canal coming from the 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 Dauraq canal. Our author evidently considers the whole of these streams as a branch of the Kārūn, spreading its waters down to Rām-Hurmuz. But in reality the chief source of irrigation of Fallāhiya is the Jarrāḥī, of which one branch comes from Rām-Hurmuz and the other from Arrajān-Behebehān (note to 35.). Schwarz, *Iran*, 373, identifies Dauraq with Fallāhiya. In a westerly direction *Iṣt.*, 95, gives the distances: Dauraq–Khān–Mardawāih (var. *μαρℏαλα*; &c.)–1 marhala; thence to Bāsiyān (where the river splits off into two)–1 marhala; thence to Ḥisn-Mahdi–2 marhalas; thence to Bayān (on the Tigris)–1 marhala. [Consequently Bāsiyān cannot be Buziya, situated 6–7 Km. east of Fallāhiya.]

40. The river of Susa (Daniel, vii, 2: *Ulaī*) is now called Shāʿūr (< Shāvūr). If we are to interpret B.dhūshāvur as Gundē-Shāpūr the situation is geographically inexact. Perhaps the text could be improved into: *miyān-i Shūsh va-Bidh va-Shāvur (*?). *Iṣt.*, 89, mentions a place Bidhān belonging to Shūsh, and the existence of a Shāvur could be postulated from the present name of the river.
41.-4.: The rivers supposed to flow into the Caspian. See Map vii.

41. The river corresponded to the which Gardizi, 83, mentions on the road from the Jaxartes to the Kimâks. Marquart, Komanen, 92, 206, noted the likeness of this name to that of the Ishim (*اصم), a left affluent of the Irtish; cf. note to § 5, 12. Though the mountain forming the frontier "between the Kimâk and Khirkhîz" (cf. § 5, 12.) might be taken for the Altai, &c., whence the real Irtish comes, the fact that, both according to our author and Gardizi, the river flows westwards to the Caspian points clearly to some confusion. The Kimâk (note to § 18) lived probably east of the Irtish but extended also in a north-westerly direction towards the Urals. If our author thought that the road to the Kimâk ran from the lower course of the Sir-daryâ northwards, we could possibly identify the Asus with the Ilâk, which is a southern tributary of the Yayiq but might have been taken for an independent river flowing to the Caspian.

42. The spelling Artush (or Ärtüsh) is corroborated by the popular etymology found in Gardizi, 82, "ارتش, i.e. come down", referring to the Turkish phrase ār tūş "man, come down (from the horse)!", Barthold, Report, 106. The mountain from which the real Irtish rises is the region of the Altai evidently referred to in § 5, 12, where a mountain is described stretching between the Kimâk and Khirkhîz. In the present paragraph, however, the mountain where the sources of the three rivers (41.-3.) lie is meant to be the Urals (most probably referred to in § 5, 19.). As the text stands, our author's Artush represents the Yayiq (Const. Porph. Περία, in Russian "Ural river") which rises from the south of the Ural mountains, flows to the west (down to Uralsk) and then to the south (down to Guryev) and empties itself into the Caspian, east of the Volga estuary. Our author has wrongly taken it for a tributary of the Volga. Ibn Faḍlân, who in 309-10/922 travelled the whole distance between Khwârazm and Bulghâr, ought to be our principal authority on the region to the south-west of the Urals. The complete version of his Risâla described by A. Z. Validi, (Meshestkaya rukopis Ibnul-Faqiha, in Bull. de l'Acad. des Sciences de Russie, 1924, pp. 237-48) mentions a number of large rivers. Beyond جام [A.Z. Validi: Emba, cf. p. 312, note 2], in the direction of the Pecheneg territory, were found جاحش, and جاحش. Of these, جاغش, which has some (?) resemblance to Gardizi's and to our [though Validi takes for the Yayiq the river mentioned beyond the Pecheneg territory]. Nearer to the tradition represented by our author and Gardizi is what Mas'ūdî, Murūj, i, 213, says, rather vaguely, about "the Black and the White Irtish (Artush? spelt on which lies the kingdom of the [restored by Marquart, Komanen, 100, as *Kimâk yabghîy], a branch of

---

1 The Ilâk rises in the Mugojar hills separating it from the sources of the Sir-daryâ northwards, see notes to § 5, 12. and 18.
2 Note that the waters of 41. and 42. are called "black" in our text.
3 [See however note to § 18, 3. where a tribe called *Yughur (still doubtful!)}
Turks beyond the Balkh river [i.e. Oxus]. On these two rivers live the Turkish Ghuzz.” Cf. also Mas’ūdi, Tanbih, 62, where the estuaries of the two rivers are said to lie at 10 days’ distance from one another. Marquart, o.c., 102, has already detected the connexion of these rivers with Gardïzï’s (p. 83) and thought that what Mas’ūdi had in view were the rivers Yayiq and Emba (v.s. note to 41.). Our author clearly uses the same source as Gardïzï 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 Išt., 222, also says: the Ithil, “as I have heard, rises from the neighbourhood of the Khirkhz and flows between the Kimāk and Ghuzz forming the boundary between them; then it takes a western direction behind (‘alā zahr) Bālghār, then turns eastwards until it has passed the Rūs, then it flows past Bulghār, then past Burtās until it falls into the sea”. In spite of the erroneous start it is clear that the name Ithil (*Ātil < Etīl) 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 تنیس (Tanais?), the river of the Şaqāliba” 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 Khīfjākh (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 Ŵānīs come from the Māwtīsh. Contrary to our author for whom the Rūs river is an affluent of the Volga, I.R. treats the Ŵānīs as a separate river flowing to the Black sea (Bontos). Even the fact that the three Rūs “towns” (§ 44)3 were “skirted” by the Rūs river seems to suit the upper

is mentioned in the neighbourhood of the Aral sea. This brings us nearer to the Caspian (Khazar) sea into which the two rivers flow according to Mas’ūdi, Tanbih, 62.]  
1 Cf. also Mas’ūdi quoted under § 3, 8. The idea of this junction is already found in Ptolemy, v, 5, though according to Marquart Streifzüge, 153, the right reading is ἐπιστροφή (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 Saqāliba" stands for the "river of the Rūs" (for I.Kh. does not discriminate between the Rūs and Slavs, cf. note to § 43) and knowing that Idrīsī (see Map ii) understands the Don under nahr al-Rūsiya, we are obliged to interpret our text in the light of its internal evidence and adhere to Toumansky's conclusion.

45. With the Rūtā we are right in the centre of the confusion. The name ḥ in Arabic script looks very much like Gardīzī's ḥ, which most probably refers to the Danube (☆), 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 Rūtā is one of the rivers to the south-west of the Volga's great bend. The Turkish Pechenegs (§ 20) are said to live north of the *Bulghār (§ 51) and *Burtās (§ 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 *Burtās, 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 Rūtā, and the northern boundary of the Turkish Pechenegs was the Rūthā (☆), it is clear that the river Rūtā, or Rūthā, divided the Rūs from the Pechenegs. To the south-west of the Volga and north of the Burtās only the Oka could be taken into consideration in this connexion. From the point of view of the script ḥ, or ḥ, greatly resemble * <+ Oka, and it is not excessive to imagine that the Oka was known to the informer originally responsible for the description of the Rūs territory [Iṣt.'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 Rūtā does not know what more to do with the Rūtā. To sum up, the river in question is an imaginary stream due perhaps to a confusion of two different names looking similar in Arabic script (* and *); 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 ẓ, 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 غن (Gh. mūn) forming the outflow of eight rivers, of which the more important is شروى (Sh.rwā). 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-Rûsiya*! It is interesting that Idrïsî’s *Sh.rwî* (according to K. Miller *Sh.rwî*) flows westwards similarly to our Rûtä. I think that the confused idea about the existence of a river between the Volga and Don is common both to our author and Idrîsî, but that the name *Rûtä* (†), which our author gives to it is due to some confusion with †, *i.e.* the Danube.

46. In this passage the usual (western) course of the Lower Tigris during the Middle Ages is described. Madhär 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, *Diâjlâ*, in *EI*; Marquart, *Südarmenien*, 232–452: an extremely detailed analysis of the descriptions of the Tigris by Kisrawî, Maq., Mas’ûdî, 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 (Sàmarrà). The Nahr Sàbus, Išt., 87, I.H., 168 (where the variant *Shâsh* is also found), seems to correspond to the 'Adaim, though the latter rises, not in Armenia but near Kirkûk, in Southern Kurdistân. By the Nahravân river the Diyâlâ (Sirvân) is meant, rising in Persian Kurdistân, cf. I.R., 90.

49. On the Euphrates see Le Strange, *o.c.*, 117, &c., R. Hartmann, *Furât*, in *EI*. Here the western headwater of the Euphrates seems to be regarded as the principal one. The name of the mountain *عَلِيْكَ* is evidently disfigured. I.R., 93, says that the Euphrates rises in the Rûm land from above the locality *أَبْرِيق*, Greek *Tephrikê* or *Aphrikê*, see *Diwrigi*, in *EI*, but Khuwârizmî, 139, calls the mountain whence the Euphrates comes *جَلِّ اَوَدَّاس* Cf. *Tabâri*, iii, 1434, where a Byzantine expedition is said to march مَنِ نَاحِية أَرِقَ قَرْنَة قُرْيَة.*


54. Grave misunderstanding: the *Sâfîd-rûdh* rises, not from the Lesser Ararat (*Hwayyârîth*) but from Persian Kurdistân. I.Kh., 175, and I.R., 89, rightly state that it comes *min bâbi Sîsar*, see Minorsky, *Senna* and *Sîsar*, in *EI*.

56. The author seems to think that the Kurr rises from the main Caucasus range, though he knows that it flows past Tiflis (*§ 36, 28.*). See a correct description of the upper Kurr in *Mas’ûdî*, *Murûj*, ii, 74. On Bardij 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 (*v.s.* 43 and note to *§ 3, 8.*). However, Idrïsî’s views cannot be taken as merely traditional and more likely he combines both the earlier sources and his own information, cf. p. 438.
BLACK SEA LANDS
according to Idrisi (A.D.1154)
[ad § 6, 45]
58. *Nahr al-kurûm*, "river of the vineyards". I.Kh., 108, among the towns of Buqallâr, names Anqara or Şamâluh (?). This river [which has nothing to do with the place "al-kurûm" (next station west of Budhandûn = Podandon = Bozanti)] is most probably the Halys (Qızıl-Irmâq) flowing east of Anqara to the Black Sea. [Şamâluh = Σημαλονος κάστρον.]

59. All depends on the name. It cannot be I.Kh.'s, 101, Santabaris, which Ramsay, *o.c.*, 445, places on a source of the Sangarios. If we restore it as *Kangrî*, 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 Kabul river, § 6, 13.]

60. If 61. is the Sangarios, this river (60.) must be either the Tembris (now Porsuq-su), left affluent of the Sangarios, or some river west of it (cf. Rhyndakos, I.Kh., 103, *Rundhâq*, though this latter flows into the lake Artynias). The solution depends on the phrase *ب شر بندانلي وبديند باکدار* पर शहर बन्दालिस बुंदानलिस, the first element of which can be Greek *βάνδα* “banner, district” (in Arabic usually *band*, plur. *bunûd*, I.Kh., 109, but the form *bandâ* could survive in *status constructus* and the sentence would mean “skirts the town of the district”). This last element [usual confusion of final *ς* with *ς*] could then stand for *Κότυαειον* (now Kütahye), a well-known fortress on the Tembris, I.Kh., 103. As regards *بندانلي*, it seems to have been copied from *Budhandûn* which is out of place on the Tembris. The most celebrated place on the latter was Dorylaion, in Arabic دارولیه, now Eski-Shehir, *cf.* the detailed account of it and its river in I.Kh., 103. As regards *κοτυαειον* it is most likely that our text refers to Dorylaion which in Arabic script has been confused with Badhandûn, better known to the Muslims as the place of death of the caliph Ma'mûn. In I.Kh., 109, *in fine*, the name of the Darovia stands with the preposition *bi- and so* بدرولیه could be more easily confused in script with *بندانلي*.

61. This river is Sangarios which exactly flows north of Amorion (*Amûriya* placed by I.Kh., 107, in Nâtulûs) and west of Anqara (placed by I.Kh., 108, in Buqallâr). I.Kh., 110, calls the river Sâghari and makes it flow into the Black Sea (*Bahr al-a'зам*?); while our author wrongly makes it empty itself into the lake of Nicaea. The mysterious *khâk* “earth”; it is a Persian translation of Arabic, *غرا* for *I.Kh.*, 102, precisely mentions an “Earthen Fort” and adds that it stands opposite Nicaea (وزنيعا غرا، الربراء). *Cf.* Marquart, *Streifzüge*, 214.

from Khuwârizmî, 106 (see also plate IV), or from the complete version of I.Kh.'s work, now lost. In the abridged version, I.Kh., 176, says only that the Nile forms two lakes beyond the Equator. Idrîsî's map, reproduced in Reinaud's Introduction, strictly follows the same tradition (10 rivers, 2 lakes, then again 6 rivers). As regards Sukar I.H., 103, mentions Askar between Fayyûm and Fustât; Yâqût, iii, 107, says: "Sukar . . . to the east of Upper Egypt (Sa'id); between it and Cairo (Miṣr) two days' distance."

63. The river is more likely the Blue Nile than the 'Atbara (Ptolemy, iv, 7, 'Aσταβόρας). Kâbîl is the title of the king of Nubia, see § 59. His capital lay most probably in the province of 'Alwa, near Khartûm (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 Tarnût.

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. Hâr.dâ, as suggested by Barthold in his Index, is Mârida (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 Shantarîn (Santarem) cf. § 41, 14.

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

§ 7. The Deserts and Sands

The terms biyâbân and rîg correspond respectively to Arabic sahrâ and ramî. The first term does not naturally mean a waterless and uninhabited land. As the text shows, biyâbân, as opposed to rîg, 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 "Kuchchâ river" must be the Huang-ho, cf. § 6, 3.

3. As the swamp formed by the "Kuchchâ river" (sic) is the Lob-nor, these sands must be those separating Turfan from Kan-su. The distance indicated is too short. Between Qumül and Sha-chou Gardîzî counts seven days. On the two towns see § 9, 20. and 21.

* On the sources of the Nile see in great detail Maqrîzî, 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.

Our author Real bearings

| Tibet           | E.  | S.  |
| Indian lands    | S.  | SW. |
| Transoxiana     | W.  | NW. |
| Khallukh        | N.  | N.  |

5. Here, evidently, the lowlands of the Carnatic are meant, which stretch along the east coast up to the Godavari beyond which the Eastern Ghats approach the coast.

6. This desert is Makrân.

7. Kargas-kūh "the Vulture mountain" is the name of a mountain near Kāshān, Le Strange, o.l., 208. It is unexpected to see the name applied to the whole of the Central Persian desert (Kavīr, Lūt) but Maq., 487, 490, also describes the Kargas-kūh as the highest point of the desert. On the bearings v.s. note to 4.

8. The Transcaucasian desert. On the bearings of the Caspian Sea and Volga, v.s. 4.

9. Jand and J.vāra (Khwāra?) are situated on the Jaxartes, § 26, 27. The situation of the steppe depends on the identification of the river beyond which lived the Kīmāk (cf. §§ 6, 42, and 18). [Qara-qum? Cf. p. 309.]

10. The description of Arabia is sufficiently exact. On the southern [read: south-western] border, the Red Sea (daryā-yi 'Arab) must be followed by the Barbari Gulf (§ 3, 3a.) instead of which the Ayla has been named, whereas in the following sentence the latter is rightly mentioned west of Arabia (cf. § 3, 3b.). The sands within the bādiya are clearly distinguished from the latter. The pilgrims from 'Irāq had to cross these Habīr sands. The term Habīr is not found in Iṣṭ. or Maq., but I.H., 30 and 104, in his detailed account of the deserts mentions al-raml al-ma‘rūf bil-Habīr. His text is not very clear but seems to indicate that on one side these sands stretch towards Egypt, and on the other extend "from the two Tayy mountains to the Persian Gulf and are adjacent to the sands of Bahrayn, of Başra, and of 'Omān, down to Shīhr and Mahra . . .". Originally al-Habīr must designate the desert al-Dahnā "the red one", uniting Great Nufūd with al-Rub’ al-khāli, see Hogarth, Penetration of Arabia, Map. I.H. mentions yellow, red, blue, black, and white sands but does not say anything of the use of the red sand for smithing purposes.

11. The term ahqāf in Southern Arabia is a synonym of the northern nufūd; cf. de Goeje, Arabia, in EI.

12. The [Arabian] desert between the lower course of the Nile and the Red Sea, cf. §§ 53 and 59. The bearings are evidently displaced and the combination of the Gulfs of "Barbar" and Ayla is a result of some confusion (v.s. 10. and note to § 3, 3a.).

13. The Nubian desert following 12. immediately to the south. According
to 12. its name appears to be "the Buja Desert", while the "country of Buja" lay south of it. Under Habasha seems to be understood the coastal line (Eritrea, &c.) considerably to the north of the present-day Abyssinia.

15. The Sahârâ. Sijilmâsa in Southern Marocco is usually mentioned as the limit of the cultivated zone, cf. Ist., 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 Islâm (Sind–Persia–Jazîra).
(f) §§ 37–41. Southern zone of Islâm (Arabia–Spain).
(g) §§ 42–53. Byzantium, Northern Europe, Caucasus.
(h) §§ 54–60. Southern countries.

§ 9. Chînistân


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-Sa’dayn (a more complete text found in Ḥāfiz-i Abrū’s Zubdat al-tawāriikh, 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 Amīn Ṭāhir’s Haft Iqlim (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). Mas’ūdi, Murūj, i, 307-12, mentions a merchant from Samarqand who travelled from Sīrāf to Canton (خانغرخان), and from there visited the capital called Anmwā (?): اندار الملك (variants: خندان).3 A rich Quraishite Ibn al-Wahḥāb, a descendant of Habbār b. Aswād, went from Canton to see the king of China “who at that time (i.e. shortly after A.D. 870) resided at the city of Khumdān”, Murūj, i, 312-21. Abū-Zayd Muḥammad Sīrāfī, the editor of Sulaymān’s report (p. 77), interrogated Ibn al-Wahḥāb when the latter was an old man, and left a record of this conversation, cf. Reinaud, Introduction, p. lxxiii. Later Mas’ūdi, who in 303/915 met Abū Zayd in Baṣra, wrote down the same record, Murūj, i, 321-4.


3 I now see that خندان several times occurring in Mas’ūdi’s text is but a misreading of خندان. Cf. the parallel passages in the Murūj, i, 309, and Sulaymān, 103; the latter has: Khumdān wa huwa balad al-mulk al-kabīr. In Murūj, ii, 131, A̲mmaw is identified with the legendary Kang-dīx which Kay-Khusrau built in China. خندان is entirely distinct from مذ (Murūj, i, 305)= خندان (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 Toghuoghuz. Qudama, 264, in a legendary report on Alexander the Great’s campaign, only mentions Khumdän and Jū; the latter name has been restored as *Sharag = Kāshghar*, or better as *Sarag = the eastern capital of the T’ang dynasty Lo-yang* which appears as *Saragh* in the old Soghdian letters of the second century and in the Nestorian inscription of A.D. 781. See Yule, *o.c.*; Marquart, *Streifzüge*, pp. 90, 502; Pelliot, *Jour. As.*, July 1927, pp. 138–41, and *T’oung-Pao*, xxv, 1928, pp. 91–2; Schaedler, *Iranica*, 1934, pp. 47–9. [It appears strange that an early Arab writer used Центр to render the sound g or gh!] The interpreter Sallâm’s account of his trip to the wall of Gog and Magog under the orders of the caliph Wâthiq (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’âr b. Muhalhil’s pretended journey to China in the company of a Chinese embassy returning from Bukhārā in 331/941 is a series of disconnected notices, of which some are genuine, and some imaginary, see Yâqût, 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-Faqlîh, first described by A. Z. Validi, *v.s.*, p. 215 and Appendix B.]

Mas’ūdî, 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 (*jibâl al-nîshâdîr*). Mas’ūdî himself (?) saw these mountains from a distance of 100 farsakhs: fires were seen over them at night and smoke during the day-time. Reinaud, *o.c.*, p. clxiii, thought that these details might apply to the ammoniac mines

in the T'ien-shan, north of Kuchä. However, Mas'ūdī'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.-ʿĀ 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. Kḥālb.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 Manichaeans, cf. Chavannes and Pelliot, Un traité manichéen, in Jour. As., 1913, i, 295-305. We might eventually admit that our author has in view the special conditions obtaining in the Kan-su province which he knows best. According to Marquart, Streifzüge, 88, in a.d. 844 (one year after the events on the Orkhon) Long-tegin, the chief of the south-western branch of the Uyghurs which occupied the region between Sha-chou and 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 Kuchä. 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'ê-le?). The characters p'ang and *lung differ only by one stroke. In principle no Turkish name would begin with an l. As regards the second elements Chavannes, o.c., p. 225, note 3, and p. 367, confirms that "le titre turc de tegin est constamment écrit en chinois t'ê-le" [the characters le (*le) and k'in (*ch'in) being easily confused].
still residing in Kan-chou. The king "of China", called Qalin b. Sh.khîr (*Chakhîr?), to whose court the Sâmânid embassy went in 381/941 must have been the ruler of the same branch of the Uyghurs. But as our source is silent on the presence of the Uyghurs in the province of Kan-su and only mentions the struggle going on in Kan-chou (7.) between the Chinese and the Tibetans, the impression is that it has in view the state of things before the arrival of the Uyghurs in that province in a.d. 843-4. Under 10. it is said that the Toghuzghuz are attacking Kuchâ but it is possible that the question is not of the T'ien-shan Uyghurs but still of the Western Tu-chüeh, v.i., p. 267, because Kuchâ (v.i. 10.) and Khotan (v.i. 18.) [cf. also Käshghar, § 13, 1.] are still reckoned to China, though entirely encircled by Turkish and Tibetan dominions. The above-mentioned towns, with the addition of Sui-shih on the Chu river (or, from 719, of Qarashar), constituted precisely "the Four Garrisons" on which the Chinese power rested in the west. In a.d. 670 the Four Garrisons were taken by the Tibetans, but in 692 the Chinese reoccupied them. In 760 the Tibetans became masters of the whole country to the west of the Huang-ho, but the garrisons of Pei-t'îng (= Bish-baliq) and An-hsi (= Kuchâ) still held out till 787; see Chavannes, Documents, pp. 113-14. Our author's statements must reflect China's incessant struggle for political influence and the possession of the strategic positions in the present-day Hsîn-Chiang province. [With regard to Khotan, the author may have in view the re-establishment of connexions with China after a.d. 938 (v.i. 18.).]

The statement that the emperor of China was descended from Faridhûn is certainly explainable by the tradition according to which Faridhûn's son Tûr became the master of the Turk and Chin and was accordingly called Tûrân-shâh or Shâh-i Chin, see Shâh-nâmâ, cf. Minorsky, Tûrân, in EI. More directly our author's source may be I.Kh., p. 16, who says that *baghpûr is a descendant of Afaridhûn. The same geographer also, p. 70, gives a list of the products of China, though more complete and not entirely coinciding in details with that of our author.

In the H.-A. China is called Chînistân and 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.-A. the well-known ports of Khânfû (= Canton, v.i.) and Zaytûn (Ts'üan-chou, near Amoy). About the 9th cent. a portion of the sea trade was diverted to the latter, Chau Ju-kua, p. 17. Abul-Fidâ, 363, calls it "Shînjû, known in our time as Zaytûn".
18.-21., as well perhaps as 11. and 22. (?)—south of the Tarim; of 12. nothing can be said. This analysis shows that the source utilized by our author was chiefly acquainted with the Tarim basin and Kan-su, inclusive of the road leading to the T’ang capital Ch‘ang-an-fu.

1. Muslim information on Wäqwäq is utterly confused. It has been exhaustively analysed by Ferrand in his articles Wäk-Wäk in EI and especially Le Wäkwäk est-il le Japon?, in Jour. As., avril 1932, pp. 193-243. Ferrand comes to the conclusion that two Wäqwäqs 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 Zäbaj, Fansùr, Bälüs). In our text (§ 4, b 3.) the Gold-island (= Sumatra) is inhabited by the Wäqwäqians, and the latter are confused with the homonymous Wäqwäq of the Zanj country. This entails a further complication: the Wäqwäq disappear from the immediate neighbourhood of Zangistän but the latter (§ 55) becomes a neighbour of Zäbaj (= Sumatra = Chinese Wäqwäq = Gold-island, § 4, 3.). The detail about gold collars used in Wäqwäq is also found in I.Kh., 69. The town مِنْس 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 Rashid al-din, ed. Blochet, GMS, pp. 484-98. İr.sh (ایران) and Khür.sh (خریش) are the provinces between which the Yangtze-kiang passes before disemboguing into the sea (§ 6, 2.). On the other hand, the localities similarly divided by the Huang-ho are Kür.sh (کورش) and F.r.jäkli (فریکلی) (§ 6, 3.). The absence of قُرُش in the present enumeration could be best explained by the identity of قُرُش and خریش. In this case, Kür.sh/Khür.sh would be located between the Yangtze and Huang-ho, İr.sh south-west of the Yangtze, and F.r.jäkli north of the Huang-ho, in Pei Chih-li. According to our text all the Nine Provinces lay on the shore of the Ocean and following the order of enumeration (from S. to N.?) the last six mentioned provinces should be situated in the extreme Far East. Consequently (d) Thay can hardly refer to the former T’ai kingdom in Yün-nan (Nan-chao), destroyed by Qubilay khan in 1253.1 To take (f) تکی for Tangut (Waşşaf, ed. Hammer, p. 22; Rashid al-din, 492: تکی) would be an anachronism. (h) قُرُش can hardly stand for Corea: in earlier sources (I.Kh., 70, I.R., 82) this country is called Shilä or Shilä2 whereas Rashid al-din, p. 486, gives a different transcription: کُرِل. As on principle we must prefer the explanations consistent with the attested Muslim tradition it is more probable that قُرُش

---

1 Nor does Tai in Shansi [Dr. P. Fitzgerald] suit our case.
2 Shilä < *Sin-lo, the native kingdom comprising the central and eastern part of Corea. The Corea proper (Ko-ku-rye) lay in the north. In 904 Ko-ku-rye rose in arms against the Sin-lo rulers and in 935 Corea became united under the national Wang dynasty, R. Grousset, Histoire de l’Extrême Orient, 1929, p. 290.
refers to the people mentioned under § 14, i., for the Khirkhiz were supposed to extend to the coast; in this case they might also be considered as a mis-spelling for قای (usually coupled with ترن, see note to § 14, i.). Khasâni, Bünûghni and انفس (perhaps انفس) are obscure.

§ 9

Chinistân

3.-9., 13.-15. are to be located along the following itinerary found in Gardïzï, 92: from Chïnistân in the Toghuzghuz territory (§ 12, 9.) via B.gh-shürä (where a river is crossed in a boat) to Qomül (§ 12, 9.)—8 days; from Qomül, across a steppe with springs and grass, to the Chinese town Shä-chü—7 days; thence to Sang-lâkh—3 days; thence to S.kh-chü—7 days; thence to Kham-chü—3 days; thence to K.jä—8 days; thence 15 days to the river Qiyan (Yangtze-kiang); from B.gh-shürä to Khumdän, by a road of ribâts (fortified stations) and mansîls (stations) 1 month. As the last-mentioned distance does not sum up the distances previously quoted, we must conclude that Gardïzï’s text is out of order. Indeed the first mention of B.gh-shürä (between Turfan and Qomül, where no such place is known and no such important river exists!) is only a misplaced part of the second passage where B.gh-shürä comes in the enumeration immediately after the Yangtze. This correction is fully confirmed by our author, who says (§ 6, 2.) that the river Kisau, after it has entered the limits of Bughshür, is known under the name *Ghiyän (<kiang). Consequently it seems that Gardïzï’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 (Bughshür?) turns back northwards to Khumdän (Ch'ang-an-fu). See Map iii.

Another important point is that in Gardïzï, 91-2, the name spelt كم stands for two totally different places: (a) the well-known town Kuchä, 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 Gardïzï’s itinerary in the opposite direction.

3. Khumdän 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 Coedès, o.c., 141. Marquart, Komanen, 60, considers the name as Iranian (Soghdian?) and explains it as “potter’s kiln”. Our author is very vague on the situation of Khumdän. The town is said to lie on the Khumdän river apparently confused with the Huang-ho (? 6, 1.). A lake is mentioned “in the region of Khumdän” (§ 3, 35.), and finally (§ 2, 4.) Khumdän 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-dîn (see note to § 12) calls a Buddhist stupa tanûra “funnel” semantically very close to Khumdän. Could not the capital of China be called “stupa [town]”? On another Khumdän see the Index.
4. *Baghshūr (spelt: *Bughshūr* and *B.ghsüz*) is very probably an Iranian name. A homonymous place (§ 23, 33.) lay between Herat and the Murghāb, İst., 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 renamed 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 Čhmānjkat–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 Čh'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 Tzū-liu-ch'ing.]

5. Kuchān (<kč̲an>) 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. Gardizi calls the place كچا Kuchā and places it at 8 days south of Kan-chou, and at 15 days north of the Yangtze. Following these distances it is difficult to identify Kuchān with Kung-chang in southern Kan-su and one should rather place it in the region of Lan-chou. In the confused § 6, 3., the Tarim is represented as continued by the Huang-ho. Beyond the swamp the imaginary watercourse is said "to flow down to the limits of Kuchān". This latter form 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 Kāshghari's Map, south of the Tarim, the following places stretch W. to E. in one line: Yārkand, Khotan, Jarjān (Cherchen), then behind a mountain شانچو (Shan-chou, probably *Sha-chou* and towards the south-east ارض گیل and كچان (sic). This Kūşān 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: Čh'ung-ch'ing—principal trading centre of Ssū-Ch'uan; Tzū-liu-ch'ing—a great industrial centre with 1,000 salt-wells (it lies at circa 200 Km. to the west of Čh'ung-ch'ing in the basin of the Lu-ho tributary of the Yangtze).

2 If restored as *أرچِر*, may stand for Er(i)-chou, a Mongol name for Liang-chou, cf. Zhamtsarsano in the *Festschrift 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. Khälb.k looks non-Chinese. In Arabic cursive خالب (see especially its three last letters) has some likeness to ميسل سلطان which is what Mis‘ar b. Muhalhil (v.s., p. 225) calls the capital of the “king of China”. A curious point is that Khälb.k is mentioned precisely before Kan-chou with which Marquart, Streifzüge, 86-8, identifies Sandābil, see also EI under this name. As Khälb.k (said to be a large town) is not mentioned in Gardizī it must have passed into the H.-Ä. from some additional source, perhaps Mis‘ar b. Muhalhil.

7. Khämchü is Kan-chou, cf. Rashīd al-dīn, 497, “تپج، one of the towns of Tangqūt”.

8. سوكچی wrongly vocalized Saukjū is Su-chou, old pronunciation Suk-chou. Turkish Yögurs of this region still pronounce Suk-chū, see Potanin, Tangut.-tibet. okraina, 1893, ii, 435. The Mongols say Tsugchi.

9. S.khčhū (?), ditto in Gardizī, at three days’ distance from 7. Khämchū. As Gardizī does not mention سوكچی and Su-chou could scarcely be omitted in the itinerary from Sha-chou to Kan-chou, one cannot dismiss the possibility of both 8. سوكچی and 9. سوكچی equally referring to Su-chou. It is true that our author distinguishes سوكچ from S.kh-chou but he connects them administratively. [In the Turkish document written in Orkhon script Suyğu-balik seems to refer to Su-chou, see Thomsen in jRAS, 1912, p. 186.]

10.-12. seem to disturb the order of enumeration.

10. Kuchä (چئچئ) is the well-known town lying north of the Tarim (in Chinese 库车-tszü or Ch‘ü-tszü, French trans. K‘ieou-tse or K‘ieou-tse). On the long history of this Aryan (later Turkicized) principality see S. Lévi, Le ‘tokharien 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-tàn. Our source (v.s., p. 227) still reckons Kuchä 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 Kāshgharī i, 332, Kusan (كس) is given as “the name of a town called Kujä (کیئ) which is the frontier of the Uyghurs”. The form Kūsän is also found in the “Secret history of the Mongols”, cf. Pelliot, Notes sur les noms anciens de Kučä &c., in T‘oung-Pao, 1926, p. 126.

11. Kūghm.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 Köhmärî hill which Sir A. Stein, Ancient Khotan, 1907, pp. 185-90, and Serindia, 1921, i, 93-5, identifies with Hsüan-tsang’s Mount Göšrīqa “Cow’s horn”. However, the passage of ج & ز into [so according to Sir A. Stein’s transcription!] is not at all obvious, to say nothing of the mention of Kūghm.r in our text after Kuchä and before the “Stone-tower”.

The eastern T‘ien-shan?). [I now see that A. Herrmann in his commentary on Kāshgharī’s map (1935) tentatively identifies Kūshān with Kuei-shun, Ning-hsia. Phonetically this identification presents some difficulty.]
12. It is difficult to say which of the “Stone Towers” this Burj-i Sangin represents. Is it Tash-qurghan in Sarikol (east of the Pamir), or simply a reminiscence of Ptolemy’s λίθινος πύργος, as supposed by Barthold, Preface, v.s., p. 26. Birūnī, 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, Serindia, 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. Khājū = Kua-chou, i.e. the present day An-hsi oasis on the Su-lo-ho river and on the road from Su-chou to Sha-chou, see Stein, Serindia, p. 1040.

15. *Sha-chou, “Town of the sands”, mentioned in Gardīzī 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. Sangläkh with its Buddhist (?) associations. It is true that Gardīzī places Sangläkh 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 Gardīzī, the place of Sangläkh (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 Sangläkh, “The Stony Place”, would accord with the natural characteristics of the Ch’ien-fo-tung. However, Sangläkh 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, J.R.A.S, April 1930, p. 294, Sen-ge-lag, closely resembling our Sang(a)lakhy, 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, J.R.A.S, July 1928, pp. 555 and 565. The Tārikh-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 كشائي.
to go hunting wild camels in the country round Turfan, Tarim, Lob, and Katak". Even now the memory of a Shar-i-Katak lives in the region, cf. Barthold, Tarim in EI.

18. Though surrounded by Tibetan possessions (see note to § 11, 10.) Khotan is not included in Tibet, and, on the contrary, reckoned to China. Its king, styled 'azîm (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 'azîm mentioned in our text is the king Li Shêng-t'ien in whose long reign most of the above-mentioned embassies visited China. The embassy of 971 brought the news of a war between Khotan and Kashghar, and, some thirty years after, Khotan succumbed in the struggle and was occupied by the Muslim Qara-khânid Turks of Kashghar, cf. Barthold, Turkestan, p. 281, and notes to § 13. Gardizi, 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 Sâvnik are spelt Khuthum (sic) and Sânrik (perhaps: Vasânrik). 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). *Vasânrik (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 Charcan of which the latter must have been reckoned to Tibet (cf. § 11, 8.). [V.i., p. 485: B.rwân.]

22. The meaning of bar karân-i daryâ is dubious. Perhaps the mention of Bürkhimû and Navijkath just before 23. Sarandib is accounted for by the interpretation of daryâ as "the sea". But Navijkath looks distinctly Iranian (Soghdian): "the New Town". Therefore the two localities seem

1 The Mujmal al-tawârikh also calls this king 'azîm 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, \textit{La Colonie sogdienne de la région du Lob-nor}, in \textit{Jour. As.}, 1916/17, pp. 111–23 (after a document written in A.D. 885). Consequently one would have reasons to translate \textit{bar karän-i daryä} as “on the bank of the river”, or perhaps “in the riverine region”, \textit{i.e.} of the Tarim. Less probably N.vijkath “the New Village” could be compared with Yangi-baliq (“the New Town”) which Kâshghari, i, 103, mentions among the Uyghur settlements near the Eastern T’ien-shan, see note to § 12, 2.

23. 24. have been added from some totally different source. Sarandib (Ceylon), left out under India, is treated as a mountain under § 5, where it is somehow brought into connexion with the continental system of mountains (cf. § 6, 1. and § 9, introduction), and it is possible that it was sometimes looked upon as a continuation of Indo-China.\textsuperscript{1} Under the name of Taprobana (Tabarnä), and perhaps (?) of Närä, 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 Khuwärizmî, 97–8, in the \textit{Mohit}, and on the Portuguese maps, \textit{Mohit}, Maps XVII and XVIII.

§ 10. India


Some important additional information on India will be found under § 5, 2. 4.–8. (mountains), § 6, 13.–16. (rivers) and § 7, 5. (deserts).

In his \textit{Preface}, p. 27, Prof. Barthold suggests that as regards India “the original source (\textit{pervoistochnik}) of I.Kh. and other early Arab geographers was Abü 'Abdilläh Muḥammad b. Ishāq”. However, even for I.R., p. 132, who alone names this authority, the latter does not exhaust the

\textsuperscript{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.]

\textsuperscript{2} On the Arabic sources of the \textit{Mohit} see G. Ferrand’s detailed articles \textit{Shihāb al-dīn Ahmad b. Maqājīd} (Vasco de Gama’s pilote) and \textit{Sulaimān al-Mahri} in \textit{EI} and his edition of these two pilots’ works, Paris, 1921–2 and 1921–3.
sources on India. Abū ‛Abdillâh, who [probably before the beginning of the 9th cent.] spent two years in Khmer (Qimâr), could hardly know much about northern India. I.R. himself, 13520, 13614, distinctly quotes some other sources of information on India. Finally, Sulaymân 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‘ûdî. [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 Birûnî. 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 (Qämarûn), represented as master of Şanf and Mandal, that of Fansûr (Sumatra) called S. tûhã(?), and that of Qimâr (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 rây” (the raja of Qinnauj?) along the Vindhya Range and the Lesser Mihrân (Narbadâ), evidently in their more easterly parts.1 Dahum’s name has numerous variants in Muslim sources. Sulaymân the Merchant, p. 29 (Ferrand’s tr., p. 50), has ٍرُمُي. He places him in the immediate neighbourhood of the Ballah-râ (v.i.) and the kings of Gujra and Ṭāqin (v.i.), adding that he is at war with both the Ballah-râ and the king of Gujra. Though not of noble extraction Ruhmî was a powerful monarch.2 I.Kh., 67 (whose relation to Sulaymân is not quite

---

1 For in the west was the kingdom of the Ballah-râ.
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. (chowries, yaktails), cowrie-money, and spotted rhinoceroses. [H. A. R. Gibb suggests that the sentence وياتثن ان قلبي عكره نحور من عشرة الف اليل خمس عشر الہا must mean:
clear), says: "and after [the Ballah-rä] (comes) the king Jurz who has ṭāfri-dirhams; after him Ghäba; after him R.hmi (Rumī; 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 aloe. Then after him (comes) the king of Qämärūn, whose kingdom adjoins China. . . .” Ya’qūbī, Historiae, i, 106, mentions between Dänq (دائنق, perhaps: ظرُ) and the Ballah-rä and considers him the most important of the kings ruling over a most extensive country which lay by some sea and produced gold. Mas‘ūdî, 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. Beyond him lives the king of in whose possession there is no sea and whose people are white and have pierced ears. The latter kingdom evidently corresponds to the al-ain, which I.R., 133, mentions after Qimär (good-looking people, boys married at a tender age). Yule-Cordier, i, 243, suggested the identification of *Ruhmî*, &c., with Pegu, called in Burma Rahmaniya [Śsk. Rāmanya-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‘ūdî].” This cautious suggestion becomes still less alluring in view of our text which attributes to Dahum the whole of the east coast of India.

Our analysis of the Arab sources enables us to infer the identity of the forms Ḥrm دهمی رهمن دهم, but it is still to be seen whether our author has not transferred to the original Ruhmî/Dahum some traits of a king whose name was very celebrated in the second half of the 10th century, namely of Dhanga (A.D. 950-99) who was the best-known king of the Chandel family which ruled in the province of Jejakabhuki, i.e. the present-day Bundelkhand lying between the Jumna and Narbada. The Chandels, 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 Dhanga joined the league formed against Mahmūd of Ghazni by Jaypāl of Vayhind (explicitly mentioned by our author under 56.). See V. Smith, o.c., 405-7. If,

"[others] say that the utmost limit of his regular army is from 10,000 to 15,000 [men].” However, Murūj, i, 384, shows that already Mas‘ūdî had imagined that the passage referred to the الصحراء والساسن.

1 The source of this and several other details in Mas‘ūdî is Sulaymān who is evidently to be understood by "the informer" (al-mukhbir), i.e., i, 393.

2 Perhaps the Burmese are meant by *al-Armān. In a Mon inscription (A.D. 1101) the Burmese are called Mīrmā; in later Burmese their name is Mraamā, see G. H. Luce, Note on the Peoples of Burma (quoted under 8.-10.).

3 For Tomaschek’s identifications, v.l. under 8.-10.

4 Ibn Iyās in Arnold’s Chrest. Arabica, 1853, pp. 66-73, invoking the authority of Mas‘ūdî says that زهم (sic) is the name of the king of هماري(?).
however, *d in Dahum* and a common frontier between Dahum and Kanauj may refer to Dhañga, the mention of the great part of the east coast of India as belonging to Dahum does not apply to this king. The basic characteristics of Ruhmi/Dahum point back to the times before A.D. 850 and it must be left to the specialists in Indian history to decide to which dynasty of north-eastern or eastern India they may refer (Orissa, Eastern Chalukyas of Vengi who ruled A.D. 815–960, &c.).

The southernmost part of India (Madura?) is described as the realm of a queen (*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 Rāṣṭrakūta 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 Rāṣṭrakūtas of the Deccan (A.D. 743–974). Sulaymān, p. 28, says that the Ballah-rā’s kingdom starts from the coast called *al-Kumkāmi* i.e. Konkan, the region stretching along the sea between Bombay and Goa. Mas‘ūdī, i, 162, 177, and Iṣṭ., 173, definitely mention, as the Ballah-rā’s residence, Mānkīr, i.e. Manyakheta, now Malkhed, south of Gularga (Ḥaydarābād). 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 Malabār 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 < Anhālvaṭa, now Pattan in the northern Baroda] est gouvernée par un grand prince qui prend le titre de Balhara.”

Another great king was the RAJA OF QINNAUJ (such is the Arabic spelling, in Indian *Kanyākubja* > Kanauj) whose army is mentioned under 29. as consisting of 150,000 horse and 600 elephants, and under 38. as being 100,000 horse strong. His other title seems to be “Raja of the Indians”, (§§ 5, 9. and 6, 16.). Our author includes in his possessions 38. Jālhandar (though this latter had princès 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 Mas‘ūdī, *Murūj*, i, 383, have somewhat misunderstood Sulaymān in saying that *Kum-
and reigned over a “tongue” of territory (waw huwa 'alā lisānīn min al-ard). Yet Sulaymān’s continuator Abū Zayd, p. 127 (Ferrand, 123), mentions Qinnauj as “a great city in the Jurz kingdom”. Mas‘ūdī, on the one hand, speaks of the king of Qinnauj called Ba‘ūra (v.i. under 53. Bīrūza) who possessed four armies, each seven to nine hundred thousand strong, of which the northern one was directed against the Muslims of Multān, the southern against the Ballah-ray, and the two others against any eventual enemy, see Murūj, i, 372–4, cf. Marquart, Brānsahr, 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-Pratīhāra 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. Tythāl, and 43. Bytāl (Nepal?) lay in the region of Nepal (v.i.), whereas 44. Tāqī (Takka-deṣa?) and 45. Salūqī (Chambā?) must be looked for in the neighbourhood of Kashmir. The S.lūqī king was particularly famous for his nobility (v.i. 45.).

As regards Muslim possessions (see now Ray, o.c., p. 24) Manṣūra belonged to the descendants of ‘Omar b. ‘Abdil-‘Azīz, a native of Bāniya, descended from the Quraishite Habbār b. Aswad, Iṣf., 173, cf. § 27, i. and v.i. 16., whereas the ancestor of the amirs of Multān was the Quraishite Sāma b. Lu‘ayy. The dynasty of Manṣūra recognized the ‘Abbāsid caliphs, whereas that of Multān, the Fātimid caliphs of Egypt, Maq., 485, (v.i. 32). The amirs of Multān were the immediate neighbours and enemies of the raja of Qinnauj and they are said to have had under their sway even the town of 53. Bīrūza (named after the title of the raja of Qinnauj) and Lahore, in which case the communications of Qinnauj with its northern feudatories were of a precarious nature.

Description of India.

We shall now proceed to the identification of single localities mentioned in the text.

The plan of the chapter is the following: 1.–6. localities to the east of India, stretching east of the Bay of Bengal from north to south; 7. localities of the east coast of India enumerated from south to north; 8.–10. localities

1 The mention of the “tongue of territory” most probably refers to the peninsula of Gujarāt which owes its name to some other branch of the Gurjara tribe. On the Gujrāt of the Panjāb, v.i. 46.
on the Chinese frontier (west of Yün-nan); 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 Afghanistān 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 Qimär ought to be named side by side but by some mistake Şanf is placed under Assam!).

1. Qämarün (*Qämarüb), I.Kh., 13, is Kamārūpa, 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 Qimär (v.i. 6.). There seems to have existed a Muslim colony in Champa as shown by P. Ravaisse, Deux inscriptions coufiques du Campa, in Jour. As., Oct. 1922, pp. 247-89; one of the documents is a tumular inscription of some Ahmād 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 Qämarün is not a mere mistake, the name in our case stands for some different place. The names of the type Champa, 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 Kamārūpa.

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 Mandari (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 Mandalā in the Ganges Delta?). [But Mandalay is a late name.]

4. 5. Fansür <Panchür, celebrated camphor port, lay on the western

---

1 In modern Persian champā, or champa, is applied to (1) a white flower resembling a xambaq (and also called gul-i champī) and (2) a kind of rice; according to the Burhān-i qāṭi both “came to Irān 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 Mohiț, Maps XXV–XXVI. Cf. Ferrand, Črîvidjaya, pp. 55, 95, who, moreover, p. 72, admits the existence of a second *Panchûr, an island off the eastern coast of Sumatra. The town H.dd.njûra (?) and the king S.tûhâ are unknown unless šṭērâ stands either for Šailendra, “lord of the mountains”, title of the Śrîvijaya dynasty, or for the later (15th–16th century) or šṭērâ, Sumatra, cf. Ferrand, ibid., pp. 80 and 86.¹ The mention of a port of Sumatra is out of place in the present chapter and ought to come under § 4, B (5.–8.).

6. Qimâr = Khmer, i.e. Cambodia on the Me-kong. The Khmer empire formed in A.D. 802 lasted till the middle of the thirteenth century, Grousset, Histoire de l'Extrême Orient, 1929, pp. 559, 568, 587. I.Kh., 68, counts from Qimâr to Sanf 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 'Abdillâh Muḥammad b. Isḥâq, 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 Kûdâfarid (Godavari) 2 days to Kaylkân (Portuguese: Calingam?), al-Lavâ (?), and K.nja (= Ganjam); thence to Samundar <Samudra (north of Ganjam, south of the Rio de Paluro = Baruva, Mohiț, Map I), 10 farsakhs; thence to *Urîshîn (spelt: اورشین = Orissa) 12 farsakhs; thence to 4 days. Our Urîshîn and S.m.n.d.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 اندراś Andrâs (or perhaps Andrâ'iya, Andrâniya, Andrâliya?) recalls Āndhra, as the region between the Godavari and Kistna is called. H rk nd and N.myâs must be sought north of Orissa. In the Preface to the second edition (1906) of Maq., de Goeje quotes Marquart's emendation: Harkand <*Harikel (纪委书记 = Orissa). Indeed, Harikel is the name of Eastern Bengal. An inscription of the end of the tenth century mentions the conquest by the king of Harikel of Chandradvipa (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 which seems to stand for several similar but different local names (v.s., note to § 4, 11.). In Sulaymân, pp. 5–9 (and Abū–Zayd, ibid., 123), the Harkand sea comprises the waters between the Laccadives and Malabar, as well as those round Ceylon, and stretches even as far as Ramnî, i.e. Sumatra (§ 4, 5.)! Our N.myâs, according to its place in the enumeration, seems to lie still farther east. It must be identical with N.yârs which Ibn Iyâs, Arnold's Chrrestomathia 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 Baṭṭûta, iv, 230.

² Chau Ju-kua (A.D. 1225), p. 61, says that adultery was severely punished in San-fo-ts'i (Palembang in Sumatra).
S.m.n.d.r from places 15–20 days distant from there. I.Kh. evidently means that the aloes wood was floated on rivers, such as Godavari. Cf. Idrïsï, trans. Jaubert, p. 180: “On apporte [à Samundar] du bois d’aloës du pays de Kârmût, 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?). *shank (read: شک) is Ssk. *šankha. The text suggests perhaps that the šankha is the peculiar trait of this country, but these conchs were usually employed as insignia of the kings, cf. Sulaymân, 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.

\[
\begin{array}{l}
H.-’Ä. & مانك  \\
Ya’qûbi & موشه  \\
Sulaymân & مابد  \\
Mas’ûdi & موجه
\end{array}
\]

Ya’qûbi, Historiae, i, 106, also places them near China with which they were at war. Sulaymân, p. 32 (Ferrand, 52), says that the Mûja have a white complexion and dress like Chinamen; good musk is found in their country, through which stretch long ranges of white mountains; Mâb.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 Yünnan). Prof. G. H. Luce of the Rangoon University, to whom I submitted my passage, has most kindly communicated to me (21.v.1933) a series of very valuable materials¹ and personal suggestions. As regards T.sûl (Ya’qûbi: T.rsûl; absent elsewhere), Prof. Luce quotes as a parallel the name Tîrchul 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 Tîrchul may be the people known in Burman history as Pyû (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 Pyû into the central and upper Burma. By A.D. 1060 both had yielded to the domination of the Mrañma (Burmans).²

The Man-shu composed by Fan-ch’îo after A.D. 863, in the enumeration of the barbarian kingdoms bordering on the T’ai kingdom of Nan-chao (Yünnan), mentions at the first place the Mi-no (*myie-nâk) and Mi-ch’în


² Sulaymân and Mas’ûdi give here a name which looks entirely different from our *Tîrsûl: Sulaymân, p. 32, says that Qîr.nîj 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 Mas’ûdi, Mûrûj, i, 388, F.r.nîj 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 Mänak and Mûja¹ though he does not conceal some difficulties for such an identification: according to the Chinese sources the people of Mi-ch’ën had “black short faces” (not “a white complexion”!); likewise doubtful are the points on musk and “long fortresses”. One may remark that the “white” mountains do not necessarily refer to snowly peaks; Dr. Blagden tells me that many of the mountains in Burma are of calcareous formation.²

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, “from which the inhabitants of Sarandib 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-aghabāb adding that its queen is called Rābiya and that the tallest elephants are found there. De Goeje took for 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 *arōshin 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 Ür.shfin is bahr al-aghabāb. 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 (Sarandib) vast aghbāb are found. The meaning of ghubb is a huge river [or valley, wādī] extremely long and wide which disembogues (masabb) into the sea”.³ On the strength of our passage S. Lévi (d. 6.XI.1935) suggested for Urshfin the Mandam peninsula continued towards Ceylon by the Ramesvāram island. Instead of our

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: *Mūcha, 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.


¹ Dr. Barnett suggests for B.llin “Baliapatam, more correctly Valapat-anam, a few miles NW. of Cannanore in Cirakkal Taluk, Malabar District, which is Ptolemy’s Βαλαιπατ-ανα” [ed. Renou, 1925, vii, ch. i, §6: Βαλαιπατανα]. This would indicate for B.llin a much more westerly position than Ürsh.fin. However, it must be remembered that I.Kh. places B.llin at 2 days’ distance to the south (or SE.) of Malay (Malabār) and at 1 day’s distance from Ceylon.
passage in which immediately after the king of Sarandib is mentioned the king of £àjj (variants &jj à & andˆ which is a country opposite the Sarandib island, as well as opposite Qimäf... [text out of order]... and every king ruling the country of M.ndürfïn is called al-Qayday” [the last element perhaps -ray instead of -day].

Bïrünï, Canon, describes *Mandürí-pattan as “the harbour and embarcation point (ma’bar “ferry”) for Sarandib, lying in the ghubb”. Idrïsï (Jaubert), pp. 185-7, describes 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... From (in the direction of China) the distance is of 3 days.

Abul-Fidä, p. 355, mentions a town Manïfattan 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. xl, [though probably Manifattan is only a mis-spelling of *Manduri-fattan, found by Abul-Fidä in some other source of his]. The Mohït, 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 = Malayabär, “Malabar coast” (Abul-Fidä, p. 353: الْمَيَّار) could hardly be under the direct rule of the Ballah-räy. In I.Kh., 64, whose enumeration runs from west to east, Malay comes immediately before Bllín, v.s. 12.

14. Išt (whom our author follows in the opposite direction) gives the distances, pp. 172, 179: Kanbaya to Sübära 4 marhalas; thence to Sindän 5 marhalas; thence to Saymür 5 marhalas; thence to Sarandib 15 marhalas. Mas’üdï, Moruj, i, 330, who visited the Ballah-räy’s possessions in 303/915, gives a somewhat different enumeration: Saymür, Sübära, Täna, Sindän.

Generally speaking a place on the west coast of India is hardly suitable for bifurcation of roads leading farther east.

* King, not queen, as in I.R. and the H.-Ä. In Sulaymän, p. 6, a queen is mentioned in the Dibäjät, i.e. the Laccadive, &c., islands.

Ferrand, Crividjaya, p. 62, explains the name as “Mandürapatan, la capitale de Madura”, but the city of Madura lies far inland.

Abul-Fidä, p. 353, in his quotation from the Canon seems to have misread -pattan into “between”.

Idriši is certainly wrong for I.Kh., 69, counts 100 farsaks from Şanf (v.s. 2. Annam) to Luqín, “the first of the ports of China” (awwalu marâqi al-Sîn). O. Franke, Zur Geschichte der Exterritorialität in China, p. 894 (13) identifies Arabic Lukim (read: Luqín) with Lung-pien in Tonking, south-east of Hanoi.
and Kanbāya; like our author he, too, praises the sandals of Kanbāya.

In our text is a mis-spelling for Ist., 170, Maq., 477: and Birûnî, India, 102, Čom, both transcriptions standing for *Chaymūr which was identified by Yule with Ptolemy's, vii, i, 6, Ṣetvula, 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 = Σουνπάρα (cf. Mas'ūdi, i, 253, Sufāra) also in Thana; Kanbāya = Cambay in Gujrat. On the Kült of Cambay v.s., § 6, 16.

15. Ist., 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. Ist., 175, spells Bāniya adding that the said 'Omar was the grandfather (jadd) of the conquerors of Mansūra.

17. This Qandāhar (Indian Ghandhār) is totally different from its Muslim namesakes in Afghānīstān and the Panjab, v.i. 56. Some light on its position is thrown by § 6, 16. Idrīsī counts from it to Naharvāra (Anhilvāra) 5 days in a cart. It stood in the eastern corner of the gulf of Cambay, see Ibn Baṭṭūta, iv, 58, cf. Marquart, Erānsahr, pp. 266–8. Both the Moḥiṭ, Map XIII (Bandar-i Ghandāri), and Portuguese maps, ibid. (Bandel Guandari), show it between Cambay and Broach (evidently in the bay of Amod, SW. of Baroda).

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 Nūnūn must correspond to one of the towns 18., 19., 20., or 22., and more probably to Қозер which not only is mentioned immediately before Nūnūn (cf. the order in § 6, 16.) but in Arabic cursive has some resemblance to Nūnūn. It would be tempting further to consider both these forms as corruptions of Ujjain, a place of great fame, through which Indian geographers drew their 0° of longitude, v.s. note to § 4, 13.; Greek Ὄζήνη; I.R., 22: Birūnī, Canon: أذن یوال یجید (يی) عليه حساب البلد; Birūnī, India, p. 159: or Ujjain does not lie on the Narbadā, but the terms of § 6, 16. cannot be interpreted too strictly. As regards the important Nūnūn (Nūnūn) one would tentatively identify it with the capital of Mālwa: Mandū (مئدو or perhaps مئدو 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 Qanda-

24. It is not known whether B.lhārī has anything to do with the king Ballah-ray whose capital Mankîr = Mānyakheta lay some 350 miles south of the Narbadā. Birūnī, *India*, 102, mentions a locality called Vallabha, but places it south of Jymwr (*Chaymûr > 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 *Kanyâkubja > 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 Işt., 171, does not separate from the rest of Sind (§ 27).

30. Işt., 171, 175, places Qallârī, Annârī, Bulrî, and Rûr in Sind. The two first lay far to the east of the Indus on the road from Manşûrâ to Multân. The situation of Annârī is uncertain. Bulrî lay to the west of the Indus, where a branch (*khâlij*) separated from the river beyond Manşûrâ. A Bulrî is shown on Cousens’s map [cf. § 27], 40 miles south of Haydarâbâd. Rûr, encircled by a double wall, was not second in size to Multân, and formed the limit of [the possessions of] Manşûrâ. The ruins of al-Rûr (Arûr, Alor), the ancient capital of Sind, are situated near Rohri, see H. Cousens, *o.l.*, 76–9, and Minorsky, *Les Tsiganes Lûlî*, in *Jour. As.*, April 1931, p. 286.

31. Işt., 175, places Basmad at 1 farsakh to the east of the river, at 2 marhâlas from Multân, and at 3 marhâlas from Rûr.

32. I.R., 135–7, Işt., 173–5. According to I.R., 135, the amîr of Multân did not obey the lord of Manşûrâ, but read the *khutba* in the name of the caliph (*amîr al-mu‘minîn*). By his term “Maghribî” our author means that the *khutba* in Multân was read for the Fâtimid caliph, and this fact is confirmed by Maq., 485: *[al-Maghribi] the Western One (i.e. the Fâtimid caliph) delivered it from (the Byzantines)*.

33. According to Işt., 175, *Chandror* was the military camp of the amîr.

34. Jab.rs.ri unknown. 35. Bahrayîj. The amîr of Multân could not possibly control the town and district of Bahraich, situated north of Gogra, some 125 miles to the north-east of Qinnauj; consequently some different place is meant here.

36. Lahore must be Lahore on the Râvî (Ssk. *Lavapura*, modern *Lâhaur*),

1 Contrary to Barthold, *o.s.*, p. 27.
though its name is spelt in Birûnî, India, 102: Lôhâvar, and in Idrîsî, transl. by Jaubert, 170: Lahâvar. In Birûnî, India, 102, 163, Lôhûr (or Lôhûr) stands for an entirely different place, the fortress Lohara on the western approaches of Kashmir. Cf. M. A. Stein, Memoir on Maps . . . of Kashmir, in JASB, lxviii, part i, extra No. 2, 1889, p. 20.

37. *Râmayân must correspond to which Maq., 478, mentions among the dependencies of Multân. It lay at a distance of 5 days from 38. and evidently to the west of it, seeing that 38. belonged to Qinnâuj and 37. to Multân.

38. 39. Qinnâuj (Kanauj) itself was quoted under 29. as the last in that series of localities. With 38. and 39. we come back to the possessions of the raja of Qinnâuj, this time approaching the basin of the Ganges from the Panjab (N. to SE.).

38. Jâlhandar = Jâlandhara, now Jullundur in the Panjab, between the Bias and Sutlej. Cf. Hsüan-Tsang, Si-yu-ki (Beal), i, 175.

39. No parallel could be found for S.lâbûr, unless it is related to *Sîmhapura (Seng-ha-pu-lo) which Hsüan-Tsang, Life, St. Julien, p. 89, Beal, p. 67, and Si-yu-ki, St. Julien, i, 172, Beal, i, 143, mentions on the way from Takshâsilâ to Kashmir (and further to Jâlandhara, v.s. 38.). Seng-ha-pu-lo lay at 700 li = circa 403 Km. to the south-east of Takshâsilâ, had no king, was a dependency of Kashmir and possessed a natural fortress. The location of Seng-ha-pu-lo cannot be regarded as finally settled. Cunningham, Ancient Geography of India, re-edited by S. M. Sastri, Calcutta 1924, p. 145, identified Sîmhapura with Ketâs (Kaṭās, Kaṭâksha), 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, 263, thinks that the Chinese traveller, rightly or wrongly, thought of Sîmhapura as lying north (or north-east) of Takshâsilâ, not south-east of it! In our text both S.lâbûr and Kashmir (v.s. 57.) are dependencies of Qinnâuj. To judge by the variety of currency in S.lâbûr it was a busy commercial town but it is noteworthy that salt is not mentioned among its products.

40. *Rîbûn (or Rîbûn) must be identical with which Maq., 478, mentions as a dependency of Qinnâuj. The detail about the sacred water makes one think of Benares (Vârânasi, Birûnî, Canon: Bânârsî) which was a part of the dominions of the rajas of Qinnâuj, Ray, o.c., 579, but “5 days to Tibet” is evidently too short a distance for Benares, even if by Tibet some of the principalities 41.-3. are meant. The name, apparently disfigured, has some outward resemblance to Budâ’un (بُدّاْوُن) but it is still to be seen whether the latter fulfils the conditions of our text.

41.-3. undoubtedly situated in the sub-Himalayan region. 41. About مئال (or مئال, § 5, 9 b.) we know that it was the nearest of the three to Qinnâuj from which it was separated by a high mountain. Beyond Hitâl

1 This detail is repeated in the T'ang-shu, Chavannes, Documents, 167.

2 The names of the coins were un-known to the specialists whom I have had the advantage of consulting.
(H.btâl) the range of mountains crossing India from west to east split into two branches. Hitâl possessed a ruler who was hostile to the raja of Qinnauj. 42. Tïthâl is the wild mountainous country separating Hitâl from 43. Baytâl (Nîtâl) described as a commercial centre from which (Tibetan?) musk was imported. Two of our names also occur in Bïrûnî's Canon at the end of the third climate (the text unfortunately without dots):

the region (الرصد) which is the observation point between (?) ... ... (بار): long. 104° 35', lat. 30° 10'.

the region (الرصد) 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 *Nîyâpîl, i.e. Nepal. It is, however, much more difficult to identify the two other names. 41. follows on 40. which, with regard to Qinnauj, lay evidently in the direction of "Tibet" (Himalaya). If 40. is Budâ'ûn (?) the continuation of the line Qinnauj-Budâ'ûn may indicate the direction in which Hitâl ought to be sought, but the identity of 40. is not certain. Hitâl was evidently an important valley considered as "splitting" the Himalaya range: the valleys of Sarda, or Gogra in westernmost Nepal would serve that purpose. As a name resembling our Hitâl (Bïrûnî: سال) one may quote Nainîtâl (*ل) 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 Dhaulagiri, to the west of the central part of Nepal.

The route from Qinnauj to Nepal quoted in Bïrûnî's India, 98 (transl., 201) ran eastwards along the foot of the mountains and did not touch our 41. and 42. From Qinnauj to Bârî, 10 farsakhs; thence to Dûgum, 45 fars.; thence to the Sh.lhat kingdom (ملكه شامب), 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 (تر) and the inhabitants Tarû, people of very black colour and flat-nosed like the Turks. Thence you come to the mountains of Qâmûrû, which stretch away as far as the sea. To the left [i.e. to the north of T.lwt] is the realm of Naypîl." Some informer of Bïrûnî's travelled that way: "when in T.nwt (تنّ), he left the easterly direction and turned to the left. He marched to Naypîl, a distance of 20 farsakhs, most of which was up-hill country."

1 Perhaps "Outer Tibet" is here meant for Bïrûnî, *ibid.*, places Inner Tibet in the fourth climate at long. 94° o' lat. 36° o' [perhaps 37° o'?]. For comparison's sake one may quote the position of Yûrkand long. 95° 35' lat. 43° 40', Sîkâshim long. 96° 20' lat. 37° 0'.

Abul-Fidâ, 361 (quoting Ibn Sa'id and al-Atwâl), mentions among the towns (مود "lands"?) of Qinnauj Outer and Inner Tibet, of which the latter lay at 7 marhâlas from Qinnauj. On the Outer Tibet cf. § 11, 9.

2 In the region of Nainîtâl there are several names ending in 털 "lake" (< Ssk. talla).

3 The identification of the route must
44.-6. These kings must undoubtedly be sought in the direction of Kashmir. Of them Sulaymān, pp. 28-9, mentions malik al-furz and malik *al-Tāqin; I.Kh., p. 16: ِJa'ba, malik al-Tāqin, malik al-furz, *Ghāba, and p. 67: al-Tāqin, ِJa'ba, al-furz, *Ghāba; I.R., p. 135: malik al-Tāqin, N jāba, al-furz. I.Kh.'s *Ja'ba, is perhaps a dittography for ِJa'ba (Ghāba/Gāba); in any case it cannot be confronted with I.R.'s Ja'ba (Mas'ūdī, i, 394: al-madī) which belongs to the southern group of rulers enumerated by I.R., p. 133 (as it seems, on the authority of Abū 'Abdillāh Muḥammad b. 'Īsāq).

44. On ِJa'ba (or Tāqin) see Sulaymān, 27, I.Kh., 13, I.R., 130. It is the country Takka-deśa, or Takka-visaya mentioned in the Rājatarangini, ed. by M. A. Stein, 1900, i, 205 et passim. Hsüan-Tsang, Si-yu-ki (Beal), i, 165, calls it Tseh-kia and describes it as bordering in the east on the Vīpāsa (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 Inde, in BEFEO, v, 1905, p. 300, and Ray, o.c., 119, and Map 3, where Takka-deśa 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 Tāqin women. In the immediate vicinity of Kashmir Bīrūnī, Indīa, 102 and 206, mentions jointly جابه والهوار, of which *Lohāwar is certainly Lohāra, valley of the Upper Tohi on the western approaches of Kashmir (and not the town of Lahore!) while Tākēshar (Takka-deśa) stands for ِJa'ba of the earlier geographers.

45. This name undoubtedly applies to the ruling dynasty and not to the country itself. The form S.ļūqīyin (Arabic gen. plur.) shows that the name S.ļūqī has been found in an Arabic source. I.R., 135, says: "and after [the king of Tāqin], (comes) a king called N jāba (*Ja'ba) who enjoys an honourable position among (the kings), and the king Ballah-rā takes wives from among them, and they are S.ļūqī, and on account of their pride (sharaf) take wives only from among themselves. The well-known ِJa'ba-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 ِJa'ba, and clearly distinguishes this ِJa'ba from his namesake Ja'ba (see § 4, 9.) whom he calls "Ja'ba the Indian" جاَبة الہندى. 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.ļūqī king ِJa'ba the dry land, continental Ja'ba", as Barthold has suggested. In the same passage the inner range of the Himalaya (in the neighbourhood of Kashmir) separates Ja'ba's country from that of Lhrz (v.i. 46.). It would be left to the specialists. Bārī, later capital of the rajas of the Gurjara-Pratīhāra dynasty, lay east of the Ganges; then the road would cross the distance between the Gogra and Great Gandak rivers (ancient Northern Kosalā) and on the left bank of the latter reach Battiah (our بِہت؟). The country T./w.t would be the region between Nepal and Mithila inhabited by the forest people Thāru (our جو Tarū). Going farther east towards the Jamuna the road would enter Assam (Kāmarūpa, our مِلَا). T.tut and T.mut evidently represent the same name corresponding to modern Tirhut <Tira-bhukti).
be tempting to identify Jâba's kingdom with Chambâ, on the head-waters of the Râvi, north-east of the Țakka-daesa, see J. Ph. Vogel, *Antiquities of Chambâ*, 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 Chambâ [took wives from them?], cf. Ray, o.c., 107, &c. According to Prof. Vogel, o.c., 97, the founder of the Chambâ 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.lûqî may somehow reflect this Solar.² Prof. Vogel himself (letter of 4.iii.1935) would rather compare our Jâba with another hill state Jammû (=<*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 Râjatarangini does not know either *Durgara* or *Jammû* and only mentions the old capital *Babbapura>Babor*; in the town of Jammû (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 Chambâ still seems to me the most suitable correspondence for Jâba (<*Châba*).³

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, Chambâ 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.lûqî corresponds best to Chaulukya. Moreover, according to V. Smith, o.c. 440, “there is some reason for believing that the Chaulukyas or Solankis were connected with the Châpas, and so with the foreign Gurjara tribe of which the Châpas were a branch”. This combination of Chaulukya with Châpa would be a curious parallel to our pair of S.lûqî and Jâba (<*Châpa*)! However, I hear from Dr. Barnett that Chaulukya and Chaulukya must be distinguished and that the Solanki-Chaulukya dynasty of Râjpūt origin could not as yet be traced much farther north than 25°.

³ As in Sumatra Jâba 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 Jâba (<Chambâ?). The variations of length may be due to 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 Tāqin, and N.jāba (*Jāba). [It must be remembered that a locality Gujrāt (reflecting the name of Gurjara) exists in the Panjab, north of the Chenab and south of Naoshera, at the very threshold of Kashmir.] See Map iv.

47.–57.: Places of the northernmost zone of India (beyond the Indus), enumerated in the order from west to north-east.

47.–50. and 54.–5 lie near the southern frontier of Afghānistān. 47. 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 marhāla, thence to Ügh, ditto; thence to L.jān (?), ditto; thence to Vayhind—the whole stretch being of 17 stages (mansīl). Apparently this road was a short cut from Ghaznī, across the mountainous region of the Pathan tribes, to the Indus, of which it then followed the right bank upstream to Gandhāra (region of Pēshāwar). 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 Maqdisī’s Ügh and L.jān. Birūnī in his Canon, mentions on the road “from Ghaznī to Multān” (immediately after Gardīz) *Farmul, or Parmul. This district, named after the [Tājīk?] tribe inhabiting it, lies precisely on the road from Ghaznī to Bannū, 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 Bannū is situated. In the upper part of the Tochi valley the first stage on the road is Urgūn, which is the centre of the Parmul district (23 kurohs to the south-east of Ghaznī). According to the order of enumeration in our sources it is probable that 54. Lamghān (Laghmān) and 55. 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 Bannū. Cf. Raverty’s description of the route in Notes of Afghanistan, 1888, p. 85.

Geographically 54. and 55. ought to come between Kābul (mentioned unexpectedly under the Marches of Khorāsān, § 24, 20.) and 50. *Ninhār. The exact situation of the town of 54. Lamghān (Laghmān), Ptolemy, vii, 1, 42, Laμβάξ (Ssk. Lampāka, Birūnī, Canon, Λαμβάξ) is not indicated on the maps, but as regards the district of Lamghān (Lamghānat) the Emperor Bābūr says that originally it consisted of Alangār, ‘Ali-shang, and Mandrāvar, situated on the left side affluent of the Kābul river, which flows from Kāfiristān (to the NW. of the Kunār basin). Alangār is the eastern valley and ‘Ali-shang the western one; their waters join below Mandrāvar and form the

1 The Bābūr-nāma, GMS, fol. 128a, mentions south of Kābul: Farmul, Naghar, Bannū, and the Afghān coun-

2 Indistinctly written in the MSS. Could it echo the name of Urgūn?
Bärän river falling into the Kābul river, cf. The Bābur-nāma, trans. by A. S. Beveridge, 1922, i. 207–13. Bar miyāna has been translated “on the middle course” in view of § 6, 58.; an alternative would be “a middle sized” town, cf. § 12, i.

55. (§ 6, 13. دنپور. دنپور (§ 6, 13.) 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>long.</th>
<th>lat.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lamghān</td>
<td>96° 10'</td>
<td>33° 50'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynwr</td>
<td>96° 25'</td>
<td>33° 45'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the latter being placed to the south-east (*south-west?*) of the former (corrected latitude in Birūnī, *India, 167*). Anyway, Dynwr must correspond to دنپور 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 دنپور is said to reflect Sk. 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 southern-most 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.

50. The name is spelt better under § 6, 13. (*Ninhār*?), where it is explained that the place lies downstream from Lamghān, on the northern (? bank of the latter’s river. The name certainly refers to the Jalālābād district of which a detailed description is found in G. H. MacGregor’s article in *JASB*, 1844, xiii/2, pp. 867–80: “the country which is subject to the control of the governor of Jullalabad is the valley of the Cabul river, but it is generally termed Ningrahar, 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 دنپور; see the passage describing the extent of the fief granted to Zāl by Minūchinch, ed. Vullers, i, 144: “The whole of Kābul and D. nb. r and Māy-hind, from the China sea to that of Sind, from Zābulistān to the lake of Bust.” On Māy-hind v.i. 56.

2 The distance is confirmed by Birūnī’s route, *India*, p. 101: Vayhind-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 نينهار (Ningnahār) and the more correct نگارهار (Nagarahār), cf. also A. S. Beveridge's translation, ii, Appendix, pp. xvii–xxviii. The mention in our text of the three idols of *Nînhâr is curious, as this locality (Hsüan-Tsang's Na-ka-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 Hadīta, i, 1933, pp. 1–12 (geographical account).

51.–3. according to § 6, 17., are situated on one of the Panjâb rivers, perhaps the Sutlej. Light on 53. Bîrüza is obtained from Mas‘ūdī, Murūj, i, 206–7, who says: "The king of Qinnauj, one of the kings of Sind, is (called) B.uruza (بیروز, &c.). This is the title of the king of Qinnauj, and here (too) stands a town called B.uruza (named) after the title of the king. It is now the territory of Islam forming a district of Multān. From the town comes one of the rivers which form the Mihrān of Sind." The spelling Birūza (perhaps influenced by a popular etymology) is very near بیروز which Marquart, Ėrânsahr, 264, has restored after the Leiden codex. [Less satisfactory seems to be a later surmise by Marquart, Komanen, 100, according to which Mas‘ūdī erroneously made a title of the king of Qinnauj out of the name of his town بیروز which should be interpreted as Mahodaya?]. If we keep to our texts, Birūza lay in Panjâb, and Ray, o.e., p. 16 and Map I, places it, with some probability, in the neighbourhood of the Sutlej, for the Panjâb 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 Hîvân, B.lwt (بیلوا) and J.lwt (جلو) lying upstream from Birūza have been identified. The reading of the two last names is uncertain. Under § 6, 15, they are spelt B.l.w.t and J.l.w.t, but they may possibly be B.l.t, B.l.w.t, J.l.t, J.l.w.t, &c. A fort of Bilwat is mentioned in Ni‘matullah’s Makhzan-i Afghâni, Elliot-Dowson, o.c., v, 107, as the place against which Bâbur marched from Lahore. Elliot thinks that it is identical with Milwat found in the Tuzük-i Bâburi, ibid., v, 248: moving from Kalanūr (situated half-way between the Râvi and Biyâh) Bâbur crossed the Biyâh (opposite Kamvahîn). 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 (Biyâh) 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 Milwat/Milwat; equally T.l.w.t (ثلوث) mentioned in Birūni, v.s. 43., is an entirely different place.]

54.–5. v.s. after 47.–50.

56. Vayhind,1 Indian Udabhända > Ohind, lay between the Indus and

1 Firdausi's Shâh-nâma (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.dhán, Bít.r, Núj, L.vár, S.mán, Qúj. Vayhind was the capital of the kingdoms of Gandhāra (Bîrûnî, India, 101: Qandahār, cf. Marquart, Erânsâhr, 271), which was ruled by the Hindūshāhí dynasty. The latter was founded in the second half of the ninth century by the Brahman Lalliyā, who had deposed his former master, the Turkish ruler of Kābul. According to Muhammad Nāźim, Sultan Mahmūd, 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 Mūltān. The name of the town may belong to an earlier source, but the mention of the king Jaypāl (Jayapāla) must have been added by our author. Jaypāl, who reigned A.D. 965–1001, was the gallant, but unfortunate, opponent of Sultan Mahmūd, cf. Ray, o.c., 78, 103. Jaypāl’s feudatory ties with the raja of Qinnauj are rather unexpected.

57. The fact that the name is spelt here Qashmīr, while under § 26, 19.–20. it appears as Kashmir, shows that our author depended on several sources. § 26 suggests the existence of a road linking Kashmir with Transoxiana and running through Bolor and Vakhān. More detail on Kashmir is found in Bîrûnî, who personally visited the country, see his India, p. 101, and Canon, where he calls Srinagar Addishtān < Ssk. Adhiṣṭhāna “the residence”.1 From 855 to 939 (and even down to A.D. 1003) the Utpala dynasty reigned in Kashmir, Ray, o.c., 181. It is true that the tenth century was a time of considerable weakness of these kings, but nothing seems to confirm their vassal dependence on Qinnauj.2 Nor can Dimashqī’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 (abwāb) 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 Mehran, in his French translation of Dimashqī, 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.
2 Only the western marches of Kashmir could depend on Qinnauj, o.c., p. 239.
3 The text of this chapter (without translation) was published by Barthold in Comptes rendus [Dokladi] de l’Acad. des Sciences de Russie, 1924, pp. 72–4.
Mîrzâ Haydar’s Târikh-i Rashîdi, 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 Khutukhu’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 (Jayhâni?) common with that used by Gardîzî, 88–9, 94. Gardîzî described three routes leading to Tibet:

(a) from Kâshghar a road passes between two mountains and follows an easterly direction until it reaches the province of Ādh.r (آذر)¹ which is 40 farsangs long and consists of mountains, plains (read: سبل instead of سجد), and barren hills (kauristân); the text, which is out of order, seems to indicate that Ādh.r formerly belonged to the khâqân of Tibet, but at the time to which the source refers was under Kâshghar. From the “province of Kâshghar” the road goes to Sâr.mäsâbkhath and then to Alishûr (الشور) after which it follows the stream of K.jä (كیا) on which, in the direction of the desert, lies the village of حسان (or حساس) where Tibetans are found; then a river is crossed in a boat and the travellers reach the frontier of Tibet;²

(b) from Kâshghar to Khotan by the places enumerated in the note to 10. down to which is the first village of Khotan; “and at this stretch (andar in miyân) comes the river Y.ร (ي)”; thence [from R.stüya or Y.ร?] to the village of S.mywb.m, then to the “barren hills belonging to the Muslims” (گریستان مسلمانان),³ then to a stream (جوی) coming from China (چین, or *Khotan ختن?), then to the town of Khotan; at 15 days’ journey from Khotan lies the large town of Kay (کی, perhaps *کی K.ج) 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 town Al.shän, 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 ādîr means “low foot-hills”, cf. Tajikistan (by several authors), Tashkent 1925, p. 47. Radloff, Wörterbuch, quotes ādîr (in Qirghiz and Qara-Qirghiz dialects) in the sense of “broken, mountainous country”. Very probably the Persian correspondence of ādîr is kaurîstân standing in our text.

² This road seems to stretch north of the Tarim down to the region of Kuchâ 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: gürîstân “cemetery”.

⁴ The final portion of the itinerary seems to describe a short cut across the Tarim from Khotan to Kuchâ, cf. § 9, 10., where similar particulars on Kuchâ are given.
mountain") where the travellers suffer from mountain sickness, to the "Gate (dar) of the khäqän of Tibet".1

Our author says nothing on the first two roads but incorporates the names of the road (b) down to R.stüya (see notes to 10.-20.). The rest of the places of the present chapter is not in Gardïzï; of them 1., 3., 9., 21., 22. (Klbänk) are also mentioned in the chapters on the mountains and rivers (§§ 5, 3. and 6, 3.); one rare name (9.) is also found in Birûnî; one name 23.) has a parallel in the Tärikh-i Rashïdï; the names 5., 6., 7., 8., and 22. (Binä) 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. Rång-rông 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 Gardïzï 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 [Sarî]-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-khäqän) was

---

1 This road, also mentioned in Birûnî, v.s., p. 24, evidently led across the K’un­­lun range to the Tibet proper. From Khotan it must have followed one of the head-waters of the Khotan river. The Tärikh-i Rashïdï, 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 Kashgar in 715, in Bull. S.O.S., ii/3, pp. 472-3, and Chinese Records of the Arabs in Central Asia, ibid., ii/4, pp. 616-18. The situation in the 8th—9th cent. is reflected in such notices as Qudäma, 208: Aṯbâsh (in the Narin basin) “situated between Farghäna, Tibet, and Barskhän”, 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.

in the north-east of Tibet. Dr. W. A. Unkrig, whom I consulted on the matter, very ingeniously suggests to me (letter of 25.11.1935) 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 אָחָא, 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-khäqän) whose troops occupied Ṭūsmat (evidently lying in the neighbourhood of Khotan), and whose treasure was kept in a fortress, south of the road leading from Kāshghar 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-khäqän 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 רָאנְק רָאנְק 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 Chīnistān; must be looked for in the south-east and east of Tibet, cf. the description of the Mānisā range (§ 5, 3.) which crosses Rāṅg-rong from the neighbourhood of India to a northern point where Tibet borders only on China (perhaps in Sū Ch’uan, see note to § 5, 3c.). Prof. F. W. Thomas suggests the possibility of Rāṅg-rong standing for “Sgaṅ-Roṅ, i.e. the Sgaṅ and the Roṅ, the two different kinds of territory which make up south-east Tibet towards China”, whereas Dr. W. A. Unkrig’s restoration would be *gTsang-pong 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 лай may eventually be interpreted as äckä [with Arabic īmāla: ཭ི for མ>ཅ] 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 aqa in that of the Mongol-speaking group. This acha may be a local form of Mongol eche.
2. The "Bolorian Tibet" corresponds to the Great Bolor (Pu-lu of the Chinese sources, Chavannes, Documents, 149), i.e. Baltistan, as opposed to the Lesser Bolor (Gilgit, &c.) on which see § 26, 19. See Map iv.

3. N.zvän (Tvän, Tzâdîn?) is placed by the Mânisâ range at the point where the latter bends to the north-west (§ 5, 3.). Geographically it may be identified with the Koko-nor and Tsaïdam, and the name may be Tibetan. On the interpretation of Mayül as "mother country" or "the mother's country", v.s., p. 257. It apparently has nothing to do with Mar-yul "the low country" which in the Târîkh-i Rashîdî, pp. 410, 456, is applied to Ladak.

4. may correspond to Gardizi's جەبان which (v.s., p. 255) seems to have been situated north of a river. This latter detail makes it difficult to identify the two names with Cherchen (Kâshghari: جەبان) on which v.i., 8.

5. It is extraordinary to find the name of Lhasa so perfectly transcribed in Arabic characters لَهْسَا. The report about a mosque in Lhasa is quite unexpected and M. Bacot doubts its truth. V.i. 23. K.rsâng.

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. "the Ajâ Country". The name transcribed in Tibetan characters Ha-ža [French transcription 'A-ža] belongs to the people whom the Chinese call T'u-yü-hun and of which the original form is restored as *Tu'u-γun, or *Tuyuy-γun. This people, in the beginning of the fourth century A.D., founded a kingdom in the region of the Koko-nor among the Tibetan K'iang, with a capital lying 15 li = 8.6 Km. west of the Koko-nor. The kingdom was destroyed by the Tibetans in A.D. 663, but the name 'A-ža still survived as shown by the Tun-huang documents. According to the Chinese sources (Sung-shu) "the T'u-yü-hun or Barbarian A-ch'ai [Tibetan: Ha-ža] were the Sien-pi of Liao-tung"; as regards the name A-ch'ai it was that given to the T'u-yü-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 *Tuyuy-γun; some scholars took them for the Tunguz, others for the Mongols. The last opinion has been lately supported in the light of fresh evidence by P. Pelliot, Note sur les Ty ou-yu-houen et les Sou-pî, in T'oung-Pao, xx, 1920, pp. 323-31. Prof. F. W. Thomas, Tibetan Documents, v, in J.R.A.S., Oct. 1931, p. 831, states that "the Tibetans (who speak of a Ha-ža kingdom long after the overthrow of Tu-yü-hun) understood by the term Ha-ža the people of the Shan-shan [i.e. Lob-nor] area and knew the Tu-yü-hun, who had long dominated the Shan-shan kingdom as Drug-cun". In this case our *Ajâ-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 (v.s., p. 257), supported by his interpretation of the name Ma-yül, 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.rm.ngän, quoted between J. and Tüsmat, 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 Chalmakaszan. 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 Kharoṣṭhī documents, and states that “it manifestly corresponds to the present Charchan”. The situation of our J.rm.ngän “on the edge of the desert” better fits the region of Cherchen, and in this case the occupation of the inhabitants —sayyädt—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 Tüsmat, according to § 5, 3., must have lain somewhere to the south of Khotan. As a dependency of Tüsmat 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 Tüsmat 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 Tüsmat from China (Khotan? § 5, 3.). It is curious that in the enumeration of the places lying between Käshghar and Khotan (v.i. 10.–20.) our author at the last place mentions some م instead of Gardizi’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 Tüsmat. This may be the reason, too, why he leaves out one or two localities mentioned by Gardizi immediately before Khotan. Prof. F. W. Thomas draws my attention to the likeness of the name Tüsmat to Tibetan 'Mdo-smat "Lower Mdo", south of the Koko-nor region. Has our author misunderstood the situation of Tüsmat? In Birünî’s Canon (the fifth climate) I now read توسمت (indistinctly written without dots); it is placed in “Outer

1 Abū Zayd (= Sulaymân, 64) in the story of the revolt of Huang-Ch’ao says that the emperor fled to مدينة م̀دو مأخسة للبلاد الشيت. Ibid., p. 109, a locality of M.̀dù (al-mauḍî al-ma’rīf bi-M.̀dù) is mentioned on the Tibetan frontier, and it is said that its inhabitants are constantly at war with the Tibetans. In the parallel passage Masʿūdi, Murūj, i, 305 and 297, gives مدو. Already Reinaud, note 134 to Sulaymân’s text, compared M.dhow with Mdo (Amdo). In any case, the tradition of Tüsmt in the H.-‘A and Birünî is different from Sulaymân-Masʿūdi’s *Amdo.
Tibet” and mentioned along with Chınänjkath (§ 12, 1.):

Tūsmat  long. 110° 0' lat. 39° 10'
Chınänjkath 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

1. Anhe (?)  long. 100° 40' lat. 43° 30'

10.-20. As the author says, the places quoted here belonged formerly to China but “now” are held by the Tibetans. They exactly correspond to the places which Gardīzī, 94, enumerates along the road from Kāshghar to Khotan. The mention of a fortress “to the right of Künkra and Rāy-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-Ālām:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gardīzī</th>
<th>Ḥ.-‘Ā.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kāshghar</td>
<td>see § 13, 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. باس</td>
<td>10. كرمان</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. كرمان</td>
<td>12. وچخان</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. غرا [غرا]</td>
<td>14. جنگک</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. كونکرا</td>
<td>16. راکوند</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. بریه</td>
<td>18. ترهوف</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. دستوهی</td>
<td>20. مث.</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. Brikha looks like the name quoted at the upper course of the Khotan river (§ 6, 3.), in which case our identification of the latter with Brinjak becomes less probable. There is some graphical likeness between our 18. and the Tizna'f river but the latter flows too far west (immediately east of the Yārkand-daryā). Perhaps only 19. could stand a comparison with Zanguya (*़ज़ु़गा) 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 (*दुलङ्क), 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 Pevtsov, Putesh. po Vost. Turkestana, SPb., 1892, p. 107, Gunduluk lies among reeds at some 10 Km. to the north-west of Zangüya, 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.bǎnk. The first name recalls the names of Ghaṣ-daryā and Ghaṣ-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.bǎnk is obscure and Binā is not found elsewhere.

23. Barthold, v.s., p. 25, has recognized the identity of our كرمان (Osāng?), which name in Mīrzā Ḥaydar’s Tārikh-i Rashīdī refers to Lhasa. Ḥaydar, p. 130, calls Ursāng “the Qibla of Khitay and Tibet”, and p. 48, gives an account of an unsuccessful expedition which in the summer of 939/1533 he led with the object of destroying the idol-temples of Ursāng. Elias in his commentary on the Tārikh-i Rashīdī, p. 136, explains that Ursāng is a probable corruption of the names of the two central provinces of Tibet, Wu and Tsang, which in speech are usually coupled together. 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 for the travellers going from Khotan to Khotan. Zangüya is the turning point Sanju.
§ 11-12

Tibet

263

tits capital. The form کرکنک in our author may have arisen from the vowel sign (damma) its capital. The form کرکنک in our author may have arisen from the vowel sign (damma) in the initial position. 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-qulūb, 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: RadlofFs Introduction to Das Kudatku Bilik, part i, SPb., 1891, pp. i-1xxxiii (contains a survey of the sources on the “Toghuqghur” and Uyghurs known at that time; the Introduction is now out of date, except for the Persian texts of the Mongol epoch quoted in the original); Bretschneider, Mediaeval Researches, i, 236–63; Chavannes, Documents; the following are the editions and translations of the Orkhon inscriptions to which reference is made in the text: V. Thomsen, Inscriptions de l’Orkhon, Helsingfors, 1896 (tumular inscriptions for Kül-tegin and Bilgä-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; Radlof (fourth version) in Die alttürkisch. Inschriften, Neue Folge (Kül-tegin, Bilgä), SPb., 1897 and ditto, Zweite Folge (Tonyuquq), SPb., 1899; P. Melioransky, Pamiatnik v ehest’ 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, Toghuqghuz, Turfän, and Türk in EI; Vorlesungen, pp. 48–9. [O. Franke’s, Gesch. d. Chines. Reiches, ii, 1936, containes numerous data on the Turks, but it comes to late to be utilized in this commentary.]

§ 12. The Toghuqghuz

Even though the reading ज़ु: Toghuqghuz (and not Toghuqghur as formerly supposed) and its interpretation as Toquz-Oghuz, i.e. “the Nine (tribes of the) Oghuz”, are now generally accepted there remains still some obscurity with regard to the origin and use of the term in Muslim literature.

1 As another possibility Dr. Unkrig suggests in Tibetan mK’ar bZan (> K’arsang 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 (baryār) is not connected with Indian vihāra, and is an Iranian word <*par-x-vādīra, “full of happiness”, cf. Benveniste, Bull. Soc. Ling., 1928, xxi, 7–8.

3 There seems to exist a still unpublished final translation by Thomsen.
Before the sixth century A.D. the peoples now called "Turkish" were known under various tribal and political names. In the first half of the sixth century a group of Turks living in the Altai began a movement to regroup the neighbouring peoples and in a short time succeeded in organizing a great empire which from Mongolia spread its influence down to the neighbourhood of the Black Sea. The founders of this new empire for the first time assumed the name Türk (or Tûrük "strength") which the Chinese rendered as T'û-chüeh, and in order to avoid confusion with other occasional uses of the term Türk we shall adopt this conventional Chinese term² in speaking of the first Turkish empire. From the very beginning³ the T'û-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.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'û-chüeh kingdom and in 745 the Uyghurs, former associates of the T'û-chüeh, took the leadership on the Orkhon. Cf. Bichurin, Sobr. sved., i, 338.

The rule of the Western qaghans (khâqân) of the original T'û-chüeh dynasty lasted till A.D. 657, when the Chinese subjugated them. From A.D. 685 to 688 the territories of the Western T'û-chüeh were constantly invaded by the tribes of the Eastern qaghans. The Indian summer of the Western T'û-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, o.c., 4, 43, 79, 85, and passim. Such was the end of the two original T'û-chüeh kingdoms.

The Uyghurs remained on the Orkhon till A.D. 840, when in their turn they were defeated and decimated by the Qirghiz (§ 14). The remnants scattered in various directions; the chief group seems to have gone to Kan-su where the Uyghurs founded a new kingdom which survived till the times of the Tangut supremacy, i.e. circa A.D. 1020.⁵ Towards A.D. 860 a second

---

² Soon after A.D. 572 Turkish troops cooperated with the Utigurs during the siege of the Cimmerian Bosphorus (¼ Kerch, at the entrance of the Azov Sea). In Hsüan-tsang's time the dominions of the western qaghan reached the Indus, Chavannes, o.c., 241, 256.
³ To the English transcription T'û-chüeh corresponds the French transcription Tou-kîue. The Chinese presumably had in view not the singular Türk but its Mongol plural Türkîü (Pelliot).
⁴ Hsüan-tsang in A.D. 630 found the khan of the Western Turks at his encampment on the Chu river.
⁵ V.s., notes to § 9. According to the T'ang-shu, transl. by I. Bichurin, i, 419, after the catastrophe of 840 the minister of the former Uyghur khan called Si-ch'i P'ang-tê-lê led 15 aymaqs from
The Toghuzghuz 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. Qudäma, 262, Mas‘üdî, Murüj, i, 288, Işt., 10, Gardizî, 90-2, as well as our author. Kāshgharî, who personally knew the region, quietly substitutes Uyghur for the antiquated Toghuzghuz and the latter term occurs no more in the literature of Mongol times. How, then, did it happen that the T’ien-shan Uyghurs were surnamed Toquz-Oghuz (“Nine Oghuz”)?

In the authentic Orkhon inscriptions of the Eastern T’u-chüeh qaghans the term Toquz-Oghuz is well known and seems to be almost a synonym of Türk, with the difference that the latter refers more to the political and the former to the tribal side of the organization, cf. Barthold, Türk in EI, for not always and not all the Oghuz recognized the qaghan’s authority.

On the other hand, the Uyghurs are separately mentioned in the same inscriptions. The account of Bilgä-qaghan’s campaign in the Selenga region (ii, E 37 in which a few words are unfortunately missing) is immediately followed by the record of the flight of the Uyghur eltäbir 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: Bay an-chur who reigned a.d. 756-9. On it the On-Uyghur (“Ten Uyghurs”) and the rest of the Uyghurs retreated to P’ang-t’ê-lê is found in Kan-chou; pp. 233-53. 


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’iing and took from them Si-chou (Yar-khoto) and Lun-t’ai = Urumchi. He also was confirmed by the emperor (though the latter seems to have lost the throne at that very moment). Marquart, Streifzüge, 390, gives a.d. 866 as the date of the Uyghur occupation of Kao-ch’ang.

2 Cf. Thomsen, Inscriptions: i, N 4 and ii, E 30, translation, pp. 112 and 124 (= ZDMG, 1924, p. 154), where Bilgä-qaghan says that the Toquz-Oghuz people was his own people but became his enemy. A similar situation existed between the Seljuks and the Ghuz tribes at the time of Sanjar.
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 Ὠγόρ 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 Tölös or Tölös, *v. supra*, p. 196.)\(^1\) The nine subdivisions of the Uyghurs are further enumerated and it is added that their number was increased [after 745?] by the Basmil and Qarluq, as respectively the tenth and eleventh divisions.

It must be admitted that the terminology of Chinese, Turkish, and Arabic sources presents still considerable difficulties. The former reading of the name as Toghuzghur was in favour of its further interpretation as Toquz-Oghur, but the solidly established reading Toghuzghuz (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.e.*, 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 Türken haben, in der Gegend des Selengauflusses. Die meisten dieser Stämme scheinen zu dieser Zeit zu einer anderen grossen Konföderation von Stämmen, die in den Inschriften Oyuz heissen, in einem nahen Verhältnis gestanden oder ihr gehörig 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 Toghuz-Oghuz and the Uyghurs, thought that the term Toghuzghuz 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 *Semirechje*, 15, *Toghuzghuz in EI*, and *Vorlesungen*, 53–4. According to the *T'ang-shu* (Chavannes, *o.e.*, 96–9) this group, which had separated from Western T'u-chüeh, lived in the seventh century near the Barkul lake (at the eastern extremity of Eastern T'ien-shan) and after 712 near Pei-t'ing (Bish-baliq) from where it was

---

\(^1\) Chavannes, *o.e.*, 87–94. The later *T'ang-shu* enumerates the 15 tribes of the Ch'ê-lé (>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 hin und da zerstreut lebten!" Cf. also Chavannes, *o.e.*, 221, and Barthold’s critical remarks in *Zap.*, xv, 0172–3. [Is the reading T'ieh-lé correct?]
dislodged by the Tibetans in 808.¹ 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 (황차오)² and the expulsion of the emperor Hsi-Tsung (A.D. 881), says that the latter asked for the help of “the king of the Toghuzghuz who live in the land of the Turks. The Chinese and the Toghuzghuz are neighbours and their royal families are allied.” So the king of the Toghuzghuz sent his son with an army who restored the emperor to his throne. According to Chinese sources, see Wieger, Textes historiques, 1905, pp. 1759-61, the emperor was restored by Li K’o-yung and his 10,000 men of Sha-t’o and Ta-tan.³ Although these parallel texts show that the term Toghuzghuz could refer to the Sha-t’o, the evidence in favour of the Sha-t’o having been alone responsible for the transmission and perpetuation of the name Toghuzghuz as applied to the inhabitants of Eastern T’ien-shan does not seem very decisive. It is curious that Mas’ūdī, Murūj, 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 Kūshān (v. i. 1). In both cases the name is undoubtedly to be restored as ارخان* Uyghur-khan, as both Bïrünï, Canon, and Kāshgharï, 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 (Ṭabari, iii, 1044; Ibn al-Athîr, xi, 117; Maqrizi, Khīyat, i, 31325) 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 Türgish within the Western Turkish federation. If even, as time wore on, the Arabs learnt to discriminate between the single tribes nearer to Transoxiana, the new group arriving from the Orkhon after the events of A.D. 840 could rightly be regarded as a wave having risen from the original home of the Toquz-Oghuz.

It remains to explain the two curious passages from Jāhīz (died circa A.D. 868) quoted by Marquart, Streifzüge, 91-3. Jāhīz ascribes to the effeminating influence of 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.i. under 2.
² According to Pelliot, T’oung-Pao xxi, 1922, p. 409, the Arabic form must be *Bānishwā (Bansho?) which gives an equivalence of the southern pronunciation of Huang Cao, “mot à ancienne gutturale initiale laquelle s’est complète-
numerous as they”. Even if this passage hints at the catastrophe which befell the Manichaean Uyghurs in A.D. 840, the name *Toghuzghuz* as applied to them would only confirm our point of view on the indiscriminate use of the term by the Arabs who could not very accurately distinguish between the Orkhon tribes and who have not left any record of the role played by the Qirghiz in the events of 840. It is more likely, however, that Jāḥīz (with some confusion in the details, cf. p. 290, n. 2) had in mind the subjugation of the Türgish (Western *T'u-chüeh*) by the Qarluq towards 766.

The earliest visit to the Toghuuzghuz country recorded by the Muslims seems to have been the journey of Tamīm b. Baḥr 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 Yāqūt, i, 840, and iv, 823. The following analysis will show to what extent it was utilized by the early geographers. [D stands for *ditto* and A for *abest.*]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tamīm (Yāqūt)</th>
<th>I.Kh., 31.</th>
<th>Qudāmā, 263.</th>
<th>Abū Dulaḥ</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 are fire-worshippers and Manichaean</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>inhabitants have no places of worship</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>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to the right, the country of the Turks</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to the left, the 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 Barskhân to the khäqän's town, viz. 3 months' journey, might refer to the Orkhon capital, but as I.Kh. undoubtedly depends on Tamîm's data the distance of "three months" has been probably calculated from the latter's indication that he was riding day and night at the rate of 3 sikka per day. Consequently I.Kh. must have converted Tamîm's 40 [Qudâma: 45] days into more quiet stages.1 Yäqût omits to mention the starting-point of Tamîm's journey, but it could certainly not be *Barskhân al-a'lâ*, as I.Kh.'s text has it, but (as Qudâma, 262–3, clearly implies) the Lower Barskhân which lay in the neighbourhood of Ţarâz (see note to § 15, 11.). In this case 40–5 days to Bish-baliq would be no great exaggeration. That the terminal point of Tamîm'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'ü*, Chavannes, o.c., 12 and 305). The Arabs call it *khaima* "tent" but Fakhr ad-dîn Mubârakshâh!, ed. Sir E. D. Ross, p. 39, uses for it the curious Persian term *tanûra* "funnel" [not = the Arabic *tannûr.*] [See Appendix B.]

The traces of Tamîm's tradition are also found in Idrïsî, i, 491, who says that the capital of the Toghuzghuz 팠سنبع, read *Bish-balîq (?), has twelve iron gates, the inhabitants are Zoroastrians and some are Magians and fire-worshippers. From a different source Idrïsî, i, 502, has the name of the "principal city of the Toghuzghuz" خرخزک separated from the khäqän'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 *جانجک* (v.i. 1.).2 The second name, mutilated as usual in Idrïsî, could be *Panjikath* (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 "khäqän's town" and Panjikath would be approximately right in view of Idrïsî'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 Tamîm's report.4 More probably, in common with Gardizi, the author derives his

---

1 It is true that 40 $\times$ 3 = 120, i.e. 4 months, but I.Kh. with his experience as a postmaster probably made some allowance for Tamîm's exaggeration of his powers of endurance.


3 Cf. Qudâma, 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 Tamîm's indication (Yäqût, i, 840) concerning the religion of the Toghuzghuz ("most of them are fire-worshippers of the Magian religion, and among them are found *sindiq* of Mäni's creed"). What does Tamîm take for the majority's religion? Does he confuse Buddhists with Zoroastrians and use the term 'abadat al-
principal information from Jayhânï, who certainly had numerous opportunities for completing the data on the Turks from direct sources. The Sâmânids 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 Yaghmä are said to have the Toghuzghuz on the east, but, to say nothing of Kûchä reckoned to China, the Khallukh (§ 15) also intervened between the Yaghmä and the Toghuzghuz. On some Khirkhïz found to the west of the Toghuzghuz see notes to §§ 14 and 15, 13. The Toghuzghuz (probably in a wider sense) are also said to have been numerous along the road from Kâshghar to Khotan (§ 11, 10.). The real frontier of the Toghuzghuz towards the north-east seems to have lain near the Tarbaghatai (v.i. 8.), but under § 3, 1. the Eastern ocean is said to adjoin the extreme eastern limits of the Toghuzghuz and Khirkhïz. 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 "Turkistân", the latter term being of course used in the sense of "territories occupied by Turkish tribes" and not in the later acception of Transoxiana, or even Semirechye. The same ancient recollections may account for the item of the Toghuzghuz-Tätär (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 Tätär". Finally the item on some prosperous "Turks" belonging to the Toghuzghuz may refer to the remnants of the Western T'uu-chüeh and their Türgish continuators (see notes to § 12, 10.). Some remains of the Sha-t'ô (v.s., p. 266) at the eastern extremity of the T'ieen-shan could also be called Turk.

*nirân* in the loose sense of "heathens"? A Manichaeans minority could certainly exist in Bish-Baliq even in the times of Western T'uu-chüeh. Had Tamîm known the real Uyghurs (who according to Marquart occupied this region towards A.D. 866) his presentation of the religious situation would have been quite different. Should we then (contrary to Marquart, *Streifzüge*, 390) assign an earlier date to Tamîm's journey, this assumption would be in favour of a further hypothesis that this traveller may be the source of information on the situation in Kan-su as described in our § 9 (v.s., p. 227). Cf. Barthold's *Preface*, p. 26 and p. 268, note 1.]  


2. Even in Mongol times the Uyghurs kept up their national traditions, Juvaynî, i, 39-45.

3. Gardïzî mentions the Tatar (sic) only as one of the Kimäk tribes (§ 18). But the item referring to a definite clan has nothing to do with our author's statement about the relationship of the Tätär and Toghuzghuz.

4. Tamîm, v.s., p. 268, mentions the Turks to the "right" (i.e. to the south) of the Toghuzghuz. If the term *Turks* does not stand here for the Tibetans (considered as Turks) it may refer to the Sha-t'ô.
Our author starts (i. 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 Kuchä. 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. **Chïnänjkath**, “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 *Jour. As.*, May 1912, p. 590. Birûnî, **Canon**, f. 103a, quotes “Chïnänjkath which is قره ترخان Qocho, the residence of the Uyghur-khän”. Kâshghari, iii, 165, calls the town ترخان Qocho (on his **Kûshân** see note to § 9, 5.; on his **Kusan** see note to § 9, 10.). Juvaynî, i, 32, spells (with a popular etymology) **Qara-Khwäja** and the **Masâlik al-absâr**, transl. by Quatremère, *Notices et extraits*, xiii, 224: **Qarä-Khwäjä**. 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 Lecoq, *Chotscho*, Berlin, 1913. The latest description is found in Sir A. Stein, *Innermost Asia*, Oxford, 1928, pp. 566–609.

2. The mountain Tafqän, separating Chïnänjkath from Panjikath, cf. § 5, 6., is certainly Eastern T'ien-shan (Boghdo, highest peak 12,080 f.). The name, otherwise unknown, looks like a mis-spelling of Turfan (the name of the town **Turpanni-kamtha** occurs in the Saka document, written probably in the latter part of the eighth century). See Barthold, *Turfan*, in *El*.

The “Five Villages” lying behind the mountain did not form one close group. The village called Panjikath was only one of them. The Turkish equivalent of this Iranian (Soghdian?) name is Bish-baliq, both meaning

---

1 The name Chïnänjkath “the Chinese town” was also borne by a town of Shâsh, Išt., 323. The name is distinctly Soghdian, the element -ânj being a feminine suffix to suit the word -kath, cf. also Gurgän in Khwârazm and perhaps Kabûdhänj-kath “the Blue (?) Village” in Soghd, Išt., 322. Cf. Benveniste, *Essai de grammaire sogdienne*, ii, 1929, pp. 87–8, and *Jour. 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 تفخمان is certainly an entirely different name, see note to § 15, 15.


5 I owe to H. W. Bailey the reference that in Middle Persian the form pnâznîyy kw'd'y, “the lord of Panjkând”, is found together with čyn'nîzkîyy kw'd'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 й) 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-balîq is mentioned in the Orkhon inscriptions (ii, £ 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 Khalluks defeated the Basmil and since 744 the latter had been incorporated in the Uyghur federation, Chavannes, o.c., 94. So towards the middle of the eighth century the Uyghurs already had Bish-balîq under their sway. In 791 the Qarluq (§ 15) occupied "the valley of the stupa which belonged to the Uyghurs", Chavannes, o.c., 305. The town is the one visited by Tamîm b. Bahr (v.s.). In the year of the composition of the H.-Ä. the Uyghur prince Arslan was entertaining at Pei-t'ing the Chinese envoy Wang Yen-tê, see S. Julien in Jour. As., 1847, ix, pp. 50-66; Chavannes, Documents, p. 11; Barthold, Bishbalîk in EI; Sir A. Stein, Innermost Asia, 1928, p. 582 sq. On the mention of Bish-balîq in Idrisi, v.s., p. 269. The ruins of Bish-balîq lie some 47 Km. west of Guchen near Jimisar. 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 Kâshgharî's list, i, 103, of the "five towns" composing the Uyghur possessions, namely, Sulmi (founded by Alexander the Great!); Qocho (= our 1. Chînânjkath), Jambaliq, Bish-balîq (= 2. Panjîkath), Yangi-balîq. Bretschneider, Mediaeval Researches, ii, 27-33, quoting the Yiian-shi mentions under Pei-t'ing the following five places: Qara-khocho (= Chînânjkath); *Taksin (T'a-ku-sin) shown on the old Chinese maps between Qumül and Bish-balîq; Jambaliq shown west of Bish-balîq and east of Manas; Khutukbai (Ku-t'a-ba) west of Jambaliq; and Yangi-balîq (the Yangi-balghasun station between Khutukbai and Manas). If our author, as is his habit, enumerates the five places east to west, Küzar.k and J.m.lkath must be placed east of Panjîkath (Bish-balîq), and Bärughand Jâmh.r west of it. This surmise is corroborated by the fact that the

1 Birûnî, Canon, mentions S.lm.n situated long. 113°6', lat. 43°6', i.e. north-east of Chînânjkath lying long. 111°20', lat. 42°6'. On some other mentions of this town (called Üê-Solmi 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. Birûnî, 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 *Panjîkath, Yîrîmîczîmî kamthâ is probably Urumchi and Cammoiđi Badaiki nâmma kamthâ [read: *jamîl-balîq?] may stand for our J.m.l-kath = Jam-balîq, or (less probably) for our 10. J.mli-kath.

4 Kûrazâk has some outward resemblance to the lake of Kûrazî which according to Idrisi lay probably near Bish-balîq (cf. p. 269, note 3) though on Idrisi's map this lake seems to correspond to the Lob-nor.
same Jämgh. 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. The name is perhaps to be pronounced *Chämghar in view of the similar name belonging to a place on the road from Farghana to Khujanda spelt in I.Kh., 30, and in Maq., 341 (with Arabic $ for $). On the name of j.m.lkat (cf. the present-day Jimisar?), v.i., note to io.

3.-5. belong to the itinerary given in Gardizi, 91: Barskhän—B.nchül (?)—Kujä—arl—Sikat—M.k.shmighnæthür—Chinãnjkat. Our author quotes them in inverted order (reckoning Kuchä to China, and B.nchül and Barskhän to Khallukh). The same itinerary is mentioned by Raverty in his translation of the Tabaqät-i Näsirî, p. 961: Barskhän—کشمناور—سکت—سحل—چینانکئت (read: چینانکئت ?). Raverty, with his exasperating vagueness about references, pretends to quote from I.Kh., but all the details of the passage coincide with Gardizi, of whose work Raverty must have had a defective copy.

3. The strange corresponds to Gardizi’s مکمیتایور and Raverty’s کشمناور in which the element جی is perhaps an additional name or term, for Gardizi’s text runs: “from Sikat to M.k.shmighnæthür, and from Thür to Chínænjkath”. 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 Rashîd al-dîn, ed. Berezin, Trudi V.O., vii, 10o–1, xiii, 237 with numerous variants. This place lay near the region of كٰمان (or كوشان) “on the frontiers” of China (or Khotan?) and Kâshghar. Whether *Kûshân (K.sân) refers to Kao-ch’ang (v.s. 1.) or to Kuchä (§ 9, 10.)3 the place described by Rashîd al-dîn geographically suits our K.msïghiyâ. Pelliot, in Jour. As., April 1920, p. 183, quotes a parallel Chinese name: k’iu-sien-kiv-tch’ö-eul-kosseu-man [in English transcription: Ch’ü-hsien-ch’ê-eh-ko-sü-man]. The first three syllables seem to run parallel to our Kamsïghiyâ and Rashîd-al-dîn’s Kûsäqü (?).

4. Gardizi’s Sîkand or Shî-kand is a better name for a group of 3 villages (cf. Soghdian ْع “three”). It must be also remembered that the Chinese called سی the district of Yar-khoto, situated at 12 km. to the west of Turfan.

5. lying near the Khüland-ghün river (§ 6, 3.) corresponds to Gardizi’s بال and Raverty’s بال. Barthold, Report, 116, suggests the reading *Aral (“island”) though he feels embarrassed by the position of a village

---

1 In this case Bârlugh (“wealthy”) cannot be compared with Barkul (< Barskul “Tiger lake”) at the north-eastern extremity of the T’ien-shan. Hardly, either, can our Bârlugh 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 Barskhän see note to § 15, 15.

3 The latter is the opinion of Tomschek, SBWA, Bd. cxvi, p. 758, and Pelliot, Jour. As., April 1920, p. 180.

4 P. 91: بال ba-AsL.
of this name\(^1\) to the west of Kuchä, whereas Gardïzï 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 Gardïzï, \(^{90}\) speaking of the strife between a former khäqän of the Toghuzghuz and his brother Kür [Kür]-tegin he says that the capital (ha'drat) of the Khäqän “was” [at that time?] in Azal (*Aral?). The nearest place of importance to the east of Kuchä is Bügür (on the western bank of the Qizil river). Käshghari, i, 301, says: “Bügür is a fort (gal’a) between Kuchä and Uyghur lying on a height (’alā shahiq) and it is a frontier-post (thaghhr)”. From a palaeographic point of view a confusion of *jj« and \(\text{Ü}j\) \(\text{z}\) is not impossible (cf. note to § 15, 15. on \(\text{Azdr}^{*}\)).\(^3\) Some complication in the way of this identification lies, however, in the fact that it is difficult to take Qizil-su for the important Khüland-ghün (cf. § 6, 3; and § 13). [The latter probably corresponds to the Muzart river which flows west of the Kuchä-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 Kuchä studied by A. Herrmaïn in S. Hedin, Southern Tibet, 1922, viii, p. 431.]

6. Kümas (Kümis?)-art has some likeness to K.mïz-[art?]\(^4\) which Gardïzï, 86, mentions on the road from Toghuzghuz to Khirkhiz (see note to § 14). The route is very vague and only tentatively would one place K.mïz-art (after which a mountainous tract succeeds to the plains) somewhere to the south of the Tarbaghtai, say near Chuguchak. On the other hand, Käshghari, i, 306, and iii, 177, speaks of a Kümi-Talas (or Talas-yüz)\(^5\) forming the frontier (thaghhr) of the Uyghur; on his Map he shows it between the upper courses of the Ili and Irtish, south of a mountain (Tarbaghtai?). At 1,500 li due north of Yar-khoto the T’ang-shu mentions a “To-lo-se valley” which Chavannes, o.c., 32, identifies with that of the Black Irtish. This may be another hint for the location of Kümi-Talas, though the connexion of the latter with Kümas-art\(^6\) is still problematic.

---

\(^1\) On Grum-Grzhimalo’s map this Aral lies circa 90 Km. west of Kuchä and 11 Km. east of Bai.

\(^2\) See p. 273, n. 4.

\(^3\) \[Ark may be the generic Persian word “citadel” = Käshghari’s gal’a.\]

\(^4\) Cambridge MS., fol. 182a: K.mrāz.

\(^5\) To be distinguished from the Ulugh-Talas (v.i., § 25, 93.).

\(^6\) In script Küm.s and Kmy can be easily confused. Käshghari’s orthography is different, for he expressed the vowels by harakhāt while the Persian authors use in Turkish names matres lectionis.
Both the name of Küm.s-ûrZ and the detail about its inhabitants being hunters point to a mountainous locality. The alternative tentative explanation would be to connect the name *Kümäs with that of the river Künēs (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 (Daght, Narat, Adun-kur). The fluctuation of n/m is not unknown in Turkish (göňshu > gomshu).

9. The obvious restoration of خیود would be *Khumûdh for Qumül which Gardïzï, 92, places on the road from Chinânjkath to Sha-chou (see note to § 9, 3.). The fluctuation of δ/l would not make difficulties in Eastern Iranian; in the Soghdian letters published by Reichelt Qumûl is called K.myδ. Our author having split the itinerary into political areas could, of course, insert Qumül in his enumeration out of definite order. If, however, in his usual way he followed some system one ought to consider the fact that Kh.mûd mentioned among the places lying in the north-western corner of the Toghuzghuz possessions, immediately before J.mlîkath, and its description would suit the upper valleys of the Qarashar drainage area (the two Yulduz valleys). [Eventually could be improved into *خیدو Khaidu, but this latter name of the Qarashar river seems to be of later Mongol origin!]

10. According to the description جملک must be different from جملک mentioned above under 2. but their names have a striking likeness and it is possible that both are composed of the same elements: ḫml or ḫmly† + kat or kath. As a parallel one would quote the name of the tribe جمل Jumul to which Kâshghari, i, 28, assigns the following place in his north-to-south enumeration (al-qâbâ’il al-mutawassita bayn al-janîb wal-shimâl): Chigil, Tukhsî, Yaghmâ, Ighráq, *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.mlîkath bore the title of *yabghû. That he was distinct from the Khallukh yabghû (§ 15) results from the facts that he is mentioned under § 12, evidently as a vassal of the Toghuzghuz, and that his village was exposed to the Khallukh raids. Perhaps a passage of the T’ang-shu, Chavannes, o.c., 86, may give us a clue to the situation. Speaking of the disruption of the Western T’u-chûeh (i.e. Türgish) federation towards A.D. 766 (see notes to §§ 15 and 17) it says: “when this people was destroyed there was a certain T’e-p’ang-lê who settled in the town of Yen-ch’i (= Qarashar) and took the title of shê-hu (= yabghû)”.

1 Cf. our Panjy-kath (§ 12, 2.) = Panj-kath in Gardïzï, 90, note 8.
2 On Kâshghari’s Map the Jumul (or a section of them?) appear much farther to the east on the Obi upstream from the Qây, v.d., p. 285.
3 In the T’ang times Qarashar was usually under the Western T’u-chûeh 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 Youlouz,d puis traversant la passe Narat pour arriver sur le Koungès et dans la vallée d'Ili. Mais le T'ang-chou ne nous en fournit pas la description." Precisely the existence of this road connecting the territories lying south of the T'ien-shan with the Ili valley could account for the variety of tribes which raided J.m'llkath 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 Barskhān, at which our source hints under § 15, 11. On the Yabghū-pass see note to § 15, 5.

11.17. called "stages" (mansil) must belong to the routes in the northern region of the Toghuzghuz possessions, partly in the T'ien-shan and partly in the Ili basin. The order of enumeration is obscure. See Maps i and v.

11.12. Our situated by a large river very likely corresponds to Kāshghārī's (iii, 277) Yafinj, "a town situated near the Ili". Juvaynī, GMS, ii, 88, records the limits of the Qara-Khitay empire as stretching from Tārāz to ʿamām (or ʿawām), which must represent the same name. On Kāshghārī's Map the name Yafinj is inscribed south of the Ili. However, at another place (i, 58) he says that the town of Iki-Ōgūz (v.s. 16.) is situated between the rivers Ili and Yafinj and the name of this Iki-Ōgūz is inscribed north of the Ili. It is not clear whether Yafinj is an independent river or an affluent of the Ili but for the reasons quoted below one might take Yafinj for the Qara-tal flowing to the Balkhash lake north of the Ili. [On Idrīsī's Map, Bib. Nat. Paris, MS. arabe 2221, f. 178v., a ʿamsh is shown on the right bank of the river Serum (Sh.rmākh?) flowing to the lake B.rwān.]

14. A name parallel to our Sīdīn-kūl is Sīdīn-kul, as according to Kāshghārī, iii, 99 and 273, a lake was called near Qochingar-bashi (> Qoch-gar-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. [Sīdīn < sīd- "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") Kāshghārī's frontier place (baldatun bil-thaghr) Iki-ōgūz, i.e. "(situated between) the two rivers", namely the Ili and Yafinj. Near Iki-ōgūz lay the township of Qamlanchu, ḫibid., 184.

¹ Kāshghārī, iii, 99, mentions a lake Yulduz-kūl, situated on the frontier (thaghr) between Kuchā, Kyk.t, and Uyghur. The name Kyk.t is suspect and may be identical with Kingūt mentioned on the Uyghur frontier, iii, 268.
As mentioned above, Iki-ögüz appears on the Map to the east (north) of the Ili, and to the west (south) of Kümi-Talas (v.s. 8). Rubruquis (A.D. 1253–5) quotes the name in the amusing Latin disguise of Equius (<iki [or ek]-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 quandam bonam villam qui dicitur Equius, in qua erant Saraceni loquentes 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 dextris, et quoddam mare a sinistris sive. quemdam lacum qui durat XXV dietas in circuitui (sic). Et illa planicies tota irrigatur ad libitum aquis descendentibus de montibus que (sic) omnes recipiuntur in illud mare. In estate redivimus ad latus aquilonare illius maris ubi similiter erant magni montes. . . . Invenimus ibi unam magnum villam nomine Cailac (Coilac) in qua erat forum et frequenterant eam multi mercatores.” F. M. Schmidt, Über Rubruks Reise in Zeitschr. d. Ges. f. Erdkunde, Berlin, 1885, xx, 203, places Cailac (*Qayaltiq) 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. Ighräj-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 Ighräq, v.s. 10., approaches our Ighräj. Cf. also the mysterious لَاءِ عِراقَ, where according to Gardïzî, 84ג, the Kimãk used to take their horses in winter. But then the *Ighräq (instead of 'Iräq) comprised some warm valleys!

§ 13. The Yaghmâ

Gardïzî, 84, recording some older traditions2 says that a party of Toghuzghuz having separated from their tribe joined the Khallukh who by that time had succeeded in establishing friendly relations with the Haytäl of

1 I now see that the explanation of Equius by Iki-ögüz is already found in Barthold, Vorlesungen, 95.
2 Marquart who has commented on this passage, Komanen, 13–15, thinks that their source is Ibn al-Muqaffa whose Gardizî quotes among his authorities.
The Turk-khäqän [of the Türgish] felt some uneasiness at this combination and directed the above-mentioned Toghuzghuz to settle between the Khallukh and the Kimäk, 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 Kimäk oppressed the new federation the latter moved to the neighbourhood of the khäqän. The name of the chief of the Toghuzghuz in question was Yaghmä and now the khäqän called him tutuq in order to spite the Kimäk chief (who had a similar title).

In the H.-i.A. we find the Yaghmä (Yaghmiyä) living astride of the Ighraj-art (Central and Western T'ien-shan) and occupying both the region south of the Khatläm river, i.e. Narin (§ 6, 21.) and the north-western corner of the present-day Chinese Turkestan. We do not know how the Yaghmä came to occupy this region. § 13, 1. suggests a previous struggle between the Chinese, the Khallukh, and the Yaghmä. From the fact that Käshghari, i, 85, mentions on the river Ilä (III) the tribes of Yaghmä and Tukhsï and a clan of the Chigil, we may infer that the Yaghmä known to Gardizï’s source had split into two. The presence of some Yaghmä near the Ili basin may be inferred from § 12, 10., but the important group of the tribe must have centred round, and north of, Käshghar. The Mujmal al-tawärïkh, Barthold, Turkestan, i, 20, definitely says that “the king of the Yaghmä is called Boghrä-khäń”. 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 Afräsiyäb, “khan of Turkestan”, Iläk-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 Tukharistän (see note to § 23, 69.). Under a.h. 119 Ţabari, ii, 1421, line 9, mentions the jabghüya al-Tukhâri and ibid., line 16, calls him jabghüya al-Khartukhi.

2 The region “between” the Khallukh and the Kimäk 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.mwjni restored by Marquart as samür-i chini), 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 Khüland-ghün (§ 6, 3. and § 12, 5.) as the southern frontier of the Yaghmä. Does Khüland-ghün stand here for the Aq-su and its western tributaries (Taushqan) ? The name *Tağhuskhan or *Tawushkhan is found in Gardizï (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 Yaghmä 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 khäqän 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, Guwaimis Bericht über die Bekehrung der Uiguren, in Sitz. Berl. Akad., 1912, xxvii, 491, has shown that Abü Dulaf Mis’ar b. Muhalhil (cf. note to § 9) while speaking of the shi’a tribe 정적 refers to the dynasty of Boghra-khän, v.i.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 Nizām 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 quem* of our author’s original source. It is also noteworthy that Üzgand which was destined to become an important centre of the Qara-khanids is still reckoned (§ 25, 58.) to Transoxiana. In the south the Qara-khanids waged war on the kings of Khotan (§ 9, 18.) and the mention of the 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-lē, Sha-lē, 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. S.O.S*, 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.3 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, *Guvainis 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”. Bīrūnī 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?), Kāshghari, i, 317, mentions a tribe Alḵā (sic) Bulāq (بلاک) 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 *Alqabölük.*] 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 Kāshghari, i, 9 and 31, says that in the districts of Kāshghar a non-Turkish language was spoken, called kānja. In the town itself the *khaqāni* Turkish was used. [In later times a place called K.nj.k is often mentioned in the neighbourhood of Talas, cf. Wassāf, *Tarikh*, ed. Hammer, i, 22. It may have been a colony of the same tribe.]
is mentioned in the *Shāh-nāma*, ed. Vullers, p. 782, note 7, and p. 787, note 7. Rustam speaks to Kay-Khusrau of a land belonging to Zābulistan which Manūchihr had freed from the Tūrānians but which was again seized by the latter under Kay-Kaʿūs:

\[
\text{Mar ān marz Khargāh khwānad ba-nām} \\
\text{Jahān-dīda dīhqān-i gustarda-nām.} \\
\text{Za-yak nīma bar Sind dārad guzar} \\
\text{Ba Qinnaj-u Kashmīr-u ān būm bar;} \\
\text{Dīgār nīma rāhash su-yi marz-i Chīn} \\
\text{Bi-payvāst bā marz-i Tūrān-zāmīn.}
\]

Kay-Khusrau sends Rustam for the deliverance of

\[
\text{Zāminī-ki payvāsta-yi marz-i tu-st:} \\
\text{Za Khargāh tā būm-i Hindūsītān} \\
\text{Za Kashmīr tā marz-i Jādūsītān.}
\]

2. Instead of *Bartūj* one must read *Artūj*. Kāshgharī, i, 87, mentions two villages of the name *Artūj* in the Kāshghar region.1 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 Boghra-khan lies buried in Artish, see Jamāl Qarashī, *Mulḥaqāt al-Šurāh* in Barthold, *Turkestan*, i (texts), 132: māta Satuq Bughra-khan al-ḡāzī fī sanāt 344 wa mashhadahu bi-Artūj min qurā Kāshghar, wa [huwa] al-yaum maʾmūr wa mazūr, cf. Grenard, *Jour. As.*, January 1900, p. 6. The legendary details on the decay of Artūj are likely to refer to the time before Satuq Boghra-khan’s burial in 344/955 (?) because Islamic tradition would hardly have allowed the resting-place of a famous champion of Islam to become a ruin.

3. The easiest solution is perhaps to identify *Khīrmū* 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 *jārūn* situated at four days from Bākhwān (see note to § 15, 14.), at 10 days from Barshkhān 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: بَرْقُ). In a similar way our 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” (*’ar‘ar*), i.e. probably the tree called in Turkestan *archa* “Juniperus polycarpus”.
§ 14. The Khirkhïz

Marquart, Komanen, 65-8; Barthold, *Kirghiz in EI*, and *Kirgiz, 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.-Ä.* have also been utilized).

This very ancient people, first mentioned by the Chinese in 201 B.C., 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) 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 (khâqân) of the Qirghiz returned to the old residence on the Yenisei, and Muslim reports on the Qirghiz must have in view this stage of the Qirghiz history. [But see § 3, i. and p. 94, l. 11.]

Gardïzï, 86, describes a road from the Toghuughuz to the Khirkhïz which may be divided into four sections: (a) From Chïnânjkath to Kh.s.n, thence to Nûkhb.k, and thence to K.miz-[art]; the journey lasts 1-2 months in a grass-steppe and 5 days in a desert. (b) From K.miz-art to Mänb.klū; 2 days among hills, after which begins the region of forests; then come steppes, springs, and hunting grounds until the high Mänb.klū mountain is reached, which is wooded and abounds in sable-martens, grey squirrels, musk-deer, and game. (c) From Mänb.klū to Kükmän (Kökmän), by a road along which grazing grounds, pleasant streams, and abundant game are found; in 4 days the traveller reaches the Kökmän mountain which is high and very wooded; here the road grows narrow. (d) From Kökmän to the Khirkhïz encampment (hâyita): 7 days by a road on which one finds steppes, verdure (sabzi), 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 (lashkargâh) of the Khirkhïz 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 *Körös Csoma-Archivium*, i, 1925, pp. 1-15, takes Qirq-iz for an old Turkish plural of qirq “forty”.

2 Gardïzï, 85, reports a legend according to which the founder of the Khirkhïz tribe was a Slav(1): “the signs of Slav origin are still apparent in the Khirkhïz, namely their red hair and white skin”.

3 In the Camb. MS., fol. 182a, these four last names have respectively the forms: خين (؟); نیک (؟); نیک (؟); and مین (؟).
The Khirkhiz

K.mïz-art may lie on the southern skirts of the Tarbaghatai range. Mänb.klü would *grosso modo* correspond to the Altai mountains. Kökmän, known also in the Orkhon inscription, cf. Thomsen, *Les inscriptions*, p. 149, n. 24, is more likely the Tannu-ola (south of Uriankhai)⁴ than the Sayan mountains (north of Uriankhai). The khäqän’s residence must have lain on the upper Yenisei, in the Minusinsk region known for its excellent climate and picturesque nature. See Map 1.

Gardïzï mentions three roads from the Khirkhiz territory: (a) following a north-to-south direction (just described in the opposite direction); (b) a western road leading to the Kimäk and Khallukh; (c) a road leading eastwards to the great tribe of Fürï (*v.i.* 1.).

In our source the Khirkhiz territory is represented as extending down to the Northern Uninhabited Lands and the Eastern Ocean (*§ 3, 1.*) On the west a mountain separated them from the Kimäk (*§ 5, 12.* and *§ 18*). As the Kimäk lived on the Irtish the mountain must be the Altai (= Mänb.klü, *v.s.*). In *§ 6, 41.* it is said that the “Ras” river rises from the same mountain [or its continuation?]. The Tülas (Töläs, Tölös) mountain where the Khirkhiz were also found (*§ 5, 8.*) may be another name for the Altai, borrowed from a different source and wrongly placed north-west of the Issik-kul (cf. *§§ 16* and 17).² Some isolated groups of the tribe must have wandered even into the Tarim basin: they are mentioned in the neighbourhood of Käshghar (*§ 13, 1.*) and more definitely in B.njül (*§ 15, 12.*) which, to believe our author, formed a Khirkhiz enclave in the Khallukh territory.³

¹ Gardïzï, 86, gives much more information on the Fürï. The eastern road from the Khirkhiz, 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 Khirkhiz take them prisoners they go on hunger strike. They suspend their dead on trees in order that their bodies should decay, &c. The text could be literally taken as indicating that the said wild people were found on the

---


² The name is evidently that of the well-known Turkish federation (Töläs, Tölis, Tölös, in Chinese *T’ieh-lé*, Thomsen, *Inscriptions*, 61, Chavannes, *Documents*, 87) to which the Uyghur originally belonged. At a later date, Eltärish 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.njül group could be only a colony of the tribe.

⁴ Gardïzï, 84²², read: *āb-gīr* as two lines down!
way to the Fürï, but then it would be strange that Gardzi gives no separate description of the latter "great tribe". According to our author the Fürï were exactly the wild men in question. The Fürï must be located near the Baikal. Rashid al-dîn, ed. Bérêzine, in Τriði VORAO, vii, 168, mentions in the neighbourhood of this lake the tribes: Qûrî (قؤری), cf. our Burghut, Tümät, Bäylük "which are some of the Mongol tribes". Barthold, Kirgizî, 23, identifies the Qûrî with the Ku-li-han 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. In the Orkhon inscriptions the name of Qurîqan twice follows on that of Qîrîqiz. This identification is somewhat complicated by the existence in some Muslim sources of the tribal name 頌. The chief authority for it seems to be Bîrünî, see Taf'him, ed. Wright, p. 145: "the Sixth Climate begins from the territory of the Eastern Turks, such as Qây, Qûn, Khirkhîz, Kimâk (spelt Kumakh), and Toghuzghuz, and (in it lie) the Turkoman country, Fârâb, the country of the Khazar, and the northern (part) of their sea". The Syriac map described by A. Mingana (v.s., p. 182) also mentions at the eastern extremity of the Sixth Climate: "Qarqîr (Qîrîqiz); Qâî and Qûn; the country of the Turks and Mongols".

1 Not "die zum Teil Mongolstämme sind", as Marquart translates in Komane, 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 Bretschneider, Mediaeval Researches, i, 24, where Yeh-lî Ch'u ts'ai's report is quoted (towards A.D. 1224) saying that the land Ko-fu-ch'a was called Ku-li-han under the T'ang. Bretschneider 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-dû = Hindustan!) have hardly been transmitted accurately. [Marquart, Arktische Länder, 281, places the Qurîqan to the east of the Baikal.]

3 Thomsen, Inscriptions, 98: "Tabghach, Tüpüt, Apar, Apurim, Qîrîqiz, Ùch-Qurîqan, Otuz-Tatar, Qitay, Tatabi"; ibid., 102: "Qîrîqiz, Qurîqan, Otuz-Tatar, Qitay, Tatabi", cf. Thomsen, ZDMG, 1924, p. 147. On these names see now Schäeder, Iranica, 1934, p. 39. [In the Oghuz-nâma the word qurîqan, or *qorîghan 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 *Qurî (<Qurîqan) the testimony of the Yüan-shi is interesting.]

4 The same text, evidently borrowed from Taf'him, stands in Yäqût, i, 33. Cf. Wiedemann, Geographisches von al-Birûnî, in Sitzungsb. d. Physikalisch-med. Societät zu Erlangen, Band 44 (1912), p. 18. It is, however, noteworthy that the names Qûn and Qêy do not occur in the description of the "Climates" in Birûnî's Canon.

5 Perhaps the Sârî-su basin is meant, in the region between the Irtish and Jaxartes, v.i., § 18. I.Kh., 29, and Qudâmâ, 206, mention a village of Sârîg 4 farsakhs west of the town of the Türgish-khaqan, i.e. probably west of the Chü. 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-Qün ‘Aufî mentions the Khirkhïz who lived between the “aestival east” (mashriq-i ṣayfī) and the Kimäk (living north of the Khirkhîz). There is no doubt that قرئى and قرئى refer to the same people, and Barthold in his edition of ‘Aufî’s text quotes the variants: قرئى (Br. Mus. Or. 2676) and قرئى. Marquart adopts the reading قرئى and boldly makes it the starting-point of a series of far-fetched hypotheses having in view to prove the identity of the قرئى with the later Qoman (in Hungarian Kun), see Komanen, 7780. Linguistically قرئى cannot account for Qoman which still awaits an explanation. Consequently the reading قرئی, as found in the older source from which both the H.-‘Ā. and Gardîzî derived their information, and having good parallels in Chinese and Old Turkish sources is preferable in the present state of our knowledge. In Birûnî, on the Syriac map, and in ‘Aufî the name Qün is coupled with the name of another people قئى (Yâqûṭ: ١اتي) which several times occurs in Kâshgharî, whose enumeration (i, 28) of the outer belt of Turkish tribes (running west to east) is as follows: Pecheneg, Qifchaq, Oghuz, Yimäk, Bashghiirt, Basmîl, Qây, Yabaqû, Tatär. On the map the Qây 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) Kâshgharî says that Jumul, Qây, Yabãqû, Tatär, and Basmîl have languages of their own (perhaps dialects?) but at the same time speak good “Turkish”. In Chinese sources and the Orkhon inscriptions the name Qây has not been found and one might suppose that this tribe did not originally belong to the earlier federations (Tölös, Türk, Uyghur). In Kâshgharî’s time the Qây seem to have shifted to the west, perhaps subsequently to the displacement of the قرئی/قرين of whom no trace is found in the Dîwân lughat al-turk composed A.D. 1077.2

As the easternmost Turkish (?) tribe our source regards the Fûrî <*Qurî. Meanwhile in the description of the provinces of China are found the names: قئى (§ 9, 2d) and قرئی (§ 9, 2h). It is tempting to identify the first of them with قئى (as located in Birûnî) and take the latter as a mere repetition of "Black" and "Yellow" (in Turkish sarîsh>sari) clans. Both Sari-su and Särîsh 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(?) 2 As regards the other appellation of the QûrîQûn in ‘Aufî, namely قئى (variant: قئى "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 Kâshgharî makes a distinction between the Qây and the Qayîgh (i, 56), the latter being one of the 22 clans of the Oghuz. This distinction was insisted upon by M. F. Köprülü-zade, İlk mutasavvifler, Istanbul, 1919, p. 146. The names have been often confused, and even Yâqûṭ’s قئى (i, 33) reflects *Qayî(gh) rather than Qây.
of (§ 14, 1.) easily explained in an enumeration made in an opposite direction (i.e. east to west). Should this surmise prove acceptable, the rest of the enigmatic “Chinese” provinces (§ 9, 2.) would also have to be explained from Turkish and cognate languages.

2. The town К.м.какт, according to Barthold, may correspond to Мi-ti-chik-t’o mentioned as the royal camp of the Qirghiz in the Т’анг-шу, Schott, Über d. ächten Kirgisen, 1865, p. 434. Then our name ought to be accordingly restored as *Киситим (Киситым), a people which was conquered by Chengiz-khan simultaneously with the Qirghiz. Aristov, Notes on the Ethnical Composition of the Turkish Peoples (in Russian), in Zhivaya starina, vi, 1896, p. 340, sees in them some Turkicized Yenisei tribe (Chinese: Ting-ling); in Russian seventeenth-century documents the Turkicized tributaries of the Qirghiz are indiscriminately called Kishtim. [A. Z. Validi reminds me of the Turkish town of К.р.ш.м. which may be a mis-spelling of the name of the capital.]

3. Judging by the traits of likeness between the К.сайм (Кэйм) and the more westerly tribes, they must have lived to the west of the Khirkhïz proper. A possible restitution of this name would be *Киситим (Киситым), a people which was conquered by Chengiz-khan simultaneously with the Qirghiz. Aristov, Notes on the Ethnical Composition of the Turkish Peoples (in Russian), in Zhivaya starina, vi, 1896, p. 340, sees in them some Turkicized Yenisei tribe (Chinese: Ting-ling); in Russian seventeenth-century documents the Turkicized tributaries of the Qirghiz are indiscriminately called Kishtim. [A. Z. Validi reminds me of the Turkish town of К.р.ш.м. mentioned in the Mashhad MS. of Ibn al-Faqih, but its whereabouts are not quite clear to me.]

§ 15. The Khallukh

The Т’анг-шу translated by Bichurin, Sobraniye svedeni, 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, Ču, Issik-kul, Karluk, Türk, in EL.

The original name of the tribe is Qarluq (in Chinese transcription Ko-lo-lu) but more frequently the earlier Muslim authors use the forms Qarluqh and Khallukh of which the latter (خالخ) is very easily confused with Khalaj (خالج) = Qalach, cf. § 24, 22. and § 23, 69.

According to the Т’анг-шу 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 То-tä [perhaps Tarbaghatâ?], Chavannes, Documents, 85, note 4.1 In the south the Qarluq were the neighbours of the Tu-lu group of the Western T’u-chüeh which lived to the east of the Issik-kul in the Ili basin. In A.D. 742-5 the Qarluq helped the Uyghurs to destroy the federation of the Eastern T’u-chüeh, after which they considered themselves as candidates to the succession of the Western T’u-chüeh (at that time under the leadership of the Türgish clan) and gradually moved westwards. At the time of the famous battle of Talas (133/751) the Qarluq revolted against the Chinese

1 This fact may explain § 5, 8. (p. 196). Cf. also p. 278, n. 2.
and joined the Arabs thereby securing the latter's victory, Chavannes, *Documents*, 143, 297. Towards 766 the Qarluq occupied Süyāb (§ 17, 2.) and Talas (§ 25, 93.), i.e. the habitat of the western (Nu-shih-pi) group of the Western T'ü-chüeh, Chavannes, *o.c.*, 286, 297. It is very possible that to this initial expansion of the Qarluq refer the two curious passages in Jāhîz (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 yataqaddimūnā al-Kharlukhiyya wa-in kānū fil 'adad aqīf 'afahum.)"

In Muslim literature two curious reports are found on the earlier events in the Khallukh history. The one by Gardïzï, 84, suggesting some contacts between the Khallukh and Yabāghū is still obscure (v.i., p. 288). The other by 'Aufi (Barthold, *Turkestan*, i, 99–100, and Marquart, *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 İslām. There are nine clans (of them): three jīgīlī, three H.ski, one N.dā (B.dvā), one K.valin and one T.khsīn." The name of the mountain must stand for *تُولس*, 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 Kāshghar. 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 'Aufi's term *Toghuzghuz* most probably refers to the Western T'ü-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, *Kariuk in EI*. [Cf. p. 94, 1. 21.]
the Oxus in Upper Ṭukharistān, Tabarî, ii, 1604. Gardîzî’s record of the friendly relations between the Khallukh and the “Ḥayṭal of Ṭukharistān” (see note to § 13) may echo the penetration of the Khallukh into that province; quite possibly the Khallukh themselves established in Ṭukharistān are understood under the name of their Hephtalite predecessors (in Arabic Ḥayṭal). Our source (§ 23, 69.) confirms the presence of the Khallukh in Ṭukharistān, and even now the name Qarluq survives in one of the Uzbek clans of Northern Afghānistān, cf. Barthold, Turks in El and Kūshkāki [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 بیگر) 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 jabghūya”. According to Kâshghāri, iii, 24, yafghū was a title two degrees lower than khāqān.¹

The title yabghū (Kâshghāri, iii, 24: yafghū <yapghū) must be distinguished from the name of the tribe Yabāghū which is placed by Kâshghāri, i, 28 and passim, considerably more to the east between the Qāy and Tatār. In Gardîzî’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 Toghuğuz. 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 Turkistān (*Türgishān?) and was settled by the khāqān of the latter who gave them a jabūy (jabūya?).³ Finally the people of Turkistān (*Türgishān?) rose against the khāqān* Khutoghlan (ْخُتُوُعُ) who was killed and whose kingdom passed to (the) Chūnpān (clan?) of the Khallukh.⁴ The first Khallukh ruler who sat on the throne was Īlmālm.s.n *jabūya (یالملم چرمه sic). It is likely that under the “Yabāghū Khallukh” are understood the Khallukh who stayed at their original home in the Altai. The migration of some of the “Yabāghū” westwards is supported by the fact that the Üzgand river “rising from behind the mountain of the Khallukh” (§ 6, 17.) is called *Yabāghū (§ 25, 58.), and Kâshghāri, iii, 27, confirms this name: Yabāghū-swī. 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 Kâshghar.

¹ According to the Chiu T'ang-shu the T'u-chüeh used to give the title shê-hu and t'e-lê (which Chavannes, Documents, 21, identifies respectively with jabghū and tekīn) to the sons, younger brother, and relatives of the khāqān. However, at another place I.Kh., 40, merges the two titles into one: jabghūya-khāqān, probably referring to the earlier times, for according to Chavannes, Documents, 38, note 5, the kings of the Western T'uchüeh were called jabghū-qaghan.

² Yabāgū according to Kâshghāri, iii, 27, means “felted wool” (al-qarada 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.
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\(^1\) of the Chu basin, both north and south of the Alexandrovsky range,\(^2\) as well as the region stretching south of the Issik-kul and overlapping the T’ien-shan into Chinese Turkestan along the Aq-su valley. The enumeration begins with the places mentioned under Transoxiana (§ 25, 93.) as the “Gate of the Khallukh”. 1.–3. (and 4.? ) are situated along the road from the Jaxartes to the Chu basin (north of the Alexandrovsky range); 7.–9. in the Chu valley (?); 10.–12. south of the Issik-kul [12. perhaps much farther east]; 5.–6. and 13.–15. south of the T’ien-shan, the first two lying to the north-east of Kâshghar and the rest on the road connecting the Chu and Issik-kul basins with Kuchä (§ 9, 10.) and the towns of the Toghuuzghuz (§ 12, 5. 4. 3. 1.). See *Map v.*

1. 2. Cf. I.Kh., 28, Qudâma, 205–6, and Maq., 275 (the latter with different details). Külän corresponds to the present-day Tarti, and Mirkî 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; Bystân is perhaps related to *Bwyâän* in the Stambul MS. of Maq.”

3. After Mirkî we find here Nûn-kat, whereas under § 25, 93. Mirkî is followed by N.vîkath. I.Kh., 29, gives the following itinerary: Külän, 4 farsakhs to B.rkî (= Mirkî); thence 4 f. to Asbara (*Ashpara*); thence 8 f. to Nûzkat (var. *Nûnkat*!); thence 4 f. to Kh.r.nj.wân (several variants); thence 4 f. to Jûl; thence 7 f. to Sâr.gh; thence 4 f. to the town of the Tûrgish khâqân; thence 4 f. to Navâkat; thence 3 f. to K.bâl (var. *K.nâd*); thence 15 days to *Barskhân*. So Nûnkat must be distinguished from Navâkat, the former lying west of the Chu and the latter apparently east of it. According to Gardîzî, 89, from a place called Tûmkat (*Nûnkat*\(^3\)) started a road running in a south-easterly direction and leaving Issik-kul to the left (*i.e.* north), while (*ibid.,* 102), from a place called N.vîkath started a road leaving the basin of the lake to the right (*i.e.* south). Barthold, *Report*, p. 114, simply substitutes the reading for *Tûmkat* and, (*ibid.,* 32, identifies N.vîkath with Kök-muynaq), but in view of the facts just quoted this is surely a mistake and one must distinguish between *Nûnkat* (*= I.Kh. Nûnkat*)

\(^1\) Süyâb 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” (Yasl pass), *v.i.* note to 11.

\(^3\) More rightly from the more easterly Tun-kien, cf. Chavannes, *Documents*, 10.
Our author (who did certainly use I.Kh.) says that Nünkat "was a town". But both I.Kh. and Qudäma call Nūzīkat/Nünkat simply "large village" (qaryatun 'ażīmatun), while Navākat is styled by Qudāma, 206: "a large town (madīnatun kaba'rītun), from which a road leads to Barskhān". As in our § 25, 93. Mirkī is followed by Navākat, we may suppose that in the present paragraph Nünkat has been given the characteristics of Navākat. Our author, evidently mistaken by the similarity of the two names, simply skipped from Mirkī to Navākat leaving out the places lying to the west of the Chu. If such is the case, the mountain Ürūn-'Ārj must correspond to the range forming the watershed between the Chu and Ili. 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 ("the long farsakh, or stage") which provides a very satisfactory correction for the impossible Gardizi's report (p. 192) 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 Navākat a mountain and a meadow which formed a forbidden zone reserved for commissariat purposes in case of expeditions. See Map vi.

4. غناسك 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 Khallukh bordered on the Yaghmā in the south-west (v.s., p. 278, n. 3), 5. Tūzūn-bulaq must be looked for near the Western T'ien-shan. If the Tūz-kūl corresponds to the Shūr-kul (§ 3, 17.) Tūzūn-ârj lay in its neighbourhood. All three names: Tūzūn-bulaq, Tūzūn-ârj, and Tūz-kūl may contain the same Turkish element tuz "salt", whereas a similar element -ârj under 3. has been restored by us as *aghach. In spite of the outward likeness of and it is impossible to identify them in view of the geographical details. The element aghach (yighach) "farsakh, stage" is common in Turkish names. KĀSHGHĀRI, i, 77: Ala-yighach; i, 108 Qara-yighach; iii, 118: Bay-yighach. [Cf. also note to § 5, 7.]

1 Very often old Iranian ñ is rendered alternately by  and 1, the latter to be read with imāla: ā. [Tūmkat=Toqmaq?]
2 The importance of the Navākat results from the facts that it was the seat of a Nestorian bishop, Assemani, BIBL. ORIENTALIS, ii, 458 (Kasimghar [Kāshghar?] and Navakath) and iii/2, p. 630 (Chasimgarah and Nuavchet), cf. YULE, CATHAY, p. 179 (2nd ed. ii, 24) and that Manichaean were particularly numerous in it, FIHIRST, i, 338: Nünkath, but ii, 125: Navīkah. The Führist has chiefly in view the situation in the early 10th century but it also records the previous emigration of Manichaean to Turkish lands.

3 The same mountain is also men- tioned 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 Stämme zum Führer erhoben zu werden pflegt."

4 I admit that grammatically the form tus-un from tus is not easy to explain. However see Kāshghāri, i, 92, tolu "full" and i, 336, tolu 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. *Navïkat 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. Gardïzï, 102, describes a route from Navïkat to the "Chigil and Tür-gishî", i.e. running from the Chu basin north of the Issik-kul.1 Gardïzï says that following this road one must travel from Navïkat towards Panjïkat,2 close to which lies the village *Rëk. To the left (north?) of this village three other villages are situated: (a) *Sûyâb (the text is not quite in order), (b) حورکال and (c) ترمجع (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.

Gardïzï’s text is closely connected with Qudäma, 206. Both are in a very sad state but they mutually complete one another. Qudäma (much more complete than I.Kh., 29, v.s., p. 289) says that the road Navïkat–Barskhân goes (first) to B.njïkat (2 farsakhs), close to which (at a distance of 1 farsakh) lies the village called *Rëk.3 At 2 farsakhs from B.njïkat lies Sûyâb to which [cf. the variant read: *Sôyâb] belong two villages ساغورکال and ساغورکال,4 and from the latter the road continues to Barskhân. It is obvious that Sûyâb with its two villages corresponds to Gardïzï’s three villages lying “to the left” of Panjïkat. These preliminaries facilitate the explanation of our text, which starts in the north with the village called in Qudäma خورکال and corresponding to Gardïzï’s خورکال of the Mujmal al-tavärikh, Barthold, Turkestan, i, 20). One of the remaining three villages mentioned together with Kükyäl (?) ought to be Sûyâb but our author quotes the latter as belonging to the Tukhs (§ 17, 2.). Therefore it is not impossible that both لغ دلومغ and لغ دلومغ may be two different readings of the same difficult name which Gardïzï transcribes دلومغ. (The Mujmal, l.c., mentions a village دلومغ but the title of its prince suggests its identity with § 17, 3.). See Map vi.

8. and stand for رک and ملچک (v.s.). In Gardïzï’s text, 102 (lines 16 and 17), the word ار is found twice; the second of these ار is superfluos and may belong to a road to Bärskhân but to the village near B.njïkat. Read: *رک. Qudäma’s passage is full of explanatory notes (formerly written on the margin and later incorporated by the scribes?).

* It is very tempting to associate this ساغورکال—Sâghûn—with the later Balâ-Sâghûn. According to Kâshghârî, i, 337, ساغورکال was the title of the Qarluq nobles. Cf. Barthold, Balâsâghûn in EI, and his Vorlesungen, 81.

1 This route is quoted separately from that starting from Tûmkat and running south of the lake, Gardïzï, 89.

2 Entirely different from § 12, 2.

3 Gardïzï enables us to check de Goeje’s edition: رک Hem Rëk does not refer to the road to Bärskhân but to the village near B.njïkat. Read: *رک. Qudäma’s passage is full of explanatory notes (formerly written on the margin and later incorporated by the scribes?).

4 Goeje’s edition: Dŏmğ does not refer was the title of the Qarluq nobles. Cf. Barthold, Balâsâghûn in EI, and his Vorlesungen, 81.
east enumeration, Kirmūn-kath quite naturally follows on 8. It undoubtedly corresponds to which Qūdāmā quotes immediately before (i.e. south or west of) Navikat and to which Gardizi traces the road running from Tūmkat to the south of the Issik-kul. It is probable that the two roads leading from Talas 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, l.c., gives the title of the “king of L.bān” Q.tūn-i L.bān, probably *Qut-tegin which is good Turkish.1 [A possible restoration of the name L.bān would be *Jūn (cf. similar mis-spellings in § 10, 46. and § 17, 1.) albān, in Mongol “tribute, service”. Rashīd 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 alpāḡūt 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 imjūva and adapahutti should be respectively read *injū (“the tribe belonging to the chief’s house-hold”) and *alpāḡūt (“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 Gardizi 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 Gardizi mentions between Kūmb.rkat (?) and Tūng. Barthold, Report, 56, 114, has identified Jīl 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-tāvārikh, Tabāqāt-i Nāṣirī, 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 Tarāz (Maq., 275: only at 3 sīha, each equal to half a farsakh). The situation of the Upper Barskhān had been much discussed, though the road leading to it from Fargāna and described in I.Kh., 30 (Qūdāmā, 20)4 was rightly explained by Tomaschek.5 I.Kh., 29, and Qūdāmā, 262, describe the northern road leading to Barskhān from the Chu valley. Gardizi 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.f. under 15. According to

---

1 See it used as a personal name in Gardizi, 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 Nūshān) was already clear from the Mujmal (v.s. 10.) which after Tūng (*Tong) names another son of Turk: Barskhān. The name is confirmed by Kāshgharī, iii, 308: Barsghān (sic).
4 Qūbā–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.
Qudäma, 262, the Upper Barskhän (or rather its district) consisted of 4 large towns and 5 small ones.¹ The fighters of Barskhän, 20,000 strong, lived in the town situated on the bank of a lake surrounded by mountains. Our source leaves no doubt that the lake in question is the Issik-kul. Tomaschek placed Barskhän in the Barskaun valley drained by a river which flows south-west into the Narin. However, both Qudäma and the H.-A. 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 Barskhän 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 Barskhän 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 (*Yabäghü), v.s., p. 288. This short stream is very remote from the presumed position of Barskhän and it could have received its name only because the road to Barskhän from Farghäna followed it up to the pass (I.Kh., 30). Our author only says that the dihqän of Barskhän was a Khallukh. Gardïzï, 90, gives him the title of *M.n.gh which Barthold compares with the name of the Turkish [Soghdian!] ambassador Mavîx found in Menander, see Fragm. histor. graec., iv, 225, but this seems doubtful. One would rather think of the title manaf (منف) common among the Qirghiz. The Mujmal calls the king of Barskhän tabîn. [See Appendix B.]

12. *Jämghar, as the name and description shows, must be the westernmost (?) of the “Five Villages” lying north of the “Tafqän” mountain (§ 12, 2.). Following the order of enumeration in the present paragraph Jämghar lay east of Bärskhän at the extreme limit of the Khallukh territory. Tentatively one would place it in the region of Manas. Jämghar, 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 Jämghar, lying east or south of Barskhän on the Toghuzghuz frontier, our author seems to return to Barskhän from the south-east by the road starting from the Toghuzghuz country. Following his habit he splits that road into political sections and quotes K.msîghlya, S.tkath, and Ark under the Toghuzghuz (§ 12, 3.-5.), and Kuchä under China (§ 9, 10.). Skipping all these stages he now starts with B.nchül (which Gardizi, see note to § 12, 3., mentions between Kuchä and Barskhän) and then mentions Aq.räq.r and Üj (of which Kâshghari, i, 329, says that the Badal-art, i.e. Bedel pass, separated it from Barsghän). That 13. B.nchül was more remote from the main territory of the Khallukh is shown by the fact that it had first belonged to the Toghuzghuz and that at the moment to which our source refers it was occupied by some Khirkhiz. On the other

¹ See Idrïsî, 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.qräq.r and 15. Üj being still in Khallukh possession. This evidence leads to the conclusion that the author has in view the following sequence of stages: Kuchä-B.nchül-A.qräq.r-Üj-Badal-art-Barskhän, and consequently B.nchül must have lain south of Üj.

In his earlier Semirechye, p. 9, Barthold identified B.nchül with the town of Aq-su, evidently on the ground of some phonetic resemblance of the names: B.nchül and Chinese Wen-su. Here is the abstract of the original Chinese itineraries (from the T'ang-shu, &c.) quoted in Chavannes, Documents, pp. 8–10: 60 li west of Kucha the river Pai-ma-ho was crossed; 180 li farther the stone desert of Kū-p'i-lo was entered and after another 120 li the town of Kū-p'i-lo reached. Thence 60 li to A-si-yen; thence 60 li to Po-huan (also called Wei-jung, or Ku-mo district). Thence in the 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 *Yū-chou; thence 60 li to “Ta-shih also called Yū-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 Yū-chou (Ta-shih, “Wen-su district”) with Aq-su could not be maintained and under the influence of F. Grenard he finally took Po-huan for Aq-su,2 the Hu-lu for the Taushqan river, and Yū-chou [so instead of the impossible Yū-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 Idriśī’s بختريان. On the other hand, he identifies Uch with Hi-chou-kia (< Hechuka (sixth century)), Wen-su (Han period), and Yū-chou (T’ang period), and seems to connect the names Wen-su (<ʿUrsük, Ūrchük) with Yū-chou (<ʿUchük, Hechuka).

These then were the reasons for Barthold’s hypothesis on the identity of Üj and B.nchül 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.nchül and Wen-su for the latter in older times sounded *Uen-sjük with final k). This consideration makes, however, no insuperable difficulty for ل ở in the Ḥ.-ʾĀ. and Gardīzī may stand for *B.nchük (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 Yū-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 Üj belonged to the Khallukh.  
2 Cf. also Pelliot, La Ville de Bakhouan dans la Géographie d’Idrīsī, in T’oung-Pao, 1906, pp. 533–6, but the origin of the form Bākhwān is still somewhat mysterious, v.i., pp. 295, 297.  
3 From Uch-Turfan to Aghacha-quů where the ascent only begins there are 78 versts (= 83 km.), see Kuropatkin, Kashghariya, 1879, p. 306. [On a similar uncertainty of distances in the Chinese itinerary from Aq-su to Kāshgär 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 *Yu-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. Üj (lying in the mountains) remains the firm point and certainly corresponds to Uch-Turfan. It is followed by 14. *aqar-aqar*, which, if read *aqar-baqar*, 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, Balâsâghûn, Qochqar-bashi, Barshân, At-bashi, Ordû (= Khâshghar), and Yärkand, Birûnî, *Canon*, quotes at the very end of the 6th climate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>long.</th>
<th>lat.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Üj</td>
<td>99°20'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Âmâh</td>
<td>100°40'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Börmän</td>
<td>101°40'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kâshghar</td>
<td>102°20'</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 Kuchâ. In any case *Bärman* must be placed to the south-east of Üj. Kâshgharî, iii, 272, says: “*Yüngü* (Yîngü?) is the name of a large river flowing past the township (*bulaidâ*) of Bärman built by Afrâsiyâb’s son on its bank.” In view of these two authorities it is not impossible that in Idrîsi’s usually inaccurate text *Bärman* stands simply for *Börmän*. 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.t* on compte 4 journées. ... De

1 To quote a parallel: *Zeitsch. d. Gesellsch. f. Erdkunde*, xx, 1885, p. 75, recording the contemporary changes in Chinese administrative terminology states that the *tao-t’ai* of Aq-su had under his authority four districts: *Wen-su chou*, i.e. the territory of Aq-su (“engeres Stadtgebiet von A.”), Kucha, Kharashar, and Wu-shih-ch’eng, i.e. former Uch-Turfan.

2 The person in question is certainly Bärman, brother of Piran, son of Visa (Tabari: *Vîsaghân*). The two brothers were only commanders in Afrâsiyab’s army. Piran was the prince of Khotan. See *Shâh-nâmâ*, ed. Mohl, i, 338, ii, 58, iii, 564, 573, 584, Tabari, i, 600 and 610, and Thâ’alibi, *Ghurar akhbar mulûk al-Furs*, ed. Zotenberg, p. 206.

3 MS. arabe 2222 of the Bib. Nat. in Paris, fol. 120v. reads at this place: يصَعُّضَ النَّامَيْنِ (الحرير) كل غريبة من جميع الصائغات من انواع الخوَد (وق) الحار (الجارة) وغير ذلك. Consequently the specialities of Bakhwan were objects in iron and wood. The former were exported as far as Tibet and China. Idrisi adds that round the town lay the fields and pastures of the Turks, and in its mountains musk deer were found.

4 Cf. § 13, 3. The distances in Idrisi are usually too short.
J.r.m.q à Barskhan la supérieure 10 journées." I presume that our B.njül and Bämân must somehow refer to the same locality which can be identified with the neighbourhood of Aq-su. But which Aq-su? The "New Town" (Yângi-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 Kâshghari’s Yãngû. Another Aq-su lies also near the left bank of the river upstream from Yângi-shar. Finally to the north-east of these two towns, on the Qizil-üstâng (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-üstâng is found Pâman-üstâng of which the name strongly reminds one of our Bämân [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 Pâman-üstâng) 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.nchül (B.nchük?) and its origin cannot yet be finally settled, though, in view of the considerations presented above, the possibility of *B.nchük<Wen-su(k) cannot be discarded. Gardïzï does not mention our 14. and it must have been borrowed by our author from another source which can be traced also in Birünî (cf. § 10, 41., § 11, 9., &c.). Kâshghari relied of course on his personal information.

With regard to this section of the road connecting Barskhän with Aq-su, Kuchä, and Chinänjkath, Gardîzï, 91, infra, one must also consider Gardîzï’s passage, 90 supra, on the T’ien-shan passes: "To the right (i.e. the south?) of Barskhän there are two passes, one called Bayghü (*Yabghü) and the other Azär (cf. note to § 12, 5.); and the river called T.f.škhän flows eastward to the limits of China. And this pass (Yabghü?) is very high so that the birds coming from the direction of China cannot fly over it." Kâshghari, iii, 23, also mentions a village and a pass of Yafghü in the neighbourhood of Barsghän. One of the two passes must stand for the Bedel pass and as Kâshghari separately speaks of Bädäl-art and Yafghü-(art) one must conclude to the identity of اژر with پل (palaeographically the former may be a mere mis-spelling of the latter). The Yabghü pass would then be either the Janart or Muzart pass, and more probably the Janart which lies in the Kok-shaäl-tau (in Central T’ien-shan) to the east of the Bädäl-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 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 most probably stands for ғәрə, attested in two independent authorities (Bīrūnī and Kāshgharî) and confirmed by the present-day name of Pāman-üstäng. 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 ғәрə got into Idrīsī’s compilation. Does it attempt to reproduce the Chinese form, perhaps on the authority of the mysterious Jānākh b. Khāqān al-Kīmakī 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 may be a mere mis-spelling of ғәрə (the group -l»j- having been wrongly transcribed as -r- if the original r was written too closely under л). [See also Appendix B.]

As regards the exact relation between Wen-su (= our *B.nčük) 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 چېلک appears from the Persian popular etymology (în chi gîl?) quoted in Kāshgharî, i, 330. The name often occurs in Persian poetry, see Mathnawī, ed. Nicholson, ii, 3149, iii, 4131; Hāfiz, ed. Brockhaus, i, 318, says: ba-mushk-i Chîn-u-Chigil nîst bü-yî gul muhtâj.

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 Toghu zughzuz.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 Tûls mountains (§ 5, 8.).

Gardīzī has two passages on the Chigil. P. 89: “The road³ to (Upper) Barskhān from Tûmkat goes to Kûmb.rkat (which lies) on the Chigil road; thence to Jîl which is a mountain and the explanation (tafsîr) of jîl is “narrow” [Buam defile through which the Chu flows]; thence 12 farsakhs to Yâr which is a village turning out 3,000 men and in it are found the tents of the Taksîn’s Chigil⁴ among whom there are no villages (äbädâni). 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. Kāshgharî, 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. چېلک کنک, restored by Barthold as چېلک کینک which means “the Chigil of the taksîn” rather than “the taksîn of the Chigil” (cf. taksîn-i ḥūl, as the Mujmal al-tavârikh calls the king
the left of the road lies the lake of Isigh-kul &c." This text ought to be immediately followed by the description of the "road to the Chigil and Türgish" which through some misunderstanding is given only on p. 102. The description starts at Navîkat (v.s., note to § 15, 3.) which was the next stage to the east of Kûmb.rkat,¹ the latter evidently being the point from which the two roads separated: the one "to Barskhân" passing south of the lake and the other "to the Chigil and Türgish" north of the lake.

On the situation on the right bank of the Chu (west of the Kastek and Kurday passes) some light is thrown by the following list of rulers which will be examined in more detail under § 17, 2.:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gardîzî</th>
<th>Mujmal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Navîkat</td>
<td>Kûsakî</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.njîkat</td>
<td>Kûlb.qâr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z.kât</td>
<td>separate dihqân</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sûyâb</td>
<td>Bayghû’s brother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khûtkiyâl</td>
<td>B.ghlîla (a Türgish)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The situation behind the mountain, i.e. east of the Kastek pass, is described by Gardîzî as follows: "When you have crossed the pass, to the left of it (i.e. the road ?) lies the country of Turkestan (*of the Türgish) consisting of the Tukhs and *Az. There lies a village turning out 1,000 men. Close by lies a village Biglîh where the *jabûya’s brother lives. . . . Five hundred men mount with him, and if necessary 1,000 men. In the neighbourhood lies a village whose dihqân of local origin (o-LW ?) is called B.dân-Sânkû (or Dân-Sânkû); (the village) turns out 7,000 men. And near this pass (Kastek or Kurday ?) there is a river (äb) beyond which appear the Chigil (and their) tents and felt huts." [Cf. Appendix B.]

A close study of these two texts shows that both slopes of the watershed evidently belonged to the subdivisions of the Türgish (§ 17) and only beyond a river² lay the region of the nomadic Chigil whose other group is mentioned south of the Issik-kul round Yär; 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 chassez-croises movements which such state involved.

Kâshghari, i, 330, 354, mentions the Chigil in three places: the nomad Chigil (as well as the Tukhsî) lived near the township of Quyâs (*Quyash) lying beyond Barsghân and watered by the two Keykân 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 of the Chigil). If our explanation is right the tents in question belonged to some of the taksîn’s subjects and not necessarily to the taksîn himself.

¹ Qudâma, 206, quotes كرمقررا ( = Gardîzî’s Kûmb.rkat) immediately before (i.e. to the west of) Navâkat.

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 Vernîly stands.
§ 16

The Chigil

...camping place of Chaghatai, see Juvayni, GMS, i, 226–7, Barthold, *Otchet*, 66. Another group of the tribe lived in the township of Chigil, near Târâz (Talas), cf. Maq., 274, and a third one in the villages of the same name near Kâshghar.

Map vi

Under the Qara-khanids the Chigil tribe formed the main body of their troops, Barthold, *Turkestan*, 317. Therefore probably Kâshghari, i, 330, says that the Ghuz used to call "Chigil" all the Turks between the Oxus and Upper China.

1. The town Sikül (*Isik-kul*) stood probably on the northern bank of the lake, where the *Carta Catalana* (A.D. 1375), too, places a town Yssicol, and where an Armenian monastery seems to have existed, see Barthold, *Isik-kul*, in EI. It must be borne in mind that in the north the lake is separated from the Ili basin by a double range of mountains, Küngey and

1 Kâshghari 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*.

Gardîzî and Kāshgharî spell the name *Tukhsi* and it is possible that our *Tukhs* has been formed on the analogy of such plurals and singulants as *Khirkhiyân* < *Khirkhiz*, *Khallukhiyân* < *Khallukh*, ergo *Tukhsiyân* < *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’yče* *Tukhsich* in which the ending -ich, or -ch must represent the Iranian suffix of origin. The text, Reichelt, *Die soghdischen Handschriften*, Heidelberg, 1931, ii, 53 and 59, refers to *Txs’yče bntk*, i.e. to a slave whose personal name was T.khsich or to a T.khsich slave.

According to our author to the north and east of the Tukhs lived the Chigil, to their south the Khallukh, and to their west a group of the Khirkhiz (on which see § 5, 8. and § 14). All these bearings must be taken with the usual reserve, v.s., pp. 270, 289. Further details show that in our author’s opinion the Tukhs lived chiefly on the northern bank of the Chu (intermingled with the Khallukh) and on the eastern slope of the mountain separating the basins of the rivers Chu and Illi.

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-lê 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 khaqân of the Türgish, *ibid.*, 44, 81–6. The Arabs nicknamed this doughty opponent of theirs Abû Muzähîm, Ṭabarî, 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 Almata (Verniy), see Prince Masalsky, *Turkestan*, p. 777. These lakes (called by the Qirghiz *jasîl* “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-şul). 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 (= Qudâma, 206), places the town of the [former?] Türgish khâqân at 4 farsakhs to the west of Navâkat. In the tradition going up to Balkhî (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 Kharrukh and Ghuzz), but the authors depending most likely on Jayhânî (i.e. in the H.-'Ā. and Gardizi) include some additional details on the destinies of the Türgish. As suggested by Barthold and Marquart, in several passages in Gardizi (8125, 8416, 10226) one must read Türgishân instead of Turkistân. 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 khâqân and how the power finally passed to them. In the paragraph on the Yaghmâ (see notes to § 13) Gardizi tells how the latter were exploited by the khâqân (of the Türgish) as an offset against the Khallukh, Haytâl, and Kimâk. Finally, in the description of the route to the “Chigil and Türgish” (see notes to § 16) Gardizi mentions in the Chu valley two (?) dihqâns of Türgish origin and says that to the east of the [Kastek or Kurdai] pass lies the country of “the Türgish (who consist) of Tukhsî and 'Aaron”’. A parallel of the second of these names is found only in the H.-'Ā. (v.i. 1) while the first (Tukhsî) is known to the H.-'Ā. (the whole § 17 is devoted to them), to the Mujmal al-tâvârîkh (the king of *Tukhsî (?) is called Qûtegin, cf. supra, p. 292), to 'Aufî (who includes them together with Chigil, &c. in the Khallukh federation, v.s., § 15), as well as to Kâshghari. It is curious that the H.-'Ā. and Gardizi who know very little about the Ili (§ 6, 5.) speak of the Türgish and Tukhsî only in the neighbourhood of the Chu, whereas Kâshghari, whose ideas of the Chu (iii, 305, 307: Shû) are vague, mentions, i, 85 and 342, the Tukhsî tribe (qabila) on the Ili, where according to him it lived together with the Yaghmâ tribe and a clan (tā’îfa) of the Chigil.

1 On the fate of Kür-şul 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 T'-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 التركى (var. مدينة خاقان التركى)
4 See also ibid., i, 28 (in a north-to-south enumeration: Chigil, Tukhsî, Yaghmâ); iii, 129: Quyâs (*Quayash) is
I. East of the watershed range Gardiz mentions “the Türgish (consisting) of Tukhsiyän and çaran)”. Our author evidently takes the Tukhs for the successors of the Türgish and the latter’s name no more occurs in the H.-Ä. Of the Tukhs who are mentioned as the clans of the Tukhs the first most likely represents the same name as çaran (as well as its companion) reflects an Arabic form (aze) while Aziyän gives the name in Persian garb (cf. Tukhsiyän, Khallukhiyän, &c.). A name beginning with an I is unlikely in Türkisch; therefore Aziyän must be further improved into al-Aziyya. Already in his earlier Semirechye, 15, and Die alittürkischen 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 (1, N2): az budun yaghi qalâ; qara-kölâ sînûsdimiz . . . Kül-tegin . . . az-eltâbär tûtûd; az budun anda yagq qalâ. “The Az people proved to be in revolt; we fought at the Qara-köl lake . . . Kül-tegin captured the eltâbär of the Az; on this occasion the Az people was broken (annihilated)”. This interpretation has been accepted by Radloff, Melioransky, and finally by Thomsen, ZDMG, 1924, p. 154. It makes clearer the other passage which comes earlier in the inscription (1, E19) and refers to the revolt of the Türgish qaghan and its repression; immediately after it stands an unfinished sentence in which Bilgä qaghan says: “in order that our ancestors’ land should not remain lordless [!] organized the Az people (az budunîgh itîp yaratîp)”. This quotation is particularly interesting as it establishes as it were some link between the Türgish and their Az successors.2 [budunîgh—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 çaran Aziyän might perhaps have a connexion with A-li-shih in which case Gardiz’s Aziyän would be due to the wrong treatment of initial al- (as in al-Lân<Alân) taken for the Arabic article. This supposition is, however, less probable.

1. Cf. § 10, 46. for this hypothesis going counter to the other. 
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., i, Ezo, 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 Assîn, but this hypothesis going counter to the association of the Türgish and Az is not conclusive.

3. The meaning of the passage 1, E38 mentioning a dignitary called az 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 *Qaräjya* easily restored as *Qaräjya* or *Qaraji*. In the Orkhon inscriptions (1, E38) the Qara-Türgish are specially mentioned.

2. In Ţabari, ii, 1594, Sûyâb is quoted as the starting-point of the expedition of the khâqân Abû Muzâhim (i.e. the Türgish 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 (*Khütkiyäl*) is distinctly said to have a Türgish lord (*va ü Türgishî-st*). With regard to the dihqân of Sûyâb Gardîzî's text is out of order unless the passage be restored as: *va dihqân-i ü barâdar-i *yabghû bâshad *va ü Turgishi-st*. The last four words would then run exactly as in the case of Khütkiyäl, and this would be further confirmed by the inclusion of Sûyâb in our § 17 dealing with the Tukhs (regarded as the remnants of the Türgish). *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 Türgish (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 Târâź (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.e., 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>H.-“A.</th>
<th>Gardîzî</th>
<th>Mujmal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>name</td>
<td>Biglílgh</td>
<td>Biglílgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prince</td>
<td>*Yinal-beg-tegin</td>
<td>brother of the j.nûba Yinal-tegin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forces</td>
<td>3,000</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-àriq 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 vi the position of the Sughatî station.] [As *yâb* < *âb* means "water", *Sû-yâb* = "the Chu canal"?]*
Gardizi omits to give the title of the prince and only indicates his family relations to some جُرْفٌ, as he also calls the lord of Süyāb (v.s. 2.) bayghū’s brother. Both these forms may reflect the same title yabghū and indicate that Süyāb and Bīglîlîgh were under the control of the same family. In our source both places are quoted under Tukhs (= Türgish) and we are placed before an alternative: either the Türgish-Tukhs rulers enjoyed a title similar to yabghu/jabgfiu of the Khallukh, or Gardizi introduces some later data suggesting the gradual absorption of the Tukhs by the Khallukh.

The alternative Soghdian name of Bīglîlîgh indicates the presence there of a Soghdian colony, cf. Barthold, *On the Soghdian and Tokharian languages* (in Russian) in *Iran*, 1926, i, 35. Our Bīglîlîgh looks entirely different from the five villages also inhabited by Soghdians and also ruled by a Bektégīn, but mentioned (§ 12, 6.) under Toghużghuz.

4. According to the order of enumeration this village ought to be the easternmost of the Tukhs possessions. Gardizi speaks of a village lying in the neighbourhood of Bīglîlîgh whose dihqan B.dân 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 Ürkath for a repetition of Üzkath (§ 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 Kimäk


The legend quoted by Gardizi, 82–3, shows that the Kimäk were supposed to have separated from the Tatār. The eponyms of the original seven clans were: Êmî, Êmäk, Tatār, Bayändur, Khifchâq, *Nilqâz,* and

1 The same form j.nûba (*jabbüya*) stands in Gardizi, 82g, as the title of the first Khallukh chief who succeeded to the last (Türgish) khâqân. Just before, 82g, the title given to the Khallukh ruler is spelt خوی. On the different forms of yabghū see Marquart, *Erânsâhr*, 247, *Wehröt*, 143, *Provincial capitals*, 10: the Middle Persian text gives Yabb(u)-

khâkân. Cf. also Armenian *febû-khak’ân*. [V.s. note to § 15.]

2 The latter assumption would contradict our emendation of the text *va ü Turgishî-st.*

3 So instead of *L-nilqâz*; the clan Nilqaz is still known among the Shâh-sevân of Sâwa; see Minorsky, *Sâwa in EI.*
Ajläd (?). Our source seems to suggest that there were eleven divisions of the tribe.1 The name Kimäk (to be pronounced Kimäk), according to Marquart, is an abbreviation of Iki-Imäk “the two Imäk” (probably with reference to the first two clans of the federation). Käshghari no longer knows the Kimäk, but only the Ya[mäk (*Yimäk)], of whom he says, iii, 22, that “with us they are (considered as) Qiçhäq, but the Qiçhäq Turks consider themselves as a different group (hisb)”; this statement shows that the process of regrouping the remnants of the Kimäk federation had already been accomplished under the leadership of the new influential tribe, the Qipchaq (§ 21).

It is no easy task to locate the Kimäk 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 Gardīzī 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 Gardīzī who is our chief authority for the route to the Kimäk has amalgamated several variants of the itinerary.

As regards the frontiers our source says that the eastern neighbours of the Kimäk are the Khirkhız (confirmed under § 14), whereas 'Aufī (cf. note to § 14), locates the Kimäk north of the Khirkhız. In fact, with the Kimäk, our author, too, launches on the description of the northernmost belt of Türkish tribes: Kimäk, Ghūz, Pecheneg, Khifchakh, and Majghari, and we shall see the important conclusions to be drawn from this arrangement with regard to the location of the Majghari (§ 22). That the “Artush” and the “Ātil” are placed south of the Kimäk only means that the Kimäk lived beyond these rivers. [Moreover at this place may be a simple misunderstanding for .]2 The bearing of the Khifchakh and the Northern lands, both located “to the west of the Kimäk”, must be taken as meaning north-west. All seems to indicate that the principal territory of the Kimäk lay in Western Siberia, north of the Irtish, say up to the Obi.3 Gardīzī says that the land of the Kimäk is very cold and that in winter their horses are taken to the place (Ük-tagh) in the country (perhaps , 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 Rüs frontier and the

1 Or twelve if the khäqän had a clan of his own.
2 See however note to § 6, 43. on the Volga rising from the Altai (!).
3 On Käshghari’s Map the rivers (from south to north) İlā, Art.sh, a nameless river, and Ya[mär are represented as emptying into a lake. The Ya[mär (Yimär, a clan of our Kimäk) are shown on the left bank of the Art.sh, and the J.m.l and Qāy on the nameless river.

beginning of the Kimäk 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 Kimäk (or at least their Khîfchâkh branch, § 21) extended, at some time, to the southern part of the Ural. The raiding activities of the Kimäk covered a still larger area, for under § 12, 10. J.mlikath, in the Toghuzghuz country is mentioned as exposed to their attacks.

In § 6, 42. the Artush is described as flowing between the Ghûz and the Kimäk, but in § 18 the Ghûz are not mentioned among the immediate neighbours of the Kimäk, 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 Isfîjâb (§ 25, 84.), Saurân (= § 25, 90. Šabrân) is said to be a frontier post (thaghr) against the Ghuzz and the Kimäk, and Sh.ghl.jân a frontier post in the direction of the Kimäk. 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 Kimäk territory.

Passing now to the roads leading to the Kimäk we must register, in the first place, the indication of the earlier I.Kh., 28, and Qudâma, 209, who make Ţarâz (§ 25, 93.) the starting point of the route to the residence of the Kimäk king. The position of the first stage on the road («jC/*, or consequently the initial direction of the route, are still dark, but Qudâma, 20510 and 26218, distinctly says that to the left, i.e. north of the road Ţarâz-Kûlân lies a sand desert which stretches up to the territory of the Kimäk. The fact that the traveller before setting out from *Kuvêkat 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 Kimäk ran entirely separate from that linking up Ţarâz with the Semi-rechye, see notes to §§ 15-17 and § 25, 93. The itinerary of Mis‘ar b. Muhalhil, Marquart, Streifzüge, 79, and that of Idrîsî, Marquart, Komanen, 111-12, are very confused and still of no practical help. The only detailed description of a route to the Kimäk is found in Gardîzî, 83. It started from an entirely different point (some 850 Km. to the north-west of Ţarâz as the crow flies) and its successive stretches were as follows:

a. from Pårâb (spelt J ojl, cf. § 25, 88.) to Dih-i Näu (§ 26, 29.);

b. a river and the sands called لر (or م) are crossed;

c. the river (or م) is crossed beyond which begins a salt desert (cf. § 7, 81.) leading up to the K.ndâv.r-tâghî (§ 5, 12.);

d. the wooded banks of the “same” river (S.qûq) are followed up to the source of the river which rises from the large mountain K.ndâv.r;

e. from this mountain the road, for 5 days, descends through woods to the river (§ 6, 41.) of which the waters are black and which flows from the east to the Ţabaristân (Caspian) sea;

f. from the Asus to the following river اش (§ 6, 42.) where the Kimäk frontier begins. This river is large and its waters are black.

Marquart, Komanen, 205, takes م for the Sari-su, which flows from
KIMÄK-GHÜZ TERRITORY
(ed 9 18)
north to south and disappears in the sands to the north-east of the town of Perovsk; he identifies *Kundävar with the Ulu-tau and the Ishim *Kändür and finally traces the road to the Irtish in the direction of Pavlodar. This is a very ingenious suggestion. The identification of Kändür (perhaps *Kändür for Kändür) with the Ulu-tau (“Great Mountain”, cf. § 5, 12.) which is a prominent land-mark (2,070 feet) is very tempting. Moreover, the names of the two sources of the Sari-su coming from this mountain: Sari-Kängir and Qara-Kängir have some remote likeness to Kändür.1 However, we must bear in mind the fact that the starting-point of Gardizï’s route is Dih-i Nau = Yängi-känd = Qaryat al-ḥadītha which lay near the present-day Kazalinsk, some 280 Km. downstream from Perovsk! To follow the Sari-su there would have been no need to descend the Sir- darya to the neighbourhood of its estuary. If we accept Gardizï’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 Kändür 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 Gardizï’s data unless by supposing that in his description he somehow merged the data belonging to two different roads to the Kimäk. In the present state of our knowledge we should not easily sacrifice the identification of the Kändür with the Ulu-tau.3

Until now we have proceeded on the supposition that Kändür stands for the Irtish, contrary to the description of the course of the Asus in Gardizï, and of the and *Suquq in our author, where these rivers are represented as

---

1 V.î., note to § 5, 12. Near Qar- garali (§ 18, 2) stands the peak of Kend (4,644 feet), but it is difficult to fit in Qargarali into our route. [For Kândür v.i., p. 324, and the Russian and Georgian family name Kändür-08]

2 [As in Abul-Ghâzi’s text v.i. 3 which already Marquart interpreted as a Turkish word for “cold”. In this case the probability of my explanation of Gardizï’s itinerary (as running along the Irghiz and Turghay rivers) is considerably increased.]

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 Ulutau (circa 400 Km.), 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 Tarâz (another 625 Km.). Some 50 Km. to the south of the Ulutau 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 “Kimäk road”, at least as described by the earlier geographers.
flowing westwards. In this latter case the two rivers would eventually be the Iläk 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 Khifjäq” formed evidently the north-western march of the Kimäk territory, while Qarqarkhän (?) was the southern march of it. If the words about the Irtish flowing “between” the Kimäk and the Ghüz 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-Khifchaquia”, but if az replaces here an idäfat the term may mean “The inner (part) of Khifchaq”. [Cf. H-Ä, fol. 3a13].

3. The location of Y.ghsün-yäsü depends upon the identification of the two rivers. The real Irtish and Volga lie too wide apart. Moreover in § 18, 3. ١٠١, through a graphic mistake, may stand for the river mentioned in § 6, 41.

[Additional note. The complex يفسون إیسو to some extent resembles the names of the two northernmost peoples known to the Muslims respectively as (or) ووژه and (or) و pests, see references in Marquart, Arktische Länder. In Birüni’s Canon the two peoples are mentioned at the very end of the table of co-ordinates, after the 7th climate. بلد السر (read: بلد إيسو) has the caption: “the Bulghäri trade with them”, and the other people is described as follows: ghiyäd Yüra wa hum mutawahhishün yutä-jiräna mu‘äyanatán” “the forests of the Yüra, who are wild and trade by bartering the objects placed on sight”.

The Wisü are usually identified with the Finnish Ves’ (see note to § 44), and the Yüghra with the Ugrian Ostiaks and Voguls (v. i., § 22).

In the year A.D. 1216 Khwārazm-shāh Muḥammad led an expedition against Qadir-khan, leader of the Qanqli.² Güzgānî, as available in Raverty’s translation, p. 267, says that he “penetrated as far as Yihur of Turkistän, 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 Fadlān’s report (Yäqüt, 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 م ارذر “river Irghiz”, and Juväynî, i, 101, speaks of the Qara-qum occupied by the Qanqil (جلمم ك موضع)

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) قدر خان كه شغفان تنار بود which I read: کی بی سار کي Qanqilyân-i Tatār bûd. The Qanqil were closely associated with the Qipchaq, cf. Barthold, Vorlesungen, 114 and 116. The latter formerly belonged to the Kimäk federation which according to Gardîzî included a Tatār division (to be distinguished from the later Mongols!). Therefore the combination of names in Güzgānî is quite plausible. On the connexion of Qadir-khan with the “Yimäk” cf. Raverty, p. 1097.
and of two rivers جَبْرُود. Nasawi’s İrghiz cannot be one of the more northern İrghiz rivers flowing to the Volga downstream from Samara; in Abul-Ghāzī, ed. Desmaisons, p. 10, Shiβ’ın’s ʿulas, of which the western limits were the Yayiq and the Sir-daryā, comprised both the İrghiz-Savuq and the Qara-qum which must respectively correspond to the names quoted by Nasawi 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 Qanqlı were probably a clan) and some tribe called Yığhqur 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 ʿoruz with all the Qifchaq tribe, adding that he sent to the king’s camp his eldest son with a large number of Yūghur (b. YUGHUR (var. &Gowe Roeikan (t.) of which the western limits were the Yayiq and the Sir-daryā, comprised both the İrghiz-Savuq and the Qara-qum which must respectively correspond to the names quoted by Nasawi and Juvaynī and refer to the same locality.1

Very probably another reference to the name is found in Masʿūdī, 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 كمک بیغور. Instead of Marquart’s restoration *Kimāk-yagbhuy (going counter to Gardizī, 83, who calls the chief of the Kimāk ʿad-tutuq) I should restore this name as *Kimāk-Yığhqur (b. YUGHUR) and compare it with Guzgānī’s يغور and the just quoted.

According to Masʿūdī’s text this was the name of a Kimāk territory, or of a Kimāk division. The expression Yığhqur-zāda ( = *banū Yighetur) 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 Yığhra.

The fact that our يغور is described as lying between the Ātil (*Asus?) and Irtish (Artush) is reminiscent of the natural conditions described in the Murūj, i, 213, and at least our § 6, 42. is identical with one of Masʿūdī’s rivers. The first element يغور can very easily be improved into *يغور (the 5 may have been mis-read from a longish joint between G and W. More difficult is يغور. As in Turkish yast means “broad, wide”, could it have stood here for “a plain”? The fact is that Yast is attested as the name of a town on the Yaxartes since at least the twelfth century, see Barthold, Vorlesungen, p. 141.)

4. very probably *يماکه يیمکیه. Yīmākiya? For the distance of 80 days see I.Kh., 28, who counts from ʿTarāz to كرکک 7 farsakhs and thence 80 days to the residence (maudi) of the ʿKimāk king, ditto in Qudāma, 209, 262.


1 The Qara-qum sands lie to the south-west of the Chalqar lake into which the İrghiz disembogues.

2 Raverty does not give the Arabic spelling of Yighetur 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 ْتَا بیغور ٍ تکستات. One would think that the original had *يغور .
§ 19. The Ghûz


§§ 19–22 describe a special group of northern “Turkish” tribes adjoining the Ural region. See Map vii.

The Ghûz (Arabic transcription Ghuzz) as their name suggests were a part of the people called Oghuz in original Turkish sources (v.s. notes to § 12; and Kâshgharî, i, 56–8). The infiltration of Turkish (Oghuz) tribes in the direction of Transoxiana and Khorâsân began before Islam: the steppes in the south-eastern corner of the Caspian Sea were occupied by the Turks probably in the sixth century A.D.* (prince Şûl of Dihistân, cf. Marquart, *Erânsahr*, 73, Barthold, *Turkmeniya*, pp. 12–13); on a similar early migration of the Khalaj see note to § 24, 22. An important movement of the Ghûz (Oghuz) was caused by the Qarluq occupation of the territories previously possessed by Western Turks (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 Sultân Sanjar, Ibn al-Athîr, xi, 117 (year 548/1153), says: “Some historians of Khorâsân have given much more definite data about them. They say that these Ghuzz came over to Transoxiana from the region of the marches (var. ‘from the Toghuzghuz country’), from the remotest Turkish (lands), in the days of the caliph 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 Khâqânian kings but the Qarluq punished them and expelled them from their seats.” Though this passage refers chiefly to the Balkh Ghuzz, the disruption of the Western T’u-chüeh must have occasioned many similar migrations.¹

Later the Ghûz were chiefly known under the name Türk mân of which the most likely interpretation is that offered by Jean Deny, *Grammaire de la langue turque*, 1921, p. 326, according to which Türk-mân is formed with the “augmentative” suffix *man/mân* having in Turkish an intensifying or aggrandizing sense (*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 (Oğz) 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 Kimäk from the Ghüz, but he adds (§ 18) that in winter the Kimäk visited the Ghüz territory. Gardizî, 107, also places the Kimäk country beyond the Irtish but without any reference to the Ghüz. It is difficult to see how the Volga could constitute the frontier of the Ghüz both in the west and north (?) but it is clear from § 50 that the Khazar had very little control over the territories beyond the Volga, and Mas‘ûdî, Murûj, 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 Išt., 9, who places it between the Khazar, the Kimäk, the Kharlukh lands, the Bulghär, and the Islamic lands along the line Jurjän (Gurgän)—Farâb—Ispîjâb.

The historical situation in the steppes stretching between the Irtish and Volga is still insufficiently known. On the way from Gurgânj to the Pechenegs running west of the Aral Sea Gardizî, 95, omits to mention the Ghuz but he does not mention any other tribe either. On the other hand, Ibn Faḍlân, who in the spring of A.D. 929 travelled approximately the same way from Khwārazm to Bulghär, found the Ghuzz in the region between the Üst-yurt (plateau between the Aral Sea and the Caspian) and the river Jâm identified by A. Z. Validî, o.c., 246, with the Emba. Beyond the Jâm the traveller found the Bâshghurt patrols.

In § 19 the author says that the Ghüz 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 Ghüz king. The source of this latter passage may be common with that of I.H., 393. Ibn Faḍlân, see A. Z. Validî, o.c., 245, styles the king of the Ghuzz yabghû and his viceroy kûdärkin (?).

The source of the characteristics of the Ghüz is uncertain. Gardizî, 81, who has no special chapter on the Ghüz, only mentions their eponym ūj 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 Mis‘ar b. Muhalhil, in Yâqût, iii, 448, the rain-magnet (hijâra wa hiya maghâtis al-matar) belonged to the Kimäk.

§ 20. The Turkish Pechenegs


1 In Mas‘ûdî, Murûj, i, 213, the Ghuzz are placed on the Black Irtish and the White Irtish, though the latter is described as the territory of the *Kimâk-Yîghûr (v.s., p. 310).

2 Abul-Ghâzî, p. 92, has ṣr for the Emba.
and Polovtsi before the Mongol Invasion (in Russian) in Kiev. Universit. Izv., 1883–4 (not found in London or Paris libraries); Marquart, Streifzüge, 63; Marquart, Komanen, 25–6, 98–9, &c. A short survey in English is given in C. A. Macartney, The Pechenegs, in The Slavonic Review, viii, 1929, pp. 342–53. J. Németh, Die Inschriften des Schatzes von Nagy-Szent-Miklós, in Bib. Orient. Hungarica, ii, Budapest, 1932 (inscriptions found on vessels dating, as it appears, from the beginning of the tenth century; the author attributes them to some princes of the Pechenegs, who shortly before that time settled in the present-day Hungary, and it is curious to read in Gardizî that the Pechenegs possessed numerous gold and silver vessels). D. A. Rasovsky, The Pechenegs, Turks, and Berendeys in Russia and Hungary (in Russian), in Seminarium Kondakovianum, Prague, 1933 (concerns later times; very complete Russian and Hungarian bibliography).

§§ 20 and 22, as well as 43–4 and 48–52, find close parallels in the respective chapters of I.R., Gardizî, Bakri, and ‘Aufî 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 Πατζανακίται were first between the Volga (Ἀρη) and Yayiq (Τεηχ, the “Ural river”) where they had for neighbours the *Majars (Μαζάρους) and the Oghuz (Ονζ). 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 Ibn Faḍlân on the Bāshghurt = Majghār, v.s., p. 312, line 19.

1 Cf. Ibn Faḍlân on the Bāshghurt = Majghār, v.s., p. 312, line 19.
2 In 889, according to Reginonis Abbasitis Prumiensis Chronicon. Cf. Németh, o.c., p. 48.
3 More precisely the region which Constantine calls Λεβεδαία and which must be located somewhere north of the Azov sea, its river Χίδμας alias Χιγγουλος 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 ’Aufi’s interesting text on the further migrations of the tribes.

Our § 20 undoubtedly has in view the situation before A.D. 893 (or 889). It is true that Const. Porph., o.c., admits that until his own time (μέχρι τον νυν) some of the Pechenegs (ριβες εξ 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 Gardîzî 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. Gardîzî, 95, describes a road from Gurgânj (in Khwārazm) to the Pechenegs which touched the Khwārazmian 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 Faḍlān as an eye-witness found in 922. He met the Pechenegs to the south of the river *Jayîkh* (= *Yayîq*) 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 Bàrdâhs 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 Üst-yurt. Bakri, 42, places the mountain at 10 farsaks from Gurgânj.
² But u.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 Rütä river (flowing westwards!) rises from a mountain on the frontier between the Pechenegs, Majgharï, and Rüs. Such an involved idea would be comprehensible to some extent only if the author imagined that the Pechenegs and Majgharï, or a part of them, were found to the south-west of the great bend of the Volga (in the region of Kazan). The Rütä was evidently considered as the frontier between the Pechenegs and Rüs (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. Gardizī’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 Polovtst (from половьи “yellowish, sallow”) to which name in western languages correspond the terms: Pallidä, Falones, Valani, Vakwen, &c. This group of names has no correspondence in Muslim literature. Another name under which the Qipchaq were known in the Byzantine empire and Western Europe is Komani, Comani, which is also found in Idrīsī, who (perhaps quoting from a European source)3 calls the Qipchaq and their land Qanān and their land (Jaubert’s translation, ii, 395, 399, &c.). The identity of all these appellations is clear from Rubruquis (Paris, 1839, p. 247): “Communi qui dicuntur Capthat

1 If the Pechenegs lived north of the Burtäs (i.e. Bulghār) and Barādhās, how could they neighbour on the Ghûz along the Volga, unless under Ātil we have to understand the Kama? But this surmise would create new difficulties. According to Mas’ūdī, 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 (or ) which Gardizi quotes on the road to the Kimák (see note to § 18) and (variants and ) given by Rashíd al-din, ed. Bérézine, Trudi 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: Falani] et provincia Valania [read: Falania].” The origin of the names Coman-|Qoman remains dark (cf. note to § 14, 1.). The name نہ (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 نہ into consideration we can imagine the derivation of Magyar Kün from Qoman but there is no explanation for the expansion of an earlier *Qün into Qoman, simultaneously with its supposed survival (?) as Kün in Magyar.

Like the Khirkhïz, Kimäk, and Rüs the Khifchäkh 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 Rüs river (Volga above its junction with Kama?) skirted the Khifchäkh confines.² Were then the Qipchaq imagined to live down-stream from the Rüs 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 Gardïzï, who uses much the same materials, distinctly says that the Khifchäq 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.

Gardïzï, 82, mentions the Khifchäkh as one of the seven tribes of the Kimäk. Our author seems to refer to a later stage of the Khifchäkh emancipation: he admits the vassal dependence of their king upon the Kimäk but considers the Khifchäkh as a special tribe, maybe separated from the Kimäk by the territory called Andar az Khifchäkh. To what an extent the form of association of the Qipchaq with the Kimäk was changed towards the end of the eleventh century is witnessed by the quotation from Kâshgharï (iii, 22), v.s., p. 305, which shows the Yimäk, i.e. presumably one of the two original clans of the Kimäk, as a kind of poor relatives of the Qipchaq. In A.D. 1318 al-Warrâq quotes the Yimäk 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 Ghüz 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 (= Ghüz) and the Polovtsi (= Qipchaq). The former were evidently fleeing under the pressure of the latter. Henceforth for 170 years up to the Mongol invasion

² On the other hand the northern boundary of the Turkish Pechenegs was the mysterious river Rüthä (§ 6, 45.) which is not mentioned in connexion with the Khifchakh. We may imagine then that, on our author’s Map, the Rüthä divided the Rüs and Pechenegs only on the right bank of the Volga. [Or should we read eastern, instead of northern, boundary, cf. supra note 1.]
³ Here we cannot discuss the migrations farther south and west. See now Rasovsky, o.c. [The first attack of the Pechenegs on Kiev is recorded in the Russian Chronicle under A.D. 968.]
(A.D. 1224) the Qipchaq remained masters of the steppes down to the Caucasus.

Explaining the process of formation of the Qipchaq tribe Marquart assumes three gradual stages of its mongolization (?). According to Gardizi the original Kimäk separated from the Tatär (following Marquart, o.c., 95, in the seventh century); for a second time the Qün, a clan of the Mongolian Marqa mentioned in 'Aufî (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 Yüan-shih: *Kin ch'â) state is explained by the arrival towards A.D. 1120 of some princes whose original habitat was near Jehol in Northern China, o.c., 115, 117, 137. Many of these facts still need confirmation and their interpretation by Marquart is subject to considerable caution (see the reviews of Marquart's book by Pelliot and Barthold and the latter's Vorlesungen, p. 114).

It remains to mention here that in 'Aufî's much discussed passage the chain of moves among the nomadic tribes is opened by the invasion of the Qün (Q.ri) into the Sârî land (xamïn-i Sârî). The inhabitants of Sârî (ahl-i Sârî) press the Ghuz-Türkmâns and the latter move into the southern seats of the Pechenegs (§ 47). Barthold in his review of Marquart's Komanen thinks that by Sârî the Qipchaq are meant, and this hypothesis is certainly supported by the fact that the Qipchaq were the people who drove before them the Ghuz (Yau O'koi) and gave their own name (Dasht-i Khifchäkh) to the steppes formerly associated with the name of the Ghuzz. Barthold even suggests that sârî<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'u-chüeh, v.s., § 17.]

Against Barthold's hypothesis is the fact that in 'Aufî's text ahl-i Sârî can only be interpreted as "people of [the territory called] Sârî". However, the name of the Sârî-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 Sârî-su (notes to § 18) lay the sands called by the Turks أورتم (v.s., p. 315, n. 3). Had this latter name anything to do with the Qomans it would pave the way to the demonstration that the "people of Sârî" were not different from the "Qomans" (= Qipchaq).

§ 22. The 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 Mzik, Beiträge, pp. 92-6; Németh Gyula,

1 The text as it stands does not suggest any leadership of the Qûn over the people of Sârî.
A honfoglaló Magyarság kialakulása, Budapest, 1930 (a short résumé of this important work is La Préhistoire hongroise, in Nouvelle Revue de Hongrie, Budapest, June 1932, pp. 460-8, the communication of which I owe to the kindness of the author); C. A. Macartney, The Magyars in the Ninth Century, Cambridge, 1930 (a painstaking revision of Byzantine and Oriental sources, the latter being used in translations; Gardîzi’s text accepted in Marquart’s earlier interpretation); J. Moravcsik, Zur Geschichte der Onoguren, in Ungar. Jahrbücher, x, Heft 1-2, 1930, pp. 53–90. See Map xii.

The question of the remote Hungarian (Magyar) origins depends chiefly on linguistic evidence and more especially on that of loan words in Magyar and its cognate idioms. As the nearest of kin to the 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 “Ursite” 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 languages 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 Majghari, Basjirt, and other similar names 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 Bulghärs had migrated from the northern Caucasus northwards, cf. Munkácsi, o.c., 221. The name of the Bashghirs mixed with that of the Hungarians living near

1 For traces of former contact of the Magyars with the Osset see now Hannes Sköld, Die ossetischen Lehnwörter im Ungarischen, in Lund Universitätets 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. Alân > Osset) elements in Hungarian exclusively with the Caucasus for the Alâns once stretched well to the neighbourhood of the Aral Sea. [The theories on the earliest home and migrations of the Magyars are necessarily very controversial.] [Cf. Appendix B.]

2 See their enumeration in Chwolson, o.c., 112, and Marquart, Streifzüge, 68–9.

3 Moravcsik, o.c., 89, thinks that this migration took place simultaneously with the westward trek of the Onoghundurs (§ 53) about the middle of the 7th century.

4 Németh explains it as *bâsh-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. Kâşghârî considers the Bashqirs as Turks speaking a dialect akin to that of the Kimäk, but the Dominican Julian who, in search of the lost Hungarian tribes, visited the region of the Volga in 1235 found a “Magna Hungaria” near the “Magna Bulgaria” (i.e. the Volga Bulghârs). 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 (Kouprouneyumátov = Hung. Kürt-Gyarmat=Bashq. Yurmatu; Tevâx=Hung. Jenó=Bashq. Yeney). See Németh, Magna Hungaria.

The clearest and simplest presentation of the case in Muslim sources is found in Işt., 225, who says: “there are two classes of Basjirt (بجیرت). The one is found at the farther end (âkhir) of the Ghuzz behind the Bulghär (‘alâ zahr B.) and they are said to be about 2,000 men and to be protected by impassable thickets (mashájir); they obey the Bulghär. The other class of them borders on the Pechenegs; both they and the Pechenegs are Turks and they border on Rüm.”

Much more entangled is the group of sources represented by I.R., 142, Gardızî, 98, and Bakrî, ed. Rosen, 45, who under the name Majghâri mechanically string together the information referring to two different territories and most probably derived from different sources (Muslim al-Jarmî, Hârûn b. Yahyâ, &c., cf. Marquart, Streifzüge, 28) as if the Uralian territory stretched without interruption down to the Black Sea. The introductory paragraph (A) of these authors places the Majghâri in the north

1 In the curious legend on the formation of the Khirkhîz, Gardîzî, 85, says that their ancestor after having been obliged to leave the court of the Khazar-kâqân joined Bashjirt who “was one of the Khazar nobles and with 2,000 men lived between the Khazars and the Kimâks”.

2 It is possible that I.Kh.’s (p. 31) الجفر is quoted in the series Toghuzghuzh-Kharlukh-Kimäk-Ghuzz-愳fr-Bajanak-Türkish stands for الجفر rather than for *بجیر the supposed by de Goeye and Marquart to represent Chigil. The same consideration may apply to Mas‘üdi’s (Murûj, i, 288) البصرة. On other passages in Mas‘üdi relative to the Magyars see Marquart, Streifzüge, and our notes to § 53. [In principle I. Kh. 31, could hardly mention the little-known Çaqir, or render Cîgîl by *Cîghîr].

3 In another passage Işt., 227, reckons from the Pechenegs to the Inner Basjirt 10 days, and from the latter to Bulghär 25 days. This last distance could only refer to the Magyars living north of the Black Sea. A parallel term to Basjirt al-dâkhil is Bulghär al-dâkhil (i.e. the Danubian Bulghär) mentioned in Işt., 226 (v.i. § 45). In Mongol times the Magyars occupying their present seats in Hungary were still called باشترت, cf. Juwaynî, 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 Gardîzî’s text is given without the final sentences.
between the *Pecheneg [our "Turkish Pecheneg"] country and the Bulghar 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 disemboiling into the Rûm Sea, and in connexion with this land Gardîzî particularly names the peoples *N.n.d.r and *M.rdât. On the other hand, Bakrî (B 2) says nothing about the rivers and as the neighbours of the Majgharî quotes the and undoubtably connected with the Caucasus, cf. notes to § 50, 4.1 Contrary to Marquart2 I am inclined to think that, even supposing that I.R. (B 1 a) has in view the Λεβέδία home of the Magyars near the Azov see, Gardîzî (B 1 b) refers to the Άρελκουζοω 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 H.-ʿĀ. we find traces of the additional source (B 1 b) to which we can assign our details on the southern (*western) frontier of the Magyars, as well as on the V.n.n.d.r (§ 53), Mirvât (§ 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 (B 1) but which also contains details (B 1 b) on the neighbours of the Majgharî found nowhere else except in the H.-ʿĀ. 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 salâr (has) 20,000 horse. They call this salâr *k.nda and this is the name of their greater king, (whereas) the salâr who makes the appointments (shughlâ khwânad) is called jula and the Majgharî do whatever he orders them. They possess a wide plain all covered with grass. Their country is 100 farsakhs by 100 farsakhs. Their country adjoins the Rûm Sea into which flow two large rivers [instead of *j.jj read: از رود چیمون] and they live between these two streams (میان این [دو] چشی) and when (C. چشی) winter comes those who had gone far from the river (jayhûn) come

1 Cf. also Mas'ūdî, v.s., 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 Majghari, i.e. the Bashqirs (item A). The rest of the passage seems all to refer to the real Magyars (item B).
near to it and stay there in winter. They catch fish and live on them. And [with regard to] the river (jayhūn) which is to their left [we must add that] towards the Saqlāb (country) there is a tribe of Rūm who are all Christians. They are called N.n.d.r. They are more numerous than the Majghārī but weaker than they. And of these two jayhūns the one is called Atil (ḻāl) and the other Dūbara (ḻarā) and when the Majghārī are on the bank of the river they see the N.n.d.rians. Above (zabar; C. zīr: ‘below’) these N.n.d.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.n.d.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 Majghārī 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 buzurgtar-ast). The country of the Majghārī is all trees and marshes (ābīr ‘lakes?’) and the soil is damp. They always vanquish the Saqlāb and constantly impose tribute on them and treat them as their slaves. The Majghārī are fire-worshippers and raid the Saqlāb and Rūs and bring captives (barda) from them. They take them to Rūm for sale. These Majghārī are handsome and pleasant looking. They dress in satin (dībā). Their arms are embellished with silver and gold (instead of سِمِيمَةَ انْدُو رُوودةٓ and read: سِمِيمَةَ انْدُو رُوودةٓ). They constantly go to sack the Saqlāb and from the Majghārī to the Saqlāb there is a distance of ten days.”

The crucial point is the identification of the two rivers which Gardiš, 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.n.d.r from the river flowing “on the left” of the Majghārī, i.e. evidently on their west, because the peoples living beyond it lived in the direction of the Saqlāb, one of the westernmost peoples of Eastern Europe (§ 43). This makes it evident that the river َدو رُووِدآ is one of the rivers of the north-western corner of the Black Sea, and probably Barthold was right in restoring in his text *دو رُووِدآ (Dūnā, “Danube”) instead of َدو رُووِدآ. As regards the river flowing “to the

---

1 I.R., 143, mentions كَرِكُ as the point where the Majghārī slave-traders were met by the Byzantine merchants. If this place (cf. § 3, 6. and 8. and § 42 15.) is كَرِكُ Kerch (at the entrance of the Azov sea) there is an indirect indication that I.R. still referred to the Lebedia home of the Magyars.

2 I.R., 143, quotes the distance of 10 days between the Pechenegs and Slavs and, ibid., 142, records the Magyar attacks only on the Slavs. Gardiš’s variants may reflect an influence of his special “N.n.d.r.-M.rdāt” source (B 8 b).

3 The Khazar king’s letter (which also mentions the name V.n.m.t.l.r., cf. § 46) positively applies the name Rūnā/Dūnā
right” of the Majghari, the mention of the Khazars shows that it must be sought in the eastern part of the southern Russian plain. Marquart, *Streifzüge*, 32, quotes the Hungarian chronicler Simon de Keza according to whom the Hungarians called the Don *Atul*.\(^1\) This may be a hint for the identification of Gardizi’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 Ἀτελκοῦζου explained as “(the land) between the rivers”, see Marquart, *Streifzüge*, 33. If the element κοῦζοι corresponds to Magyar köz, köze “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 Gardizi’s *Atil* perhaps be an echo of the term *Atelkuzu*?\(^3\)

Coming now to the *H.-Ä.* we see that its author with regard to the Majghari territory followed exclusively the tradition A and entirely disregarded the tradition B. He places the Majghari near the Ural mountains as the last territory in the series of the northern Turkish lands (§§ 18–22, east to west: Kimäk, Gḥūz, Turkish Pechenegs, Khīfsākh, Majghari). This disposition of chapters is still more significant in view of the fact that the southern territories of Eastern Europe (§§ 43–9) are described in an opposite direction (west to east: 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, Būrtās, Barādhās, and V.n. nd. r. Cf. Map xii.

Our author undoubtedly represents the same tradition as I.R., Gardīzī, and Bakrī, and in his sources certainly the two different Majghari homes were found. As in § 22 he proposes to describe the Bashqir country (A), the question is what he has done with the residue of information relative to the Magyars (B)? In the immediate neighbourhood of the Magyar territory Gardīzī mentions the people *N. nd. r* screened by a mountain from another people *M. rdāt*. These peoples are also described in our text: the Majghari to the Danube, cf. Kokovtsov, o.c., pp. 75 and 92, but this document is suspect.\(^4\) Cf. I.Kh., 54, on the Tanaïs, “the river of the Saqāliba” which the Rūs merchants follow before reaching the Khazar capital.

\(^1\) Cf. I.Kh., 34, on the Tanaïs, “the river of the Saqāliba” which the Rūs merchants follow before reaching the Khazar capital.

\(^2\) Cf. in Volga-Turkish dialects, *Yayîq-itîli, Vîtkâ-itîli, Aq-idîl*, &c. Cf. Marquart in Ungar. Jahrb., ix/1, 1929, p. 96. [The word is said to be of Chuvash (< Bulghār) origin.]

\(^3\) If *Dubâ* is the Danube and *Atil* the Dniepr (or even the Don) it is difficult to call the eastern river the larger of the two. One could perhaps imagine that in the original Muslim report based on Byzantine sources *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. *Aufî*, v.i, p. 324.]
are the northern neighbours of the V.n.nd.r (§ 53) and the Mirvät (§ 46) live south of the V.n.nd.r mountain. Consequently the order of enumeration of the peoples is maintained, but the starting-point being different, the Majghari, V.n.nd.r, and Mirvät are disposed in a north-to-south direction, so that, instead of the Majghari, the Mirvät come to be the maritime people on the northern coast of the Black Sea. This basic error will be especially considered in the notes to §§ 53 and 46. See sketch on p. 440.

Having ignored the southern Magyars our author transferred to the inhabitants of the northern territory all the characteristics found in the sources with regard to the “Majghari” and as a matter of fact belonging mostly to the southern Magyars.

Population: 20,000, as in I.R. and Gardizï.

Country: 150 X 110 farsakhs; Gardizï and Bakrï: 100 X 100 farsakhs; I.R.: “extensive country”.

The King’s name: ٠ (read: ḫle). I.R. and Gardizï, كدhe principal king, but ٠ real administrative chief; Bakrï, title ḫle.

The Majghari live on fish. Ditto in Gardizï, but I.R. and Gardizï 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 Majgharï?]

Trees and waters, as in I.R. and Gardizï.

Good-looking, as in Gardizï.

Victorious wars against “infidel” neighbours. I.R.: dominate over the Slavs (several details on slave trade); Gardizï: raid the Slavs and Rûs.

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). As regards the name of the king, the form ḫle is explained by the confusion of the final * with ٠. The name is certainly ḫle *jula, cf. Const. Porph., chap. 40, pp. 174-5: ḫulas and Hungarian Gyula. Our author omits the name of the chief of executive power k.nda for which Const. Porph. strangely gives κραξs (perhaps: καρχαν). The title as it stands in Muslim sources may be connected with that of the dignitary who occupied the third place in the Khazar hierarchy: كندر خاقان (“k.nd.r khāqān” or “the

---

1 On its disturbing influence, cf. note to § 6, 45.
2 It is true that the Rûs are mentioned as the western and northern neighbours of the Majghari. In § 6, 45. the river Rütä rises strangely from a mountain situated between the Majghari, the Rûs, 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 Uralas. One of the western sources of the Oka is called Ugra (= Hungarian!). According to N. P. Barsov, Ocherk russkoy istoricheskoy geogr., Warsaw 1885, p. 241, Ugra lay on the road connecting the Dniepr with the Volga.] See Map xii.
khäqän’s **k.n.d.r**’?)... Yäqüt, ii, 436–40 (after Ibn Faḍlān). Munkácsi, in *Keleti Szemle*, x, 1909, pp. 179–80, compares it with **kündi/kündü** which the Altai Turks in quite recent times used to give to their dignitary next in rank to their ruler (sāyān).¹

[Additional note. In his *Streifzüge*, 161, 164, Marquart, misled by the idea that the two pairs of names “**N.n.d.r** and M.*rdät*” and “**Twläs** and *Aughaz*” were identical (cf. § 50, 4.) came to the conclusion that the river جُرَا was “Kuban”. In *Komanen*, 99, Marquart was less categorical and wrote with reference to our رَوْرَا (which he found in Tounansky’s translation, *Zap.*, x, 1897): “Auf die Frage, welcher Fluss unter dem رَوْرَا 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 Dübä/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 مَحْرَى) according to Brit. Mus., Or. 2676, fol. 67v.) ‘Aufī first quotes the well-known data on the vastness of the Magyars’ country (100 × 100 farsaks), on their 20,000 horse and on the *ra’is* called **K.n.d.a**, adding that the Magyars own tents (khargāḥ) and wander with their herds. Then he goes on:...

The influence of the Balkhï tradition (as represented by Išt.) is apparent in this chapter, but numerous details are also common with Maq.\(^1\) who undoubtedly used Jayhâni. Several details find parallels in Ya‘qûbi‘s short but graphic description of Khorasân, *BGA*, vii, I.R., and Bîrünî’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 Gû zgân, whose ruler was our author’s patron (see notes to § 1).

In the introductory paragraph the bearings of the frontiers are displaced as if the north-east were taken for the north. In this our author follows Išt., 253. By the former kings of Khorasân (who unlike the Sâmânids did not rule over Transoxiana) the Tâhirids and Šaffârids are meant. Among the products of Khorasân, gold was found in Gharchistân and Badakhshan, and silver in Panjhir, cf. Maq., 326.


Very notable is the author’s tendency to give the names their true Iranian form as is also the case in the Persian translation of Išt.

I. The province of Nishâpur

1. Our author agrees with I.R., 171, who also counts in Nishâpur 13 rustâqs and 4 “quarters” (*arbâ’*), whereas Maq., 300, has 12 rustâqs and 4 khâna (*khânät*).\(^2\)

For 1.-5., 7. cf. Išt., 256-7. As regards 8. Išt. also gives Khûjân but Jarmagân and Sibînagân have a parallel only in Maq., 300\(l\) (MS. C) who under the dependencies of Nasâ mentions “Isfînaqân, Jarmaqân, Afrâva, and Shâristâna”. Under § 6, 50. Ustuvâ (the district of Khûjân > Qûchân, ancient *Aσταυηνή*) and Jarmagân are mentioned on the Hirand (Atrak) river.\(^3\) Consequently Sibînagân and Râvînî, coupled with them in our 8.,

---

\(^1\) Especially with the Constantinople MS. C which contains numerous additions.

\(^2\) The present-day Khorasânian divisions, such as Sunnî-khâna, ‘Arabkhâna may be a trace of the ancient khânät.

\(^3\) V.s., p. 29.
ought to be looked for in the same direction. However, Ravin! is probably identical with Khan Ravän (var. Ravin?) which Ist., 257 and 284, mentions at one marhala from Nêshâpûr on the road to Isfarâ‘în, and which must correspond to Maq., 300, Rivand (*Rëvand) mentioned as one of the four khânât of Abarshahr (= Nishäpûr). The famous fire temple of Burzin-Mihr according to the Bundahishn, xii, 18, stood on the Rëvand mountain which in a larger sense may refer to the Bûnâlût range separating Nishäpûr from Tûs, see Hoffmann, Auszüge aus syrischen Akten, 1880, pp. 290-1.

6. Jâjarm is also found in Maq., 300, but not in Ist.

9. 10. 12. Now in ruins. The town Nasä lay near the village of Bâgîr (Bagir?), west of ‘Ashqâbâd. Bâvard lay near the present villages of Abîvard, at 8 Kms. west of the Qahqa station of the Transcaspian railway. Mayhana, now Me‘âna, lay between the Dûshak station and Sarkhs, to the west of Chahcha. Maq., 300 l, alone mentions Ribât-Mahna. See Barthold, Irrigation, 37, 41, Semenov, Po Zakaspiyskim rasvolînam (“Along the ruined sites of Transcaspia”), Tashkent 1928, and Semenov and others, Drevnosti Abiverdskago rayona (“Antiquities of Abîvard”), Tashkent 1931; Minorsky, Nasä and Bâvard in E.L. According to Isidore of Charax royal Parthian graves (Βασιλικοί ταφαι) lay in Nisä. Recent excavations, south-east of Bâgîr, 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. Tûs, see Minorsky, Tûs in E.L. Ist., 257: Râdhagân (now Râdkân), Tâbarân, Buzdîghûr, and Nûqân. B.nvâdha may be a dialectic form of Junäwidh (*Gunävidh) which Maq., 300 l, mentions among the minbars of Tûs (cf. Persian gunjîshk/bunjîshk). This town is different from 13. According to the Târikh-i Nâdiri, Junäbid lies between Tûs and Mashhad. Maq. also mentions among the produce stone kettles (birâm) and trouser-cords.

Ia. Kûhistân.

13.–19. Kûhistân, i.e. the region lying south of Nishäpûr, towards Sistân. See Le Strange, o.c., pp. 352–63 and Map viii. Administrative limits between Nishäpûr and Kûhistân were certainly confused. In Ist., 256, 273–4, the arrangement is different. Of the places mentioned under 13. Ist. speaks of Turshîz and Kundur under Nishäpûr, p. 256, and of Bunäbidh (Maq., 309: Junäbid, var. MS. C., B.näbid, now Gunäbâd) and Kûrî under Kûhistân, p. 273. In our text Kûrî is repeated under 16. Instead of Tâbasayn (under 15.) it would have been better to mention only one Tâbas (the so-called Tâbas al-Tamr, or Tâbas-î Gilakî called after Gilakî b. Muḥammad, râ‘îs of Tâbas, see Nâşîr-i Khusrau, Safâr-nâmâ, ed. Schefer, p. 94) and let it be followed by 16. and 18. after which ought to come 17. Tâbas-î Masînân (or Tâbas al-‘unnâb). Under 19. are grouped
the places lying in the north-eastern part of Kūhistān towards Harāt,\(^1\) cf. Ḩ., 256 (Būzajān, Jāymand, Salūmāk, &c.). 14., 15., and 18. are described entirely after Ḩ., 274 (where the last name is spelt Khaush<
\*Khōšp).

II. Province of Harāt.

20. Description of Harē (Harāt) chiefly based on Ḩ., 264–7. The expression which our author uses with regard to the mosque abādhāntar ba-mardum az hama exactly corresponds to Ḩ.’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 Ḩ., 266).


24.–27. Bādhghis, closely following Ḩ., 268–9 (Kābrūn [*Kālvūn], Khujistān, Jabal al-fīḍda). Kātūn (?) must be Kālūn (Maq., 298 g.; variants Kābrūn, Kālvūn, Kālyūn) which is often mentioned in the Ţābaqāt-i Nāsirī, cf. Raverty’s index under Kāl-yūn. Bādhghis was the residence of Nizak Tarkhān, the famous opponent of the Arabs who was said to be a Hephthalite (Hayṭal); therefore Yāqūt, i, 461, calls Bādhghis dār mamlakat al-Hayṭīla, see in great detail in Marquart, Wehrot, 39–43.

29. Ḩ., 267: Asfuzār with the towns Adraskar (also in Maq., 298, now Adraskand), Kavārān, Kūshk (var. Kūsād), and Kavāshān; the area of the district is 3 marhalas by 1 marhala; the Khārijites only in the Kāshkān ward.

30. Sarakhs as in Ḩ., 272. On the Khūshkarūd see interesting details in I.R., 173, who says that it reaches a place called al-Ajma, lying towards Abīvard (ajama “wood, thicket”?). Marquart, Wehrot, 5–7, identifies it with the river Sind mentioned in the Bundahīsh, xx, 30, of which the name was misread in Firdausī as āb-i shūr (see note to § 3, 27.).

31.–33. Ganj-rustāq lay towards Marvarūdh, cf. Ḩ., 269. 31. On Bābn, cf. Yāqūt, i, 764, who personally visited it and calls it Bābna and Babn. 33. Baghshūr, according to § 5, 9 B.C., was separated from Marvarūdh 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 Wāṣṣāf, in Mongol days the Khorāsānian Baghshūr was called Mori Shīburghān (the first element [in Mongol “horse”] still survives in Qal‘a-yī Maur, the name of the Russian railway station near which Baghshūr was situated), cf. Barthold, Irrigation, 64.

35., 36. Ḩ., 271: Ghari al-shār with two towns Bāshīn (Armenian Geography: Abshīn) and Shūrmīn. Geographically Gharchistān corresponds to the present-day Firūz-kūh. The shārs were faithful vassals of the Sāmānīds. Later they submitted to Maḥmūd and in 389 H. (25 years after the composition of the H.-‘Ā.) ‘Utbī, the author of the Tārikh-i Yamīnī was sent to receive their oath of allegiance. He speaks favourably

---

\(^1\) Pūchagān (cf. Le Strange, o.c., 357), Tārikh-i Nādīrī, in connexion with the operations of 1141 and 1143 H.
of the old shâr Abû Naṣr b. Muḥammad and of his son Shâh Muḥammad, but finally in 403/1012 Gharchistân was annexed by Maḥmūd, 'Utbî-Maṇînî, ii, 133 and 146 (Persian transl., 337-41). Cf. L. Dames, Gharchistân in EI, M. Nāẓîm, o.c., 60-2. A part of Gharchistân was in vassal dependence upon Güzgân (v.i. 47).

III. Province of Marv.


40.-45. On Marv-i Shâhîjân see in great detail V. A. Zhukovsky, o.c., where the H.-'Ā. is also quoted, p. 21. Our author follows Iṣṭ., 258-63, but adds some details (e.g. the products).

40. Barakdiz, according to Sam'ânî, was the original name of the village of Qarînayn (so surnamed on account of its being reckoned now to Marv and now to Marvarûd, Zhukovsky, o.c., 41.). Qarînayn was situated on the left bank of the river near the present day Imâm-Bâbâ railway station. Opposite it, on the right bank, stood *Logar mentioned in § 6, 26., cf. Maq., 299, Laukar, and Yaqût, iv, 370. By Bih-Âfarîdî is evidently meant the followers of Bihafarîd b. Mâhîfarvardîn, who tried to reform the Zoroastrian faith but at the instigation of the mobads was put to death by Abû Muslim (circa a.d. 750), see Houtsma, Bih'âfrîd, in WZKM, iii, 30-8; Barthold, Turkestan, 194, note 7. Qudâma, 209, also speaks of the majûs in Qarînayn whom he calls رگن (Rîgān).* 41. Girang, Iṣṭ., 263, Jîranj, though a pun in Anvari's satire presupposes the pronunciation kîran. 43. Iṣṭ., 263, Sinj, but Maq., 299, سل سل کر (Q., 321-2 (criticises the conservatism of the inhabitants of Pâryâb); 44. Maq., 312, says that outside Dandànqân stood a ribāt. 45. Iṣṭ., 263, mentions Kushmayhan, Bâshân (*Pâshân), Sausaqân, (Yaqût, iii, 245: Shavashkân) and p. 261, Zarq (with a water-divide). M.sf.rî is a popular name for Hurmuzfarra, Sam'âni in Zhukovsky, o.c., 42: Masfara. Shâbirinji, a village at 3 farsakhs from Marv, ibid. 47, and Yaqût, iii, 225: Shâhbirinj.

IIIa. Güzgânân.

46.-71. Güzgânân (in Arabic ژیژیان). See Ya'qubi, BGA, vii, 287; Iṣṭ., 270-1; I.H., 321-2 (criticises the conservatism of the inhabitants of Pâryâb);
Maq., 298 (quotes among the towns or otherwise unknown); cf. Marquart, Eränzahr, 80, R. Hartmann, Djüzdiân in EI, and Barthold, Preface, v.s., pp. 4–6. In the first place this principality occupied the area between Marv and Balkh watered by two rivers, now called Āb-i Qaysār and Āb-i Safīd, which rise on the northern face of Band-i Turkistān and disappear in the sands a long distance short of the Oxus towards which they flow. Yahūdhān and Pāryāb stood on the two different branches of the Āb-i Qaysār (so spelt in Isfizārī, Zap., xiv, 028–032), and Ankhudh on their joint course; Anbār and Ushburqān stood on the Āb-i Safīd. Moreover,
in the south the sway of the king of Güzgänän 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 Güzgänän reached the "limits" of Bāmiyān (§ 23, 78.)¹ and that the amīr of Ghūr drew his force from the king of Güzgänän (§ 24, 1.) can hardly be taken à la lettre. His statement that the frontier of Güzgänän extended to the extreme limits of Ghūr and marched with the boundary of Bust must refer only to some vague feudal suzerainty (based, perhaps, on the reception of presents from Ghūr). On the produce of Güzgänän our author speaks twice under 46. and 51. Our 47.-51. 63. (and probably 64. and 65.) enumerate the southern dependencies of Güzgänän, 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 Güzgän (*Gözgän or Gözagän) and Gozbun mentioned in the Armenian Geography (eighth century). The meaning of Göızgän 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 (*Gözbn) 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, Erānsahr, 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 ərəxša) who shot an arrow to fix the frontier between Irān and Türān.

The event is briefly alluded to in Yašt, 8, 6, where the shaft flies from the mountain Aryō-xšūba to the mountain Xvanvant, both still obscure.² In Muslim times it was admitted that Ārish stood somewhere in Māzandarān (Rūyān, § 32, 15., or Sārī, § 32, 9.) but there was a considerable divergence of opinion about the exact spot which the shaft struck, reflecting the important political interests at issue and the historical fluctuations of the eastern frontier.

According to Ṭabarī, i, 435-6, the arrow reached the river of Balkh. Thā'ālibī, ed: Zotenberg, p. 133, reports that it was about to fall in Bādhghis but an angel carried it on to a place near Khulm (§ 23, 68.) called which name Stackelberg restored as * Korzin Gözbun. Birūnī, Chronology, 220, places the goal³ at the farthest end of Khorāsān, between ʼAmūdariya (?), and ʼAmūdariya (?). The latter name was improved by Stackelberg as * Fardashtan but I should rather restore it as * Malatuna (L could have been mis-read into a longish س, v.i., p. 340), and take the impossible Furdār 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 Gūlgān 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" (asl shajarat al-jauz).
(Kishm flowing into the Kokcha). This is really the easternmost point of Tukhāristān (comprised in Khorāsān) for Badhakhšān 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 Talaqān, the one just mentioned in Tukhāristān (§ 23, 76.) and the other lying on the western threshold of Gūzgān (§ 23, 52.).

Finally Gurgān in his Vis-u Rāmin, ed. M. Minovi, 1935, p. 366, and Zahīr al-dīn, ed. Dorn, p. 18, place the limit of Ārīsh’s exploit near Marv, i.e. more or less in the neighbourhood of Gūzgān.

In the light of these data, we shall now consider the two relevant passages of the Armenian Geography. In the first, Gosbon 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 "Āpeia (vi, cap. 17) the author winds up by saying that the Persians call this region Khorāsān and reckon to it the provinces of Komī (Kūmish), Vrkan (Gurgān), Apršahr (Nishāpūr), Mrv (Marv), Mrot (Marvarūd), Hrev (Harāt), ḫaḍšān (cf. the present-day Kādis in Bādhghīs), "Gozkān, from where the kingly horses come", *Gosbon 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 Vehroṭ. 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 Tukhāristān.] It seems that in that land of Kōsakan (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 Gosbon is to be placed between Gūzgān and the Oxus. As a parallel to the name Gosbun (§ 23, 64.) and Tunakābun which Rabino, Māzandarān, 153, explains as "below Tunakā"). Whatever the origin of the name Gōzgān (or Gōzagān), Gosbon (< Gosbun) 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, Wehroτ, 153, but the system of enumeration appears to me quite clear.
3 Evidently referring to the agreement between Manūchīhr and Afrāsīyāb who made the decision depend on Ārīsh’s shot.
4 The forms found in Armenian writers are Gosbon, Kæsbion, Gasbun. The form Gosbon, suggesting in Persian *Gōzbōn, may have been influenced by the name of the neighbouring Bahn, Bāun > Bōn, the chief place of Ganj (§ 23, 37.) and later even of the whole of Bādhghīs, Yāqūt, i, 461. [?] 5 Cf. the verse quoted as the first Persian rubā’ī, in Shams-i Qays’s Mu‘jam, 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 Andkhūdh (§ 23, 61.) and Karkūh (now Karkī on the Oxus), v.s., p. 6.

In any case it would have been only too natural to connect the boundary of Irān with the region of Güzgān for Marquart, Erānsahr, 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 Güzgān itself was reckoned to Tūkhāristān, see I.Kh., 36.

47. Following the description, R. būshārān (*Rëvshārān) 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 Güzgānān. As regards the name, I.Kh., 40, calls its ruler malik al-Rūvshārān (cf. Ṭabarī, iii, 1876), but has a variant R. būshārān. One of the vazūrs of the Ghūrid Muḥammad b. Sām was Jalāl al-dīn Rūvshārī, Ṭabaqät-i Nāṣīrī, 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 “Rëwšārān must have lain in the neighbourhood of Bāmiyān”. 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 (var. jūc jāq c).” The place referred to seems to lie much farther east than the sources of the Balkh river for which Marquart, ibid., 219, 227, takes I. Faqīh’s “Jayhūn”. It is noteworthy that a place Andamān (now spelt خبل) exists in the Lesser Pamir and comprises the lake Chīlāb (Turkish Çaqmɑqting). Kūshkākī, 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 Bīrūnī’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, Kashmir, &c., mentioned in the 4th climate, viz.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Long.</th>
<th>Lat.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Panjwāy</td>
<td>93°5'</td>
<td>32°50'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Rivshārān</td>
<td>93°20'</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 Azmān), acted Nīzak with some of his generals (fi jamā‘a min al-quwwād). Among the latter, Harthama “the Shār” and Ḥasan b. Jaʿfar “the Révshār (read: Revshār)” were taken prisoners. No particular conclusion as to the respective position of their fiefs can be drawn from their association in an expeditionary force.
Consequently Bîrünî’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 Güzgânän dominions “down to the limits of Bâmiyân”. Were we, however, to maintain his other statement that some of the Murghâb waters come from Rivshârân, we should perhaps move the latter to the south-easternmost corner of the Murghâb basin. Cf. infra 64. The final certainty can be attained only by an investigation on the spot. [See Appendix B.]

48. D.rm.shân (V.rm.shân, Varmëshâni) must have been a considerable principality, for, in the north, a part of it lay in the Murghâb basin, while in the south it bordered on Zamîn-dâvar (§ 24, 12.-15.). It had a chief (mihtar) of its own, but our text, which is not very explicit, divides Darmashân into two “regions”, the one depending on Güzgânän, and the other on Bust. The part of the Güzgânän zone which lay in the Murghâb basin must be placed south [or west] of the R.bûshârân, perhaps on the “Sar Acha” (*Sarëcha?) affluent of the Murghâb, communicating in the south with the Shorak valley leading to Ahângaran (v.i.).

So far as geography goes, Darmashân certainly belonged to Ghûr (§ 24, 1.), but as the latter’s king had a different title (Ghûr-shâh) we ought to conclude that Darmashân formed a special march of Ghûr under a special dynasty.1 The history of Ghûr at this period is very obscure. According to the Ṭabaqät-i Nâṣiri, transl., 312–16, there were two rival families in Ghûr, of which the one (that of *Shanasp< Vshnasp = Gushnasp, cf. Marquart, Das Reich Zäbul, in Festschrift E. Sachau, p. 289), since the time of Hârün al-Rashîd (?) possessed the princely power (imârat), while the other (that of Shîth) had the military command (pahlavânî). The later Ghûrids, o.c., 300–420, descended from Shanasp and the author of the Ṭabaqät 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 Darmashi-shâh, while the title of Ghûr-shâh (§ 24, 1.) belonged to some rival family (that of Shîth?). As regards the name D.rm.shân, the reading *Dar-i Mashân “Gate of M.” would not be satisfactory for such a vast tract on purely geographical grounds. On the other hand the author of the Ṭabaqät says that the amîr B.njî (presumed contemporary of Hârün al-Rashîd, A.D. 786–809) was the son of Nahärân, son of V.rm.sh, son of V.rmshân, and it is likely that these names and with many variants (V.rm.thân, D.rm.nshân, V.rh.shân) correspond to our Drmshân. As a parallel to the district Rivshârân called after its king’s title (or ancestor) Rivshâr, D.rm.shân would be the fief of the descendants of V.rm.sh/D.rm.sh. The important fortress of Ghûr called Ahângaran which was taken by Sultân Mahmüd was situated on the Hari-rud (see notes to § 24, 1.) and this fact again is in favour of the identification of the Darmashi-shâhs with the Shanasp family.

1 If only Darmashân is not a popular name for Ghûr itself! V.i., § 24, 1.
49. For the location of T.märän and T.mäzän we have to go by the following indications: Mänshän (51.) which we take for the Mäk valley lay in the Tamrän mountains; Tamrän and Tamäzän lay near the limits of Ribät-i karvän (63.). The two districts must be sought south of Mänshän on the easternmost sources of the Murghab. Tamrän could be the Chiras valley, and Tamäzän that of the more southerly Äb-i Vajän. Tamrün was the more important and its mountains comprised probably the whole (?) watershed region between the Balkh river and the Murghab. The Tabaqät, 319 (text, 39), places in Tamrän the highest of the peaks of Ghür called اَک (؟). The most elevated points of the whole area are situated south of Bämiyän in the Koh-i Bäbä range (16,874 feet), but north of the sources of the Harî-rüd (i.e. in the neighbourhood of the presumed district of Tamrän) there is a peak of 14,845 feet. Several natives of Tamrän were in the service of the Ghürids, Tabaqät, 390. “Abul-Abbäs Abul-Hasan Khalaf” whom Bayhaqi, pp. 128, 795, mentions as an important muqaddim of Ghür may have been the chief of Tamrän for his fortress lay at three days’ distance from Ribät-i karvän (§ 23, 63.), and he seems to have been a neighbour of Shîrvän (v.i. 50.).

50. As Särvän (Shärvän ?) comes in the enumeration between Tamrän and Män-shän one would suggest for it a place near the Falakhar (*Farkhär ?) mountains. Under the name of شيرزان Bayhaqi, 127, probably refers to its chief. During his Ghür campaign in 411/1020 Mas'ûd was joined by Abul-Hasan Khalaf (v.s.), “and following the latter came Shîrvän, who was another chief from the frontier of Ghür and Güzgänän. Mas'ûd had gained him to his side and he came with many horse and foot and brought numberless gifts and presents.” Amir Muḥammad [Mas'ûd’s brother and governor of Güzgänän, cf. note to § 1] in view of the fact that “this man was living close to Güzgänän 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'ûd”. The twofold way of spelling شيران and سيران would suggest the reading *Servän or *Shervän (cf. شیر زن and اسناد).  

51. Mänshän is mentioned in the Armenian Geography, Marquart, Bränzähr, 17, 85, and Huschardsan, p. 301, as well as in the T’ang-shu list of provinces incorporated by China towards A.D. 657 after the subjugation of the Western T’u-chüeh, Chavannes, Documents, 71, note 9 a (on I.H., 270, v.i., under 55.). Mänshän 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 Jahûdhän, 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 Mänshän, lying south of the Dar-i Andara (and its valley), must be identical with the Mäk valley, watered by the northernmost of the eastern sources of the Murghab (Mäk tagâb, or tagão). The upper part of this valley lies immediately to the south-west of the sources of the Astarâb (the western of the headwaters of the Äb-i Safid). In § 3, 26. a small lake of Mänshân is mentioned lying close to “B.starâb”. The latter is undoubtedly identical
with Astarâb, and this detail confirms the identification of Mânsnâh with Mâk. Some day the lake will be found there! The title (nick-name?) *Barâz-banda “Herdsman of wild boars (?)” according to I.Kh., 39, belonged to the king of Ghâristân, but the attested title of the latter was shâr, v.s., under 36. Consequently our author’s statement merits more credit.

52. Išt., 270, and Maq., 299, mention Tâlaqân under Marvarûdh. This Tâlaqân, which lay at three marhalas both from Marvarûdh and Pâryâb (Ya’qûbî, BGA, iv, 287, counts 4 marhalas from Tâlaqân to Fâryâb) must not be confused with the other Tâlaqân in Tukhâristân (v.i. 81.). The names of both places are sometimes spelt Tâyaqân. According to Marquart, Erânšahr, 80, the Tâlaqân of Marvarûdh was the Sâsânian frontier-town towards the east. Le Strange, o.c., 423, places Tâlaqân at Chachaktu, cf. Zafar-nâma, i, 806, whereas Barthold locates it at Qal’a-Valî.

53. Jahûdhân corresponds to Maymana (ancient *Nisâk-i miyânak, Marquart, o.c., 78). Birûnî, Canon: al-Maymana wa huwa (sic) Jahûdhân. 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. Pâryâb, now Daulatatâbâd, on the eastern branch of the Ab-i Qaysâr. Tabarî, ii, 1206 (year 90/709) mentions a king of Fâryâb called رسل (?), distinct from the ruler of Jûzjân.

55. Naryân, mentioned in Yâqût, iv, 775, may correspond to I.H., 322, var. (Marzân, &c.).

56. Gurzivân, Ya’qûbî, 287, Qurzumân, a district from which the Pâryâb and Andkhoy river (Shirîn-Tagâb) takes its outflow, cf. Yâqût, ii, 59. A ruined town (Shahr-i viärân) exists on its eastern side. South of it lies the central part of the Mâk valley, v.s., under 51. The district covering the headwaters of the Pâryâb river is still administratively called Darzâb-va-Gurzivân.

57. Kundarm, Ya’qûbî, 287, and I.H., 322, كرمان. It lay in the mountains at one marhala from Jahûdhân (and according to § 5, 9 b c. to the east of Anbîr).

58. Anbîr< Anbër, as in Birûnî, Canon; Ya’qûbî, 287, and Išt., 270: Anbår, now Sar-i pul (altitude 2,040 feet) on the eastern of the two rivers of Gûzgân (Ab-i Safid). The Imâm Yahyä b. Zayd b. Hasan b. ‘Âli b. Hasan b. ‘Âli b. Abî Tâlib was killed there, see Yâqût, i, 370, under Anbîr. Under Anbîr, i, 367, Yâqût, 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-rûdh.” According to Tabarî, ii, 1773, the Imâm Yahyä was captured in “a village of Jûzjân”.


60. Usbhûrqañ, now Shibarghân, downstream of Anbîr (altitude 1,303 feet). As appears from Birûnî, India, 158–9, some “undiscriminating
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'qūbī, 287/11.

61. Antkhudh, now Andkhoy, on the lower course of the Āb-i Qāṣār. According to Išt., 270, the town of the district of Antkhudh bore the name of Ushturj (Bīrūnī, Canon: إسلح).

62. Under § 5, 9 b Sān is coupled with Chāryak. Both elements survive in the name of the Sangchārak (sic) district in which numerous streams form the eastern headwater of the Āb-i Safīd. Ya'qūbī, 287, has اسنان and which Marquart, o.c., 86, suggests to read as with Arabic ʃ for Iranian č. The Bābur-nāma, GMS, fol. 57a and 184b, gives سان و چهاریک.

63. Of Ribāt-i *karvān (kirvān?) Išt., 265, says that the Harāt river rises "from its neighbourhood" (min qurb R.-K.), and further, 272, that it belongs to the province (ʾamal) of Ibn Fārīghūn (i.e. the king of Gūzgān) and lies on the frontier of Ghūr. Under 49. Tamrān and Tamīzān 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 Išt. 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 Tamīzān. Tentatively Ribāt-i karvān could be identified with Kūshk-i khāna standing in the said valley. In Bayhaqī, 494–5, Ribāt-i karvān is mentioned as a dependency of Gūzgān and a place of sheep-breeding; ibid., 791, 795, Masūd, 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 *Šing-būn 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 Küfich of Kirmān (§ 28, 7.).¹ The Arabs mentioned in Sultān Maḥmūd’s troops

¹ I.R., 128, says that the Lombards lived "in the Kurdish way" in the steppes round B.lātīs (in the plains of Pavia, according to Marquart’s ingenious correction, Streifzüge, 240).
were very probably recruited from among such nomads, cf. *Siyāsāt-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 Sasanian antiquities on the Khulm river renders plausible the existence of Sasanian 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, Mas‘ūdī, *Murūj*, iv, 48, Yāqūt, i, 713, iv, 817–18 (after ‘Omar b. Azraq al-Kirmānī). The products of Balkh are enumerated after Ist., 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-Qurghan.

**IVa. Ṭukhāristān.**


The notion of Ṭukhāristān varies with different authors, Marquart, o.c., 229. Barthold in *EI* quotes *Ṭabarī*, ii, 1180, where Shūmān and Akharūn belonging to Khuttal and lying north of the Oxus are reckoned to 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). Yāqūt, ii, 518, is evidently wrong in locating the Lower Ṭ. to the east of the Upper Ṭ. *Ist.*, 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
(Tukhāristān) and 70. north to south up the Khulm river; 71. (?)-73. south to north down the Dargham (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 Yaqūt, iii, 142, but ’Abdul-Qādir Baghdādi’s Lexicon Shanamianum, 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 Nūshirvān and Dukhtar-i Nūshirvān, which has been recently explored and described by J. Hackin in Les Antiquités bouddhiques de Bāmīyān, by A. and Y. Godard and J. Hackin, P. 1928, 65-74.

71.-76. situated in the basin of the Dargham 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 Kūshkakī, p. 9.

71. Sakalkand. In the enumeration of the localities of Tukhāristān, Ya’qūbī, 288, Ist., 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.1 Birūnī, India, 149 (transl. 299) says that in the revenue books Sakalkand figured as Fārfza.2 It is possible to identify Sakal-kand with Iskar (Kūshkakī: Iskan?) lying in a side-valley, at the entrance to the district of Barfak whose name could be an echo of Birūnī’s *Farzd (sic) Faraz [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 Nizak3 Ṭarkhān. The latter having taken up his position in Baghlān, near the source called ملخ, 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 Alkrz (cf. also § 5, 9 B. (Hindūkush)). I quote the name merely as a parallel. (In his Das Reich Zābul, 269, Marquart repudiates his former hypothesis (Fārwāf = Qūzān) in Erantsahr, 256).]

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 Erantsahr, 256). *Nišuk, Chin. Ni-chou.
was besieged by Qutayba's brother and finally had to surrender. Most probably Nizak sent his heavy loads along the usual Bāmiyān road up the Doshi river (on which Baghlān is situated). He himself could not help following the same direction by some short cut. He undoubtedly crossed from the left to the right bank of the same Doshi river of which the upper course is now called Barfak. This name must correspond to Bīrūni's *تَارِکْ* mutilated in Ṭabarî's MSS. into تَارِغَانِ. 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. Ṭabarî distinctly says that the winter season was well on and Nizak must have been blocked here by the snow. The name الكرز الكرر البلد الكرن accepted in the printed text has several variants الكرر الكرر البلد الكرن and it is quite possible that its ل has been misread from a س written in a straight line, while the group رز may represent ن. With the form *Iskânkand* we decidedly approach the form اسکلنکند Iskânkand, attested in Maq., 49. The difficult name may have been contracted in usual pronunciation, as its present-day avatar Iskan seems to indicate. If this theory is right, the place of Sakalkand in our enumeration is right, showing that it lay upstream from Baghlān. Marquart's hypothesis (o.c., 219) that Nizak fled in an easterly direction (die Burg Kurz (sic) auf dem Wege zwischen Baghlān und Andarāb) is less satisfactory for it does not explain the names and does not take into consideration Nizak's natural desire to rejoin his baggage train.

[However, Bīrūni'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 Doshi river (formed by the Surkhāb (= Barfak) and Andarāb).

73. Valwālij corresponds to Qunduz (Kuñhan-dīz “the fortress”), situated at the junction of the Doshi river with that of Tālaqān. Bīrūni, Canon: “Valwālij, the capital of Ťukhāristān, which in the days of old was the country of the Hayṭal (Hephthalites)”.

74. Maq., 303, Ishkimish, now Ishkamish, on the western affluent of the Tālaqān river. Not to be confused with Ishkāshim, § 26, 14. Marquart, Wehrot, 86, identifies Ishkimish with the old Tokharian capital, in Chinese Kien shih (*Kam ŝie) or Shêng Kien shih.

75. The small mountainous kingdom of Yūn (?) is perhaps identical with which Ya'qūbī, 288, mentions between Ťarakān and Badhakhshān. The Tālaqān river, formed by the streams of Gufagān and Farkhār, receives from the left side an important affluent formed by the rivers of

\[1\] Different from فَرْخَانِ < Farkhār, v.s., p. 330, line 39 [?].
Khost, Chäl, and Ishkämish. The district Chäl [now united with Ishkämish], is well known for its salt-mines (kän-i namak), situated near the confluence of the three rivers. This is an important detail for the identification of Yūn. The Chäl valley itself does not seem to have ever risen to prominence, but the Khost valley (خست ترس) adjoining Chäl immediately to the east and to the south and communicating with it by several roads, is well known on account of its inexpugnable character, Kūskaki, 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 Chäl, 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 Ṭūkhāristān, 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. Birūnī, Canon, also gives Tāyaqān. On its position v.s., p. 330 ult.

77. Andarāb lies on the south-easternmost headwater of the Doshi river (v.s. 77.-79.). This important valley leads up to the Khāvak pass south of which Panjhūr is situated. On the north-east Andarāb adjoins Khost. Iṣṭ., 279, names the two rivers of Andarāb: Andarāb and Kasān (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-Ḍā'ūdids of Balkh (a branch of the Khuttal family, § 26, 1.). See on this little-known dynasty R. Vasmer, Beiträge z. Muham. Müntzkunde in Wien. Numism. Zeitscr., Band 57 (1924), pp. 49–63. Among the coins struck in Andarāb, Vasmer finally recognizes as belonging to the Abū-Ḍā'ūdids 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 ʿAbbāsids, Sāmānids, and Ghaznavids. On the dynasty of Balkh, cf. note to § 24, 12.

78. The statement that Bāmiyān lay “between” Gūzgānān and the marches of Khorāsān (§ 24) must be understood cum grano (v.s. 46.). The shēr1 of Bāmiyān is mentioned both in I.Kh., 39, and Iṣṭ., 280. On this dynasty see Marquart, o.c., 93. Yāqūt, i, 481, has the same Persian terms for the famous statues.

79. Iṣṭ., 286: Andarāba to Jārbāya 3 marhalas, thence to Panjhūr one

1 Certainly not “lion” as Yaʿqūbī, represents Old Persian xšaṭriya, Marquart, Erānshār, 79.
day, thence to Parvän (§ 24, 21.) 2 marhalas. Maq., 296, gives جاریه but, 346, گارپیه (*Garpïya?).

80. 1st., 286: Balkh to Madhr 6 marhalas, thence to Kah one manzil, thence to Bāmiyān 3 marhalas. Madhr is situated in the basin of the Sur-khāb which after its junction with the Andarāb coming from the east, forms the Doshī (v.s. 76.-79.). Mūy corresponds perhaps to Kah which is now called Kā-Mard. The combination دو موي figures in the report of Sabuktegin's death, ۱۲۲۵, Raverty's trans. 75, cf. M. Nāzīm, Sultan Mahmūd, 32. [Mūy can hardly stand for Rūy (Ṭabarī, ii, 1219: Rū'b) lying upstream from Simingān on the Khulm river.]

§ 24. Khorasanian marches

By the hudūd, in a special sense (see Barthold, Preface, p. 30), our author means the frontier regions (marches) of Khorāsān (§ 24) and Transoxiana (§ 26).

Maq., 337, speaking of the “Eastern Clime”, says that over its whole extent the provinces and khutba belonged to the Sāmānid family; but the princes of Sijistān, Khwārazm, Gharj al-shār, Jūzjān, Bust, Ghaznīn, and Khuttal sent only presents (hadaya) and the Sāmānids were gratified with this substitution for the kharāj. “The (Sāmānid) commander of the army resides at Nishāpūr; Sijistān is in the hands of the family of ‘Amr b. Layth, Gharj in those of the shār, Jūzjān in those of the Farīghūn 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 Gū zgānān 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 Sistān and Kābul) with the addition, in the east, of the buffer territory of Badhakhshān stretching between ۱۲۲۵, [of which the frontier-points were Tāyaqān, Andarāb, Bāmiyān, and Panjhir, § 23, 76.-79.] and the southern dependencies of Khuttal (§ 26, 12.-20.).

The order of enumeration is the following: ۱. (and 14., 15.) Ghūr; ۲.-۸. Sistān; ۹.-۱۳. Bust and Zamīn-dāvar; ۱۶., ۱۷. Rukhudh (region of Qandahār); ۱۸. Bālis (region of Sībī); ۱۹.-۲۳. Ghaznīn; ۲۴. (and ۲۵.-۲۷.? ) Badhakhshān.

I. Ghūr.

1. Although our author had, in Gū zgānān, exceptional opportunities for collecting information on Ghūr, the present paragraph is desultory. It is not at all clear in what relation Ghūr stood to Darmashān which (§ 23, 48.)

D.r.m.shān or V.r.m.shān may be a popular expression ("dominions of the family of D.r.m.sh/Varmish"), whereas Ghūr as a merely geographical term may be due to literary sources.
occupied the space between Güzgänän and Bust. L. Dames, Ghör, Ghörī in *EJ*, admits that in the beginning there must have been several clan chiefs in Ghür but considers as its central region the basin of the left affluent of the Farah-rūd which still bears the name of Ghör. Ist., 272, 281, 285, defines the limits of Ghür as follows: the Harät province down to Farah, then to Baladay-Dāvar (*v.i. 12.)*, then to Ribāt-i karvān (§ 23, 63.), then to Ghar­chistān, then back to Harät. In any case Ghür comprised the upper part of the Hari-rūd for (Ist., 285) one entered Ghür at (now Oba). The name must undoubtedly be جَفَنَان, as in *Nuzhat al-qulūb,* 154, and correspond to the present-day Khwāja-Chisht. The name of the old capital of Ghür is not found in Arabic geographers, but Āhangarān was considered as its important place at the time of Sultān Mahmūd’s campaigns, see *Tabaqāt-i Nāširī,* p. 321, and Muhammad Nāzim, *Sultān Mahmūd,* pp. 70–3, as well as in Mongol times, *Nuzhat al-qulūb,* 150. As the latter source assigns to Āhangarān the position of long. 99° and lat. 35° (Güzgän lay at long. 98°, lat. 35°20’), it is clear that this capital is identical with the present-day Āhangarān, situated at 260 Km. east of Harāt, at a point where a road coming from the north (from Maymana = Yahudhān) crosses the Hari-rūd (to the south of the Shorak pass). As the home of the ruling Shanaspid dynasty very often is named *M.n.d.sh* or *M.ndysh* (probably *Mandēsh* to judge by the popular etymology in the *Tabaqāt*, 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 Mas’ūd’s campaign in Ghür in 411/1020 contains many valuable details, but the geographical and personal names in the printed edition are in a very unsatisfactory state. Mas’ūd reached the frontier of Ghür in 6 stages by the road up the Hari-rūd described by Ist., 285, and Maq., 347 (cf. also Maq., 307). He entered Ghür at Bāgh-i Vazīr, the first ribāt of Ghür beyond (Bun-i Chisht?). Mas’ūd was accompanied by two chiefs of Ghür: Abul Ḥasan Khalaf (*v.s., § 23, 49.*) and Shirvān (*v.s., § 23, 50.*) After the conquest of the fortresses of-*Ruf,* capital author of the *Tabaqāt-i Nāširī* (Raverty, p. 319) places in the mountain of *V.r.ni, Chisht, F.rws,* and the castle of *K.jūrān.*

1 In Birūnī’s *Canon* two points are mentioned in Ghür: K.jūrān lying in the mountains and “Rūf, capital of Āhangarān, also lying in the mountains”:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{K.jūrān long. } & 80° \, \text{o’} \text{ lat. } 33° \, \text{o’} \\
\text{Rūf } & 89° \, \text{o’} \, 33° \, 30’ \\
\end{align*}
\]

Cf. the co-ordinates quoted under § 23, 47. In the description of Ghür the author of the *Tabaqāt-i Nāširī* places in the mountain of *V.r.ni* “the territories of Dāvar (?) and Vālisht [§ 24, 18.?], and the castle of K.jūrān.”
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 Ghûr [I.H., 323: on the border towards the Muslim territory]. Consequently our author's assertion that the people of Ghûr were "mostly" Muslims looks exaggerated, and still more so in the light of Sultan Mahmûd's campaigns against the heathens of Ghûr, cf. M. Näzim, i.e. The stubborn resistance of the inhabitants to the famous conqueror makes it equally doubtful that, some forty years before, the Ghûr-shâh could, without demur, accept the suzerainty of the local ruler of Güzgân. 'Utbï-Manïnî, i, 185, distinctly mentions the Farîghûnîd amîr of Güzgân and al-shâr malik Ghûr [if only Ghûr is here not a mistake for Gharchistân]. On the genealogy of the Ghûrids see Tabaqät-i Nâşiri, p. 29, 49 (transl., p. 302, 312); cf. Justi, Iran. Namenbuch, p. 455, and Marquart, Das Reich Zâbul in Festschrift E. Sachau, 1915, p. 289.

The language of Ghûr according to Išt, differed from that of the "Khorä­sân people", the latter expression suggesting some dialectical differences only.

II. Sistân.


5. The detail not found elsewhere.

9. Bust (now Qal'a-yi Bist) was situated at the confluence of the Hilmand with the Arghandâb (Maq., 304, calls the latter خردروی). The Turkish ruler whom Maq., 337 (writing in 375/985) mentions in Bust, is certainly Mahmûd's father Sabuktegïn, who had seized Bust soon after 366/977, cf. M. Näzim, o.c., pp. 29-33. Our author must also have in view Sabuktegïn while speaking of "Bust" as being conterminous with Güzgânân, § 23, 46. and § 24, 12. The Farîghûnîds lived at first on excellent terms with the Ghaznavids, v.s., notes to § 1. The following route in Išt., 252, is useful for the understanding of our text: "from Bust [via Fîrûzqand] to Sarvân 2 marhâlas along the road of Balad al-Dâwar; then the *Hidmand is crossed at a marhala beyond (mîn) Sarvân and the traveller enters Till; thence a marhala to Darghash lying on the Hidmand on the same bank; from Till to Baghnîn r day in the qibli (western, or south-western?) direction; Bishlang lies in the southern direction of Baghnîn", cf. Le Strange, o.c., Map viii.

10. Išt., 248, spells Şalaqân (Zalaqân), Maq., 297: Châlakân (jh = Û?). The place lay at one marhala from Bust.
II. On the road from Bust to Zamín 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 which lay far too east beyond Panjvāy, perhaps on the site of Qandahār, cf. Iṣṭ., 251, and Gardizi, ed. M. Nāzīm, p. 14, where Yaʿqūb b. Laith marches from Sistān to Bust and then to Panjvāy, Tekinābād, 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-ʿAskar in which the governor resided. Perhaps this عسك or السكر (?) the reading does not seem certain) is responsible for our mysterious الین which, then, ought to figure under 9. and not 10. Another suggestion is found in Yaʿqūbiʾs, 281, interesting list of kūrats of Sijistān: Bust, Juvayn, Rukkhkhaj, Khushshak, Jirr, Khwāsh, Zaranj. Is الین = لمر؟

12. Iṣṭ., 244, speaks of Biläd al-Dāwar under Sistān, 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 Zamín Dāvar had a separate marzubān, Marquart, Ėrānsahr, 37. It is also possible that a special position for this region was created by the still obscure expedition of the governor of Balkh Dāʾūd b. Abī Dāʾūd (b.) ʿAbbās (of the Khuttālān family, § 26, i.) against the king of Zābulistān Firūz. This expedition must have taken place before 258/872 when the Saffārid Yaʿqūb occupied Balkh where Dāʾūd b. ʿAbbās was ruling. See I.Kh., 180., Masʿūdī, Murūj, viii, 42, Marquart, Ėrānsahr, 40, 302. In his description of the frontier of Ghūr I.H., 323 (= Iṣṭ., 272) curiously enough replaces Iṣṭ.’s unexpected Baladay Dāwar, “the two districts of D.” (?), by Balad bani Dāʾūd b. ʿAbbās. This substitution suggests that for a time some members of the Khuttālān family remained in possession of Zamín Dāvar until they were dispossessed probably by Sabūktegīn.

Till and Durghush (many variants) lay on the right bank of the Hīlmānd. 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 *Zunbīl (so instead of Rutbūl!),1 and of whom a second sanctuary was known in Ubulla (§ 33, 9.), ibid., 285. Marquart thinks that Zamín(-i) Dāvar means “the land of the Just One”, i.e. of Zūn (cf. Τζοννγαδβέρ and Zundaber of the Christian authors), cf. Minorsky, Zūn in El. Bayhaqi, 125, says that peacocks were bred in Zamín Dāvar in great numbers (khāna-zād-and dar Z.-D.) and adds, 123, that Maḥmūd considered Zamín Dāvar as “blest” (mubārak) “for it was the first governorship which Sabūktegīn gave him”. It is not clear whether Zamín Dāvar originally belonged to the region traditionally called Zābulistān, see Ėrānsahr, 37, 39. The term Zābulistān is very vague, see Nuzhat al-gulūb,
13.-15. belonging to Ghür seem to represent the part of “Darmashān” (§ 23, 48.) depending on Bust. Here the practical identity of “Darmashān” and Ghūr is obvious. Ist., 244, says: wa Bilād al-Dāwar iqlīmun khīshūn wa huwa thaghrun lil-Ghūr wa Baghnīn wa Khalaj wa Bishlānq wa Khāsh (var. حاـس) wa laysa ‘alayhā (?) sūrn wa lahā qal’atun. Though the text is out of order (cf. Marquart’s tentative restoration, Ėrānšahr, 252) the mention of these places after, or under, Bilād al-Dāwar must be attributed to the latter’s situation on the frontier of Ghūr. Baghnī and Bashling are still shown on the maps. Our خرائين certainly corresponds to Ist.’s حاـس and must be distinguished from 8. خراى (lying on the left bank of the river Khwāsh and placed by Ist., 252, at 1 marhala from Qarnīn). Bayhaqī, 127, also describes خرائين as “a province of Ghūr adjoining Bust and Zamīn-Dāvar in which the unbelievers were filthier (pältīd) and stronger (than elsewhere)”. In 405/1015 Māhmūd led an expedition against it.

16. Rukhudh, Ist., 244, and I.H., 303, spell Rukkhhaj, but Maq. has Rukhūdh (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 پنجواي the chief place.

17. Kuhak, Ist., 244, belonged to Rukkhhaj, while Rūdhān, Ist., 248 [= Balādḥuri, 396, R.sānī?], was situated in the neighbourhood of Fīrūzqand (var. Fīrūzfand; v.s. 11.), to the left of the road leading to Rukkhhaj, and its produce was salt.

18. بکس as in Ist., 244 (var. Bālish). Maq. has both this form, 486, and Vālishṭān, 297. Cf. Marquart, Wehrot, p. 124, note 6. This is the well-known region of Balūchistān 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 Qaṣr. Ist., 239, gives Isfinjāy.

III. Ghaznī and Kābul.

19. Ghazāq غزان, see Barthold, Preface, 30, is a clerical error for Ghaznī (غزن) for lower down (22.) Ghaznī 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 Sabuktegīn 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).

21. Cf. Iṣṭ., 280 and Maq., 296. Birūnī, Canon, mentions “the fortress of *Sukāvand in the ḥamr *Lahōgar > Logar rustāq”; the latter is the valley of the southern affluent of the Kābul river. In Sukāvand stood the temple of an Indian goddess (Marquart, Catalogue, 89 : Sukhavati = Lakṣmī) which was plundered by ’Amr b. Layth circa 283/897, cf. Ėrânsahr, 296. Maq., 349, gives the following route: Ghaznīn-Ribāt al-Bārid-Bāmiyān. Consequently Istākh (Asnākh, &c.) lay at two marhalas to the north of Ghaznī towards Bāmiyān.

22. As regards Ṭukhāristān the name خَلَخ Khallukh standing in our text is right and confirms § 23, 69. On the contrary, with reference to Ghaznīn, Bust (and probably Gūzgānān, cf. Masʿūdī, Murūj, iii, 254, and v. i. quotation from the Jahān-nāma) it must be taken for خَلَخ Khalaj. Like خَرَج standing both for خر Khazar (§ 50) and خر Jurz (§ 42, 15.) the complex خَلَخ is a source of endless confusion for Muslim geographers. The locus classicus on the Khalaj is Iṣṭ., 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, Ėrânsahr, 251-4, sees in the “Khalach, or better Kholach” remnants of the Hephthalite hordes (cf. Khuwārizmi’s curious passage quoted in the note to § 26, 10.) and he further connects the restored form *Kholach with the names Khulas (mentioned in a Syriac source under A.D. 554) and Χολάται (used by the ambassador Zemarchos in 569). This development (based chiefly on Masʿūdī, 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 Khalaj (الخُلَج var. خَلَج); the Kīmāk, the Ghuzz, the J.f.r, the Bajanāk, the *

*Türgish, 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 خَلَج belongs). In another passage, ibid., 28, I.Kh. seems to contradict himself: having placed the winter quarters of the Kharlukh near Kašrā-bās (in the neighbourhood of Ṭārāz, § 25, 93.) he unexpectedly adds: “and near them are the winter (sic) quarters of the Khalaj (الخُلَج)”’. 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 Turkun 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.
Commentary § 24

Kharlukh and Khalaj in this passage are only two variants of the same name (خُرَلَع), 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'üdi, Murūj, iii, 254, and v, 302, where the Turks, the خُرَلَع and the Khalaj, are mentioned in the region adjoining Sīstān and stretching towards Gharch and Bust, it is possible that the term Ghüz 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'üdi 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'üdi's Kharlaj stands not for Khalaj (*Kholach) but simply for the Kharlukh who were not Oghuz but whose early penetration into Tūkhāristān is a well-known fact. From Tūkhāristān a group could easily push farther to the south [?].

The Khalaj Turks are the putative ancestors of the well-known Afghan tribe Ghazay (Ghilzā'ī, Ghiljā'ī). This fact has been doubted by L. Dames in his article Ghalsai in EI, but reaffirmed by Barthold, Khalady, and T. W. Haig, Khalādī, in the same Encyclopedia. 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 Bākhrān (fol. 17 of the copy bound together with the H.-Ā. MS. and fol. 206 of Bibl. Nat., anc. fonds pers, 324):

جَلَلُ قُوْمَ از تَرَگان اُن حُرَلَع خَلْعُ به‌حدود زَلَبستان افَانَدَن ودْر نواحی غزین مَحْرَابْسَت

أَنا مُقَام كَرَدنَد پَس بِبَب کَری هُوا لَو اهِانَتی خَلْعُ مشْت و سَبَعی مَالْ شَد ورزیان

وَتَغییرِ یَدِرْف و لَتَی ذَکَرِی خَلْعُ و طَائَفَهُ اَن جَهْلُ به‌حدود باورد افَانَدَن و بَهْرَکی

مُقَام سَاخْتَنَد و خَلْع را مَردَمان بِسَحیف خَلْع مَخْوَانَد

"The Khalaj (Kh.l.j) are a tribe of Turks who from the Kharlukh 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 Kharlukh Khalaj."

23. Parvān situated at the confluence of the Ghörband and Panjhir rivers ought to come geographically after § 23, 79., but just between them must have passed the frontier of Tūkhāristān and Kābul. Parvān is still shown on the maps to the north-east of Chārkār. There may be possibly another Parvān in the upper Logar valley between Ghazni and Bāmiyān, where Raverty, Tabaqāt, pp. 288, 1021, and 1042, places the battle between the Mongols and Jalāl al-dīn, cf. Barthold, Turkestan, 441, note 6. No such name, however, figures in the itinerary quoted in the note to 21.
IV. Badhakhshan.

24. The itineraries of Arab geographers to the east of Balkh usually stop at Talaqan (§ 23, 76.). However, Ya'qubi, 288, in his enumeration of the towns of Balkh, and following on the towns of Tarakan (Talaqan), and Badhakhshan mentions "the town of Jirm (v.i. 25.) which is the last of the eastern towns following on Balkh, towards the country of Tibet (immam yali Balkh ila nähiyati balad al-Tubbat)". Here the territory of Badhakhshan is implicitly reckoned to Balkh. Coming another time from the north Ya'qubi, 292, winds up his description of the road Tirmidh-Chaghaniyan-Khuttal as follows: "and from Khuttal [the road goes] to Upper Tikharistan and the kingdom of Khumur-big, king of Shiqinan, and Badhakhshan, and from it [i.e. Khuttal] the great river [Oxus stretches up] to Shiqinan, and this all is Upper Tikharistan."

Ist., 279, speaks of Badhakhshan (or Balakhshan) and its products (garnets, lapis-lazuli, musk from Tibet and Vakhân) jointly with Khuttal, but a little above, 278, assigns to Badhakhshan a more special position: "it is a clime (iqlim) with rustaq; its town is Badhakhshan; 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 Badhakhshan under Balkh but outside the towns of Tikharistan, and adds, 303: "Badhakhshan which is con-terminous with the country of the Turks [Ya'qubi's Khumur-beg?] lies above Tikharistan; there is a mine in it of the precious stone resembling the ruby (yaqqi) and there are no other mines of it except this one, and this (place is called) "Ribat Fadil" (Jli jli j). There (also) stands a wonderful fortress (built) by [Hârûn al-Rashid's wife] Zubayda, and there (also) are found mines of lapis lazuli, (rock)-crystal, bezoar-stone, wick-stone (asbestos) ... and a stone which being placed in a dark house lights up the smallest objects."

Our author in this short paragraph follows Ist. only adding that there are merchants in Badhakhshan and that silver is found in it. He solves the difficulty about the special position of Badhakhshan by including it in his category of "Khorasanian marches". In § 23, 75., we have an important indication as to the little kingdom of Yun (?) depending on Khuttal. If Yun, belonging still to the system of the Qunduz river, was under Khuttal, one cannot help admitting that the Kokcha basin situated east of Yun

1 Such is the editor's vocalization confirmed by the Chinese Shih-k'i-mi, Chavannes, Documents, 162; but starting from the present-day Shughnan one could read the name as *Shuqnan.

2 Mas'udi, Tambih, 64, says that the Jayhân rises beyond the ribat of Badhakhshan situated at 20 days' distance from Balkh at the very end of its province. This ribat stands over end of various kinds of "Turks", viz. Aukhan (*Vakhân), Tubbat (Tibet), and Ayghan (?), cf. Marquart, Wehrot, 100. Nizâm al-mulk, Siyasat-nâma, 128, confirms the statement that Zubayda built "on the frontier of Kâshghar (sic) a mighty town which she called Badhakhshan, as well as several strong ribâts in the same region". [Ayghan < possibly *Abghân, as I. Athir, xi, 108, 110, calls the Afghans.]
could not escape the same suzerainty (see above Isṭ., 278, on the prince Abul-Fath).

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 Fayḍābād, see Kūshkakī, o.c., 120–34. The place of the gate would be between Jirm and Zaybāk (§ 26, 12.), e.g. at Bahrārak or in the Zardīv valley, so as to intercept the traffic coming from Vakhān and the countries neighbouring on the latter (Chitral, Gilgit, Kāshgār). 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 Fāḍl b. Sahl, governor of the eastern provinces “from Hamadān to the mountain of Shiqīnān and Tibet”, Tabarī, iii, 841. Very probably Maq.’s Ribāt Fāḍl (v.s.) stands for *Ribāt al-Fāḍl. However, if we leave aside Ma’mūn’s name it will be easier to suppose that the ribāt of Badhakhshān was, at an earlier date, built by the Barmakid Fāḍl b. Yahyā b. Khālid as a counterpart to the gate built by him in Rāshīt (see note to § 26, 9.). The advantage of this hypothesis would be that we know for certain (Ya’qūbī, 304) that Fāḍl b. Yahyā whom Hārūn al-Rashīd appointed governor of Khorāsān in 178/794 “conquered a number of kūras of Ṭuhkāristān, of Kābulshāh, and of Shiqīnān”, i.e. exactly in the region interesting us. Tabarī, iii, 631, says of Fāḍl’s activities in Khorāsān: wa baḥā biḥā al-masājid wal-ribāṭāt. Ya’qūbī, Historiae, ii, 492, mentions Fāḍl’s victory over the Turks near Ṭālaqān.

26. The special mention of Muslims shows that Sng.s lay amid an infidel region. A pass called سکک Sanglich does not seem to exist in the Hindūkush unless this name be identical with *سکک 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 سکک Sanglich (perhaps *سکک Sanglich which is a possible Arabic rendering of Sanglich) would be the Dora pass.

27. The simplest solution is to restore شاقين Shāqīnā 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 شاقن Shāqīn, cf. Ya’qūbī, 292, I.Kh., 37 (in the revenue list of the Ṭāhirid ʿAbdullāh), and I.R., 89, but I.Kh., 178, mentions a ford on the Oxus leading to “the Turks’ called Shakīnā” and Isṭ., 290, gives exactly Shāqīnā. 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” Shāqīnā at

1 See note to § 26, 12: road from Khuttal.
this place would refer probably to Ishkäshim, see note to § 26, 14. A less satisfactory alternative would be to identify *S.qlta with Iskitul, a village lying 14 Km. south of Zaybäk and 22 Km. north of Sanglich, 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


The chief source of this chapter is Išt.’s (<Abū Zayd Balkhi’s) excellent account (pp. 286-346) of the Mä-warä’ al-nahr. Farther to the east, especially in Farghäna, 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 Chaghāniyän there are some points of special likeness with I.Kh. and I.R.

Contrary to the enumeration of the countries which in principle goes *min al-mashriq ilä al-maghrib* the description of Transoxiana (similarly to that of Khoräsän, § 23) proceeds from west to east: Bukhärä: 1.—4., 6. (plus Karmina); Sughd: 5., 7. (minus Karmina), 8.—10., 12., 14.; Kashka-daryä: 15., 16. (?), 17.—21.; upper course of the Oxus: 21.—35.; Ursūshna: 36.—43.; Farghäna: 45.—62.; İläq and Shāsh: 44., 63.—83.; Ispïjâb: 84.—93.

The bearings of the frontiers are again (as in § 23, &c.) given as if the author was facing north-east:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H.-’Ā.</th>
<th>Real bearing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tibet (v.i. 58.)</td>
<td>E.</td>
<td>SE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khoräsän</td>
<td>S.</td>
<td>S. to SW.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghûz and Khallukh (?)</td>
<td>W.</td>
<td>W. to NW. (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khallukh</td>
<td>N.</td>
<td>NE. (?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Išt., 286, shows a similar peculiarity of orientation while he quotes as the Transoxianian frontiers in the east (in a straight line): Pämir, Räsht, and the parts of Hind adjoining Khuttal; in the west [?] (in a semicircular line): the Ghuzz and Kharlukh from Tarâz to Färâb, Bïskand, Sughd, and then the districts of Bukhärä up to the Khwæräzm lake; in the north: the Turks and Kharlukh from the extreme limits of Farghäna to Tarâz; in the south (in a straight line): the Jayhûn from Badakhshän to the Khwäräzm lake.

The term Turkistän, cf. Ya’qûbī, 295: زرک استان is applied by our author to the lands beyond Transoxiana, cf. Minorsky, *Türän in EI*. 
Of the general remarks very few are not in Iṣṭ., 286–95, 312–13, such as the mention among the products of sulphur and arsenic (v.i. 66.).

I. Province of Bukhārā.


II. Province of Sughd.


9. Zarmān (numerous variants), Iṣṭ., 334, 343, between Rabinjan and Samarkand at 1 farsakh’s distance from Ishtikhan.

11. This Farinkath, now Prinkant, not mentioned in Iṣṭ., I.H., or Maq., but found in Yaqūt, iii, 885, is entirely different from 74. It lay north-west of Samarkand towards Ishtikhan, see Barthold, Turkestan, 96. Ganjkath must lie in the same region.

12. دران probably دار, Vadhār, at 2 farsakhs’ distance from Samarkand, Iṣṭ., 342.


From the Fihrist, 337, we know that under Muqtadir (A.D. 907–32) the Manichaeans, in fear for their lives, fled to Khorāsān. Some 500 of them gathered in Samarkand and the [Sāmānid] ruler of Khorāsān would have killed them, but for a warning from the “king of China, but I think [says al-Nadīm] from the lord of the Toghuzghuz”, who threatened to take reprisals against the Muslims living in his country. This diplomatic protection may account for the security which the Manichaeans in Samarkand enjoyed perhaps down to our author’s times.

III. Basin of the Kashka-daryā.

IV. Basins of the Chaghän-rüdäh and Käfirnihän.


25.–35. Cf. Barthold, Çaghäniyän, in E1. Maq., pp. 283, 290, says that there were 16,000 villages and 10,000 warriors in Chaghäniyän, though economically it was inferior to Khuttal (§ 26, i.). On the rulers of Chaghäniyän of the Āl-i Muhtāj dynasty see Muḥammad khān Qazvīnī in his edition of the Chahär-maqāla, pp. 193–6. For the position of 27.–33. the following “route of Chaghäniyän” quoted in I.Kh., 33–4 (Qūdāma, 211) is essential: Tirmidh to Šarmanjān (Charmanqän) 6 farsakhs; thence to Đârzanji 6 f.; thence to B.ṛnjī 7 f.; thence to Şaghäniyän 5 f.; thence to ḫuṣ 6 f.; thence (across a wādī which is 2–3 f. wide?) to Ḩa♭vrān 7 f.; thence to *Abān Kasavān 8 f.; thence to Shūmān 5 f.; thence to Vāshjīrt 4 f.

26., 28.–31. Cf. Išt., 339–40 (without our details). The town of Chaghäniyän corresponds to the present-day Denau (Dih-i nau). 26. lay certainly south of the town of Chaghäniyän (in view of Ya’qūbī, 289, خلک iqlīm, the name must be *Đârzangi) and the other four towns on the various roads diverging from the Chaghäniyän town in westerly and northerly directions. 28. in view of our detail is Baysun. 29. may be Zīnā-āb (north of Denau). 30. perhaps better than يرران, Išt., 340, Maq., 268 (many variants). 31. دک must be Regar (half-way on the road from Denau to Qaratagh, see note to § 6, 11.); Išt. gives رک (var. رک) and Maq., 268, Rykd.sht <*rêg-dasht. [Rēg-ar, cf. lang-ar, Cand-ar.]

32. Hamvārān is not in Išt. but has a parallel in I.Kh., v.s. 25. On the river K.s.vān “near” (?) which our author places Hamvārān see § 6, 11. Hamvārān may be identified with Qaratagh and *Abān-Kasavān with Ḩiśār which already lies in the Kāfīrnihān (Kasavān?) basin.

33. Shūmān mentioned usually together with Akhartūn was a considerable principality, Marquart, o.c., 226, probably comprising the Kāfīrnihān basin, or rather its upper part. The town of Shūmān may have lain on the site of Du-shanba (now Stalinābād), capital of the small Tājikistān republic. Gardizi, ed. M. Nāzīm, p. 36, counts 12 farsakhs from Chaghäniyän to Shūmān, probably by a short cut.

34. Anzān mentioned between 33. and 35. corresponds to anziyan which Išt., 340, places between Shūmān and Vāshjīrt at a distance of 1 day from each of them. This detail is in favour of its location at the present-day Kāfīrnihān. Cf. also Ya’qūbī, 291: الإخباري.

35. (in Arabic: رهشگرد and رهشگر) *Vēshgird or Vēshagird is explained by Marquart, o.c., 227, as *Vēsagird, i.e. the legendary town of Vaēsa, Frānraisiyan’s henchman, which Yasht, v, 57, places in the Xšārtō-suka defile, high up in Kanba (Sughd). Vēshgird must correspond to Faydābād
on the Ïläq, left affluent of the Kāfīrnihān river. Ïläq is mentioned in Iṣṭ., 340, as the next station situated at one day’s distance from Vēshagird towards the east, but from Vēshagird on the road may have followed this river. On Shaqīq Balkī see ‘Aṭṭār, Tadhkirat al-awliyā, ed. R. A. Nicholas, i, 196–202. Ibn al-Athīr, sub 194/809, says: “in this year was killed the hermit (zāhīd) Shaqīq Balkhī during a Muslim expedition (ghazāt) to Kulān 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 farsakh:

<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>Vēshagird</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. Usrūshana.

The name has several readings. De Goeje in Iṣṭ., I.H., and Maq. gives the variant Usrūshana but in I.Kh., 29, and Ya’qūbi, 293, Usrūshana. Consequently it is safer to render our ʿUSR as Surūshana though the frequent occurrence in Iranian of the group -šn- would favour the pronunciation *Surūshna. The district, Iṣṭ., 225–7, lay to the west of the Jaxartes on the northern slopes of the Buttamān mountains (ranges of Turkestān and Zarafshān). Our author says nothing on its former kings called afshīn, I.Kh., 40. The last afshīn was the famous Khaydar (?) b. Kāvūs executed by Mu’tasim in 226/841. Iṣṭ. and Maq., 323–6, are silent on the produce of Usrūshana. On the market of 39. Marsmanda, cf. Maq., 278. Instead of 41. Faghkath, Iṣṭ. spells Vaghkath (now Vagat, Barthold, Turkestān, 167). Sābāt means in Arabic “covered passage, awning”. Kurkath, perhaps ancient Cyropolis (Benveniste)? On 42. Buttamān, cf. § 5, 9a. Iṣṭ., 327, mentions in the Buttamān mountains mines of gold, silver, vitriol, and ammoniac. 43. Barghar now Falghar (not to be confused with Pärghar, § 6, 8.). This upper part of the Sughd river was indeed reckoned to Usrūshana, Barthold, o.c., 168. On the lake see § 3, 24.

VI. Province of Fargḥāna.

44. Khujand (or Khujanda) belonged to Shâsh but lay on the frontier of Farghâna.

45. On the minerals of Farghâna, cf. Išt., 313 and 334 where al-jirâgh-sank [sic] is also mentioned. The kings of Farghâna bore the title of *ikhshêd, I.Kh., 40 (Maq., 279, gives this title to the kings of Samarqand, cf. Ya’qûbî, Historiae, ii, 344).

47. On the Jaxartes see note to § 6, 17.

48. Vâthkath, Išt., 346, places Vân-kath (?) at 7 farsakhs to the northeast of Akhsikath on the frontier of Ïlâq.

49. There is nothing corresponding to this paragraph in Išt., but I.H. (who, according to de Goeje, Preface, p. viii, has reproduced the “complete” text of Išt.’s description of Transoxiana) writes, p. 397: وریثع ٍالربق بسخ من جالیا “quicksilver is produced in Sökh (sic, cf. BGA, iv, 438) from its mountains”. Our author took بسخ for a special name (cf. variants in I.H., 395) and separately mentioned it almost immediately before Sökh.

50. Išt., 347: Bämkakhush. The two villages of the Isfara district in southern Farghâna, I.H., 395, cf. Barthold, o.c., 159, 161. The Sökh 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 Sökh.

52. Išt., 347, Avâl, 10 farsakhs from Sökh, south of Margelan, Barthold, o.c., 161. Our author follows I.H., 396, in mentioning the villages of Avâl. Must be which according to I.H., 396, was the town of the Naqäd district (مکان brands) mentioned immediately after Avâl.

53. All three in Išt., 335: Khwâkand is the present-day Kokand (*خوکند).


57. The rivers of Khurshâb and Ürasht are found in I.H., 392. Cf. § 6, 18. and 19. where the Ôsh-river (Barthold, o.c., 159) is said to flow between Ürasht and Ôsh.

58. Išt., 334. Our author’s data on the rivers are new, cf. notes to § 6, 17., § 15, 11. At the time of I.Kh., 30, Üzgand had a chief called Khûr-tegin (*Chûr-tegin). Soon after our author’s times Üzgand became one of the residences of the Qara-khânids, see § 13, Barthold, Turkestan, 157, Cohn-Wiener, Turan, Berlin, 1930, pp. 17-20 and plates x-xvi (the Qara-khânid buildings), I. I. Umniakov, Arkhitek. pamiatniki Sredney Azii, Tashkent, 1929, pp. 27-9.

59. Išt., 334: Khaylâm (this reading adopted in Barthold, o.c.). Its river is the present-day Narin (§ 6, 21.).

60. The name كرک appears in Idrïsî at one day’s distance from Akhsikath (towards the east?), Sprenger, Postrouten, 27. One must distinguish between Bâb-Akhsikath “the Gate of A.”, Išt., 335, in which Barthold, o.c., 162, sees a suburb of A. lying on the left bank of the Jaxartes, and Bâb (in our source and at present Pâp), a village lying at 4 farsakhs from A. on the right bank of the river, Išt., 336, I.Kh., 30.
VI. Province of Iläq and Shäsh.


63. The province Iläq lay on the Āhangarān river (in Russian: Angren) and was hardly distinguishable from Shäsh (Chäch) situated on the Chirchik, both rivers being right affluents of the Jaxartes, downstream from Farghāna, Barthold, o.c., 169. Some “dihqāns” struck coins in Iläq 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-ulûm, p. 28, the mubayyida “wearers of white raiment” (in Persian safid-jamagān) were the supporters of al-Muqanna’ (“the Veiled Prophet of Khorāsān”) who, as I. Athīr, vi, 25-6, says, placed Abū Muslim above the prophet Muhammad and denied the death of the imām Yahyā 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 Bīrūnī’s Canon, f. 25, the Zoroastrians of Irānshahr living to the west of the river of Balkh (i.e. Oxus) are distinguished from those who lived beyond that river and were called Mubayyida or Isfandiyāriya; cf. Sachau, Zur Geschichte von Khwārizm, Sitz.WAW, 1873, lxxiii, p. 485 (15). [In MS. Or. 1997, fol. 25α below, the name is spelt المبعض الإسفندار. Sachau’s interpretation may refer to Isfandiyār’s exploits in Tūrān, but it is more likely that the reading is *al-isfīd-dāriya, cf. *shahradār > shahriyār) of which al-mubayyida is the exact Arabic rendering.]

64. Ist., 331, calls the provincial capital Tunkath (variant Yëk), 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. Ist., 332, I.Kh., 28, ma’dīn al-fidda. The spelling saym would indicate the pronunciation *sēm instead of the usual sīm. The word is derived from (ἀργυρόν) ἁσημον, 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. Ist., 332, 345: Dakhkath. The mention of arsenic gives more precision to Maq.'s mention (p. 326) of it (dhul-fār [sic]) in Ilāq.

67. Ist., 331: N.mūdhlugh, *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 اسفیدار (“white tree”) and آسفندار (Asfandar).
71. Iṣṭ., 331: Tukkath; cf. 79.
72. Iṣṭ., 329: K.l.shj.k, Ardalānkath, and Ishbīngū (in Shāsh); ibid.,
73. Iṣṭ., 330: Tukkath; cf. 79.
74., 75. Iṣṭ., 330: Anūdānkath, Baghunkath, Farankath, Jābghūkath, all
in Shāsh. In view of several other Turkish names in the region Baghūy-
kath could contain the Turkish name Baghūy; cf. Dib-Baqūy (one of Oghuz-
khān’s mythical ancestors). Abul-Ghāzī, ed. Desmaisons, i, 10, explains that
dīp means “the place of a throne” and baquy “the leader of a nation”
(īl-ulughī).
76. Iṣṭ., 331: Sh.kākath, Bänjikāsh (in Ḫālq), cf. 67. 77. This Tunkath
is decidedly different from 71.
78. Iṣṭ., 331: Bālayān (in Ḫālq). 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, Barkūsh, Khārūnkath, D.nf.ghānkath, Bānakath,
Kharashkath, Biskath, Najākath, K.nk.ṭāk (all with numerous variants).
80. Binkath is the present-day Tashkent. Bīrūnī in his Canon writes:
∗Bīnkath, chief place of Shāsh; in Turkish and in Greek (called)
Stone Tower (burj al-ḥījāra)”. The hint is at the popular Turkish etymo-
logy tash “stone”–kand “village” brought into relation with Ptolemaic
λίθων πύργος, v.s., § 9, 12. However *Taš-kand most probably con-
tains the name of the province Chāch (v.s. 79.): Chāch-kand or Shāsh-kand
>Taš-kand, with a dissimilation similar to ēdbr->Middle Persian ta-
“four”; Shūstar>Arab. Tustar; *sarpūsh>Arab. tarbūsh [see s.v. Turban
in EI]. 81. Nūjakath near the Chirchik railway station, Barthold, o.c., 174.
83. Taurwāk probably which Iṣṭ., 332, places in Ḫālq. 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 Iṣpījāb (*Iṣpēchāb).

The original part of the Iṣpījāb 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. Iṣpījāb
belonged to the Turks and, though subjugated in A.D. 840 by the Sāmānid
Nūh, still enjoyed great privileges. The town of Ispïjâb is the present-day Sayram; on their identity cf. Kâshgharî, i, 78.

84.—93., cf. Išt., 333-4.
85. For Sânikâth, Išt., 346, gives Usbânîkâth, and Maq., 263, Arsûbânîkâth; it lay at 2 days' distance to the north-west of Ispïjâb (in Kunjîda, cf. 89.).

86. I.H., 390, Budakhkâth, Maq., 263, Adhakhkâth (in Isfîjâb); different from 66. Dhakhkâth in İläq.

87., 88. Pârâb (Fârâb) occupied a small area on both banks of the Jaxartes. Its chief place Kâdir is also in Išt., 346, Barthold, o.c., pp. 176-7. For Sutkând I.H., 335, 391, gives Bîskând; its ruins lie near the Qâra-kül lake, Barthold, o.c., 177.

89. I.H., pp. 390-1: Kunjîda; see 85.
90. Şâbrân, Išt., 346, details in I.H., 391.
91. Dharnûkâh may correspond to Maq., 263f, 274: Turâr-Zârâkh: "a town belonging to a rustâq lying behind Saurân [cf. 90.] in the direction of the Turks; it is small and fortified; it possesses a citadel; Zârâkh is a village in this rustâq". It is possible that this زار 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. Sûnâkh corresponds to "Sughnaq, town of the Ghuz", in Kâshgharî, i, 392; cf. Maq., 323k: طار و سنâkh, i.e. Otrar and Sîghnâkh. In Turkish sîghnakh means "place of refuge"; cf. the name of a town in Georgia and of several places in Qara-bâgh (Transcaucasia). The ruins of Sîghnâkh are situated at 20 Km. north of the Tûmân-aryq post station, cf. Yakubovskî, Ruins of Sîghnakh (in Russian) in the Soobshcheniya Gosudar. Akademii materialnoy kulturi, Leningrad, 1929, pp. 123-59. (It is open to doubt whether سوس in İšt., BGA, iv, 424, and Maq., 263q, mentioned under Ispïjâb may conceal the name of Sûnâkh).

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 Ispïjâb to Barskhân, on which see I.Kh., 28-9, and Qudâma, 105-6 (v.s., § 15, 10.). Maq., 263, 274-5, describes them under Isfîjâb, though all of them certainly did not belong to the latter. Ȧrâz (Talas) was situated on the Talas river near the site of the actual Auliya-Ata and is entirely different from Otrar on the Jaxartes (v.s. 91.). Shaljî stood in the mountains at 4 farsâkhs to the south of Ȧrâz, Barthold, Report, 14-17. P. P. Ivanov, K voprosu o drevnost’akh v verkhovakh Talas, in the Fest-schrift to S. F. Oldenburg, Leningrad, 1934, p. 241-51, identifies Shalji with the ruins of Aq-tapa (near the village Dimitrievskoye) on the upper course of the Talas. Farûnkâth (Afrûnkâth) is not in the Arabic texts unless it is the ribâṭ *Anfarun (?) which İšt., 336-7, places in the Qalâs steppe, on the frontier between Shâsh and Ispïjâb. Between Takâbkâth and Mirî, Maq. mentions Kûlân; both Kûlân and Mirî 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 Nûh’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 Khuttulän and Khwārazm respectively.

As in §§ 23 and 24, the difference between Transoxiana and its marches is more geographical than political, for the amīr of Chaghāniyān (§ 25, 27., to say nothing of 46. Farghāna, 63. Īlāq, and 79. Chāch) is mentioned in Transoxiana whereas his neighbour of Khuttulän ruling over the south-eastern wedge of the territory is included in § 26. See Map ix.

1. Khuttulän, Išt., 349: Khuttal, occupied the area east of the Vakhsh river down to the Panj (cf. § 6, 6.-9.). The principal authorities for the region are: Ya’qūbī, BGA, vii, 289, I.Kh., 37, I.R., 92, Išt., 297, 339, Maq., 283, 290. The pronunciation Khuttulän is confirmed by the popular song quoted in Ṭabarî, ii, 1492, 1494, which is considered as one of the earliest specimens of Modern Persian.¹ The princes of the Bānījūr family bore the title of Shēr-i Khuttulän, I.Kh., 40, Marquart, Erānsahr, pp. 300–2 (genealogy),² Barthold, Khuttal in EI. On the celebrated Khuttulän 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 the localities (I.Kh., 37, 38., I.R., 92, Išt., 298, 339, v.s.y. § 6, 10.), Vakhsh ( = Lēvkand), Halāvard, Kārbang, Andishārāgh, Rustā Bīk, Hulbuk, and Munk. More useful are the distances quoted by Išt., 339, under “Khuttal and Saghāniyān and the region between them”. Marquart, o.c., 232, has analysed these data, but I believe that two emendations are necessary in the text to render it intelligible. Išt. starts from the two fords on the Jaryāb (Oxus); the one lying higher up on the river is (A) Ma’bar Badakhšān (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 Badakhshān) to Kulāb = Hulbāk (in the Soviet Tajikistān); the latter lay near Ḥadrat-Īmām-Ṣāhib, Marquart, o.c., 233, Barthold, o.c., 70. Išt.’s passage consists of several distinct items.

From the Badakhshān 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 (Tōkharian, Hephthalite?).
² More specially on the Abū Dā’ūdid branch v.s., § 24, 12.
³ This sentence is probably an interpolation. To complete his east-to-west semicircular description Išt. would have better said: “and from Halāvard to the Ārhan ford”.

1 The name Khuttal as well as several other names of the region (Hulbuk, Munk) sound non-Iranian (Tōkharian, Hephthalite?).
2 More specially on the Abū Dā’ūdid branch v.s., § 24, 12.
3 This sentence is probably an interpolation. To complete his east-to-west semicircular description Išt. would have better said: “and from Halāvard to the Ārhan ford”.
From “the” ford (al-ma’bar) to Hulbuk 2 days; thence to Munk 2 days.

Kârbanj lies above the Arhan ford, circa 1 farsakh.

Tamliyät to the Stone Bridge 4 farsakhs (along the Munk road).

From the Badakhshân [read: *Arhan] ford to Rûstâq Bîk 2 marhâlas; thence across the Andîchârâgh river [= Tâ’ir-su] to Andîchârâgh 1 marhala; thence across the Pâргhar river to Pâргhar 1 day; (thence) across the Pârgan river [p. 296, , I.H., 401, read *Talva = Munk river] to Hulbuk (distance left out).

2. At present Hulbag to the south of Kulâb, cf. § 6, 8.

3. “Nuchârâ” coupled with Rûstâ-Bîk certainly corresponds to Andîchârâgh (the name has several variants and the alternating ofж andش in them confirms the چ of Nuchârâ), see Ya’qūbi, BGA, 279, Išt., 296, 339, Maq., 290 r. Misunderstandings in the available manuscripts and editions have complicated the identification of Andîchârâgh, but Barthold, o.c., 69, is certainly right in placing it near the Tâ’ir-su (a small river between the Pâргhar and Vakhshâb). In our text we must certainly assume that Nuchârâ lay between “*Vakhshâb (not خرزاب Kharnâb) and Jayhûn”, for placing it between the Kharnâb (= Bârtang, § 6, 7.) and Jayhûn would upset Išt.’s distances and, as regards the other indications of our text, would be contrary to the order of enumeration and to the item on Nuchârâ being the store-place of Khuttâlân. Maq., 291, confirms that Andîjârâgh lay close to the Jayhûn, and as regards the mountain mentioned in our text, the hills stretching east of the Tâ’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 Kâfirnihân river, cf. Maq., 292, and Saray lying upstream from it (opposite the Afghân settlement of Ḥâdrat-Imâm-SAhib). Beyond the Qaraül-tübe post (circa 97 Km. upstream from Ayvaj) the road “ascends the Jili-kul plateau, famous for its pastures, on which the Qirghiz and Uzbek successfully breed horses”, and then near Faydâbâd [different from the one mentioned in the note to § 25, 35.] descends into the thickly inhabited Saray plain, see Prince Masalsky, Turkestanskiy kray, SPb., 1913, p. 738. Therefore I should more exactly identify Nuchârâ to Saray and Rûstâ-Bîk to Jili-kul (lying to the east of the Vakhsh river). The Jili-kul pastures must still carry on the Rûstâ-Bîk

1 Marquart takes it for the just mentioned (B). I decidedly take it again for (A) in view of the distances: 6 marhâlas 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 Tamliyät 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.y, § 23, 69., placed it on the left bank of the Oxus. Le Strange, The Lands, 435, identified the Andîchârâgh river with the Bârtang (= Aq-su, Murghâb, Sarêz in the Pamir) having taken it for the first affluent of the Oxus, whereas Išt., 296 (= I.H., 347) and Maq., 22, assign to it only a fourth place.
traditions, now one thousand years old! Some coins struck in Andîchârâgh have come down to us. See Markov, Invent. Katalog.

4. Now Pärghar, east of the river formed by the streams of Baljuvân and Kulâb, cf. note to § 6, 7.

5. Having mentioned separately the capital of Khuttal (2.) our author seems to carry his enumeration from the south-eastern corner of the province (3.), in a north-easterly direction (4.) to 5. Munk, thence to turn back southwards along the course of the Vakhshâb (Tamliyät, Halâvard, and Livkand). In this case Bärsâragh (not otherwise known) ought to be looked for somewhere between Pärghar and Munk on the Munk-Hulbuk river. If, however, we examine the outward form of the name the only parallels are which Ya’qûbî, 289, names somewhere in the Käfîrnîhân basin. I.Kh., 39, names Bûs.rä between Şaghâniyân and Vâshjîrd. In I.R., 92, B.săr seems to be due only to de Goeje’s surmise, cf. Marquart, Eränsahr, 234. Bûsärän/Bûs.rä lay outside the Khuttalân proper but it could be an acquired fief of a member of the Khuttalân family. Ya’qûbî names a Hâtim b. Dâ’ûd in D.â’ûd in which comes in the enumeration immediately after Qubâdhiyân. It may correspond to our Nûdiz (§ 6, 10.) which in this case must be looked for on the lower course of the Käfîrnîhân river.

As regards the other two names of our 5., according to Išt., 297, Munk (= Baljuvân) was larger than Hulbuk. Tamliyât (in Išt., but not in Ya’qûbî) lay probably at Shir-guzâr near the loop of the Vakhsh.

6.-8. Halâvard = Qurghan-tübe; Lëvkand = Sang-tüda, both on the Vakhsh, the latter upstream from the former. Cf. Barthold, o.c., 69.

9. Our source clearly spells زاشت and so does Gardîzî, ed. M. Nâzîm, p. 35. The usual reading is زاشت (Râshî) and a sukîn over ذ could be taken for the three dots over ذ. More curious is the fact that Ya’qûbî, 290e gives حاسب*Joshb<*Joshit which is a good parallel for Zhâsht. Yaqût mentions separately, ii, 733: Râshî and ii, 907: Zâsht, though he does not even explain where this latter locality (maudi’) was situated. I.Kh., 34, says that Râshî is the farthest distant point of Khorasân in the [north-eastern] direction; Râshî lay between two mountains and the Turks used to penetrate through it on their raiding expeditions; therefore the Barmakid al-Fâdî b. Yahyâ b. Khâlid constructed (allaqa) there a gate. The thirteenth-century Spanish geographer Ibn-Sa’ïd pretends that this Jabal bâb al-Fadîl was connected with the well-known wall in the Qalâs steppe, see Barthold, Ibn-Sa’ïd, p. 239, and Turkestan, 175. According to I.R., 92, the Vakhshâb rising in the Kharlukh region flowed through the lands of Fâmîr (Pâmîr), Râshî, and Kumêdh. Išt., 340, continues his route from Vâshjîrd (v.s., § 25, 35.) to Îlq (the Faydâbâd river is still called Ilak) 1 day; thence to Darband 1 day; thence to Jävkân 1 day; thence to the fortress of Râshî 2 days. Râshî is certainly Garm (in Turkish Qara-tegin, see Barthold, Karategin in E1). Zhâsht had an amîr of its own, v.i., under 11.

10., 11. The Kumîjî and the K.njîna-Turks were evidently remnants of some earlier population or wave of invasion. Both our text and Bayhaqî,
611, 696, mention these two groups distinctly. Only the K.njïna-Turks (whose number was small and who occupied only one valley between the Khuttalân and Chaghäniyân) are classed as “Turks” in our author as well as in Maq., 283, Bayhaqi, 696 (زک مکیه؟), and the Mafâtîh al-‘ulûm (written in 365 or 381 A.H.). The latter, p. 110, has a curious passage: “The Hayâtîla (Hephthalites) are a tribe of men who had enjoyed grandeur and possessed the country of Țukhâristân; the Turks [called] Khallukh (cf. notes to § 15, § 23, 69., and § 24, 22.) and K.njïna (اترگ خلغ و كچیه) are their remnants.”

The use of the term “Turk” in early Muslim literature is loose and even the Tibetans are considered as Turks, see Birûni, India, 101, 207, cf. Marquart, Wehrot, 102-3; therefore the racial appurtenance of the Hephthalites is still obscure. Marquart derived the name of Chaghäniyân from Mongol tsaghân “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) (کچیه) as *Kamiğïna in order to compare this name with that of the Kamiçik Hephthalites whom the Armenian historian Moses Kâlankatvats’i mentions in the Caucasus (i, ch. 27, Patkanian’s trans., p. 70). [Cf. also Marquart in Ungar. Jahrb., 1929, p. 98: “die hephthalitischen Kamiçiân in Çaghäniyân und Kamiçik Hep’t’alk’ im nördlichen Daghistan, die wohl nach ihrer Heimat am Käm (Jenisseï) benannt sein werden”.

The question of the K.mïjï is still more complicated. Two earlier authors, Ya’qûbî and I.R., refer to a locality of which the name may be restored as *Kumëdh. Ya’qûbî, 290, says that Munk (§ 26, 5.) was the frontier “towards (ilâ) the lands of the Turks, towards the locality called Râsht, *Kumëd (کامپ), and Bâmîr (پامیر)”. 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 Kumëdh downstream of Râsht. On the other hand our author, Maq., 283, Gardîzî, ed. M. Nâzîm, Index, and Bayhaqi, 499, 576, 611, 696, speak of the people K.mïjî (K.mêjî?). Maq., 283, somewhat vaguely says that “neighbouring on Şaghâniyân are the people called *K.mïjî and the K.njïna Turks (کمیچی)”, whereas our author not only clearly separates these two peoples but among the K.mïjî distinguishes two groups, of which the one (that of Chaghâniyân) occupied the locality of Saylakân between Şûmân and Vêshgird (وزکر), v.s., § 25, 35., and the other (that of Khuttalân) lived between Tamliyät and Munk (on a distance hardly exceeding one marhala, v.s., Işt., 339). It is added in our § 6, 10. that the Kâfîrnîhän river rises from the limits of the K.mïjî. [Shaykh Muhammad khân Qazvînî draws my attention to Nâsîr-i Khursau’s Wajh-i din, ed. Berlin, p. 53, where the پکچیان of Khoräsân and the Kûfîchàn of Kirmân stand for barbarity, as they have no divine book. The first name is certainly *Kumîjiyân.]

1 Here the Turkish K.njïna are mentioned distinctly from the tribe (qaum) called *K.mïjî.
The term *Kumēdh* undoubtedly corresponds to the mountainous tract (ὀρεινή) which according to Ptolemy, vi, 12–13, was inhabited by the Saka tribe Κωμηδαῖ. More particularly ἡ τῶν Κωμηδῶν ὅρεων must be distinguished from ἡ φάραγξ (defile) τῶν Κωμηδῶν, of which the former comprised the region of the so-called Buttanān mountains (§ 5, 9.) and the latter might correspond to the upper Vakhshāb valley (Rāshṭ) through which, as accepted by Marquart, *Wehrot*, 63, and Sir A. Stein, *v.s.y*, § 9, 12., ran the silk trade route described in Ptolemy. Our *K.mijī* can hardly be detached from *Kumēdh*. The indications of the *H.-Ā.* are particularly precious as showing that the K.mijī were scattered along the whole of the Comedian ὅρεων. Therefore the name *K.mijī* must be read *Kumeji*< *Kumējī* with the Iranian suffix of origin -jī, -zi, &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.y.*) do not distinctly call the K.mijī “Turks” which they probably would have done had the K.mijī been regarded as Hephthalites. In any case, pending a proof to the contrary, it is safer not to dissociate the *Kumējī* from the territory *Kumēdh* which in its turn is connected with the Saka (*i.e.* Iranian) Κωμηδαῖ.1 On the historical role of the Kumijīs see Barthold, *Turkestan*, Index. Very characteristic is the following passage in Gardizi, ed. M. Nāzim, p. 36: pas Abū ‘Alī (lord of Chaghāniyān) az amīr-i Khuttalān yārī khwāst va khud lashkar jam’ kard ... pas madad andar rasid Abū ‘Alī-rā az Kumijīyān va amīr-i Zhāsht, which confirms our yārī khwāstan in the sense of “ask for aid”.

Ia. Road from Khuttal to Kashmir.

This is the road the beginning of which is hinted at by Ya’qūbī, 396, and vaguely described in I.Kh., 178. The latter says that the merchants starting from the “town of Khuttal” (madīna Khuttalān) travel one farsakh to some ribāt (ribāt fulān). Thence by a narrow path their goods are carried by the local people up a mountain situated on the bank of the great river (right bank of the Oxus?). From the top of the mountain the carriers make signals to the people of 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 (*ālā hādhā*) every merchant takes his route travelling (*al-rā’īḥ*) towards China or Mūltān.” I.Kh. adds that the said ford is situated at 3½ days’ distance [*?] from the place where the Oxus splits into two branches of which the one is supposed to flow towards Sind and the other is the Jayhān (Oxus, *v.s.y.*, § 6, 15.). The terms Shikinān and “Shikīnā Turks” undoubtedly refer to the subjects2

---

1 Less certain is their relation to the name of K.mrūdh (*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 Kāfīrnīān river in the territory of the K.mijī. The Kāfīrnīān flows between the Vakhsh (coming from Zhāsht (9.) and the Surkhān.

2 And rather to his Turks (camel-men!) than to the real Shighni Tājiks.
of the Turkish chief whom Ya'qūbī, 292, calls *Khumār-bīk (v.s., § 24, 24.).
Shikīnān 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 ford¹ 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 (Afgān) 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 stream³
or cross into Chitral 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 men­
tioned to the east of Badhakhshān:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>§ 24, 24. Badhakhshān</th>
<th>§ 26, 2. Hulmuk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— 15. Khāmdādh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— 16. Sanglnj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— 17. Bljm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— 18. Samarqandāq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— 20. Andrās</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>§ 10, 57. Kashmir</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ This ford undoubtedly lay con­
siderably upstream from the Badhakh­
shān ford, v.s. 1., somewhere in Darvāz,
for example near Lārān (whence a road
runs to Baljuvān over Langar), or still
higher upstream, near Qal‘a-yi Khum.
² The roads passing through Rāgh
and the Afgān 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. Hsūan-
Tsang travelled that way. See now the
description of the road over the Vakhjir
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 Bīrūnī’s Canon, where much of the same sources are utilized. See Map ix.

12. The “Gate of Tibet” standing apparently west of 13. is very possibly another aspect of the “Gate of the Arabs” (see details in § 24, 25.), unless there were two gates: one between Jerm¹ and Zaybāk (near Bahārak) and one between Zaybāk and Ishkāshim (near Zirkhān, where now stands the ribāṭ Sirājīya?).

13. Bīrūnī in his Canon (towards the end of the 4th climate) enumerates in a NW. to SE. direction:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>long.</th>
<th>lat.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Badhakhshān</td>
<td>95°10'</td>
<td>30°0'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>district of K.rān</td>
<td>95°20'</td>
<td>34°50'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>رحال</td>
<td>*96°0'²</td>
<td>37°30'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikāshim</td>
<td>96°20'</td>
<td>37°0'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the geographical point of view it is very likely that رحال stands for زیباک 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, see Kushkakī, Rāhnumā, p. 138, which very closely resembles رحال, whereas Sir G. Grierson, Ishkāshmī, Zebakī, and Yāzghulamī, London, 1920, spells throughout (see p. 4) Zebak, i.e. زیباک. There is hardly any doubt about our being identical with Bīrūnī’s رحال, but it may be a distortion of the slightly different arabicized form *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 Bīrūnī’s co-ordinates: (?) رحال في حدود مخادن اللمل وحلالو (؟) سدحسان (?) رحالو وحلالو. As regards the script the best restoration is that suggested to me by Shaykh Muḥammad khān Qazvīnī: ³رحالو وحلالو for سدحسان وحلالو. I must ³for a better reading i.e. 96°0’. As Bīrūnī’s tables are arranged in the order of increasing longitude “97” cannot precede “96”.

¹ Called by Ya’qūbī, 288, the last town to the east of Badhakhshān before Tibet.
² Or. 1994 gives as the longitude i.e. 97°0’, but the Berlin MS. has a better reading i.e. 96°0’. As Bīrūnī’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 (Badhakhshán). The tentative translation would consequently be: "Badh" lies within the limits (or on the frontier) of the ruby mines and opposite it is Badhakhshán”. The mention of the ruby mines in connexion with Zaybák can be explained but the meaning of 

1 It is strange though that, after having correctly spelt and dotted the name of Badhakhshán 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 Zaybák is separated from Ishkáshim by a watershed, the whole Zaybák-Ishkáshim tract forms one geographical area shut off by narrow gorges from Badakhshán, Vakhán, and the present-day Shughnán. The Gháran district (“the caves”) lies in the defile through which the Oxus forces its way northwards to Shughnán, see Sir A. Stein, Innermost Asia, p. 873, and it is noteworthy that Kushkaki, 140 and 148, mentions Gháran both under Zaybák and Ishkáshim.]
Russian side. Hsüan-Tsang, Si-yü-ki, St. Julien, ii, 425, describes Hun-t’o-to as the capital of Hu-mi (Vakhân): “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 (Vakhân), 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 *Snglj = *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. badaksh, with eastern-Iranian l for ẓ); 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 Khārōgh). 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 Khārōgh lies the village Kūh-i la’ī where some garnets are still found, cf. Tājikistān, p. 261. ² As regards the Afghan 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 Vardojo valley, now exhausted and forgotten. Apart from the above-mentioned passage from Birūnī’s Canon where Zaybāk is placed in the region of the mines, our text may be supported by Qazwīnī’s Āthār al-būâd, ii, 325, where silver and garnet mines are mentioned inJB * Yumgân. This valley (Nāsir-i Khusrau’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 is most probably Munjān⁴ 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 Afghan Kāfīristān (Nūristān) to which also a road leads from Sanglich. [Kūshkakī, p. 235, mentions a road connecting Fāydābād with Nūristān over a difficult pass called ندال (alt. 15,300 f.). The road, ibid.,
the same name upstream from Yumgân (v.s. 16.) and communicating with Sanglich by an easy pass. This suits perfectly our text which after *Sanglich (i.e. evidently continuing the road Zaybäk-Sanglich) adds: *va az änjä bigudhari nāhiyatī āyadh ü-rā rūsta *M.lj.m khwāñand, "and when you are out of it (= beyond it) comes the district called *M.lj.m".1 Remembering now Birûni’s caption (v.s. 13.) which accompanies Zaybäk: وحلاوه سدحٌان "and beyond it is Mundajän”. That Birûni speaks of *Zaybäk and our source of *Sanglich makes no difference: Birûni leaves out Sanglich for which he has no co-ordinates but both Zaybäk and Sanglich lie on the same road and in the same Vardoj valley. In Birûni’s copy the name *مَدنْجَان may have been influenced by the better-known Badhakhshân, but the form *مَدنْجَان is attested in I.Kh., 37, where it comes after Karrân, Shiqinân, and Vakhkhân, and even now the Sanglichî neighbours of Munjän call it Mandešān. It was not a rich district for its contribution in taxes (2,000 dirhams) looks insignificant next to the 20,000 of Vakhân and the 40,090 of Shiqinân.2 Marquart suggested the identification of Munjän with the land of the Sakäh-Haumavrgah (Σακανράκαι), Markwart, Das erste Kapitel des Gāthā uštavatī, p. 42; cf. now Morgenstierne, The name Munjän, &c. in Bulletin SOS, vi/2, 1931, pp. 438-44.

[Additional note. In the easternmost part of Badhakhshân the revenue list of 211/827, I.Kh., 37, mentions the following group of districts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(السعان)</th>
<th>3,500 dirhams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Karrân (sic)</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shiqinân</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vakhkhân</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-M.nd.jan</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1st., 297, says that the following districts neighbour (yutākhim) on the Vakhsh (v.s., note to § 26, 1.): “al-Khuttal, Wakhkhân, *al-Sh.qîna, and

Marquart, Erânsahr, 222, restored the first name as *Yanbaqän > Yamgân (better Yumgân), and the second one as Kurän (with a ǧamma for the tashdīd). As mentioned above, Yumgân occupies the middle course of the river of which the upper part waters Munjän, and the lower part is called after the borough of Jerm. The Kurän tributary joins this river from the left, upstream from Yumgân. If the identifications are right, I.Kh.’s list does not follow any strict system, for beginning with Yumgân it runs south-west to Kurän, then skips to the Oxus valley (Shughnân and Vakhân, enumerated N. to S.) and finally returns westwards to the upper course of the Yumgân valley.

ıst., 297, seems to run up through the Munjän villages Magnul, Takāb, and Vilav. The Mandāl pass is very clearly shown on the map in Sir G. S. Robert-son’s The Kafirs 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 Bīrūnī’s Canon in the following way:

13. R.kh.tj.b
14. Sikāshim
15. Kh.mdād
16. S.ng.lnj
17. M.lj.m.
18. Samarqandāq
19. B.lur

As K.rān is located by Bīrūnī to the south-west of ṭrhāl ḍīnāl 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.1 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 Kūshkakī, p. 150, the name is spelt in Arabic characters . 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 Rashīdi, Engl. transl. E. D. Ross, 385, B.lur 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 = Bukhārā in Orkhon Turkish.
2 Pelliot contests the reading and says the place was really called Qum-singir, see Toung-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 Sarikol situated on the south-eastern slopes of the Pamirs, on the road from Käshghar and Yärkand 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 Zäbul, 251, interprets *Hat-pan-t'o as *Gharband "angustiae"][1] 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. lying on the road to Kashmir could be tentatively identified with Dräś (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.).[1] As this part of the H.-'A. has several points in common with Birüni's Canon, one can postulate the identity of Andräs with Birüni's (رمان or رمān (اندراس (اندرکول) (Andarkül), which also may be identical with our Andräs. The next stage south of Andräs must be Kashmir which is mentioned as the last place in India (§ 10, 57.).

[Additional note. N. Elias identifies Andarkül (or *Indrakot?) with Bärämüla (circa 40 Km. to the north-west of Srinagar, on an important road to Gilgit, &c.) whereas Birüni, who describes the western approaches of Kashmir, gives the following co-ordinates:

\[
\begin{align*}
B.rhän (?) & \text{ long. } 98° 0' \text{ lat. } 33° 25' \\
Srinagar & \text{ " } 98° 40' \text{ " } 33° 20'
\end{align*}
\]

After all Andräs, Andarkül, and B.rhän may be different places. Sir A. Stein in an additional note to his Memoir on map... of Kasrnir, Calcutta 1899, p. 222, finally admits the identification of Birüni’s place “lying halfway between the rivers Sind and Jaylam” with Babarhān, as the basin of the three rivers uniting near Chamhad is still called. Chamhad lies south-west of Abbotabad in the Mian Khaki Nullah drained westwards to the Indus.]

II. Khwärazm.


21.–22. The description of Khwärazm is extremely brief. The author says nothing of the destruction of Kāth by the Oxus, cf. Išt., 131, I.H., 351,

1 Mīrzā Iskandar invaded Kashmir over Zoji-La, Tāririk-i Rashidi, 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. Muḥammad, the eponym of the Ma'mūnid dynasty, see Sachau, Zur Geschichte von Khwārizm, Sitz. WAW, 1873, Ixxxiii, 500 (30). Cf. also M. Nāzīm, Sultan Mahmūd, pp. 56-60 and 184-5. In common with the detailed list of products in Maq., 325, our list has only rukhbīn and, perhaps, qazhāgand (if the latter stands for durū' “armour”).

23. Khushmīthan (Ardakhusmīthan), 24. Nūzhābān (Nūzvār), and 25. Gurgān (Arabic: jurjāniya) follow each other in Ist., 341. Maq., 287 and 289, has a variant Nūzābān and also speaks of the iron gate of this town. The description of Gurgān 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 Gurgān (on the left bank of the river) is an interesting portend of the events of A.D. 995, see Gardīzī, ed. M. Nāzīm, p. 57. Cf. notes to § 1. [On the ruins of Gurgān see A. Yakubovsky, Razvalini Urgench in Izv. Akad. Mater. Kult., vi/2, 1930, 68 pp.]

26.-28. The form كرمانخس is nearer to Maq., 287: than to Ist., كرمان خسا. For Ist. 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 Ist. 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

In addition to the works enumerated in the notes to § 10 (India), see H. G. Raverty, The Mihhrān of Sind and its tributaries, in JASB, lxi, part i, 1892, pp. 155-297 (2 maps); Le Strange, The Lands, 329-33; many arduous problems connected with the Muslim itineraries across *Mukrán (Makrán) and Sind have been studied in detail by Marquart, Erānsahr, 177-99: "Zur historischen Topographie von Kermān und Mukrān"; H. Cousens, The Antiquities of Sind, Calcutta, 1929, vol. 46 of Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India (with a detailed map of the ancient course of the Indus); N. G. Majumdar, Explorations in Sind, 1934, vol. 48 of the same series (map); Sir A. Stein, Archaeological Reconnaissances in Southern Persia, in GJ, Feb. 1934, pp. 119-35 (clear sketch map).
By "Sind" (as distinguished from Hind, cf. § 10) Muslim geographers mean Baluchistan and the lower region of the Indus, up to Aror. It must be borne in mind that formerly the Indus (Mihrän) followed a more easterly course (the Eastern Nara or Hakr 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 Brahmanabad = Manṣūra) but still to the east of its present course, Cousens, o.c., plate ciii (general map).

The present chapter is a brief résumé of Iṣṭ. 170–80, but the region is better defined, inasmuch as the Indus is taken for its eastern frontier, while Iṣṭ., 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. Mukran (Baluchistan); 12. the Ṭūrān district; 13.–14. the Bud-ha district.

On the products of Sind our author has more details than Iṣṭ. Somewhat unexpectedly Maq., 481, mentions Kanbaya-shoes (al-nī'all *al-kanbā'tya?) exported from Manṣūra (sic).

1. According to Iṣṭ., 172, the local name of Manṣūra was Brahman-ābād (<Bahman-ābād). Bīrūnī, Canon: "منہہ (?) or the Greater مشہب M.nha [perhaps *تهلا Thatha, v.s. 4.] is (called) Manṣūra because its conqueror said: nasartu". The ruins of Manṣūra lie 47 miles to the north-east of Ḥaydarābād, Cousens, o.c., 48–73, and plates iv.–v. Iṣṭ., 173, calls the Quraishite king a descendant of Habbār b. al-Aswad. Cf. notes to § 10.

2. Manjābari (?), Iṣṭ., 175, lay opposite Manṣūra on the right bank of the Indus, and Sadūsān west of Manjābari, perhaps between Sahbān (now Sahwan) and the Indus, cf. Elliot, i, 401, Marquart, o.c., 188, 190.

3. *Jj stands evidently for *ِپہ Manṣūra, Iṣṭ., 174, which lay half-way between Daybul and Manṣūra, probably on the site of the present-day Ḥaydarābād. On the various forms of the name (Iṣṭ. صیام Manṣūra) see Elliot-Dowson, i, 396–401, and Marquart, Erānsahr, 188. The form Bīrūn is attested in Ibn-Sa'id (610–673/1214–74) quoted in Abul-Fidā, 346–7: "al-Bīrūn, to which belongs Abū Rayhān al-Bīrūnī". This statement has a very relative value, for Bīrūnī's nisba refers to the Bīrūn (>Arabic Bayrūn) suburb in his native Khwārazm and generally speaking the thirteenth-century Spanish geographer was hardly in a position to improve the reading of a doubtful Indian name. Abul-Fidā speaks of the town as "a port of Sind, situated by a salt-water gulf, separating from the sea of Fārs" (?). M.svāhī (?) stood to the west of the Indus.

4. Daybul (Dēbul). Its ruins are differently identified with the localities lying south-west of Tatta (<*Thatha), cf. Le Strange, o.c., 331, Cousens, plate ciii. The Turkish admiral Sīdī 'Alī (1556) speaks of the port of Tatta called *Bandar Lahori, situated on the site of the former دولی پور Bandar Lobezu (sic. Portuguese Dioli-Çindi), see Tomaschek, Nearch, p. 9, and Mohiṣ. Bīrūnī, Canon, immediately after Daybul mentions separately a place called دیلوسپنی *Lohrāni "which is the Lesser منہہ M.nha [*Thatha? v.s. 1.], situated at the place where the Indus disembogues into the sea".
All the localities in Baluchistan are quoted after Ist. with a noticeable tendency to iranize the names.

Ist. gives the following itineraries (which are from place to place and not in one line, see Marquart, l.c.): Tiz (6.) to Kiz (7. Kiz and Kij) circa 5 marhalas; thence to Fannazbûr (10. Panjbûr)—2 m., thence to Dizak (7.)—3 m., thence to Râsk (8.)—3 m., thence to Fuhlafahra (11. Puhlpara)—3 m.; thence to Isfaqa (7. Isk.f with metathesis)—2 light m.; thence to Bind (7.)—1 m.; thence to Bih (7.)—1 m.; thence to Qasrqand (7. Kushk-i Qand)—1 m.; thence to Qanbalî (5. F.niki) —2 m.; thence to Daybul—4 m.; thence to Mansûra—6 m. Most of these places still exist in Baluchistan.

6. Tiz (Ptolemy vi, cap. 8, Τήσα) is situated in the bay of Chahbâr, a short distance to the west of the Chahbâr village; 7. *Këch (Kiz, Kij) is the name of a district east of the Nihang river. Kushk-i Qand (Qasrqand, north of Chahbâr), Bih (Geh), Bint, and Dizak follow in good order, but Iskaf (now Ispaka, south of Bampûr) ought to precede Dizak (situated south-west of Jâlk). 8. Râsk lies on the middle course of the Sarbâz river, but the original Râsk lay probably more to the north on the site of the town of Sarbâz. Its district in Ist. is called Kh.âj (I.Kh., 55, Kharûn, read: Kharûz, as suggested by Marquart).

9. ِکشک (Ist., 178, كشک) hardly corresponds to the Mashkai river. As, according to Ist., it lay near to Kirmân, it may be more likely identified with the important district of Mashkël (also Mashkêdh). Ist. distinguishes Mashkay (a district stretching for 3 marhalas and possessing some palms) from Mâsakân (belonging to the Khârijites and producing some sugar-candy). 10. Panjbûr, now the Panjûr district, south of Mashkël. 11. Puhlpara (*pahra), “the bridge watch”, now Pahrjaj, east of Bampûr. Ist. says nothing about its belonging to Kh.rûj. Less clear are the names 5. Armâbîl and Qanbalî (F.niki). According to Ist., 178, Armâbîl lay at half a farsakh from the sea.

12. See Minorsky, Türân, in EI. Quzdâr, now Khuzdar, 85 miles south of Kalât, altitude 4,050 feet. Kizkânân (= Qîqân, Balâdhuri, 432?) where the local ruler resided is probably identical with Kalât. Shora-rûd is the name of the lower course of the Kalât-river (off Quetta).

13., 14. The capital of the district belonging to the people called Bud-ha was Qandabîl, now Gandâwa, 75 miles (120 Km.) north-west of Khozdar, north of the Indus, altitude 314 feet (102 m.). Ayl (Utl, &c.?) was the district between Kizkânân and Qandabîl, named after its conqueror.

§ 28. Kirmân

Le Strange, The Lands, 299-321; Schwarz, Iran, 211-88. On the tribes of Kirmân see Marquart’s survey in Catalogue, pp. 74-81: Balûch, Köfich, Bâriz, Muzâj, Rasûkh, Jut (ancient Yutiya, not Indian Zutt). To their number must be added the Indian اندکار settled in a district of Kirmân in
the direction of Sistân, see Balâdhurî, 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 Istâkhri, 157-70. On the mountains of Kirmân see § 5, 10.

1. I.Kh., 49, says: "Jïruft is the largest of the towns of Kirmân, but the wâlî lives in Sïrjân", although already Ya'qûbî, BGA, vii, 286, considers Sïrjân as the greatest of the towns of Kirmân. Our author probably substitutes king for I.Kh.'s wâlî in view of later information regarding the semi-independent rulers of Kirmân, viz. the short-lived dynasty of the Ilyâsids (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 Kirmân by Ibn Ilyâs, already names Jïruft as the capital and the fortress Bardasîr as the treasury of Ibn Ilyâs. Sïrjân 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 Ist., 167 (wells, houses with äzäj). No special mention is found in the older geographers of the Qamâdîn suburb of Jïruft (Marco Polo’s Camadi) frequently mentioned in the History of the Seljuks of Kirmân, cf. Houtsma, Zur Gesch. d. Selguken v. Kermân, in ZDMG, 1885, p. 380 and Houtum-Schindler, JFRAS, 1898, pp. 43-6.


3. Ist., 166. On the river see § 6, 28.


6. The Balûch whose language belongs to the north-western group of Iranian dialects are apparently later immigrants in the Kirmân region, see L. Dames, Balöcistân in EI. One of the typical traits of Balûchi is the initial gu corresponding to Persian initial b (cf. gwâd/bâd "wind"). Traces of the same phenomenon in the dialects spoken in the central desert of Persia and in Khoräsân toponymy (cf. Bâkharz< Ist., 256: Gwâkharz) may indicate the stages of Balûch migrations. Maq., 471, says that the Qufs lived in terror of the Balûch whom 'Aţud al-daula finally defeated. However, 'Aţud al-daula also defeated the Küfîch and in the long run the Balûch must have profited by the weakening of their neighbours.

7. On the Küfîch mountains see also § 5, 10. *Kûfîch means in Persian simply "mountaineer"; in Arabic transcription Qufs with s for ñ. Ist., 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 Ist., 167. Maq. compares it (as well as Balûchi!) with Sindî. Very possibly the Küfîch were of Bramâ'î origin. About our author’s times the power of the Küfîch was crushed by 'Aţud al-daula, v.s., p. 28. The details on the Kûhistân-i Abû Ghânîm not in Ist. Under this term our author seems to understand the hills round Khânû to the east of the sources of the Minâo.
river (Rüdhän, now Rüdbär). However, Ist., 162, places the Hauma Qühistän Abi Ghänım in the neighbourhood of the Bäriz range.


10. All in the cold zone of Kirmān, Ist., 159: Jīruqān, K.shīstān, Rūbīn, Surqān, M.rz.qān with many variants.


12. Cf. § 5, 10. Ist., 162g (Gothan Persian version) gives دم و قنیر. The name Dihaj also in I.H., 220.

13. Ist., 161, after enumerating the localities mentioned under our 15. (and ending with Dārjīn) goes on: “and between Jīruft and Bam the town of Hrmz (many variants) is situated known under the name of Qaryat al-jaws”. This last name (“the Walnut village”) is found in our text in the Persian form Dih-i göz. 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, Sīno-Iranica, 1919, p. 541, the cinnamon tree is a native of the Ceylon forests.]

14. Ist., 162, says that some people placed Khāsh (ór Khwäsh) under Sīstān; he himself places it on the frontier of Kirmān and immediately after it mentions Rīqān (now Rīgān) near the Bäriz mountains. The inhabitants of Khwäsh (الاختراق) were tent-dwellers and evidently belonged to the Bäriz tribes who, besides Persian, possessed another language, Ist., 167-8. Khwäsh probably lay in the neighbourhood of the Bazmān-kūh (= Dūnbāvand in I. Faqih, 106, this latter appellation hinting at some migrations from Māzandarān to Kirmān). Cf. Schwarz, o.c., 252.


16. In Ist., 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. Ist., 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 (Ist., 162, S.nīj *S.bīj); the Balūches still give the name Ispī to the present-day Nuṣratābād, Le Strange, 325. Nhla seems to stand for *Fahla<Fakraj.

20.-21. Ist., 161, Firzin, Māhān, Khabīs, Bardāshīr, Janzrūdh on the road from Sirjān to the desert. Bardāshīr (*Bih-Ardashīr) is the present-day Kirmān. [Le Strange, 303, considers the form Yāzdāshīr, under which it sometimes appears, a clerical error. But the continuator of Miskawaih, iii, 190, mentions ‘Ays Ardāshīr “forest (?) of Ardāshīr” in the immediate neighbourhood of Bardāshīr. This can be a popular Arabic etymology of a name like *Yāzdāshīr.]

22. For this group Ist., 161, gives Unās, K.rdakān, and Bīmand. Under § 29, 44., too, Anār stands in our text for Ist.’s Unās (but cf. Tās in § 5, 11.).
The name Bîmand (Mîmand) is firmly attested in numerous Muslim writers; our may be a compound *Küt-Mîmand or *Küh-Mîmand. Maq., 464, particularly speaks of the strong position of Mîmand.

23. The mountains between Sirjân and Kirmân reach the height of 13,000–17,500 feet.

§ 29. Fârs

Le Strange, The Lands, 248–98, and Schwarz, Iran, 1–211, contain very good descriptions of Fârs according to Muslim geographers. See also the Fârs-nâma, ed. by Le Strange and R. A. Nicholson and the excellent Fârs-nâma-yi Nāṣirī, by Ḥasan Fasã‘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 Fârs are discussed by E. Herzfeld in his thesis Pasargadae, Berlin, 1907 (with a carefully prepared map), reprinted in Klio, viii, 1908.

The present chapter is a mere abridgement of Iṣt., or perhaps, of a Persian translation of the Arabic original (see below under 39.). The abundant toponymy of Fârs in Iṣt. is not devoid of doubtful points and the names in our text appear in an aggravatingly mutilated form.

With some inevitable inconsistency the author follows his habitual system of enumerating the places as they come on the map in straight lines. He begins with the two capitals, giving the first place to the Islamic Shīrāz, then skips to the south and follows the coast westward, then through Arrajān returns eastward to Shāpūr, then goes on eastward to Dārābǧird 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 Fârs: Iṣṭakhr (A): 1., 20.–24., 36.–44.; Ardashīr-Khurra (B): 2., 3.–11., 29., 30., 33.; Arrajān (C): 13.–17.; Shāpūr (D): 12., 18.–19.; Dārābǧird (E): 25.–28., 31.–32. The provinces are quoted below respectively under the abbreviations: A., B., C., D., E.

On the products of Fârs see Schwarz, 158–67. Iṣt., 155, denies the existence of gold in Fârs, but the Leiden epitome (BGA, iv, 399) and I.H., 215, mention gold in Sardan, v.i., under 41. Some curious information on Fârs 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. Fasã‘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 farsakhs distant from the westernmost 15., cf. Iṣṭ., 135.
5. Gūr, renamed Fīrūzābād under the Būyids. Iṣṭ., 153, seems to indicate that only the *qaisūm*-water was the exclusive speciality of Jūr.
6. These four names look badly mis-spelt. Tentatively one might suggest as parallels to *Chīmkān* (the Bundahishn places Yama’s castle Yankert near the Chīmkān mountain in Fārs), cf. also *Fārs-nāma*, p. 139; to حَمِير, *Khabr* (*Khafīr*); to نَبَّانَد (i.e. the inland Nāband (Maq., 422 p) and not the one lying on the coast south of Tāhirī); and to سِمَرْ (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.
7. According to the distance Najīram lay on the coast south of the Mānd estuary, near the present-day Dayyir (Iṣṭ., 135: twelve farsakhs from Sirāf), 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. مَصَامَيْر 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 *Sūfārā* should have anything to do with the “shore” Sāf bānī Saffār (or Saffāq) which bordered on the territory of the Kāriyān Kurds (this territory, Iṣṭ., 115, lying in Ardashir-Khurra and extending eastwards towards Kirmān). Our بُبِلْ (indistinct) cannot be بُبِلْ (placed by Iṣṭ., 111, in D.) and stands perhaps for كُرْبَان (mentioned in Iṣṭ., 106, under B. soon after *Sūfārā*.
11. Tawāz or Tawwaj [Bīrūnī, *Canon*, gives also the form *Tava*] lay on the river Ratin (now Rūd-i Hilla), probably near the junction of its headwaters coming from Shāpūr and Dāliki, cf. Iṣṭ., 120. Cf. § 6, 30. and 31.
12. On the two fire temples of Kāzārūn see Iṣṭ., 118.
13. Le Strange, 273, places the ruins of Siniz at Bandar-i Daylam and H. Fāsā’ī at some distance to the north of this port. However, south of Bandar-i Daylam the maps show a small inlet (khor) called Sīnī, which is most likely Siniz. The *Pilot*, 1864, p. 222, says: “Khor Sīnī 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 Husain... There is a small village and some trees near it. Cap. Brucks states that there are extensive ruins at Khor Sīnī.”
The name Bïmand (Mïmand) is firmly attested in numerous Muslim writers; our *Küt-Mïmand or *Küh-Mïmand. Maq., 464, particularly speaks of the strong position of Mïmand.

23. The mountains between Sirjän and Kirmän reach the height of 13,000–17,500 feet.

§ 29. Fârs

Le Strange, The Lands, 248–98, and Schwarz, Iran, 1–211, contain very good descriptions of Fârs according to Muslim geographers. See also the Fârs-nâma, ed. by Le Strange and R. A. Nicholson and the excellent Fârs-nâma-yi Nâsirî, by Ḥasan Fasāʾî, 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 Irân, A. A. khân 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 Fârs are discussed by E. Herzfeld in his thesis Pasargadae, Berlin, 1907 (with a carefully prepared map), reprinted in Klio, viii, 1908.

The present chapter is a mere abridgement of Išt., or perhaps, of a Persian translation of the Arabic original (see below under 39.). The abundant toponymy of Fârs in Išt. 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 Shîrâz, then skips to the south and follows the coast westward, then through Arrajān returns eastward to Shâpūr, then goes on eastward to Dârâbjird 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 (küra) of Fârs: Ištâkhr (A): 1., 20.–24., 36.–44.; Ardashir-Khurra (B): 2., 3.–11., 29., 30., 33.; Arrajān (C): 13.–17.; Shâpūr (D): 12., 18.–19.; Dârâbjird (E): 25.–28., 31.–32. The provinces are quoted below respectively under the abbreviations: A., B., C., D., E.

On the products of Fârs see Schwarz, 158–67. Išt., 155, denies the existence of gold in Fârs, but the Leiden epitome (BGA, iv, 399) and I.H., 215, mention gold in Sardan, v.i., under 41. Some curious information on Fârs 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. Fasāʾî.
1. Shírāz, 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. Ḥisn ibn ‘Umāra, Iṣṭ., 105. This famous castle (cf. § 36, 18., Marquart, *Erānsahr*, 45) was the easternmost point belonging to Fārs on the coast, 160 farsakhs distant from the westernmost 15., cf. Iṣṭ., 135.


6. Gūr, renamed Fīrūzābād under the Būyids. Iṣṭ., 153, seems to indicate that only the *qāsīm*-water was the exclusive speciality of Jūr.

7. These four names look badly mis-spelt. Tentatively one might suggest as parallels to *Chimkān* (the *Bundahishn* places Yama’s castle Yamkert near the Chimkān mountain in Fārs), cf. also *Fārs-nāma*, p. 139; to حرمک, *Khabr* (Khafar) to نابند (i.e. the inland Nāband (Maq., 422 p) and not the one lying on the coast south of Ṭāḥirī); and to سیاران (but see 32.). All these places are mentioned in Iṣṭ., 104-6, I.H., 182, Maq., 422, as appertaining to B. in which lies Jūr.

8. According to the distance Najīram lay on the coast south of the Mānd estuary, near the present-day Dayyir (Iṣṭ., 135: twelve farsakhs from Sirāf), 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 خرمک in the Dasht-i Dastāqān (?) district crossed by the Shādhakān, see § 6, 31. Contrary to Le Strange, 259, note 1, it is impossible that this *Sufāra* should have anything to do with the “shore” *Sīf bānī Saffār* (or *Saffāq*) which bordered on the territory of the Kāriyān Kurds (this territory, Iṣṭ., 115, lying in Ardashir-Khurra and extending eastwards towards Kirmān). Our پبلان (indistinct) cannot be پبلان (placed by Iṣṭ., 111, in D.) and stands perhaps for پبلان*کرمان* mentioned in Iṣṭ., 106, under B. soon after *Sufāra*.


11. Tavaz or Tawwaj [Bīrūnī, *Canon*, gives also the form *Tavaz*] lay on the river Ratīn (now Rūd-i Ḥilla), probably near the junction of its headwaters coming from Shāpūr and Dālikī, cf. Iṣṭ., 120. Cf. § 6, 30. and 31.

12. On the two fire temples of Kāzarūn see Iṣṭ., 118.

13. Le Strange, 273, places the ruins of Siniz at Bandar-i Daylam and H. Fāsāʾī at some distance to the north of this port. However, south of Bandar-i Daylam the maps show a small inlet (khor) called Sinīz, which is most likely Siniz. The *Pilot*, 1864, p. 222, says: “Khor Sini is a small creek about midway between the tomb [of Sabz-pūshān] and Ra’s at-Tamb, with deep water inside it. To the southward of it is an old tomb or mosque called Imām Ḥusain . . . There is a small village and some trees near it. Cap. Brucks states that there are extensive ruins at Khor Sini.”
14. In view of Ist., 112 and 119, both at this place and under § 6, 32. Rîshahr must be read for رپر. According to Ist. the Tāb river after having flowed past Arrajān یاقی rustāq Rîshahr thumma yaqi' u fil-bahr. I think that here “rustāq of Rîshahr” must be taken for what it stands and distinguished from the town belonging to it which according to Maq., 426, bore the name of درچان *Dayragān? This town, which is not explicitly mentioned on the Tāb, may have lain to the south of it and nearer to the Shīrīn river. This may account for our author’s puzzling transfer of Rîshahr 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 Rîshahr¹ was the seat of a Nestorian archbishop, Sachau, *Vom Christentum in der Persis*, Berlin, 1916, p. 9. The name of the town *درچان* may be a derivative of در “convent”?

15. In Ist., 113, Maq., 422, Mahrūbān, but I.R., 97, gives Māhīrübān. Ist., 135, fixes the western maritime frontier of Fārs at Mahrūbān. Maq., 453, counts from Arrajān to Rîshahr ی marḥala, and thence to Mahrūbān ی ditto, and further says: “and from Mahrūbān to Siniz, or to the river (al-nahr), ی marḥala, and from the river to Arrajān ی ditto.” It is not impossible that in the second passage ی stands for رپر, or that, Rîshahr lying near the Shīrīn river, the distance to Rîshahr, 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 Māhīrübān was situated “in the sea between (the bends or branches of) the Tāb river” (§ 6, 35.), but as explained in the notes the courses of the Tāb and Shīrīn (§ 6, 32.) rivers have got confused in the text. The estuary of the river Tāb (Jarrāḥi), 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 “Tab river” (by which the Shīrīn river is meant).²

16. This curious popular form for Arragān is confirmed by Yāqūt. In the Zafar-nāma, i, 600, the river Tāb is called Āb-i Arghūn (popular Mongolian etymology?). The town stood north of the present-day

¹ This Rîshahr must be clearly distinguished from ResHIR (on our maps Rîshahr), situated south of Būshir. See Marquart, *Erānīahr*, 147, who tentatively restores its name as رپرپل تَرْجَمَات. 

² The Shīrīn (Hindiyān, Zuhrā) river is still called “Tāb” on our maps. Our author’s confusion of the names Tāb and Shīrīn may point to an ancient origin of this ambiguous use.
Behbehän mostly on the southern bank of the Tāb (now Kurdistān, Jarrāḥī) 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, Iṣṭ., 151. On dūshāb, Iṣṭ., 95.

17. As under 7., this residue of information on Arrajān is in a desperate state. Cf. Iṣṭ.’s lists of localities of Arrajān, pp. 112-13. Our یوزک پرک یوزک پرک might be (?) a simple repetition of the mis-spelt یوزک ریشر. Lārandān and Vāyagān are mentioned under § 6, 32. near the sources of the Shirīn. لوزکان لوزکان may stand for Lūrdagān, the chief place of Sardān (the Lūrdagān lake is shown on Haussknecht’s Map between the two headwaters of the Kārūn!). Vāyagān, though not impossible as a name (cf. Vāyghān in the north-eastern corner of the Urmiya lake), is not found in Iṣṭ., and stands perhaps for روزکان روزکان, mentioned under § 6, 29. in a region where several rivers rise.

19. Bishāpūr <Bih-Shāpūr, see Le Strange, o.e., 262. On the two fire temples, Iṣṭ., 118. On the images of kings, Iṣṭ., 150. On the well of Hindjān near Sābūr, from which smoke rises, Iṣṭ., 151; Schwarz, 34, places it near the oil-wells of Dālīkī.

20. In Iṣṭ., 110, after Kumārij (sic) follows H.ṇdijān but Vāyagān is perhaps a repetition of *Rūyagān (cf. above under 17.).

21. Iṣṭ., 104. The Persian form is Gūyum, as given for its homonym under 32.

22. Maq., 430, says that the best water of Shīrāz was from Jūyum, just mentioned under 21. Under 32. the name may have been repeated in the Persian garb of Gūyum.

23. B.r.sarkān, B.rs.kān, perhaps Kāskān, Iṣṭ., 102. On the term kauristān see p. 255, note 1. The only Kauristān mentioned in the Fārs-nāma-yi Našīrī is the one on the road from Lār to Bandar-i ‘Abbāsī, but this does not suit our case. Here the name may stand for Kavār, mentioned under § 6, 29. as lying on the river Sakān.


26., 27. All lying in E. (see under 27.) and found in Iṣṭ., 107-8, Schwarz, 101-5. On the tables (mawā’īd) made of rock-salt see Iṣṭ., 155. On mūmiyā see Nuzhat al-qulūb, p. 207.

28. Ramm [Shahriyār], Shaqq (or Sūq) al-Rustāq, Furj, Tārm (now Tarom) in Iṣṭ., 109, but Maq., 428, gives a nearer form to ours: Rustāq al-Rustāq.


32.-34. Ist., 106-9, mentions under E.: Mādāvān, Juyum (our text at this place gives the Persian form Güyum, see above 21., 22.), and Jahrum, but places under B.: Samīrān, Iraj (now Ḫīraj, south of Nîrīz), and Kīz. Rūftā is obscure.


36. Ist., 108-9, under E. Khiyār was the town of Nîrīz. Ist. spells Iṣṭahbanāt with ṣ.

37. Abādha belonged to E., Ist., 107, but B. rīdān (Ist., 101 p) and *Chāhuk (Ist., 102, Šāhuk) belonged to A.

38. All under A., Ist., 101-3, except Khurra, placed by Ist., 112, 118, under D. Ist., 102, also writes *ṣerāmāk for Pāpak.

39. All under A. in Ist., 101-3, who gives the forms M. škān, Iqlīd, Arkh. mān, S. rm. q. The Persian translation of Ist., edited by Ouseley, confirms that Iqlīd and Surmaq “in Persian are called Kīlīd and Surma”, Ist., 101 b.


42. The district Sardan lay in the Kūh-ūlū mountains between the provinces A. and C. The details given under § 6, 36. show that the district belonged to the Tāb basin (cf. Ist., 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 Kārūn. Ist., 103, calls Lūrdagān capital of Sardan.1 On the mine of sufr in Sardan see Ist., 155. Sufr is “copper” and, though occasionally it means “gold”, Ist. at this place clearly distinguishes it from dhahāb.

43. Ist., 102, under A. The form Abraj (not Iraj) is correct, Le Strange, o.c., 281. Instead of ݨuspended some of Ist. MSS., 102 k mention ݡr (?).

44. Ist., 102, under A. Our D. rākān corresponds to azzānān.

45. Our clear Anār, for Ist., 102, 110, is rather against Le Strange’s theory about Anār being an error for Unās, o.c., 266. The remaining four names are given by Ist., 100, in the Yazd district of Iṣṭakhr (he spells Fāhraj). 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 Ist., 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 Iṣṭ.’s route, p. 95; in the opposite direction: Arrajān to Āsk (two easy marhālas); thence to Zaydān (1 ditto); thence to Daurāq (1 ditto); thence to Khān Mardawāih (1 ditto); thence

1 On the Lūrdagān 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 on to Baghdād.

1. Ist., 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. Ist., 95, Dauraq, Khān-Mardawaih, Bāsiyān, all three on the road from Arrajān to Başra, cf. § 6, 39.


4. Ist., 92 (the fire seen on the ʿAsk mountain is due to some burning naphtha), 94 (battle of the Azraqi Khārijites).

5. Ist., 93: AbūʿAlī, imām of the Muʿtazilites (d. in 303/916), see Djubbaʿi in EI.

6. Ist. has nothing on the position of Süq al-arbaʿā but our author derives his record from Ist.'s Map, cf. § 6, 37., where Süq al-arbaʿā is placed upstream from Ahwāz (?).

7. Ist., 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: اَلْفَاعِلِ.


9. Ist., 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 Aʿlä, or Gūpāl) is not mentioned under § 6. See Minorsky, Rām Hurmuz in EI.

10. Ist., 91 (sugar from Masruqān comes to ʿAskar-ʿMukram). The specification of sugar not in Ist.

11. Masruqān is a locality, not a town, Ist., 90.

12. Rām Ürdmizd اوردهور is probably a simple error for Ürmizd, cf. § 6, 39.


14. Idhaj, now Mālāmīr, is barely mentioned in Ist., 89, 90, 92. This paragraph in reality describes Shūshtar (Tustar), Ist., 92. 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.ndu-shāvūr is an interesting form [cf. 12.] for Junday-sābūr, Ist., 93 (*Gundē-Šāpūr). The town founded by Shāpūr I, according to Tabārī, i, 826, was named Bih az Andēw Šāpūr. Nöldeke considers this explanation (probably hailing from Ibn Muqaffa') untenable. Marquart interpreted it first as "better than Antiochia is (the town) of Šāpūr", Erānšahr, 145, and later as "better (is) the Antiochia of Šāpūr", Catalogue, p. 98. In the Middle Persian list of towns edited in the latter book, the name of Gundē-Šābūr has the form of V.ndwy (or V.ndwg)-Shaḥpuhr which Marquart emendates into Vand<iy>ог-Shaḥpuhr. But whatever the learned
etymologies of the original Säsänian name may have been, the fact is that \( V.ndv\% \) exactly corresponds to the first part of the Byzantine \( Βενδοςαβόρων \) and to our \( \text{ودنور} \), which all agree in showing that the people simplified the name into a compound \( \text{Vindoy-Shãpür} \). On the well-known name \( \text{Vindoy} \) see Justi, *Iranisches Namenbuch*, 370. Hübschmann, *Armenische Grammatik*, 85, explains the Armenian form \( \text{Vndoy} \) (borrowed from Middle Persian) as a pet-form of some name like the Old Persian \( \text{Vindafarnah} \) ("he who obtains glory"). Ibn al-Qifti, ed. Lippert, 133-4, confirms that the name of \( \text{جندی ساور} \) was regarded as a combination of the names of \( \text{جندی} \) and \( \text{شپور} \), a former master of the land, and Shäpür. For the explanation of \( \text{مین شوش ویشروار} \) in § 6, 40. see note to it. [However, a simpler restoration might be \( \text{شوش [و] ویشروار} \).]

16. Išt., 92: long story on Daniel's coffin; 93: \( \text{khazz-textiles and sham-mämät-citrons} \).

17. Išt., 39, Mattûth and Birdhaun were known only as places producing textiles, cf. Schwarz, 365-7. 18. Išt., 93: \( \text{Basunnè (sutür)} \). Maq., 417: \( \text{al-sutûr al-jayyida} \). 19. Išt., 94 (\( \text{tikak in Tib} \)). 20. Išt., 93: \( \text{sîsanjird-textiles produced in Qurqûb, on them see special treatise by Karabacek (Karabaòek), Die persische Nadelmalerei Susandschird, Leipzig, 1881} \).

§ 31. The Jîbîl

Le Strange, pp. 185-231; Schwarz, pp. 445-957 (an amazingly detailed analysis of Arabic sources).

This chapter, too, is based on Išt., 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 Išt.'s work which, as usual, contain many additions (cf. notes in \( BGA, i \) and \( iv \)). The description has been arranged according to Išt.'s itineraries (or his Map). 1. the capital; 2.-7. the road from Isfahân to Hamadân (the latter town forgotten!); 8.-12. ditto from Hamadân to Khûzistân; 13. ditto from Hamadân to Kirmânschâh; 14.-15. western localities; 16.-18. the road from Qazvin to Tabriz; 19.-21. Rayy and its neighbourhood; 22. the road from Rayy to Hamadân; 23. ditto from Rayy to Isfahân.

1. Išt., 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. Išt., 199, speaks of \( \text{al-'attâbî wal-washy wa sâ'r thiya'b al-''arîr wal-qusun} \) but the Gothan epitome (ed. Moeller) adds \( \text{والعل والقلاطن} \), cf. also \( BGA, iv, 407 \) (from the Leiden epitome): \( \text{والقلاطنيات} \). Our author omits \( \text{ورى} \) and incorporates the addition which is interesting, for no other writer seems to speak of \( \text{siglaton} \) being fabricated in Isfahân, see Schwarz, 888-90. This heavy figured silk stuff was chiefly produced in Armenia and Baghdad (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, iiv, 178-90 and
418. The Zarînrûdh is not in Išt., but in I.Kh., 20, 176 (whose story on its reappearance in Kirmān is not reproduced in our author).

2. Išt., 198. This Khân Lanjân has been wrongly taken for the place of refuge of Firdausî, 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 Firdausî but to the scribe (who apparently wrote in 779/1377).

4., 5. Išt., 199, cf. Qudāma, 199, under Ighârayn. The mention of the ruin of Burj may have been suggested by what Išt. says of the past glory of Abû Dulaf’s dynasty in Karaj.

7. No details on Rāmin in Išt. but I.H., 258, calls it مدينه صالحة.

8., 9. This Karaj was the minbar of the Rūdrâvar rustāq, Išt., 199. The indistinctly written " in view of the explanation seems to be پیر “cheese”, but no other author mentions cheese in Rūdrâvar, Schwarz, 504. Perhaps the word was misread from cheese. 10. cf. Minorsky, Nihāwand in EI.

11. Lishtār, Išt., 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 Nushat al-qulûb, p. 107, there stood (formerly) in Alishtar the fire temple of اردوخش, i.e. either ādarakhsh “a thunder-bolt”, or ādharkhush “the 9th day of the Ādhar month”. [Marquart, Erānšahr, 82, and Streifzüge, 347, restores Ādharkhush in I.Kh., 120, &c., as Ādhar-jushnasf. He adds in Wehrot, 88: “der Hengst wünasp 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.]

12. Shāpurkhāst, as results from Maq., 401, is Khurramābād (surnamed probably after the Khurrami sectarians who, in the tenth century, were very numerous in this locality, cf. Ibn Miskawaihi, The Eclipse, i, 278). See Minorsky, Luristān in EI.


15. The words on the sociable character of the inhabitants belong only to Dināvar, Išt., 198. On the other hand both Shahrazūr and Suhravard 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, Shehrizûr in EI) and the other between Hamadān and Zanjān. The spelling شهريون (cf. also Sharaf-nāma, ed. Veliaminov Zernov, i, p. 20 ult., شهريون زرول) shows that the name was not considered as an idāfat construction. It rather confirms the etymology *Shah-razūr “the Kingly Forest”, for Siyā-razūr “the Black Forest”, in view of the Byzantine τὸ Σιαρσούρων, τὸν Σιάζουρον, and the similar Pahlavi and Syriac forms, see Marquart, Südarmenien, 1929, p. 558, and Herzfeld, Mitt. aus Iran, ii, 2, 1930, pp. 73–4.

19. Ṭalaqān, 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 (abrād) and ibid., 208 (in the Gothan epitome): cotton stuffs. Maq., 396, mentions precious ṭaylasān-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 "china and oil (?)". Ghaḍāra means "greenish plastic clay", "big plate", and "china". The word رزغ in our author's source very probably (*raughān kashīda ?) 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’īrī 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., 198 b, 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. Balādhuri’s and Ṭabari’s remarks, valuable as they are, have a fragmentary character. I.Kh. and Qudāma do not describe the Caspian provinces. Ya’qūbī, 276–7, and even I.R., 149–51, are too brief. I. Faqīh, 101–14, chiefly follows Balādhuri 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 Lāhijān suggests the idea that he might himself have sojourned there, or perhaps been a native of that region. Our author’s description is separated by some three centuries from the next independent and valuable account of Gīlān found in ‘Abdullāh Qāshānī’s Tārikh-i Uljāytū, Bib. Nat., supplément persan 1419, ff. 38b–45a (partly and inadequately edited in Schefer, Chrestomathie persane, ii,
94-8). Cf. also the Nuzhat al-qulüb, 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 Uljāytū’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, Qazvīn, and Zanjān. On the episodes of their extraordinary career see Minorsky, La Domination des Dailamites (No. 3 of Publications de la Société des Études Iraniennes), Paris, 1932, the object of which is to show that in a period when the Arab dominion had waned in Persia and the Turks were still lingering on the eastern frontier of the 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 Īrān. 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.), Ṭabaristān (6.-15.; 21.-23.), Kūmish (16.-19.), Daylam “proper” (24.), and Gilān (25.).

1. Gurgān. The seat of the king of Ṭabaristān 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-qulüb, 212, cf. Barthold, Irrigation, 31-7, and Minorsky, Meshhad-i Miṣriyān in EI.
Dihistän undoubtedly echoes the name of the ancient nomad people Δάαι (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-Encyclopädie, viii, 1945-6. I.Kh., 118, seems to quote a different Dihistän in Tabaristän; another Dihistän 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 Ḥurūfī sect, cf. Huart, Textes persans relatifs à la secte des Houroufs, GMS, ix, 1909.

5. Abaskün (or Ābaskün, cf. Yāqūt, i, 55 and 91) must correspond to Σωκαννα πόλις which Ptolemy, vi, cap. 9, mentions in the south-eastern part of the Caspian. Abaskün was an important port after which the whole Caspian Sea was sometimes called, cf. Juvaynī, GMS, ii, 115: bahr-i Ābaskün. It is usually located near the estuary of the Gurgān river (at Gümüş-tāpā), cf. Dorn, Caspia, pp. 67-8, 92, Barthold, Irrigation, 33; Le Strange, The Lands, 379. Ḥamdullāh Mustaufī, Nuzhat al-qulūb, 239, calls Abaskün “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.ṛjī (?) 3 ditto; thence to Sāriya 1 marhāla; thence to Mār.št [or Maq., 372: Abār.št] 1 ditto; thence to Abādān [or to Limrāsk] 1 ditto; thence to Ğamīsha 1 ditto; thence to Astarābād 1 ditto; thence to Ribāt Ḥafīs 1 ditto; thence to Jūrjān 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 Ribāt al-ajurr (*Ribāt al-ajurr “the burnt brick ribāt”) which probably is connected with the brick wall (ḥā’īt . . . min ajurr) which stretched between the mountain and the sea and was attributed to Anūshirvān, cf. also I. Faqih, 303. In later times Shāh ʿAbbās built (or rebuilt?) the wall on the river Kirrind (cf. Ptolemy, vi, cap. 9, Xpivōais) 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. Māmhīr = Bārfurūsh.

14. Išt., 217, ʿAyn al-Humm, but the name Alhum may be of local origin. This place situated at an easy marhāla 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 Maḥmūdābād, cf. Melgunov, 177: 1AML R Ḹ.
15. Rüdhân "copper (mines?)", later Püyän and *Rüyanj (so instead of Rubanj in Išt., 204) formed a separate küra, I.R., 149, and was ruled by the dynasty of Ustundârs, see Justi, Iranisches Namenbuch, p. 433, and Minorsky, Rüyän in EI.

16. Kümish (*Kömish) is the region lying outside Tabaristân proper along the southern foot of the mountains, cf. Ptolemy, vi, cap. 5: ᾨ μὲν παρὰ τὴν Ὕρκανίαν Κομισην. Standing in the text must be an error for *Ya'qübî, 276, says explicitly under Qûmis that the inhabitants of its capital Dâmaghân, who are of Persian nationality (*ajâm), are extremely skilful in production of woolen qûmisî-textiles (اَكْيَة الصرف التوميَةِ).

17. Dâmaghân (now Dämghân) is probably Ἐκατόμπνλος βασίλειον of Parthian times. In the list of its products I translate the word *alam by "border" preferably to "banner", as it grammatically belongs to dastâr. Curiously enough one of the imâm-zâdas of Dâmgân, built according to Khanikoff, Mémoire sur l'Asie Centrale, p. 74, in the fourth century A.H. is called Pîr-i 'Alamdâr (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 Damâvand.

21.-23. The Qârin mountain lay to the south of Sârî. The castle of Pirrîm was probably situated on the western branch of the Tijîn river. Sâmâr corresponds to Išt., 205: Sahmâr which stood at 1 day's distance from Sârî and was the only city (madina) of the Qârin-kûh. The last prince of the original Qârinid dynasty (which claimed descent from the legendary Kâva) was Mâzyâr, executed in 224/839, cf. Minorsky, Mâzyâr in EI. Then the rival and more important Bâvand dynasty (supposed to descend from Kayûs, brother of the Sâsânian king Kavâd) must have seized Pirrîm. Several princes of this dynasty bore the name of Shahriyâr, after which the mountains were called Shahriyâr-kûh. The story of the miraculous spring in the Qârin mountains is not identical with what is found in Ibn al-Faqîh, 310 (on the spring at al-Tâq), Zakariyâ Qazwînî, ii, 239, 270, and Hamdullîh, Nuzhat al-qlûb, 277 (on the spring Bâdkhâna near Dâmgân), cf. Vasmer, Die Eroberung Tabaristâns, pp. 101-2. However, all these reports point to a former adoration of springs which is clearly confirmed by the H.-'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 sâsânides (in Russian), SPb., 1909, pp. 110-35.

24. Of the districts of Daylam proper (cf. Išt., 204, al-Daylam al-mahd) Latrà and Varfû [for the ending cf. Laspû south of Somâm] are mentioned in Ibn Isfandiyâr, p. 162, and Langâ, home of the 'Alid Abûl Husain (d. 421/1030), ibid., 54, all three in connexion with Rûyân; consequently they must be located on the eastern side of Daylam. A Langâ on RM, Map, is shown in the eastern part of Tunikâbun, south of 'Abbâsâbû and Aspîchîn, cf. Melgunov, o.c., 182. M.rd is unknown. Châlkarûd river is some 65 Km. west of Châlûs, RM, 131. K.rkrûdû must correspond to Karkarûsar lying immediately east of the Châlûs, Melgunov, o.c., 180, RM, 151,
and Dinär-rüdh to Dînā-rûd, a narrow strip of coast mentioned in the Tārikh-i Khânî, ed. Dorn, SPb., 1857, p. 212, between Sakhtasar (eastern frontier of Gîlân) and Khushkarûd (in Rûnikûh). Jûdâhanjân and Jûjj have not been found.1 Hausam, according to RG, pp. 336–7, is identical with Rûdisar, which lies 13 Km. east of Langarûd. With regard to Hausam we have Zâhir al-dîn’s indication (ed. Dorn, 1850, p. 19) that the western frontier of Ţabaristân is Malât “which village of the town of Hausam is now known as the port of Rûdisar”. 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 Somâm (not Bashm west of the Châlûs), cf. RG, pp. 306, 351, and RFG. Shîr is the mountain south of Ashkavar. Vastân, considering the order of enumeration, must be sought east of Somâm on the southern frontier of Gîlân. 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 Kalâr and Châlûs, but as Isţ., 206, reckons them to Ţabaristân, our author evidently means only that Kalâr and Châlûs were the market-places which the Daylamites visited. The town of Kalâr must have lain near the col of Bashm (west of Châlûs). In the plain of Kalârâdsht (on the right affluent of the Sardâbrûd) Miss F. Stark found a mound probably of the frontier fortress of Kalâr. See F. Stark, The Site of the City of Kalar, in Gf, March 1934, pp. 211–17 (with a map).

25. Gîlân. The contents of this passage have been treated by Barthold in Isvestiya Kavkaz. Istor.-Archeol. Instituta, 1927, vi, pp. 63–6, though without any explanation of the geographical terms. In the tenth century the Gîl (Jîl), inhabitants of Gîlân, were a tribe usually distinguished from the Daylamites, see Minorsky, La Domination des Dailamites, p. 23, note 28, and the Gîl often quarrelled with the Daylamites, as our author seems to confirm. The frontier between the two tribes passed roughly speaking between Langarûd (Gîlân) and Rûdisar (Daylam).

The Safid-rûd divides Gîlân into two parts, viz., “this side” and “that side”, in local dialect respectively called Biya-pîsh and Biya-pas (biya “water” is cognate with Avestan vaday “watercourse”), and each of them had a different dynastic history, cf. Zâhir al-dîn, Tārikh-i Gîlân wa Daylamistân, ed. Rabino, Rasht, 1330 A.H., and the epitome of it in H. L. Rabino, Rulers of Gîlân, in ÆAS, July, 1920, 277–96.

On “this side” of the river the districts (not yet towns! as pointed out by Barthold) were Lâfjân = Lâhijân [for f> h cf. Nîfâvantja> Nihâvand]. Miyâlafjân seems to be identical with Mâlfjeân, on the road from Lâhijân to Siyâhkal (Barfjân), RG, 329.2 Kushkajân lies on the eastern bank of the

1 If the second name is *Nylânrâdâr it may be compared with the source of the Langarûd river rising near the village now called Leyl (<*Neyl or Nîl?). Cf. p. 410, l. 16.


3 Another restoration of this indistinctly written name may be Nîyâlfjân (?), cf. notes to § 36, 36.–41.
Safid-rūd, ibid., 327. Barfjān is the centre of the district Siyāhkal, south-east of Lāhijān, ibid. 278, 284. Dākhil, in Rāh-shāhi-pāyīn, north of Lāhijān, ibid. 322. Tijin, on the road going west from Lāhijān to Kūstūm, ibid., 328. Ch. ma (reading uncertain) may be connected with Chomkhala, port of Langarūd, north-east of Lāhijān.

On “that side” of the river, Khāŋgajāl (reading uncertain: Jānkajāl, &c.) could not be identified. The district of Nanak lies south-east of Rasht, RG, p. 228, 242. Kūtum (*Kōtum), 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 highroad from Qazvīn to Rasht following the left bank of the Safīd-rūd emerges from the Elburz mountains into the Gīlān plain. 'Abdullāh Qāshānī in his Tārikh-i Uljāytū, f. 39v, says: “On the western side of the Safīd-rūd the first province (wilāyat) is Kūtum, lying on the bank of the Sabīd-rū (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 Shahrīstān. . . . The province of Kūchasfān [now: Kūchasfān] is situated north of Kūtum on the sea-coast. . . . Rasht is situated to the north-west of Kūtum.” In later sources there is some confusion as to the location of Kūtum. Ḥamdullāh in the Nuzhat al-qulūb, 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 kashhtī). Abūl-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 Shahrīstān or Gūrāb-i Kuhdum, cf. RG, 215, which must have lain considerably to the north of the present-day Kuhdum village (even as the crow flies, the latter is situated at 47 Km. from the nearest western estuary of the 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-dīh as giving access to the Kūtum district. By Sarāvān our source evidently means the upper (southern) part of the former principality of Kūtum (on its extent see RG, 215). In Nāṣir al-dīn Shāh’s grant of 1280/1863, quoted in RG, 83, the Sarāvān borough is considered as a part of the Kuhdum borough, cf. ibid., 218, 237, and RFG. Most probably Sarāvān (“head of the waters”) is precisely the locality now called Kuhdum “tail, or foot of the mountain”, whereas the ancient centre of Kuhdum lay lower down on the left bank of the 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 Tārikh-i Uljāytū, f. 40v., 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-gulûb, 163. The further rise of Rasht is connected with the dynasty of the amîrs Tijaspî 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 Tulîm (now Tülim) district lies north-west of Rasht and adjoins the Murdâb lagoon, RG, 190. The Dûlâb district adjoins the north-west corner of the Murdâb; its mountainous part is called Tâlish-Dûlâb and that lying near the coast Gil-Dûlâb, ibid., 107-14. Kuhan-rûdh seems to refer to Kergâna-rûd, the central part of Persian Tâlish, ibid., 89-100. Astarâb most probably is Astarâ, cf. Târikh-i 'Alam-ârâ, p. 742, Astarâ. Khân-Balî (?) must be sought in the region of Mûghân, see Minorsky, Mukân in EI. This part of enumeration has a pretty close parallel in Maq.'s route (pp. 372-3): Salûs (*Châlûs) to Isbûrûdî 1 marhala; thence to Qaryat al-Raṣad 1 ditto; thence to Kh.shm 1 ditto; thence to Baylamân 4 ditto; thence to al-Dûlâb 4 ditto (?); thence to Kuhan-rûdh 3 ditto; thence to Mûghakân 2 ditto; thence to al-Kurr (Kur river) 2 ditto; thence to Hashâdhar 2 ditto; thence to al-Shamâkhya 2 ditto. These distances are not exempt from suspicion and it is right that after Kuhan-rûdh the H.-'A. should insert Astarâb. As our Khân-B.li corresponds to Mûghakân, it is very likely identical with Bilasuvâr, an important centre of Mûghân. [The name, probably *Pîla-suvâr “great cavalier” is a familiar Daylamite name.]

The “boroughs” of Gilân (Gilbâdh, Shâl, Dûlâb, and Paylamân-shahr) cannot yet be located. Maq., 355, mentions the towns in Daylam: B.rvân, V.îmr, Sh.kîr.z, Tàram (Târom on the middle course of the Safîd-rûdh), Khasm; and in Gilân: Dûlâb, Baylamân-shahr, and Kuhan-rûdh, ibid., 360.

Neither under Daylam (§ 32), nor Ädharbâyjân (§ 35) does our author mention by name the Tâlish region extending along the coast between Gilân and Muqân. In the earlier Arab writers two names occur frequently together al-bîr (âl-Ṭâlishan), see Marquart, Streifzüge, 280 (with numerous quotations). As regards Taylasân it is clear that it is an Arabic popular etymology for Persian Tâlishân (whatever the real origin of the interesting Tâlish people be). In Arabic taylasân means not only a sort of headkerchief 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 Tâlish is situated. The only place remaining available for the al-bîr is the mountainous tract lying west of Tâlish between Ardabil and Zanjân, called Târom (in Arabic al-ṭâlûm) and Khalkhâl, see Minorsky, Târom in EI. Birûnî in his Canon quotes al-bîr between al-Ṭàrm and Zanjân. I feel sure that both al-bîr and the al-bîr must be read *al-Hûr (Hêr) and refer to Khalkhâl of which the chief place is still called Herow<Her (*Hêr)-âb, see Minorsky, Transcausica, in Jour. As., July, 1930, p. 72.

1 See Khuwârizmî, pp. 80-1 (Caspian Sea) and the annexed map illustrating different forms of sea-coasts. Cf. Renaud, Abul-Fidâ, i, 19. Nallino, Rifacimento, p. 16, explains Khuwârizmî’s pâyelâsân as “una insenatura lunga e regolare, ma non molto profonda”.
§ 33. 'Iraq


Starting with the capital 1. Baghdâd, the description follows the course of the Tigris down to 6. Wâsit; 7.-13. lie in the region of Basra; 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 Baghdâd 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 Büyids are evidently meant.


8. Maftah mentioned by Ist., 81, and its position is indicated by the canal Ma‘qil (§ 6, 46).

10. Basra. Ist., 80 (= I.H., 159) mentions the same graves and states that Basra 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” (burga‘) Alid, i.e. the leader of the rising of the black slaves in 255/868. On his supposed genealogy see Tabari, iii, 1742, 1857; cf. Nöldeke, Orientalische Skizzen, Berlin, 1892: “Sklavenkrieg im Orient”.

11. Bayân according to Ist., 95, was the last place belonging to Khûzistân. This is a new example of our author’s method of enumeration, v.s., § 29.

12. Salmânân (?) not found. Salmân-i Pâk lying in the neighbourhood of Baghdâd would be out of place here. Perhaps the sâmâni-mats mentioned under 13. are connected with Salmânân (?). 'Abbadân may belong to the same locality. 'Abbadân with its humble industries had to wait another thousand years before becoming the present-day bulwark of the Anglo-Persian Oil Co.

14. Mádharâyât (above Wâsit) is to be distinguished from Madhâr (§ 6, 46.) which would come naturally at this place.

20. Küthay-Rabbâ, as in Ist., 86.


26. The formula of blessing karram 'Ilâhu wajhahu, as applied to the caliph 'Ali, is sunnite. Very astonishing is the omission of Karbalâ (Ist., 85) which would have been unthinkable for a shi‘i, but see p. 177.

§ 34. Jazîra

I.Kh., 73-4, 93-9; Ist., 71-8; I.H., 137-57; Maq., 136-51 (iqlim aqûr). Le Strange, The Lands, 86-114 (most of the places will be found on Map

The definition of Jazîra 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 Balîkh river; 20. - 22. down the left bank of the Tigris. Āmid and Sinjîr are omitted in the enumeration though Āmid is mentioned under § 6, 46.

4. The details on Niṣîbîn all in Iṣṭ., 73. Sang-i ḏâginâ stands for jawâhir al-zâjâj (I.H., 143: jauhar lil-zajaj), by which “silica, silicious earth” is evidently meant.

7. Abridged from Iṣṭ., 74.

8. Diyâr-Rabi’a is precisely the province comprising 1. - 7.


16. See Herzfeld, *Balîs*, in *EI*. Jîr Manbij is a different place from Manbij reckoned to Syria (§ 38, 1.). The spelling Shumaishât, instead of Sumaisât, is very common, and a ready Yâqût, ii, 276, 417, warned against it. Sumaisât (ancient Samosata) lies on the right bank of the Euphrates west of Āmid; Shimshât (ancient Arsamosata) lay north of Āmid on the left bank of the eastern Euphrates upstream from Kharpût, cf. Le Strange, *oc.*, 108, 116, and Markwart [Marquart], *Südarmenie und die Tigris-quellen*, Wien, 1930, pp. 242-4. Moreover, Marquart postulates the existence of two different Shimshât 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 Shumaishât under § 36, 16., and Sumaisât under § 38, 3.

19. On the church of Ruhâ (Edessa) Iṣṭ., 79; already I.Kh., 161, says: “The Romans pretend that there is no stone monument surpassing in beauty the church of Ruhâ.”

§§ 34-6. Ādharbādhasâgân [Armâniya and Arrân]

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 Arrân 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 Ädharbayjân (cf. Išt., 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 Arrân has certain points in common with Išt. and the paragraph on Shirvân is undoubtedly based on the same source as Mas’üdï’s passage in the Murûj, but here, too, the H.-‘Ā. contains a good deal of original information:

I. Ädharbayjân.

Under Ädharbayjân first comes the capital Ardavil, 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 Ädharbayjân south of the Araxes (16.–18. and perhaps 19.). In Arrân: 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 Ädharbayjân for the greater part of the tenth century were the Daylamites of the Musäfîrid family. See Kasravï, o.c., Minorsky, La Domination des Dailamites, Paris, 1932, and Musäfîrî in EI. However, the province had a number of local rulers as appears from I.H.’s enumeration of the Musäfîrî feudatories, BGA., ii, 254.

2. See Minorsky, Ushnü in EI. Saräv, now Saräb (I.Kh., 120: 1). Jäbrüqän corresponds to I.Kh.’s 119, 121, Jäbrvän, which, together with Nirïz, belonged to ‘Alî b. Murr. Nirïz lay 14 farsaks south-east of Urmiya, and Jäbrvän 4 farsaks farther south-east. The two places must be located south of the lake of Urmiya, probably in Sulduz, see Minorsky, Nirïz and Sulduz, in EI.

3. See Minorsky, Tabrîz, in EI. In the tenth century Tabrîz was an insignificant borough. ‘Alâ b. Ahmad al-Azdî towards 251/865 was the financial agent for Armenia (and Ädharbayjân) and in 260 rebelled against the new wâli of that province ’Omar b. ‘Ali b. Murr, see Ṭabarî, iii, 1584, 1668.

5. Barzand, Müqän, and Vartān lie north of Ardabil, see Minorsky, **Müqän** 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 Dikhakhgān (local Turks call it: Tukhakhgan). Yaqūt, ii, 636, derives the name from that of Kīsrā’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 Dikhakhgān. In 1905 I saw there a number of old tumular inscriptions in Armenian.

10. and 11. see Minorsky, *Urmia* and *Salmās* in *EI*.

12. The form Arjīj (perhaps influenced by the popular etymology arčī > arzēx) is unusual instead of Arjīsh, in Armenian Archēsh (on the north-eastern bank of the Van lake).


16. See Minorsky, s.v., in *EI*.

17. Here begins the more original part of the chapter. Mīmadh (*Mēmadh*)¹ is found in Baladhurī, 207, and Maq., 51, but only the mention of Aḥar as its centre enables us to locate the district in southern Qaraja-dagh (this latter name must be a Turkish popular etymology for some Iranian name like *Karaj*, see Minorsky, *Urm* in *EI*).

Ibn Rawwād was certainly a member of the Rawwādīd dynasty which ruled intermittently in Tabriz and its neighbourhood from the beginning of the third century A.H. till the Seljuk times, see Baladhurī, 331, I.Kh., 119, cf. Minorsky *Tabriz*, *Marand*, *Marāgha* in *EI*. More particularly our Ibn Rawwād must be identical with Abul-Hayjah 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 Mīmadh. I.Kh., 23, mentions a Mīmad in Kūmis and, 43, a Mīmad in Fārs (Iṣṭ., 104: Mā’in, town of the Mymand nāhiya); a Mīmad, Iṣṭ., 161, lay between Sirjān (Kirmān) and Fārs and, according to Yaqūt, i, 799, was also called Mīmad. It is possible that some of them are connected etymologically.
that from his possessions at Ahar and Varzuqăn (this latter situated southwest of Ahar, and upstream from it on the same river) he paid in 344/955 50,000 dinars to the Musâfirid Marzubân b. Muḥammad, cf. Kasravî, o.c., ii, 37. The earlier Rawwâdids, mentioned with the nisba “al-Azdi”, evidently belonged to the Arab tribe which first occupied these parts of Ädharbayjân; the later Rawwâdids have the nisba “al-Kurdî”, but there is no need to imagine that the later Rawwâdids 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 Musâfîrîds, I.H., 254.

A most unexpected statement is that the said Ibn Rawwâd belonged to the family of Ḷulînî b. (more probably *ibn?) K.R.K. (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 Ädharbayjân. Iṣṭ. describes Ǧulûnî as an Azdite of Yemen and the first idea that occurs is that our author wanted to hint at the Azdite origins of the Rawwâdids. However, such an admission would be of no help for the explanation of the patronymic Ǧulûnî accompanying Ǧulûnî 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 Ǧulûnî is given by the appellation Ǧulûnî which the poet Qâṭrân uses with regard to the grandson of Abul-Hayjâ mentioned above.

The question is only how to read Ǧulûnî.² Our author obviously uses Ǧulûnî as a man’s name and considering the local possibilities I venture to read the whole complex Ǧulûnî as *Jâvânšîr 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 Ǧulûnî we must admit its likeness to the Armenian name of Grigor which was particularly frequent among the princes of Ärân (Caucasian Albania, in Armenian

1 He belonged to a branch of the Khârijîte Julandîs of ʿOman among whom the name Julandä seems to have been hereditary. ‘Abd and Jayfar, sons of a Julandä, are said to have been converted to Islam as early as 8/629, Balâdhurî, 76; Ṭabârî, ii, 1949 (under 129 A.H.) mentions a Julandä b. Masʿûd b. Jayfar b. Julandä al-Azdi, see ibid., iii, 77-9. Cf. G. P. Badger, History of the Imâms of ʿOman, 1871, pp. xi, 7-8; Zambaur, Manuel de généalogie, 1927, p. 125. In Persian the pronunciation seems to be Julindi, cf. O. Mann, Die Mundart d. Mukr-Kurden, Berlin, 1909, ii, 361 (the name surviving in Kurdish folk-lore may be a reminiscence of the Azdite tradition in Ädharbayjân).

2 Kasravi, o.c., ii, 57, spells chirâgh-i gargariyân “lamp of the sovereigns” (?), from gargar “throne”. The former explanation by Riḍâ-qulî khan was “lamp of the Gargarians” from the little borough of Gargar on the Araxes near Julfa, though there are several other Gargars, cf. Hübßchmann, Die altarm. Ortsnamen, pp. 273-4.
The real founder of the Mihrän dynasty (which claimed Sásānian 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 Sásānian 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’ałankatvats’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 Shaddādīds, 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 Qatrān, see Kasravi, o.e., 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”.

¹ According to Vardan, tr. by Dularier, Jour. As., 1860, vol. xvi, p. 294, the Mongols on taking Mayyāfāriqīn captured “a fine young man Sevata of Khachēn [south of Bārdā’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-ōn in common Persian pronunciation sounds-ūn. Moreover, a short i before u (ū) may be assimilated to the latter, bi-kūn > bukūn. Therefore one can imagine a development Singān > Singūn > Süngūn, and finally, in Turkish pronunciation, Süngün.
III. Arrān.

20. Qabān is the Armenian Kapan ("defile"), a locality lying north of the Araxes (north of Ordübād), cf. Nasawī, Ṣīrat Jalāl al-dīn, ed. Houdas, p. 164: Qabān; Hübschmann, Ortsnamen, p. 348; Brosset, Collection d'histoires arméniens, ii, 223-55: Davit'-beg on the wars (circa A.D. 1721) of the Armenians with the Ottomans in the region of K'ap'an (Kapan?).

21. Cf. Barthold, Bardha'a in EI. The term tūdh-i sabīl must be understood in the sense of "mulberries offered for God's sake" (ṣi sabīl allāh), cf. Juvaynī, Jahān-gushā, ii, 96, note 5, and Sykes, The Caliph's Last Heritage, 1915, p. 370: "Tut-Rabat (west of Dersim) takes its name from five large mulberry trees the fruit of which is a charitable gift for travellers, being a religious bequest of some long-dead Agha." Ist., 183, speaks of the silk-worms bred in Bardha'a on the 

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. Vardüqiya must be a popular name for *Bardūj, the frontier district of Georgia lying south-east of Tiflis on the river Berduj (now Borchala).

27. Qal'a (as in Maq.) is Qal'a ibn Knd.mān which Ist., 193, locates at 12 farsakhs to the east of Tiflis. Marquart, o.c., 29, suggests the reading *Kransan which would suit the Georgian district Gardaban, Vakhusht, o.c., p. 179 [to be distinguished from another Gardman, Balādhuri, 202, ğrdsan, which lay farther east on a tributary of the Shamkhor river, cf. Hübschmann, o.c., 352]. V.i.f 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 Dagestan. The extent of Shakki is considerably exaggerated. Cf. Minorsky, Shekki in EI.

30. On the expedition of the Rūz see Ibn Miskawaihi, The Eclipse, ii, 62–78, cf. Barthold, Preface, p. 29. Moses Kalankavats'i who wrote about our author's time also recorded this invasion of the Ruzik, Book III,
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 Khachēn 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 Yaqtān (or Baqtān) none of which are now known.

31., 32. As the enumeration obviously proceeds in a northerly direction the Sūq al-Jabal can be tentatively sought near the present-day Aresh, and Sunbātmān 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’asī)–Nukhi. Aresh (circa 40 Km. north of Bardha’a) occupies an important position near a passage through the belt of hills (Na’lband-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 Adamarsa. I.Kh., 122 (= Qudāma, 227), counts 8 stages (sikak) from Varthān to Bardha’a and thence 4 stages to مصورة ارية. All three places seem to lie in one direct line. Therefore “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. Şanār are the Σαναραίοι, 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 Dagestan. Iṣṭ., 193 a (MS. C.), between Shakkī and the الساره, (read: Sanāriya) mentions which may correspond to the valley called in Georgian Elisemi and in Turkish Eli-su, cf. Minorsky, Transcaucasica, p. 102. The name might then be restored as البیبی, v.i. 34.

The identity of the Sanar (in Georgian Ts’anar with ejaculative ts‘) does not clearly appear from the sources of which the principal are enu-
merated in Marquart, *Streifzüge*, 424. According to the Armenian Geography, ed. A. Soukry, pp. 26–7 (I am using Patkanov’s translation in *Zhurnal Min. Nar. Pros.*, ccxxvi, April 1883, p. 30): “in the same mountain [i.e. the Caucasus] after the Ardozians [an Alan tribe] live the Dajan, then the Dual, then the Tsokhoy, 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 Khuž, the anthropophagous *Kist*, the Dzlavat, the *Gudamakar*, the Durtsk, the Dido, the Lek, the Tapotaran, the Alutan, the Khennav, the Shlp, the Chibl, the P’wi. Then the Caucasus splits into two branches of which the one goes straight on and includes Shrvan and Khsvan [§36,37. ?] down to Khorsvem (?). The other branch having let out the river Arm² which flows northwards into the At’l [Attil], runs in a north-easterly direction. In it live the T’avaspar, the Hechmatak, the Ižmakh, 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 Alminon 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. North³ 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 Miuli ("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 *Eliseni*, 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 Säsänians 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 *korepiskopos/korikoz (χωρεπίσκοπος), 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 Kaks (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. Kriimsky, *Iz istorii severn. Azerbeijana*, in the *Festschrift to S. F. Oldenburg* (in Russian), Leningrad, 1934, pp. 289–305. Towards 332/943 Mas‘ūdî, *Murūj*, ii, 68, mentions the King of Qabala “the one-eyed Lion (*Leo?*)” and Iṣt., 1931, seems to refer to the same king in a passage which is found only in the Constantinople codex:

> بين الكر و شروان حد بين شروان والإيران حد مأخم بين الإيران والليزان ولوزانية حد.

> وكذلك بلاد الميسية وهي كورة ليست بكثيرة القرى فيها ضمة حضينة ظهرها مما إلى بلاد الكر إلى جبالها وهم يحاجن عليها ليل صاحب الميسية اليوم وحسن جواره أيماهم.

> الميسية ثم الميسية ثم السارية ثم تقليس.

> "the Lakz have a common frontier with Shirvān, and so has Shirvān with *al-Lyzān, and so has al-Lyzān with al-Mūqāniya as well as with the land of al-'Absiya (*Anbasa?*); and this (al-Lyzān?) is a district with not very many villages and in it stands a strong castle backing, in the direction of the Lakz, on their mountains; and they (*i.e.* the people of Lyzān) guard these mountains on account of the good disposition to them of the master of al-'Absiya and his good neighbourly relations with them. Then comes Shakkī, then the *marīya (al-Isiya < Eliseni), then the *Sanāriya, then Tiflis." It is true that it would be more easily restored as *الميسية Eliseni* (v.s.), but the description shows that it lay to the east of Shekkī. Therefore *بلاد الميسية*.

¹ More exactly some Khaledian (*v.i.*, p. 420), emigrants backed by the Gardamanians, see Vardan (transl. by Emin), p. 126.
35. In de Goeje’s edition of 1st, 187, the names بَرْزَانِجُ and بَرْدنِجُ have been accepted as independent names though they are undoubtedly mixed in the MSS. According to I.R., 8914, the Araxes flows past Warthān towards the town of بَرْزَانِجُ and beyond it (یَدَهَا جَوْاْثَا-حَا) joins the Kurr. On the other hand, Masʿūdī, Murūj, ii, 75, says that the Kurr flows at 3 miles’ distance from Bardha’a, then past Bardāj بَرْدنِجُ with یَمَالأ must be identical with بَرْدنِجُ *بَرْدَنِجُ which is “one of the districts of Bardha’a”, and finally joins the Araxes near the village al-Ṣanārā2 (جَرََرًا؟). In the description of roads 1st., 192, gives the following distances: “from Bardha’a to بَرْدنِجُ (variant بَرْدَنِجُ) 18 farsakhs; thence to the ford on the Kurr3 and (?) to Shammākhiya 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’a to Bardij and thence 2 marhalas to Shammākhiya, we are led to conclude that the name of the place where the Kurr was forded (cf. also I.H., 251) was Bardij *بَرْدَنِجُ and that it lay much nearer to Bardha’a than is indicated in 1st., 192 (I.H., 251). There are reasons for locating Bardij 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 Barda (Bardha’a) is circa 34 Km., and from Shammākhi circa 100 Km., which roughly corresponds to one light stage and two heavy ones. Our بَرْدنِجُ may be a mistake for بَرْدَنِجُ. In any case, Masʿūdī’s بَرْدَنِجُ is in favour of a form without ن. Much less certain is the situation and even existence of بَرْدنِجُ for which we have to depend on I.R.’s vague indication (which may even refer to the well-known Barzand, v.s. 5., situated between Varthān and Ardabil?).

IIIa. Shīrvān.

36.–41. On Shīrvān see Dorn, Versuch einer Geschichte der Schirwānischache, in Mém. Ac. des Sciences, SPb, 1840, iv, pp. 523–602; Pakhomov, Kratkiy kurs istorii Azerbayjana, Baku 1923; Barthold, Derbend, Shīrvān, and Shīrwānshāh in EI; A. Z. Validi, o.c. On the localities neighbouring on Shīrvān see under § 50. See Map xi.

The history and historical geography of the region still raise numerous

1 I do not think A. Z. Validi is right in locating Barzanj near Javād. The road to Shammākhi had to cross the Kur much farther upstream from Javād. 1st.’s distances cannot be considered as decisive.

2 [*Chināra ?].

3 یَمَان بَرْزَانِجُ ilā al-Shammākhiya 14 farsakhan. Very probably instead of ilā ma’bar al-Kurr we must read یَمَان ma’bar al-Kurr and place Barzanj “at the ford”. The MS. C has the variant یَمَان ma’bar al-Kurr (confirmed in Yaqūt, iii, 317n) indicating that the river was crossed immediately beyond Barzanj.
questions and for the better understanding of our text we shall have to examine the following points:

The old centres of Shîrvân.
The dynasties of Shîrvân-shâhs.
The Mazyadid dynasty
Kh.rsân-shâh.

THE OLD CENTRES. The earlier transmitted form of the name Shîrvân is Shrvan (شیروان *Shîrvân?). It does not seem to be connected with the name of its ancient capital 39. Shâvarân (İst., 187: Shabaran) 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 Shabrân 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 Shîrvân were buried in Shabarân, and that Shabarân was fortified [only] in 373/983-4 (one year after the composition of the *H.-*i'Á.). To the south of the Caucasian range lay the centre of the *Layzân fief held by a collateral branch of the Mazyadids and probably corresponding to the present-day Lâhîj (v. i.). The second important place to the south of the range was Shamkhâhiya, so named in honour of Shamkhâh b. Shujâ', ruler of Shîrvân towards A.D. 796-9, see Tabari, iii, 645, Balâdhuri, 210, cf. Marquart, Streifzüge, 455. This place rose to notoriety under the name of Yazidiya2 when the Shîrvân-shâh Yazid 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 Shamkhâhiya (>Shamkhî) survived. İst., 192, counts from Shamkhâhiya to Shîrvân (=Shabarân) 3 days.

THE DYNASTIES. Four dynasties of Shîrvân-shâhs are known.3
I. The original Shîrvân-shâhs of Säsânian times. In the enumeration of the Caucasian “gates” (bâb) I.Kh., 124, does not mention Shîrvân but among the kings appointed by the Säsânian Ardashîr, ibid., 17, he quotes (in Âdharbayjân) a who may be identical with Shîrvân-shâh.
II. After the Arab conquest the descendants of Yazid b. Mazyad al-Shaybânî became masters of Shîrvân (end of the eighth century to middle of the tenth, or even of the eleventh century).
III. The Kasrânid 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, verheereten 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 Yâqût, iv, 147, identifies Yazidiya with Shamkhî it is possible that more exactly Yazidiya corresponds to the *lashkar-gâh where according to our text the king resided and which lay at 1 farsakh’s distance from Shamkhî.
3 See Dorn, o.e., 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 Ibrahîm Darbandî founded the last dynasty of Shîrvân-shâhs which lasted till the occupation of Shîrvân by Shâh Tahmâsp in 957/1550.

THE MAZYADIDS. Our knowledge of the chart of this dynasty is chiefly based on the work of Aḥmad b. Luṭfullâh Münejjîm-bashi. This author (d. in 1113/1702) wrote his *Jâmi‘ al-duwal* in Arabic but it is accessible only in a Turkish abridged translation printed in Istanbul in 1285/1868 under the name of *Ṣaḥā‘if al-akhbār*. Münejjîm-bashi uses very good sources and among them an old Arabic *Tā’lîkh Bāb al-Abwâb* (tenth or eleventh century?), as shown by A. Z. Valîdi, *o.c.*, who had the opportunity of consulting in Istanbul a MS. of the original *Jâmi‘ al-duwal*.


1. Yazîd b. Mazyad b. Zâ‘îda

2. Khâlid

3. Muḥammad (i)

4. Muḥammad (ii)

5. Haytham (independent in 247)

6. Muḥammad (iii)

7. Haytham (ii)  
Fulân

8. ‘Alî (i) (*circa* 300)

9. Abû Tâhir Yazîd (ii) (305–37)

10. Muḥammad (iv) (337–45)

11. Aḥmad (345–70)

12. Muḥammad (v) (370–81)  
13. Yazîd (iii) (381–418)

14. Mañûchihr

15. Abû Mañûr ‘Alî  
(418–25)  
(425–35)

16. Qubâd  
(435–40)

17. Bukhtannaṣr  
(440)

18. Sâlîr  
(440–55)

19. Farîburz

20. Farîdûn
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 Kasranid dynasty (v.s.).

On the founder of the dynasty and his sons we possess a long paragraph in Ibn Khallîkân (de Slane's translation, i, 68, and iv, 218–32), according to whom Yazïd died in 185/801 and Khālid in 230/844–5. [Tâbarî, iii, 650, says that Yazïd died in Bardha'a in 175/791.]

Several important dates are found in Masûdi and I.H. The former in his Murûj, ii, 21, says that at the time of the well-known Russian invasion (soon after 300/912–13) the king of Shirvân was 'Alî b. Haytham which fully agrees with Münejjim-bashi. Masûdi adds, ii, 4 and 69, that 'Alî b. Haytham having perished [in a war with the Khazars, &c., as we learn from Münejjim-bashi, iii, 174], the power, about the time of the composition of the Murûj, was seized (taghallub) by Muḥammad b. Yazïd who (previously?) killed his uncles. As Masûdi wrote in 332/943, the beginning of Muḥammad IV's rule must either be placed a few years earlier than in our chart, or Masûdi must actually have in view Muḥammad's father Yazïd (the builder of Yazïdiya). According to Masûdi Muḥammad and his father were originally masters of to which now were annexed Shirvân, Mūqāniya, and even Darband (v.i. 40.). Muḥammad claimed to be a descendant of the Sasanian king Bahram Gur but we need not interpret this ambitious assertion as a break in the Mazyadid line for Masûdi's text suggests that his rivals were his uncles, and even the names of Muḥammad b. Yazïd and his descendants follow the onomastic traditions of the family. The claim of Sasanian 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 Murûj, ii, 4, that the masters of the neighbouring Sarir were also "true" descendants of Bahram Gur.

Another interesting indication is found in the list of feudatories of the Musâfirid Marzûbân emanating from the latter's minister Abul-Qâsim (344/955), and transmitted in a trustworthy text (I.H., 250, 254). In it is quoted the name of Muḥammad b. Ahmad al-Azdî (sic) šâhib Shirvânshâh (sic). The contemporary of Abul-Qâsim could be only 10. Muḥammad b. Yazïd 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-Azdî (instead of al-Shaybânî) may be an auditive slip for al-Yazidi which latter would eventually indicate that the ruler was one of the banû Yazïd b. Mazyad.

RULERS OF *LYZÄN AND THEIR FIEF. One detail must particularly attract our attention. Masûdi, Murûj, ii, 6, affirms that originally Muḥammad b. Yazïd and his father\(^1\) were rulers of (variants: \(\text{الیران} \text{لایران}, \&c.).

\(^1\) Ibid., 69, more decidedly: \text{huwa wa man salafahu min 'āba'ihi}, i.e., his ancestors, but perhaps on his mother's side!
This geographical name has been studied in detail by Marquart, Eränšahr, 119, who finally adopted the reading *Erän-shäh and thought that the bearers of this title were the princes of the Arrän proper, i.e. the region between the Kur and Araxes. Marquart's principal argument seems to be that the passage of the Murūj, ii, 5, suggests for the land of “Lāyrān” a position between Shirvān and al-Mūqāniya. However, the Murūj, ii, 68–9, distinctly states that the Mūqāniya in question lay in the immediate neighbourhood of Qabala and was different from the Mūqāniya situated on the shore of the Caspian, see Minorsky, Mukān in EI. Of great importance for the location of Lāyrān is the passage of Išt., 193 a (Lyrán, Lyzan), translated above under 34. If our interpretation of it is right, “Lýrān” must have lain above Qabala on the southern slope of the Caucasus range, somewhere to the west of Shamākh. 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 (dūna) of M.sq.t (§ 50, 3.) lies the town of al-Shābārān, small, fortified, and possessing numerous rustāqs. Above it is the rustāq of jābul and beyond it (warā’ dhālika) the villages of Jābul, v.s. 31. Sūq al-Jābul? and Shirvān down to the frontier of Bākūh, D.rnyq (?), al-Lakz, and the confluence of the two rivers [Kur and Araxes?]. Then al-Lýrān 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 Muhammad b. Yazīd, or one of his descendants. Our text completes Mas’ūdi very essentially. The name of Lyzān-shäh’s celebrated stronghold, mis-spelt in the Murūj, ii, 69: تار, appears in our text in the perfectly correct form of ت، Niyāl which is the name of the mountain (6,566 feet high) which separates our 37. Kurdivān (in the south) from Lāhīj (in the north). We may then assume with a great degree of probability that the second fortress mentioned in the same neighbourhood is no other than Sulūṭ (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” (Tārikh-i Aminī, Bib. Nat. Paris, fonds persan 101, fol. 134v, in fine). These two fortresses undoubtedly marked the original centre of the Lyzān-shäh’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 Lāhîj 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 Lāhîj. The Niyāl mountain, our firm point, overhangs Lāhîj from the south.

*Lyzän, “al-Abkhāz”, Lāhîj.* Though the name لزان has numerous variants (see their list in Marquart, *o.c.*, 119), the majority of MSS. indicate an initial *L*; the dot over ی is also sufficiently attested and generally speaking there are more cases of ی being mis-spelt as ی 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 *Layzän is preferable to *Lizän or Lëzân.

Not only geographically is *Layzän to be placed near the present-day Lāhîj, 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 -زی, -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. Lāhîj, 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 Layzän. Iṣṭ., 187, enumerates the localities of Arrān in the following order: . . . “al-Shammākhiya, Shirvān, al-Abhhāz, al-Shäbarān, Qabala, Shakkï, &c.”, and further, 192 (= Maq., 381) in the description of the route from Bārdha’a to Bāb al-abwāb (v.s. 35.), places al-Abkhāz between Shirvān (*i.e.* Shäbarān ?) and the bridge on the Samūr river, undoubtedly in the region of Qubba, see Minorsky, *Kubba in EI*, and A. Z. Validi, *o.c.*, 39. The form of the ابن‌ها 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 ابن‌ها *Lāyijān, Lāyijān.* [In the additional note, *ibid.*, 508, he less happily connected the variant ابن‌ها with Balādhuri’s (p. 197) بَنْهِ بَكْحِ.] The inhabitants of the Lāhîj valley are at present called Tät, this Turkish term (cf. Kāshghari, i, 378, ii, 227) applying in general to sedentary, particularly Iranian, populations, see Minorsky, *Tät in EI*. They are undoubtedly of Iranian origin and the dialect they speak (Tätî) 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 topographic importance of these suffixes of origin. B. V. Miller, *o.c.*, p. 35, confirms the existence of this suffix (-یس, -یس, -یف) in the Tätî dialects.

2 The name is known only in Russian transcription of which the original must be لاهیج, but the form لاهیج is also possible.

3 Shirvān and Shäbarān 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 Lâhïj sub-dialect slightly differs from the rest of the Täti group\(^1\) suggests that its speakers have been secluded in their valley for a consider-
able period, very probably since the times of the *Layzân-shâhs. The "small" area of *Layzân (v.s., 193 a) could hardly account for *Layzân-
shâh's prodigious career had he not some supporters elsewhere. The fact
is that the Qubba district is another considerable centre of the Iranian Täts 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 Arrän territory most probably date back to the Säsänian epoch when the deliberate policy of the kings was to settle in the sub-Caucasian region a faithful population of frontier guards.\(^2\) These ethnological and historical considerations make it probable that the master of *Layzân 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, *laïjan* and *layjan*, are also related. The former is attested in the ninth-century authors (Balâdhurî, 196, I.Kh., 124); the latter is found only in the tenth-century geographers (Ist., I.H., Maq.). The term Layzân in the tenth century (I. Faqîh [in Yäqüt], Mas'ûdî, Ist.) seems to survive only as a traditional title.\(^3\)

The difference of the terms *Lay-z* and Lây-j (or Lây-îj) is then reduced merely to that of the vocalic length (resp. a/â) and even in this regard we possess an intermediate variant in Mas'ûdî's *Lâyizân* or Lâyzân. We may also remember such parallel forms as Arabic *âtrîjan* and Persian *âtrîjân* now (the two latter with a long â after ã). The earlier Arab writers often used ٌ with *imâla* to render Persian ë (v.s. 35. for *Bardêj*) and to them their short a appeared probably more adequate for rendering the special timbre of the Persian ã. The existence in Arabic of


\(^2\) Mas'ûdî, *Murûj*, ii, 2. Balâdhurî, 194-5, 197, and I. Faqîh, 288, 291, call them *sâssîjan* &c., cf. Marquart, *Erân-shâhr*, 120. In his *Aêina in Festschrift Szînnyei*, Ungar. Bibliothek, xiii, 1927, p. 83, Marquart restores the name as *spâssîgan* "Diensteute". In his *Kulturamlékten in Ungar. Jahrbücher*, ix/1, 1929, pp. 71 and 78, he suggests that the "Tätî" speaking Jews of Daghestan are descendants of the former camp-followers of the spâssîgan. [In *BSOS*, viii/2, 1936, p. 616, J. H. Kramers quotes some forms in the MSS. suggesting the reading *niâstag* "the settled ones, settlers".]

\(^3\) I.H., 250, after the Shirvân-shâh mentions a king of *laïjan* الابن الإخاز ـ "possessing a kingdom which adjoins some of the Qabq mountains, and his districts (nawâbih) are known under the name of al-Abkhâzshâh (sic)". However, in the enumeration of Marzubân's feudatories, *ibid.*, 254, this king does not appear, and I strongly suspect that this *malîk al-Abkhâz* is no other than the who on p. 254 appears only in his new avatar of Shirvân-shâh! If so, the very confusion of the laïjan *laïjan* الابن الإخاز and the *laïjan* الابن الإخاز 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 (Lāyiz) 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 Lāhījān but the oldest attested form of it is *Lāfījān (v.s., § 32, 25.) [cf. Ptolemy, vi, 2: Nīfauvdā>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>Lāyījān (or jljJ) proceeded more rapidly.1 The evidence in favour of the Lāhīj tradition would be considerably corroborated if it were possible to prove that the name of the Nīyāl mountain is also to be found in the Lāhījān region. In Melgunov, o.c., 203–5, Niyaku (*Niyākūh?) is a village belonging to Lāhījān; another village Liyālāsān or Liyārāstān is mentioned on the road Lāhījān–Langarūd (Liyl <*Niyāl?). The Caucasian Lāhīj would not be the only colony of Lāhījān, for south-west of the Urmia 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, Lāhīdjān in EI. See Map x.

Incidentally it is interesting to confront the Lāhīj tradition with the possible meaning of the name Shīrvān. In the latter -vān may be a suffix similar to that of the neighbouring Kurdivān (also v.s., p. 335).2 The remaining element Shīr/Shir is reminiscent of the name of another Caspian locality Shīrīz (<Shīr-ūz) in Tabaristān, Tabarī, i, 2658, which in later times was called *Shīrīz (<*Shīr-īzān), Zahīr al-dīn, p. 291, cf. Marquart, ZDMG, xlix, pp. 650–4.3 Such an interpretation would suggest that the two groups of the Mazyadīd 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'īj which corresponds to the Lāhījān stage of the name. Russian maps spell it Ландж, differently from Lāhīj (Lanço; B. V. Miller: Лачиан). However, La'īj may be due to the Georgian pronunciation in which h 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 Shīriyān-shāh = Shīrvān-shāh?

3 Cf. also ibid., 660, the personal name شریان شاه of one of the ancestors of the Daylamite Buyids. [Shīrīz (Shīrūd-hāzār) is definitely substituted by Zahīr al-dīn, 291, to Tabarī's, iii, 1884, al-Shīrīz. Both Tabarī, iii, 1015, and Yāqūt, iii, 275, reckon Shīrīz to Daylam. The river Shirīz flows to the Caspian in Tunikābūn, the district intermediary between Gilān and Māzandarān, see Stahl's map in Pirmann's Mitt., 1927, Heft 7, Tafel 13. On the other hand some Shīrīz is often coupled with Lārīz which presumably lay much farther east, Marquart, Ērnāsahr, 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.Ḥ.Š.-SHĀḤ. As regards the third title of our king, Barthold has already recognized its connexion with خرمان 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 Ist., 193a (quoted above) and Mas‘ūdī, Murūj, ii, 510. Our author under 37. explains that Kh.ḥ.š. (Kḥursān?) lies between Darband and Shirvān near the mountain Qabq. If it is true that the people of *Layzan 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 Lāhīj and Qubba. The Lakz are also named under § 50, 3.

40. The description of Darband is extremely brief and poor in comparison with Ist., 184. According to Mas‘ūdī, Murūj, ii, 5, Muḥammad b. Yazīd of Shirvān seized Bāb al-abwāb after the death of his son-in-law (or father-in-law شهر) *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 Bākū shows the antiquity of the present-day form. Ist., 190, writes Bākū. The Persian form Bādkūba is a late popular etymology “wind-beaten”. The Daylamites used naphtha for military purposes; cf. Ibn Miskawaiḥi, 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 Ṣanʿa’ 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 Varač’an are called Zirdkīn-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 Zirdkīn is of Iranian origin (sīr “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 Ḥ. 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 *Khaulân must be read instead of *J ailân (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). Naswa 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 Naswa (var. Naswāy, Ḥ., 26g) situated at some 150 km. to the south-west of Masqat on the southern slope of the 'Omān range. Its only title to distinction is that it was an important Khārijite centre. Another Nazwa is shown on the eastern side of the Cape Qatar (but the dual of Naswa would be Nazwān). Among the Arab tribes is a puzzle unless it stands for Ḍālián.

The enumeration, as usual mechanical and erratic, begins with the two sacred towns to which Tā‘if 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 Yāqūt, iv, 279. The circuit “round the stone” seems to be a wrong translation of ḥijr (an enclosure adjoining the Ka‘ba), which the author must have misread into ḥajar (“stone”). I.Kh. precisely evaluates the circuit of the ḥijr (daur al-ḥijr) at 50 cubits, whereas Maq. assigns to it only 25 cubits. The meaning of the last of the measurements quoted becomes clear in the light of I.Kh. and Maq., who at this place give the length of the circumambulation of the Ka‘ba (dhar‘ al-ṭawāf), viz. 107 cubits. The “150 cubits” standing in our text must be the scribe’s error provoked by the “50 cubits” mentioned immediately before it. The corrected text ought to run thus: *va as girād-i *ḥijr 50 arash va *darāzā-yi ṭawāf *107 arash.

6. Sa’da. Hamdānī, 67, only says that before Islam it was called Jumā‘ and in the days of old (fī qadīm al-dahr) possessed a castle with plastered walls (qasr mashīd). I.Kh., 136, speaks of the tanneries in Sa’da.

7. evidently stands for the important district of which Hamdānī, 109, also places “between Ṣan‘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 ḍāli. Maq., 87, says “al-Ḥimyarī is the town (balad) of Qaḥṭān between Zabid and Ṣan‘ā‘”. Ḥ., 26 (= I.H.) 33, mentions the Ḥimyar tribe only in Saba‘ and Ḥadramūt.

8. Ṣan‘a‘. The detail on the crops stands practically as in I.R., 109, and more remotely reminds one of Hamdānī, 199. As regards the antiquity of the town Hamdānī, 55, says that it is the most ancient of the towns (aqdam mudun al-arḍ) having been built by Noah’s son Shem.


Iṣṭ., 2612, confirms that monkeys are very numerous in Yemen: they gather in masses and obey their chief as the bees obey their queen. Cf. W. Schmidt, *Das südwestliche Arabien*, 1913, p. 49, who says: “Gelegentlich trifft man ... Paviane.”


17. I.Kh., 148. The town of ‘Aththar is Baysh, Ḥamdānī, 120, Maq., 70, 86.

18. Mahjara, I.Kh., 135, Ḥamdānī, 186, Maq., 111. According to Qudāma, 189, between Sharūm-Ḥaḥ and Mahjara stood a tree forming the frontier between Yemen and Ḥijāz.


21. On this famous centre of the Sabaeans and Ḥimyarites cf. Tkatsch in EL. ‘Uqāb is mentioned on the road from Ṣan‘ā’ 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.* Bayhān, “a long valley with fields and palms”, which Ibn Mujāwir, *ibid.*, 142, mentions on the road from Ḏādīn to Shibām at 7 farsakhs from Dāthīn, I.Kh., 138. On *Bayhān* see Landberg, *Arabica*, Leiden, 1898, v, 4. مغت looks like which I.Kh., 142 mentions under the mikhlāfs of Ṣan‘ā’.


23. ‘Ommān spelt with the usual mistake ‘Ommān.

24. Sharja is here evidently the place on the western side of the cape Musandam (*Sharja ibn al-Khattāb*) and not the dependency of Zabīd, Maq., 53 and 92.


27. Fayd, belonging to the Ṭayy territory, Iṣṭ., 20, lies half-way between Qādisiya and Mekka, Maq., 251, cf. § 5, 16.


29. Fur’, a district of Medina lying at 4 days’ distance to the south of it, I.Kh., 129, Iṣṭ., 18.

30. All situated on the Tabūk road, Maq., 250: Tabūk–Taimā’–Wādī.

§ 38. Syria


The elements of this chapter are mostly borrowed from Išt. 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 Jazîra; 6.–11. are situated in the basin of the Jayhän; 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 Jazîra (§ 34, 16.).

2. The river of Sanja according to Le Strange, The lands, 124, is Bölamsu, one of the sources of the Kakhtā river, which empties into the Euphrates south-east of Malatya. On the bridge see Išt., 62.

3. The bridge-head mentioned under Jazîra 16. lay east of Manbij.

4. The two places are united arbitrarily. Ḥiṣn-Mansûr is now called Adī-yaman. Qūrus, Išt., 65 and 67, lay much more to the south at 2 marhālas from Manbij and at 1 day's distance from Aleppo.


14. The detail about the Byzantine sanctuaries is not found either in Išt. or in I.H. Cf. also Le Strange, Palestine, 404.

15. This enumeration of maritime towns seems to follow a map. صحة (?) which is not found in Išt. and I.H., seems to correspond to 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 Išt., 61, 65.

18. Ayla corresponds to the Elath of the Jews and the Aelana of the Romans, now al-'Aqaba, see Nallino in Battâni, ii, 17. See now a very complete study by Ph. Schertl, Ela-'Aḥaba in Orientalia Christ. periodica, ii/1, 1936, pp. 33–77.

21. So in some MSS. of 1st., BGA, iv, 386, and I.H., 118 m, but in Maq. Ma'arra Qinnasrîn. This place is to be distinguished from Ma'arra Nu'mân lying some 50 Km. south of it, see Honigmann in EI.

23. A slight development of 1st., 61. I.H., 117, instead of the nice looks (jamâl) of the inhabitants speaks of their vices (khabâl). The details about the reptiles seems to be a lapsus, as 1st. (and still more vigorously I.H.) deny their existence in Êims.

24. Kafr-Ṭāb not in 1st. or I.H. but in Maq., 54.

26. Maq., 181, among the produce of Damascus mentions ṣufriyât, which means “copper vases”, BGA, iv, 281, but the variant gives ṁsfryât (?), of which turanj (?)-i zard may be a tentative rendering.

27. Raqqa, already mentioned under Jazîra 9.


29. Adruh, north of Mu'ān (Ma'ān), see Le Strange's map in Palestine, and Lammens, Adroh in EI.

40.-42. 1st., 56, distinguishes between Zughar, Diyâr-qaum-Lūṭ, and Jībāl al-shurāt (cf. Le Strange, Palestine, 28). Zughar, as shown by Le Strange, lay near the south-eastern bank of the Dead Sea. 1st., 58, 66, counts from Rihâ (Jericho) to Zughar 2 days, and from Zughar to Jibâl al-shurât 1 day. Maq., himself a native of Jerusalem, instead of Zughar writes Ŝughar, thereby following still closer the Hebrew name Ṣo'ar (Tso'ar) “smallness”, Gen. 19, 22, Zoar. The Jibâl al-shurât are evidently the highlands (Edom) east of the Diyâr-qaum-Lūṭ. Balkâ' is the locality around 'Ammân in Transjordania, 1st., 65, cf. F. Buhl, Balkâ’, 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 Fâṭimids 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-Ša‘îd).

1. Of the long description in 1st. only the detail about Shâfi’î’s tomb (1st., 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 دَبْقُ (vocalized: Dabqu) or Dabqû, see Maq., 54, 193, but the place is better known as Dabiq, from which the celebrated textiles came. See Becker, Dabîḵ, in EI.


5. The lake of Alexandria is that of Maryūṭ and not of Tinnîs. 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 "Baṭlîmiyûs al-Qâlûdî al-malîk" (sic) and quotes an inscription written in musnad, of which the text is: بِنَيَّنَا فِي مَلِكِهِمَا فَانَّ الْهَدْمِ أَيْمَرَ بِالنَّارِ cf. also I. Faqîh, 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’āum; Išt, 154, and I.H., 106, quite briefly remark that off Būṣîr and Fustṭāt the crocodiles do no harm.

9. For Bulaynā Išt., 53 i, 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-Bakrî, 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-Bakrî, o.c., pp. 28–9, and E. Banse, Fazzān, in EI. Išt., 47, Maq., 246, without any detail evaluate the distance from Qayruwān to Zawīla as one month, while I.H., 66, counts from Zawīla to Ajdabiya 2 months, and from Ajdabiya to Fazzān 15 marḥalas. Cf. note to § 60, 1.


7. Qalsānda 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: Ist., 38, Maxghannâ, and 37 d, R.'by. Maq., 217, 228, Zaghnâya, some MSS. Ra'nâya, &c.

12. "Like Tanas", probably in that it lies on the coast.


15. Ist., 38, also says that Basra lies opposite (bi-ḥidhâ') Gibraltar and in a variant, 39 a, the form Busaira is also given. However, Basra was an island town, cf. Yver, Basra in El, and I.H., 55, gives a correct description of it.


17. Cf. Ist., 39, where Tanja is described as a great province (kūra) and Fâs said to be still in the possession of the (Fāṭimid) Idrîsids, but in our author's times the Spanish Omayyads were masters at Fâs (from A.D. 973).

18. The details about gold and panther-skins are not in Ist., I.H., or Maq., but Jâhiz in his interesting treatise on the different classes of merchandise, Tabâṣṣur bil-tijâra, published by Hasan Husnî 'Abd al-Wahhâb al-Tunîsî, Damascus, 1351/1932, p. 21, mentions among the produce of the Berber country and Maghrib: “panthers, qarāz ('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 dinârs.

§ 41. Spain


This chapter is entirely based on Ist. and bears no trace of borrowings from I.H.'s additions. Additional details on Spain are found under § 5, 25.–26. and § 6., 67. On the northern neighbours of Spain see § 42, 19. and 21.

1.–2. the two greatest cities; 3., 4. Tudela, Lerida, Saragossa, Shantabriya in the north-eastern part of Spain; 4.–8. starting with Écija in the south the author, without much system, enumerates the inland towns, moving west, then north, and finally east. 9.–14. southern coast from east to west (all on one route in Ist., 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, Ist., 44. Tudela not mentioned in I.H.

4. Birûnî, Canon: "Lârida on the Gh.lj.sk frontier (thaghr)." Shantabriya (?), mentioned in the neighbourhood of the eastern watershed of Spain (§ 5, 25.), corresponds to Shantabriya where Ist., 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., Rayû) is the present province of Málag, cf. Seybold, Archidona, in EI. Saavedra, 23, interprets the name as “regia, or regium” and compares it with the Phoenician name of Málag, Malkhā. Isinja, so too in Iṣṭ. 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 Ghalijaskush and Ifranja see under Rüm (§ 42, 20.).

11. Iṣṭ., 42 (cf. also 45), among the produce of Málag mentions السفن الذى تنخذ منه ماطبع السرف. 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 Shantarin is the only place in the Mediterranean and Atlantic where amber is found. The town Shantarin (Santarem) lies a considerable distance up the river Tagus (§ 6, 67.). Consequently the expression ākhirīn shahrī-st az huṣud-i Andalus bar karān-i daryā must refer to the province of Santarem. Iṣṭ., 47, reckons from Beja to Shantarin 12 days “and to the extreme limit of the Shantarin province (aqṣā 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 Yaqūt); Mas‘ūdī, Tanbīh, 176–89; Iṣṭ., 8, 45 (Kharshana), 68–71; I.H., 128–37 (an interesting and independent report based chiefly on Abul-Hasan Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Wahhāb al-Tadmūrī); Maq., 147–8, 150; Yaqūt, 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; Idrīsī, ii, 209–304 sq. Constantine Porphyrogenitus, De thematibus, ed. Becker, Bonn, 1840 (cf. idem, De administrando imperio: additional remarks on Charsianon, ΛνκανΒού, &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. Themenver-

1 I have also used the commented Russian translation by G. Laskin, Moscow 1899.
Byzantine Empire

§ 42


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-Jārnī and Hārūn b. Yaḥyā. On the former we possess a notice in Mas’ūdī’s *Tanbih*, 190, according to which he lived on the Arabo-Byzantine frontier (*thughūr*) and wrote “on the history of the Byzantines and their kings and dignitaries, on their land and its roads and routes, the times (favourable) for the raids into their territory, the campaigns therein, on the neighbouring kingdoms of the Burjān, Abar, Burghar, Saqāliba, and Khazar”. Mas’ūdī also gives the exact date (231/845–6) at which Muslim was redeemed from Byzantine captivity. I.Kh. *expressis verbis* quotes Muslim as his source.

Much less is known of Hārūn who also was a prisoner of war and taken from ‘Asqalān (§ 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 *H.-Ä.* 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 Saqlāb 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. Yaḥyā’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 بر الرور 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 Hārūn’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)¹ for which no similar systematic descriptions in Greek are available.

I.Kh., 105, quotes 3 themes in Europe and 11 in Asia (τα περατικα θεματα) 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. Buccellarion</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. Armeniacon</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 enumeration² 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>Taylā</td>
<td>Ṭāflā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarqasîs</td>
<td>Tarqasîs</td>
<td>Tarqasîs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ubfīmāt</td>
<td>Ubfīmāt</td>
<td>Ubfī-māṭī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nāţliq</td>
<td>Nāţliq</td>
<td>Nāţulūs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afakhunîya</td>
<td>Afaghunîya</td>
<td>Aflajûnîya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kharshana</td>
<td>Kharshana</td>
<td>Kharsiyûn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khâldiya</td>
<td>Khâldiya</td>
<td>Khâldiya</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The name 1. Täblän (numerous variants in different sources: طبلان) has been explained by de Goeje (I.Kh., 105, note i) as Τάφραι (Τάφρος). Suidas, Lexicon, ed. 1853, p. 1053: τάφρος· το περὶ το τείχος δρυμα· και τάφρη ... παρ 'Ηροδότω. Consequently the popular name would refer to the Great Wall (το μακρον τείχος, I. Faqih in Yäqût, ii, 863) or rather to the moat (δρυμα) round it. Gelzer, o.c., 86, accepts the interpretation "Θέμα τής τάφρου, or τού τείχους" and compares it with the terms Ἡ Αστική 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 *Tälàyä, whereas the better attested forms are *Täflä, Täblän.

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. Ἄνατολικόν; b. Ἀρμενιακόν; c. τῶν Θρακησίων; d. Ὀφίκιον; e. Οπτίματον; f. Βοικελλαρίων; g. Παφλαγόνων; h. Χαλβία; i. Μεσοποταμία; k. Κολωνείας; l. Σεβαστείας; m. Λυκανδού; n. Σελεύκειας; o. Καμπαρακτά. § 42

Constantine Porphyrogenitus does not separately mention our 11. and 12. He speaks of Cappadocia under Armeniacon and adds that Χαρσιανόν 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'ūdî, Tanbih, going his own way, mentions 5 provinces in Europe (inclusive of Salonika and Peloponnesus) but only 9 in Asia, viz. our 8., 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 Qudäma, 258 (<Muslim) the number varied from 15,000 (in Nätliq) to 4,000 (Kharshana, Cappadocia, Khalidia). 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 Grus-in. The element -z (-j) is a suffix of origin, see Marquart, ZDMG, 49, p. 664; cf. also § 36, 36.: Laysän and § 50, 3.: *Lakz. The older form of Gur-z is attested in Armenian Vir-k', pointing to Middle Persian *Vr-kän. The earlier Arabic transcription is جرمان (i.e. *Gurz-ân), Balâdhuri, 202, but already Ya'qûbi, Historiae, ii, 519, gives جرمان *Gurj-ân and the later authors write جرمان *Gurj, see Ibn al-Athîr, passim, Yäqût, ii, 219. See now Markwart (Marquart), Iberer und
Hyrkanier, in Caucasica, viii, 1931, p. 78. The variation of the forms Gurz/Gurj must be due to some dialect distinctions, cf. -ns/-nj in the name of Ganja: earlier Arabic ġurj, I.Kh., 119, and later Arabic كَعْبَة, 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 Balâdhuri, p. 202 (conquest of “Armenia”), the Arab authors know nothing of Western Georgia, whereas they usually include Eastern Georgia (watered by the Kur) in Armenia, as also does our author, cf. § 36, 28. (Tiflis). The inclusion of (Western) Georgia in the Byzantine Empire, which may be explained by the fact that the Georgians belonged to the Greek Orthodox Church, is responsible for the statement (§ 49) on the Byzantine Empire being conterminous with the Sarir. Under § 5, 21. our author speaks of a Küh-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 Rüs (§ 44) who according to some earlier source lived on an island. A series of errors with regard to the whereabouts of the real Maeotis (§ 3, 8.) may have caused our author to dissociate the rare Warang from Rüs and finally to misread it into another rare name Gurz. Bîrünî is the earliest known author mentioning بحر ورنگ but he must have found it in some literary source.²

The other source of confusion may have been I.Kh., 105 (<Muslim al-Jarmî), according to whom the themes of Ṭaffā (Constantinople) and Träqiya (Thrace) bordered in the north on بحر الخور. 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 Idrîsî, ii, 396, mentions an island جزيره on the way between Taman (on the Azov Sea) and Trebizond. [Const. Porph., De adm. imp., ch. 42, mentions an island near Tamatarkha (evidently a part of the Taman peninsula) and several islands off the coast of Zixía (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 Bîrünî cf. § 10, 55., § 11, 9., § 26, 13., &c.
supposed that I.Kh.'s refered 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. On the other hand, Hārūn (I.R., 130) applies this term to the Burgundians whereas he calls the Danubian Bulghars Bulghar. 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 because they were christianized from Byzantium in A.D. 864. The qualification kāfir is rather strange. One may remember that Bakri, 4520, 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 (Bahr 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 Şaqlība; in the north, the Burjān. This quotation leaves no doubt that by the " Şaqlība 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 Salūqiya (read: Salonica) and Venice (B.nd.qis) to Rome. The text is out of order, but Marquart, Streifzüge, 237-59, has suggested a series of very ingenious corrections of it. At 3 days' distance to the west of Salonica lies Mutr.n (Marquart: *Qutron <Kīrpos); "beyond it you travel through wooded lowlands (ghiyād min al-shajar) among the Şaqlība 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., 1262a) stands first erroneously for Belgrad (v.s., § 6, 66.) but after this passage on the water conduct comes (I.R., 1262b) 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, Murūj, ii, 318, also has Salūqiya for Salonica.
houses. They are Christians; they were (gradually) converted (*kānū yatanaṣṣīrūna*) 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. Ἀσπάλαθος*).” In our text al-Ṣaqqāliba al-mutanaṣṣira, standing in the Arabic garb, without any doubt reflects Ḥārūn’s account (through Jayhānī’s medium?). According to Marquart, *ibid.*, 207, Hārūn must have drawn up his report between A.D. 880 and 890, but the text seems to indicate that the Emperor Basil I’s time (A.D. 866–86) was regarded as past; therefore we may bring Hārūn’s date down to the years 890–900. The exact date of the conversion of the Serbs cannot be established. In the years 867 and 870 Basil I subjugated the Serbs (Narentani, 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. Dvorník, *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 Hārūn’s report. If so, we may assume, contrary to Marquart, *o.c.*, 28, that in other chapters too, particularly those on the Magyars, V.n.m.d.r, and Mirvāt, our author’s source was Hārūn, who was recording the situation towards the very end of the ninth century, and not al-Jarmī, who belonged to the earlier part of that century. [This admission has a considerable importance for the history of Magyar migrations, *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 Ist., 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 (*dukhūlhum 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 Saraquṣṭa, Tuṯayla (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-Anku바르다 (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
Jacà region, south of the important pass in the Pyrenees (at present Jacà is connected by a railway tunnel with Oloron on the French side). The Jacà people were already known to the classical authors under the names of Jaccetani, Ιακκητανοί (Ptolemy, ii, ch. 5), Lacetani (Livy, xxi, 60–1). Ya‘qūbî, B.G.A., vii, 355, says that north of Saragossa lies the town of Tudela, situated towards the land of the unbelievers called Bashunas, and that to the north of Tudela lies Huesca (Washqa) situated towards a tribe of the Ifranj called (the latter name has a variant corrected in a different hand into the bātina al-jāqiya; cf. also Ibn al-‘Adhārī, ii, 302: al-ṭakēr). Ya‘qūbî’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 seímejanza 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 (variant جل السکر) “near the sea”. Cf. de Goeje, Specimen exhibens descriptionem al-Magribi sumtam e Libro Regionum al-Jaquibii, Leiden, 1860, pp. 112–13, and F. Codera, Límites probables de la conquista árabe 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. Birūnī, Canon, places Lerida over against the Gh.l.j.s.k, see § 41.4.

About 19. Rūmiya (Rome) I.Kh., 10, says that it was [in turn] the seat of 29 Roman kings (emperors). 21. Britannia is not in I.Kh., İst., or I.H., but I.R., 130 (after Hārūn b. Yaḥyā) mentions Barṭiniya (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 İst., 70: “Athīnās is the seat of learning of the Ionians (Yūnāniyūn) and there their sciences and learning are preserved”, cf. Barthold, Preface, pp. 21 and 41.

§§ 42–53. Byzantine Empire

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, Saqlāb, &c., to judge by A. Z. Validi, in Izv. Ross. Akad. Nauk, 1924, pp. 237–48; I. Rusta, 138–48 (Khazar, Burdās, Būlkār, al-Majghariya, al-Ṣaqlabiya, al-Rūsiya); I. Faḍlān, Risāla (quoted and utilized by Yaḥūt under İtil, Bāshghurd, Bulpghar, Khazar, Khwārizm, Rūs, and Wūsū); Mas‘ūdī, Murūj, ii, 1–77 (Rūs, Burghar, W.l.nd.riya, Caucasian peoples); the passage on the Slavs edited in Marquart’s Streifzüge, 97–101; Mas‘ūdī, Tanbīh (Burṭās p. 62; W.l.nd.riya pp. 180–3; Burghar, Saqāliba, Rūs, Sarīr, passim); İst., 220–7 (Khazar, al-Sarīr, Burṭās, Bulghār, Rūs, &c.); I.H., 278–87.
(Kharaz, Burtâs, Basjirt, Bulghâr); [Ibrâhim b. Wasîf-shâh], L'abrége des merveilles, tr. Carra de Vaux, 1898 (Slavs, pp. 45–6; Burjân, pp. 123–4); Maq., 360 (Itil, Rûs, Bulghâr, Suwâr, Kharaz—very brief); Gardizi, 78–126 (Bahcanâk, Kharaz, Burdâs, Bulkâr, Maqîhar, Saqîlāb [sic], Rûs, Sarîr, Alân); al-Bakrî, ed. Rosen, SPb., 1878 (Saqâlib, Bajanâkiya, Kharaz, Furdâs, Bulkâr, Majghariya, Sarîr, Burjân); 'Auffî, Jawâmi’ al-hikâyât, part iv, ch. 16, in Barthold, A new Muslim report on the Russians (in Russian), Zap., ix, 1895, 262–7; [the rest of 'Auffî’s data on the Kharaz, Burdâs, Majghariya, Saqâlibiyân are an abridgement of I. Rusta; the data on Gurj, Usłân (*al-Lân?), Sarîr, and Darband are very brief, see Br. Mus., Or. 2676, ff. 67–9]; Yaqtât, Itil, i, 112–13, Burtâs, i, 567 [this paragraph refers chiefly not to the Burtâs but to the Bulghârs], Burghar, i, 568 (after Mas’ûdi), Bulghar, i, 722–7, Bâşghhart, i, 468–70, Kharaz, ii, 436–40, Khwârîzâm, ii, 484–5, Rûs, ii, 834–40, Saqlab, iii, 405; Wisû, i, 34 and iv, 944; Ibn Iyâs, in F. Arnold, Chrestomathia Arabica, i, 73–6: Rûs, Bulghâr.

§§ 43-53
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§ 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 Kommentarii, 1903; also passim in Beiträge, 1899, and K analizu, 1908; Marquart, Streifzüge, 95-160 (Mas’ūdi on the Slavs), 188-206, 466-73 (“Jayhānī” on the Slavs) and passim; Lévi-Provençal, Şakāliba 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 Rüs 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 Rüs; the third and most complete source, which was also utilized by I.R., Gardizī, and ‘Auft 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 indepen-
the following comparison [D.—ditto; N.—absent; A.—approximate likeness].

<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 ْواپيَ near the frontier wooded plains; no vines or fields bee-hives, 10 įbriqs honey from each</td>
<td>D. and 10 days from the Majghari D. Vāntit</td>
<td>different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D. Vābnit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. each hive 50–100 mann honey; some people possess 100 khum of honey</td>
<td>A. vast wooded plains</td>
<td>A. much honey; honey-wine; wooden casks; some people prepare 100 casks of wine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A. the dead burnt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>A. vast wooded plains</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>A. vast wooded plains</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...The geographical data on the Slavs scattered in our source seem to refer to two different groups of this people. On the one hand in § 3, 6., the (A.D. 965), adding to it some details from 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 expressions in Ibrāhīm (e.g. on the women scratching their faces with knives after a death) point to the use of the literary source utilized by I. Rusta.]
Saqláb 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 Bulghāri.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 (!) 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 Saqláb.

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-Abar), and places them “north of Spain”. On the other hand, p. 124, he says that the Khazar town Khamlīj (§ 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 farthermost region of Saqlaba to the Rūm sea (Black Sea?); if eventually they “travel by the Tanīs [*Tanais = Don], river of the Saqāliba, they pass to Khamlīj” 3 روان سأروا في تئین نهر السقابالا مروآ بخليج, and finally starting from Spain they either visit Africa or “follow the road behind Rome in the Slav lands and then to Khamlīj” (خلف رومية في بلاد السقابالا ثم إلى خليج). I. Kh., 17, gives the king of the Slavs the title قنار qinnāz, i.e., κιάνβ κνέζ’ (from Germanic *kuning), common among Slav nations.

The source utilized by I. Rusta and Gardizī seems to have in view a more definite territory. The items regarding the habits and customs of the Slavs are somewhat ambiguous, but the names of the rulers and towns may serve as clues. According to Ibn Rusta, 144, the supreme chief of the Slavs bore the name of Swyyt-mlk (šyti̇-mlk) (رئيس الرؤساء سواءة ملك); the vice-regent (khalīfatu-hu) (living in the centre of the Saqālab country?)4 was called سویح or سویح سویح. [Similar forms are found in Gardizī whereas in the Ḥ.-‘Ā. only the king is

1 Burjān = Inner Bulghār = Bulghāri.
2 Ibid. the Slavs among the Rūs.
3 Though the Don and Volga are often connected in Muslim geographers, here the verb marrū 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 Ilovra 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.witàt 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 S.sùt bulk \(<\) Svetolíuk (< Svetolíukú), and *xúpanets (?) and thought that the first referred to the well-known king of Moravia proper, Svetolíuk I (870–94) whom Const. Porph., De admin. imp., cap. 40, &c., calls Σβενδοπλόκος. 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-Jarmí 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’án’e by the Khazars) Marquart himself suggests, *ibid.*, 471, the identification of the Slav king with the king of the White Croatians Béloχròbátov whose capital must have been Cracow-on-the-Vistula.\(^2\) The king’s capital (Gardizi, Ḥ.-‘Ā. خراب, خرآب, ‘Aufl, خرآب) is then restored as خرآب Khovát\(^3\) 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-Jarmí, the weak point of Marquart’s theory is that no Svetolíuk has yet been discovered in Cracow. A fact which remained unknown to Marquart is that according to the Ḥ.-‘Ā., § 6, 45., the capital of Khurdáb was situated on the Rútá 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 Rútá flowing from the Rús to the Șaqlábs, 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 Gardízi, who apparently is more faithful to the source responsible for the details on the Magyars, V.n.n.d.r, and Mirvát (§§ 22, 46, 53), suggests that the prototype of our Rútá is *Dúnā (Danube). In this case the town of *Khovát standing on the *Dúnā 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 Svetolíuk was certainly a close neighbour, if not the suzerain of the southern Croats. Const. Porph., cap. 13, says that south of the Magyars

---

\(^1\) ‘Aufl, Or. 2676, fol. 67b says: va یشان-رَآ*رَی-سَت کی یُرَآ سویت کهداند.

\(^2\) 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 Chorવعت in zweifelhaft [sic. V. M.] mit den Bélochorwaten an der Weichsel gleichzusetzen haben, so scheint es doch, dass er selbst [i.e. Constantin] sie mit den illyrischen Chorwaten zusammengeworfen hat” [sic. V. M.].

\(^3\) Chwolson, o.c., p. 142, took جراسبی for Grádist < Hradátye, the residence of Svetolíuk, cf. Šafarík, Slavische Alterthümer, ii, 501. [Very doubtful.]
(Τούρκοι) 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, I. 24 on Khurdäb is fantastic.]

Although the recent authority, F. Dvorník, Les Légendes de Constantin et de Méthode vues de Byzance, Prague, 1933, p. 240, admits that Svetopluk's conquests in Pannonia (i.e., the region between the Danube and Sava) had an ephemeral character, they may have been sufficient to create the impression that he was the supreme lord ("ra'is al-ru'asā) of the Khorvāt. Already Marquart, o.c., 470, pointed out that I.R.’s text on the relations between Suyyt-mlk and the sūbanj is out of order. The real ruler of the southern Croats was perhaps the sūbanj (*shūbāŋ?) and Chwolson’s restoration of it as *šučanets (*šučan?) if right, would tally with Const. Porph., according to whom, cap. 30, Croatian lands were divided into ζοπανίαι.\(^2\)

Very uncertain is the reading of the other Slav town. I. Rusta says that the journey from the Pechenegs to the Slavs lasted 10 days and thereupon adds that at the beginning of the Slav land (fi awā’il haddihā) stands the town راپث. In Gardïzï, راپث follows the mention of the road from the Majgharî to the Slavs (10 days’ journey). In our text راپث 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 connect this town with Kiev, the capital of the Slav Pol’anie. Marquart, Streif-züge, 189, first restored the name as Dānast but finally, ibid., 509, read it راپث Zābait, which he compared with Σαμβάτας which in Const. Porph., cap. 9, is a surname of Kiev (το κάστρον Κιοάβα το ἐπονομαζόμενον Σαμβατάς).\(^3\) Marquart’s theory is hardly contradicted by the fact that in the chapter on the Rūs (§ 45) Kiev seems to come up again under a name belonging to a different tradition (Iṣṭ. < Balkhi), 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 (εὐπα) 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 εὐπαν et εὐπα (préfet, comitat) ne sont attestés que plus tard et dans un autre sens, celui de 'fonctionnaire' et de 'service de ce fonctionnaire'."

\(^3\) The origin of the name is still a moot question. A. I. L'ashchenko, Kievi Σαμβατάς, in Dokladi Akad. SSSR, 1930, No. 4, pp. 66–72, mentions 22 different explanations of Sanwatas (Slavonic, Scandinavian, Hungarian, Armenian, Lithuanian, &c.) and inclines towards the Khazar origin of the name as suggested by Y. Brutzkus.

\(^4\) If the previous restoration of the name by Marquart as Dānast be adopted, the eastern Slav town might be sought on the Dniester, cf. Idrīsī, p. 395. دنيست. Westberg, o.c., 1908 (March), p. 22, connected *Vǎnț with the Ventič (Вентици), 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 Rüs, p. 159, the Bulghārs, and the Khazars, cf. Barthold in EI.

§ 44. The Rüs.

See bibliographic note before § 43. The translation and analysis of the
principal Muslim sources will be found in the works of Frähn, Chwolson,
Garkavi [commented translations from 26 Muslim authors on the Slavs and
Rüs; the text used mostly in older, now superseded editions]; Barthold, Zap.,
1895 (Muhammad ‘Auf); Toumansky, Zap., 1896 (the text and transla-
tion of the present chapter); Marquart, Streifzüge, 200-4, 330–53 (Mas‘ūdī).
The literature in which Muslim data on the Rüs have been utilized is
enormous, see V. A. Moshin, Var’ago-russkiy vopros in Slavia, Prague,
1931, x/i–3, pp. 109–36, 343–79, 501–37 (a digest of the more important
works on the subject), and his The origins of Rus’. The Normans in Eastern
Europe (in Russian), in Byzantinoslavica, Prague, 1931, iii/1, pp. 33–58,
iii/2, pp. 285–307. See also Prof. P. Smirnov, The Volga route (in Ukrainian),
Kiev, 1926, which particularly deals with the earlier Muslim
sources. [Seippel, v.s., p. 427, and Minorsky, Rüs in EI.]

Since the beginning of the seventeenth century the origin of the name of
Russia (Русь, Россиya) 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 (Баптът,
i.e., Varegō, Βάραγγος, Waring3 referring to the parties of Norman adven-

1 Const. Porph., cap. 31, calls the Белорусь (White Croats to whom
perhaps the name of the Carpathians Karpat is due) διπλωματος.
2 Chwolson, Izvestiya, p. 143, pointed out that in Swyut-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. Свеатдоплόκοσ.
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 ninth-century form of the name in
question was probably Sventoplīk >now Svætoplūk (my friend Dr. B. Unbe-
3 In Arabic القراح, is first attested in
Би́рні́, but cf. § 24, 15. [The late Prof.
A. A. Shakhmatov, Introduction to the
history of the Russian language (in Russian), Petrograd 1916, p. 52, 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 (vdr). 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, *Wiringerespuren 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* (*Hrœrekr*) built the town of Ladoga on the Volkhow 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 Rüs with the Slavs and traces their commercial activities between Spain and China. There is no trace in I.Kh. of a Rüs state. He calls the Don (?) “river of the Slavs”.

The common source of I. Rusta, Ḥ.-'Ā., Gardūzī, 'Auṭī, &c., most formally distinguishes the Rüs from the Slavs. The latter, primarily the

---

1 The Russian word corresponding to “all” is here an evident mistake for the homonymous *Becb*, the name of another Finnish tribe.
Western Slavs, are represented as living under their own princes (cf. § 43), whereas the Rüs are described as occupying a damp island which has an area of 3 days by 3 days and lies amid a lake. These data point to the northern lands and seem to refer to the times before the foundation of the Kiev state, but it is characteristic that in spite of the modest size of the territory the king of the Rüs is given the pompous title of Khâqân Rüs and that according to Gardïzï 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 Balkhi tradition (Išt., I.H.) knows very little about the [Western] Slavs (Ṣaqāliba) between whom and the [Volga] Bulghâr it places the Rüs. Here we have evidently to do with the Kiev period of Russian history. Išt., 225-6, distinguishes three "kinds" (sinf) of Rüs. The prince of those who live nearest to the Bulghâr resides in the town of *Küyāba, i.e. probably Kiev (Const. Porph., cap. 8, Kioāba or Kuβa). The farthest distant Rüs are called S.lāwiyā, which looks very much like a parallel form of Ṣaqāliba, perhaps referring specially to the Sloveni of Novgorod among whom the Normans first settled. The third group are the arži (many variants) whose king lives in یل (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 Frähn’s Ibn Foszlan, Annex I, p. 162, the name Arthā (Arða) has been interpreted as Erz’a, which is the name of one of the two great divisions of the Mordva (§ 52). The Constantinople MS., Išt., 226 n, very definitely says that the یل (Arða, *Arthā) are [or perhaps: trade?] between the Khazar and the Great (a’zam) Bulghâr", which eventually suits the Erz’a. If the interpretation is right it indicates that there existed a Rüs centre in the Oka region. Frähn 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, Streifszüge, pp. xxxiv, 201, Westberg, o.c., 1908, iii, 25.

2 I.H., 285, adds: "and their king is in س.ل، a town of theirs." The variant ملوري might indicate the reading of ملوري as *م.ل- (?), 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 ἀνδροφάγου, v.i., § 52.

5 If the latter is the Bulghâr 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 Išt., 226х, ارزی renders رامس and فلی. Our §§ 4, 9, and 25, 13. show that arźiz means both "tin" and "lead"; qal‘ which only means "tin" may be an arbitrary addition by the translator who hesitated between the two meanings of arźiz.

7 V.s., p. 217.
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equally paid tribute to the Rūs.¹ The identification Arthā = Erz’a conflicts with Ist.’s indication concerning Kūyāba being the nearest to Bulghār, but on the other hand Arthā must have lain to the east of Ṣlāwiya 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 Gardizî appears from the following synoptic table. ['Aufl in the first part of his report closely follows the same tradition.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I.R.</th>
<th>Gardizî</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 Ist.)</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;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>newly born presented with swords</td>
<td>D.</td>
<td>Slavs among the Rūs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no villages*</td>
<td>N.</td>
<td>N.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>traders in furs</td>
<td>D.</td>
<td>N.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neatly dressed; gold bracelets</td>
<td>D.</td>
<td>furs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kind to slaves and guests</td>
<td>D.</td>
<td>woollen bonnets [linen mentioned under § 43]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>numerous towns*</td>
<td>N.</td>
<td>some of the R. practise chivalry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sulaymānian swords</td>
<td>D.</td>
<td>vast country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>united against enemies</td>
<td>D.</td>
<td>A. valuable swords</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trial by kings; duels</td>
<td>D.</td>
<td>N.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>physicians powerful</td>
<td>N.</td>
<td>N. tithe to the government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>courageous, enterprising; sailors, not horsemen</td>
<td>N.</td>
<td>A. physicians respected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trousers of 100 cubits</td>
<td>N.</td>
<td>A. warlike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>treacherous</td>
<td>N.</td>
<td>D. as in I.R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nobles buried with all belongings</td>
<td>N.</td>
<td>N. quarrelsome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 (<Ventići) lived, but originally (from the 7th to the 9th century) the lands along the Oka probably belonged to the Mordva territory. Cf. V. A. Gorodtsov, The ancient population of the R’azan’ province, in Izv. otdel. russ. yazika, 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 ܦܲܨܪ which suggested to Chwolson the identification of *Abāra with Biarmia (Perm) of the Scandinavian sagas (Anglo-Saxon Beor-mas, Old Norse Bjarmar, cf. Thomsen, o.e., 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 Ist. does not mention the two northernmost
The third source (Balkhi > Išt.) having supplied our author with the names of the three Rüs territories [shahr, “town or land”] the item on the damp “island” (I.R., Gardizi, 'Auft) 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 Gardizi’s item on the sulaymāni swords which the Rüs possess (lahum al-suyūf al-sulaymāniya = va andar miyān shamshīr-i sulaymāni farāvān bāshad). On “Solomonian swords” see the Qor’ān, xxxiv, 10–12, cf. Chwolson, o.c., 195. The detail on Ş. lãba 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 Rüs and the course of the Rüs river (§ 6, 44.). The situation of the Rüs country, as understood by our author, appears from the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Northern Lands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Şaqlab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RÜS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pecheneg Mts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Rūtā river |

which must be supplemented by the indications that the Majghari (§ 23) had the Rüs to their north and west [= NW. ?], and that the Turkish Pechenegs (§ 20) lived to the south of the river Rūthā (sic) and had the Majghari and the Rüs to their west [resp. to the west and north-west ?]. As the Pechenegs are placed north both of the *Bulghārs (§ 51) and *Burjās (§ 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 Rüs (o.s., p. 217). The Pecheneg mountains (ural ?) would then form the Rüs boundary somewhere in the region to the north-east of the Volga. The latter river itself, at least down to its junction colony of the Rüs (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 Arthā land, and its exports.

1 See § 5, 19. where a mountain (Urals) is described as stretching between the end of the Rüs and the beginning of the Kimāk. Cf. also the eventual restoration of *Abārma < Biarmia?
with the Oka, was evidently thought to flow in Rüs territory (§ 6, 44.) but the description of the “Rüs river” (upper Volga)¹ does not imply that Urtäb, Š.läba, and Küyäfa stood on its banks. The text only indicates that the river watered their “confines”. Their enumeration logically goes in the inverse order to Iṣt. who certainly wrote as if he were looking from Bulghär westward. [Urtäb 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.e., 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 Chacamus of the Rhos in A.D. 839, the mention of the Khäqän Rüs in the common source of I.R., Ḥ.-ʿĀ., and Gardïzï, and the item of our source on the Rüs river. Along the latter he disposed the three towns so that Küyäfa (?) comes to occupy the place of the future Nizhni-Novgorod at the junction of the Oka with the Volga; Š.läba, that of the later Yaroslavl, and Arthä (?) is tentatively sought between the two, perhaps in the Oka basin. This hypothesis revolutionizes the accepted views on the origins of the Great-Russian nation. Here is not the place to enter upon its consideration as a new theory, but as regards the arguments derived from our source (which the author knew through Toumansky’s excerpts) it is to be feared that no particular and decisive weight can be attributed to a text which is mainly a compilation and a rearrangement of written sources with a dangerous tendency towards artificial systematization.²

§ 45. The Inner Bulghär.


The term undoubtedly belongs to Balkhī for only the two geographers who remodelled his work mention the Bulghär al-dākhil. Iṣt., 226, writes: “the Rüs trade with the Khazars, Rüm, and Great Bulghär (Bulghär al-a’zam). They border from the north on the Rüm; their numbers are great and their might is reported to be such that they have imposed the

¹ I.Kh., 124, is evidently responsible for the indication that it flows from the Slav territory (see note to § 44).
² Among other sources Smirnov, o.e., 202-7, utilizes Idrīšī, ii, 401, who adds to Iṣt.’s data some characteristics of the three towns (Š.läva “sur le sommet d’une montagne”; Arthān “jolie ville sur une montagne escarpée”; at 4 days’ distance from the two other towns, &c.). No trust, however, can be put in these details, for which there is no authority in the earlier sources. These additions left alone, the three names of Russian towns were undoubtedly found by Idrīšī in the traditional sources and must be clearly distinguished from Idrīšī’s original data on his contemporary Rūsiya and Qumāniya, ii, 397-400. Therefore Idrīšī’s كiar Kiev may easily be another avatar of the older كیرایه. Idrīšī combines various sources of different epochs and Marquart has shown how inaccurate (“Schwindelwerk”) he is in eastern regions, cf. Eränfahr, 261-2 (India), Komanen, 102-4 (Central Asia).
kharāj on those of the Rūm and Inner Bulghār who live near to their country. The Inner Bulghār are Christians.” I.H., 286, gives a considerably different version: “the Great Bulghār border on the Rūm from the north; their numbers are great and their might is reported to be such that in the old days (qadīman) they imposed the kharāj on those of the Rūm who lived near them. As regards the Inner Bulghār there are among them Christians and Muslims.” To this I.H. adds that in his time (fi waqtinā hādhā) no trace (bāqiya) 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., 225.² 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).³ 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 hendiadyoin, refer to the Danubian Bulghars (“so weist das darauf hin, dass beide Namen bereits Wechselbegriffe geworden waren”). This interpretation⁴ 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 prihastijshikh 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 Uturgh, to the east of the Maeotis, cf. Marquart, Streifzüge, 503. In the explanation of Bulghār al-’azam Marquart, ibid., 518, hesitates between the Volga and Danube. In Russian chronicles (1236) the “Great town of Bolgar” (velikij gorod Bolgar’skij) is the town on the Volga. Similarly the Hungarian Dominican monk Julian who, in search of the Hungarian kinsmen, travelled in A.D. 1234–6 beyond the Volga calls the country of the Volga Bulghars Magna Bulgaria, see G. Fejér, Cod. diplom. Hungariae, Budapest 1829, iv/1, p. 54.

³ Marquart, Streifzüge, 503, places the Black Bulghars between the Dniepr and the Khazar lands, and further identifies them with the 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 Bulghârs lived north of the [Western] Saqâliba, or in close contact with them, cf. the indications of the present paragraph.

Our author tries to weld together the data found in Išt. and in his other source but the result of this operation cannot be trusted. The details on the Saqâliba as the western neighbours of the Inner Bulghârs and on the Russo-Bulghâr wars hail evidently from Išt., 7 and 226. The Mirvât living to the east of our Bulghâr along the Black Sea (cf. §§ 3, 6. and 46) reflect a wrong interpretation of the source which is better preserved in Gardîzî (v.s., § 22 on the basic error with regard to the Majgharî territory).

To sum up: our chapter is worth only as much as is due to Išt. 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 Bulghâr with the Danubian Bulghars. Our author must have taken the different names found in his sources for four distinct peoples:

I.Kh. Burjän (§ 42, 16.)
I. Rusta Bulghari (§ 42, 18.)
Išt. Inner Bulghâr (§ 45)
source common with Gardîzî V.n.nd.r (§ 53) (?)

§ 46. The Mirvât.


This chapter ought to come logically after § 53. Our author’s geographical indications can be resumed in the following schemes:

but all the tentatives to disclose the identity of the Mirvât from this internal evidence have lamentably failed.¹ The solution came from another side.

¹ I have been trying successively to identify the Mirvât with the Magyars expelled by the Pechenegs from their Azov seats (cf. § 47), with the Crimean Goths, and with Mopôla mentioned by Const. Porph., v.s., notes to § 20.
The only sure parallel of our Mirvät (so vocalized) is Gardïzï’s M.rdät.

The discovery of our author’s basic mistake with regard to the Majghari territory (see notes to § 22) has shown the futility of the attempts of reconciling the views resulting from this erroneous conception with Gardïzï’s passage which follows the tenor of the original report without trying to fit it into an imaginary scheme of “frontiers” (hudūd).

Assuming that Gardïzï describes the Atelkuzu stage of Magyar migrations we have further identified the N.nd.r/v.n.nd.r with the Onoghundur-Bulghars living beyond the Dübä/Rütä, i.e. Danube, or perhaps Sereth (§ 53), and we shall now proceed one stage farther along the same road suggesting that the M.rdät/Mirvät must be the “Moravians”.

Const. Porph., De adm in 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 (ή μεγάλη Μοραβία) and settled in the land “in which they are still living”. In ch. 40, p. 173, the mention of Σέρμιον (situated at 2 days’ distance from Belgrade at the estuary of a river), is accompanied by the note that beyond it (άττο των εκείος) lies “the Great Unbaptized Moravia which the Magyars (Τούρκοι) destroyed and over which previously ruled Sventopluk (Σφενδοπλόκος)”. 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.”

Gardïzï’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 *, to which Gardïzï strikingly resembles. The distance of 10 days which according to Gardïzï separated the N.nd.r from the M.rdät is also acceptable if we consider the difficulty of communication across the Carpathians.

The name (var. *Moravia Morao) is indeed found in Mas‘ūdî’s report on the Slavs, Murüj, iii, 61-5, where it is associated with *Khurvät-in (Northern Croats? v.s., § 42) and *Sakh-in (Czechs?). As Mas‘ūdî 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 (Τούρκοι = Magyars) in the neighbourhood of the kingdom of *al-Firagh (Prague).

1 Sirmia (Sryem) lies north of the Sava and upstream from Belgrade.

2 A transposition of ٓ and َ in Arabic script is extremely frequent, and for the substitution in Persian of a َ for the final ِ, we have an example in جل for جن 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 Prëslav (at 4 hours’ distance to the west of Shumen).

4 The text was first edited and explained by Charmoy, in Mem. Acad. SPb., ii, 1834, pp. 297-408, and in the last place by Marquart, Streifzüge, pp. 95-160.

5 In Mas‘ūdî’s Tambih, 67, the “Slavonic Nâmj-in and Murâwa” are mentioned on the river called *Dunabawa-M.lawa. Mas‘ūdî 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: Majghari–V.n.nd.r–Mirvät from north to south, so that the Mirvät, 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 (e.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 Gardizî’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 Mirvät are made to border on the “Inner Bulghärs”, 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 Gardizî says that the Christian Mirvät 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‘ūdi’s report and that of Ibrāhīm 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 Mirvät knew Arabic and were tent-dwellers. These may be merely personal deductions from the fact that the Mirvät dressed like “Arabs”.

The confusion in our source is blatant and we are obliged to go in the first place by Gardizî’s less sophisticated parallel text. It could be objected that the identification of Mirvät with Moravia conflicts with the description of the Saqāliba (§ 43), subjects of the same Sventopluk. We must, however, admit that the source on the Saqāliba has been utilized by I. Rusta, the H.-Ă., and Gardizî, whereas the combination of V.n.nd.r and Mirvät is known only to the H.-Ă. and Gardizî 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 (= ḥ meyday  Moraβla) could easily be disconnected from its famous ruler, associated in the other source with the Saqāliba.

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.

§ 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 Balkhî > İst. tradition (cf. notes to § 20 where İst., 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.

İst. 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 Khazarian Pechenegs from the Khazars. In the south the Khazarian Pechenegs bordered on the Alân (cf. § 48) and in Mas’ûdi’s account of the *W.l.nîd.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 Khazarian Pechenegs is due to some wrong idea about the configuration of the north-eastern corner of the Black Sea. To the north (and partly to the west, cf. p. 440) the Mirvât are named as the neighbours of the Khazarian Pechenegs, but here we are certainly on a purely imaginary ground for between the Azov sea and the Danube our author tries to drive in, as a wedge, the Mirvât whose name he found in his special source [or passage] unknown to I.Kh., I. Rusta, or İst. The latter author, v.s. p. 314, 1. 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 embroiled account of the *W.l.nîd.rî* hordes operating against the Byzantine empire. But the above-mentioned particular source, common to the Ḥ.-‘Ā. 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. Porphyr. quoted in the notes to § 20.
² Cf. § 5, 18. where miyân-i nāhiyat-i *Bachanâk-i Khazarî* biburadh, to suit § 47, ought to read: miyân-i *Bachanâk-i Khazarî [va Khasar]* 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.d.r and Mirvät arranged the bearers of them from north to south, so that the Mirvät 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 ‘Auffi’s text published by Barthold, *Turkestan*, i, 99, and Marquart, *Komanen*, 40, is of great interest. ‘Auffi (thirteenth century) writes that the arrival of the Q.ri (Qün? v.s., notes to §§ 14, i. and 21) in the Sârî land made the inhabitants of the latter move into the land of the Türkmâns [= Ghuz] with the result that the Ghuz [= Türkman] 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 ‘Auffi has in view the migration of the tribes in the eleventh century when the Qipchaq (see notes to § 21) drove the Ghüz out of their steppes. For a short time the supremacy in the southern Russian steppes passed to the Ghüz. Russian chronicles under A.D. 968 register the first incursion of the Pechenegs into Russian lands. In their turn the Pechenegs must have been considerably weakened by A.D. 1036 when Yaroslav of Kiev defeated them.

§ 48. The Alân.


¹ The term (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 [?]. As regards the Caucasus Charpentier, p. 363, considers the Ossets as an independent branch of the great Alani people.1

§§ 48 and 49 ought to come logically after § 36 (Shirvān).

The Iranian Alāns, later called Ās (cf. § 50, 4. Tilās) were the ancestors of the present-day Ossets (from Georgian Ovs-et'í-<Ās). All the bearings of the frontiers in this paragraph must be rectified by 90° (e.g., instead of east read: north; instead of west read: south). The item on the Alāns bordering in the west (*south) on the Rūm is explained by the fact that the Georgians (Gurz) are described under the Byzantine Empire (§ 42, 15).

[Additional note. In the Armenian Geography composed towards the eighth century (?) the westernmost Alans are called Ashtigor. The name, most probably, is an Armenian rendering of *As-Digor. Digor (further appearing in the same Geography as Dik'or) is the name of the present-day western Ossets, cf. Marquart, Streifzüge, 170. Ash as an original form is hardly possible there being no ŭ in Osset (at least in the present-day dialects) and the appearance of this foreign sound must account for the surd t of Tigor (instead of *Digor).2 The restoration *Ās can be supported by the fact that nowadays the Ossets call their western neighbours the Balqar Turks Asiag and their territory Asi3 having, evidently transferred to them the name of their own tribe which formerly occupied the region near the Elburz.4 Some temporary elevation of this particular branch may account for the generalization in Muslim literature of the Mongol epoch (thirteenth century) of the term Ās, instead of the older Alān. However, the Mongol dominion, under which many Ās were carried away as far as China must have dealt a fatal blow to the western Ossets. Probably at that time (?) the region near the Elbrus (i.e. the valleys along the westernmost sources of the Terek and the easternmost sources of the Kuban), was occupied by the Turks now respectively called Balqar and Qara-chay.

According to I.R., 148, the noblest (ashraf) of the four Alān tribes, the one to which the king belonged, was called دخاس *D.khs-Ās.5 The *Tuwal-Ās mentioned in our § 50, 4. may be another ramification of the Ās. As the Tuwal-Ās are coupled together with the Abkhaz their notoriety may be due to their holding some important pass (e.g. the Klukhor connecting the Qara-chay territory with Abkhazia). At present Twal-tā is the name of the Ossets living on the southern slope of the Caucasian range but they may have been pushed south-eastwards by some wave of Turkish invasion.]

1 All this is rather obscure.
2 That the Osset ŭ sounded to a foreign ear like ŭ is shown by such names on the Turkish (former Osset) territory as Ashtotur < Oss. Was-Totur "Saint Theodore", Miller, Oset. Et'udī, iii, 8.
3 Miller, o.c., iii, 6–7.
4 Const. Porph., De cerimoniiis, ii, 48, speaks separately of the ἐξουσιοκράτωρ 'Alavias and the ἀρχοντας 'Alias (in whose land the Κασπείαι πόλαι = Darial are situated). This 'Alía may possibly refer to the Ās?
5 Perhaps Ῥὔκης-Ās, cf. Rox-alani?
1. Käsak (as in Masʿūdi, Tanbih, 184) but Murūj, ii, 45, corresponds to Byzantine Kaosaxla, old Russian KacorH, 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 Käsak 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 Gardizī and here again, as in the account of Lyzan (§ 36, 36.) we find in the H.-ʿĀ. some common traits with Masʿūdi.

2. Khaylān (?) is otherwise unknown, unless it is a repetition of Khaydān mentioned under the Sarīr (§ 49, 2.), but Khaydān was separated from the Alān territory by the whole length of the Sarīr.

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 (Qalʿat al-Lān) in Masʿūdi, 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 Gardizī, where it is expressly stated that the king’s subjects are heathens. V.s., p. 444, l. 26.

According to Masʿūdi, ii, 42, the capital of the Alāns was called *Maghasan meaning “piety” (diyāna). It is not mentioned in any other Muslim source but may be connected with the city A-su Miṣ-eš-ez (probably “M., city of the Ās”) which is several times mentioned in Chinese sources (Yüan-shi, &c.) in the accounts of Mangū’s expedition in Northern Caucasus in A.D. 1239, cf. Bretschneider, Mediaeval researches, i, 316-7. See also Pelliot, Jour. As., April 1920, pp. 168-9, who further identifies the town of the Chinese sources with Nek or mentioned in Rashīd al-dīn, ed. Blochet, pp. 43, 47, after the expeditions to Qrim? and before that to Darband. However, in Juwaynī, GMS, i, 222 (Mīkār) 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 Tanbih, 184, both Kāsak and Kashak are mentioned erroneously as separate peoples.
2 Instead of Garš and Kʿut in the Armenian Geography, Marquart, Komanen, 181, suggests to read Kʿarš (i.e. Kashak, Cherkes) and Gut (i.e. Crimean (?) Goths).
§ 49. The Sarir.

Sarir is no original name of the country, being only an abridgement of the title șahīb 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, Murūjī, ii, 41, Ist., 223). I.R. and Gardizī, 101, call the king respectively ʻarz and sarīr. This detail suggested to Marquart and Barthold (Daghestān in El) the identification of the Sarir with the Avar people in Dagestan (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 Daghestān says: “the khāqān of the mountain (khāqān al-jabal) who is the Master of the Throne is called ʻurāz (variants: ʻurāz-e, ʻurāz-e, ʻurāz-e, ʻurāz-e).” Thomas Artsruni (tenth century) mentions the people Aurhaz-k’ (ʻUr, ʻUr, ʻUr) jointly with the Tsanar-k’ (Şanār, § 36, 33.), cf. Marquart, o.c., 496. In the Zafar-nāma (written in a.d. 1424), i, 772, 777, 779, the Dagestan 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 Gūr, and abusively confers on him an additional title of Filān-shāh (v.i., § 50, 3c.). 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 Sarir princely families but we know that Ishaq b. Ismā’īl, rule: of Tiflis circa a.d. 830–53, was married to a daughter of this king, see Tabari, 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 Dagestan. 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 Sarir. See Map xi.

1 The Avars are now an entirely Dagestani people, but their name may reflect that of some former dynasty issued from the pre-Islamic ʻAbārōi, ʻAbārōi, ʻAbārōi, see I.Kh., 92 and 119: al-Abar, cf. Marquart, Komanen, 74–5.

2 In Armenian Auhraz’, 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 ə+suffix ən. As regards the form ʻurāz we may suppose that it is a result of several tentatives to transcribe the difficult name containing the elements ʻurə and ʻurə ən usually confused in writing. One of the ə may be superfluous and with *Auhra (or still better *Auhra, or still better *Auhra) we approach the Armenian form. The tentative restoration would be *Auhar–ən-shāh.

3 Cf. T.-Pao, xxxii/4, 1936, p. 235.
and according to Theophylactos Simocatta fled partly to China (Ταυγάστ = Tabghach = the Wei dynasty) and partly to the Moukpi. 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 Ὄγωρ (Uyghur) tribes Ὄβαρ, Χουβί, &c. Cf. Marquart, Die Chronologie d. alttürk. Inschriften, 94, Eränšahr, 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, Eränšahr, 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 Rashíd al-dîn, ed. Bérezine, vii, 90 (transl. v, 70) one of the four divisions of the Merkit or Ṣukuk was called Ṣum (*Auḥar?), which name is, indeed, reminiscent of the title borne by the Sarîr king. This item does not, of course, constitute a proof for the “true-Avar” origin of the rulers of Sarîr, who, following 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 Sarîr see § 5, 18. On the wrong idea of the sources of the Kur see § 6, 56. Our author makes the Sarîr border on the Rûm, the latter term evidently referring only to the Georgians (§ 42, 15.).

No parallels could be found for the story about the giant flies (pasha). Mas’üdî, ii, 42, gives the name *MughasU f l to the Alân capital (ü.s.). Could not some popular etymology *M agha$ > Persian m a g a s “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’üdî, ii, 42, calls the seat of government (dâr al-mulk) of the Sarîr (d’ohsson quotes the variant qa^-). This place may correspond to the present centre of the Avar territory, Khunzakh (*£ÿ^). · See Map xi.

2. (perhaps repeated under § 48, 2.) corresponds to خرمان (خزخ) of: See Map xi.

Abul-Fidä, p. 71, says that Jabal al-Qyiq (perhaps for *Qabq?) stretches from the coast of the Caspian sea near the town of Bâb al-abwâb in a southern
Kāṭib-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 Khyzân Ādharnarse and says that he is equally respectful to the three religions of his subjects (Muslims, Jews, and Christians). He places Khyzân at 12 manzils “to the right”3 of the Master of the Throne’s castle which distance is certainly exaggerated, unless it is based on a confusion with a different Khyzân. According to Masʾūdi the ḫydān 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 Qaṭān tribe, bore the hereditary name of ʿaylūn.4

A certain difficulty results from some of Baladhuri’s data on خیران: p. 204, in the enumeration of Salmān’s federates he mentions “Shakki, Khyzân, Shīrvān”, &c., as if they were neighbours; p. 206, he says that Jarraḥ after having attacked the people of ḥumrin(Ḥumrun? cf. Baladhuri, 208) settled them in the “rustāq (sic) of Khyzân” which suggests a place in the rear [?]. Finally I.Kh., 124, in his identification of the places mentioned in the Qur’ānic legend of Moses, mentions “the village of Khyzân”5 along with Bājarvān (south of the Araxes) and Shīrvān. 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 manzils” (v.s.).

Masʾūdi entirely separates ḫydān from the Sarīr but I.R. and Gardizi speak of Khyzân 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.nādīn in the present chapter. The Sarīrian “generals” living in the town may be only an echo of the original report on the king Ādharnarse.

3. A parallel of رئنس is found only in I.R., 148, who places رئنس at a distance of 10 farsakhs from the town of Khyzân and describes the cult of the tree practised by its inhabitants, cf. Marquart, Streifzüge, 15. The direction. Then quoting from alʾ-Asīṣī (cf. note to § 60, 4.) Abul-Fidā adds that this mountain is called ḥab al-alsun because some 300 languages are said to be spoken on it. Then he proceeds “and on its northern side are the Qaytaq who are a (special) race (jins); and on its southern side the Lazgī who are also a (special) race”.

1 Jīhān-mūmā, pp. 401–2.
2 Marquart, o.c., p. 492, identifies ḫydān 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 بئر عليه where according to Baladhuri, p. 195, Anushirwān met the khāqān of the Khazars. Consequently ḩīmāy may be Bashli = بارسلي [= Armenian Varačʿan].

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 Masʾūdi’s ḫydān.
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 *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 Khyszān and Rūhs, finishes the chapter by mentioning a second castle belonging to the Master of the Throne: "it is called ḥāli al-ruḥ and has a strong position; in it is the treasury (bayt al-mal) of the king and it was given to him by Anūshirvān". This fortress is undoubtedly mentioned in Mas'ūdī, ii, 39, in the neighbourhood of Zirigarān 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.

§ 50. The Khazar.

Marquart, Streifzüge, Index; Barthold, Khazar in EI; H. v. Kutschera, Die Chasaren, Wien 1910 (unimportant); J. N. Simchowitsch, Studien z. d. Berichten arab. Historiker über d. Chasaren, Berliner Dissertation 1920, still unpublished; the author’s résumé in Jahrbuch d. Dissert. der Philol. Fakultät . . . zu Berlin, 1919-20, pp. 248-52, is reviewed by M. Palló in Ungar. fahrbücher, ii, 1922, pp. 157-60 (with a list of Hungarian literature on the subject): Simchowitsch studies the earlier history of the Khazars down to Harūn al-Rashīd’s times; M. Kmoksó, Die Quellen Iṣṭahri’s in seinem Berichte über die Chasaren, Körösi Csoma-Archivum, 1/2, 1921, pp. 141-8; M. Kmoksó, Araber und Chasaren, ibid., 1/4, 1924, pp. 280-92 and 1/5, 1925, pp. 356-68. The Jewish sources on the Khazars have been recently republished by P. K. Kokovtsov, Yevreysko-khasarskaya perepiska v X veke, Leningrad 1932 (exhaustive bibliography and very detailed commentary). Some Byzantine sources are quoted in Dietrich, o.c., Index; see also Constantine Porphyр., De admin. imperio, chap. 10, 12, 42 (scarce details).

The principal Muslim source on the Khazars is Ibn Faḍlān (in Yaqūt, ii, 436-40), many of whose data are found also in 1st., 220-5, though each of the two sources has a good many independent details. Since Frähn it has been admitted that Ibn Faḍlān (who travelled in 309-10/921-2) was the

1 The Tā’rīkh Bāb al-Abwāb quoted by A. Z. Validi, Azerbaycan, p. 39, spells the name ٍروباس but the name may have had an older form.

2 The territory of Qumiq is occupied by the Lak who are also called Qazi-Qumug (to be distinguished from the Turkish Qumug living further north-east towards the Caspian sea). Cf. Dirr, in Peterm. Mitteil., 54, 1908, pp. 204-12.
source of Ištakhrī, 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 Išt., 220-5, is undoubtedly responsible, but our author cuts down even such characteristic features as the existence of a dual political system under which the supreme chief only appointed the head of the executive power who was the real ruler. The system is mentioned in all the sources:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Const. Porphyr.</td>
<td>χαγάνος, πέχ</td>
<td>Hispanic system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(cf. Marquart,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o.c., 27)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Rusta</td>
<td>Khazar Khāqān</td>
<td>Ayshā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masʿūdī, Murūj,</td>
<td>Khāqān</td>
<td>Malik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii, 12</td>
<td>Malik Khazar 1</td>
<td>Khāqān Khazar, or Bek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ištakhrī</td>
<td>Khāqān Khazar</td>
<td>Malik Khazar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Hauqal</td>
<td>Khazar Khāqān</td>
<td>Abshād</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardīzī</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the H.-ʿĀ. 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 Rās-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, (aturday, 328, *As-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, Išt., 225. According to this description the Khazar language of which no texts have come down to us, belonged to the aberrant branch of Turkish languages of which the only living representative is now the Chuvash language.

Prima facie our enumeration of the Khazar towns presents great difficulties. In fact these towns were only four, of which two were divided by the Volga near its estuary, and the other two lay in the Caucasian region (Balanjar and Samandar). Our compiler mentions the two Volga towns under five different names and thus his total rises to seven, to say nothing of the five additional names wrongly quoted under Khazar.

1 The places of the rulers are wrong.
The complication with the Volga towns will be best presented in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Western Ätil</th>
<th>Eastern Ätil</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Išt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.Kh.</td>
<td>أتيل</td>
<td>حبيلخ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.R.</td>
<td>سارعشن</td>
<td>حبيل هل</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakri</td>
<td>بارغش</td>
<td>خليل</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.-'A.</td>
<td>[Western] Ätil, يبيلص and ساوعر</td>
<td>[Eastern] Ätil and خليل</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The three traditions, namely: A (Išt. < I. Faqlân), B (I.Kh.), C (I.R. and Gardîzî), are all side by side incorporated in H.-'A. The order of enumeration fully confirms this conclusion.

1 and 2. are evidently borrowed from Išt., 220-3, who in the Khazar land knows only these two towns of which أتيل (read JrT Ätil>Etil) was a double town for it was divided by the Ätil 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.

Mas'ûdî, Murûj, ii, 7, reckons from Darband to Samandar 8 days and thence to Ätil (so instead of Āmul) 7 days. According to Išt., 219, 227, the respective distances are 4 and 7 days, the distance between Samandar and the Sarîr boundary being only 2 farsakhs. These data indicate for Samandar a place somewhere between Kizlar (on the Terek) and Petrovsk (now Makhach-qal'a) 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 Sarîr, and our author's indication that Samandar lay near the sea-coast. Išt., 222, mentions extensive gardens and vineyards between Samandar, Darband, and the Sarîr, 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 هل " which may easily stand for "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: va mudun al-Khazar: *Khamlikh wa Balanjar wal-Bayda. Of these Balanjar lay certainly in the Caucasian region. During his campaign of 119/737 Marwân penetrated into Khazaria, as it seems, through the Alân gate, i.e. the Darial pass in the Central Caucasus, and then (I. Athîr, v, 160) marched eastwards to Balanjar, Samandar, and al-Baydâ. 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, Balädhurî, 204, Ya'qûbî, 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 Sarir). It is true that according to the Khazar letter the river ought to be placed much more to the north (Kokovtsov: Kuma river?) but then it would be difficult to understand how Marwān could march to Samandar via Balanjar. So besides the Qoy-su (Sulaq), only some of the right affluents of the Terek, or the Khasav-yurt river could eventually be taken into consideration with regard to the still doubtful situation of Balanjar. As Samandar lay by the sea, al-Baydā, whither Marwān³ marched from Samandar, could lie either to the south, or, more probably, to the north of Tarqu. As I. Athīr, 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 ساریش. The first element of the name *Sārīgh-sh.n is evidently Turkish sarīgh “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 ش as shar < shahr, but I am strongly inclined to think that the name *Sārīgh-shin is the original form of the still enigmatic ساوسین Sāqsīn, as the geographers of Mongol times call a town situated by a mighty river and usually quoted along with the Volga Bulghār, cf. Barthold, Saksīn in El.⁵ To sum up: Baydā may be only an Arabic name for the first of the two Ātil towns already mentioned under 1. As according to Īst. 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.

³ & 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 وران which here is an entirely different place from Varthān in Ādharbayjan and evidently refers to northern Dagestan. [It is very probable, however, that the name refers here to Barshiyya, v.s., p. 449, note 1, in Armenian Varač’an, see Moses Kafankatvats’i, book ii, ch. xxix, Russian transl. by Patkanov, SPb., 1861, p. 192.]

² Marquart, ibid., 166, identifies Balanjar with Varač’an or Varajān 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 Դարկել = Russian Bēlaveža “White tent” is called in the Khazar king’s letter (version B) Sharkīl, 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 Sāqsīn with the Itil town was recognized by Westberg, o.c., 1908 (March), p. 40; I think that even phonetically Sāqsīn< Sarīgh-shin (or -sin?). [As a parallel cf. the name of Tsaritsīn “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” (?). *Sarī-sīn would mean “yellow tomb”.]
also to I.R., Bakri, and Gardizi (see the table above). The unusual form of the first name شاوه may have been influenced by the two towns Shävghar in Transoxiana, cf. Barthold, *Turkestan*, 174. The second name, as spelt by our author, would be *Khutlug* “happy” but to judge by I.R.’s variants it looks like a compound with the Turkish word -balîg “town”. Very probably another form of the same name is I.Kh.’s خلیف (so instead of خلیف chosen by de Goeje) *Khamlikh*, possibly with a contraction from <Khammalikh< Kham-balîk< Kham-balîg. The first element still offers a difficulty. Marquart, *Komanen*, 71, rightly criticized M. Hartmann’s restoration *Khan-balîg*, but his own reading *Qapîgh-balîg* 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 Jurjân, *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-Bâb (Darband) are a. the Malik of Suwar, b. the Malik of al-Lakz, c. the Malik of al-Lân, d. the Malik of Filân, e. the Malik of al-M.sq.t, f. the Master of the Sarîr, and g. the town of Samandar”. In this list a. corresponds to our Swr; b. to our Lkny, c. to our M.s.t; g. was already mentioned under 2., and c. and f. are treated in separate chapters (§§ 48 and 49). Only d. Filân has been left out of consideration.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 Khazarân* (§ 36, 40.) is a purely conventional historical term pointing to the fact that Darband (which from circa a.d. 800 remained in the hands of the Muslims) was a “frontier post” (thaghê) directed against the Khazars and their successors. In our author’s times Darband and consequently the lands lying to the south of it belonged to the Shirvân-shâh, *v.s.*, notes to § 36, 36. and Ist., 219. A remote reason for the inclusion of *Lakz*, *Suwar*, and

¹ Perhaps because our author, like Mas’ùdî, *Murûj*, ii, 42, took Filân-shâh for the hereditary title of the Sarîr kings. This, however, is inexact, for Balâdîrî, 196, names separately sâhib al-Sarîr and malîk-Filân. Nothing practically is known of this prince and his people. In Yâqût’s very valuable passage on the peoples of Daghestân, i, 438 (cf. *BGA*, i, 184) immediately after Tabarsarân (on the Rubas river) is mentioned umma ilâ janbîhim tu’raf bi-Filân which suggests that the Filân lived quite close to the Tabarsarân. After the Filân come the Lakz, al-Lîrân, and Sharvân (sic). Balâdîrî, 194, speaks of سد الله “the wall of the L.b.n” which the Sasanian Qubâd built between Shirvân and Bâb al-Lân (Darial), cf. I.Kh., 123, bâb L.bân-shöh. This L.b.n probably corresponds to Lip’în-k of the Armenian authors and Lupenii of Pliny, *n. h.*, vi, 29, and it is not impossible to connect Lip’în, &c. with Fil- by admitting a metathesis *Lif/Fil*. It is true that Balâdîrî, 196, specially mentions Malik Filân but the different sources may account for the difference L.b.n/Filân. [In the eastern part of Shakkî near the sources of the Turian-chay several places are found with such names as Filisî, perhaps <Fil-i Filân (cf. the royal title of Gil-i Gilân). This is only a hint to the future investigators on the spot.]
Masqut in the Khazar chapter may be the fact that Marwan is said to have brought from his famous expedition (of 119/737) a number of Khazars whom he settled between the Samur river and Shaharan in the lower parts of the Lakz lands (fi sahl ard al-Lakz), see Baladhuri, 207. On the middle course of the Samur there is still a village Khazri.

Lakz. As mentioned above (§ 36, 36.) the Lakz, or a part of them, seem to be identical with the *Khursan (Baladhuri, 196: 'iblak al-lakz wa'du harasa hasa). According to Mas'udi, Muruj, ii, 6, the Shirvan-shah Muhammad b. Yazid annexed the possessions of Khursan (Khazan) and this agrees with the threefold title of the Shirvan-shah in our source (v.s.). Mas'udi, ii, 5, even adds that the Lakz kingdom (mamlaka) was the bulwark (mu'awwal) of the Shirvan kingdom. Baladhuri, 209, mentions a fortress of the Shirvan-shah named خرش. The original extent of the Lakz territory is uncertain but they appear as the immediate neighbours of the Layzan (v.s.). According to Abulfidā, trans. ii/2, p. 299, the Samur river flowed across the Lakz territory and Baladhuri's passage, 207, indicates that in the region between the Samur 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. غميق) living on the eastern branch of the Qoy-su. The linguistic evidence shows that the Lak once occupied a much larger area (Prince N. S. Trubetskoy's lecture at the School of Oriental Studies, 21.iii.1934), but the connexion of the Lakz with the present-day Lak is still uncertain. By metathesis Lakz became Lazg, which form was further used by Persians with the addition of the usual suffix of origin Lazg-i (in Russian Lesg-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, Daghhestān in El. See Map xi.

On vocalized Suwar in I.Kh., 124, nothing is known and de Goeje's annotation: "Suwar vulgo سوار" (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'udi, Tanbih, 83, pretends that the "Turkish" name of the Khazar was *Vrr-^J.1 [V.s., p. 401.] سوار (sawir) الساط (cf. also § 49, 3.) vocalized in I.Kh. al-Masqat most probably must be read *Masqut.2 Marquart, Kulturanalekten in Ungar. Jahrbücher, ix/i, 1929, p. 78, quotes as its parallels Armenian Mas'ut'k', Maskut', &c., and ingeniously takes the present-day Muskur for a later avatar of the old

1 The Suwar and Suwar whom the Khazar king mentions in the list of his neighbours, Kokovtsov, 98, do not seem to be connected with Daghestan.

2 Cf. a mountain south of Ganja called Maskhut on Russian maps.
name (the passage $t > \delta > r$ is characteristic for the Iranian Tātī dialects, v.s., note to § 36, 36.). The Mushkur district is situated south of the Samūr 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):

| I.R., 139 | Tulās | Lūgh.r |
| Bakrī | این | اوغز |
| ‘Aufī | Tulās | Kūgh.r |
| Shukrullāh | Tulās | K.rgh.ra |

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 aqsāhu) live the Tulās 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 Tulās as *Tul-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: اس; Ibn Battūta, ii, 448: اس. Bakrī’s Ās could then be easily improved into Ās, and, as a compound, Tul-Ās would be paralleled by the name of the principal clan of the Alān as given by I.R., 148: دجسم D.hs-Ās.1

The second name اوغز, cf. Bakrī’s اوغز, is restored by Marquart as اوغز AUGHAX, i.e. Abkhaz, Arabic ابيض, Greek Αβαγγολ, [Contarini, ed. Hakluyt Society, p. 144: Avoagasia]. This people occupies, on the Black Sea coast, the south-westernmost slopes of the Caucasian range, which quite well suits I.R.’s mention of the “farthest end of the mountain” and Bakrī’s, p. 45, clear indication that the people in question lived “below that mountain on the sea-coast”. In the tenth century all the western Georgians (of the Rion basin) were usually called Abkhaz after the dynasty which ruled them. Mas’ūdī, ii, 65, seems to distinguish between the جرمان (Eastern Georgians) and the Abkhave, 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 اوغز would refer only to the real Abkhaz.2

1 It is indeed possible that the name of one of the clans was substituted to that of the Alān in general. Abul-Fidā, p. 203, who wrote at the epoch when the terminology was changing, says that the Ās are a Turkish (?) people living near the Alān, being of the same origin as the latter (!) and professing the same religion. [V.i., p. 481, 3.]

2 'Aufī and Shukrullāh consider the Tulās and Kūgh.r (K.rgh.ra) as “two kinds of Turks” [cf. also Abul Fidā, quoted above in note 1]. The term Turk is here applied in a loose sense: not only the Magyars but the Rūs as well were considered Turks by Muslim writers. طوروس could even have been mistaken for خرما (v.s., notes to § 14).
So far, so good, but Marquart in his *Streifzüge*, 173, 495, overreached the goal by further identifying the *Tüläs* and *Aughaz* respectively with the *N.nd.r* and *M.rdät* 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 *Tüläs* and *Lügh.r* in the western Caucasus;
(3.) provisionally maintain the first part of Marquart's hypothesis: *Tüläs* = some tribe of *Ås*, and *Lügh.r* = Abkhaz.

Our additional remarks will be as follows:

(4.) I.R., 139, only says that at the farthest end of the mountain near which lay the Khazar land, lived the *Tüläs* and *Lügh.r*, whereas our author makes of the latter "two districts of the Khazar". It is true that in the seventh century the Khazars penetrated down to Tiflis through the central Caucasian pass but the western Caucasus was hardly ever under Khazar sway. Our author's mistake may be somehow connected with the frequent confusion of *Khazar* with *Jurz* "Georgians". I.R.'s detail on the mountains "stretching to the land (biläd) of Tiflis" is perhaps a hint of some mention of the Jurz in the original source.

(5.) The first element of *Tül-Ås* 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 *Tual-tä*, i.e. the Tual, or Southern Ossets, in Georgian *Dvali*, who on the map annexed to Brosset's edition of Prince Vakhusht's *Geography*, St. Petersburg 1842, are shown (1) north of the Caucasian range on the upper course of the Ardon which is the left tributary of the Terek, and (2) in the upper valley of the Great 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 طلالاس ملالاس would then be read *Tuval-Ås*.\(^3\) See Additional Note to § 48.

(6.) As regards Bakri's report on the *Tuläs* and *Aughaz*, 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 *Mivrät* in our author and Gardizi (v.s., § 46).


\(^3\) There exists a Georgian family Tulasdze but I am unable to ascertain their origins. Brosset, *Histoire de la Géorgie*, ii/2, p. 151, mentions a locality *T'ula* which 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 درایلی which Nizâmi in his *Ishandar-nâma* gives to the Abkhâz king may reproduce *Dvali*.]
parative table of the relevant passages in I.R.'s and Bakri's chapters on the Khazars:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I.R.</th>
<th>Bakri</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description of the road from the Pechenegs to the Khazars.</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The Khazar country is a vast land one of whose sides adjoins a huge mountain&quot;</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;and this is the mountain at the farthest end of which live the Tüläs and Lügh.r&quot;</td>
<td>left out, v.i.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;and this mountain stretches to the lands of Tiflis&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;then [you go tasiru] to the lands of Tiflis, the latter (Tiflis) being the beginning of the frontier of Armenia&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instead of the sentence on the two peoples left out in the chapter on the Khazars, Bakri, in the chapter on the Majghari, says: "a frontier of their country adjoins the Rüm country whereas another frontier of theirs, on the steppe side, adjoins a mountain inhabited by the people called اين 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."

Bakri’s information on the one hand contains some independent traits and on the other reflects his own arrangement of the principal source. The description in I.R. moves from east to west (the Pechenegs [in their Ural seats], the Khazars, the mountain stretching to Tiflis, the peoples at its farther end). Bakri proceeds in an opposite direction (the Majghari [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 Bakri’s names is peculiar. If اين لوغز is due to the general use of forms in -iya (Bajānākiya, Majghariya), اين لوغز اين رين presents more difficulty. Marquart, o.c., 167, restored it as *أس As which is a later appellation of the Alān (§ 48), the latter name not appearing in the known fragments of Bakri. Although the forms *D.khs-As and Țwl-As occur already in I. Rusta as the names of special tribes, the pure form As as referring to the Alāns in general appears only in Mongol times. Moreover Bakri’s description of the اين lacks the characteristic features of the Alān. Even the combination of اين with the *Aughaziya suggests that Bakri has in view the particular clan corresponding to Țwläs.2 The disclosure of the identity of Bakri’s اين (i.e. whether it stands for Alān or Țwläs) is important

1 The passage in italics is a repetition of what had been said under the Khazar.
2 As the separation from the name Țwläs of the basic element Ās is not at all an obvious matter we are perhaps entitled to suppose that Bakri has been inspired by some later source. Under Pecheneg he quotes the evidence of Muslim captives in Constantinople for the events after a.d. 1009.
for in the former case Bakri possessed some more detailed knowledge of the early Magyar seats near the Caucasus than is found in the more complete text of the earlier I. Rusta. In the second eventuality the vicinity of the Magyars to the must be merely a guess on Bakri's part.

This author's information on the Magyars [who over a century before had settled beyond the Carpathians] is certainly traditional and derived from the same source as that utilized by I.R., Gardizi, and 'Aufi. This group of authors definitely says that the Magyar country reaches down to the Rûm sea (bahr, daryâ) instead of which Bakri mentions "Rûm country" (biläd al-Rûm), thus considerably modifying the situation. This procedure does not give us much confidence as to the eastern frontier of the Magyars with regard to which Bakri quotes a detail not found in I.R., H.-'Ä., Gardizî, or 'Aufi. We must remember that according to I.R., 143, the Khazars "some time ago" entrenched themselves against the Magyars and other peoples (yuqâlu anna-'l-Khazar fimâ taqaddama hânât qad khandaqat 'alâ nafs-hä ittiqâ'a 'l-Majghariya wa ghayrihim min al-umam al-mutâkkima li-bilädihim). Assuming then that the Magyars were the neighbours of the Khazars, Bakri could logically infer that, more precisely, they bordered on the peoples who were said to live at the westernmost limit of the mountain mentioned on the confines of the Khazars. Such then may be an explanation of Bakri's mysterious passage.

This hypothesis may be objected to on the ground that according to our § 47 the Khazarian Pechenegs neighboured in the south on the Alân and a similar view is suggested by Mas'ûdi's embroiled passage on the W.î.n.d.riya (v.i. § 53). Both indications are supported by the well-known passage in Const. Porph., ed. Bonn, p. 166, according to which the Pechenegs lived at 6 days' distance from the Alâns. As the Pechenegs ousted the Magyars from their Lebedia seats it could have been inferred that the latter as well had bordered on the Alâns. However, the fact is that Muslim authors knew nothing of what we ourselves, thanks to Const. Porph., know about the events, cf. İst., 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 Bakri the Pechenegs were still in the north and, living a century later than I. Rusta and depending on the same source as I.R., he could hardly have improved on the latter's data. Therefore I am inclined to maintain the view that (a) Bakri's refers not to the Alâns as a whole but to the little-known tribe of Twläs, and (b) that the idea that the Magyars and were neighbours is a result of Bakri's personal surmise. As a matter of fact even at the time when the Magyars lived near the Caucasus the Twläs mountaineers must have been separated from them by the other Alân 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)
Tä'ús appear as the names of two local chiefs, though they may represent hereditary titles. The fortress of Tä'ús 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 Balqän (Balqar? at the sources of the Terek). Both the name طلائس, which could be easily restored as طلأس, and the geographical details make it possible to see in our passage an echo of the tenth-century terminology. [Hājji-Khalifa, p. 402, repeats the statement of the Z.-näma.]

§ 51. [The Bulkär.]

Frähn, Drei Münzen and Die ältesten arabischen Nachrichten über die Wolga-Bulgharen, 1832 (still valuable); Chwolson, Izvestiya ... Ibn Dasta [*Rusta], 80–101; Barthold, Bulghär in EI (in great detail); R. Vasmer, Über die Münzen der Wolga-Bulgaren, in Wiener Numism. Zeitschrift, 57 (1924), pp. 63–84 (instead of یاپاران read on some coins Vasmer restores the well-known title of the Bulghär kings بلطوار); Marquart, Arktische Länder, 365–77.

There are two gross misunderstandings in the present chapter. Its title “Burtäs” is entirely wrong (cf. also § 20). Burtäs is only another form of *Burdäs (see § 52), whereas here the Volga Bulghärs are described, i.e. the northern colony of the people from which the Danube Bulghars had separated. The language of the Volga Bulghärs of which we possess only a few specimens in the late funeral inscriptions was probably related to the present-day Chuvash (a special and very aberrant member of the Turkish family). The Danube Bulghars had, at an early date, adopted a Slav language, but some expression in the original Bulghar language are found in the inscriptions, as well as in a Slavonic chronicle discovered by A. N. Popov in 1866. They are still the subject of much speculation, see J. J. Mikkola, Die Chronologie d. türkischen Donaubulgaren, in Journ. de la Soc. Finno-Ougrienne, xxx (1918), fasc. 33, pp. 1–24 (with a survey of the former tentative of decipherment). Perhaps the strongest argument for the Chuvash language being a remnant of the old Bulghar is the great number of loan-words in Hungarian which have a striking resemblance to the Chuvash (“bull” is őkör in Magyar and ۆкәр in Chuvash) as well as the enormous number of Chuvash cultural words in the languages of their Finnish neighbours of the Volga basin, see N. Poppe, Chuvashi i yikh sosedi, 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 Rashīd al-dīn, ed. Blochet, p. 45, mentions an ʿĀs chief executed by Ögedey: قاپیرا،ولگ (note the final گهل). ² As Barthold has pointed out, the Bulghär and Burtäs are also confused in Yāqūt, i, 567.
Bulghär khäqän in view of the latter's desire to be advised on religious matters.

The present chapter is a poor abstract chiefly of Ist. The details on the special language and the number of the Bulghärs and their towns remind one of this latter author who, p. 225, says that the Bulghär language has a resemblance to the Khazar language (the latter, p. 222, being an idiom apart), and that in the towns of Bulghar and Suvär there are some 10,000 men (*näs*). Gardizi, 97, gives an entirely different number (500,000 *ahl-i bayt*). The names of the three tribes have the following close parallels:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H.-'Ā.</th>
<th>Ibn Rusta</th>
<th>Gardizi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.hdülä</td>
<td>B.rsülä</td>
<td>B.rsülä</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ishkil (?)</td>
<td>Ishkil (?)</td>
<td>Ishkil (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.lkär</td>
<td>B.lkär</td>
<td>B.lkär</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The form of the latter name points to the Persian (?) origin of the basic source: *Bulgär*. The name *B.rsülä* (*B.rchülä*) is known in two places: since the fifth-sixth century A.D. the Byzantine and other Christian authors mention *Baporítla, Bepčülia*, &c., in the north-eastern Caucasus whereas Muslim authors (tenth century) speak of the *Barchula* off the middle Volga. According to Marquart this tribe of unknown origin was turkicized by the Huns, see *Die Chronol. d. alttürk. Inschr.*, pp. 87-93, *Streifzüge*, 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 *βαρσηλτ, βαρζυλία, &c.* in the north-eastern Caucasus whereas *Μουζκαλα* off the middle Volga. More to the south from this point a station *Birsula* exists on the Kiev-Odessa railway.

The king *M.s* in Ibn Faḍlān's original *risāla* is called *λαβραχο Σικλικι* to *Bolvar* 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, *Streifzüge*, 497. Our author dropped *al* which he evidently took for the Arabic article. *Bltwār* must be perhaps restored as *بطلفار*, *Yiltwār* in view of the Hunnic (= Turkish) title *Alp-Iltüver* found in Moses Kalankatvats'i, Part ii, chap. 41, Patkanov's transl., p. 198. [Marquart: *Alp-Ilatvär* ? ]

The second error in our text is that the description of the two Bulghär towns is inserted out of place between § 53 and 54. The ruins of Bulghär (cf. § 6, 43.) are situated near the village Bolgarskoye, or Uspenskoye, in the Spassk district, 115 Km. south of Kazan and at 7 Km. from the left bank of the Volga. Suvär lay on the river Utka near the present village Kuznechikha, cf. Barthold, *Bulghär* in *EI*. See Map xii.

1 Chwolson, *Izvestiya*, 97, compares this name with that of the Transylvanian *Szekler* (?). [Cf. supra p. 320, line 2.]

§ 52. Burädhäs (?).


Although according to Persian phonetics in *پادکاس* is consistent with an intervocalic position, the first 1 appears superfluous in view of *پراس*, in I.R., 140, and Gardizi, and *پرکاس* in Bakri. All these spellings point to a special tradition to which also belongs the form *(بکار)* (§ 51) instead of *(نار)*. The usual Arabic transcription of the name is *پرکاس* which is found in Mas’üdi, *Murüj* 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 *Burtâs* 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 Burtâs from old Iranian *mrtâsa* “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 *pârâtu*, Kurdish *purd*) and Bakri’s alternate spelling *Furdäs* 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 Burdas between the Khazar and Bulkâr 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 Burtaş boundary, adding that the Burtas 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 Rüs, then Bulghâr, then Burtaş”. Mas’üdi, *Murüj* ii, 14, in a confused passage speaks of a Burtaş river which from the upper regions flows into the river on which the Khazar capital stands (*nahrun faq al-madîna yaśibbu ilâ nahri-ha min a’âli-hâ yuqalu la-hâ Burtaş*). 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’üdi aggravates his statement by saying that “into the Khazar river ... flows the Burtaş river. The Burtas are a great nation of Turks (?) living between the lands of Khuwârizm (?) and the Khazar king-

1 Already Tomaschek, *Kritik d. ältesten Nachrichten über d. skytischen Norden*, in *Sitzungsb. Wien. Akad.*, 1889, t. 107, pp. 7-16, suggested an identification of the Herodotien ‘*Avdrôfâgos* with the Mordva whose name he compared with the old Persian *μαρτιχώρας* commented in Greek as *nTheρoφάγος*.

2 A rigorous interpretation of this text would indicate that Burtaş lay downstream from Bulghâr (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 Khuwärizm lands and other places. From the Burtäs (country) are exported black foxes which are the best of furs, &c.” The passage must be full of confusion. No other authority mentions the Burtäs in the direction of Khuwärizm 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 Khuwärizm to the Khazar country and, judging by Ist.'s indications, one would think that by some mistake Mas'ūdî has substituted Khuwärizm for *Bulghär. Of all the sources the H.-'Ā. (§ 52) most positively locates the Burädhäs to the west of the Atil river (§ 6, 43. which simply follows Ist., 222, is less clear).

The fact that the Pechenegs are mentioned as the northern neighbours of the Burądhs suggests that the Pechenegs occupied some territory on the right bank of the Volga between the Burądhs and Rūs. I.R., 140, Bakrī, 44, and Gardīzī, 96, say only that struggles were going on between the Burtäs and the Pechenegs and, moreover, speak of the Pechenegs as neighbours of the Slavs. On the western neighbours of the Burtäs cf. notes to § 53 and diagram on p. 440.

Generally speaking our chapter on the Burądhs 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 Burdäs have no chief (ra'īs) but “in every community of theirs (mahalla) there is an elder (shaykh), or two (shaykhayn) to whom they have recourse in the matters which happen to them” (ditto in Gardīzī). The religion is described as in I.R. and Gardīzī, and the burning of the dead as in I.R.2

Since Frähn's time the Burtäs have been usually identified with the Finnish Mordva who, as long as we have known them, have lived between the Oka and Volga. Their remnants (since 20.xii.1934 organized into an autonomous republic with the centre at Saransk) are still found in the same region. Two tribes compose the Mordva people: the Moksha in the basin of the Moksha river which flows to the Oka from the east and of which the southernmost head-water is still called Burtas, and the Erz'a in the basin of the Sura which flows to the Volga to the east of the Oka.3


1 This latter fact, as bearing on the location of the Pechenegs, already attracted Marquart's attention in Komanen, 98.

2 Several tombs of the L'ada mound situated in the Mordva region (on the Saratov-Tambov railway) show traces of cremation of the dead, see I. N. Smirnov, o.c., 249–50.

3 Location rough. The emigration of the Mordva to the east of the Volga dates only from the 17th–18th century.
cription proceeds west to east: Moxel stands for Mokša-ley (many Mordvan names are composed with ley “river”). The Merdini (Mordvin) are evidently the eastern 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 Išt., 225, the language of the Bulghär (of which Chuvash is at present considered to be a survival) was different from that of the Burtas. However, even lately Prof. M. Vasmer kindly wrote to me (Berlin, 7.xi.32) that the Burtas 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 Burtas,² I think that their identity with the Moksha is to be retained. The Arab sources may reflect a temporary supremacy of that particular clan, or it may be that the latter first came under the notice of Muslim travellers. It is only natural that the numerous and sturdy Mordva people (even now, after long series of invasions and struggles, counting over 1 million representatives) could not fail to be mentioned by the Arabs. The details on the forests (I.R., 140;

¹ And as a corollary the identification of Išt.’s اذ (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 mashājīr),¹ the honey, and the Burtāsī furs suit the Mordva quite well. The travellers like Rubruquis and Herberstein quite particularly insist on these details.² 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 (Majghari), § 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.n.d.r.
Harkavi’s and Marquart’s views
The Onoghundur.
The source of the H.-‘Ā. and Gardīzī.
W.l.nd.r in Mas‘ūdī.
W.n.nt.r in the Khazar king’s letter.

The seats of the V.n.nd.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.n.d.r are the immediate neighbours of the Majghārī though the latter’s habitat is conceived differently: our author places them near the Ural, 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.n.d.r territory contiguous on that of the Majghārī we have to depend chiefly on Gardīzī and disregard our author’s theoretical constructions.³ 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 Majghārī 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 kilen “birch” (the Chuvash form for “birch” khorin does not resemble the Arabic word).
² The only puzzling detail is that
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 Majghari 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. Gardizi adds that the N.n.d.r lived in the direction (bar ja nb “on the side”) of the Saqläb. 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 Majghari-V.n.n.d.r-Mirvät is concerned. In § 46, north [east?] of the Mirvät are named “some of the Inner Bulghär and [!] the V.n.n.d.r mountains”. As the Inner Bulghär belong definitely to the Ist.<Balkhi 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.t.r by that of the Bulgarian ᪤ vmaxnvvpltvpo but it was a long time before the parallel names in H.-‘Ä. and Gardizi became known.¹ When Marquart first studied Gardizi’s passage, Streifzüge, 172, he was led astray by the fact that Bakri also mentions a pair of the Majghari’s neighbours. Having very ingeniously located the latter in the western Caucasus Marquart was less happily inspired in identifying them with the two peoples found in Gardizi. He overlooked the fact that Bakri (see notes to § 50, 4.) speaks of their south-eastern neighbours, while Gardizi has in view the later Atelkuzu territory and its south-western neighbours. The identification of Gardizi’s jjJ and with Bakri’s مصابل ایسی and ایسی and has often been taken for granted, but after the publication of the H.-‘Ä., where the two series of names are separated, no place for doubt could remain as to its inconsistency.² 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 Länder (1924) Marquart, among other things, studies the disappearance of the sound ϵ in old Bulgarian and Turkish and gives as an example the name of the Turcoman tribe Salar <Sahgar. As another instance of the same phenomenon he quotes (p. 275) “den bulgarischen Hordennamen ᪤ vmaxnvvpltvpo (Nikephoros); Jāqtū); Oltontor (Anania

¹ In his translation of § 52 (in annex to Markov’s work) Toumanský illustrates V.n.n.d.r by *Jle, found in Ibn al-Athîr, i, 243 (<Mas’üdi, Murût, ii, 58–64). On other similar hints cf. now Kokovtsov, o.c., 92.

§ 53

**V. n. nd. r.**

Sirakac'i, VII. Jahrh. > W(u)i(u)ndur Butkhar (Ps. Moses Chorenac'i, letztes Drittel des IX. Jahrh.), Wunundur (Hudūd al-'Ālam, Ende des X. Jahrh.), bereits mit protheticem w vor labialem Vokal, wie im Čuvaschischen; \(\text{Wulundur} \text{ (al-Mas'ūdi, 943–4 n. Chr.) = magy. Nándor Fejérővár = Belgrad.}^*\)

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, al-bidr (sic),^1^ Burjān, Jurzān, Fārs, Rūm; Géographie de Moïse de Corène [attributed sometimes to A. Shirakats'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'ūdi mentions the, 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.* [Gardizi's N.nd.r can hardly be compared directly with the Magyar form Nándor; most probably the initial v taken for the conjunction va was dropped by the scribe in the same way as we find in our text Khān instead of Vakhān, cf. also Mas'ūdi's Rândar, with initial w.]

**THE ONOGHUNDUR.** The people called Onoghundur were a Bulgarian tribe (cf. § 51) which “from the sixties of the fifth century down to the end of the seventh century” lived north of the Caucasus, to the east of the Azov sea in the Kuban region. Their great ruler Kobrat (Κοβρατος) organized them into a powerful state but after his death (circa A.D. 642) the advance of the Khazars split the Bulgar kingdom; a part of the tribes under Bayan (said to be Kobrat’s son) remained in their former seats as Khazar subjects, whereas another of Kobrat’s sons Asparukh travelled westwards and after having crossed the Danube (A.D. 679) conquered the territory of the present Bulgaria. Const. Porph., *De thematibus*, p. 48, says that since that time the name of the Bulgar has become known for “previously they were called *Ονογουνδουροι*.^2^ The centre of Asparukh’s kingdom was in the strong locality *Ογλον* surrounded on one side by marshes and on the other by very high rocks. Jireček, *Geschichte d. Bulgaren*, 1876, p. 129, read the name *Ογγλον <Slavonic oglu “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 *Ογλον* 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^3^...
began their westward trek which finally brought them into the present-day Hungary, cf. Moravcsik, o.c., 89.

THE SOURCE OF THE H.-'Ä. AND GARDIZI. 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. Both in the H.-'Ä. and Gardizi 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.-'Ä. and Gardizhi belong to the same source (Härün b. Yahyä?). If so, the special information of our two sources must refer to the second lot of Onoghundur pushed on by the Magyar migration. Neither the H.-'Ä. nor Gardizi 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-dil) may be due to a wrong interpretation of the word tarsä (which means both "Christian" and "coward"). In Gardizhi the N.nd.r are definitely called Christians (tarsä) and Rümî, 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 Onogurs (δ 'Ονογουρων) is mentioned under the metropolitan of Crimean Gotha (ἐπαρχία Λοβίας), cf. Moravcsik, o.c., 64. The Onogurs in question were certainly those who still remained to the north-east of the Black Sea and therefore could be controlled from the Crimea. The rest of our author's characteristics may be only a development of his initial mistake about tarsä.

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 "Ογλον occupied by Asparukh?  
3 Was then the original source on Eastern Europe, or the text in which it was available, in Persian? The absence of underground canals (käris) in the M.rdät country, mentioned in Gardizi, could hardly strike any one except an Iranian. Cf. also the strange transcription of the name بلکار (§ 51) راذاس (§ 52). These facts still await an explanation. Mas'udi, Muruji, ii, 59, says that dissensions among the W.l.nd.r tribes arose in connexion with the presence among them of a Muslim merchant from Ardabil. Consequently Persian traders penetrated into the southern Russian steppes and could be the source of information for their co-religionists.  
4 [And also in our § 22.]  
5 Were it not for the name *Vinundur one might consider as the Magyars' neighbours the Rumanian Vlachs, see Kunik in Izvestiya al-Bakriy, 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 (= Burjän = Inner Bulghär = 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'üdî's "W.l.n.d.r". An entirely independent use of the term¹ is found in Mas'üdî's well-known report on the incursion into the Byzantine Empire of the nomads called W.l.n.d.rî in (or after) 320/932.² In the Murüj (written in 332/943), i, 262, ii, 58-64, Mas'üdî calls the invaders "Turkish peoples" and enumerates their four tribes, namely, B.jnî,³ Bajghurt (= evidently Magyar), Pecheneg (the most valiant of the four), and Nükarda (still obscure). In the Tanbih, 180, 182, Mas'üdî 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'üdî's version. As regards the date, the invasion seems to correspond best to that of the Τούρκοι (i.e. in Byzantine terminology: Magyars) recorded under 934! However, Mas'üdî presents the four tribes as living in the neighbourhood of the Khazars and Alâns,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'üdî says that the tribes were called الزندرع "after the town of الزندرع situated in the extreme frontier region of the Rûm 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.n.d.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 Δεβέλτος 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.n.d.r a Bulgarian (non-Slavonic) name corresponding to some different official term (Debeltos?). Mas'üdî 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.n.d.r peculiar to Mas'üdî results from the dissimilation n.n>l.n. Cf. the Armenian form Վունդուր.

² See Marquart, Streifzüge, 60-74, 499-500, 527.

³ Contrary to Marquart, o.c., 67, بقنتî, mentioned alongside with Pecheneg can hardly be identical with the latter. Perhaps it is only a metathesis of قپمî, as one of the Oghuz clans is called in Kâshghari, i, 57; on their later history see M. F. Köprülü-zade, Oğuz etnolojisine dayâr, pp. 24-7 (v.s., § 18).

⁴ Marquart, o.c., 74: "verblasste Erinnerungen".

⁵ See now V. Zlatarski, Istoriya na Bûlgarskata dûršava, 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 Kôbrat, Streifzüge, 529, or because it was directed against the Vulundur (in Arabic one might say: аль thaghth al-Wulundur), and consequently Mas'ûdí'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".\footnote{Whatever the explanation of the raid,\footnote{In his final "Zusatz", o.c., 528, Marquart writes: "was es mit der Erstürmung 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 Peçenegen, sind..." [Cf. C. A. Macartney in Byz.-Neogr. jahrb., 1939, pp. 159-70.]} Whatever the explanation of the raid,\footnote{In his final "Zusatz", o.c., 528, Marquart writes: "was es mit der Erstürmung 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 Peçenegen, sind..." [Cf. C. A. Macartney in Byz.-Neogr. jahrb., 1939, pp. 159-70.]} the survival of the name *Vulundur in Mas'ûdí is a firmly established fact interesting as a parallel to our *Vunundur.

**The Khazar King's Letter.** Among the parallels to the name V.n.nd.r it remains for us to consider V.n.nt.r נוֹנֶּר found in the Hebrew letter supposed to have been sent by the Khazar king Joseph in answer to that of Chasdai ben Shafurat, an agent to the Cordovan caliph 'Abd al-Rahmân (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:\footnote{Unless the coalition was formed on some special territory, v.s., Ὠγλον = Bujaq.} 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.n.nt.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 lived formerly the V.n.nt.r. Our Khazar ancestors warred against them. The V.n.nt.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 Rûnâ (A. רון) or Dönâ (B. דון), and "until the present day they are situated on the river Rûnâ/Dönâ, near Kushtantiniya/Kustandina [i.e. Constantinople] and the Khazars have occupied their country".\footnote{Kokovtsov's transl., pp. 75 and 92.}

---

1. \footnote{Unless the coalition was formed on some special territory, v.s., Ὠγλον = Bujaq.}
2. \footnote{In his final "Zusatz", o.c., 528, Marquart writes: "was es mit der Erstürmung 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 Peçenegen, sind..." [Cf. C. A. Macartney in Byz.-Neogr. jahrb., 1939, pp. 159-70.]}
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 ( believably *Bačna referring to Bajni or Bajnä whom Mas‘ūd 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.gry’im (A. Hyndy’im), i.e. evidently Hungarians. Consequently the lands of a (Turkish) tribe and those of the Magyars stretched to the west of the Khazar and separated the latter from the Danube. The writer clearly refers to the expulsion of the V.n.nt.r beyond the Danube as a remote past (events of A.D. 679), whereas the account of the Khazar frontiers presupposes the arrival of the Pechenegs in the second half of the ninth century. The form W.n.nt.r has a striking resemblance to our V.n.nd.r, and on the other hand considerably differs from the forms attested in Greek and Armenian sources. Numerous names in version B seem to have been borrowed from Muslim geographers and the question arises whether such is not the case of W.n.nt.r as well. The interpolator could not possibly know the H.-‘Ā. or Gardīzī [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/Dübā as Danube and, on the other hand, suggest the identity of our V.n.nd.r with the Danubian Bulgars. However, the origin of the Hebrew interpolation remains obscure and the clever interpolator may have read his own sense into his source. Therefore in our own explanation of the Muslim texts we have to go principally by their internal evidence.

§ 54. Southern Countries.

The countries described in the remaining part of the book lie in Africa, with the exception of the semi-mythical Zābaj (§ 56) which is a connecting link with the southern islands (§ 4, 8.). The principal sources of the African chapters are Khuwārizmī (indirectly), I.Kh., Iṣt., and perhaps some Book ofMarvels of which traces are also found in the chapter on Egypt (§ 39). The last folio is the only one in the MS. more seriously damaged.

§ 55. Zangistān.


1 The most striking example is the Arabic form Ṣlaviyūn, Kokov- tsov, o.c. 98–9.

2 See, however, supra, p. 217.
The term Zangistän (later Zangibär > Zanzibär, "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 Bâb al-Mandeb et le cap Guardafui était à peine modifiée, de manière à faire face successivement à l'Arabie, à l'Inde, aux Îles Malaises et à la Chine ... l'extrémité du Ouaqouaq, qui continue la côte de Sofâla, se trouvant ainsi reportée au sud le la mer Chinoise", Devîc, o.I., 46. This explains why our author places Zangistän opposite Fârs, Kirmân, and Sind and mentions the enmity existing between the Zanj and the Zâbaj. Cf. Išt., 11, who assumes that the land of the Zanj "lies opposite Yemen, Fârs, Kirmân, and Hind". Cf. also ibid., 29. Shahriyâr b. Buzurg, Livre des merveilles de l'Inde, ed. Van der Lith, pp. 174-5, says that in 334/945 the people of Wâqwâq [here rather Madagascar than Sumatra, v.s., p. 228] attacked the region of Sofâla in the Zanj country.

1. میلان M.l.jàn, which stands before Sofâla must correspond to ملیان M.I.nđi, mentioned in Idrîsî, i, 56, and Ibn Sa'id (A.D. 1250) in Ferrand, Relations. Malindi lies on the coast north of Mombasa, see Tomashek, Mohît, maps I-II, on which Mombasa is shown as the seat of the Zanj king, cf. also Storbeck, o.c., 129-30. [Mas'üdî, Murûj, iii, 6, calls this king ملیان M.l.jàn, read cf. in Bantu mfâlem "king", plur. wafâlem, Ferrand, Jour. As., January 1921, p. 163.] This ملیان (M.I.nđi) must be distinguished from the name similarly spelt under § 56, 2.

2. Sufâla (Sofâla) lies in the southern part of the Portuguese Mozambique (south of Beira). The place is mentioned in Mas'üdî, Murûj, i, 223, as the southernmost point of the Zanj possessions and it was known as a great gold-producing centre. See Ferrand, Sofâla, in EI, and Storbeck, o.c., 141.

3. هوفل Hwfl (?) At this place one would expect هوفل Hwfl and such a restoration is admissible in Arabic script. Cf. Mas'üdî, i, 233: bilâd Sufâla wal Wâqwâq (الزنجوارق) min aqâsî ard al-Zanj wal-asâfil min bahrihim. See Idrîsî's map (Reinaud, Introduzione, i, p. 120) on which Wâqwâq forms an immediate continuation of the Zanj land. The only other name somewhat resembling هوفل Hwfl is هوآ (Howa), applied to the southern part of Madagascar (jastîrat al-Qumr) by the Turkish admiral Sîdî 'Ali Chelebi in his Mohît (1554) based on Arabic sources, see Mohît, map III, and Ferrand, o.c., 502. The name Howa could, however, hardly be known in the tenth century.

§ 56. Zâbaj.

G. Ferrand, L'Empire sumatranais de Črivijaya, in Jour. As., 1922, t. xx, pp. 1-104, 164-246 (an extremely complete survey of sources), and Zâbaj in EI. That our author pronounced Zâbaj (not Zâbij) is clear from his other transcription of this name ژبا Zâba (§ 4, 6.) on a false analogy with the Persian
forms: Khūnaj >Khūna, &c. Zābaj ("Javoga "Javanese") is a term designating now Java, now the centre and south of Sumatra, now the whole of the Sunda archipelago, see Tomaschek, Möhlt, map 1, Nieuwenhuis, Java, in El, 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 princes 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 puñgawa “prime minister, officer, hero, courtier” but admits that it may represent the personal name of some Çrīvijaya 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 mahrāj>maharāy. The complex shahr-i Maharāy “the town of the M.” could easily be transformed into “M., the town [of Zābaj]”.

2. L*L 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-bahr (* 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. Iṣt., 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 is that it was the king’s residence. According to I.R., 96, the capital of the Abyssinian (Ḥabasha) king was called Jarmī جرmie. This then must be the reading of the name of
which the mis-spelt form can without much difficulty be explained in Arabic script. *Jarmi* greatly puzzled the commentators who since Golius’s times, cf. Reinaud, *Abul-Fidā*, transl. ii/A, p. 228, tried to connect it somehow with Axum, supposed to be the contemporary capital of Abyssinia, though as a matter of fact Axum (so instead of أَكْسُوم or أَخْسَرُ) appears only in later Muslim sources (*Maqrīzī*). Marquart, *Benin*, pp. ccciii–iv, has finally disposed of the mistake in the Ma’mūnian map and Khūwārizmī’s *Sūrat al-arḍ* caused by Ptolemy’s broad use of the term *Anthropoi* in the sense of “dark-skinned people” (and not especially “Ethiopians”). The name *Jarmi* [or rather *Jaramī*] al-Habash 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 *Γαράμαντες*, is shown to the south-west of *Phazana = Fazzān* (near Murzūq, in the present-day Italian Libya, cf. § 60, 1.).

2. The first idea is that by some mistake أَسْرَى represents أَسْرَان Assuan (v.s., § 39, 10) which in Khūwārizmī, No. 80, is spelt أَسْرَان and stands 4 lines below أَحْرَى, but I now prefer to restore the name as عَذَاب which, as 1ṣt., 54, admits, was reckoned to Abyssinia in spite of the fact that its inhabitants were Buja. ‘Aydhāb is identified with Aidip lying on the sea-coast opposite Jidda at N. lat. 22° 19’ 47”, cf. C. H. Becker, ‘*Aidḥāb in EI.*’)

3. رَِين (different from its homonym § 60, 2.) most probably is زِبْل Zayla’, which in 1ṣt., 36, follows on ‘Aydhāb. It is the well-known port of British Somaliland, immediately east of the Bay of Tajura. During the late Abyssinian crisis (1935) Zayla’ was mentioned as an eventual point of access to the sea for Abyssinia. [November 1936: *tempora mutantur*]

§ 58. Buja.


These Hamitic tribes living between the Nile and the Red sea formerly occupied the territory between Cairo and Abyssinia, cf. Ya’qūbī, *Historiae*, i, 218–9, and *BGA*, vii, 336–7; Mas’ūdī, *Murūj*, iii, 32.

In the mutilated part of the text the question was probably of the celebrated gold mines lying in the desert of Buja (§ 7, 12.–13.), see Ya’qūbī, *BGA*, vii, 334–5, 1ṣt., 28, 34. The Buja had no towns, ‘Aydhāb on the

---

1 Jointly with *Jarmi al-Ḥabash* (long. 41° 40’, lat. 10° 40’) Khūwārizmī mentions another *Jarmī madinat al-kabīra* (long. 34°, lat. 19° 30’). Marquart thought that “Gross Garma und Garma der Ḥabas sind ... in Wirklichkeit identisch”, but Mžik, *Afrika*, No. 75, with more probability restores the second name as جَرْة مَدِينَة الْكُبْرَى]* and explains it as Γείρα μητρόπολις* (cf. Ptolemy’s *Γείραν Αἰθιοπίας*).

2 [See *Geog. J.*., 68, 1926, p. 235–40.]
coast of the Red Sea being considered as Abyssinia's, Iṣṭ., 54, v.s., § 57, 2.
The trait of the king keeping aloof from his subjects is well known in
African countries (v.i., under § 60).

§ 59. Nubia.

Quatremère, Mémoires géogr. et hist. sur l'Égypte, 1811, ii, 1–126:
"Mémoire sur la Nubie"; Marquart, Benin, pp. ccxlviii–ccxlvi; G. Roeder,
Die Geschichte Nubiens, in Klio, xii, 1912, pp. 51–83; von Mžïk, Africa
(v.s., § 57); S. Hillelson, Nüba in EI.

Iṣṭ., 11, says that Nubia is conterminous with Egypt,1 with the desert
lying between Egypt and the Südän, 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'qūbî, Historiae, i, 217 (cf. also BGA, vii, 335–6), there
were two kingdoms in Nubia, of which the one was Muqurra with the
capital Dunqula ("Old Dongola") and the other 'Alwa with the capital
Sūba (to the east of the present-day Khaṭūm). Mas'ūdî, Murūj, iii, 32,
confirms these facts adding that in 332/943 he heard in Fustāt that the
king living in Dunqula and ruling over Māqurra and 'Alwa was Kbry b.
S.rwr,2 a descendant of a long line of kings. On Dongola cf. also I.R.,
96, and I. Faqih, 78.

I.Kh., 17, gives the king of Nubia the title of Kâbîl, which detail is
reproduced in our text. كَبِّيْل 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 Yāqūt, iv, 820,3 where Kâbîl is called king of Muqurrä and Nûba,
whereas 'Alwā is mentioned separately. Idrîsî, i, 33, mis-spelt the name of
the king into Kāmil.

The mines situated amidst the sands are mentioned in § 7, 12. See in
detail, Ya'qūbî, BGA, vii, 334–5.

The item on the two Christian monasteries may belong to the source
from which similar fabulous details on Egypt have been borrowed. The
name T.ri (T.ḥi?) 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 Tarî, nor Ṭahî reminds me of anything) they
would seem to belong to the unknown region which is fairly extensive

1 I. Faqih, 78, says that Nubia began
at 5 days' distance to the south of
Assuan. Cf. § 39, 10., and I.Kh., 83.
2 Ya'qūbî, BGA, vii, 339, calls the
king of Muqurrâ (sic) Zakariyâ b.
Q.rqî = Zacharia son of Kyriakos, cf.
Quatremère, o.c., 65.
3 Marquart takes I. Faqih for the
authority of this passage in Yāqūt, 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 qâlti and
has no parallel in I. Faqih's printed text.
4 [See now Appendix B.]
in Nubian geography." Outwardly resembles \( \text{ضرة} \) and \( \text{طلا} \). Of these \( \text{Tahā} \) 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 \( \text{Tūrā} \) and Shahrān (lying in the neighbourhood of \( \text{Tūrā} \)) possessed each a monastery. See Abū Ṣāliḥ (\( \text{circa AD} \, 1202 \)), The Churches and Monasteries of Egypt, ed. B. T. A. Evetts and A. J. Butler in Anecdota Oxoniensia, 1896, fol. 47a, 74, and 77. However, \( \text{Tahā} \), I.Kh. 81, lay in Egypt, north of Munya between Ushmūnayn and Qays, cf. Mžik, Afrika, 12 (No. 148), and \( \text{Tūrā} \) was situated still more north near Ḥulwān. Another, equally doubtful, hypothesis would be the restoration of \( \text{ضرة} \) as originally the lake Tsana in Abyssinia, and later the lake Chad was called, cf. Maqrīzī, Khīṭat, ed. Wiet, i, 229. No monasteries could exist near the Chad region, but the existence of some legends referring to the western Abyssinia closely associated with Nubia are imaginable, cf. Conti Rossini, Notes sur l'Abyssinie avant les Sémites, in Florilegium M. de Vogüé, 1909, p. 143 (\( \text{بhra kuwrā} \) [sic] associated with the people \( \text{Quārā}, \text{Khūrā} \)) and Marquart, Benin, lxxxiv, and additional note in Index, p. 104. [See additional note in Appendix B.]

\( \text{§ 60. The Südān.} \)

W. D. Cooley, The Negroland of the Arabs (after Ibn Khaldūn, Ibn Baṭṭūta, &c., whom the author used in Don P. Gayangos's translations), London 1841; Marquart, Benin, Leiden 1913 (a capital work as regards the earlier Arabic sources on the Südān); H. v. Mžik, Afrika (cf. § 57); Delafosse, Südān in El refers only to later times.

This unexpectedly long and vivid paragraph particularly contrasts with the aridity of Išt.'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 (\( \text{al-sūdān al-\text{'urāt}} \) whom he calls \( \text{Zāgḥī} \) b. \( \text{Zāgḥī} \), which undoubtedly corresponds to the name \( *\text{Rā'i} \) b. \( \text{Rā'i} \) in our mutilated passage. In view of this important point of likeness [v.s., § 59: \( \text{Kābil} \)] one is tempted to admit that some more complete text of I.Kh. is the source of the whole § 60 (and maybe of the other curious details on Africa). In fact I.Kh. (cf. pp. 153-5) is fond of relating the exploits of merchants', v.s., § 43. Marquart, o.c., p. cxxv, commenting on I.Kh., 89, calls \( \text{Zāgḥī} \) b. \( \text{Zāgḥī} \) "eine unbekannte Grösse", but makes several interesting suggestions: the most obvious conclusion is that he was the king of the mighty kingdom of Ghānā (western Südān); on the other hand the name resembles the title \( \text{zā} \) of the ninth-century kings of Gogo, or Songoy (on the middle course of the Niger), see Delafosse, Songōï in El, among whom such names are found as \( \text{Zā-Zakoy}, \text{Zā-Akoy}, \text{Zā-Kū}, \) see al-SA'di, Tā'rikh al-sūdān, ed. Houdas, pp. 2-3; finally Marquart quotes several Berber names (\( \text{زاعع} \), &c.) resembling that of \( \text{Zāgḥī} \),

\footnote{Maqrīzī quotes Idrīṣī as his authority on the lake Kuwarā but the passage is not found in Jaubert's translation.}
The Sudán

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 Sudán 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) Khwârizmî, 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-Bâhiyya</td>
<td>60° 0'</td>
<td>12° 20'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fazzân</td>
<td>62° 0'</td>
<td>10° 45'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaghâwa</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>Ghâna</td>
<td>43° 30'</td>
<td>10° 45'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


2. *Kh.fân* and *Ryn* (cf. § 57, 3.) look mutilated. One of them may be Gogo on the Niger to the south-east of Timbuktu, cf. Yâqût, iv, 329.

3. resembles مقيس (maqs < maks “toll-house”), an Egyptian frontier post towards Nubia, lying at 6 days above Wâdi Halfa, see Maqrîzî, *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 ي resembles غانة 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 Lâba near Nubia it is probable that it stands for غاز،, a great heathen state of which the centre lay near the lake Chad. It stretched from Nubia to the Niger, and comprised the Kâwâr country, Kânem, northern Wâdâî, and Dârfûr. At present one of the five tribes of Dârfûr still bears the name of Zaghâwa, see C. H. Becker, *Zur Geschichte des östlichen Sudán*, in *Der Islam*, i, 1910, pp. 162–77, cf. Yâqût, ii, 932, iv, 230 (who quotes Hasan b. Āhmad al-Muhallabi’s work *al-'Asîsî*, written *circa* A.D. 975–6). Zaghâwa is often associated with Fazzân (v.s. 5.). Khwârizmî gives wrong bearings according to which Fazzân and Zaghâwa would lie far to the east, beyond the Nile, towards Adûlis (!), cf. von Mžik, *Afrika*, Map. On Khuwârizmî’s own map, *ibid.*, Zaghâwa is placed to the south of bilâd al-Nûba and this may be the reason for out author’s location of Lâba near Nubia. I.H., 66, places Zaghâwa at 2 months’ distance from Fazzân (v.s. 5.). Idrîsî, transl. i, 112, reckons Fazzân to Zaghâwa.
APPENDIX A

MARGINAL NOTES IN THE H.-'Ā.

As mentioned in the Preface, p. v, the marginal notes in the unique copy of the H.-'Ā. do not shed any light on the history of its composition.

The uppermost part of fol. 1a is obliterated with ink. Some later possessor of the book evidently tried to destroy the name of his predecessor. One can faintly distinguish the words Kitāb-khāna . . . mustaţāb Ḥājjī 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 زنگ دل بجتان بخیر,
خشمت این کی کویم کی خری.
The first of the two verses (rhyme in -āz) to the left of the title is

کفتم کی کام خری رده عمر دراز
تا بوك شیرما با تور منجم راز.
The poem below the title (9 verses of which the rhyme + radif is -āz rasadh) begins

روزها را پیکان زدست مده،
نیست امکان ان کی پاز رسد.

I am obliged to my friend 'Abbâs Eghbâl Āshtiyânî 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-dîn Jāmi, otherwise unknown.

Still lower down there are entries in a different hand (B). The first, on the authority of the Qor'ānic Tafsîr 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 dīw called Āl, and of that called Umm al-śibyān. The second (hand B?) is a rubā'î composed by Ḥādrat-i Amīr Sayyid Aḥmad Lālā'i, one of the khulafā' of the late Amīr 'Abdullāh Burzishābâdî (?), 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'îl 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 Ghāzî 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’îl’s victory over Shaybak-khān which took place in the winter of 916/1510. The second date may be read 952, or 932 (?). The latter is adopted by Zhukovsky who utilized our entry in his Ruins of Old Merv, p. 74. Moreover, Zhukovsky reads the name of the invader ‘Ubaydullāh-khān. According to ‘Abdullāh Naṣr-allaḥī’s Turkish Zubdat al-tawārikh, ‘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 Shībānīd khāns ‘Abdullāh I (ruled 946–7) and the famous ‘Abdullāh II (ruled 991–1006) were remote relations of ‘Ubaydullāh-khān. ‘Abdullāh-khān destroyed the Merv dam and abducted the population in 1566 (974 A.H.), but this does not suit our date of 952 (?). Nondum liquet. Our entry does not seem to be very exact and in this case may belong to a considerably later time (seventeenth century?).]

On fol. 22b Abul-Fadl Gulpāyagānī, the discoverer of the manuscript, in his fine writing recorded some data on the construction of the walls around Bukhārā [evidently borrowed from Narshakhī, cf. Tārikh-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 Tamîm 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 Tamîm 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:

وذكر ان خاقان ملك التزغر كان مخاتنا بملك الصين وأن ملك الصين يحمل الهم

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 Biruni’s Canon has proved to be very faulty in comparison with the Stambul MSS. Thus بحر اروامان (v.s., p. 180) must be improved into حرب اروامان, i.e. “Hyrcania”, whereas روخان (v.s., p. 369) must be read رخان. As regards the first rectification I cannot help remarking how unexpected the form *Irqäniyä (for *Hurqäniyä) appears in Arabic. As for *Vakhân, it suits Biruni’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 Vakhân” may still have a different origin [or may have been misread by the compiler of the H.-A. 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 Biruni’s Tahdid al-amäkin:

The passage shows how long the “Alân and (!) Ās” remained in the region to the east of the Caspian. Their memory survives in Firdausi’s Dīsh-i Alânān (ed. Vullers, i, 115) and probably in the wall in the Turkman steppe called Qizil-Alan, cf. my article Türän in EI.
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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 tribè was originally one of the Khallukh tribes, but the territory occupied by the Chigil still possessed a numerous local population, cf. quotation from Gardïzï, 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 Barskhân is found in the Mashhad MS. of Ibn al-Faqîh, fol. 170a (cf. Yâqût, iv, 823).

8. Ad p. 297, l. 15. In the Manichaean Mahrnâmag edited by F. W. K. Müller, Ein Doppelblatt, SBA, 1913, l. 77, a certain Prvän-č zabghû is mentioned among the local rulers. The town (or district) *Parvän of which this zabghû was the lord may be identical with Bârmân/Po-huan.


10. Ad p. 365, note 3. A. Z. Validi has found in a Constantinople MS. of the Canon: wa jala’uhu bi-Badhakhshan, “and the polishing (of the rubies) is done in Badakhshân”, with reference to the preceding item.


[The source of Ibn al-Wardi (689-749/1290-1348) is undoubtedly Idrîsî 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 طریه, populeuse et dont les environs sont fertiles en riz” (follows the story of the statue). This T.ry (I. al-Wardi: T.ry) must be another avatar of our T.ry.]
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The present index contains all the names found in the text of the H.-‘Ā. 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.-‘Ā. 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
Abān Kasavān 114, 209, 353
Abarlīq (?) 117
Ābaskūn 28, 38, 77, 134, 386
'Ābbādān 76, 139, 392
Abbūlābād 370
'Abdāšī 138
'Ābdin 381
Abhar (Auhār) 132, 383
Ab-h Gargār 214
Āb-i Qaysār 329
Āb-i Safīd 199, 329
Abkhāz (= Aughaz, Lūgh.r.) 43, 168, 324, 445, 456
Abkhāz (= Lāyzān?) 403-4, 406-10
Abl (?) 123
Abraj 129
Ab-rdkath (?) 117
Abrīq (Aphrike) 218, cf. Ibrīq.
Absūs see Arabissos
Ābū Ghānīm’s Highlands see Kūhistān-i Ābū Ghānīm
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
'Aden 19, 147
Ādhāna (Adāna) 149
Ādharaksh, fire temple 383

Ādharbāyjān (Ādharbādhagān) 19, 29, 36, 37, 39, 53, 65, 66, 77, 83, 131, 133, 136, 137, 143, 393
Ādīkhš t. 347
Ādh.r (*Ādhīr), cf. Kaurīstān 255
Ādhruh 150
Adināpūr see Dunpūr
Adishtān (Srinagar) 254
Ādrama (Ādhrāma) 140
Ādīskand 327
Adūlīs 477
Afghāns (cf. Ayghān) 30, 91
Afghānīstān 4, 30, 288
Afakhūnīya see Paphlagonia
Āfrākhūn 68, 204
Āfrāva 325
Africa 33, 53, 78, 153, 154
Afīrīdhān 115
Afīrūnkāt 119
Aghbāb, Bahī al-Aghbāb, Bilād al-Aghbāb 87, 180, 242-3
Aghriśtān 377
Āhārān (Angren) t. 24, 211, 356
Āhārān, in Ġhur 333, 343
Ahar 39, 143, 395
Ahqāf sands 77, 81, 222
 Awāz 12, 74, 75, 130, 381
Aja’ mt. 203
Ājāyul 93, 257-8
Ājlād, Kimāk t. 305
al-Ajma, near Sarakhs 327
Ajugh 200
Arsäng (K.ygsäng), cf. Úsäng 25, 262
Arránhya (Abáma? 434, 436–8
Artúj (Bartúj) 96, 281
Artush see Irtish
Arrän (Arzhan) 55, 185
As t. 445, 456, 458, 481
Asábád (Asadábádh) 132
Asbuzär see Aspuzär
Asak (Asak, Æsk) 130, 380-1
Asbuzär see Aspuzär
Asgil (Ashkil, &c.) 162, 320, 461
Ashbürqän see Ushbürqän
Ashkavar 383
Ashkîl see Asgîl
Astarâb (Astärâb?), on the Caspian 137, 391; in Güzgän see Bastarâb
Astarâbâdh 29, 134, 386
Asus r., cf. Ishim 308
Atak 200
Attarâb r. 221
At-Bashi 292
Atelkuzu 313, 320, 322, 441, 444, 468
Athens 21, 41, 158
Asher see Ilîl
Ashîl, cf. Ishim 308
Atak 200
Atrim town 75, 80, 161, 452; r. see Ilîl
Athlîlîagh (Ottâlîagh)? 98
Atlantic 201
Atrâbulus 60, 149, 153
Atrak 29, 200, 218, 385
Aupa see Oba.
Aughaz see Abkhaz
Auhar in Adharbajjân see Abhar; in Dâghestân see Avâr
Aulâs (Eleusa) 149
Aurhazk, cf. Avâr 447
Avâ 133, 384
Avâl 116, 355
Avâr t. 42, 419, 439, 447, 450, 455
Avars, Pseudo- 448
Avâza-yi Paykand, cf. Paykand 56, 73, 181, 211
Awâs see Ephesus
Axtum 474
Ayvaj (Awuj), on the Oxus 360
‘Aydhâb 474
‘Aymhân (Abghân, Afghan?) 349
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baikal 1 284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bajanak see Pecheneg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bajaravan 449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bajghurt t. see Bashghird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bajirbagän 127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bajja 129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bajghurt t. see Bashghird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bajirbagän 127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bajja 129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakhtagän (Bïchagân)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakrābãd 133, 385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakrūsh, cf. Barqüh 94, 272, 273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bâkü (Bëkùh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balkans, cf. Balkh 16-17, 39, 63-4, 70-1, 73, 81, 105, 107-8, 111, 311, 337, 369; Balkh r. see Dah-ās</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balkhän (Balqän), east of the Caspian 180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balkhash (Balqash) 1 208, 276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balkā 67, 151, 415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balkān (Balqar?), in the Caucasus 460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bāls (Bëlus?), 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balaljar 162, 452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balâsâghûn 280, 291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balawat (B.l.w.t) 72, 91, 253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bâlâyân 357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baliapatam 243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bâlis (Bälish, Valishän), in Balùchistan 346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bâlis, in Jazïra 142, 149, 393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baljuvän (= Munk) 208, 361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balkans, cf. Balkan 205, 411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balkh 16-17, 39, 63-4, 70-1, 73, 81, 105, 107-8, 111, 311, 337, 369; Balkh r. see Dah-ās</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bâmkakhush 355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bampūr 373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bãnjkash (Bänkhäsh?) 356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bankälüs see Lankabälüs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banjikath see Panjikath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basinnay see Baçunnay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Başarı (spelt: Nâra) is. 179, 189, 190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baradan 140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bärimala 370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar, see Midyan 317-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baradjizar 208, 360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bârsâragh, cf. Bäsirän, K.brs.rägh, 120, 359, 361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bara (spelt: B.r.k.d.r?) 73, 105, 328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bashghird, Bashghurt, Bashqir, cf. Basjirt 312, 318-20, 322, 469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basâfûya (Bäsfañûya) l. 54, 183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basâfûya see Bäsfañûya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basjirt al-dâkhil (&quot;Inner B.&quot;) 319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bashghird, Bashghurt, Bashqîr, cf. Basjîr 312, 318-20, 322, 469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basra 58, 76, 81, 137-9, 146; sea of Basra 58; swamps 56, 76; desert 137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Başra (Buçayra), in Morocco 154, 417</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Cambodia (Khmer) 27
Canary is. see Islands of the Blest
Çanton see Khan-fu
Çapni see Chäpni
Cappadocia 156
Çaçir see Chaçir
Carmona 155
Carnatic 222
Carpathians 203, 441, 466
Caspian Provinces 29, 37, 39
Caspian (Khazar) Sea 28, 32, 36, 38, 42, 53, 60, 67, 71–2, 75, 77, 80–1, 100, 133–4, 136–7, 156, 180, 215, cf. Daryâ-yi Armina 444
Caucasus see also Qabq mt. 42, 145, 201, 204, 318
Ceylon, cf. Tabarnâ 7, 157, 189, 194, 235
Châch town (Tashkent), cf. Burj-i-Sängin 24, 72, 73, 116, 117, 118, 119, 233, 357; r. 13, 122, 149
Chachaktu 335
Chad 1. 476
Chadhghal (Chatqal, Jadghal) 116, 117, 118, 119, 233, 357; r. 13, 122, 149
Chahär-dar p. 340
Chahâryak see Sangchârak
Chahbâr 373
Chähuk 379, 380
Châkarän 365
Châl r. 344
Chaldia 156
Châlkân (Chälakän) 110, 344
Châlkrûdh (Chälkarüd) 136, 387
Chalmadana 259
Chalmakan 259
Chalqar 1. 310
Châmghär see Jämghar
Chamhad see Babarhân
Champa (Sanf) in Indo-China 86, 240
Chandror 89, 246
Chrang-an see Khumdân
Châl-i sangin (Lithinos pyrgos?) 26, 85, 233
Châlüs r. 134, 135, 136, 388, 391
Châmpîn-mîhr, fire-temple 325
Chechen t. 402, 446
Chechen t. 402, 446
Chesâma-yi Sabz see Tüs l. 185
Chaymür (Chaul) see Saymür
Cadiz (Ghadira) 58, 190
Cairo 37
Caspian (Xiraz) 192
Cambridge (Xarah) 20
Cambridge (Xarah) 20
Cambridge (Xarah) 20
Cambridge (Xarah) 20
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>F.irdi?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F.ż.r.k.</strong>, cf. <strong>B.ż.r.k</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fur</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Füri</strong> see <strong>Qüri</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Furj</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fustāt</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ganāfa (Ganâwa, Jannâba)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gandâwa</strong>, cf. <strong>Qandabïl</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gandhâra</strong>, cf. <strong>Vayhind</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ganges r.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ganj, Ganj rustäq</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ganja (Ganza)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardabān, south of Tiflis, cf. <strong>Qal’a ibn Kandmān</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gardîz</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gargar</strong>, on the Araxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gann</strong>, in Khuttal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Garsh t. near the Azov sea</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Garsh t.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ghânah, in the Südän</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ghândhär</strong> see <strong>Qandähar</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ghärän</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gharchistän</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ghâfiq</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ghalzay (Ghilzai)</strong> t.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ghana, in the Südän</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ghana, in the Südän</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ghazaq</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ghazza</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ghazni (Ghazna)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ghazaq</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ghazwän</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ghazza</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gh.drank</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gh.nksir</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ghiyân r. (Kiang, Yangze-kiang)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gh.nün l. 217</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ghöband</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ghurba</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ghund (Ghunt)</strong> r.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ghūr (Ghūr)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ghūz t.</strong> 35, 38, 43-4, 53, 72, 75, 80-1, 83, 97, 100-1, 102, 112, 119, 122, 133-4, 162, 216, 305-6, 314, 317, 444; Ghūz desert see <strong>Khwārazm desert</strong>; Ghūz Turks see <strong>Ghūz Turkes</strong>; Gate of the <strong>Ghūz</strong> 121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gh.żand</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gh.zk</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gh.zr see ’Azr</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Giblārta (Jabal Tāriq)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gilabādāh</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gilān</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gilgit</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Girang (Kirang?)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Godavari r.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gogo, in the Südän</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gogra</strong>, 246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gök-chay r.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gold island (Dhahabiya, cf. Chrysē, Wāqwāq)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gośunga</strong>, near Khotan, cf. <strong>Kohmārī</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goths, Crimean</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gözbūn (Gözbur)</strong>, cf. <strong>Güzgän</strong> 330-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Great Sea see Bahr al-ä’äm</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Greeks (Yünāniyän)</strong>, cf. Byzantines, 21, 33, 41, 51, 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Green Sea see Bahr al-akhdar</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gualalajara (Wādi al-hijārā)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gualalquivir</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Guadiana</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Guchen</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gujarat peninsula</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Guraja</strong>, in Panjāb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gulfagān</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gulnābād</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Günkri (Humri?)</strong> r. in Daghestan 449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gümush-tāpā</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gundalik or Gundulik, near Khotan</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gundēshāpur (Vindūšāvur)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Güpāl see Rūd-i A’là</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gür</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gūrab-i Kuhdum</strong>, cf. Kütum 390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gurgān 29, 38-9, 53, 64, 77, 102, 133-5, 200, 218, 312, 386</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gurgānji (Gurgānch)</strong> 38, 122, 312, 314, 371, cf. also 180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gürrūdūh (?)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gurz (Georgia)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gurzivān</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gushaí (Kushaí)</strong>, in China 233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Güyum (Jüyum)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Guzâr (Khuzâr)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gügân, Güzgänän</strong> 4-7, 31, 39, 55, 63-4, 73, 104-11, 173, 177, 328, 331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Habasha see Abyssinia</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Habīr sands</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hadath</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hadīthah</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hadramūt</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hadrat Imām Şāhib</strong>, on the Oxus 359, 360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Haft-Dīh</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hajar</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hakra</strong>, or Eastern Nara r. in Sind 372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Halâvard</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Halys (Qizil-Irmaq)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hamadan</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hamânān (?)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hāmat</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hāmadān t.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hāmrīn mt.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamvärän 114, 209, 353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Han-hai mt. 284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haramayn (Pyramids) 152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haranj (H.r.nj?) is. 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harät see Herat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Härda see Märida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harhaz (Haräzpey) r. 77, 218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hari (*Harê) see Herat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harikel see Bengal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harîrûd (Herat r.) 5, 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Header</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harkand, on east coast of India 87, 241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrän, in Jazira 12, 141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hârunï 149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hasan-Kiyä-Dih 390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hashädhar 391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hâshimï t. 149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hâshumkirt (Hâshim-gird) 114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hauf [al-sharqï] 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hausam 136, 388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilaush 108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haybak 338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haydarbâd 372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haytal or Haytäl (Hephthalites) 277, 288, 301, 327, 340, 347, 359, 362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazâr 128, 379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.dd.njîra(?) 87, 241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hephthalites see Haytal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Her-äb (Herow), in Ädharbaijän, cf. Babr 391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herät (Harät, Harê) 16, 22, 26, 64, 73, 103-5, 109, 125, 327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hijâz 146, 164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilmand (Hidhmand) r. 5, 36, 39, 73, 110, 344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Himalaya 196, 198, 236, 240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Himês 67, 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Himyar (Himyari) 146, 412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hind (Panjâb and India south of the Indus) 34, 80, 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindi, Hindû see Indians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindiyân r., cf. Shûrin 212-3, 378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindûkush 39, 199, 340, 367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hira 140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hirand (Gurgân) r. 29, 77, 133, 218, 325, 385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hisâr 198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hisn-Mahdi 74, 214, 381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hit 76, 141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hitâl (Hibtäl, Haytäl?), in the Himalaya 62-3, 90-1, 198, 239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hivân (?) 72, 91, 210, 253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Home of the People of Lot 151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizon (da’îrat al-äfäq) 50, 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hormuz see Hormuz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howa 472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.r.ân (Fazzân?) 165, 477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.r.l. 188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hrmz (?) 375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsl-An-fu see Khundân</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.sînäkra(?) 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.ski t. 287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huang-ho 195, 206, 207, 221, 228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hulbuk (Hulmuk, Hulbag) 71, 119, 359-60, 369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hu-lu 294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hulwân 139, 201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hu-mi see Vakhân</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunarakart see Khunân</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungar- (H.gry’im), Hungary 319, 467, 471, cf. Magyar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humrûz, in Kirmân 40, 74, 124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humrûz-Shahr see Ahwâz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husaynân (H.synân?) 91, 251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hutm see Khuthum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huwayrith see Ararat, Lesser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwfl (Waqwâq?) 163, 472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iba (Yâbis) is. 59, 192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibryq (Abwait, Rif?) 68, 204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idha (Idhaj, read: Tustar) 130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ifakhùniya see Paphlagonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ifranja see Frank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ifriqiya see Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Îgîrâyn 283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Îghrâj(?)-Art mt. 62, 71, 95-6, 195, 206, 208, 277, 278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Îghrâq, t. or land 275, 277, 305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Îj 129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Îkî-Ögüz 276-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Î là see Ilı</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Îläk r. 309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Îlq 117, 118, 356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Îl (Îlä) r. 71, 195-6, 208, 277-8, 300-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilion 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilmen l. 181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Îmâk (Imâk), cf. Kimâk 304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İmâm-Bäbä 328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İmî t. 304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India see Hindûstân</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İndian Ocean 7, 14, 32, 34, 52, 186; gulf, 52; mt. 72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indians 39, 62, 88, 90, 92, 109, 111, 121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indus (Mîhrän) 72, 80, 86, 89, 122-3, 198-9, 210, 253, 372; cf. Sind-rûdh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inhabited world 44, 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Îqlïd see Kilîdh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İraj 128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İrâq 15-6, 36-7, 40, 52, 66, 81, 83, 88, 129-31, 137-40, 142, 392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Irâq gulf 137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İrgîz (Savuq) r. 306, 308-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Îrgûzgûkûth (?) 95, see İki-ögûz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İr.sh, in China 70, 84, 228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İrtish (Artush) r. 35, 75, 99, 100, 196, 215, 305, 306, 312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İrtish, Black r. 215, 310; White r. 215, 310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İsbijâb see İsfîjâb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İsfara r. 355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İsfarâyin (Siparâyin) 64, 102, 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İsfîjâb (İsbijâb, İspîjâb, İspêchâb) 38, 118-9, 306, 312, 357</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Isfïnàqân see Sibïnakân
Isfïzär see Aspuzâr
Isgil (Ishgil) see Asgil
Isháhâr 357
Ishim r., cf. Asus 202, 215, 305, 306
Ishkâmish (Ishkîmisht, Sikîmisht) 109, 340–1
Ishkàshim (Sikâshim) 121, 248, 351, 364–6
Istahbänät 129
Istäkh see Chandror
Istakhr 74, 126, 129, 376
Isü t. (Ves') 437
Itil (Ätil) r. 43, 75, 80, 99, 100, 161-3, 216, 305, 321
Itlukh (?) 117, 356
Jäb.rs.ri (?) 89, 246
Jäb.rs.ri ( ?) 89, 246
Jäbrüqän' (Jabr.vän) in Ädharbayjän 142, 394
Jäjarm 39, 102
Jaen (Jayyän) 155
Jagin r. in Baluchistan 374
Jalâhán in Güzgân 5, 64, 107, 334; in Ispahân 131
Jâhuk 129
Jâjarm 39, 102
Jalâdàjan 212
Jalàlábâd 252
Jalâliqa (Galicians in Spain) 424
Jalâvat (Jalût) 72, 91, 253
Jâlînu 90, 247
Jâlûlà 139
Jâm, in Fârs 127
Jâm (Emba) r. 215, 312
Jâmagîrd, Jamakût, Yamaköti 183, 377
Jâmâliq 272
Jâmí 188
Jâmghar (Châmghar?) 94, 98, 273, 287, 293
Jâmí'ayn 77, 140
Jâmârrû (Jambû), Indian state 250
Jâmshïdgîrd 189
Jand 72, 81, 122, 222, 371
Jandrûz see Chandror
Jânzarûdh 125
Japân 228
Jär 81, 148
Jâramî al-Ḥabash (Garamë, spelt Râsun) 34, 164, 473–4
Jârâshàn 104
Jâr-i Kulbâd 386
Jariyâna (Jârbâya, Gârpâya?) 39, 64, 109, 341–2
Jârjarâyä 138
Jârgâmân (Jarmaqân, Jarmûkân) 29, 103, 259, 325
Jârgâmân (Charmâgân?), in Tibet 93, 259
Jârmî see Jaramî
Jârâhî r. see Tâb
Jâryâb r. see Khârnâb
Jassàn (?) t. 146
Jaulân, cf. Khâlân 412
Java see Jâba
Javâd, on the Kurr 398
Jâvârâ (Khâyâra?) r. 72, 81, 122, 222
Jâvkân 361
Jaxartes (Khâshart, Sir-dârja, Sayhûn) r. 22, 73, 116–8, 149, 202, 210–11, 306, 308
Jayhûn (Oxus) r. 67, 71–2, 80–1, 102, 106, 113–4, 119, 149, 200; “a large river” 321
Jázîra, in Mesopotamia 36, 66, 83, 137, 140–3, 148–50, 392; cf. Thughîr al-Jázîra; in Spain see Algeciras
Jázîra bani Kâwân (or Barkâwân) 190
Jázîra bani Zaghânnâ (Algiers) 154
Jázîra ibn ’Omar 141, 203
Jázîra-yi Rûynäs 193
Jázîrat al-Bâb 60, 193
Jázîrat al-Fi’dda (Silver island) cf. Argyre 56, 186
Jázîrat Istiwä al-Layl wal-Nâhär 188
Jáz-Moriyän 1.201
Jeddâ (Jidda, spelt: Jûdda) 19, 81, 148
Jehol 317
Jerîm, in Badakhshân 349–50, 365
Jerusalem (Bayt el-Muqaddas) 151
J.f.r (Chigil, Chaqir, Majghar?) 319, 347
Jibâl al-Shurât 415
Jïdğil see Chatgal
Jïfâr sands 68, 81, 151
Index A

Jigilî (Chigili), a Khallukh t. 287
Jîl(-a-rig), on the Chu 292
Jîlî-kul plateau 360
Jînânjkath see Chinânjkath
Jîra, in Fârs 127, 377; in Africa 474
Jîrm see Jerm
Jîrufû 65, 73, 124, 125, 201, 374
Jîsr-Manbîj 141
J.mîlîkat 95, 306
J.m.lkat (J.m.l-kath), 94, 272, 273
J.n.lkî (J.n.lkî), 95, 306
J.n.kh.kî 93
Jîbäl (Media) 36, 65, 74, 83, 136-7, 150, 382-4
Jou-Jan t. 447
J.r.m.q (Barchuq?) 281, 295
Jubaylâtis. 58, 190
Jubbay (Jubbä, Jubbê?) 74, 130
Jübîn see Chübîn
Jüdähanjän 136, 388
Judda see Jedda
Jüdi mt. 66, 203
Jumul t. 275, 285
Jüdíj, 326
Junday-Säbur see Gundê-Shâpur
Jurî 128, 379
Ju-nân see Khâyân
Jyvum see Güyum

Ka’ba 37, 412
Kabûdhan l. and is. 54, 60, 143, 192
Kâbul lxx, 346; Kâbul r. 209
Kâdhâkh (Katak?), near the Lob-nor 85, 233-4
Kadar, on the Jaxartes 118, 358
Kafarbayyâ 149
Kâfartûtîhâ 141
Kâfsirîstân 367, 369, cf. Bolor
Kâﬁrînhân r. 353, 360, 362, 363
Kâfî, Tâb 150
Kafûrî, 65, 125
Kah 342
Kâhûn 125
K’ai-Feng 226
Kakhêta, cf. Tsanar 402
Kakhîtâ r. 414
Kala (Kalâh-bâr, Kra), in Indo-China 57, 187, 473, 487, 488
Kalâr, Kalâr-dasht 135-6, 388
Kalb t. 116
Kaldâniyûn (Chaldaeans) 392
Kalvûn (Kâlûn) 104, 326-7
Kâm see Yenissei
Kama r. 41, 216
Kâ-mard 342
Kâmarûpa see Qâmarûn
Kâmûn 129
Kân’mân (al-Arm.n), in India 237
Kâmsîghiyû 94, 273
Kân’âniyûn see Kaldâniyûn
Kanbûya 62, 88, 244, 245, 372
Kan-chou see Khâmchû
Kândûr-taghî see Kundâvar
Kang-diz 189, 244
Kânqûr 308, 324
Kangrî (Gangra in Asia Minor) 220
Kânîs 149
Kânjâk t. near Kâshghar 280, 281
Kan-su 226
Kao-ch’ang see Chînânjkath
Kapar see Qobân
Karaj-i Abû-Dulaf 65, 132, 201, 383
Karaj-i Rûdrîrâvar 132
Karakorîm mt. 196, 199
Karas-kûh see Kargas-kûh
Kârblâl 77, 392
Kârbang (Kârbanji) 359-60
Kargas-kûh mt. and desert 36, 80, 83, 102, 126, 131, 222
Kâriyûn 128, 379
Karkh 40, 140
Karkha r. 75
Karkî (Karkûh) 6, 332
Karrân see Kûran in Badhakhshân
Karûk 105
Kârûn r. see Shûshtar r.
Kârvân, in Fârs 74
Kârzûn 128, 379
Kâsâk (Kashak) see Cherkes
Kâsân 341
Kasavân, cf. Abân Kasavân
Kasba 114
Kasbân 124
Kâshân (Qâshân) 80, 133
Kâshîbîn, in India 242
Kâshghar (Ordû-kand, Khargûh) 25, 34, 96, 225, 234, 255, 260, 280-1, 349; r. 206
Kashkûl (?), 206
Kashmir (Qashmîr) 63, 92, 121, 198, 199, 238, 254, 363, 364, 370; Inner and Outer K. 254
Kâshûkî 117
Kâskân (Barsarkân?) 379
Kâsrâ-bâs see Qochqar-bashi
Kastek p. 195, 290, 298, 301
Kâth (spelt: Kâzh), in Khâvârzâm 38, 121, 370, 371
Katha (Yazd) 129, 380
Kâtnûn (Kalvûn) 104, 326-7
Kavar 74, 219, 379
Kavâzhan (?) 104
Kâw see Kiev
Kazâlin 308
Kanaz 315
Kâzûrûn 54, 127
K.bâl, on the Chu r. 289
K.briya 117
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K.b.rna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kchi-Surkhâb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kebin, Great</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kend mt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerch (K.rj, Karch?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kergân-rûd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keykân r., cf. Quyãs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khabis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khabr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khabruqân</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khabs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khabrüqän</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khâbûr r.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khâchên r.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khada-lik, near Khotan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khafän (?) in the Südän</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khâjü</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khâk (Hisn al-ghabrä)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khâlb.k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khälhin (Jâlhln)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khâliya (Khälidät, Islands of the Blest)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khalkhäl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khallukh (Kharlukh, Qarluq)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khân Lanjän</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khan Mardüna (Khan Mardawayh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khân Ravân, cf. Râvinî</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khânl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khârak is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khâram, in Asia Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kharghâ see Kâshghar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khâshar see Kharzianon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khärín</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khân Lanjän</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khân Mardüna (Khan Mardawayh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khâns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khârijites, Mountain of the, (Kuh-i sharât?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khârlukh see Khallukh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khârân b. (Oxus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khârâgh (Khorogi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khârshana see Kharzianon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khârûn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khâs (Khabs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khasâni t. in China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khasav-yurt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khashart see Jaxartes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khathum see Khuthum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khatlam see Khaylâm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khatr (Khabr?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khâtünkath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khâulân</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khâvâk p.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khâvâra see Jâvâra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khâyâm (Khatlâm), now Narin r.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khâyân (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khâyam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khâymand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khâyâyâb (Fâyâyâb?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khazâr sea see Caspian; but 419 = Black sea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khazri (Khazari)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khîr (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khîrkî (Qîrghîz)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khîrîn (Kimî), cf. J.r.m.q (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khîtî (Qîtî), China since Liao dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khîva, cf. Khîwârzîm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khîvâl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khîyâr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khîzî, near Bâkû</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kh.mbr.k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khîm (Kîmî), China since Liao dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khîsarma see Khalaj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khîrásan 6-7, 10, 15-17, 19, 22, 30-1, 36, 38-9, 71, 78, 80, 83, 88, 92, 102, 104-6, 108, 110, 112, 131, 133, 135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khîrásan (Kargas-küh) desert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khîrásan Marches 30, 80, 83, 109-12, 119, 122, 342-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khîr-Müsä</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khîst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khîton 24-5, 61, 70, 85-6, 194, 206, 255, 259-60, 270, 280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khîrây.n-d-e-hün (Khûwây.n-d-e-hün)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khîr.nj.wân</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khîrû</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KhÎsāni t.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khîshîm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khîjudâk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khîjân (Qîchân), cf. Ustuvä</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khîjand (Khujanda)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khîjistân</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khîlân (Khûkand?)-d-e-hün</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khîlum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khûmdân (Ch'ang-an-fu)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Khumdän r., cf. Huang-ho and Wei-ho 70, 80, 206
Khumrak, in Iläq 357
Khūnā (Khuñaj) 142
Khanān (Humarakert) 144, 398
Khunāsira 81, 149
Khunzakh 448
Khūr (Khuvar?) 103
Khurdāb (?), a Rüs town 42, 67, 76, 159, 217, 430
Khurmuk (Khurmuj) 127, 377
Khurra 129
Khurramäbäd (Shäpürkhäst) 383
Khursäb (Khurshäb), in Farghäna 72, 116, 211, 355
Khûr .sh, in China, cf. Kür.ish 70, 84, 228
Khûr .sh, in China, cf. Kür.ish 70, 84, 228
Khuvät-in (Croat) 441
Khushkäb (?), in Transoxiana 117
Khushkarüd 388
Khushmîthan 121
Khushnäbädh 125
Khusrau-gird 102
Khuthum (Hutm) 80, 86, 234
Khutukbai (Ku-t'a-ba) 272
Khuväkand (Khwäkand, Kokand) 116, 355
Khuvänin (Khwänin), in Ghür in, 346
Khuvar (Khwär) 36, 132
Khuväsh (Khwäsh), in Sistän 110
Khüyadhän (Khuwayjän ?) 74
Kirdk in Khotan, cf. Khadalik 86, 234
Kiang see Yang-tze
Kiang-su province 221
Kie-tan, sacred mt. near Kastek 290, 303
Kif 104.
Kij (Këj, Kijkänän, Kiz), in Balüchistän, cf. Qïqän 123, 373
Kilian 262
Kildh (Iqlid) 129, 380
Kimäk t. 35, 44, 66, 68, 75, 81, 83, 94-101, 180, 202, 204, 214, 216, 222, 283, 301, 304-5, 312, 316-7, 437
Kimäk-Yighür see Yughur
Kimärj (Kumärj, Kamärj) 128, 379
Kins-sha-kiang see Kïsäu
Kis 129
Kis 129
Kisau r. 70-1, 206, 229
Kis (Kishsh), in Bukhärä 113, 200
Kishm r. 331
Kishim, cf. Ting-ling 286
Kistna r. 241
K'itan see Qitay
Kp. in Čars, Pārs 129
K. jā 229, 255
K.jürän, in Ghür 343
K.k.räl 118
K.lär, in Güzgän 107, 335
K.l.bänk, in Tibet 71, 94, 207, 256
K.L.sh.j 117, 357
K.L.skän 117
K.Tukhor p., in the Caucasus 445
K.miz (K.mrz), cf. Kûmis 282
K.m.jkath (Mi-ti-chih-t'o) 97, 286
K.mürdäh 363
K.m.sghiasi 94, 293
K.njkath (G.njkath) 113
K.ofu-ch' a 284
Koh-i bābā 199
Köhmarî mt. 232
Kokand see Khuväkand
Kokcha r. 209, 341, 349
Koko-nor l. 194, 258
Kokshaal-tau mt. 296
Kömēdai see Kümîji 363
Könkan (Kumkam) 238, 246
Kop r. 303
Kopal 287
Kotyaeion (Qutiyâ, Kiitahye) 220
K.räl 117
K.rärkhün (K.värkhün) 95
Krasnovodsk 205
K.rdağän 125
K.rdnâkhäs (Kurdarânkhäs?) 122
K.rjâkath (?) 118
K.rk. (K. rj, K.rts, Kerch?) xvii, 32, 182, 321
K.rkrûdh 387
K.r."sangi see Usâng
K.r.yän (?) 93
K.sän, in China 85, 233
K.saym, cf. Kïshtim 97, 286
K.sba 129
K.shütük 355
Kua-chou 85, 233
Index A

Mudhaikhira mt. 203
Mūghakän 391
Mughün (?) 124
Mugojar mt. 202
Muhit see Ocean
Mukrän (Makrän) 123-4, 222, 371
Mukri, cf. Merkit, t. in Far-East 448; Kurdisch t. 410
Mültän (Multän) xv, 27, 72, 89-91, 121, 210, 239, 363
Münjan (B.lj.m, M.lj. am, Mundajän) 364-8; Kurdish t. 410
Mültän (Multän) xv, 27, 72, 89-91, 121, 210, 239, 363
Musfan, in Marv 105
Mushki(?), in Balüchistän 123
Mushkür, cf. Masqut 455
Müy 109, 342
Muzäj t. in Kirmän 373
Muz-tagh 199
Mýnta (Smäty) 1. 54, 183
M.zxrakän (?) 129
Nämband 377
Näbulus 151
Nakahar see Nînhär
Naghar 251
Nahlã (Pahra) 125
Nahr-Isã 76
Nahr al-Karum 78, 220
Nahr al-Malik 77, 139
Nahr-Säbus see Sâs
Nahr-Säbur 212
Nahr-Sarçar 76, 77
Nahrwän 139; z. (Diyâla, Sirvän) 76, 218
Nahrwàra, cf. Anhilvara 238
Najîram 74, 127, 377
Najrân 146
Nakhchuvän (Nakhichevân) 143, 352
Nakshab (Nasaf) 114, 200, 352
Nàkùr 154
Namakiya (Kimakiya, Yimakiya) 100, 310
Nàmkâkhus 116
Nanak, in Gilân 137, 390
Nandar see Vanandar
Nan-shan 194
Naqâd, in Farghâna 355
Nara (or Hakra) r. 372
Närä is. (Ceylon) see Bâra 58, 179, 235
Narbada (Lesser Mihrän?) 72, 196, 198, 210, 236, 245
Nargen is., off Bâkû 191
Nárî (?) see Anärî
Narine r. see Khaylâm, cf. Úzgand
Narmâshîr 125, 375
Närîn (M.rsän?), in Güzgân 107, 335
Nasà (*Nisà) 29, 64, 80, 103, 134, 325, 335
Nâtîl 135
Naubandagän (Naubanjän) 128, 212
Nàb-Bihär, in Balkh 108, 337
Nautak-i Quraysh (Nûqad Quraysh) 114, 352
Nauqän (Mashhad) 103
Nauzhän 114
Navâkat (Navikat), cf. Nûnkath 24, 97, 119, 289-91, 298, 301, 303
Navîjîkhat (?), in China 86, 234
Nawyta (Farîta?) l. 54, 183
Nàyîn 129
Nazzîn (T.zvân?), in Tibet 61, 93, 194, 258
Nazwa 412
N.dä (B.dvä) t. 287
N.drüf (Tadrüf?) 93, 260
Negroes 33, 476
Nèpâl (Naypâl, speit; Baytâl, Nîtal, &c.) 63, 198, 248
Nicaea (Niqiya) 78, 220; l. 55, 78, 184
Niebla (Labia) 155
Nih 110
Nîlhâm r. 114, 209
Nîhang r., in Balûchistân 373
Nîhâvand 132
Nile 54-6, 68-9, 78, 151-2, 220, 475, 482; Blue N. 221
Nîlqâz t. 304
Nîrûf (Tadrîf?) 138
Nînhîr (Nîhâr, Nagarahär, Ninghâr) 72, 91, 209, 251-3
Nîrîz, in Fârsk 201, 380
Nîshâpur 16, 18, 64, 102-3, 199, 325
Nîshibîn 66, 140
Nîtal see Népâl
Nîyâl mt. 145, 407, 410, cf. 388
Nîzayn (Bahrayn ?) 146
N.müdhûgh 356
N.myâs in India 87, 241
Northmen, cf. Rüs, Warank 181
North Pole 50-1, 181
Novgorod 434
Nubia (Nûba) 33-4, 55-6, 68, 78, 81, 83, 151-2, 164-5, 475; desert 222
Nûbîn (Bûbûn) 87, 243
Nûchârâ see Andîchârâgh 119, 360
Nûdîz (Naudiz?) 71, 209, 359, 361
Nûjakath 118, 357
Nûkarda t. 469
Nûkath see Tûnkath
Nükhb.k (Nükük) 282
Nükî, in Shakkî 400
Nu‘mániya 138
Nümijkath 352
Nu‘nîn (?), cf. Ujjayn 72, 245
Nükat (Navâkat); 289-90
• (Navâkat and Tümkat)
Nu‘nün(?) 72, 88, 245
Nu-shih-pi t. 287
Nyrätabad 375
Nûzhân 122
Nûzhgân 104
Nüzkat (var. Nünkat)
see Tümkat 289
Nylân-Rüdbâr 388
Oases see Wahât
Oba (Aufa) 343
Obi (Yumar) r. 275, 285, 305
Ocean, Eastern (Ugiyânûs-i Mashriqi), cf. Green See 32, 34, 51-2, 56, 70, 79, 80, 82-4, 96, 179, 186
Ocean, Encircling (Muhît) 216
Ocean, Western (Uqiyanüs-i maghribi) 7, 8, 32, 41, 51, 53-4, 58-9, 79, 83, 153-4, 156, 158, 165, 179, 181, 190
Ocsonaba (Ukhshunaba) 155, 418
Oghör, cf. Uyghur, Avars (Pseudo-)
Oghuz, cf. Toghu-zghuz, Ghuz 311
Oglon (*Onglon) see Bujaq 467, 470
Ohind see Vayhind
Oichardës (Tarim?) 206
Oka r. 217, 434, 438, 442
'Oniän 39, 58, 148, 164, 396; sea 52, 145
Omayyad t. 149
On-Uyghur see Uyghur
Opsikion (Ubsiq) 78, 156
Optimaton (Uftimât) 156
Ordu-kand see Kasghar
Orissa, Urshln 27, 87, 241
Ōsh 22, 72, 116, 355
Osset see Alân, Ās 318, 456
Ostiaks 309, 318; Yenisei Ostiaks 302
Ottrar, cf. Turăr 358
Oxus (Amû-daryâ) 5, 17, 198-9, 208
Pâb (Pâp) 72-3, 117, 355
Pai-mâ-ho 294
Pamelbang 188
Palestine (Filastîn) 150, 151
Pa-lu-kia 294
Pamir (Fâmîr) 196, 361-2
Panj r. see Amû-daryâ, Vakhsh r. 198
Panjâb (Hind?) 89
Panjbûr (Panjûr) 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.ljkath) 98, 291
Panjvây (Panjvây) 111, 332, 345-6
Pannonia 431
Paphlagonia, cf. Afrakhûn 78, 156, 204
Parâb (Pârâb), on the Jaxartes 72, 118-9, 122, 284, 306, 312
Parak r. 73, 118, 211, 289
Pârîghar (Pîrkhâr, Bârghar) in Khuttal 71, 119, 208, 360-1
Pârs see Fârs
Partav see Bardhâ'a 397
Parthians see Dahae 386
Pârvân 39, 112, 348; P.rvân 482
Pârây (Pîrây) in Güzgân 4, 5, 39, 107, 335
Pasâ (Fâsâ) 65, 128, 129
Pashm (Bashm), different from Pazhm? 388
Pavlodar 308
Paykand, cf. Āvâza 56, 73, 113, 352
Paylamân(?)-shahr 137, 390
Pazhm 136; cf. P.zhm
Pechenegs (Bachenâk) 35, 42, 44, 53, 75, 96, 101, 142, 159, 162, 305, 312-5, 319, 458-9, 463, 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 Irâq) 52, 180
Perta, cf. Nawyta
P'iao see Pyu
Pir-i 'Alamdär, in Dämghân 387
Pirrîm (Pîrîm, Pirrîm) 39, 77., 135, 136, 387
Podandon see Budhandûn
Po-huan 294, 297
Poland 433
Polovtsi see Khichcaq 315
Pontos see Black sea 182
Po-ta-ling see Bedel p.
Prague (Firagh) 441
Prinkant see Farînkath 352
P.r.kd.r see Barakdiz
Przhevalsk (Qara-qol) 293
Pu-blpara 123
Pu-ku-chen (Black Irtish?) 286
Pu-li Zâghül 177
Pu-lu see Bolor
Pulvâr r. see Farvâb 213
Pyrû, 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
Qâdisiya 38, 81, 140
Qâghan-Stupa, in Bish-baliq 269
Qâhtân t. 412, 449
Index A

Raml al-Ma'dan 81-2, 164; r. 78

Râng-Rong (?) 61, 92, 194, 256-7

Raqa 76, 141, 150

Ras (?) r. cf. Asus, Ishim, Artush 75, 215, 283, 305, 308

Ra's al-'Ayn 141

Rasht, in Gilân 137, 361, 362, 390

Rasht see Zhasht

Râsk 123

Rasükh t. 373

Räsun see Jarmî

Rävim (Rivand) 103, 326

Rayy 18, 36, 39, 64-5, 80, 102, 132, 135, 384; mt. 77

Rayyu (Regio?) 155

Rauf in Ghûr 343

Rävini (Rivand) 103, 326

Räykütiya (Rayküyand ?) 93

Red sea (Khalij-i 'arabi) 52, 180, 222

Regar 353

Rhodes (Rhudas) 8, 158, 190

Rhodoses (Rhudas) 8, 158, 190

Ribât Afrîghûn 6, 175, 331; R. al-ajurr 386; R.-Fädıl 349-50; R.-Hafs 386, R.-i kârûn (spelt kirdûn) 5, 73, 106-7, 211, 330, 334, 336

Rif, in Egypt, cf. Ibrîq 204

Rihâ (Jericho) 151

Rikän 125, 375

Rïshahr, in Khûzistan 74, 127, 212, 213, 378; in Fârs (Resîr) 378

Riştân 116

Rivand see Râvini 326

Rivshârân (Rûshârân?) 106, 108, 332, 336, 482

Riyas (?) 55, 184

R.kht.jab see Zâybak 120, 364, 481

R.nj.s see R.bkh.s

Rome see Rûmiya

R.ştûya 255, 256

Rûbâs r., cf. R.bkh.s 450

Rûd-i A'la (Gûpûl) r. 381; R.-i Hilla 212, 377; R.-i shûr 183, 212

Rûdbär, in Kûrmân 124

Rûdha, in Jîbîl 133, 384

Rûdhnân (Rûdhân), in Āfghânîstan 111, 346; between Kûrmân and Yâzâd 65, 125, 201; between Fârs and Kûrmân 120; in Daylâm (Rûyân) 135, 387

Rûdhrâvar (Rûdhrâvar) 132, 383

Rûdisar 388

Rûf in Ghûr 343

Rûfta 128

Ruhâ (Edessa) 37, 141

Ruhûn (Adam's peak) 134

Rukhûdh (Rûkhûdh, Rûkhkhaj, Arachosia) xv, 64, 111, 121, 346

Rûm (Byzantine Empire) 8, 40-1, 52-5, 58, 67-9, 76-9, 82-3, 142-3, 148, 153-8, 160-1, 321, 439; Western 69, cf. Rûmiya

Rûm sea (Mediterranean) 32, 52-4, 58-9, 60, 82-3, 148-9, 151, 153-6, 158, 191, 320, 459

Rûmî strait 52

Rûmiya (Rome, Roman land) 21, 59, 60, 158, 192

Rûmiyân see Byzantines, cf. Greeks

Rûnâ see Dûnâ (Danube)

Ruotsi, cf. Rûs 432

Rûr (Rohri, Rûr) 72, 89, 246, 372

Rûs 29, 35, 41-2, 44, 67-8, 75-6, 83, 101, 144, 158-60, 181-2, 204, 314, 321, 398, 406, 432; mt. 42, 160; r. 41, 75, 217-8, 316, 429, 438

Rustâ Bîk 119, 359-60; R. Blj.m (M.lj.m?) see Mûnân 121; R. Rustâm (?) 128; R.-yî Awâs (Ephesus?) 68

Rustâq 359

Rûtâ (Rûthâ) r. cf. Dûnâ 43-4, 76, 101, 159, 217-8, 315-6, 430, 437

Ruvât 150

Rûy (Rû'b) 338

Rûyâgân (Ruwayjân) 74, 212, 379

Rûyân see Rûdhân, in Dalâylm

Ryn, in Abuûssinia (Zayla') 34, 164, 474; in the Südân 165, 477

Sa'âda 127

Saba' (Sâbâ) 148

Sâbâlân (Savalan) mt. 66, 202

Sâbât 115, 354

Sabir t. cf. Swr 455

Sâbrân (Saurân, spelt: Sâhrân) 119; 306, 308, 358

Sâbûr, Bishâpûr 212

Sâbus cf. Sâs (Shâsh) 76, 138, 218

Sâbzâvar 64, 102

Sa'da 146

Sadûsân, in Sînd 72, 122

Sâfîd-Rûd (Sapidh-rudh) 77, 137, 218; 390

Sâghûr (Bâlâ-Sâghûn?) on the Chu 291

Sahand mt. 201

Sâhârâ 223

Sâhâbân, in Sînd 372

Sâhûk see Châhûk

Sâhîd see Egypt, Upper

Sâju see Sha-chou

Sakâh-Haunavrgah 368

Sâkala (Sialkot), cf. Tâqi 249

Sâkând (Iskând) 39, 63, 109, 338-40

Sâkân (Mûnd) r. 74

Sâkhchû (Sukhchû), cf. Saukjû 85, 232

Sâkh-în, Czêchû 441

Sâkhtûsar 388

Sâkîfâghn 114

Sâlâmât see Salâhât

Sâlâmâs (Salâmâs) 143
Index A

Shābirinji (?) 105
Shābūrqān, &c. see Ushbūrqān
Shabwa 77
Sha-chou 25, 70, 85, 207, 229, 230-1, 233, 235
Shādhagān (Shādhakān) r. 74, 212, 377
Shāh-Mōbadh’s Fortress 126
Shahād, cf. Sind, Tus 139
Shahra-zhūr (Shah-razūr, Siyā-razūr) 132, 383
Shahr-i Bābak (Pāpak) 129, 380
Shahristān, in Gurgān 133, 385; in Ispahan 131
Shariyār-Kūh see Qārin 387
Shahruvā 124
Shah-sevān t. 304
Shāhī peninsula 193
Shākh ( ?)-dara r. 367
Shaki (Shakki) 77, 144, 398
Shāl 137
Shāls 21
Shamagān 129
Shamākhi (Shammākhiya) 144, 403
Shāmāt 125
Shamistiyān 17
Shamkūr (Shamkhor) 144, 398
Shān-chou, cf. Sha-chou, 230
Shan-shan 258
Shantarin see Santarem
Shantariya (read Shantabriÿa, Centobriga) 69, 205, 229, 417-8
Shantung 221
Shāpūr 376 see Bishāpūr
Shapūr, cf. Khurramābād 132, 383
Shāristāna, near Nasā 325
Sharja 148
Sibdāst 200
Sibhīr, in Kirmān 125, 375
Sibinakān (Isfānaqān) 103, 325
Si-chow see Yar-khoto
Sicily (Siqiliya) 20, 59, 192
Siif bānī Ṣafār 148
Sijilmāsa 82, 154, 223
Sīkāshī, cf. Yar-khoto 273
Sīkūl, on the Issik-kul 99, 299
Sillistriâ (Distra) 313
Silver island see Jazīrat al-fidda
Simhapura (Seng-ho-pu-lo) see S. lãbūr
Simingān 63, 108, 109
Simnān 36, 64, 135
Sinai see Tūr-Sīnā; S. desert see Thīh
Sind 19, 34, 36, 52, 64, 80, 83, 89, 109, 122-3, 125, 163, 371; desert 109; village near Nasā 185
Sind-rūdh, cf. Indus 72, 327
Sindān, port in India 57, 88, 244-5
Sinz 74, 127, 212, 377
Sinn 76, 141
Sipāhān see Ispāhān
Siparâyīn see Isfarāyīn
Sirāf, 40, 74, 127, 224
Sir-dārâyī see Jaxartes
Sirgān (Sirjān) 124-5, 374
Sirīn see Shirīn (Hindiyān) r.
Sirīn see Shirīn (Hindiyān) r.
Sirīn, near Saymara 132, 218
Sirvān, near Saymara 132, 218
Sisar 218
Sīstān 19, 36, 55, 73, 80, 110, 125; desert 80, 123
Siyāh-kūh (Manghishlaq) 60, 193
Sīvī, in Balūchistān 111, 346
Siyāhkal 388, 390
Shirvān (Shirvan) 144-5, 193, 403-4, 410, 445, 454
Sh.mākāb (Shīkākath) 118, 357
Sh.lāt (S.lāt) 117, 356
Sharak p. 343
Sh.rwī r. 217
Sh.türkāth 118
Shughnān (Shakīna, Shaqīna, Shakhnān, Shīkinān, Shiqīnān, S.qliya?) 63, 71, 86, 112, 349-50, 363-4, 366, 368
Shu-lé see Kāshghar
Shūmān 115, 120, 337
Shumaysīhāt (Sumaysāt, Samosāta) 76, 148, 393
Shūrā, in Sind 123
Shūr-kūl, cf. Tūz-kūl 184, 290
Shūrīn 105, 327
Shūsha, in Transcaucasia 398
Shūshtar (Tustar) town and r. 74, 130, 213-4
Sialkot 249
Siao-shih 294
Sibdāst 200
Sibīh (Sibij), in Kirmān 125, 375
Sībīnakān (Iṣīnaqān) 103, 325
Si-chow see Yar-khoto
Sicily (Sīqiliya) 20, 59, 192
Siī bānī Ṣaffār 377
Sīffīn 141
Sījilmāsā 82, 154, 223
Sīkāshī, cf. Yar-khoto 273
Sīkūl, on the Issik-kul 99, 299
Silistriâ (Distra) 313
Silver island see Jazīrat al-fidda
Sīmphūra (Seng-ho-pu-lo) see S. lãbūr
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place Name</th>
<th>Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tabghach (Taugast, China under Wei dynasty)</td>
<td>284, 448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tablān (Ṭablān, Taylān)</td>
<td>156, 421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabrīz</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabūk</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tadmur</td>
<td>81, 149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tāffī</td>
<td>see Tāfi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tāfqān (Turfan?)</td>
<td>62, 94, 194, 271, 293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taghdumbash-Pamir</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tahā, in Egypt</td>
<td>476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tahart</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tahī</td>
<td>see Tari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tā'īf</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tā'in fil-bahr</td>
<td>see Jabal-T.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tā'ir-su, cf. Ändichärägh</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tājikistän</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tagus (Tāju)</td>
<td>r. 79, 155, 205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takka-Dea, cf. Tāqi</td>
<td>239, 249-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takrit</td>
<td>66, 140, 201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talas</td>
<td>see Tarāz, cf. Kümi-Talas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talaqān, near Qazvin</td>
<td>132; in Güzgän</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tālish (Taylasän?)</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tālkh.za</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talvār</td>
<td>see Munk r.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamākhus</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamāzān</td>
<td>106, 334, 336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tambūk-i Müristān</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamīm</td>
<td>t. 146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamīsha</td>
<td>134, 386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamīstān</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamliyāt (Namlīyāt)</td>
<td>120, 360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamrān</td>
<td>106, 334, 336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tāna (Thāna), near Bombay</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tannu-ola</td>
<td>mt. 283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tārābulus, in Syria</td>
<td>9, 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tārān</td>
<td>58, 190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tārāz (Talas, Ulugh Talas)</td>
<td>61, 100, 119, 194, 202, 269, 274, 292, 303, 306, 308, 357; r. 286, 358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarbaghatai range, cf. To-ta</td>
<td>274, 278, 283, 286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tāri (Taḥi), in Nubia</td>
<td>164, 475, 482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarīm (Kuchā, Waṣāl)</td>
<td>r. 70, 206-7, 222, 235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tārūq (Tarkhu), cf. Samandar</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarkūs (Tarkūsh)</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarmīdīh (Tirmīdīh, Termesz)</td>
<td>71, 114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarūt</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taṣrāṣ AQan r. see Ishim 202</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarūm, in Fārs</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tās (Unās?)</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasāwā, in N. Africa</td>
<td>474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ta-shīh, cf. Wen-su</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tashkent</td>
<td>see Chāch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tash-Qurghan, in Sarikol</td>
<td>233, 369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasht (Bakhtagān)</td>
<td>l. 183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tāt t., in Shīrvān</td>
<td>408, 456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatabi t.</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatar, a Turkish t.</td>
<td>285; Volga T. 460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tātār, cf. Mongols</td>
<td>94, 270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tātār, a branch of Kimāk</td>
<td>304, 309, 317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taurus</td>
<td>204; Cilician 205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ta'sūs fortress, cf. Tulās</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taushqan (spelt: T.f.skhan, *Taghush-khan, or, if spelt Tāsh-khan, *Tawush-khan), cf. Ag-su</td>
<td>278, 296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tāvarān, near Tūs</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tāvāvis</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tāvaj</td>
<td>74, 212, or Tavaz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarāsān (Tālish)</td>
<td>180, 391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taymā</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tayy mts., cf. Jabalān</td>
<td>67, 221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tābhāgh.r, read Yabhāghu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tekes r.</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teknābād</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tepīrikē see Abrīq</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terter (Tharthūr, Bardha’a)</td>
<td>r. 400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thājākh (?) t. and r., near Khotan, cf. Wajakho</td>
<td>70-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thātha, cf. Mansūra and Lohāri</td>
<td>372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thay (Qāy?)</td>
<td>84, 229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrace (Thirāqiya)</td>
<td>32, 40-1, 79, 156-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thracesion</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thughūr al-Jazīra see Jazīra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thule is. (Tūli, Tūlya, Shetland is.)</td>
<td>52, 59, 181, 191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thīb, in Khūzistān</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tibet (Tubbat, Tūpūt)</td>
<td>24-5, 34-5, 39, 61, 63, 70, 80, 83-6, 90, 92-4, 96, 97, 112, 116, 119, 121, 233, 254-63, 284, 340, 482; Bolorian T. (Baltistān) 93, 258; Gate of T. 39, 120, 385; Inner T. 369; Outer T. 248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tibetans</td>
<td>39, 85, 93, 121, 227, 234, 256, 267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tien-ho ch'êng, cf. Lou-lan</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ti'en-shan, cf. Ighraj-art, Tāfqān</td>
<td>194-5, 207, 226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiflis</td>
<td>43, 144, 447, 456, 458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tigris</td>
<td>10, 76, 138-41, 218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tih bani Isrā'il (Sinai desert)</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tihāma</td>
<td>146, 203; mts. 66, 77, 145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tijaspi</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tijin, in Gilān</td>
<td>137, 390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tijīn see Tizhīn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Til (Till), on the Hilmand</td>
<td>73, 111, 211, 345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timbuktu</td>
<td>477</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Tûnis 153
Tûnkat see Nûkath 24, 117, 356
Tûnkat-i B.khârân 118
Tun-kien, cf. Tûnkat 289
Tûrâ, in Egypt 476
Tûrân, in Balûchistân 123, 372
Tûrân-Zârâk, on the Jaxartes, cf. Òttar 358
Tûrân (cf. Tafqân) 26, 195, 229, 271
Turghay r. 308
Tûrgish 264, 268, 278, 285, 287–8, 291, 298, 300, 302, 347; Black T. 301–3; Yellow T. 301–2, 317
Tûrî (?) 134
Turks 11, 20, 32, 36, 38, 44, 82, 85, 94 (Toghuzghuz), 96, 101, 115–9, 121, 160, 456 and passim; Tork, i.e. Ghuz in Russia 316; Turk-Magyar 469; Balqar T. 445; K.njïna T. 120, 361
Turkistân, ‘Turkish lands’ 38, 61, 94, 102, 118, 121, 351; Eastern T. 24; Gates of T. 38, 102, 112, 115, 122
Tûrmân (Ghuz) 311, 317
Turshîz 103
Tür-Sînä (Sinai) 67
Tûs 29, 55, 64, 77, 103, 133, 185; l. (Chashma-yi sabz, Shahd) 55, 185
Tûsmat (?), in Tibet 61, 93, 194, 259
Tûstur see Shûshtar
Tuwas, see Thule is. 59
Tuwaysha 378
Tuyugh-ghun, cf. Ajäyul 258
Tûxz-chölü, in Asia Minor 183
Tûz-kül, cf. Issik-kul, Boro-dabasun, Shûr-kul 28, 54, 98, 184, 290
Tûzün-‘ârij (hardly Õsûn-aghach!), near the l. Tûz-kûl 98, 184, 195, 290
Tûzün-bulagh 98, 184, 290
Tûwsm see Tûsmat
Tythäl 63, 91, 198, 239, 248
Ubulla (Bula) 76, 138
Üch-qariqan 284
Ugra r. 323
Uj (Uch-Turfan) 28, 98, 293–5
Ujjayn, cf. Nü’nîn 189, 245, 336
‘Ukbarä 76, 140, 218
Ük-tagh mt. 305
‘Ulayq (‘Alîq?), mt. in Armenia 76
Uninhabited Lands, of the North 42, 96, 99, 101, 156, 158–9, 316; of the South 69, 83, 163, 165
‘Uqâb (?), in Arabia 148, 413
Urâl mts. 204, 306, 443; r. see Yayiq
Urash (Urast) 72, 116; r. 355
Urdunn (Jordan) r. 150
Urgun (?), cf. Farmul 251
Ürkath (Üzkath?) 99, 304
Urmiya 143, 183; l. (Kabüdhän) 379
Ur.shîn, cf. Manduri-pattan, Mandam 27, 87, 243
INDEX A

A

Ürshîn (Ürshîn) see Orissa 27, 87, 241
Urtaβ see Arthaniya 75, 159, 438
Urûmchi 265
Ürûn-ärij (Üzûn-aghach) mt. 97, 290, 298
Üsâng, (Arsâng, K.rsâng) 25, 71, 94, 208
Ushbânîkât 358
Ushbûrçân (Shabûrçân, Shîbahgân, Sapurçan, &c.) 5, 39, 117, 335
Ushnû (cf. Asna) 394
Ushtrurj 336
Ustâb bani Junayd 139
Ust-yurt (Chînk) 312, 314
Ustuvä, cf. Khüjän 29, 77
Ust-yurt (Chînk) 312, 314
Uswän see Assuan
Utigur t. 264
Uwäl (Wal) 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, Toghuzghuz, Yighur, Yughur
Uzam (?) 130
Uzbeks, in Afghanistan 288
Üzkath (Z.kath), on the Chu 98, 291, 304
Uzu see Dniepr
Uzun-aghach see Ürûn-ärij

B

Balansiya 155
Vâbnit (Vântit, Vâbit, &c.), a Slav town 159, 428, 431
Vadhrâ 352
Vâghkath (Vagat) see Faghkath 354
Vakhân (Vakhkhan) 39, 63, 71, 86, 120–1, 325, 350, 366–8; r. (Vakhkhâb) 208; Vakhi (Vakhâniâns) 39, 121
Vakhjîr p. 364
Vâghsh (Vakhshâb, Surkhâb) r. 71, 120, 198, 209, 360–1; district 120; mts. (Alay?) 77
Vâlsîntan see Bâlis
Vallabha, south of Chaul 246
Valvâjî 72, 109, 209, 340
Varač’an (Varshliya, Bashli?) 449, 453
Varaghârsar 113
Varang see Warâk
Varhûl 117
Vardoj r. 365
Vardûk 357
Vartig (Var'îg), cf. Warang 423–3
Varmêshân see D.m.shân
Vârpûva (Varfû) 136, 387
Vartân (Warthân, Altan) 77, 142, 395, 403

C

Varzûqân, near Ahar 396
Vasârmîk see Sâvnîk
Vascons see Basques
Vastân, in Daîlam 136, 388
Vâtkhâth (Vankhâth) 116, 355
V’âtîchi, Russian t. 436
Vayagân 74, 127–8, 213, 379
Vayhînd (Ohind, Gandhâra) 63, 92, 251, 253–4
Vayshagîrt (Bishgîrd, Vêshagîrt) 115, 120, 355
Vehrot (Oxus) 331
Venice 423
Vima, in Tâbarîstân 135
Vindhîya, mts. 198, 236
Vindûshâvur see Gundê-Shâvur
Vistula r. 430
V.j.khîyan (?), in Tibet 93, cf. Wajâkî (?)
Vlachs (Rumanians) 468
Vogul t. 309, 318
Voïga, cf. Itîl 41, 43–4, 305, 309, 312–6, 462
Voïga Tartars see Tatâr
V.r.nî mt., in Ghûr (?) 343
V.r.shan, in Khazaria, cf. Varač’an (?) 453
Vülashgîrd 124
Vulundur see W.l.ndr 470
Vuy-tsang, in Tibet, cf. Üsâng 262

D

Wâdi Bâhyân (spelt: Miyân) 77, 148
Wâdi al-Qurâ 148
Wâdi Halfa 477
al-Wâhât (Oases’) mt. 69, 78, 81, 152; desert 151
Wajâkî r., near Khotan 70, 206–7
Wâqwâq 228; Gold island (Sumatra) 52, 83–4, 187; in Zangistân 472
Warâk (Varang, Var’îg) 181, 432; W. sea 182, 422
Wâsit 37, 76, 129, 138–9; swamp 77
Wei-ho r. 206
Wen-su (B.nchûl, *B.nchûk) 27–8, 98, 240, 283, 293–4, 296
White Croats 430, 432, cf. Serbs
Wistû, northern t. 309
W.l.ndr (W.l.nd.r, *Wûlûndûr), cf. Vanandar 443, 459, 468–70
Women, Isle of, (Kwen, Naissare) 8, 58–9, 191
Wu-sun t. 444

E

Xâšrû-suka see Vayshagîrt 353
Xvanvant mt. 330

F

Yâbâghû, Khallukh t. 285, 287–8; r. (cf. Uzûnd r.) 116, 211, 288–9, 293
Yâbghû (Yagfûh, Janart) p. 276, 296
Yâbis (Ibiza) is. 59, 192
Yâfî 149
Yafinj, cf. Mâb.nj-J.râbiûs 95, 276–7
Yaghmû (Y.ghmiyû) t. 34–5, 62, 73, 83, 95–8, 195, 260, 270, 278, 290, 301
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yahudhan</td>
<td>see Jahudhan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yakh-su</td>
<td>cf. Kulab r. 208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yakh, Kuh-i yakh</td>
<td>see Qasak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yakutsk</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yalama</td>
<td>r. 456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yalapani</td>
<td>? 118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yamak (Yimak)</td>
<td>cf. Kimak, Namakiya 305, 316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yamakoji</td>
<td>see Jamagird, 189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yamana</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yamgan, Ynbqan</td>
<td>see Yumgan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yamkert</td>
<td>see Jamagird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yanqi-Baliq</td>
<td>in the Ti'ien-shan 235, 272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yang-su</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yang-su (Akhshu)</td>
<td>cf. Kulab r. 208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yang, Kuh-i yang</td>
<td>see Qasak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yanq-te klang</td>
<td>195, 206, 208, 228, 230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yar, near the Issik-kul</td>
<td>[perhaps = Sariq] 292, 297-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yarkhoto (Si-chou)</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yarim, in Arabia</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yarkand</td>
<td>r. 206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yasi p.</td>
<td>292-3, 310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yasin-Gilgit</td>
<td>r. 210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yavadvipa</td>
<td>(labadiu, Jazirat al-fiida) 186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yayik (Ural)</td>
<td>r. 215, 309, 313-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yazd (Katha)</td>
<td>129, 380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yazdashir, in Kirman</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yazidiya, in Shirvan</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>20-1, 40, 66, 81, 146-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yen-ch'i</td>
<td>see Qarashar 275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yenisey r. 196, 283, 286, 362</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yevlak, on the Kurr</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y.ghsun-Yasu,</td>
<td>in Kimakia 100, 309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yighur</td>
<td>see Yughur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yighur of Turkistan</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yumur see Obi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y.ra r., near Khotan</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yucho, cf. Uj, Wen-su 27, 294</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugria, &quot;Southern&quot; (?)</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yukand 117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yughur (Yihur, Kimak-Yihur), a t. near the Aral sea 180, 215, 310, 312</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yulduz, in the Ti'ien-shan 275-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yumgan 367-8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yun (?) kingdom, in Tukharistan</td>
<td>109, 340, 349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yun (Bwr, Mwr?) l, in Fars 54, 127, 183</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yunan see Greece 158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugru see Aq-su 296</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yun-nan 236, 240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yun's mt. see Tulas 287</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yura (Yughra), t. 309-10, 437</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zab, Greater and Lesser 76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zabj, cf. Sridh, Sumatra, Wawwaq, Zaba 33-4, 52, 57, 83, 163-4, 228, 471-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zabid 20-1, 40, 147</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zakbal (Jibulistan) 112, 346</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaghawa (spelt: Laba) 165, 477</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zagros 383</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zakatali(according to A. Genko, &quot;Zakartala? &quot;Zacharia's plot&quot;) 410</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zamun 200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zamr-i Atash-parast</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zandana 112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zandaramish 116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zangun 132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zangi, &quot;East-Africans&quot; 51, 163-4; Waw- wajian Z. 56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zangistan (Zangibir, Zanj) 33-4, 52, 83, 163-4, 179, 228, 471-2; sea 52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zangya 262</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zarafshan r. see Soghd r.; range see Buttanm 211</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zarah 55, 73, 185</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zari-i Murgh mt., in Ghur 343</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zarindrud (Zayanda-rud) 131, 383</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zarmun (spelt: Armun) 113, 352</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zarq, in Marv 105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zarqan, in Fars 128, 379</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zava, near Khotan 93, 259</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zawila, in Fazzan 153, 416, 477</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaybak, cf. R.kht.j.b 120, 364-5, 367</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaydan 380</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zayla (spelt: Rym) 474</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaytun, in China 227</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhaisht (Jasht, Rasht) 63, 120, 361, 363</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zina-ab 353</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zinvar 114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zirgaran, in Daghestan 450</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zirkhan 365</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z. Kat see Uzbek 291</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zughar (Zor) 67, 151, 415</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zuzan (Zozen) 103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following names could not be transliterated in Latin characters:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arak, in Transoxiana 117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arudx, mt. in Armenia 218</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assas 229</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arwqam (Aoqqm), east of the Aral sea 306, 315, 317</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anjbas, in Transoxiana 118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nawabk Art, in Toghuaghuz 95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suhor, in Khalluk 98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malan Rozadar (Nylan?), in Gilan 136</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhakak, in Transoxiana 118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinaaj (Ghannah?), in Transoxiana 117, 357</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shukur, in Transoxiana 118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rezjestem, in Transoxiana 117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharq, in Farghana 116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miskan (Miskan?), in Transoxiana 116, 355</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kakan, in Transoxiana 119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mlm, in the Hindukush 121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lmr, in Sistan 345</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. PERSONAL NAMES AND TITLES

'Abd al-Rahmân, Cordovan caliph 470
'Abdalläh ibn al-Mubärak 141
'Abbâsids 11, 12-13, 15, 27, 40, 140-1, 352, 360
'Abd al-Qayyüm b. al-Husayn b. 'Ali al-Fârisî, owner and scribe of the H.-A. vii-viii, 166
Abraham 37, 88, 139, 146, 150
abshâd (ayshä, ansä), Khazar title 162, 451
Abû 'Ali Ahmad, of Chaghäniyän 17
Abû 'Ali, a Mu'tazilite imâm 381
Abû Bakr Muhammad, of Chaghäniyän 17
Abû-Dâ'údids 341, 345, 359
Abû Dulaf of Karaj 132, 383
Abû Abd, caliph 141
Abû-Fadl ibn-al- 'Amîd 29, 133
Abû-Fadl Gulpäyagäni ix, xv, 3
Abû-Fath, of Badhakhshän 349-50
Abû-Härîth, see Muhammad b. Ahmad
Abû-Muzaffar, see Muhammad b. Ahmad
Abû Muhammad [b.] Hasan b. Mihrän 177
Abû Muslim 356
Abû Muzähim, khäqän, 300, 303
Abû-Naṣr Ahmad b. Muhammad 6, 177
Abû-Säj, see Yusuf
Adam 37, 61, 146, 194
'Adud al-daula, Büyid 28, 214, 374
Afraşîyáb, dynasty of 278, 295
Afrîgh (Afrîghûn, Farîghûn, Ifrîgh) 6, 173-4, 342, 371
ayshä', title in Usrûshana 354
Ahmäd b. Farîghûn 6, 175
Ahmäd b. Mu'tasîm, 'Abbâsids 11
Ahmäd b. Sahl, of Marv 16-17
'Alî b. 'Abd al-Azîd 172, 394
'Alawi Burqa'i 139, 392
Alexander the Great 156, 225
'Ali b. Abî Tâlîb 17, 140
'Ali b. Haytham, of Shîrvân 406
'Ali b. Mûsâ al-Riḍâ, in Mashhad 103

Bâbûr 251
Badi' al-Zamân Hamadhânî 178
Bagratunids 397
Bahrâm Chûbin 102
Bahrâm Gûr 447
Ballah-râ (Ballah-rây), king in India 88, 89, 91, 236-8, 244, 251
Bânîjûr family, of Khuttal 353, 359
barâz-handa, ruler of Möünsän 106, 335
Barzuvîlà, Turkish prince 461
Basil I, emperor 424
Ba'ura (B.ûzä), king of Qinnauj 239, 253
Bâv, Bâvand dynasty 135
Bayan, son of Kubrat 467
bayghû, cf. yabghû 296, 303-4
B.dân-Sänkû (B.dân-Sângû), dihqân 298, 304
beg-tegin, cf. Yinal-beg-tegin 95, 274, 304
Bilgä-Qaghan 265, 302
Bltwâr (Yiltuvar?i), Bulghär king 461
Boghra-Khân 278
Boris, king 468
Bsmût-Swyt, see S.mût-swyt
Bughä, Mutawakkil's general 401
Bûlûrm-shäh, of Bolor 121
Bûyids 28-9, 138, 214, 374, 377, 392
Chalukya dynasty of Vengi 238
Chandël dynasty 237
Charlemagne (Qärula) 191, 424
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maghribi, cf. Fatimids</td>
<td>3, 246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-maharaj of Zabaj</td>
<td>473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahdi, caliph</td>
<td>10, 11, 40, 120, 220, 350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahmodaya, cf. Ba'ura</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma'mun, caliph</td>
<td>31, 112, 140, 220, 350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma'munids of Khwarazm</td>
<td>174, 371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manaf (?)</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mäni</td>
<td>25, 84-5, 130, 269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manjik, poet</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansur, caliph</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansur (b.) Nur, Samanid</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marwan, Omayyad</td>
<td>452, 455, 476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-MarwazI, Husayn b. 'Ali, a general</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-MarwazI, Muhammad Suluk</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marzbân b. Zadiya</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marzubân b. Muhammad, Musafirid</td>
<td>396-7, 406, 409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mas'ud Ghaznavid</td>
<td>177, 334, 336, 343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mazyadids</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meysar</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mihran dynasty</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.n.h.b (Fanjab, puigawa?)</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses</td>
<td>148, 449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad b. Ahmad, Abul-Muzaffar, of Chaghaniyan</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad b. Ahmad, Abul-Harith, Farighuni vii, 4, 6, 49, 173, 175-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad b. Fa'idi Qarmati</td>
<td>21, 66, 203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohammad b. Hasan the Lawyer</td>
<td>133, 384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad b. Yazid, Shirvan-shah</td>
<td>406, 455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad Ghaznavid</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad Khwarazm-shah</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad Nadir khan, king of Afghanistan</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad b. Zakariyya Razi</td>
<td>132, 384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhtaj family of Chaghaniyan</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mu'izz, Fatimid</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munisir, Samanid</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Muqanna'</td>
<td>311, 336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muqtadir, caliph</td>
<td>352, 460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musafirids</td>
<td>394, 396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mu'tadid, caliph</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutamid, caliph</td>
<td>12-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mut'asim, caliph</td>
<td>11, 40, 140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutawakkil, caliph</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasir al-Daula, Hamdanid</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasir al-din Shah</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasr b. Ahmad, Samanid</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasr II 16-17, 22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nayzak [<em>Nizuk ?]</em></td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nayzak Tarkhan</td>
<td>327, 338, 240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nimrud</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nizam al-mulk</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.jaba, cf. Jaba</td>
<td>249, 251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noah</td>
<td>66, 412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuh b. Asad, Samanid</td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuh b. Mansur, Samanid</td>
<td>4, 176, 178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oldenburg, S. F. x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oleg</td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Omar b. 'Abd al-'Aziz, in Mansura</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Omar ibn al-Khattab</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omayyads</td>
<td>155, 417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pâkh (?), prince in Turkharistan</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panâ-Khusrau, Buayd</td>
<td>28, 124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P'ang-t'ê-lê 226, 264</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parmudha, son of Shah</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piran</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pralambha dynasty</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.rvânê-žâbgû 482</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pu-ku-ts'un, Uyghur chief</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qadir-khan Qangli</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qalin b. Sh.khir, in Kan-su (?)</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qara-Khanids (Al-i Afrasiyab)</td>
<td>234, 278, 280, 287, 295, 299, 355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qara-Khitay (Liao) dynasty</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qimnaz, Russian title</td>
<td>429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qubilay</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qut-tegin (Qutegin), ruler of the Laban t. 292, 301</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qutayba b. Muslim</td>
<td>338, 340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ra'i b. Ra'i (Z'ai b. Za'i)</td>
<td>165, 476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ra's-Tarkhan</td>
<td>451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rastakuta dynasty</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravshar, see Rivshar</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Rawwad 143, 395</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rây, Indian rajah</td>
<td>62, 72, 238, cf. Ballah-rây</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>râyina [*râniya ?], Indian queen</td>
<td>87, 238, 243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.hmî, see Dahum</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R'urik</td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rüs-khäqän</td>
<td>159, 433, 436, 438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rustam</td>
<td>17, 280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rusudan, queen of Georgia</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutbil, see Zumbil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabuktigin 30, 176, 342, 344</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sa'd ibn Abi Waqqas</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Şaffâris 6, 176</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sägîhîn, title 291</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sailendra (Srivijaya) dynasty</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salmân al-Fârisî 453</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salûqiyn dynasty 91, 239, 249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sâm (Sâma b. Lu'ayy), ruler of Multân 89, 239</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sâmânids 5-6, 16, 30, 102, 175-7, 227, 270, 352, 357</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanjar, sultan 311</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarv, known to Firdausi</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sapûhâ (?), ruler in Sumatra (?)</td>
<td>87, 236, 241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satuq Bughra-khan 278, 281</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
se-li-fa, Turkish title 449
Shába, “Turkish” king 185
shad-tutug, title 278, 310
Shaddâdids 397
Sháfâ, imâm 151
shahr-salîr, king of Andarâb 109
Shâhrukh, Tlemùrid 20
Shammâkh b. Shujâ‘ 404
Shâfi‘i, imâm 151
Shâpür I 128/381
Shaqiq Balkhi 114, 354
shïr (shër), title in Bämiyän 109, 341,
and Khuttalän 359
Shâpûr I, king of Persia 128/381
Shïrvân (Shërvân), a Ghûr chief 343
Shiriyân-shäh 404, 410
Shïrvân-shäh 144, 404, 454–5.
Shu‘ayb, prophet 148
Sipahbadh-i Shahriyär-küh 135
Sïrïn’s son 139
Siyävush 174, 371
Smbat I, Bagratunid 397
S.müt-swyt (Bsmüt-swyt), cf. Swyt-
mlk 159
“Son of the Sun” 121, 369
Srivijaya, cf. Sailendra 188, 241
sübanj (zupan?) 429, 431
Sül, prince of Dihistän 311
Sulaimän ibn al-Hasan al-Qarmatï 127
Su-lu 300–1
Sunbät, see Smbat 143, 397
Svetopluk (Sventopluk) 430, 442
Sviatoslav 439
Swyt-mlk (Svyt-mlk, Svetopluk?) 428–9
tabin, title 203
Tähir b. Faḍl of Chaghâniyân 178
Tahmûrât 105
taksin title 272, 297
Taḥṣîb, title 297
Tâlha b. ‘Ubaydallâh 139

C. AUTHORIZED QUOTED

L’Abrégé des Merveilles 187, 426
Abul-Fidâ 372, 390, 453, 455–6
Abul-‘Hâzi 332, 310, 312, 357
Abû Ma’shar Balkhi 159
Abû Sahîl Ahmad b. ‘Ubaydillâh, bio-
grapher of Abû Zayd Balkhi 15
Abû Salih, The Churches of Egypt 476
Abû Zayd Balkhi, see Balkhi
Abû Zayd Muhammad Sirâfî 224, 259, 267
Ibn al-‘Adhâri [‘Idhârî] 425
Ahwardt 5
Ahmad Zald Validi, see Validi
Amari 192
Amedroz 29
Anvari 328
Aristotle xvi, 7, 51
Aristov 286, 311
Armenian Geography 32–3, 330–1, 334, 401, 445–6
Assemani 290
Ibn al-Athîr 20, 28, 245, 267, 311, 397, 421, 453
‘Aţṭâr, Farid al-dîn 354
Avesta 330, 353
al-‘Azîzî 449, 477

Bâbur-Nâma 253, 336, 354
Bacot, J. 258
Badger, G. P. 39, 396
Baghdâdi, ‘Abul-Qâdir 338

Uyghur-khan 267
Varâz-Grigor 397
waranda, title in Guzgân 106
Wang Yen-tê 269, 272
Wâthiq, caliph 11–12, 13
Wu-chîh-lê, Türgish chief 300
yabghû (jabghû), Turkish title 95, 97, 98, 275, 287, 288, 297, 303, 304, 312, cf.
jabîya; zabghû 482
Yahuda ben Barzillai 470
Yahyâ b. Zayd, imâm 335, 356
Ya‘qûb b. Layth, Saffârid 131, 345
Yaroslav of Kiev 316, 444
Yazîd b. Masyad al-Shaybânî, cf.
Mazyadîds 404
Yinal-beg-tegin (Y.nâlb.rrMn) 99, 303, cf. Bek-tegin
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D. LOCAL PRODUCTS AND SPECIALITIES

Ambergris—Hindüstän, Rämi, Santarem
Animals: Civet Cats—Sarandib; Elephants—Andràs, &c., China, Qimär, Ur.shfiin, Urshfn; Game—Ararat, Ghûz, Jabalal-Qilâl, Yaghmâ; Harts—Ighraj-art; Monkeys—Yemen; Musk-deer—Sarandib, Saukjï, Tûlas; Rhinoceros—Qämârûn, Rämi, Sarandib, Wäq-wäq; Wild Asses—mt. of the Oases, region between Egypt and Nubia; Wild Sheep—mt. of the Oases
Antidotes—Rämi, Büshang
Armour, Arms, Coats of Mail—Ghûr; Arrows—Châch, Sikâshim; Blades—Urtâb; Bows—Châch; “Solomonian” Swords—Rüs (p. 437)
Asa Foetida—Marv, Sistän

Birds: ‘Akka—on the Tarim; Faucons and Pelicans—Dihistanän-sur; Indian Cuckoos, K. krï, Parrots and Peacocks—India
Brooms—Gîlân
Caraway—Barda’
Cardamum—Sarandib
Carpets—Fârs, Rüm (tanfasa); Prayer—Gîlân, Jahrum, Mûqân; Woollen—Bukhârâ, Därzangi; Zilût—Akhlät, Arjûj, Bargri, Bidlis, Guzgân, Jahrum, Khoy, Mûqân, Nakhchuvän, Fârs, Sistän; Rugs—Amol, Fârs; Paläis-rugs—Chaghânïyan, Gujar, Mûqân; Stuff used as Carpets—Sistän, Tabaristän; cf. Gilm
Cattle—Bulgari, Hâshumkirt, Khazarian Pechenegs, Khur, Kîjkänân, Maghrib, Tûran; Asses—Egypt; Camels—Sarakhs, Shïhr, S.lâbûr; Cows—Balût, Chigil, Ghûz, Guzgân, Jalût, Kzarar, Khrïz, S.lâbûr, Tibet, Toghuzychz; Horses—Chadhghal, Chaghânïyan, Chigil, Ghûz, Guzgân, Kätün, Khallukh, Khrïz, Khuttalân, K.räl, &c., Tibet, Tukhs, Toghuzychz, Tukhrïstän, Yaghmâ; Mules—Barda’, Kish; Sheep—Balût, Chadghal, Chigil, Ghûz, Guzgân, Hâshumkirt, Inner Bulghar, Isbijäb, Jalût, Khallukh, Kzarar, Khazarian Pecheneg, Khrïz, Kh.müd, Ki-mük, N.zvân, Rang-Rong, Saylakân, Sân, Sâqläb, S.lâbûr, Tibet, Toghuzychz, Tukhs, Tukhrïstän, Yaghmâ, Zâbulistän; Vakhshi Sheep—Liv-kand; Swine—Sâqläb; Yaks—Saukjï
Cereals—Andarâb, Dihistan, Gharchistän, Mûqân, Nasâ, Nûbîn, Sîk misht, Tukhrïstän; barley—Sân'â,
Sirrayn; Millet—Saqlab, Kirmân; Rice—Daylamân; Sorghum—Mughîn, &c., Sirrayn; Wheat—San’â
Cheese (?)—Karai-i Rûdhîravâr; Rukhbin—Kâth
China (ghadârâ)—China, Rayy
Cinnamon—China, Dârin
Clothing: Aprons—Bâşra; Cloaks—Isphâhan, Rayy; Handkerchiefs—Egypt; Kerchiefs—Amol, Bulli Kerchiefs—Ubulla, Gold Shot—Amol; Puttees—Dârzangî; Quilted Garments—Kâth; Robes—Egypt; Stockings—Rûm, Tûs; Trouser-cords—Akhat, &c., Duvin, Khûzîstân, Rûm, Salâmâs, Tûs, Wâsît; Turbans—Bam, Shûsh, Bulli Turbans—Ubulla, Stuff for Turbans—Khâlkhîn, R.bînd; Woolen Taylasân—Rayy; Veils—Baylaqân, Viqâyâ
Veils—Gûzgân
Cloves—Jâba, Salâhît, Sarandib
Condiments—Marv
Coral—Hindûstân, _Tabârqa
Cords—Hemp—Samarqand
Cotton—Dahum’s country, Marv, Nîshâpûr, Qâbân, Rayy
Crinmon—Duvin
Cumim—Bûrhûgân, Kûmîn, &c.
Curtaîns—Basunay
Cushions, Covers for—Kâth

Drinks (potions?)—Baghdâd
Drugs—Farghâna, Khâlkhîn, Khorâsân, Kish, Transoxiana, mt. between Coria and Truxillo; Cassia Fistularis and Tamarind—Jab.rs;ri; Cubeb—Jâba, Salâhît; Embîlica Officinalis, Myrobolan, Terminalia Blericæ—road between Râmîyân and Jalhândar; Gentian—Gîlbarata; Tîryâk (antidote) plant—Bûshang

Electuary—Baghdâd
Fans—Tirûmîdhd
Felts—Gûzgân, Isbjâh, Kâth, Tâlaqân (Gûzgân)
Fish—Abaskûn, Arzan 1, Bankûlûs, Bûzhgân, Caspian sea, Daylamân, Mymâty 1, Majgharî; Mâhã fish—Gîlân
Frankincence—Shihr
Fruit—Ark, ‘Ayn-Zarba, Barda’, Bûkhârâ, Burûjûrûd, Diza, Farah, Kumish, Malatya, Marûd, Mizhân, Nîhâvand, Palestine, Qazvîn, Simîngân, Simnân, Tûkhårîstân; Dried—Bust; Almonds—Lahore; Apples—Istakhìr; Bananas—Bûlûs, Bankûlûs; Chestnuts—Barda’; Citrons—Amol, Balkh; Fragrant citrons—Shûsh; Yellow Citrons—Damasca, Coco-nuts—Bûlûs, Bankûlûs, Kânbayá mt. Lâhore, Sarandib, S.lâbûr; Dates—‘Abdasi, Alin, Arib, Barm, Bayâs, Farah, Bûhrgân, &c., Nahtwân, Nim-Rûdhî; Qandabil; Dried dates—Sîstân; Figs—Hûlwân; Grapes—Hamdân (p. 146), Mirvât (p. 321); Hazel-nuts—Lîshhtar, yalghûsâ, Lahore; Mulberry—Barda’; Oranges, sour—Amol, Balkh; Pomegranates—Khujand; Raisins—Karûkh, Mâlin (Tâ’isî)
Fuel—Ararat, Jabal al-Qilîl, Mîzhân
Furs—Khullukh, Khîrkhi, Kuyâbâ, N.zvân, Tûkhs, Yaghmû; Beaver—Qabala; Ermine—Tibet; Foxes, Black—Tibet, Toghuzghuz; Stripped and Red—Toghuzghuz; Grey Squirrels—Tibet, Tûlas; Lambskins—Kurdar; Sabîya (?)—Toghuzghuz; Sable Martens—Kîmûk, Tibet, Tudela, Tûlas (cf. pp. 196, 278); Weasel—Barâdha, Tibet

Gilims (Tapestry Woven Carpets)—Dârzangî, Pârs, Wâsîît; Blue—Rûdhân; Kûmîsh Gilims—Amol
Glass—see Nîsîbîn and p. 165
Glaze-ware—Baghdâd, Rayy (?)
Grape-syrup—Araghân, Baun, Herat

Honey—Adharbayjân, Armenia, Arrân, Saqlâb, S.lâbûr

Insects and Reptiles: Crocodiles—Bu’sir; Flies (carnivorous)—Sarir; Mosquitoes (pashsha)—Nîh, Tamiisha; Scorpions—Kâshân, Nîsîbîn, Hîms, Tabarqa; Snakes—Ahwûz, Artûj, Hîms, Nîsîbîn

Khâvkhîr, Chinese—China
Khûtû-Horn—China, Khîrkhi, Tibet

Leather—Anbîr, Sind

Mahfûrî [Plates?]—Khûrsân
Manna (shirkhisht)—Herat (cf. p. 343) (tarangabîn)—Kish
Mats—‘Abbadân, Amol, Gîlân, Mâm-îtîr; Green—Tirûmîdhd
Metals: Copper—Bârijân mt., Cyprus, Farghâna, Georgian mts., Gûzgân, Kîrmân, Sardan, Spain, Tûs; Gold—Abyssinia, Akhsikah, Badhakshân, China, Chinese mts.; Farghâna, Gold is., Gûzgân, Iâfl, Jabal al-Qamar, al-Jazâ’ir al-khâliya, Khûrsân, Khut-talân, Kîrmân, Muqatçam mt., N.zvân, Pârs, Qâmarûn, Râbût-i Karân, Rang-Rong, R.bûshûrân, between Rûm and Armenia, Sands of the Mines, Sarir, Şâtîf, Sijilmâsa, Spain, the Südân, Sûs-the-Distant, Transoxiana, Wâq-Wâq,

Minerals: Ammoniac—Buttâman, Farghânâ, Transoxiana; Antimony—Güzgân, Sâmâr, Tûs; Arsenic—Transoxiana, Dakhkhât, Kuchâ [p. 226]; Bexorâ Stone—Farghânâ; Bitumen—Dârâgîrd; Crystal—Baghdâd; Emery—Qâmarûn, Sârî; Glass Stone—Nisîbûn (cp. p. 393); Lode Stone—Bâri-jân, Farghânâ, Kîrmân; Marble-like Stone—Simin-gân; Naphtha—Bâkû; Plasma—Cyp-rus; Salt—Abbadûn, Dârâgîrd, Kasmir, Kuhak, Limrâsk, Rûdhrâvar, Q{//p. 296}; Black and Yellow Salt—Dârâgîrd; Red Salt—Dârâgîrd, Kish; Saltpetre—Bukhârâ; Mekkan Sand—Arab country; Red Sand—Habîr; Schists, Combustible (?)—Farghânâ; Sulphur—Transoxiana; Vitriol—Güz-gân, Transoxiana

Musk—Baytâl, Bîhârî, Mûsa, Kîrk-hîz, Tibet, Tohguzghuz, Tukhs, Vayhind

Napkins, Dessert—Dâmghân
Nutmeg—Sarandib
Oil—Baghdâd, Rayy (? see p. 384)

Paper—Samarqand
Pearls—'Aden, Hindûstân, Gânâfa sea, Khârâb, Khurmânâ, Râmî, Sarandib
Pepper—Kanbâya mt., Malay, Ur.shîfîn
Perfumed Waters—Sârî; Palm-blossom, Rose and Santoline—Gûr; Saffron and Sandalwood—Sârî; Vîlet—Pârs

Plants: Indigo—Bahrûgân; Madder—Barda', Jazîrat al-Bâb, Mûqân; Saffron—Bûrûgîrd, Chaghchîyânâ, Darband-i Khazarân, Durghush, Karajî Rûdhrâvar, Nihâvand, Qum, Shûmân, Vayshagîr; Sûsan-i Nargis Flower—Shiraz; Tabârkûhân—Farghânâ; Water Lilies—Balikh

Precious Stones—Fîma, Khorâsân, Vayhind; Chrysolites—Mt. of the Oases; Corundum—Hindûstân, Sarandib, Tâbarnâ; Diamonds—Hindûstân, Sarandib; Lapis Lazuli—Baghdâd, Rayy (see p. 384); Lapis of the Oases; Lead—Khorâsân, Dârûb, Gûzgân, Kûhâk, Limrâsk, Rûdhrâvar, Nihâvand, Qum, Shûmân, Vayshagîr; Sûsan-i Nargis Flower—Shiraz; Tabârkûhân—Farghânâ; Water Lilies—Balikh

Precious Stones—Fîma, Khorâsân, Vayhind; Chrysolites—Mt. of the Oases; Corundum—Hindûstân, Sarandib, Tâbarnâ; Diamonds—Hindûstân, Sarandib; Emeralds—Mt. of the Oases; Garnets—Bahrûgân, Mt. of the Oases; jade—Khorâsân; Lapis Lazuli—Bahrûgân, Rubies—S.înîjî; Turquoise—Tûs

Qaras—Maghrîb (p. 417)

Red Abânk (?)—Sind

Sacks—Mûqân
Saddle-bags—Güzgân; Saddle-cloths, Covers for—Sîkâshîm; Saddle-girths—Güzgân; Horse-rugs—Baylaqân

Shagreen—Abâskûn

Shank (“White Conch”)—Dahûm’s country

Shoes—Bârsa, Kânâyân, Sind; Yemenn—Sâ’dâ

Silk—Barda’, China, Nishpûr, Mul- ham—Egypt; Raw—Gûzgân, Kho-tan, Mary; Textiles—Astarâbâdî, Baghdâd, Ishpâhân (“Attâbî, Sîglîyân”), Nishpûr, Rûm, Sârî, Black—Gûz-gân; Khazz—Egypt, cf. p. 382; Sun- dus—Rûm; Za’fûr (?)—Astarâbâdî

Skins—Sâ’dâ, Sind, Tâ’îf; Leopard—Berbers; Lizard—Malaga; Panther—Sûs-the-Distant


Snow—Kath, Mîzhân
Soap—Bust, Tîrmîdîh
Spices—Sarandib

Spikenard—Jâba, Salâhit, Sarandib

Stone Kettles—Nauqân

String Instruments—Sâqîlân country

Sugar—Khûzistân, S.âbûr; Red and Refined—Askar-i Mukrân; Candy—Bahrûgân, etc., Kiz, etc.; Cake—Bahrûgân, etc., Balikh, Bûlûs, Balût, Jalût, Mila

Sweets—Filâtâ—Mary; Nâtîf—Baylaqân

Tents—Tûkh

Textiles—Ardadîvî, Astarâbâdî, Barzand, Baylaqân, Dîmîyât, Gânâwa, ‘Irâq, Ishpâhân, Jâlhandar, Jîbâl, Khorâsân, Khûzistân, Kûmish, Nishpûr, Pârs, Rûm, Shûsh, Sirzûz, Tavaz; Brocades—China, Gûzgân, Ùdha (Shûshtar?), Rûm; Cotton Stuffs—Baghdâd, Bâm, Bârsa, Bust, Buzhâgân, etc., Herat, Kât, Kuri, Nishpûr, Pârs, Rayy; Linen Cloth—Amol, Bârsa, Dânqara, Darband-i Khazarân, Dhamira, Dîm- yât, Pârs, Sâqâlân, Tînnîs; Maysânî—Rûm; Precious Stuffs—Shûsh, Vayhind; Sûzangîrîd—Qurqûb; Velvet—
Jalhandar, Khâlkhîn; Woollen Stuffs—Abaskûn, Chaghâniyân, Dimyât, Ganja, Khursân, Marand, Shamkûr, Pars, Tînis; Red Woollen Stuffs—Rûdhân

Touch-Stone (mîhakk)—Shävarän; Whet-Stone (fasän)—Arab country, Radwa m., Tihäma, Tüs

Trees: Aloes—Dahum’s country, al-Jurz, Mandai, Qämarün, Qimär, 'Ar'ar—Bushang; Bamboo—Kala, Kanbäya m., Sarandib; Boxwood—Amol; Brazil Wood—Râmi, Sarandib; Camphor—Balûs, Haranj, India, S.rïl, Zäbaj; Cotton-Tree—Andràs; Ebony—Silver is., Ashmûnayn; Khadang and Khalanj—Chäch, Khirkhîz, cf. p. 465; Khînîn (“White tree”—Gûzgân; Rotans—kanbâya m., Malay, Ur.shïfn; Sandal—Jâba, al-Jurz, Salâhît; Red Sandal—Salüqiyin; Teak—Silver is.; Timber—Jabal al-Qîlîl, Khoy, &c. (?)

E: SELECTION OF CATCHWORDS

abâdîn, “prosperous” 37, 53 and pas-sim; abâdînî, “inhabited lands” 54; “oeicumene” 83, “prosperous place” 85, &c.


Vinegar—Marv Wax—Ädharbayjân, Armenia, Arrân Wine—K.n.d.m, Rayy, Şaqlîb, Sîmir-gân, Surûsna, Taleâqân Wooden Utensils—Amol, Daylamân; Wine Vessels—Şaqlîb Wool, dyed—Wâsit

Wooden Utensils—Amol, Daylamân; Wine Vessels—Şaqlîb Wool, dyed—Wâsit

Wooden Utensils—Amol, Daylamân; Wine Vessels—Şaqlîb Wool, dyed—Wâsit
Muslims in outlying lands 88, 90–1, 93
112, 119, 120–2, 136, 162
nähiyat, “country” 47 and passim;
direction” 62; “district” 84; “parts” 66; “province” 123; “region” 123; “side” 53, &c.
Nestorians 290
nighūshâk, “auditores” 113
ni mat, “amenities”, passim; “resources” 126; “well-being” 162; bâ
ni mat, “pleasant, favoured by nature” [“well-endowed”] passim
Persian language of Gurgân 134
qurday, “pelican” 303
rustâ, “district” 61, 74, 104, 119; Rûstâ [sic]-Rüstâm 128; Rûstâ-Blijm 121
sabil, “charitable gift” 398
Sâbiyân, “Sâbians” 12, 141; “Buddhists (?)” 95
Sâhâri, Muslims in Râmiyân 90
Sapîd-jâmagan 117; mubayyida 356
The Seven Sleepers 204
sayyâd “fishermen” 60, 93 (?) 124, 126; “hunters” 60, 93, 95
shamani, “Buddhist” 84
shank (sankha), conchs 242
stâsijân (“spâšk”) 409
Soghdian language 99, 185, 229, 231, 271, 273, 300, 369
Sûltân “governor, government” 89, &c.
Sun-worship 99, 121
jaylasân, “gulf” 391
taxes: bar-âb 105, 108; bridge-toll 398;
dah-yak 159; gate-toll 120; kharâj 157; maritime customs 162; sar-gazit 92; ushr 139, 392; cf. mash
thâghr, “military frontier” 133, 143–4, 148–9, 152, 470
Tukharian language 304, 359, 369, 445
türk, “strength” 264
Turkân-i âshî, “trucial Turks” 118–19
vaulted buildings 124, 374
wind-mills 110
yabaqu, “felt-wool” 288
yâdhâ’âr 49, 145
yasî, “broad”
yîgâh, “farsang” 290
Zoroastrian (gabrân, gabrakân) 95, 105, 121, 126, 269; Bihâfarîdî 105
Zûn (Zûn), Indian god 345